Andrews University

Digital Commons @ Andrews University

Dissertations

Graduate Research

2009

The Demographics, Psychographics, Reasons for Giving, and Reasons for Not Giving of Alumni Donors and Nondonors to Two Seventh-day Adventist Universities

Carol A. Bradfield
Andrews University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Educational Psychology Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bradfield, Carol A., "The Demographics, Psychographics, Reasons for Giving, and Reasons for Not Giving of Alumni Donors and Nondonors to Two Seventh-day Adventist Universities" (2009). *Dissertations*. 1704.
<https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations/1704>
<https://dx.doi.org/10.32597/dissertations/1704>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact repository@andrews.edu.

ABSTRACT

THE DEMOGRAPHICS, PSYCHOGRAPHICS, REASONS FOR GIVING,
AND REASONS FOR NOT GIVING OF ALUMNI DONORS
AND NONDONORS TO TWO SEVENTH-DAY
ADVENTIST UNIVERSITIES

by

Carol Ann Bradfield

Chair: Shirley Freed

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Dissertation

Andrews University

School of Education

Title: THE DEMOGRAPHICS, PSYCHOGRAPHICS, REASONS FOR GIVING,
AND REASONS FOR NOT GIVING OF ALUMNI DONORS AND
NONDONORS TO TWO SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST UNIVERSITIES

Name of researcher: Carol Ann Bradfield

Name and degree of faculty chair: Shirley Freed, Ph.D.

Date completed: March 2009

Problem

Adventist universities rely on donor support. The predictors of Adventist alumni giving behavior are vital in order to optimize the fundraising capability of a university, but perceptions of who gives among Adventist alumni and why they give or do not give are *not* based on research.

Method

This empirical study analyzed the relationships between independent variables (demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving) and dependent variables (donor status, level of support measured by largest gift and

cumulative gift total, and frequency of support measured by percentage of gift years). The dependent variables were derived from gift data of two comprehensive Adventist universities. The independent variables were created from responses to a survey mailed to alumni of the Universities. The Identification Theory, rather than social exchange, altruism, or obligation theories, was used as a framework for the reasons for giving and not giving. Chi-square, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and correlation tests were used to analyze the relationships between individual variables; multiple regression tests were used to analyze models composed of selected variables.

Results

Significant differences between donors and nondonors and significant relationships with level and frequency of support variables existed for all four types of independent variables. Being older, having a spouse with a degree, and receiving the highest degree earlier were demographic predictors of donors. Psychographic predictors of giving behavior included: giving to more than three nonprofits and being involved with the University. Reasons for giving predictive of giving behavior included: being asked to give, believing in the mission, respecting past and current faculty, and returning help as one was helped.

Conclusions

The discovery of predictors of Adventist alumni giving behavior will assist university personnel both in identifying alumni who are potential donors and preparing effective funding proposals to optimize philanthropic education and resource acquisition.

Additional study of the relationships between the various predictors of Adventist alumni giving behavior is recommended. Encouraging philanthropy, in general, by alumni appears to enhance alumni-giving behavior to their Adventist alma mater.

Andrews University

School of Education

THE DEMOGRAPHICS, PSYCHOGRAPHICS, REASONS FOR GIVING,
AND REASONS FOR NOT GIVING OF ALUMNI DONORS
AND NONDONORS TO TWO SEVENTH-DAY
ADVENTIST UNIVERSITIES

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Carol Ann Bradfield

March 2009

© Copyright by Carol Ann Bradfield 2009
All Rights Reserved

THE DEMOGRAPHICS, PSYCHOGRAPHICS, REASONS FOR GIVING,
AND REASONS FOR NOT GIVING OF ALUMNI DONORS
AND NONDONORS TO TWO SEVENTH-DAY
ADVENTIST UNIVERSITIES

A dissertation
presented in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Carol Ann Bradfield

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

Chair: Shirley Freed

Dean, School of Education
James Jeffery

Member: Jerome Thayer

Member: Lilya Wagner

External: Timothy Seiler

3.20.09
Date approved

Dedication

For my parents

Pam and Gerald Clifford

exemplary Adventist teachers

who by their creativity, generosity, and wisdom

(from as far back as I can remember)

encourage inquiry, learning, and thinking

for me

and countless others.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	x
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	xv

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION	1
Background to the Problem	1
Higher Education	2
Adventist Institutions and Challenges	5
Statement of the Problem	11
Purpose	12
Research Questions	12
General Methods	13
Conceptual Framework	14
Social Exchange Theories	14
Identification Theory	16
Significance	17
Delimitations	19
Limitations	21
Definition of Terms	21
Organization of the Study	23
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	24
An Overview	24
Demographics and Psychographics of Donors	26
Demographics and Psychographics of Donors to Higher Education	28
Demographics and Psychographics of Alumni of Independent and Faith-based Institutions	28
General Demographics	30

Educational Demographics	45
Summary of Demographics as Related to Donor Status and Giving Levels	49
Psychographics	51
Summary of Psychographics as Related to Donor Status and Giving Levels	57
Reasons for Giving by Donors in General	58
Influential Reasons for Giving by Wealthy Donors	62
Practitioner Wisdom and Anecdotes	62
Donor Models	64
Theories of Giving	67
Social Exchange Theory	69
Identification Theory	71
Reasons for Alumni Giving to Higher Education	74
Reasons Alumni Give to Independent and Faith-Based Institutions	75
Communities of Participation	76
Frameworks of Consciousness	82
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards	83
Invitation to Participate	85
Urgency and Effectiveness	85
Youth Models and Experiences	86
Reasons for Not Giving in Higher Education	86
Discretionary Resources	87
Negative Attitudes, Experiences, Perceptions, and Beliefs	90
Highlights of Alumni Donor Reasons for Giving and Not Giving	91
Seventh-day Adventist Advancement	93
Demographics, Psychographics, and Reasons for Giving by Adventists	94
Summary of Adventist Donor Demographics	99
Final Word	100
 3. METHODOLOGY	 101
Introduction	101
Research Questions	101
Research Design	103
Population and Sample	103
Instrument	104
Construction of the Survey	105
Validity	107
Definition of Variables	108
Reasons for Giving and Reasons for Not Giving—Clusters and Scales ...	109
Communities of Participation	110
Frameworks of Consciousness	110

Discretionary Resources	111
Invitation to Participate	111
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards	112
Urgency and Effectiveness	112
Youth Models and Experiences	112
Reliability of Scales	113
Psychographics—Scales	116
Procedures	118
Response	119
Data Analysis	120
Hypotheses	122
Summary	123
 4. RESEARCH FINDINGS	 124
Introduction	124
Descriptive Statistics of the Sample	124
Demographics	125
Psychographics	128
Attitudes Toward the University	128
Financial Support of the University	129
General Giving Patterns	135
Religious Life	138
Reasons for Giving Items	140
Reasons for Not Giving Items	142
Most Important Reasons for Giving	144
Least Important Reasons for Giving	144
Most Important Reasons for Not Giving	148
Least Important Reasons for Not Giving	150
Dependent Variables	150
Results for Research Question 1	153
Demographics and Donor Status	154
Psychographics and Donor Status	154
Summary for Research Question 1	158
Results for Research Question 2	158
Demographics and Level of Support	160
Demographics and Frequency of Support	162
Psychographics and Level of Support	162
Psychographics and Frequency of Support	165
Summary for Research Question 2	168
Results for Research Question 3	169
Reasons for Giving Scales and Donor Status	169
Reasons for Giving Items and Donor Status	170

Reasons for Not Giving Scales and Donor Status	170
Reasons for Not Giving Items and Donor Status	172
Summary for Research Question 3	172
Results for Research Question 4	175
Reasons for Giving and Level and Frequency of Support	175
Reasons for Not Giving and Level and Frequency of Support	176
Summary for Research Question 4	177
Results for Research Question 5	178
Demographics and Donor Status	180
Psychographics and Donor Status	181
Reasons for Giving Scales and Donor Status	182
Reasons for Giving Items and Donor Status	183
Reasons for Not Giving Scales and Donor Status	184
Reasons for Not Giving Items and Donor Status	184
Predictors of Donors and Nondonors	185
Results for Research Question 6	185
Demographics and Level of Support	187
Psychographics and Level of Support	187
Reasons for Giving Items and Level of Support	188
Reasons for Not Giving Items and Level of Support	190
Results for Research Question 7	192
Demographics and Frequency of Support	193
Psychographics and Frequency of Support	193
Reasons for Giving Items and Frequency of Support	194
Reasons for Not Giving Items and Frequency of Support	195
Results for Research Question 8	196
Summary of Results	197
Demographics	200
Donor Status	201
Level of Support	201
Frequency of Support	201
Psychographics	201
Donor Status	203
Level of Support	203
Frequency of Support	203
Reasons for Giving	204
Donor Status	204
Level of Support	207
Frequency of Support	207
Summary of All Result Categories for Reasons for Giving	208
Reasons for Not Giving	211
Donor Status	211
Level of Support	211

Frequency of Support	213
Summary of All Result Categories for Reasons for Not Giving	213
5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	216
Introduction	216
Overview of the Literature	217
Methodology	221
General Results	223
Interpreting Results	224
Donor Status	226
Results for Demographics With Donor Status	226
Results for Psychographics and Donor Status	227
Results for Reasons for Giving Items and Donor Status	227
Results for Reasons for Not Giving Items and Donor Status	227
Results for Reasons for Giving Scales With Donor Status	227
Level of Support	228
Results for Psychographics and Level of Support	228
Results for Reasons for Giving Items and Level of Support	228
Results for Reasons for Not Giving Items and Level of Support	229
Frequency of Support	229
Results for Psychographics and Frequency of Support	229
Results for Reasons for Giving Items and Frequency of Support	230
Results for Reasons for Not Giving Items and Frequency of Support	230
Summary of Results	230
Discussion	233
Differences From Other Studies	233
Findings That Were Similar to Other Studies	237
Level and Frequency of Support	239
Alignment With Theories	240
Recommendations	241
Implications for Development Staff	241
Implications for University Administrators	243
Implications for Researchers	244
Conclusions	246
Appendix	
A. DEMOGRAPHICS AND PSYCHOGRAPHICS NOT CHOSEN FOR THE SURVEY	249

B. NONSIGNIFICANT RESULTS	251
C. COPY OF THE SURVEYS	277
D. CORRESPONDENCE	286
REFERENCE LIST	292

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Demographics and Psychographics of Alumni From Faith-based and Independent Colleges and Universities—Donor Status	31
2.	Demographics and Psychographics of Alumni From Faith-based and Independent Colleges and Universities—Level of Giving	33
3.	Comparison of Donors' Rating of Reasons for Giving	65
4.	Summary of Reasons for Giving of the Seven Faces of Philanthropy	68
5.	Reasons for Giving by Alumni From Faith-Based and Independent Colleges and Universities—Donor Status	77
6.	Reasons for Giving by Alumni From Faith-Based and Independent Colleges and Universities—Giving Level	80
7.	Reasons for Not Giving by Alumni From Faith-Based and Independent Colleges and Universities	88
8.	Attributes of Adventist Donors Related to Giving Behavior	95
9.	Composition of Reasons for Giving Scales	114
10.	Composition of Reasons for Not Giving Scales	115
11.	Reliability of the Clusters of Reasons for Giving	115
12.	Reliability of the Clusters of Reasons for Not Giving	116
13.	Categories and Cutoff Points for Comparison of Variables	121
14.	Demographics of Respondents: Descriptive Statistics	126
15.	Psychographic Scales—Respondents' General Attitudes Toward the University: Descriptive Statistics	128

16.	Psychographic Items—Respondents' General Attitudes Toward the University: Descriptive Statistics	130
17.	Psychographic Items—Financial Support of the University—Respondents' Opinion of the Extent Stakeholders Should Support the University: Descriptive Statistics	131
18.	Psychographic Items—Financial Support of the University—Frequency of University Requests and Gifts: Descriptive Statistics	132
19.	Psychographic Items—Financial Support of the University—Responses to Method of Solicitation: Descriptive Statistics	133
20.	Psychographic Items—Financial Support of the University—Input Into Giving Decisions: Descriptive Statistics	134
21.	Psychographic Items—General Giving Patterns: Descriptive Statistics	135
22.	Psychographic Items—General Giving Patterns—Gift and Volunteer Support of Various Types of Nonprofits: Descriptive Statistics	136
23.	Psychographic Scales—General Giving Patterns: Descriptive Statistics	137
24.	Psychographic Scales—Religious Life: Descriptive Statistics	138
25.	Psychographic Items—Religious Life: Descriptive Statistics	139
26.	Psychographic Items—Religious Life—Offering Amounts: Descriptive Statistics	140
27.	Reasons for Giving Items: Descriptive Statistics	141
28.	Reasons for Not Giving Items: Descriptive Statistics	143
29.	Most Important Reasons for Giving of Donors and Nondonors: Rating	145
30.	Least Important Reasons for Giving of Donors and Nondonors: Rating	147
31.	Most Important Reasons for Not Giving of Donors and Nondonors: Rating ..	149
32.	Least Important Reasons for Not Giving of Donors and Nondonors: Rating ..	151

33.	Dependent Variables: Descriptive Statistics	153
34.	Donor Status and Demographics: Significant Differences—Chi-Square	155
35.	Donor Status and Psychographics: Significant Differences—Chi-Square	156
36.	Donor Status and Psychographics: Significant Differences—ANOVA	157
37.	Dependent Variables: Frequencies	160
38.	Largest Gift and Demographics: Significant Relationships—ANOVA	161
39.	Cumulative Gifts and Demographics: Significant Relationships—ANOVA ..	161
40.	Percentage Gift Years and Demographics: Significant Relationships— ANOVA	163
41.	Measures of Level of Support and Psychographics: Significant Relationships—Correlations	163
42.	Largest Gift and Psychographics: Significant Results—ANOVA	164
43.	Cumulative Gifts and Psychographics: Significant Results—ANOVA	165
44.	Percentage Gift Years and Psychographics: Significant Relationships— Correlations	166
45.	Percentage Gift Years and Psychographics: Significant Relationships— ANOVA	167
46.	Donor Status and Reasons for Giving Scales: Significant Differences— ANOVA	170
47.	Donor Status and Reasons for Giving Items: Significant Differences— ANOVA	171
48.	Donor Status and Reasons for Not Giving Scales: Significant Differences— ANOVA	172
49.	Donor Status and Reasons for Not Giving Items: Significant Differences —ANOVA	173

50.	Measures of Support & Reasons for Giving: Significant Relationships— Correlations	176
51.	Measures of Support and Reasons for Not Giving: Significant Relationships —Correlations	177
52.	Demographics Model and Donor Status: Multiple Regression	180
53.	Psychographics Model and Donor Status: Multiple Regression	181
54.	Reasons for Giving Scales Model and Donor Status: Multiple Regression ...	182
55.	Reasons for Giving Items Model and Donor Status: Multiple Regression	183
56.	Reasons for Not Giving Items Model and Donor Status: Multiple Regression .	184
57.	Prediction Rates for Donors and Nondonors: Discriminant Analysis	186
58.	Psychographics Model and Cumulative Gifts: Multiple Regression	187
59.	Psychographics Model and Largest Gift: Multiple Regression	188
60.	Reasons for Giving Items Model and Cumulative Gifts: Multiple Regression .	189
61.	Reasons for Giving Items Model and Largest Gift: Multiple Regression	190
62.	Reasons for Not Giving Items Model and Cumulative Gifts: Multiple Regression	191
63.	Reasons for Not Giving Items Model and Largest Gift: Multiple Regression ..	192
64.	Psychographics Model and Percentage Gift Years: Multiple Regression	194
65.	Reasons for Giving Items Model and Percentage Gift Years: Multiple Regression	195
66.	Reasons for Not Giving Items Model and Percentage Gift Years: Multiple Regression	195
67.	Level of Support With Frequency of Support: Multiple Regression	196
68.	Explained Variance Values for Tested Models	198

69.	Demographics That Were Significant Alone or Good-in-the-Model for Donor Status, Level of Support, and Frequency of Support	200
70.	Psychographics That Were Significant Alone or Good-in-the-Model for Donor Status, Level, and Frequency of Support	202
71.	Reasons for Giving That Were Significant or Good-in-the-Model for Donor Status, Level of Support, and Frequency of Support	205
72.	Reasons for Giving in Order of Importance as Rated by Alumni	209
73.	Reasons for Not Giving That Were Significant or Good-in-the-Model for Donor Status, Level of Support, and Frequency of Support	212
74.	Reasons for Not Giving in Order of Importance	214
75.	Predictors of Giving Behavior	232

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My heartfelt thanks goes to dozens of individuals all of whom significantly increased the probability that I would complete this dissertation and without whom it would still be a dream. I am grateful for each person and wish that I could name everyone, but alas, that is impossible. Those who are mentioned also represent the many others who helped in one or more ways to make this a better dissertation.

THANK YOU TO:

The multitude of family members, friends and colleagues with whom I am blessed that: encouraged, asked about my progress, discussed the project, gave me ideas, and rejoiced with me on successful completion.

Fred and Jean Thomas for being part of the postcard mailing assembly line.

Sylvia Clarke for careful editing and gracious encouragement.

Advancement staff at La Sierra for cheerfully adapting to my less-than-predictable work schedule.

Larry Geraty and Jeff Kaatz for providing the supportive environment and resources necessary for an employee to combine research, a study program and work.

Glynis Bradfield for being a dissertation production partner who bridged the distance between California and Michigan when documents had to be printed and delivered on a tight schedule.

The members of the Western Leadership Learning Group (Anthony, Eddy, Eileen, Lynda, Mike, Paul, Yami) for your reading, critiques, useful and practical suggestions after being the safe haven where I could try out ideas, writing, and presentations.

James and Carol Bradfield for making your home my home away from home providing everything from laundry service to a stapler and just enough recreation to keep me sane. You also helped double check figures in the tables and then held a celebration party.

Pam and Gerald Clifford for spending even precious holidays editing and thinking through my proposal, encouraging and instilling in me the value of curiosity, education and inclusion.

Bonnie Proctor for generously reviewing parts of the dissertation, answering questions and advising on style above and beyond the call of duty.

Tim Seiler for fitting a dissertation reading and defense into his schedule as an external committee member, asking thoughtful questions and helping me integrate theory and practice.

Lilya Wagner for being there when it counted; introducing me to the literature in philanthropy, connecting me with premiere researchers in the field, and making my work available for Adventist organizations and their staff.

Jerome Thayer for continuing to be the statistician on the committee even though retired. Jerry spent hours patiently guiding me through the maze of variables, ideas, research questions, and analysis; taught me SPSS syntax; and helped me learn and

discover by asking probing questions, ensuring that I not only knew what I had done, but why I had done it and how to defend it as a scholar.

Shirley Freed for being a treasured friend and a dissertation committee chair who listened, prayed, praised, solved problems, stayed with me even though it was “quantitative.” Shirley reminded me that I did not have to include every variable or answer every question—there was life beyond this research for other projects. Shirley also validated my decisions to detour on the study journey so that I could take in some other priorities that I would have deeply regretted missing.

Finally, Neville Bradfield—my husband—for patiently enduring and persistently encouraging, even mandating that we not go out, “so you can study,” cooking, photocopying, stuffing surveys in envelopes, formatting tables, keeping my technology functional, building filing cabinets to store “dissertation stuff” and still having it overflow on every available surface, rescuing me and . . . You are the dissertation production partner that everyone wishes for—this is OUR dissertation!

EVERYONE—THANK YOU!

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Problem

The world faces numerous challenges that both adversely affect and threaten the existence of humankind. These problems include the uneven accessibility to resources, power, and human rights; inequities in living standards, individual empowerment, and access to education; and the prevalence of disease, injustice, racial conflict, and continued destruction of the environment. Educated individuals play an essential role in solving and ameliorating these problems. Education empowers some individuals with knowledge and skills thus enhancing their ability to earn resources so they can create solutions and support themselves and others. Education also helps individuals to reach their potential and live productively. Some observers believe that only an educated world citizenry will be able to successfully confront the challenges that face the welfare of the individual, community, nation, and global community (P. M. Buchanan, 2000). In addition, the realization of social and economic progress requires an investment in a quality education (Newell, 2005). While there are many types of education, higher education is a major force in the lives of leaders and change agents such as connectors, mavens, and salesmen (Gladwell, 2000).

Recognized philanthropists such as Reverend John Harvard, Leland Stanford, and John D. Rockefeller established and supported universities by their contributions to solve problems in the New World (Caulkins, Cole, Hardoby, & Keyser, 2002). This illustrates how successful solutions to societal and environmental problems occur at the intersection of two resources, education and philanthropy. Philanthropic revenue continues to be critical for colleges and universities that provide either solutions or empowerment through education to individuals who then solve problems. Philanthropists have consistently given liberally to education. Of all the nonprofit recipients of philanthropy in the United States, education is consistently the second largest beneficiary, receiving on average over the last 9 years 14% of all gifts, up slightly from the average 12.2% over the 40 years ending in 2002 (The Center on Philanthropy, 2004, p. 27). Religion has consistently garnered the largest percentage—over the last 10 years an average of 37% of all philanthropic dollars, down slightly from the 44.9% that is the 40-year average (The Center on Philanthropy, 2004, p. 27; 1999, 2000, 2001b, 2002, 2003, 2005, 2006, 2007).

Higher Education

Tuition alone cannot solve the high cost of higher education (Jarrell, 2004). Therefore, other sources of revenue are destined to play a major role in the revenue stream of universities and colleges. There is intense competition for revenue in higher education since enrollments fluctuate and government funding is static or decreasing. Sources of income continue to be: fees for services, for example, tuition, room, board and research; church and government subsidies; and private donations.

Roda (1972) recommended that for Adventist colleges and universities in the United States to maintain financial stability, increasing the philanthropic support (alumni giving) would be advantageous, if not essential (pp. 190, 193). Philanthropic revenue (income from one-time gifts and invested endowments) assists in balancing the operational costs. Private donations also contribute to the edge of excellence that meets the demands and expectations of stakeholders for constantly improved quality in higher education (Caulkins et al., 2002). On occasion, the deciding factor in whether an institution stays open or closes its doors is the number and level of private contributions. As Michael Hooker declared, "Advancement professionals who can identify audience needs and be flexible in delivering information . . . will play a major role in determining which colleges and universities flourish or fail in the 21st century" (P. M. Buchanan, 2000, p. 14).

The department charged with the responsibility for tapping into philanthropic sources or fundraising is the advancement office. Peter Buchanan, a consultant in advancement and President Emeritus of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), notes that,

given this unprecedented responsibility in a competition for resources and reputation within a revolution of unknown power and complexity, it is little wonder that the field of institutional advancement has become increasingly important to the academy. It is a field of endeavor now considered one of the three or four most important administrative portfolios in American higher education. (P. M. Buchanan, 2000, p. 6)

Gifts are critical, and the competition for donors' dollars, by all nonprofits, is significant and intensifying due to both the proliferation of nonprofits (more than 1 million in 2005,

an increase of 67% in 10 years; Rooney, 2006) and the reticence of individuals to trust their gifts to nonprofits. Thus, the Advancement staff must use the best practices in organizational structure. They must also know the donors (or publics) in order to assist philanthropists to meet their needs and goals and effectively develop and increase the philanthropic revenue stream to the institution.

Private contributions to colleges and universities are typically given by three types of donors: corporations, foundations (corporate, family, or community), and individuals. Between 1964 and 1998 it was estimated that 77% to 85% of all donations were made by individuals (Weitzman, Jalandoni, Lampkin, & Pollak, 2001, p. 59). In *Giving USA 2005* (The Center on Philanthropy, 2006), giving from living individuals and bequests comprised 84% of total giving in 2004 (p. 16). In addition, individuals were the founders of foundations, distributors of foundation assets, and managers of corporate philanthropy which were the other sources of philanthropy. Thus individuals either give or influence *all* gifts to organizations (The Center on Philanthropy, 2005). Therefore, it is critical to encourage individuals in their philanthropy so as to maintain and increase the revenue streams for nonprofits.

In addition, there are several generations of individuals now who have philanthropic capacity, that is, great wealth and discretionary resources (time, money, and influence; Havens & Schervish, 1999, p. 13; Havens, O'Herlihy, & Schervish, 2006). In order to develop meaningful relationships with philanthropists that will result in resources for the institution, staff at nonprofits need to know their individual constituents and how to meet their needs so they can provide meaningful service. Alumni, individuals who

already have a connection to the university, are the first individuals to whom proactive advancement professionals should turn. Kelly (1997) sums it up when she notes that

organizations succeed and survive depending on how well they manage interdependencies with numerous stakeholders, or those critical constituencies that can influence organizational goals. Donors are enabling stakeholders whose resources are needed to varying degrees by organizations, and donors look to recipients of their gifts for various returns (i.e., they engage in a social exchange). (p. 141)

Where survival is concerned, fundraisers need more than an anecdotal knowledge of whom the donors are as well as why and how much they give and to whom (Wolpert, 1997). They need facts and knowledge based in sound research. Fundraisers also need to develop a knowledge and understanding of donor motivations and barriers for giving among donors (Myers, 2000; Sargeant & Kahler, 1999). Armed with this knowledge, development officers may "be more effective in every stage of the development process" (Myers, 2000, p. 44).

There are also increasing numbers of nonprofits actively seeking donors in more sophisticated ways throughout the nonprofit world. Therefore in state, secular, independent, and faith-based higher education, one segment of the nonprofit world, "it would be intellectually and practically important to carry out a multivariate analysis of the variables that predict level of giving to educational institutions" (Schervish, 1997a, p. 133).

Adventist Institutions and Challenges

What was true two decades ago, the challenge of raising private funds being

"increasingly important for both public and private institutions of higher education," is still true today (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990, pp. 1, 2). Adventist colleges and universities need greater efficiency in philanthropic resource acquisition for the same reasons that other colleges and universities, especially independent institutions, need it. The intense competition among charitable organizations, both educational and other nonprofits, is one factor that affects giving (P. M. Buchanan, 2000, p. 68). Another factor is that the percentage of support by alumni, the category of donors who provide the largest proportion of support to colleges and universities, has remained basically constant for the decade (1997-2007). The range was from 25% to 30% (Kaplan, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2008).

Further, the relatively recent entry of Adventist institutions onto the philanthropic scene in the 1980s (Knott, 1992, p. 111), their slow growth, and the decline and/or fluctuations of alternative and traditional revenue streams (such as investment income, church appropriations, and government subsidies) increase the pressure on resources. And finally, there continue to be new as well as ongoing pressing capital and programmatic needs for resources. Philanthropy (voluntary private donations) offers substantial, realistic, and potential addition to revenue sources. In turn, there is pressure on Advancement (alumni and public relations and particularly development) staff at Adventist colleges and universities to increase the total amount of private support and widen the circle of institutional friends and family members.

Kelly (1997) stated that research in three areas is necessary for successful advancement endeavors: "(1) the organization, (2) the opportunity, and (3) the publics

related to the organization and opportunity” (p. 143). The first of the three areas, the organization, is documented for North American Adventist colleges and universities in three different studies conducted by Bartlett (1989), Dial (1993), and Grohar (1989). Bartlett (1989) completed a study on organizational structures of institutional advancement in Adventist colleges and universities in 1989. The same year, Grohar (1989) completed research on fundraising practices and policies of independent institutions, including Adventist colleges and universities in the United States. In 1993, Dial completed a study of 11 Adventist colleges and universities describing “the role, status and qualifications of chief advancement officers who serve in independent colleges and universities in the United States of America” (Dial, 1993, p. 6). Gustavsson (2000) completed a further study in 2000 on organizational structures in selected Adventist colleges outside of the United States.

The second area, the opportunity, consists of the strategic plans, their implementation, and the activities of the institution that result in the need for funds. Typically, at Adventist colleges and universities, the opportunity for and rewards of investment in resources are clear and readily available to the Advancement staff and university publics (alumni, friends, church, foundations, and corporations).

The third area, the publics related to the organization and opportunity, is the stakeholders of the organization. Knowledge of the stakeholders as donors and nondonors and why they give or do not give is critical to successful philanthropic endeavors in Adventist colleges and universities. Alumni are the largest group of stakeholders who have a vested interest and a permanent connection to the university. If they are not the

most important donors and potential donors, they are certainly among the most important. However, as a group, Adventist alumni stakeholders have not been studied or described.

A substantial amount of research has been conducted on a number of populations who shared a common characteristic such as: the size of the gift (Schervish & Hermann, 1988); a demographic factor (e.g., women; Briechele, 2001); and the type of institution that received the gift (e.g., public universities; Ryan, 1997), independent universities (Haddad, 1986), and faith-based universities (Koole, 1981).

However, currently advancement professionals in Adventist higher education operate in a research vacuum. No research has been identified that has studied the Adventist donor population of higher education and their philanthropic attitudes and patterns. Practitioners must rely on extrapolation from the few studies of populations from peer institutions—-independent and faith-based or on anecdotal evidence. Three helpful studies have been conducted using various other populations of Seventh-day Adventists in the U.S. and Canada (Dudley, Fogelquist, & Cummings, 1982; Dudley & Melgosa, 1985; Stockton-Chilson, 2003). However, all three were also focused on different areas of giving (general giving and volunteering behavior, and how tithe and mission offering related to church growth), which is different from giving to Adventist universities.

In 1990 Brittingham and Pezzullo “undertook a review of the research and scholarly literature on educational fundraising in the United States” (pp. 1, 2). Their declaration then is still true for certain areas of fundraising, including that for the

Adventist institutions. "The practice of fund-raising is thinly informed by research that can lead to greater effectiveness, help institutions understand the role fund-raising plays in higher education, or illuminate the dilemmas it presents to practitioners and institutional leaders" (p. 1).

Later, Burgess-Getts (1992) also supported the concept of the importance of research to the practitioner, noting that improving "the funding of higher education in competitive times needs a consistent, purposeful approach to motivate voluntary support by alumni" (p. 4).

Then, two researchers, in their studies of peer institutions, recommended the study of the homogenous populations of church-affiliated colleges and universities as useful and beneficial (Cristanello, 1992; Hunter, 1997). One study, titled *Characteristics Describing Given Behavior of Alumni of Three Historically Roman Catholic Colleges; Canisius College, D'youvelle College and St. John Fisher College*, is comparable to my study. Cristanello (1992) recommends, "A replication of this study at other types of institutions with homogeneous alumni populations could be conducted such as: historically Christian institutions or those affiliated with a single church" (p. 83). Five years later Hunter (1997) made a similar recommendation. "Other church related schools could possibly benefit from further study of alumni within their sponsoring denomination" (p. 121). Hunter also recommended a study of nondonors as well as donors.

Finally, Wolpert (1997) advocated the study of giving behavior patterns in specific contexts. Although his primary focus is the differing cultures of generosity in geographic regions, he also acknowledges that religious, political, economic, social, geographic, historical, and cultural influences differ between contexts and affect the generosity of individuals in other types of communities. Thus, it is logical to discover whether or not an Adventist culture of generosity exists, and if it does to ascertain the behavioral determinants of alumni donors to Adventist institutions rather than to just extrapolate from the available data of national or other cultural enclaves (pp. 77-79).

As noted earlier, the percentage of alumni who contributed to their alma mater remains fairly constant although the cost of providing higher education increases. Since "alumni continue to be the driving force in the charitable support of higher education institutions," increasing alumni giving behavior is critical to success (Kaplan, 2007, p. 3). And as Koole (1981) concluded, it continues to be important that "each institution should know both characteristics of its own alumni and ... with a more thorough understanding of a college's alumni, administrators would be better equipped to approach their alumni for fund support" (p. 31).

In summary, staff at Adventist institutions have some compelling reasons to describe their donors and nondonors. Some of these are shared with other colleges and universities. There is increased competition for philanthropic dollars from individuals. Giving by alumni in general is more or less constant. Revenue from other sources fluctuates. For example, endowment earnings vary as the stock market varies. Other reasons to describe donors and nondonors are specific to Adventist institutions. While

Adventist colleges and universities tend to be 75-100 years old, the systematic fundraising efforts may only be 20 or perhaps 30 years old. Earlier investigators have recommended research on homogeneous groups of donors as well as giving patterns in a local context, and Adventist alumni donors have never been described. If development personnel knew the reasons that alumni from Adventist institutions give or did not give, they could be more efficient and effective in the development process than they currently are.

Statement of the Problem

Adventist colleges and universities rely increasingly on individual donor support. A description of Adventist donors and nondonors is essential in order to optimize the philanthropic potential of alumni and fundraising for the institution. The knowledge of who gives among Adventist constituents, why they give or do not give, is either anecdotal and/or deduced from giving theories and/or extrapolated from research on populations such as the donors to Bible colleges or independent universities which may or may not be affiliated with a particular denomination. There is no systemized, comprehensive assessment procedure for, or research exploring, the relationships between donor status (donors, nondonors), level of support (how much is given), or frequency of support (how often donors give) and demographics, psychographics (values, attitudes, and beliefs), and reasons for giving and reasons for not giving by alumni in the Adventist context.

Purpose

The study was designed to ascertain and describe the demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving of alumni donors and nondonors to two Adventist universities in the United States. In addition, the nature of the relationships between level and frequency of support by Adventist alumni donors and their demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving were explored.

Research Questions

This study was designed to describe alumni donors and nondonors, their level and frequency of financial support, and the reasons for their philanthropy to two Adventist universities. There were eight research questions.

1. How do the demographics and psychographics of alumni donors and nondonors differ?
2. To what extent are demographics and psychographics of alumni donors, when studied individually, related to the level of support and frequency of support to the institution?
3. How do the reasons for giving and reasons for not giving differ between alumni donors and nondonors?
4. In what ways are the reasons for giving and reasons for not giving by alumni donors, when studied individually, related to the level of support and frequency of support to the institution?

5. How do selected demographics and psychographics and reasons for giving and reasons for not giving, when combined, differ between alumni donors and nondonors?
6. To what extent are selected demographics and psychographics and reasons for giving and reasons for not giving of alumni donors, when combined, related to the level of support to the institution?
7. To what extent are selected demographics and psychographics and reasons for giving and reasons for not giving of alumni donors, when combined, related to the frequency of support to the institution?
8. To what extent do level of support and frequency of support relate to each other?

General Methods

The population under study was the alumni of two Adventist universities. The study used a quantitative methodology. Alumni demographics and psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving were collected using a survey. Gift size and frequency were collected from the institutional databases. The data from the survey were analyzed using standard statistical methodology. The demographic and psychographic variables were chosen, in the main, from those used in previous studies of alumni from faith-based and independent colleges and universities. The reasons for giving and reasons for not giving variables were all selected from those identified in previous studies of general, wealthy, and alumni populations and practitioners' experience.

Conceptual Framework

Although research on donor demographics and psychographics has been conducted since the 60s, researchers have only relatively recently (the 90s) turned their attention to the philanthropic theoretical frameworks or theories to explain the reasons donors give. Among the theories that have emerged to explain giving behavior, two stand out. First, there is the group of social exchange theories, best articulated and researched by Kelly (1994), and generally applications from general theory in other disciplines such as social psychology, marketing, economics, public relations, and religion to fundraising. The theories are based on the notion of one or more transactions between the donor and the nonprofit. The second prominent theory is the Identification Theory which has a philosophical base and is then also validated from research. It is considered a relational theory in which care for self is foundational to individual giving behavior in contrast to altruism theories where caring for others, potentially even denying oneself, is the primary motivation for giving behavior (Schervish & Havens, 2001, p. 8). A brief outline of each of these two theories follows with additional details noted in chapter 2.

Social Exchange Theories

The basic premise of all social exchange theories is that when a gift is given, a transaction takes place with benefit to both the donor and the recipient or benefit to only one of the two parties. The benefits may be tangible, for example, funds to an organization, or intangible, the joyous feeling that a donor experiences after seeing the great good accomplished by the nonprofit as a result of the gift of resources.

Kelly (1994) identified four models of public relations behavior that essentially each have a stimulus to obtain a response. The models and their basic methods were: press agency (propagandize a cause), public information (disseminate needs information), two-way asymmetrical (scientifically persuade giving), and two-way symmetrical model (reach mutual understanding) (p. 3). She applied the models to the fundraising discipline and studied their prevalence and effectiveness. Her research showed that the oldest of the four models, press agency, was the one predominantly, though not exclusively, practiced by fundraisers (Kelly, 1994, p. 15). She also concluded that the symmetrical model was less likely to be practiced (p. 18), though she recommended that "adoption of that model will help practitioners and their organizations be more effective in an ethically and socially responsible manner" (p. 32). Later, Kelly (1997) categorized and named three corresponding one-way or asymmetrical fundraising theories as the Theory of Magic Buttons (p. 150), the Magic Bullet Theory (p. 151), and the Domino Model (p. 152). She named the symmetrical theory the Situational Theory of the Publics (p. 154).

My experiences lead me to believe that these social exchange theories are also the models on which Adventist development staff most commonly base their practices. The majority of subjects of the study may also think within the parameters or subscribe to the philosophical "win-win" idea of the theory. In addition, the concept "give to get," foundational to the concept of exchange, matches best with the traditional Adventist and my view that humanity is basically selfish. Another basic human attitude, "get all you can," is the basis for a one-sided exchange theory. In addition, social exchange theories

are the theoretical base (either overt or implied) used by most of the studies on faith-based institutions and the studies on wealthy donors. Finally, social exchange theories are explicit or implicit in the work of researchers who have uncovered many factors that are reasons for giving and reasons for not giving (Panas, 1984; Prince & File, 1994). Because of the many similarities and the nuanced differences as well as convenience, this group of theories will be referred to hereafter in this study as one theory, the Social Exchange Theory.

Identification Theory

Schervish and Havens (2003), from their study on wealthy donors, propose that gifts are given to charity because the donors identify with the needs of others and, through giving, donors build or maintain their own philanthropic identity. Coupled with the concept of care is assurance of financial security that empowers the individual to make wise choices with his or her excess wealth. Care is a dynamic characteristic that grows over time and with association. Care also has a range of influence where care for oneself is at one end and care for organizations including government taxation is at the other end of the continuum. Three other attitudes factor into the philanthropic mind-set. They are: gratitude for the "blessing" of wealth, the compulsion to be a philanthropic entrepreneur, and an obligation to do more than just pass on wealth to heirs (Havens & Schervish, 2003).

The foundation for the reasons for giving by alumni to Adventist universities could also be the Identification Theory as postulated by Schervish (1997a). Certainly the

concept of caring, caring for oneself and then caring for others, is biblically based (Matt 22:37-39). In my experience, while the concepts he proposes are not always uncommon, fundraisers and organizations do not usually articulate or integrate them into practice in the same manner that he suggests. In addition, I have found that the Identification Theory is not one to which alumni donors and development staff of Adventist universities have been exposed. Nor is the Identification Theory the implied theory of several expert practitioners (e.g., Jerold Panas or William Sturdevant) who often educate Adventist constituencies. Thus, the results of my research should bring the theory to the attention of Adventist practitioners and potentially promote further inquiry to validate the theory with this population.

Any illumination of the extent to which the giving behavior of Adventist alumni is rooted in these two theories—either a transaction, an exchange of benefits between the giver and the receiving organization, or a caring for self that results in a caring relationship with others—will be helpful.

Significance

As they relate to giving behavior the demographics and psychographics of many specific populations have been described. For example, a search of dissertation abstracts 2008 yielded about 100 dissertations on donor characteristics, almost all studying donors to higher education. Dissertations on the topic were published as early as 1981, yet the topic continued to be one of investigation even in 2006 (Ferguson, 1981; Thomas, 2006).

The question of why there should be yet another study on donor characteristics is a legitimate one. At least four reasons exist.

1. Although there have been three studies involving Adventist giving (Dudley et al., 1982; Dudley & Melgosa, 1985; Stockton-Chilson, 2003), no systematic study to describe Adventist alumni donors and nondonors or their reasons for giving and reasons for not giving exists. Thus, this study addresses this lack and provides a baseline profile of Adventist alumni donors and nondonors. In addition, there has been very little study that described alumni and the reasons for giving or reasons for not giving that are of greatest influence to them. (Of 15 dissertations on alumni populations of faith-based and independent institutions that addressed the demographics and psychographics that are indicative of donors, only 3 of those dissertations addressed more than one or two reasons for giving.)

2. Chilson's (2003) conclusion, that Adventists differed from individuals affiliated with other denominations, provided a compelling rationale for my study (p. 208). It confirmed the established knowledge that distinct differences and similarities exist between the giving behavior of different populations, in particular other Christians and Adventists.

A known profile of demographics and psychographics as well as reasons for giving and reasons for not giving and how the profile fits into established general theories of giving will inform fundraisers at Adventist institutions and should positively impact staff fundraising practice in the Advancement offices. When the study is disseminated,

Adventist Advancement staff will have knowledge of Adventist alumni giving behavior patterns and be able to base decisions on this knowledge rather than just basing decisions on experiential wisdom, extrapolation, or clever guesswork. Adventist fundraising staff will be better equipped to achieve increased success as they compete for donor attention and gifts to increase one of the revenue streams to their institutions with more and larger donations, as well as greater participation and bigger endowments. As experts in The Fundraising School have suggested "a university could conduct a survey of its alumni to determine the incidence of each philanthropic style and then create communications and resource development plans emphasizing the mix of benefits its own donor group has" (The Center on Philanthropy, 2001a, Chapter 1, p. 21).

3. In the classic organizational loop (action, feedback, reaction) my study serves as an important source of feedback for the institution. Organizational development and improvements can now be based on research evidence rather than extrapolated theory.

4. Since the results will be reported to the alumni, individuals could also experience enlightenment. Thus, the findings contribute to a greater understanding of the needs, desires, and knowledge of individual donors that benefits both donors and institutions in their relationship.

Delimitations

I decided to focus on demographics and psychographics and reasons for giving and reasons for not giving. Rather than developing a new giving paradigm, my research provides a basis for evaluating the Adventist giving behavior in the context of the Social

Exchange and Identification theories that have already been developed to explain philanthropic behavior. Why humans think and behave as they do in general is outside the scope of this study. Thus, other long-established theories in the field of psychology regarding motivation for action, behavior, achievement, learning, and instruction, such as those articulated by Freud, Maslow, Skinner, Atkinson, McDougall, Hull, and Thorndike, have been excluded from the discussion (Smelser & Baltes, 2001, pp. 10105, 10125).

Deferred gifts, for example, charitable annuities, trusts, and estates, were excluded from both gift size calculations and donor status criteria. Since these gifts mature in the future, their exact amount is at best only an estimate. In addition, many donors do not reveal the existence of such gifts prior to their demise, so the university is not necessarily aware that they exist. Finally, deferred gifts, though known to the university, may be revocable, thus they are not recorded and possibly not given due to the circumstances for which they were initially made revocable.

The research population was delimited to two Adventist doctoral degree-granting, comprehensive universities in the United States of America. The sample did not include alumni whose postal addresses are outside of the U.S. and Canada. I assumed that, in general, these alumni are from a different culture, and, therefore, do not have the same characteristics or reasons for giving (File & Prince, 1995). In addition, cost and time for return of surveys limited the ability to survey this part of the population.

Recent graduates (last 10 years) were excluded from the population since they have had little time to establish giving patterns (Clotfelter, 2001; Cristanello, 1992). Prior

researchers used a range of 3-10 years to exclude alumni. Typically, recent alumni have a number of circumstances that preclude discretionary income and therefore limit giving. The reasons include larger debts and their payments, lower salaries than experienced alumni, and attendance at graduate school.

Limitations

A truly random sample of all alumni was not possible since neither of the two universities under study had addresses for all their alumni.

Definition of Terms

Alumni: Includes all individuals who hold a degree from the institution.

Advancement: The functional territory of Advancement is defined by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) as alumni relations, communications, and fundraising (P. M. Buchanan, 2000, p. 7; Cook & Lasher, 1996, p. 36).

Adventist university: An institution deriving financial support and governance from the Seventh-day Adventist church (Gibbons, 1992).

Adventist: Member of the Seventh-day Adventist church.

Demographics: "Characteristics about people, for example, age, sex, marital status, education, and income" (Nichols, 2002, p. 179).

Development: The fundraising branch of Advancement.

Endowment: "A fund, the principal of which is invested and kept inviolate and only the income used for the general support of the college, or for some specific object in

connection with it" (Arnett, 1922, p. 24, as cited in Andrews, 1950, p. 197).

Friends: Those stakeholders who have a connection with the institution and have made one or more donations, for example, a faculty or staff member who has not attended the institution.

Gifts: Cash and equivalents and gifts-in-kind are included. Deferred gifts are excluded.

Psychographics: "Attitudes, values, or lifestyles, which may make one group behave differently from another" (Nichols, 2002, p. 179). Those activities, interests, and opinions that "portray the whole individual and how she or he interacts with the environment," for example, achievements, entertainment, attitudes, beliefs, and values (Sargeant & Jay, 2004, p. 80).

Nondonor: An individual who has never given a gift to the institution that is contributing data to the study.

Nonprofit: A privately owned organization with legal nonprofit categorization that receives substantial contributions of time, below-cost goods, or services or money and provides, supports, or engages in activities and service of public or private interest without any commercial or monetary profit (Powell & Steinberg, 2006, p. 3).

Obligatory donor: An individual who gives primarily or exclusively from feelings of altruism, religious requirements, or feelings of indebtedness (Nirschel, 1997, p. 30).

Private donations, contributions, or funds: Donations, contributions, or funds from corporations, foundations, and individuals, exclusive of fees for services, government, and church subsidies.

Stakeholder: An individual (including those representing an organization) who has a vested interest in the university and can include, but is not limited to, students, parents, alumni, faculty, staff, community members, church members, Adventist denominational employees, and Union Conference Executive Committees.

University: When used with a capital letter, one of the two universities under study.

Organization of the Study

Four additional chapters complete the study. Chapter 2 contains a review of the literature, examining the demographics and psychographics that have been studied with respect to donors and nondonors to faith-based colleges and universities. Findings on the reasons for giving and reasons for not giving from selected studies for other populations, including the literature on wealthy donors, are also noted. A brief summary of the predominant theories of fundraising is also included.

The research design and methodology are presented in chapter 3. Chapter 4 reports on the collected data and the results of the statistical analysis. The conclusions and significant findings, the implications of the findings for current theory and professional practice, as well as recommendations for further research comprise chapter 5.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

An Overview

The larger context for any study of donors' identity and why they give begins with the watershed conference held at The Greenbrier in 1958 where professionals from higher education met in White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia. The goal of the meeting was to set out "organizational principles and provide guidance for all institutions of higher education" in areas of public relations, alumni relations, and financial support for the teaching function at institutions (Hopkins, 1958, p. 2). Research in the Advancement field blossomed after this conference. Besides studying such topics as: organizational structure, significant philanthropists, and best practices, a number of researchers studied the demographics and psychographics and reasons for giving of donors of various populations. Specific populations that have been studied since then include wealthy donors, and donors to: general nonprofits; religious nonprofits, especially churches; higher education, public, community, independent, and faith-based colleges and universities. Documented differences in the demographics, psychographics, and reasons for giving of different populations exist. The demographics, psychographics, and reasons for giving of the Adventist alumni population have not been studied. Thus the foci of my

study were: the demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving of alumni from Adventist universities.

This chapter is divided into three sections to set the context for my study of Adventist alumni. The first section consists of a brief overview of the demographics and psychographics of donors from the general population and higher education. Then the demographics and psychographics compiled from the research on alumni from independent and faith-based colleges and universities are summarized.

The second section contains the reasons for giving and reasons for not giving of individuals in three populations—general donors, wealthy donors, and alumni of independent and faith-based institutions. First, the reasons for giving and reasons for not giving compiled from the research on the general donors and wealthy donors are summarized. Second, two models of giving that cluster the reasons for giving into named profiles that have been postulated as a result of research on wealthy donors are briefly summarized (Odendahl, 1990; Prince & File, 1994). Third, the influence of the concept of obligation rooted in Judaic theology and notably influential in the giving behavior of Jews is also noted. Fourth, a brief description of two dominant theoretical frameworks also put forward to explain the reasons for giving by individuals to nonprofit organizations follows—the Social Exchange Theory (Kelly, 1994) and the Identification Theory posited by Schervish and Havens (Schervish, Benz, Dulany, Murphy, & Salett, 1993). Fifth, the reasons for giving and not giving compiled from the research on alumni donors to higher education and independent and faith-based colleges and universities are summarized.

Finally, the third section mentions the research reporting on any aspect of Seventh-day Adventist advancement in higher education. Findings related to this study are noted. Then several findings and conclusions from three studies about general giving and volunteering patterns and whose populations included Adventist adults conclude the chapter.

Demographics and Psychographics of Donors

Fundraising success in a large measure relies on dependable patterns of giving behavior in order to effectively influence and meet the needs of groups of donors, rather than only a single donor. Thus, it is worth knowing the demographics and psychographics that groups of donors share. Based on several comprehensive studies of the general population, key characteristics—age, educational attainment, religiosity, marital status and capacity (income and/or wealth)—fairly consistently indicate giving behavior. Several other demographics—itemization of taxes, ethnicity, volunteering, early life volunteering and experiences, being asked, and participation in religious organizations—were indicative of giving behavior in some studies but not in others (Havens et al., 2006; Maude, 2002; Odendahl, 1987; Pezzullo & Brittingham, 1993; Rooney, Steinberg, & Schervish, 2001; Rooney, 2007; Steinberg & Wilhelm, 2003; The Center on Philanthropy, 2002; Weiner, 1992).

Contradictory results are found in studies as to whether or not significant differences in the giving behavior exist for two demographics, gender and ethnicity. One explanation for these differences is that the design of some studies includes the

interactions of other factors on ethnicity or gender and other studies do not. Rooney (2007) notes that his research shows that when the statistical differences between giving by Whites and minorities are controlled for income, educational attainment, and other factors, the differences become insignificant. This in turn "suggests that the differences in mean levels of giving are due to differences in income and educational attainment and not race or ethnicity" (pp. 26, 27). Likewise, the study by Rooney, Mesch, Chin, and Steinberg (2005) accounts for marital status in considering gender, then Rooney (2007) concludes: "Single men and women give similar amounts on average, but once one controls for income, education, and age, single women are significantly more likely to be donors and donate significantly more than single men" (p. 26).

Another explanation for the different results is the finding that different ethnic groups give in different ways that are not always included in the studies. For example, Caucasian giving behavior may be skewed towards "formal philanthropy" defined as "tax deductible gifts to U.S.- based 501(c)(3) organizations" (Rooney, 2007, p. 28) and usually included in studies. However, African Americans' and Hispanics' giving behavior may be skewed by their informal philanthropy, that is, gifts given to family and friends or services that are not tax deductible and are less easily and less often included in studies (Havens et al., 2006, pp. 352, 353). "When informal and formal giving were combined, multivariate analysis revealed that 'when the effects of income, education, and immigration status are statistically taken into account, differences in charitable behavior among whites, Latinos, Asian/Pacific Islanders, and African Americans virtually disappear'" (O'Neill & Roberts, 2000, p. 56, as cited in Havens et al., 2006, p. 253).

Demographics and Psychographics of Donors to Higher Education

Alumni from colleges and universities are a subset of the general population. The results of recent studies—a report prepared for the Council for Aid to Education (CAE) (Caulkins et al., 2002) and studies of specific populations of universities (W. W. Buchanan, 1993; Keenan, 1994; Nicolanti, 1991; Snyder, 1993)—confirmed the conclusions of a review of the literature 18 years ago (Brittingham & Pezzulo, 1990). In summary, relatively few demographics and psychographics are indicators of alumni giving. “Alumni donors tend to be wealthier, be 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” (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990, p. iv). Several recent studies note that satisfaction with the undergraduate experience was also a central determinant of alumni donors (Clotfelter, 2001, 2003; Monks, 2003). The research presented conflicting evidence for several other demographics and psychographics of alumni (participation in activities as a student, gender, marital status, and receipt of financial aid) as indicative of giving behavior among the different alumni populations.

Demographics and Psychographics of Alumni of Independent and Faith-based Institutions

To obtain a clearer picture of the demographics and psychographics of alumni from both independent and faith-based institutions a review of 15 studies conducted between 1974 and 2005 on the alumni populations was pursued. Of these 15 studies, 3

studies considered institutions that were independent and not associated with any faith-based tradition (Haddad, 1986; Nirschel, 1997; Violand, 1998). One compared data from 11 institutions, all of which were either actively faith-based or had religious denominational roots or founding entities—Roman Catholic (5), United Methodist (3), Baptist, Quaker, and Brethren (1 each) (Wetta, 1990). Nine studied the alumni populations of faith-based institutions associated with various Baptist traditions, the Roman Catholic church, the Church of Zion, churches of Christ, and Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (Burnett, Peterson, Wright, & Parsons, 1974; Cristanello, 1992; Gibbons, 1992; Hunter, 1997; Koole, 1981; Korvas, 1984; Oglesby, 1991; Thomas, 2005; Van Horn, 2002). In a 14th study, one researcher (though examining an alumni population at a public university) selected the population of Roman Catholic donors to study (Cascione, 2000). Therefore, several demographics and psychographics that he found are included in my study. In the 15th study, the researcher (Smith, 1998) incorporated 10 demographics: gender, ethnicity, age, marital status, income, children, religious affiliation, profession, education, and family structure in her survey. The purpose of her survey was to select a representative sample for her case study, so except for frequency distribution no statistical analysis was reported. Therefore, I could not use the demographics in my study as they were not comparable with other studies I reviewed. The demographics in Van Horn's (2002) study were also not analyzed statistically, except for frequency distribution, therefore were also not useful for comparison with the other studies. Eight researchers studied one or more demographics or psychographics associated with levels of giving (Burnett et al., 1974; Haddad, 1986; Hunter, 1997;

Korvas, 1984; Nirschel, 1997; Oglesby, 1991; Thomas, 2005; Violand, 1998). One study considered only reasons for giving, comparing the importance of reasons for giving by alumni to two different types of universities (Gibbons, 1992).

For convenience, in my study, demographics were subdivided into two categories: general and educational demographics. Psychographics were classified into three categories: student involvement, alumni involvement, and religious psychographics. Where terminology differed between studies for a characteristic but the concept was essentially the same, I chose to use only one term. I also used only one term or phrase to describe a demographic or psychographic for which different researchers may have used several different measures (e.g., capacity may have been measured by assets or household income). (See chapter 1 for definitions of demographics and psychographics.)

The list of demographics and psychographics and their relationship to donor status as either indicators or nonindicators of donors or nondonors was compiled from ten studies and is presented in Table 1. A similar list of demographics and psychographics and their indication of giving levels compiled from eight studies is presented in Table 2.

General Demographics

The researchers who studied the alumni populations of faith-based and independent institutions reported 19 demographics that were potential discriminators between either donors or nondonors or the giving level (the amount of giving, higher or

Table 1

Demographics and Psychographics of Alumni From Faith-based and Independent Colleges and Universities—Donor Status

Author's Last Name	Koole	Haddad	Wetta	Oglesby	Cristanello	Nirschel	Korvas	Cascione	Van Horn	Thomas
Year of Study	1981	1986	1990	1991	1992	1997	1984	2000	2002	2005
Denominational Affiliation	Baptist	Independent	RC+	Baptist	RC	Jewish/Cuban	RC	RC	Baptist	Churches of Christ
General Demographic										
Age	I	I	I	I	I		NI	I	I	
Year of graduation		I	I	I	I		I			I
Occupation	I		NI	I	NI	NI				
Employment status		NI								
Gender		NI	I	NI	NI	NI	NI			
Marital status	I	NI	I	NI			NI			
Parenthood		NI	I	I						
Number of Children	I	I	I	NI			NI			
Age & grade level of children		I	NI				NI			
Spouse is alumni	I	NI	I	NI			NI			
Relatives who were alumni	I		I	NI						
Father's occupation	NI									
Geographic location	NI	I	NI	NI			NI	I		
Ethnicity						NI				
Capacity/Income	I		I	I	NI	NI	I	I	NI	
Receipt of grant or scholarship	NI	NI		NI	NI		NI			
Receipt of financial aid	I		NI				I			
Repayment/receipt of loans	NI		I	NI			NI			

Table 1—*Continued.*

Author's Last Name	Koole	Haddad	Wetta	Oglesby	Cristanello	Nirschel	Korvas	Cascione	Van Horn	Thomas
Year of Study	1981	1986	1990	1991	1992	1997	1984	2000	2002	2005
Denominational Affiliation	Baptist	Independent	RC+	Baptist	RC	Jewish/Cuban	RC	RC	Baptist	Churches of Christ
Educational Demographics										
Level of education		I	I	I			NI			
Degrees from other institutions	I				I		NI			
Number of years of attendance	I		I		I		I			
Academic ability & achievement	NI			NI	NI		NI			
Academic major	I	I	I	NI			NI			
Undergrad resident/commuter	NI	NI	NI	NI			NI			
High school GPA/achievement	NI						NI			
Involvement in high school	NI									
Psychographics										
As a student										
General involvement in college	I	I	I	NI	NI		NI			I
Student government	I			I						I
Athletics	I			NI						
Honor clubs and Greek societies	NI	I		I						I
Impact of institution strictness	NI									
As an alumnus										
Alumni involvement	I	I	I		NI		I			
Receipt of publications			I							
Planned campus visits			I	NI			NI			
Volunteerism						I				
Religion										
Church affiliation & attitudes										
about religion			I	NI		I	I	I		
Religious involvement				I						

Note. I = Indicator; NI = Non-indicator based on statistical analysis; RC = Roman Catholic.

Table 2

Demographics and Psychographics of Alumni From Faith-based and Independent Colleges and Universities—Level of Giving

Author's Last Name	Burnett et al.	Haddad	Oglesby	Korvas	Hunter	Nirschel	Violand	Thomas
Year of Study	1974	1986	1991	1984	1997	1997	1998	2005
Denominational Affiliation	Mormon	Independent	Baptist	Roman Catholic	Zion	Jewish/Cuban	Independent	Churches of Christ
General Demographic								
Age	I	I	I	I	I		I	
Year of graduation		I	I		I			I
Occupation	NI	I	NI		NI		I	
Employment status		NI						
Gender	I	I	I	I	I		I	
Marital status		NI	NI	NI	NI		I	
Parenthood		NI					NI	
Number of Children		I	I	I	NI		I	
Age & grade level of children		I		NI	NI			
Spouse is alumni	I	NI	I	NI				I
Relatives who were alumni			I					
Geographic location	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI		NI	
Birthplace							NI	
Ethnicity						I		
Capacity	I		I	I	I	NI		
Receipt of grant or scholarship		NI	I	NI				
Receipt of financial aid					NI			
Repayment/receipt of loans			NI	NI				

Table 2 —Continued.

Author's Last Name	Burnett et al.	Haddad	Oglesby	Korvas	Hunter	Nirschel	Violand	Thomas
Year of Study	1974	1986	1991	1984	1997	1997	1998	2005
Denominational Affiliation	Mormon	Independent	Baptist	Roman Catholic	Zion	Jewish/Cuban	Independent	Churches of Christ
Educational Demographics								
Level of education	I	I	NI	NI	I		I	
Degrees from other institutions			NI	NI	I		I	
Number of years of attendance				NI			I	
Academic ability & achievement			NI	NI	I			
Academic major	NI	NI	NI	NI	NI		I	
Undergraduate Residence			NI	NI				
Psychographics								
As a student								
General involvement		I	NI	NI				I
Student government			I					I
Athletics			I					
Honor clubs and Greek societies		I	NI		I		I	
As an alumnus								
Alumni involvement		I		I	I		I	
Receipt of publications					NI			
Planned campus visits			I	NI	I			
Volunteerism							NI	
Honorary doctorate or award							NI	
Religion								
Church affiliation & attitudes								
about religion			NI	I	I			
Religious involvement	I		NI		NI			

Note. I = Indicator; NI = Non-indicator based on statistical analysis.

lower). Fifteen general demographics were: age; year of, or years since graduation; occupation; employment status; gender; marital status; parenthood; number of children; age and grade levels of children; spousal education or graduation from same institution; relatives who were also alumni of the alma mater; father's occupation; current geographic location or distance from alma mater; birthplace; and ethnicity. Four additional general demographics had an economic focus: the receipt of a grant or scholarship; receipt of financial aid; the repayment or receipt of loans; and capacity to give, income or affluence.

Following is a summary of the research results for each demographic.

Age and year of graduation

In all but one of the eight studies, age was found to differentiate between donors and nondonors (Cascione, 2000; Cristanello, 1992; Haddad, 1986; Koole, 1981; Oglesby, 1991; Van Horn, 2002; Wetta, 1990). Donors were more likely to be older alumni. Korvas (1984) found the exception was that neither current age nor age of entrance to college were indicators of donors. In addition, all six researchers found age was an indicator of giving level (Burnett et al., 1974; Haddad, 1986; Hunter, 1997; Korvas, 1984; Oglesby, 1991; Violand, 1998).

All six researchers who reported on year of graduation agreed that the year of graduation or last attendance also differentiated between donors and nondonors (Cristanello, 1992; Haddad, 1986; Korvas, 1984; Oglesby, 1991; Thomas, 2005; Wetta, 1990). All four researchers who studied year of graduation and giving levels agreed that year of graduation was an indicator of giving levels (Haddad, 1986; Hunter, 1997;

Oglesby, 1991; Thomas, 2005). Not only did the decade of graduation correlate with giving, but in most of the institutions studied by Wetta (1990), age at the time of commencement (another indirect indicator of age) had a statistically significant relationship to giving.

In summary, almost all researchers agreed that age and year of graduation were indicators of donors and giving levels. Since year of graduation is commonly an indirect indicator of age, it was not surprising that the effect on giving behavior was similar for both demographics.

Occupation

Three researchers (Cristanello, 1992; Nirschel, 1997; Wetta, 1990) found that current occupation did not indicate that alumni would be donors. However, two researchers also disagreed with this finding, reporting that vocation did indicate that alumni would be donors (Koole, 1981; Oglesby, 1991). Researchers also contradicted each other as to whether occupation affected giving level. Haddad (1986) and Violand (1998) found that it did. Three other researchers found that it did not (Burnett et al., 1974; Hunter, 1997; Oglesby, 1991). It is fair to conclude that occupation inconsistently indicated donor status and giving level.

Employment status

Employment status was not an indicator for either donor status or giving level in one independent university population (Haddad, 1986).

Gender

Five of the six researchers who studied gender concluded that it did not indicate donor status (Cristanello, 1992; Haddad, 1986; Korvas, 1984; Nirschel, 1997; Oglesby, 1991). The sixth, Wetta (1990), found that gender did indicate donor status.

All six researchers who analyzed gender concluded that it discriminated between giving levels (Burnett et al., 1974; Haddad, 1986; Hunter, 1997; Korvas, 1984; Oglesby, 1991; Violand, 1998). However researchers disagreed as to which gender gave at higher or lower giving levels.

Marital status

The donor status of alumni was not consistently indicated by marital status in the various alumni populations, though it almost always did not indicate giving levels. Koole (1981) and Wetta (1990) found that marital status was an indicator demographic of donors. Three other researchers, however, found that marital status was not an indicator of donors (Haddad, 1986; Korvas, 1984; Oglesby, 1991). Of the five researchers who studied the relationship of marital status and giving levels, only one (Violand, 1998) found that marital status differentiated between giving levels. Four agreed that it did not differentiate between giving levels (Haddad, 1986; Hunter, 1997; Korvas, 1984; Oglesby, 1991).

Parenthood and number of children

Evidence was contradictory as to whether families with more children or fewer

children or no children were more likely to be donors or nondonors. Researchers also disagreed as to how many children in a family were indicative of giving levels. However they agreed that parenthood (having children) did not indicate giving levels.

Specifically, while Oglesby (1991) and Wetta (1990) agreed that parenthood (having children) indicated that alumni would be donors, Haddad (1986) concluded that it did not. Both researchers who analyzed giving levels with parenthood agreed that they were not related (Haddad, 1986; Violand, 1998).

Three researchers (Haddad, 1986; Koole, 1981; Wetta, 1990) found that the total number of children were discriminating factors for donor status and while they agreed that families with two children were likely to be donors, they disagreed on donor status when families had more or fewer children. On one hand, Koole (1981) found that "alumni with larger families proved to be more supportive than alumni with smaller families. The most frequent donors were alumni with two children, whereas the most infrequent, were alumni with no children" (Koole, 1981, pp. 79, 80). On the other hand, Wetta (1990) noted that nondonors had "a greater number of children than donors. Two children were characteristic of the typical donor family" (p. 154).

Both Korvas (1984) and Oglesby (1991) concluded that the number of children did not discriminate between donors or nondonors, but did for giving levels. Three other researchers (Haddad, 1986; Korvas, 1984; Violand, 1998) also found that having children was a discriminating factor between giving levels, though Hunter (1997) disagreed.

Age and grade levels of children

Until children were adults (18 or older), the ages of children in a family were not related to donor status or level. Specifically, Wetta (1990) discovered that the grade levels (reflective of age levels) of children were not indicative of donors. Korvas (1984) agreed, noting that even the number of children in college was not a indicator of donors. However, Haddad (1986) found that when the children of alumni were age 18 or older, alumni were more likely to be donors. He also found that the amounts alumni gave increased when children in the family were over 18 years old. On the contrary, Hunter (1997) and Korvas (1984) found that the age of children was not a discriminating demographic for giving levels.

Spouse as alumni

Having a spouse as an alumnus was another unstable indicator of donor status and giving level. Two researchers concurred that having a spouse who was an alumnus was indicative of donor status (Koole, 1981; Wetta, 1990). However the findings of Haddad (1986), Korvas (1984), and Oglesby (1991) were contradictory—having a spouse with a degree from the same institution was not indicative of donors.

Researchers were also almost equally divided regarding giving levels. Three researchers concluded that having a spouse who was an alumnus indicated giving levels (Burnett et al., 1974; Oglesby, 1991; Thomas, 2005) and two concluded that it did not (Haddad, 1986; Korvas, 1984).

Relatives who were alumni of alma mater

Wetta (1990) expanded on the spouse as alumni to include children, siblings, and parents as alumni and reported that having an alumni relative influenced donor status. "Donors tend to have children, parents and/or siblings who attend or have attended the alma mater" (p. 153). Koole (1981) agreed with these findings noting that alumni whose children had attended in the past were more likely to be donors than nondonors. However, Oglesby (1991) found that whether or not the parents or children were also alumni did not discriminate on donor status. He was the only researcher to study whether or not having a relative who was also an alumni affected giving levels. He concluded it did. Koole (1981) also noted that alumni whose children were presently enrolled were not more likely to give than alumni whose children were not presently enrolled.

In summary, researchers were fairly evenly divided in their agreement and disagreement with the conclusion that alumni who had a spouse or relatives who were also alumni were more likely to be donors than alumni whose spouse or relatives were not also alumni. The division of opinion also applied to giving levels.

Father's occupation

Only one researcher tested the father's occupation as a indicator of donor status (Koole, 1981). It was not a indicator.

Geographic location and distance from an alma mater

Four researchers agreed that the current geographic distance from campus did not

affect donor status (Koole, 1981; Korvas, 1984; Oglesby, 1991; Wetta, 1990). Two researchers disagreed with this conclusion. Cascione (2000) found that wealthy donors were aware of and involved in location issues, and sometimes this became an influential factor. Haddad (1986) discovered that the closest alumni to campus and the ones who were more than 200 miles away were more likely to be donors than those who lived less than 200 miles away.

All six researchers agreed that there was no difference in giving levels based on geographic location (Burnett et al., 1974; Haddad, 1986; Hunter, 1997; Korvas, 1984; Oglesby, 1991; Violand, 1998). Violand also added some nuances to the finding in her study. Although she concluded that while the state of residence for the alumnus made no difference to giving levels, the regions may have made a difference. Her study suggested that alumni in the Middle Atlantic (the region closest to the university) were more likely to be higher level donors than alumni donors from other regions further away.

In summary, the evidence was contradictory as to whether or not and how geographic location influenced donor status. Generally, researchers were agreed that giving levels were not affected by geographic location.

Birthplace

Nirschel (1997) found that the state of birth did not differentiate between giving levels.

Ethnicity

Ethnicity, a demographic also studied by only one researcher, did not differentiate between donors and nondonors, but did affect giving levels (Nirschel, 1997).

Capacity

Four researchers discovered that income discriminated between donors and nondonors (Koole, 1981; Korvas, 1984; Oglesby, 1991; Wetta, 1990). In addition, Cascione (2000) noted that the effect of discretionary income was “so obvious that it almost didn’t need to be mentioned” (p. 134). By contrast, Cristanello (1992) noted that income did not indicate donor status. Van Horn (2002) found that income was insignificant in indicating smaller-dollar gift-giving behavior—an equivalent of donor status. Nirschel (1997) found that giving potential did not differentiate for either donor status for either Cuban or Jewish alumni.

According to Hunter (1997) a significant relationship existed between income and 5-year cumulative giving total and their most recent gift, but not for income and annual gifts. Burnett et al. (1974), Korvas (1984), and Oglesby (1991) also agreed that income indicated giving levels. However Nirschel (1997) found that giving potential did not differentiate between giving levels.

Wetta (1990) summarized the findings of the majority when she noted that alumni donors tended “to have more disposable income than the nondonors” (p. 152). Income also generally seemed to be a indicator demographic of giving levels. A subtlety that

Oglesby (1991) reported is a reminder that income should not be considered in isolation from other demographics and psychographics. After taking the age factor into account, he noted that "income is not the discriminating variable. . . . The underlying variable age is more likely the cause of the variance" (p. 239).

Receipt of scholarships, grants, and financial aid

Researchers used various measures for the demographics I chose to name receipt of scholarships and grants and receipt of financial aid. These demographics excluded loans, but included government aid, academic scholarships, institutional scholarships, and grants. This may, in part, explain why the conclusions about the effect of financial aid on donor status and giving levels appear contradictory. The majority of researchers agreed that receipt of some type of financial aid did not indicate that alumni would be donors.

Specifically receipt of a scholarship or grant was not a distinguishing characteristic between donors or nondonors in five of five studies (Cristanello, 1992; Haddad, 1986; Koole, 1981; Korvas, 1984; Oglesby, 1991). Wetta (1990) also agreed with these findings, noting that receipt of financial aid was not indicative of donors. However, Korvas (1984), who measured attitude towards financial aid, and Koole (1981), who measured type of government aid, found that both differentiated between donors and nondonors.

Three of four researchers agreed that receipt of scholarships, grants or financial aid was not indicative of giving levels. Haddad (1986) and Korvas (1984) noted that receipt of an institutional scholarship or grant was not a distinguishing factor between

donors' giving levels. Hunter (1997) found that financial aid was not indicative of giving levels. However, Oglesby (1991) found that receipt of an academic scholarship was indicative of giving levels.

Repayment of loans

Although researchers used subtly different measures, it is reasonable to conclude that taking out loans or repaying them was not a indicator of donor status in three studies (Koole, 1981; Korvas, 1984; Oglesby, 1991) but was indicative in one study (Wetta, 1990). Specifically in considering the details of loans rather than scholarships and grants, Koole (1981) found that the source of funds and the amount borrowed for college did not distinguish between donors and nondonors. Oglesby (1991) found that neither college loans nor another factor, debt balance, distinguished between donors and nondonors. Korvas (1984) measured the percentage of funds borrowed and found that it also did not distinguish between donors and nondonors. However, Wetta (1990) found that repayment of educational loans did differentiate between donors and nondonors.

Repayment of loans was not indicative of giving levels in the studies by Korvas (1984) and Oglesby (1991).

In summary, in most studies, income was indicative of both donor status and giving level. The majority of researchers were agreed that receipt of a scholarship or financial aid or loan and repayment of a loan were not indicative of either donor status or giving levels.

Educational Demographics

I chose to label eight demographics included in earlier studies that were centered on academic measures as educational demographics. They were: level of education; degrees from other institutions; number of years of attendance; academic ability and achievement; major; and high school grade point average and achievement. Two demographics: primary undergraduate residence, and involvement in high school were not specific academic measures, but were related to and could affect academic measures so I included them in this section. Four studies did not consider any educational demographics (Cascione, 2000; Nirschel, 1997; Thomas, 2005; Van Horn, 2002).

Level of education

Although researchers used slightly different measures, three of four researchers agreed in their conclusions that the educational level of an alumnus indicated that they would be donors (Haddad, 1986; Oglesby, 1991; Wetta, 1990). One researcher, Korvas (1984), had contradictory results: level of education did not indicate that alumni would be donors.

With regard to giving levels Haddad (1986) and Violand (1998) agreed that the first degree was an indicator of giving level, while Burnett et al. (1974), Violand (1998), and Hunter (1997) noted that alumni with more than one degree were more likely to have higher giving levels than alumni with just an undergraduate degree. Two other researchers found that the highest degree did not discriminate between giving levels (Korvas, 1984; Oglesby, 1991). In summary, generally alumni donors of private and faith-

based institutions had a higher level of education than nondonors. Research results were inconsistent in indicating whether or not donors who had a higher level of education were also more likely to give at a higher level.

Degrees from other institutions

The conclusions from the three studies of whether or not alumni who had degrees from several institutions would be donors or nonodors were contradictory. Specifically, alumni were more likely to be donors in Cristanello's (1992) and Koole's (1981) studies, but were not in Korvas's (1984) study.

The giving level of alumni was affected by the type and number of degrees from the first institution and the type and number of degrees from other institutions in two studies, but not in two others. Specifically, while degrees from different institutions did not affect annual giving, Hunter (1997) discovered that this psychographic was indicative of the alumni donor's 5-year cumulative giving total and their most recent gift. In addition, Violand (1998) found that while the institution of the first degree was not an indicative demographic for giving levels, the institution for the second degree was. Also, alumni with a third degree from the study institution were more likely to be lower level donors than donors with a third degree from another institution. However, Korvas (1984) and Oglesby (1991) concluded that a baccalaureate degree from another university or college did not discriminate between giving levels.

Number of years of attendance

A related demographic to the number of degrees is the number of years of attendance. Years of attendance indicated donor status in all the studies that included this educational demographic. Specifically four researchers, Koole (1981), Korvas (1984), Violand (1998), and Wetta (1990), found that the number of years attended distinguished between donors and nondonors. Although another researcher, Nirschel (1997), noted that the length of time associated with the university was a factor worth examining, he did not include it in his study (p. 86).

Two researchers who studied the relationship between giving level and the number of years of attendance had contradictory findings. One found it to be an indicative educational demographic (Violand, 1998), and another found it was not (Korvas, 1984).

Academic ability and achievement

All four researchers who studied various measures of academic achievement (e.g., GPA and SAT scores) found that this educational demographic did not discriminate between alumni donors and nondonors (Cristanello, 1992; Koole, 1981; Korvas, 1984; Oglesby, 1991).

Two researchers found that academic achievement did not affect giving levels (Korvas, 1984; Oglesby, 1991). However, another researcher reported that undergraduate achievement did affect giving levels (Hunter, 1997). Violand (1998) concluded that a

related characteristic, the inclusion of an alumnus in Who's Who, did not affect giving level.

Major

Three of five researchers discovered that academic major was indicative of donor status (Haddad, 1986; Koole, 1981; Wetta, 1990). Koole (1981) even noted distinctions between different majors. "Alumni majoring in history and English were observed to be donors more often. . . . General education, music and business students appeared as nondonors significantly more often than alumni with other majors" (p. 59). On the other hand, two researchers, Korvas (1984) and Oglesby (1991), found that academic major was not indicative of donor status.

Burnett et al. (1974), Haddad (1986), Hunter (1997), Korvas (1984), and Oglesby (1991) found that no significant relationship existed between academic major and the giving levels. However, Violand (1998) found that academic major was a significant factor for giving level for engineering majors.

In summary, researchers were about evenly divided in their findings of whether or not major affected donor status. Most agreed that major did not indicate giving levels.

High school grade point average

Two researchers tested high school grade point average as an indicator of donor status (Koole, 1981; Korvas, 1984). Both found that it was not an indicator.

Undergraduate residence

When considering the type of undergraduate housing of an alumnus while completing their undergraduate degree, all five researchers concurred that the type (on-campus or commuter resident) of undergraduate housing did not indicate donor status (Haddad, 1986; Koole, 1981; Korvas, 1984; Oglesby, 1991; Wetta, 1990). Korvas (1984) and Oglesby (1991) also noted that the type of undergraduate housing was not an indicator of giving levels.

Involvement in high school

Only one researcher tested the involvement in high school extracurricular activities as a indicator of donor status (Koole, 1981). He found it did not indicate whether alumni would be donors or nondonors.

Summary of Demographics as Related to Donor Status and Giving Levels

For summary purposes, I classified the general and educational demographics into four groups based on the general consensus of researchers as to how they were related to donor status or giving levels. The groups could be useful divisions for practitioners. The first group was composed of the demographics that all or almost all researchers agreed were indicative of donor status and/or giving level. The second group was composed of those demographics studied by three or more researchers who disagreed as to whether or not they indicated donor status and giving level. The third group was composed of the demographics that most or all researchers agreed were not indicators of donor status or

giving level. The fourth group was composed of the demographics that were studied by only one researcher and did not indicate donor status or giving level.

Most or all of the researchers concluded that correlations between donors and four general and educational demographics existed. Donors were more likely to be older, graduated earlier, have a higher level of education, and have attended the institution for a longer period of time. Most or all researchers found that six general and educational demographics were indicators of higher giving levels by donors. They were: age, year of graduation, gender, number of children, capacity, and level of education.

Researchers contradicted each other as to whether 11 general and educational demographics were indicators of donors. Donor status was not reliably indicated by: current occupation, marital status, parenthood, number of children, age and grade level of children, spouse being an alumnus, relatives who were alumni, capacity or income, receipt of financial aid, having a degree or degrees from other institutions, and academic major. Researchers were about evenly divided in their opinion as to whether or not seven demographics were indicative of giving level. The demographics were: occupation, age of children, spouse is an alumnus, degrees from other institutions, number of years of attendance, receipt of grant or scholarship, and academic ability and achievement.

Researchers were generally agreed that six general and educational demographics were not indicators of donors. These demographics were: gender, geographic location, repayment or receipt of loans, academic ability or achievement, and undergraduate residence location. Five general and educational demographics were not found to be indicators of giving levels by most or all researchers. They were: marital status,

parenthood, geographic location, receipt of grant or scholarship, repayment or receipt of loans, academic major, and undergraduate residence.

Only one researcher studied five general and educational demographics so it is hardly fair to generalize based on their conclusions. None were indicators of donor status. They were: employment status, ethnicity, high school GPA, involvement in high school, and father's occupation. (It was interesting to note that no researcher studied the effect of the mother's occupation on giving behavior.) Only one researcher also studied five general and educational demographics and their relationship to giving level. Employment status, birthplace, and receipt of financial aid were not indicators of giving levels. The other two demographics, relatives who were alumni, and ethnicity, were however indicators of giving levels.

Psychographics

Earlier researchers reported on 12 psychographics that I chose to divide into three groups: when they were students (5), after graduation (5), and related to religion (2). The psychographics for the alumni, when students, were: general involvement; involvement in student government; involvement in athletics; involvement in academic honor clubs, Greek organizations, or sororities and fraternities; and impact of institutional strictness. (General involvement is the phrase I have used to capture several generic measures in different studies sometimes termed extracurricular or co-curricular or non-academic activities or sometimes just involvement as distinct from the other specific types of

involvement that were studied.) The psychographics of alumni after graduation centered on connections with the university, initiated by either the alumni or university personnel. They were: general involvement, receipt of publications, planned campus visits, volunteerism, and receipt of honorary awards or a doctorate. (Again, general involvement is the term I have chosen to include several generic measures in different studies such as alumni involvement, participation, or membership as distinct from the other specific types of involvement that were listed.) The religious psychographics were: church affiliation and religious involvement.

Involvement as students

Four of seven researchers found that general involvement as a student was indicative of alumni who were donors (Haddad, 1986; Koole, 1981; Thomas, 2005; Wetta, 1990). Oglesby (1991) found that involvement in certain extracurricular activities while a student (student publications, small group ministries, or dramatics) discriminated between donors and nondonors and involvement in certain others (music group, literary, special interest) did not. Participation in extracurricular activities was also not an indicator that an alumnus would be a donor in Korvas's (1984) and Cristanello's (1992) study.

Involvement in student activities was indicative of giving level in two studies (Haddad, 1986; Thomas, 2005), but not in two other studies where no measurements of involvement in student activities were indicative of giving level (Korvas, 1984; Oglesby, 1991).

Involvement in student government was an indicator of donors in three studies (Koole, 1981; Oglesby, 1991; Thomas, 2005). Alumni who had been involved in student government or campus leadership were also more likely to be donors of larger gifts (Oglesby, 1991; Thomas, 2005).

Involvement in athletics was also an indicator of donors in Koole's (1981) study, though not in Oglesby's (1991). Alumni who had been involved in athletics were more likely to be donors of larger gifts (Oglesby, 1991). In summary, involvement in athletics or student government as a student was indicative of donor status and giving levels.

Opinion was divided as to whether or not alumni who had had membership in a Greek organization, sorority, or fraternity indicated either donor status or giving level. Specifically, Oglesby (1991) noted that "academic honorary society membership discriminated between donors and nondonors" (p. 191) as did Haddad (1986). Thomas (2005) measured academic involvement and found it differentiated between donors and nondonors. On the contrary, Koole (1981) found that membership in honor societies did not indicate donor status. Although Haddad (1986), Hunter (1997), and Violand (1998) concluded that being a member of honor clubs or Greek societies indicated giving level, Oglesby (1991) found membership did not indicate giving level.

Impact of institutional strictness

Koole (1981) found that frequency of social discipline did not differentiate between donors and nondonors to the university.

Involvement as alumni

Most studies (four of five) reported that general involvement was an indicator of donors (Haddad, 1986; Koole, 1981; Korvas, 1984; Wetta, 1990). The one exception was the study by Cristanello (1992). All four studies that analyzed alumni involvement and giving levels reported that involvement was indicative of giving levels (Haddad, 1986; Hunter, 1997; Korvas, 1984; Violand, 1998).

One researcher (Wetta, 1990) found that reading of alumni publications differentiated between donors and nondonors. Another (Hunter, 1997) noted that receipt of publications did not indicate giving levels.

Alumni making campus visits were inconsistently indicative of both donor status and giving levels. Specifically, Wetta (1990) discovered that the frequency of visits to the alma mater campus was indicative of donors whereas two researchers came to opposite conclusions and found that campus visits did not correlate with donor status (Korvas, 1984; Oglesby, 1991). Hunter (1997) and Oglesby (1991) concluded that alumni who visited campus gave at a higher level than those who did not. However, Korvas (1984) found that a planned campus visit was not indicative of giving levels.

Volunteerism

As the lone researcher who studied alumni volunteerism and donor status, Nirschel (1997) found that volunteerism was indicative of donors, noting that "nearly all volunteers, Cuban and Jewish, made contributions where they volunteered" (p. 84). As

the only researcher who studied volunteerism and giving levels, Violand (1998) found that being a volunteer was not indicative of giving levels.

Honorary awards or doctorate

Violand (1998) found that the receipt of an alumnus award or a doctorate increased the giving level and suggested that such alumni were logical prospects to approach for donations to the institution.

Religious psychographics

Religious factors—church affiliation and involvement—were considered outside the scope of the study for some researchers. As might be expected, two were those who studied alumni populations from independent colleges (Haddad, 1986; Violand, 1998). More surprising was the fact that four who studied the alumni populations from faith-based colleges chose to not consider any religious factors (Cristanello, 1992; Koole, 1981; Thomas, 2005; Van Horn, 2002). A synopsis of the effects of two factors, church affiliation and involvement, on donor status and giving levels from six studies follows.

Church affiliation and attitudes about religion

Religious affiliation was indicative of donors in all 11 of the colleges studied by Wetta (1990). (Five of the 11 institutions were affiliated with the Roman Catholic church.) Korvas (1984) whose institution was also affiliated with the Roman Catholic church also noted that religious affiliation was indicative of donors. Nirschel's (1997) study also supported the conclusion, noting, "Religion was cited by just over half the

Cuban sample and 40% of the Jewish sample as an important influence on their charitable giving” (p. 8). However, in one study, denominational preference while an undergraduate for a Baptist population was not a distinguishing psychographic between donors and nondonors (Oglesby, 1991).

The three researchers who studied giving levels and church affiliation came to contradictory conclusions. Hunter (1997) and Korvas (1984) concluded that church affiliation was indicative of giving levels and Oglesby (1991) disagreed.

Cascione (2000), in a qualitative study, noted that both Judaism and Christianity encouraged adherents to be philanthropists by religious factors and program opportunities. Those individuals who claimed to not have been affiliated with a church at the time of his study had previously been affiliated. His conclusion seems to me to aptly portray the research findings of the influence of organized religion on donor status and level. The “impact of affiliation, if potent at one time may leave a strong residual patina to one’s philosophy of life and generosity” (p. 159).

Religious involvement

The only researcher who studied religious involvement and donor status noted that “alumni who report a higher level of involvement in the church are more likely to be donors than nondonors” (Oglesby, 1991, p. 240). The three researchers who studied religious involvement and giving levels differed in their conclusions. Specifically, in a study of Brigham Young University alumni, researchers found “that those who perceive themselves to be religiously active are more supportive than those who do not” (Burnett

et al., 1974, p. 158). However, both Hunter (1997) and Oglesby (1991) found that involvement, as measured by church attendance, was not indicative of giving levels.

Summary of Psychographics as Related to Donor Status and Giving Levels

For summary purposes, as for general and educational demographics, I classified the psychographics into four groups based on the general consensus of researchers as to how they were related to donor status or giving levels. Group one was comprised of the psychographics that all or almost all researchers agreed were indicative of donor status or level. Group two were those psychographics studied by two or more researchers who disagreed as to whether or not they indicated donor status and giving level. No psychographics met the criteria for group three, psychographics that more than two researchers found did not indicate donor status and giving level. Group four was comprised of psychographics that were studied by only one researcher and tended to indicate both donor status and giving level.

All or almost all of the researchers who studied each of four psychographics agreed they were indicative of donor status: involvement in student government as a student; involvement in honor clubs and Greek societies as a student; general involvement as an alumnus; and religious affiliation. Three psychographics: involvement in student government; involvement in honor clubs and Greek societies as a student; and general involvement as an alumnus were consistently indicators of giving level.

Researchers contradicted each other on whether or not three psychographics had indicative value for donor status: general involvement as a student; involvement in athletics as a student; and planned campus visits as an alumnus. Researchers were also fairly evenly divided in their conclusions regarding four psychographics and how they affected giving levels. General involvement by students, planned campus visits as an alumnus, church affiliation and religious involvement sometimes were indicators of giving levels and sometimes not.

Only one researcher studied three psychographics and found them to be indicators of donor status: receipt of publications, volunteerism, and religious involvement or attendance. The researcher who studied the impact of the institution's strictness concluded that it was not indicative of donor status. Four psychographics and their relationship to giving level were also studied by only one researcher. One indicated giving levels: involvement in athletics as a student. Three psychographics did not indicate giving levels: receipt of publications, volunteerism, and receipt of an honorary doctorate or award as an alumnus.

Reasons for Giving by Donors in General

Early in the history of the United States, philanthropy was the purview of the wealthy (also the powerful and societal leaders) who felt obliged to facilitate a better life for the poor and to provide access to education and libraries for those who could not afford it (Carnegie, 1993, p. 10, as cited in Oates, 1994). Odendahl (1990) notes that much philanthropy or mere charitable giving continues in order to ensure the

philanthropist a position of power, and, used wisely, that of leadership. Specifically, "contemporary American philanthropy is a system of 'generosity' by which the wealthy exercise social control and help themselves more than they do others" (p. 245). Wealthy donors also choose to give transformational gifts. These major donors are considered active investors who often want to be involved as volunteers as well as requiring direct positive evidence of improved conditions for the beneficiaries of the gift (Grace & Wendroff, 2001, pp. 4, 5, 6). Venture philanthropists are a third type of wealthy donor, a parallel to venture capitalists. These individuals desire to donate funds for social causes in which they are engaged typically over a long period of time, for which there is a strong business plan that includes milestones, tangible social returns, and an exit strategy—typically sustainability or closure of the project or organization (Pepin, 2005).

While the improvement of humankind is still a primary objective for many philanthropists, no longer is it just the wealthy who participate and the reasons for giving are multiple, integrated and complex. Both wealthy and general (or non-wealthy) donors give resources to nonprofits for a variety of reasons. Researchers have discovered that these reasons include:

the desire to buy acclaim and friendship, the need to assuage feelings of guilt, the wish to repay society for advantages received . . . egotism . . . an investment in activities that have indirect utility to the donor (such as support of an institution's research . . .) . . . or to obtain tangible perquisites (such as . . . a name on a building). (Worth, 1993, p. 31)

Respondents to the Giving USA 2001 survey noted five reasons for giving as follows. "They were personally asked to contribute. They wanted to get an income tax deduction. Their religious obligations or beliefs encourage giving. Something is owed to

the community. Those who have more should give to those who have less" (The Center on Philanthropy, 2001b, p. 57).

Sargeant and Jay (2004) noted that giving is a complex behavior and presented five key reasons for giving summarized from other research. First, people give out of self-interest. Specifically they want to increase or enhance self-esteem, atone for "sins," obtain recognition, have access to services, reciprocate for benefits, memorialize an individual, honor friends or loved ones, and obtain tax breaks (pp. 29, 30). The second and third reasons for giving are because donors feel empathy and sympathy with the beneficiaries of the nonprofit. Empathetic donors give because they identify with the suffering of others. Sympathetic donors give because they feel it is inappropriate for beneficiaries to be suffering (p. 31). Then the fourth reason is a heightened sense of social justice or their belief that a just world is threatened. Finally, some individuals donate because they believe in conforming to social norms and behaving like their peers (p. 32).

In addition, Sargeant noted some other factors that affect giving that are less fundamental than the five reasons for giving he has categorized as key. Individuals who feel that they are free to choose to give will suppress their giving if they feel they are being coerced. The level of performance of an organization also makes a difference in who receives a gift when donors choose between organizations. How requests are made, the portrayal of beneficiaries, and the strength of the stimulus can be either positive or negative influences on giving behavior (Sargeant & Jay, 2004, pp. 33-38).

Nirschel (1997) noted that altruism, religion, desire for social justice, feeling of indebtedness, tax considerations, recognition and entry or maintenance of group memberships were potential reasons for giving (p. 30).

Panas (1984) found that fear of social ostracism was a factor that influenced giving, as was indebtedness, a sense of morality, a need to share, a habit, and acquiring of wealth (pp. 39-44).

Some individuals give because they feel obliged to donate. This is perhaps best illustrated by the Jewish concept of *tsadaka*. Also spelled *tzedakah*, a Jew noted, "Tzedakah teaches us that we are supposed to do good deeds, to redeem the world by helping others . . . and, we should do it anonymously, that is the highest form of giving and the only real charity" (Nirschel, 1997, p. 70).

The comments of three experts are illustrative of the extent to which obligation is an overarching framework for giving in Jewish communities. Nirschel (1997) who studied Jewish alumni noted that "those who identified themselves as religious were most likely to consider giving an obligation" (p. 82). Cascione (2000), in reporting the comments of a non-Jewish donor on Jewish community giving, states: "There is something about that community that says there's a responsibility to give back" (p. 145). Finally, the Jewish law dictates "one is obligated to give to everyone who extends his hand [to ask for charity]. This includes gentiles [and idolaters] since one is obligated to support the gentile poor together with the poor of Israel" (Arbaah Turim, Yoreh De'ah, sec. 251, subsec. 2, as cited in Tamari, 1995, p. 165; see also Cascione, 2000, pp. 145,

146). Panas (1984) noted that one difference between Jews and Gentiles in their giving is that "the Jew feels that giving is an ingrained duty" (p. 38).

Influential Reasons for Giving by Wealthy Donors

Anecdotes and practice, models, and researched theories serve as the three sources for the reasons for giving by wealthy donors. While there are numerous anecdotes and practitioners' opinions, there are far fewer models and researched theories that explain the reasons behind giving behavior. Among these, two models—the seven faces of philanthropy and Odendal's (1990) six profiles—and two theories—the Social Exchange Theory and the Identification Theory—are among the most well-known and seem to be the most relevant to the focus of my study of the Adventist culture of philanthropy.

Practitioner Wisdom and Anecdotes

Reporters have related anecdotes and commented in a variety of news media on the reasons that wealthy donors give. Several quotations have been chosen to illustrate reasons for giving commonly attributed to wealthy donors. The reasons are: participation or involvement, a responsibility to help the less fortunate, do good and recognition or publicity.

Participation is one reason that wealthy donors give to nonprofits. Tash Shifrin (2003) noted that "many donors would like to become more involved in their chosen charities but are given few opportunities to do so. Donors can feel taken for granted and as a result either limit or halt their giving" (paragraph 6). Journalist Lynda Richardson (2003) reported that a donor told a successful fundraiser, "Dwight, you make people

want to be a part of what you're involved in, then you make them empty their pockets"" (paragraph 2).

Another reason that wealthy donors give is because they feel a responsibility to help those less fortunate than themselves. For example, staff writer Alexa Capeloto (2003) quotes businessman Larry Kraft as saying that whether his income falls or rises, philanthropy will still be a priority. "Regardless of the circumstances, people can't pull back from nonprofit organizations that need money. Those who are less fortunate need to be taken care of" (paragraph 26). Joan Kroc declared that she was "'a maverick salvationist'" (Montgomery, 2004, paragraph 7). Former President Bill Clinton supports and urges high net worth individuals to support charitable causes that fill in the gap between the government and the common good (Perlman, 2004).

By their own admission, wealthy individuals also give because they want to do good. This theme is illustrated in Andrew Carnegie's philosophy. He notes in his *Gospel of Wealth* that the millionaire who gives will be sustained knowing that "because he has lived, perhaps one small part of the world has been bettered just a little" (Carnegie, 1993, p. 25).

Wealthy individuals may give away money in a calculated fashion that takes advantage of the general recognition and publicity for a political cause or special interest as well as maintenance of the donor's elite standing. For instance, Teresa Heinz Kerry who controls the Heinz fortune has strategically used charitable donations for environmental causes and as a form of effective political power (Arnold, 2004). A few others, represented by Joan Kroc, heir to the McDonald's fortune, however, seemed to

have behaved in the opposite way. It appears that she quietly made surprise gifts of staggering sums with no apparent rhyme or reason, besides what captured her attention. She also ignored any requests for gifts (Montgomery, 2004).

Perhaps intrigued by the anecdotal documentation of reasons for giving by wealthy donors and certainly from a desire to maximize the usefulness of his long and successful experience as a fundraiser, a practitioner, Jerold Panas, searched for the answer to the question, "Why do people give a \$1 million gift?" (Panas, 1984). He interviewed 22 men and women who had made at least one such gift. They were not randomly chosen, rather were mostly individuals he knew, wanted to remain private but agreed to an interview as a personal favor. He used a list of 22 reasons for giving that had been developed with and tested by more than 1,000 fundraising professionals. An additional reason for giving emerged in each of the interviews with wealthy donors and philanthropists, an overarching reason for giving a major gift—the joy of giving. The 23 motivations in rank order by donors from most to least popular are listed in Table 3.

Donor Models

Two donor models have been developed, both based on factors that influence philanthropic behavior; one is the six profiles described by Odendahl (1990) and the other is the seven faces of philanthropy developed by Prince and File (1994).

Odendahl (1990) interviewed 140 wealthy donors using an anthropological methodology and concluded that individuals could be placed in one of six philanthropic profiles named: Dynasty and Philanthropy, First Generation Man, Lady Bountiful, Elite

Table 3

Comparison of Donors' Rating of Reasons for Giving

Reason for Giving	Donors' Rating
Joy of giving	1
Belief in the mission of institution	2
Community responsibility and civic pride	3
Fiscal stability of the institution†	4
Regard for staff leadership†	4
Respect of the institution locally	5
Regard for the volunteer leadership of the institution	6
Serves on the Board of Trustees, a major committee, or other official body of the institution	7
Respect for the institution in a wider circle—religion, nation, state	8
Has an adult history of being involved in the institution	9
Leverage of influence of solicitor	10
Great interest in a specific program within the project	11
Was involved at one time in the activity of the institution—personal benefit	12
Religious or spiritual affiliation of the institution	13
Recognition of the gift	14
The uniqueness of the project or the institution†	15
To challenge or encourage other gifts†	15
Is actually involved in the campaign program	16
To match a gift or gifts made by others	17
Memorial opportunity	18
Tax considerations	19
The appeal and drama of the campaign material requesting the gift	20
Guilt feelings	21

Note. From *Mega Gifts: Who Gives Them, Who Gets Them?* (pp. 230, 231), by Jerold Panas, 1984, Chicago: Bonus Books.

† Equal numbers of respondents ranked these reasons as most important.

Jewish Giving, Alternative Fund, and Wealthy Feminist. Her classifications were based on religious orientation and cultural and lifestyle factors.

A summary that includes the overarching reasons for giving by individuals in each of philanthropic profiles follows. The Dynasts give to repay their peers. They also give to obtain and maintain control and power as well as for the rewards of gratification and the impetus to their egos (Odendahl, 1990, p. 99). The First Generation Man gives because philanthropy is one of two pleasing alternatives (the other being his heirs). His third option is generally one that he chooses to avoid or minimize: giving to government. His philanthropy is a means of moving into or staying in an established social class (Odendahl, 1990, p. 137). The Bountiful Lady's career is philanthropy. It is a career that does not threaten men in her social class and perpetuates the class and its functions. Giving enables related self-made men to enter society and engenders acceptance for her sons and daughters (Odendahl, 1990, pp. 116, 117). The Jew gives to maintain a distinctive identity and be accepted into mainstream American circles, particularly the White ones (Odendahl, 1990, p. 159). In addition, charity is a guiding principle of the Jewish religion (p. 143) and the Jews have a strong sense of responsibility that ensures giving to Jewish causes (p. 151).

By contrast, the Alternatives give to effect social change and share power. In return, they receive "a sense of identity, meaningful activity and personal authority" (Odendahl, 1990, pp. 184, 185). The Wealthy Feminists are trying to achieve social change, but to the extent they are not representative or egalitarian in their systems and processes, they fall into the traditional status quo—a hierarchy of power brokers and

supplicants (pp. 207, 208).

In the second model Prince and File (1994) built on the groundwork of previous studies on wealthy donors using the framework of social exchange by conducting a study that included "all the attitudinal and motivational variables identified by other researchers" (p. 6). The multi-year quantitative study with over 800 participants in one or more of the three phases culminated in segmenting donors by motivations and behaviors into seven profiles that they labeled the seven faces of philanthropy (p. 8). The seven faces or profiles of people with similar reasons for giving were then named Communitarians, Devout, Investor, Socialite, Altruist, Repayer, Dynast (Prince & File, 1994, p. 5).

One reason each of the groups had in common for their giving behavior was that they believed that nonprofits were better than a government agency. For example, the Dynast believes that private philanthropy is more effective than government programs and the Devout believes that the government does not support religious causes. Illustrative reasons for giving in each of the Prince and File (1994) defined profiles appears in Table 4.

Theories of Giving

Fundraising practice in educational institutions as an internal, specialized function is relatively new (Kelly, 1991, pp. 40, 41) and has typically been based on anecdotal evidence and practitioner opinion rather than researched and developed theories (Kelly, 2002). In order to better understand the relative importance of the well-documented

Table 4

Summary of Reasons for Giving of the Seven Faces of Philanthropy

Group or Face	Reasons for Giving
Communitarian	It makes good sense, especially business sense. They want to give back.
Devout	It is God's will—a moral imperative or responsibility. It is good to be selfless.
Investor	It is good business (structure for tax benefits) and good work combined. They do not give because it is a moral imperative.
Socialite	It is fun. They want to join with their peers to make the world a better place.
Altruist	It feels right. It is a moral imperative and makes them grow as human beings or develop/evolve spiritually.
Repayer	They want to return the good done to them. They give out of loyalty and gratitude. They give because good results will follow.
Dynast	It is a family tradition. It is part of their self-concept and philanthropy is everyone's responsibility.

Note. From *Seven Faces of Philanthropy* (pp. 14, 15, 16), by R.A. Prince and K.M. File, 1994, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

factors (in the last 20 years) that induce giving behavior, researchers in the nonprofit arena have proposed several theories of giving, including altruism, obligation, and social exchange (Schervish, 1997b, p. 110). Although I have chosen to use the Identification Theory that Paul Schervish and other researchers such as John J. Havens have developed and validated by extensive research, I have also included a brief description of the Social Exchange Theory, since these theories are foundational to many models, and much practice and research (Kelly, 1991; Schervish et al., 1993).

Social Exchange Theory

A group of well-known and practiced theories can be classified as the Social Exchange Theory; in summary, defined as a transaction of mutual benefit for donor and organization. Toscano (2003) defines exchange in development as “a process where donors give to nonprofit organizations to achieve shared or complementary values” (Toscano, 2003, p. 1). Sturtevant (1997) defines the exchange relationship as “providing people with the experience they expect in return for a gift” (p. 36). The Social Exchange Theory is not only implicitly supported in studies such as those conducted by Odendahl (1990) and Sargeant and Jay (2004), it is the explicit foundational theory in the study by Prince and File (1994). It is also widely accepted and used by practitioners, an example of whom is Jerold Panas (1984). As an illustration of how the theory is applied to giving behavior, Panas (1984) relates that Moses Annenberg, father of Walter Annenberg, passed on to his young son a “motivating philosophy of life. Give, and it comes back to you. Help the poor and the needy. If you do, you will prosper” (p. 2).

Public relations is a foundational discipline for the social exchange theories that

have been applied to fundraising. The nature of fundraising is explained as the managing of communications with donors and potential donors who could have a significant influence over the future of the institution (Wedgeworth, 2000). Kelly (1997) has extensively developed this theory based on her research since 1990. Concepts of interdependence, relationship, symmetrical, and asymmetrical models are included.

Kelly (1997) noted there are three asymmetrical theories that are less useful than symmetrical theories. First is the Theory of Magic Buttons, summarized as the solicitor discovering what makes a donor give and then sending the appropriate message that results in desired behavior—a gift (p. 151). Second is the Magic Bullet Theory where the organization sends out a great quantity of communication, some of which finds its mark and gifts result. Finally, there is the Domino Model described as “four dominos—message, knowledge, attitude, and behavior—toppling each other in line” (p. 152). She dismisses these asymmetrical models as simplistic solutions that fail to acknowledge the subject’s complexity and are not very effective (p. 158).

Kelly (1997) believes that nonprofits that base their strategy on symmetrical models and mutual understanding, rather than stimulus response behavior, will be more successful. An example is the situational Theory of Publics, “which predicts that donor behavior is dependent on the three factors of involvement, problem recognition, and constraints” (p. 156). In this situation the practitioners rely on three important factors to identify donors: (a) closeness or the degree to which prospects are connected to the organization and its work, which can be defined as involvement; (b) belief or interest in the organization’s mission, goals, and priorities, which can be defined as identification

with a problem; and (c) ability or capacity to give, which is equivalent to financial constraints.

In addition to being an essential principle in the marketing and public relations arenas, the Social Exchange Theory is an overarching concept in systems theory of organizations. The Social Exchange Theory

explains the relationships between charitable organizations and donors as environmental interdependencies. Organizations succeed and survive depending on how well they manage interdependencies with numerous stakeholders, or those critical constituencies that can influence organizational goals. Donors are enabling stakeholders whose resources are needed to varying degrees by organizations, and donors look to recipients of their gifts for various returns (i.e., they engage in a social exchange). (Kelly, 1997, p. 141)

Identification Theory

A second theory is the Identification Theory formulated by Paul Schervish as a result of his research on wealthy philanthropists and reported first in 1993 (Schervish et al., 1993). Initially, this was an inductively generated theory with five determinants (clusters of influential factors) of giving behavior. Two additional determinants were discovered in later research that also confirmed the Identification Theory (Schervish & Havens, 1997, 2000; Schervish, Coutsoukis, & Havens, 1998). The determinants—reasons for giving and psychographics—were further refined in additional studies using a sample of wealthy individuals—130 millionaires (Schervish & Havens, 2000). Although the original conclusions were based on the study of the wealthy, researchers believed that “a similar intensity of dedication to the care of others is evinced by good-hearted individuals from all economic strata” (Schervish et al., 1993, p. 37). Subsequent research with a sample of Bostonians substantiated this belief that the moral

identity is not limited to wealthy individuals (Schervish & Havens, 2001).

Brief definitions of each of the seven determinants follow, in alphabetical order.

1. Communities of Participation are networks to which people are associated. A community of participation is also defined as "an organizational setting in which philanthropy is expected or at least invited by the fact of being active in the organization" (Schervish et al., p. 33).

2. Discretionary Resources is the capacity to give or the presence of liquid resources to devote to philanthropy (p. 36).

3. Frameworks of Consciousness are ways of thinking and feeling that can induce a commitment. Frameworks of Consciousness include values as well as cultural, religious, and political beliefs (p. 33).

4. Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards are a range of benefits for giving behavior such as the joy of giving, public recognition, or a tax deduction. Ultimately "philanthropy becomes its own reward and encourages deeper commitment" (p. 35).

5. Invitation to Participate or direct requests are mediating persons or organizations or an "interaction with a socializing agent—a person or organization that in some way provides an introductory path into the moral and institutional responsibilities of philanthropy" (Schervish et al., 1993, p. 34). It is being asked "by someone who is known and respected by the potential donor" who can "help them see how 'philanthropy might be the vehicle' to accomplish their goals" (p. 35).

6. Urgency and Effectiveness factors relate to the expectations of potential donors for the nonprofit organizations, how effective the organizations are, and how urgent the social need they were meeting is (Schervish & Havens, 2000, p. 11).

7. Youth Models and Experiences are the people and socializing experiences that shape adult attitudes and behavior. Examples in this category include a person or an experience in one's youth, or the effect of a childhood experience, or a significant adult teaching the importance of charity by word or example (Schervish et al., 1993, p. 34; Schervish & Havens, 1997, p. 242).

Schervish and Havens (2001) begin with the assumption that those people who care for themselves have empathy and their care then extends to family and friends (often informal giving) and then formal documented giving (Schervish & Havens, 2001). Thus, this relational theory contrasts with the theories of giving based on altruism where the first or primary focus is on others rather than the self. The seven determinants for giving are interwoven in the lives of individuals, best summarized in their words: "The organisations in which we participate, the cultural frameworks we embrace, the pleas to which we are attuned and the resources we deem able to give are inextricably linked" (Schervish & Havens, 1997, p. 242). Schervish (1993) found that one or more of the seven determinants influences the giving behavior of individuals. He also noted that these mobilizing factors for giving behavior are not all equally important or necessarily all present in one individual (Schervish et al., 1993, p. 38).

Careful reflection reveals that this theory also describes a prevalent Adventist mind-set. Adventists' philanthropy is part and parcel of their human identity, highly personalized, and derived from experience. Schervish et al. (1993) maintain that "philanthropic identity means that one's moral biography is shaped in large measure by devotion to the quantity and quality of one's charity." It is engaging "the self in a more

profound way” (p. 36). It is a matter of personal transformation moving from having to [obligation] to wanting to (Schervish et al., 1993, p. 37). For Adventists, the church is the primary charity, and their giving behavior seems to be inextricably linked with and shaped by their religion and spirituality.

Reasons for Alumni Giving to Higher Education

The reasons that a specific population group, the alumni of institutions of higher education, give to their alma maters seem to echo the reasons for giving that influence the giving behavior of the general and wealthy populations. These reasons for giving by alumni are summarized in two studies as follows.

1. Leslie and Ramey (1988) reported reasons that are specific to educational institutions. “Alumni carry on close social and emotional ties with their institutions.” While the contribution of an alumnus to his or her institution may be to provide educational benefits for society, it more likely is to “involve his or her reputation as reflected in the prestige of the alma mater.” Other reasons include “a desire to repay the institution for education and a heightened recognition of the academic benefits provided by the institution” (p. 121).

2. The authors of the report prepared for the Council for Aid to Education elucidate two similar reasons for giving by alumni: giving back and providing opportunities for others. Other reasons that alumni give to higher education are: “saying thanks, . . . improving the quality of life, solving problems in society, and preserving and perpetuating our nations’ values, to name but a few” (Caulkins et al., 2002, p. 4).

Reasons Alumni Give to Independent and Faith-Based Institutions

Haddad (1986), one of the earliest researchers of demographics and psychographics of alumni donors and nondonors, recommended that donor motivation be a topic for future study. The reasons for giving and reasons for not giving found in the subsequent research on independent and faith-based institutions of higher education are reviewed in this section.

Two studies (Gibbons, 1992; Smith, 1998) had as a primary focus the reasons why alumni populations of independent colleges and universities give and do not give. Another researcher (Wetta, 1990) included 15 reasons for giving. Eight other studies included only 1 to 5 reasons for giving and their relationship to donor status as a secondary consideration to their search for the demographics and psychographics that described donors (Cascione, 2000; Cristanello, 1992; Haddad, 1986; Koole, 1981; Korvas, 1984; Nirschel, 1997; Oglesby, 1991; Van Horn, 2002). Six researchers reported a total of 23 reasons for giving and their relationship to giving levels (Burnett et al., 1974; Haddad, 1986; Hunter, 1997; Oglesby, 1991; Nirschel, 1997; Violand, 1998).

In order to effectively compare the similarities and contrast the differences in these studies, I chose to label the results based on the four methodologies used in each of the studies: statistical analysis, qualitative analysis, answers to open-ended questions, and ranking. Findings that resulted from statistical analysis are noted as an indicator or non-indicator of donor status and giving level. Examples of studies in this category were Koole (1984) and Cristanello (1992). Findings that resulted from qualitative analysis or yes/no (dichotomus) answers to open-ended questions were reported as affecting or not

affecting donor status or giving level. Examples of studies in this category were: Burnett et al. (1974) and Smith (1998). Findings that resulted from ranking in one study (Gibbons, 1992) were reported as ranked (great, moderate, mild, and low influence).

I also classified the reasons for giving into the seven determinants articulated by Schervish and Havens (2000). They were: Communities of Participation, Discretionary Resources, Frameworks of Consciousness, Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards, Invitation to Participate, Urgency and Effectiveness, and Youth Models and Experiences. The indicators of relationships between donor status and 40 reasons for giving by alumni of independent and faith-based colleges and universities are presented in Table 5, while the indicators of relationships between giving levels and 23 reasons for giving by alumni of independent and faith-based colleges and universities are presented in Table 6.

Communities of Participation

Researchers studied six reasons for giving and their relationship with donor status in this cluster. They were: participation or involvement as an alumnus, committee service, involvement in a campaign, pride of association, family ties to the university, and spouse contributes to the university. Three of four researchers agreed that participation indicated donor status (Haddad, 1986; Koole, 1981; Wetta, 1990). One researcher disagreed, noting that participation as an alumnus had no effect on the decision as to whether or not an alumni would make a gift to the institution (Smith, 1998). The relationships between the other five reasons of giving in this cluster and donor status were studied by five

Table 5

Reasons for Giving by Alumni From Faith-Based and Independent Colleges and Universities—Donor Status

Author's Last Name	Koole	Haddad	Wetta	Oglesby	Cristanello	Gibbons	Nirschel	Smith	Cascione	Van Horn	Korvas
Year of Study	1981	1986	1990	1991	1992	1992	1997	1998	2000	2002	1984
Denominational Affiliation	Baptist	IND	RC+	Baptist	RC	Mormon	Jewish	RC	RC	Baptist	RC
Reason for Giving											
<u>Communities of Participation</u>											
Participation/involvement as an alumnus	I	I	I					NA			
Committee service						L					
Campaign involvement						MI					
Pride of association			I					A	A		
Family ties to the university			A								
Spouse contributes to university		I									
<u>Frameworks of Consciousness</u>											
Emotional involvement or loyalty			A	I	NI			A			
Religious affiliation of the university			A			G					
Guilt feeling						L					
Alumni opinion of academic quality											
proud of degree	I		I					A			
Giving as a duty, moral imperative or obligation			A			MI	A	NA	A		
Giving back to society, community responsibility, civic pride						MI		A			

Table 5—Continued.

Author's Last Name	Koole	Haddad	Wetta	Oglesby	Cristanello	Gibbons	Nirschel	Smith	Cascione	Van Horn	Korvas
Year of Study	1981	1986	1990	1991	1992	1992	1997	1998	2000	2002	1984
Denominational Affiliation	Baptist	IND	RC+	Baptist	RC	Mormon	Jewish	RC	RC	Baptist	RC
Reason for Giving											
Importance of liberal arts,					I						
Value of non-academic education				I		I					
Set an example								NA			I
Belief in the mission of the institution						MI					
Fiscal stability of the institution			A			MI					
Selfishness									A		
<u>Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards</u>											
Ability to specify use of gift						MI		NA			
Prepared for career/current occupation	I	NI		I				NA			
Memorial opportunity						L					
Tax benefits			A			M	A		A		
Expand university's economic											
benefits to community						MI					
Recognition of the gift						L	I				
Match a gift or gifts			A			L					
Challenge or encourage gifts						L					
<u>Invitation to Participate</u>											
Solicitation			A					NA			
Influence of solicitor						L					
Appeal of materials						L					

Table 5—Continued.

Author's Last Name	Koole	Haddad	Wetta	Oglesby	Cristanello	Gibbons	Nirschel	Smith	Cascione	Van Horn	Korvas
Year of Study	1981	1986	1990	1991	1992	1992	1997	1998	2000	2002	1984
Denominational Affiliation	Baptist	IND	RC+	Baptist	RC	Mormon	Jewish	RC	RC	Baptist	RC
Reason for Giving											
<u>Urgency and Effectiveness</u>											
Gratitude, appreciation for the university			A			M					
Respect for the university											
local, state, national level						M					
Interest in athletic programs						MI					
Regard for volunteers						MI					
Uniqueness of project						MI					
Regard for faculty						MI					
Regard for administrators						MI					
<u>Youth Models and Experiences</u>											
Repay/Help students financially as I was			A			MI	A		A		
Satisfaction with undergraduate experience			A			MI		A		I	I
Philanthropy an important part of my culture								NA			

Note. G = Great Influence; M = Moderate Influence; MI = Mild Influence; L = Low Influence; NA = Not Affect; A = Affect, both from qualitative studies; P = Indicator; NP = Non-indicator both based on statistical analysis.

Table 6

Reasons for Giving by Alumni From Faith-Based and Independent Colleges and Universities—Giving Level

Author's Last Name	Burnett et al.	Haddad	Oglesby	Hunter	Nirschel	Violand	Korvas
Year of Study	1974	1986	1991	1997	1997	1998	1984
Denominational Affiliation	Mormon	IND	Baptist	Zion	Jewish	IND	RC
Reason for Giving							
<u>Communities of Participation</u>							
Participation/involvement as an alumnus	A	I		I	I	I	
Committee service				I		I	
Campaign involvement						NI	
Pride of association						I	
Family ties to the university						NI	
Spouse contributed to university		I					
Received honorary doctorate						NI	
Received alumni award						I	
<u>Frameworks of Consciousness</u>							
Emotional involvement or loyalty	A		I				
Alumni opinion of academic quality/proud of degree				NI			
Giving as a duty, moral imperative or obligation	A				A		
Value of non-academic education							I
Belief in the mission of the institution					I		

Table 6—Continued.

Author's Last Name	Burnett et al.	Haddad	Oglesby	Hunter	Nirschel	Violand	Korvas
Year of Study	1974	1986	1991	1997	1997	1998	1984
Denominational Affiliation	Mormon	IND	Baptist	Zion	Jewish	IND	RC
Reason for Giving							
<u>Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards</u>							
Ability to specify use of gift						I	
Prepared for career/current occupation		NI	NI	I			
Tax benefits	A				A		
Recognition of the gift					I		
<u>Invitation to Participate</u>							
Appeal of materials	A		NI				
<u>Urgency and Effectiveness</u>							
Gratitude, appreciation for the university				NI			
Respect for the university							
local, state, national level	A			A			
Alumni perception of need							
of the university	A						
<u>Youth Models and Experiences</u>							
Repay/Help students financially as I was	A				A	I	
Satisfaction with undergraduate experience						I	NI

Note. G = Great Influence; M = Moderate Influence; MI = Mild Influence; L = Low Influence; NA = Not Affect; A = Affect, both from qualitative studies; I = Indicator; NI = Non-indicator, both from statistical analysis.

researchers who concluded that each of these reasons for giving indicated or affected donor status (Cascione, 2000; Gibbons, 1992; Haddad, 1986; Koole, 1981; Smith, 1998; Wetta, 1990).

Participation was also a reason for giving that affected or indicated giving level in five studies (Burnett et al., 1974; Haddad, 1986; Hunter, 1997; Nirschel, 1997; Violand, 1998). Four other reasons for giving—committee service, pride of association, spouse contributed to the university, and received an alumni award—affected or were indicators of giving level though studied by only one or two researchers each (Haddad, 1986; Hunter, 1997; Violand, 1998). The remaining three reasons for giving—campaign involvement, family ties to the university, and received an honorary doctorate—were all found to be non-indicators of giving level by one researcher (Violand, 1998).

Frameworks of Consciousness

The 12 reasons for giving chosen for the Frameworks of Consciousness cluster were: emotional involvement or loyalty; religious affiliation of the university; guilt feeling; alumni opinion of academic experience; giving as a duty, moral imperative, or obligation; giving back to society; importance of liberal arts; value of non-academic education; set an example; belief in the mission of the institution; fiscal stability of the institution; and selfishness. The majority of researchers agreed that these reasons for giving that reflected values and beliefs indicated or positively affected both donor status and giving levels (Burnett et al., 1974; Cascione, 2000; Cristanello, 1992; Gibbons, 1992; Hunter, 1997; Koole, 1981; Korvas, 1984; Nirschel, 1997; Oglesby, 1991; Smith, 1998;

Wetta, 1990).

Researchers contradicted the conclusions of the majority in four instances. Specifically, Cristanello (1992) found that emotional attachment, "a distinctive characteristic of historically Roman Catholic colleges, did not prove to discriminate between alumni donors and nondonors" (p. 80). Smith (1998) was one of five researchers (Cascione, 2000; Gibbons, 1992; Nirschel, 1997; Smith, 1998; Wetta, 1990) who explored the notion of duty or obligation as a reason for giving. Unlike the other four, she found that duty as a reason for giving did not affect the likelihood of an alumnus giving a gift. Smith also found the statement "I want to set an example for others to follow" was a factor that had no effect on alumni decisions to become volunteers or donors (pp. 71, 72). Finally, Hunter (1997) found that the quality of education was not a significant differentiator for 5-year cumulative giving level, annual gifts, or most recent gifts. The evidence shows that alumni values and ideals cannot be ignored for successful fundraising.

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards

Commonly, donors receive benefits from giving a gift to a university. The eight reasons for giving that researchers of alumni from faith-based and independent universities studied were: the ability to specify the use of the gift; preparation for a career; a memorial opportunity; tax benefits; expanding the university's economic benefit to the community; recognition of the gift; matching a gift; and challenge gifts. Most researchers reported that these reasons for giving indicated or affected both donor status and giving

level (Burnett et al., 1974; Cascione, 2000; Gibbons, 1992; Hunter, 1997; Koole, 1981; Nirschel, 1997; Oglesby, 1991; Violand, 1998; Wetta, 1990).

However a few researchers reported that two reasons for giving did not indicate donors or giving levels. The first was the ability of alumni to specify the use of donated funds. Smith (1998) found that alumni being able to tell the university how and where their donations were to be used neither affected nor was a deterrent to their making a gift. The second reason for giving was career preparation and job placement. In one study 88% of respondents indicated that their needs not being met by the academic program did not affect their giving (Smith, 1998). Haddad (1986) reported that whether or not alumni had received job placement through the university placement service did not significantly differentiate between donors and nondonors nor did it indicate giving level. Oglesby (1991) also reported that alumni being prepared for their career did not indicate giving level.

Tax benefits as a reason for giving has a reputation as being a determining influence on giving behavior. It also received a higher ranking in Gibbons's (1992) study than the other reasons for giving in this cluster. Therefore, it merits a brief comment. All four of the studies that considered this reason for giving had a qualitative methodology or asked this question as an open-ended one (Cascione, 2000; Gibbons, 1992; Nirschel, 1997; Wetta, 1990). Based on the findings in each, it seems clear, as Cascione (2000) concludes, that the tax benefit was a factor that alumni considered in their philanthropic decision making, but was not their primary focus, though it could "force a time frame on an individual's generous intentions" (pp. 134, 135).

Invitation to Participate

Three reasons for giving were chosen for inclusion in the Invitation to Participate cluster: solicitation, influence of solicitor, and appeal of materials. These reasons for giving generally seemed to be of little influence on or did not affect giving behavior. Specifically, donor status was affected by solicitation in one study (Wetta, 1990), but not in another (Smith, 1998). The influence of a solicitor and the appeal of materials were both reasons for giving that were ranked as a low influence on giving behavior in the only study they were considered (Gibbons, 1992). The appeal of materials affected giving level in one study (Burnett et al., 1974), but was not an indicator in another (Oglesby, 1991).

Urgency and Effectiveness

Eight reasons for giving were included in this cluster: gratitude and appreciation of the university; respect for the university at the local, state, and national level; interest in athletic programs; regard for volunteers; uniqueness of project; alumni perception of university needs; regard for faculty; and regard for administrators (Burnett et al., 1974; Gibbons, 1992; Hunter, 1997; Wetta, 1990). Gratitude and appreciation for the university affected donor status (Wetta, 1990). The other six reasons for giving were ranked as moderate or mild influences on donor status by one researcher (Gibbons, 1992).

Two reasons for giving—respect for the university at the local, state, and national level and alumni perception of need of the university—also affected giving level (Burnett

et al., 1974; Hunter, 1997). However, a third reason for giving, gratitude or appreciation of the university, was not an indicator of giving level (Hunter, 1997).

Youth Models and Experiences

As measured by five researchers, satisfaction with undergraduate experience positively affected donor status (Gibbons, 1992; Korvas, 1984; Smith, 1998; Van Horn, 2002; Wetta, 1990). The measurement for this satisfaction included such factors as university showing concern for the student and whether alumni would choose to attend this college again (Van Horn, 2002). Another reason for giving, repayment or helping students as I was helped, was also an indicator or a positive influence on donor status in four studies (Cascione, 2000; Gibbons, 1992; Nirschel, 1997; Wetta, 1990). One researcher found that philanthropy as an important part of one's culture was not an influence for donors (Smith, 1998).

Repay or help students as I was helped was a reason for giving that influenced or indicated giving level in three studies (Burnett et al., 1974; Nirschel, 1997; Violand, 1998). However, satisfaction with the undergraduate experience was an indicator of giving level in one study (Violand, 1998), but not another (Korvas, 1984).

Reasons for Not Giving in Higher Education

Twenty-one reasons for not giving affected donor status and giving level in studies of alumni of independent and faith-based colleges and universities. I classified the reasons for not giving into the seven determinants articulated by Schervish and Havens

(2000). The determinants or clusters of reasons for not giving were: Communities of Participation, Discretionary Resources, Frameworks of Consciousness, Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards, Invitation to Participate, Urgency and Effectiveness, and Youth Models and Experiences. Since most of the clusters contained only one to three reasons for not giving, an additional dichotomous categorization was made between Discretionary Resources and all the others: negative attitudes, experiences, and perceptions. The relationships between giving behavior and these reasons for not giving are presented in Table 7.

Very few of the reasons for not giving were analyzed statistically. Most conclusions were drawn from ranking the answers to open-ended questions by the percentage of alumni who reported that a reason affected or did not affect their giving behavior. Since most reasons for not giving were also only studied by one or two researchers, this is an area ripe for research. While specific influential reasons for not giving may not be generalizable, two themes are worth noting. First, whatever the specific reason for not giving, discretionary resources play a major role in affecting donor status. Second, negative attitudes, experiences, perceptions, and beliefs affect the likelihood that alumni will be donors.

Discretionary Resources

All seven reasons for not giving in this cluster were found to affect donor status. The only reason for not giving that was considered by more than two researchers was, give to other educational institutions or charities (Haddad, 1986; Korvas, 1984; Oglesby,

Table 7

Reasons for Not Giving by Alumni From Faith-Based and Independent Colleges and Universities

Author's Last Name	Burnett et al.	Haddad	Wetta	Oglesby	Hunter	Smith	Korvas
Year of Study	1974	1986	1990	1991	1997	1998	1984
Denominational Affiliation	Mormon	Independent	RC+	Baptist	Zion	RC	RC
<u>Discretionary Resources</u>							
Gift too small to count						A	
Give to other educational institutions/charities		I	A	I status/NI level			NI status/I level
Other expenses—family			A				
Other educational costs			A				
Unemployment			A				
Still intend to give	A						
<u>Negative Attitudes, Experiences, Perceptions</u>							
∞ <u>Communities of Participation</u>							
Feel excluded					NI	D	
Interested only in my money			A				
<u>Frameworks of Consciousness</u>							
Differ with the policies	A						
No loyalty	A		A				
Negative feelings toward the university			A				
<u>Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards</u>							
Insufficient minority representation						A	
No control of gift			A				

Table 7—*Continued.*

Author's Last Name	Burnett et al.	Haddad	Wetta	Oglesby	Hunter	Smith	Korvas
Year of Study	1974	1986	1990	1991	1997	1998	1984
Denominational Affiliation	Mormon	Independent	RC+	Baptist	Zion	RC	RC
<u>Invitation to Participate</u>							
Have not been asked	A					A	
Approached but not effectively						A	
<u>Urgency and Effectiveness</u>							
Help not needed			A			D	
Church support sufficient	A						
<u>Youth Models and Experiences</u>							
Discrimination or harassment						D	
Negative student experience						A	
Didn't receive financial aid			A				

Note: I = Indicator; NI = Non-indicator, based on statistical analysis; A = affects giving; D = deters giving, both based on qualitative determination; RC = Roman Catholic.

1991; Wetta, 1990). Whether or not alumni gave to other colleges or other charitable causes was a reason that differentiated between donors and nondonors in one study (Oglesby, 1991), but not another (Korvas, 1984). Giving to other educational institutions or charities was the only reason for not giving that was tested by any researchers for its relationship to giving level. The results were contradictory. Oglesby (1991) found that it did not indicate donor level, while Korvas (1984) found that it did.

Nondonor alumni cited their inability to give as resulting from too many expenses, unemployment, or other educational costs in the family (Wetta, 1990). Intention to give, but lack of follow-through, was reported by 60% of alumni as a reason of low influence for not giving in Burnett et al.'s (1974) study. Feeling like the university would not appreciate a small gift, while they were unable to make a large gift, was a reason 28% of respondents said they did not give in Smith's (1998) study.

Negative Attitudes, Experiences, Perceptions, and Beliefs

As might be expected, strong negative experiences, such as racial discrimination and harassment, deterred giving (Smith, 1998). Less intense negative experiences and perceptions, such as "not feeling a part of the University," and "alumni help was not needed by the university," also deterred giving on the part of alumni (p. 119). Other reasons for not giving were not deterrents, but were influential factors in alumni decisions to not give to the institution. For example, a negative feeling toward the university was the most important reason for not giving for 12% of the respondents in the Wetta (1990) survey. Other reasons for not giving that affected donor status in each of the six clusters

were: only asked to participate for their money, differing with the policies, having no loyalty, having insufficient minority representation, having no control of gifts, having had a negative student experience, and received no financial aid.

Most of the reasons for not giving related to ethnic and inclusion considerations were studied by Smith (1998) who was one of two researchers whose population was an ethnic minority. The other was Haddad (1986). One reason for not giving that was rated as very important or important by 75% of respondents was having minority representation in organizations within the university to which they make contributions (Smith, 1998, p. 118). Researchers also found that: have not been asked; have been approached, but not effectively; and that church support for the university was sufficient were three reasons for not giving that affected donor status.

Highlights of Alumni Donor Reasons for Giving and Not Giving

A review of the literature for independent and faith-based institutions and the reasons alumni gave or did not give yielded no absolutely conclusive determinants of donors, but did show many possible reasons for giving and some general trends. In summary, two themes of reasons for not giving and six themes of reasons for giving emerged from the review of the studies of alumni giving behavior to faith-based and independent universities.

1. Unhappiness and negative experiences or perceptions as a student or alumnus with the institution certainly affected giving and sometimes inhibited or even deterred alumni from being donors.

2. Inability or lack of resources to give a gift for various reasons affected giving behavior.

3. Being asked and some methods of solicitation encouraged giving behavior, and not being solicited discouraged giving behavior.

4. Involved, loyal, and participating alumni were donating alumni and at higher levels than other donating alumni.

5. A need to repay and help students financially were incentives to being a donor and at higher levels than other donors.

6. Satisfaction with the undergraduate experience and being proud of the quality of academic education and their degree were indicators of donor status.

7. A sense of obligation as measured by duty or giving as a moral imperative, guilt, responsibility, and religious affiliation of the university was a reason for giving that generally affected donor status.

8. The receipt of tax benefits was a secondary reason for giving or influenced the timing of a gift.

Based on my review of the reasons for giving and their relation with donor status and giving level in the studies for alumni of faith-based and independent institutions of higher education, I agree with other experts who declare that the relationship between the reason for giving and the gift is not a simple cause and effect relationship (Gibbons, 1992; Panas, 1984; Sargeant and Jay, 2004). There may be multiple reasons for giving a gift, each with differing relative importance. Time, place, as well as the influences of society, family, and social groups also play a role in the reasons for giving that

individuals have. Add to this the complexity of measurement, and it is a daunting task to discover the influence for giving behavior. Giving might even be compared to a researcher completing a jigsaw puzzle. Each piece is a reason for giving or not giving. Pieces may look similar or different. The researcher may find that a particular piece fits the first time he or she tries, or he or she may have to try them in several places before finding a match. Some pieces may be tried and then set aside, then later be used in the correct place. It is a situation where perseverance pays off and in spite of gaps the big picture or the themes are discernable.

Wetta's (1990) research results aptly illuminate this concept. She grouped 15 reasons for giving in three themes: satisfaction with undergraduate academic experience, satisfaction with undergraduate co-curricular experience, and pride of association with their alma mater. Her statistical analysis demonstrated that all factors discriminated significantly between donors and nondonors individually, and when combined as three clustered variables (pp. 60, 61). However, she cautioned that the individual variables in each cluster "are probably not as effective as institutional advancement personnel might prefer" (p. 152). So while it was realistic to use the existing reasons for giving and reasons for not giving that researchers found in the general, alumni, and wealthy populations in my survey to ascertain the reasons alumni donors have for giving to Adventist universities, it is only the beginning of the research necessary to complete the jigsaw puzzle.

Seventh-day Adventist Advancement

In my search for research on any aspect of advancement and philanthropy related

to Seventh-day Adventists, especially education, I found 12 studies (Bartlett, 1989; Bissell, 1990; Dial, 1993; Dudley et al., 1982; Dudley & Melgosa, 1985; Gaona, 1992; Grohar, 1989; Gustavsson, 2000; Pauner, 1996; Pizarro, 1985; Roda, 1972; Stockton-Chilson, 2003). These covered a variety of topics from *Marketing Seventh-day Adventist Higher Education in Southeast Asia* (Pauner, 1996) to *The Role of Institutional Advancement in Seventh-day Adventist Colleges in North America* (Bartlett, 1989). A further review of these 11 studies revealed that 4 (Bartlett, 1989; Dial, 1993; Grohar, 1989; Gustavsson, 2000) documented various aspects of Advancement organizational structure in Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities. No donor profiles or descriptions were included in these four studies. Four other studies (Gaona, 1992; Pauner, 1996; Pizarro, 1985; Roda, 1972) also did not address donor descriptions.

Demographics, Psychographics, and Reasons for Giving by Adventists

The four remaining studies each contained some information about Adventist donors, though each of the populations was different to Adventist alumni. The attributes of Adventist donors that were related to giving behavior are presented in Table 8.

The study of secondary school board members and their responsibilities had two conclusions tangentially relevant to my study (Bissell, 1990). She found that board members who believed their school's mission were likely to make a contribution to the school (p. 91). She also noted that "board members generally tended to contribute some amount annually. Approximately 32 percent (116) donated \$100.00 to \$499.00 per year" (p. 78).

Table 8

Attributes of Adventist Donors Related to Giving Behavior

Author's Last Name	Dudley et al.	Dudley & Melgosa	Bissel	Stockton-Chilson
Year of Study	1982	1985	1990	2003
Population	Washington Conference	NAD	Academy Board	NAD
Attribute				
Demographic				
Income	I/NI	NI		I
Church affiliation/religious identity				I
Length of attendance at Adventist school	I			
Higher level of education				I
Higher level of employment				I
Family are Adventists				I
Psychographics				
Christian virtues	I			
Growing churches	I/NI			
Number of purposes of giving	I	A		
Reasons for Giving				
Board members			I	
Believe in mission			I	
Being asked				I
Helping individuals				I
Making good use of time				I
Encouraged by employer				I
Enhancing moral basis of society				I
Giving back to society as you have benefitted			NI	
Reasons for Not Giving				
Can't seem to afford		A		
Don't believe in program		A		
Believe church doesn't handle funds properly		A		
Not a high priority in life		A		

Note. NAD = North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists; I = Indicator; NI = Non Indicator; A = Affects.

The attitudes of Adventists in two particular geographic regions—Washington Conference and the North American Division—towards tithe and mission offerings were the foci of two of the remaining studies (Dudley et al., 1982; Dudley & Melgosa, 1985). Several factors that predicted giving of tithe and missions offering, measures of donor status, were of interest for my study.

In the first study (Dudley et al., 1982), tithe income was positively related to income, length of attendance at Adventist schools, number of purposes for which members gave, growing churches, and Christian virtues (pp. 13, 14). However, since the sample was representative rather than random and the amount of tithe and offering attributed to each member who filled in a survey was an average (per capita), the results of this study may be used with care.

In the second study (Dudley & Melgosa, 1985), two groups of Adventists from the geographical territory of the North American Division of Seventh-day Adventists (NAD) were surveyed. A total of 3,483 usable surveys were received from pastors and lay members (p. 3). Although there were some differences between the results for pastors and lay members, the most useful conclusions for purposes of my study were those drawn from the combined profile. A summary of selected findings related to my study follows. Multiple regression analyses led the authors of this study to conclude that “the amount of family income was not significantly related to the percentage of income given as either tithe or offerings” (p. 16). Three other conclusions were tangential to giving: “those who support private ministries are the best supporters of official programs” (p. 12); “those with higher incomes are more likely to be those who . . . have more formal education” (p.

16); and “higher-income Adventists are more likely to be critical of specific programs and policies and thus give more selectively, at the same time they are the most regular supporters of local church and conference programs with which they are in harmony” (Dudley & Melgosa, 1985, pp. 16, 17).

Reasons for not giving that affected giving to denominational programs in descending order of the number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed were: can't seem to afford it, don't believe in the programs, church doesn't handle funds properly, and not a high priority in my life (p. 8).

The last of the 11 studies also had findings of donor demographics and psychographics of Adventist giving profiles which were relevant to my study. The study by Karen Stockton-Chilson (2003) compared the giving and volunteering patterns among adults with Seventh-day Adventist and other Christian religious identities. She selected a purposive sample of convenience from Adventist church members across the NAD (p. 90). “All were adults who identified themselves as active members of the Adventist church” (p. 89).

Stockton-Chilson (2003) isolated several demographics of Adventist donors in comparison to other Christians. They were: higher overall levels of education, higher levels of employment, and nominally differentiated levels of household income (p. 189). A fourth characteristic was that “SDAs were around 8% more likely to indicate that their families were church members than those of the other Christian religious identity” (p. 193).

In addition, she found that there was "a significant relationship between religious identity and the frequency of 'generous' contributions (more than \$500 in the past 12 months). Adventists were much more likely to have given generously than the comparison groups" (Stockton-Chilson, 2003, p. 189).

Motivations that were more important to Adventists than to the comparative groups (ranked in order) were the following: being asked to contribute, helping individuals, and making good use of time. Weaker relationships were found between religious identity and "being encouraged by an employer and enhancing the moral basis of society." There were "no significant differences in rates of responses based on religious identity for . . . giving back to society some of the benefits it gave you" (Stockton-Chilson, 2003, p. 200).

There were differences in the values of Adventists and their religious counterparts as indicated by the types of organizations to which either group directed their contributions. "Seventh-day Adventists when compared to other religious identity groups gave at the highest frequency to educational organizations. . . . Mainline and Seventh-day Adventist Christians gave at the same rate for public/society benefit. . . . Seventh-day Adventists had a hefty rate of giving (46%), while the other groups lag far behind in international organization giving rates" (Stockton-Chilson, 2003, p. 190). Adventists were the least likely of the groups to give to environment-based organizations.

Summary of Adventist Donor Demographics

In at least one of the studies that included some type of Adventist population, six demographics, three psychographics, eight reasons for giving, and four reasons for not giving were indicative of Adventist donors. One reason for giving, "giving back," was not indicative of Adventist donors. A more detailed comparison was difficult because besides the selection of different Adventist populations, the studies were so different in purpose, methodology, and dependent and independent variables.

The only factor that was common to more than one study was income, and the results from the studies contradicted each other. The other demographics that were indicative of either donors or a measure of donors such as giving of tithe or mission offerings were: length of attendance at Adventist schools; higher levels of education; higher levels of employment; family members who were church members; and religious identity (Dudley et al., 1982; Dudley & Melgosa, 1985; Stockton-Chilson, 2003). The psychographics that were indicative of donors were: number of purposes for which donors gave; Christian virtues; and growing churches (Dudley et al., 1982; Dudley & Melgosa, 1985).

The seven reasons for giving that were indicative of Adventist donors were: being a board member, believing in the mission, being asked, desiring to help, making good use of time, being encouraged by an employer, and enhancing the moral basis of society. The four reasons for not giving that were indicative of Adventist donors were: could not

afford to give; did not believe in programs; did not believe donor funds were handled properly by the church; and giving was not a high priority.

Final Word

Both sufficient commonalities and differences existed in the demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving that affected the giving behavior of the general, wealthy, and Adventist populations as well as the general alumni and alumni of independent and faith-based institutions to justify the study of Adventist alumni giving behavior and provide a rich inventory of variables that I used in my study.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In a comprehensive literature review, research documenting the demographic descriptors and psychographic (values, attitudes, and lifestyle) characteristics of reasons for giving and the reasons for not giving by alumni of Adventist universities has not been found. This study used a survey design to ascertain and describe the relationships between the demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving variables with variables that measured donor status, the level of gift support, and frequency of gift support of alumni donors. Thus, this study provides a description of donors to Adventist universities—answers to the questions of who gives or does not give to Adventist universities and why donors give or do not give. The alumni of two faith-based and comprehensive liberal arts universities owned and operated by the Seventh-day Adventist church were studied.

Research Questions

This study was designed to describe alumni donors and nondonors and why they financially supported or did not support two Adventist comprehensive universities. There were eight research questions.

1. How do the demographics and psychographics of alumni donors and nondonors differ?
2. To what extent are demographics and psychographics of alumni donors, when studied individually, related to the level of support and frequency of support to the institution?
3. How do the reasons for giving and reasons for not giving differ between alumni donors and nondonors?
4. In what ways are the reasons for giving and reasons for not giving by alumni donors, when studied individually, related to the level of support and frequency of support to the institution?
5. How do selected demographics and psychographics and reasons for giving and reasons for not giving, when combined, differ between alumni donors and nondonors?
6. To what extent are selected demographics and psychographics and reasons for giving and reasons for not giving of alumni donors, when combined, related to the level of support to the institution?
7. To what extent are selected demographics and psychographics and reasons for giving and reasons for not giving of alumni donors, when combined, related to the frequency of support to the institution?
8. To what extent do level of support and frequency of support relate to each other?

Research Design

Raw data were obtained from two sources: alumni databases at the universities, and responses from the alumni subjects on a survey. The variables measuring donor status, level of support, and frequency of support were gathered from the first source, university alumni databases. The second source was the survey, where alumni reported their demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving.

Population and Sample

The population under study was the alumni of two Adventist universities—approximately 12,000 and 25,000 individuals. The two universities were selected because they were the only two Adventist, doctoral degree-granting, comprehensive universities in the United States of America.

In order to ensure that only alumni who had had time to establish giving patterns would be included, only alumni who graduated prior to 1994 were to be included in the sample. Two reasons influenced this decision. The first reason to exclude recent graduates was that generally new graduates do not have discretionary income for philanthropic gifts. Fundraising practitioners note that generally younger individuals (i.e., recent graduates) are most likely to be in a survival stage and least likely to exhibit giving behavior. Middle-age graduates, on the other hand, fall in the accumulation phase and older graduates in the disbursement phase and therefore are more likely to be donors (Sturtevant, 1997). Typically, during the first 10 years after graduation when alumni are repaying educational loans, they are unlikely to have any or much discretionary income. ✓

(The average student graduates with a debt of \$17,500 for private colleges and more than \$80,000 for medical students [Palmer, 2003].) Second, a review of the literature reveals that previous researchers have chosen to exclude the most recent alumni from their studies, establishing a logical precedent. Examples include Wetta (1990), Cristanello (1992), Nirschel (1997), and Smith (1998).

It was practical to consider only alumni for whom the institution had addresses (Cristanello, 1992; Haddad, 1986). For both universities this was approximately three-quarters (9,118 and 19,935) of the total alumni on record. The survey was mailed to a random sample of 600 from each university, selected from the alumni for whom there were addresses available.

Where a potential respondent had graduated from both universities, he or she received a survey from only one university, that of the undergraduate degree. Expert practitioners note that alumni are usually most loyal to the institution where they were awarded their undergraduate degree (Jim Erickson, personal communication, October 22, 2004).

Instrument

I decided to use a survey for the following reasons. First, a questionnaire was cost efficient for the sample size, convenient for the respondents, had a uniform presentation, and allowed greater accessibility to the subjects than some other methods, such as an interview (Berdie & Anderson, 1974). Second, for this topic, there was one more obvious advantage to choosing a survey as the method. Philanthropy and reasons for it are very

personal subjects, so most individuals feel more comfortable reporting their "close-to-the-heart" information under the protection of a survey rather than other less confidential methods, such as a personal interview or focus groups.

A disadvantage of a questionnaire was that many donors are used to personal contact and might have been offended by the impersonal nature of a questionnaire and may thus have resisted completing it. This is especially true of donors of large gifts or wealthy donors.

Construction of the Survey

I constructed an instrument based on examples of questionnaires and surveys used in previous studies of donor profiles. The items were based on the variables in previous studies on the alumni populations of faith-based and independent universities and colleges in the United States as well as several studies of wealthy donors (Ashcraft, 1995; Burgess-Getts, 1992; Burnett et al., 1974; Cristanello, 1992; Gibbons, 1992; Haddad, 1986; Hunter, 1997; Koole, 1981; Nirschel, 1997; Oglesby, 1991; Panas, 1994; P. C. Ryan, 1990; Sargeant & Jay, 2004; Schervish et al., 1993; Smith, 1998; Van Horn, 2002; Violand, 1998; Wetta, 1990). (See Tables 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7 in chapter 2.) A few individuals, selected as representative of the population, as well as four focus groups reviewed and provided input to refine and improve the initial draft of the survey before the final instrument was produced. (See Appendix C.)

The first focus group, after filling in the initial draft of the survey that included all the possible items, responded that the survey was much too long. In addition, a research

professor, Dr. Robert Cruise (personal communication, October 26, 2004), noted that a survey of more than four pages would probably not net a reasonable response rate. Thus, items were eliminated using the following criteria. First, unless there were special circumstances (e.g., a particular difference in population—independent versus faith-based, or a component easily able to fit as part of a question already in the survey), any variable that was studied by only one or two researchers and found to be non-discriminatory between donors and nondonors was not included in the current study. Second, only present characteristics were included (e.g., level and type of involvement when the alumnus was a student were omitted). Third, during the review process with the subsequent focus groups, several items were omitted because members of the focus groups felt the questions were too personal (e.g., political affiliation). Fourth, administrators deemed one variable to be possibly detrimental to the reputation of the universities' relationship with the alumni (whether the alumnus had come under social discipline as a student) so requested its omission.

The questions were ordered in three sections on the survey: (a) general psychographics; (b) reasons for giving, reasons for not giving, and religious psychographics; and (c) demographics. The order of the sections was deliberate. The first section had questions of medium level of difficulty and were designed to set the context. The second section contained questions that were harder to answer. The questions in the third and final section were the easiest to answer so were placed at the end when individuals might have been feeling a little tired. Variables that could be obtained from

the database (i.e., largest single gift, cumulative gift total, dates of giving) were not included on the survey.

During the development of the survey, focus groups indicated that the survey ought to be tailored to the university from which the respondent was an alumnus; otherwise certain questions and the instructions might be confusing, especially for alumni who might have graduated from both universities. Thus, there were two versions of the same survey differing in two ways. (See Appendix C.) First, the name of the university was different throughout the survey. Second, questions 2 through 7 had different response options specific to each university (e.g., examples of events attended, the list of awards achieved, publications read, and web-sites accessed). The stem of the questions, however, remained the same and the questions were in the same order.

Validity

Validity of the survey questions was established by asking several focus groups including alumni and individuals representative of the alumni population (such as the development staff at the participating universities, colleagues in other universities, professionals, and graduate students) to review and answer the questionnaire and provide evaluative feedback. The survey was modified by incorporating the suggestions and retested. Some questions were also modeled after questions on earlier surveys.

Answers to two questions on the survey were compared with information from the database to measure survey validity: degree status (questions 41a, 42a, 43a) and donor status (question 20). When both sets of data, the self-reported degree from the study

university and the degree on record of the database, were comparatively analyzed for consistency, the answers of only 7.3% (18 individuals) of respondents were inconsistent. The self-reported and database measures of donor status were also compared. Only 18.9% of the respondents had inconsistent results. In both cases the inconsistencies were small enough to consider the survey valid and continue with the analysis.

Definition of Variables

There were four dependent variables: "donor status" (donor and nondonor), "largest gift," "cumulative gifts," and "percentage gift years." All four variables were calculated from database information over the entire period of each alumni's giving from first to last gift. Nondonors were defined as alumni for whom there was no record of ever having given to the University. All four variables included data from the database for both spouses if an alumnus reported giving jointly as a couple. If alumnus reported giving separately from his or her spouse, then the variables included only the data for the alumnus. The variable "percentage gift years" was calculated by dividing the number of years in which one or more gifts were given by the total number of years from the year of the respondent's first gift through 2006.

Four groups of independent variables were derived from items on the survey that alumni completed: 21 demographics, 44 psychographics, 48 reasons for giving, and 15 reasons for not giving.

Alumni were also asked to indicate the degree of importance of reasons for giving and reasons for not giving. They were asked to choose and rank reasons for giving and

not giving from the provided list. Alumni were also given the opportunity to add and rank specific reasons of their own that did not appear on the list, though very few did so and the reasons that were added were able to be categorized within the reasons already given.

Reasons for Giving and Reasons for Not Giving—Clusters and Scales

Using the criteria from the Identification Theory of Paul Schervish and John Havens and its classification of seven determinants of giving, I grouped the reasons for giving into seven clusters and the reasons for not giving into seven other clusters (Schervish, 1997a). I then had an opportunity to ask one of the two theorists who developed and tested the theory, John Havens, to review and discuss the clusters with me. In two phone conversations we discussed differences between the way he would have clustered the individual items and the way that I had clustered them. The final categorization was determined from these conversations in which we agreed on some changes in the way we had each categorized the items (John Havens, personal communication, September 16 and September 28, 2005). The end result was a set of seven clusters of reasons for giving and a set of seven clusters of reasons for not giving. Each of the 14 clusters consisted of 1 to 15 reasons. The clusters had the same names as the determinants in the theory. The criteria used to determine inclusion of an individual item in the cluster and examples of specific reasons for giving or reasons for not giving in a cluster follow. (For each cluster that contained more than one reason, I constructed a scale by the same name composed of items in the cluster.)

Communities of Participation

Communities of Participation are formal and informal networks with which people are associated. Networks may include voluntary or required participation, and/or are entered into as a result of choice or circumstances. As a result of the connections being established, individuals choose to give. Examples include: schools, week-end soccer leagues, social services (Schervish & Havens, 1997, p. 241) and religious affiliation (Schervish & Havens, 2002). In my study, examples of reasons for giving in the Communities of Participation cluster and scale included: "serving on a committee or board," and "have family ties to the university." The other Communities of Participation cluster had only one reason for not giving: "the University excludes me."

Frameworks of Consciousness

Frameworks of Consciousness includes variables that are ways of feeling and thinking that induce commitment. Variables include goals, political ideologies, social concerns, religious and other beliefs, including "beliefs concerning causes to which one is dedicated," general values, and fundamental orientations (Schervish & Havens, 1997, p. 247). In my study, examples of reasons for giving chosen for the Frameworks of Consciousness cluster and scale were: "loyalty to the institution" and "belief in its mission." Only two reasons for not giving were in the other Frameworks of Consciousness cluster and scale: "differ with the policies" and "not the school it was when I attended."

Discretionary Resources

One of two non-relational determinants in the theory is Discretionary Resources (Schervish & Havens, 1997, p. 241). Discretionary Resources are defined as "the quantitative and psychological wherewithal of time and money that can be mobilized for philanthropic purposes" (Schervish & Havens, 2001, p. 11). Examples of Discretionary Resources include: income, employment, retirement, and financial sufficiency (Schervish & Havens, 1997, p. 242). In my study, there was only one reason for giving in the Discretionary Resources cluster, "have available funds." Examples of reasons for not giving chosen for the other Discretionary Resources cluster and scale were: "giving to other institutions where I obtained other degree/s," and "unable to give."

Invitation to Participate

Invitation to Participate has been defined as "requests by persons or organizations to directly participate in philanthropy" (Schervish, 1997b, p. 98; Schervish & Havens, 2001). In addition, a major mobilizer for giving is a person known personally to the potential donor or a representative of the organization in which the potential donor participates. Other examples are: mail and phone solicitations (Schervish & Havens, 1997, p. 242). Examples of reasons for giving in the Invitation to Participate cluster and scale for my study were: "the appeal of the materials requesting the gift," and "the influence of the people who solicited my gift." There was only one reason for not giving in the other Invitation to Participate cluster: "have not been asked to give."

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards

The fifth determinant of donor status is Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards. These are defined as "an array of positive experiences and outcomes (including taxation)" (Schervish, 1997b, p. 98) that help shape philanthropic identity. In my study, examples of reasons for giving in the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards cluster or scale included: "recognition of gifts," "match a gift made by others," "challenge or encourage others to give," and "the opportunity to honor an individual." The three reasons for not giving in the other Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards cluster were: "emphasis on diversity in mission," "insufficient diversity in some levels," and "insufficient diversity at all levels."

Urgency and Effectiveness

Urgency and Effectiveness is defined as "a desire to make a difference, a sense of how necessary and/or useful charitable assistance will be in the face of people's and organization needs" (Schervish, 1997b, p. 98). Examples of reasons for giving in the Urgency and Effectiveness cluster and scale in my study were: "enhance the reputation of the university" and "respect for the current faculty of the university." A single reason for not giving comprised the other Urgency and Effectiveness cluster, "gifts not needed."

Youth Models and Experiences

Finally, Youth Models and Experiences is defined as "people or experiences from one's youth which serve as positive exemplars for one's adult engagements" (Schervish, 1997b, p. 98). Examples of reasons for giving in the Youth Models and Experiences

cluster and scale in my study were: "my philanthropic culture" and "helping students as I was helped." A single reason for not giving, "my student experience," comprised the other Youth Models and Experiences cluster.

The reasons for giving items that comprised each of the six reasons for giving scales are listed in Table 9.

The reasons for not giving items that comprised each of the three reasons for not giving scales are listed in Table 10.

Reliability of Scales

Although there were 14 clusters, seven for reasons for giving and seven for reasons of not giving, 5 clusters consisted of only one reason each, therefore did not require the construction of scales, so only nine scales were constructed. The Cronbach reliability tests for each of the six reasons for giving scales are presented in Table 11.

The strength of the reliability coefficients for the six scales ranged from fair (.445) to very good (0.898).

Of the seven clusters of reasons for not giving, three clusters consisted of more than one reason (between two and six reasons). The reliability coefficients for each of the three reasons for not giving scales are presented in Table 12.

The strength of the reliability coefficients for the three scales ranged from good (.655) to very good (.888).

Table 9

Composition of Reasons for Giving Scales

Cluster	Reasons for Giving
Communities of Participation	Sense of pride in partnership Involvement in programs and activities Family ties to the University Immediate or past involvement in University fund-raising efforts Serve on the board or other official body
Frameworks of Consciousness	Believe in the mission Preserve spiritual environment Give something back Have a sense of loyalty Religious affiliation—an Adventist university Personal or spiritual commitment Giving is a responsibility Fiscal stability of the University Preserve critical thinking environment Desire to help bring about change Need this type of University Preserve academic environment Set an example Community responsibility and civic pride Guilt feelings
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards	Tax considerations Receive the joy of giving Ability to designate how and where the funds will be used Prepared me for my career Ability to create a lasting memorial Makes good business sense Expand University's economic benefits to the community Recognition of gifts Opportunity to honor an individual Match a gift made by others Challenge others to give
Invitation to Participate	Asked to give Appeal of the requesting materials Influence of the gift solicitors Peer Influence
Urgency and Effectiveness	Help the less fortunate Advance the excellence and reputation of University Respect for the administrative leadership University needs funds Enhance the educational environment Uniqueness of the project/program Great interest in a specific program Respect for volunteer leadership Respect for the current faculty

Table 9—*Continued.*

Cluster	Reasons for Giving
Youth Models and Experiences	Help students finance their education as I was My philanthropic culture Respect for the past faculty

Table 10

Composition of Reasons for Not Giving Scales

Cluster	Reason for Not Giving
Discretionary Resources	Give to other nonprofit organizations Unable to give Only contribute an insignificant amount Give to other institutions where I obtained other degrees Give to other institutions where spouse obtained degrees Still intend to give
Frameworks of Consciousness	Differ with the policies Not the school it was when I attended
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards	Emphasis on diversity in mission Insufficient diversity in some levels Insufficient diversity at all levels

Table 11

Reliability of the Clusters of Reasons for Giving

Reasons for Giving Scales	Reliability Coefficient
Communities of Participation	.648
Frameworks of Consciousness	.898
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards	.785
Invitation to Participate	.594
Youth Models and Experiences	.445
Urgency and Effectiveness	.846

Table 12

Reliability of the Clusters of Reasons for Not Giving

Reason for Not Giving Scales	Reliability Coefficient
Discretionary Resources	.757
Frameworks of Consciousness	.655
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards	.888

Psychographics—Scales

In addition to the nine scales for reasons of giving and reasons for not giving, five scales were created from psychographics:

1. Financial support of nonprofits other than education and religion
2. Volunteer support of nonprofits other than education and religion
3. Perception of University reputation in the community, state, and nation
4. University involvement
5. Church involvement.

There were eight types of nonprofit organizations to which alumni reported providing financial and volunteer support. Six types of nonprofits (social services, health, arts, youth, environment, and service clubs) were combined into the first two scales by obtaining the mean of the items. This was done because the majority of respondents deemed the financial and volunteer support of nonprofits other than education and religion as less important than that of the financial and volunteer support of religion and

education. The financial and volunteer support for religion and education were variables that were analyzed separately.

The third scale involving the perception of the University reputation was also created by obtaining the mean of the items. The survey asked how alumni thought six different groups would rate the reputation of the University. There were three groups, local community, statewide, and national communities, for which the majority (67% to 80%) of alumni either had no basis to judge or thought the reputation of the University was neutral, so they were combined into a scale. The three groups with which alumni were more familiar—family, friends, and other alumni—and thus had a reasonable percentage (37%-52%) response of either “negatively” or enthusiastically” remained as individual variables.

The “University involvement” scale was constructed by combining the six different ways of being involved—serving on a board, attending on-campus events, attending off-campus events, accessing a website, receiving an award, and receiving the alumni publication—into one scale. It was created in three steps. First, the possible (four to nine) response options for each of the six survey questions (questions 2-7) used for this scale were combined to form just two options, none (zero) or something (one). This was possible because generally respondents checked only one option for each question and the number of alumni who checked some options, for example, “received an honor,” was too small to be analyzed separately. Second, the active involvement questions (4, 5, and 6) were weighted— “attending an off-campus event” = 2, “serving on a committee or council” = 3, “attending an on-campus event” = 4. Finally, the scores for all the questions

were added together. The range of scores for the involvement scale was 0 (not involved) to 12 (most involved).

The fifth scale, "church involvement," was created by adding the scores to survey questions 28, 29, and 30 (frequency of attendance at worship services, frequency of attendance at Bible study, and participation in church activities) together after the five categories for questions 28 and 29 were combined into three categories, 'weekly or more', 'monthly or less', and 'never' to match with the three categories of question 30, 'continually involved', 'moderately involved', and 'not involved'. The range of church involvement scale was zero (not involved) to nine (most involved).

Procedures

The vice-presidents for Advancement and University Relations at both universities under study gave their permission to conduct the study. They also provided names and addresses and gift information from the database. In addition they provided in-kind support, such as stationery and postage as well as reference letters from the presidents of the institutions to accompany the survey. The Institutional Research Board at Andrews University approved the study design.

A letter from me to request participation in the survey was sent with the survey to each of the prospective participants including assurance of confidentiality and noting the scope and significance of the study. An endorsement encouraging participation, in the form of a letter from the president of each institution, was also included. Participation was, naturally, voluntary.

I chose to use an independent organization, the Center for Statistical Services at Andrews University, to collect the data to assure the respondents of total confidentiality. While I had the list of names of the sample, in order to mail the survey, neither the presidents nor the other development staff of the two institutions know the names of the sample selected nor who the respondents were. I did not have the respondents' names, nor was I able to access or link responses or database information with the names of respondents. The Center staff selected the sample and coded the surveys with identification numbers different from those given by the institution. In addition, respondents sent surveys directly to the Center. The Center received the survey responses, scanned the data, and matched it with the database data from the University and assigned new identification numbers to the matched data before releasing the complete data set to me.

Subjects were requested to return the survey before March 25, 2005, two weeks after it was mailed. A postcard was mailed on April 19, three and half weeks later, to all subjects, including both a message of thanks and a reminder request with a note of extension of time for those who had not yet sent in the survey (Appendix D).

Response

Of the 1,200 surveys mailed, 29 surveys never reached the intended recipient (returned with a bad address) or in effect did not reach the recipient (e.g., death of the recipient between time of the sampling and mailing). From the effective total of 1,171 surveys that were mailed, 247 surveys were returned and usable. Thus the response rate was 21%.

The responses from one University were approximately double (158) that of the other University (89). Two reasons may have contributed to the lower response rate of the one University. First, graduates through 2004 were included in the population provided by this University and therefore were in the sample. This was discovered only after the surveys were mailed. These more recent graduates were less likely to return the survey because they were more likely to still be in one of the following situations: be in graduate school, be paying off loans, trying to survive, less nostalgic, or loyal and willing to volunteer for their alma mater, and therefore it did not make sense to them to return it. Second, six times as many (19 vs. 3) surveys from this same University were returned from the postal system with bad addresses. This may be an indication that there were more inaccuracies of other kinds in the records of this database and therefore alumni other than those whose surveys the post office returned actually did not receive the survey.

Data Analysis

Returned surveys were sent to Andrews University Center for Statistical Services for processing. Staff at the Center electronically scanned the surveys so that data input errors would be minimized. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used to compute the frequencies and descriptive statistics, as well as appropriate statistical analyses.

Four different effect-size measurements were used to measure the size of the significant differences and relationships in research questions 1 to 4. Cramer's V was

used to measure the size of the relationship between the variables that were analyzed using Chi Square. Effect size (calculated by subtracting the smallest group mean from the largest group mean and dividing by the standard deviation) was used to measure the size of the relationship between variables analyzed using ANOVA. The size of the correlation was used to measure the size of the relationship between interval variables. The unique explained variance (calculated by squaring the part correlations of the variables) was used to measure the size of the relationship of the variables in the models where multiple regression analysis was conducted. In order to compare the effect size of all of the variables, four categories were created using three steps. First, four categories were created, three using conventional cutoff points of effect size as proposed by Cohen: small, 0.20; medium, 0.50; and large, 0.80; and one for items whose effect size was less than 0.20, very small (Howell, 2002, p. 228). Second, the significant variables with effect sizes were separated into these categories. Third, the cutoff points were created for the statistics that resulted in a similar number of variables placed in each category. The cutoff points are listed in Table 13.

Table 13

Categories and Cutoff Points for Comparison of Variables Size

	Very Small	Small	Medium	Large
Effect Size	<0.200	0.200-0.490	0.500-0.790	>0.800
Correlations & Cramer's V	<0.160	0.160-0.230	0.240-0.300	>0.300
R-squared	<0.010	0.010-0.037	0.038-0.065	>0.065

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were derived for the eight research questions.

1. There are no differences between the demographics and psychographics of alumni donors and nondonors.
2. There are no relationships between the demographics and psychographics of alumni donors, when studied individually, and the level of support and frequency of support to the institution.
3. There are no differences between the reasons for giving and reasons for not giving of alumni donors and nondonors.
4. There are no relationships between the reasons for giving and reasons for not giving by alumni donors, when studied individually, and the level of support and frequency of support to the institution.
5. There are no differences between alumni donors and nondonors with respect to selected demographics and psychographics and reasons for giving and reasons for not giving when combined.
6. There are no relationships between selected demographics and psychographics and reasons for giving and reasons for not giving of alumni donors, when combined, with the level of support to the institution.
7. There are no relationships between selected demographics and psychographics and reasons for giving and reasons for not giving of alumni donors, when combined, with the frequency of support to the institution.

8. There are no relationships between the level of support and frequency of support.

In Hypothesis 1, the demographics and the categorical psychographics were analyzed using Chi Square, while the interval psychographics were analyzed using one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). In Hypothesis 2, the demographics and categorical psychographics were analyzed using one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and the interval psychographics were analyzed using correlations. All the variables in Hypothesis 3 were analyzed using ANOVA. All Hypothesis 4 variables were analyzed using correlations. All the variables for the models in Hypotheses 5, 6, and 7 were selected using hierarchical regression, and then the models for each set of variables (demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving) were analyzed using multiple regression. The variables in Hypothesis 8 were also analyzed using multiple regression. Discriminant analysis was used for Hypothesis 5 for all four sets of variables to obtain a prediction of the percentage of donors and nondonors.

Summary

To find the relationships and differences between the demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving and the giving behavior of alumni from two comprehensive Adventist universities, I collected data from a self-designed survey and the databases of the Universities. Using the SPSS software the descriptive statistics for variables created from the data were computed and appropriate analyses, Chi-square, ANOVA, correlations, and multiple regression, completed.

CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter describes the demographics, psychographics (values and attitudes), the reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving of alumni as well as the differences between alumni donors and nondonors. It also describes the relationships between the demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, reasons for not giving variables, and the level and frequency of gift support variables of alumni donors. These demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving variables were analyzed first individually and then combined in models.

Descriptive Statistics of the Sample

Of the total respondents, $n = 247$, 158 (64%) were alumni from one university and 89 (36%) were alumni from the other university. The term University, as noted in the definitions in chapter 1, always refers to one of the study universities rather than any university. The descriptive statistics for the demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving follow.

Demographics

A total of 21 demographics were considered in the study. The number and percentage of the total respondents for each of the demographics are presented in Table 14.

The median household income was in the range of \$26,000 to \$50,000. Most alumni reported income less than \$100,000 and were employed either full- or part-time. Just over one quarter of the alumni were retired with a median age in the range of 47-56 years.

A small majority of the alumni were male. Just over three-quarters were Caucasian, a similar number were married, and most alumni had one or more children. Alumni tended to have older children rather than younger children. The majority of the spouses of the alumni who were married had a degree, though not from the University. Of the alumni who reported, most had no children who were alumni of their parents' alma mater, while just under half had other relatives who were alumni of the University.

Alumni were asked to report their educational achievements and degree locations as well as the length of time they spent at the University. One third of the alumni attended the University for 4 years. Approximately an equal number (18%) of alumni reported they attended for 2, 3, or more than 4 years at the University. For just under half of the alumni, their highest level of education was a master's degree. Approximately an equal number (26%) of alumni reported their highest degree was either at the baccalaureate or doctoral level. Almost half graduated with their highest degree between 1970 and 1989.

Table 14

Demographics of Respondents: Descriptive Statistics

Demographics	Response	<i>n</i>	%
Income	Less than \$26,000	24	9.7
	\$26,000-\$50,000	57	23.1
	\$51,000-\$75,000	46	18.6
	\$76,000-\$100,000	35	14.2
	\$101,000-\$200,000	47	20.4
	More than \$201,000	21	9.1
Employment status	Employed	159	64.4
	Unemployed	12	4.9
	Retired	71	28.7
Age	Less than 47 years old	39	15.8
	47-56 years old	70	28.3
	57-66 years old	57	23.1
	67-76 years old	44	17.8
	77 years or older	31	12.5
Gender	Female	108	43.7
	Male	126	51.0
Ethnicity	Caucasian	189	76.5
	Minority	50	20.2
Marital status	Single	25	10.1
	Married	188	76.1
	Widowed/divorced/separated	27	10.9
Number of children	No children	37	15.0
	1 child	22	8.9
	2 or more	182	73.6
Number of children ages less than 12	No children	79	32.0
	1 child	10	4.0
	2 or more	21	8.5
Number of children ages 13-18	No children	72	29.1
	1 child	23	9.3
	2 or more	20	8.1
Number of children ages 19-30	No children	52	21.1
	1 child	33	13.4
	2 or more	51	20.6

Table 14—*Continued.*

Demographics	Response	<i>n</i>	%
Number of children age 31 or older	No children	65	26.3
	1 child	17	6.9
	2 or more	62	34.0
Spouse	Holds no degree	46	18.6
	Holds a degree	156	63.2
Spouse is alumnus of	Study University	44	17.8
	Other university	112	45.3
Number of children who are alumni of University	None	93	37.7
	1 or more	41	16.6
Other relatives are alumni of the University	No	136	55.1
	Yes	106	42.9
Number of years attended University	1 year	23	9.3
	2 years	45	18.2
	3 years	45	18.2
	4 years	82	33.2
	More than 4 years	46	18.6
Highest degree educational level	Associate	8	3.2
	Baccalaureate	66	26.7
	Masters	103	41.7
	Doctorate/EdS	64	25.9
Highest degree, years since graduation	Before 1969	75	30.4
	1970-1989	113	45.7
	After 1990	50	20.2
Highest degree location	Study University	120	48.6
	Other Adventist	31	12.6
	Other	84	34.0
Undergraduate degree location	Study University	173	70.0
	Other university	70	28.3
Graduate degree location	Study University	91	36.8
	Other university	152	61.5

Note. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to missing data.

Almost half of the alumni also reported the University as the location for their highest degree. Almost three-quarters of alumni graduated from the University with their baccalaureate degree, and just over one third with their graduate degree.

Psychographics

The study included 68 psychographics. For reporting purposes, the psychographics were grouped in four themes—attitudes toward the University, financial support of the University, general giving patterns, and religious life (beliefs, affiliation, and involvement).

Attitudes Toward the University

Twelve psychographics measured attitudes of alumni toward the University. Two of the nine were scale psychographics, “University involvement” and “perception of University by community.” (See chapter 3 for the details in creating these two scales.) The descriptive statistics for the two scales, “University involvement” and “perception of University by community,” are presented in Table 15.

Table 15

*Psychographic Scales—Respondents' General Attitudes Toward the University:
Descriptive Statistics*

Psychographic	<i>n</i>	Scale Range	Mean	Standard Deviation
Perception of University by community	150	1.00 - 3.00	2.31	0.51
University involvement	247	0.00- 12.00	2.57	2.44

As indicated by the mean, the average alumnus who responded thought that the reputation of the University in the community was slightly more positive than neutral. The construction of the scale for "University involvement" (see chapter 3) established an interpretation of lower scores being indicative of little or passive involvement and higher scores signaling more or active involvement. Thus, the average alumnus in this study was only minimally involved at the University.

The number and percentage of the total respondents for each of the other 10 psychographics regarding attitudes about the University are presented in Table 16.

Most alumni were positive supporters of the University who expressed loyalty, recommended attendance, and believed that the University has a positive reputation. Few alumni believed their family, friends, and other alumni had a negative opinion of the University reputation. Most alumni reported that the University needed some or much of their support.

Financial Support of the University

Alumni were asked to what extent they and other stakeholders should support the University financially. The descriptive statistics for the seven variables, in order of the highest number of alumni responding essential, are presented in Table 17.

Most alumni reported that the support of the group of stakeholders with closest ties to the University (church, board, and faculty) was essential. A majority of alumni reported that the support of the group of stakeholders with more distant connections to the University (alumni, business, and community) was only optional or helpful.

Table 16

*Psychographic Items—Respondents' General Attitudes Toward the University:
Descriptive Statistics*

Psychographics	Response	<i>n</i>	%
University loyalty	Strongly disagree	6	2.5
	Disagree	40	16.6
	Agree	149	61.8
	Strongly agree	46	19.1
Respondent recommends attendance at University	Strongly disagree	5	2.1
	Disagree	27	11.2
	Agree	145	60.2
	Strongly agree	64	26.6
Amount of alumni support the University needs	None	4	1.7
	Little	12	5.1
	Some	125	53.2
	Much	94	40.0
Your response to University has positive reputation	No basis to judge	2	0.8
	Negatively	15	6.1
	Neutral	69	27.9
	Enthusiastically	154	62.3
Family response to University has positive reputation	No basis to judge	19	7.7
	Negatively	13	5.3
	Neutral	88	35.6
	Enthusiastically	115	46.6
Friends' response to University has positive reputation	No basis to judge	43	17.4
	Negatively	15	6.1
	Neutral	101	40.9
	Enthusiastically	76	30.8
Alumni response to University has positive reputation	No basis to judge	52	21.1
	Negatively	6	2.4
	Neutral	59	23.9
	Enthusiastically	111	44.9
Local community response to University has positive reputation	No basis to judge	97	39.3
	Negatively	8	3.2
	Neutral	68	27.5
	Enthusiastically	57	23.1

Table 16—*Continued.*

Psychographics	Response	<i>n</i>	%
Statewide response to University has positive reputation	No basis to judge	124	50.2
	Negatively	4	1.6
	Neutral	72	29.1
	Enthusiastically	28	11.3
Nationwide response to University has positive reputation	No basis to judge	125	50.6
	Negatively	2	0.8
	Neutral	72	29.1
	Enthusiastically	29	12.7

Note. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to missing data.

Table 17

Psychographic Items—Financial Support of the University—Respondents' Opinion of the Extent Stakeholders Should Support the University: Descriptive Statistics

Psychographic	Not				<i>n</i>
	Needed	Optional	Helpful	Essential	
	%	%	%	%	
Extent church should support University	0.0	3.2	15.4	69.6	218
Extent board should support University	0.0	2.8	17.0	69.6	221
Extent faculty should support University	0.0	4.5	18.2	66.8	221
Extent alumni should support University	0.4	13.4	40.1	36.8	224
Extent business should support University	0.0	15.4	43.7	27.1	213
Extent community should support University	0.0	16.6	46.2	23.5	213
Extent government should support University	27.1	24.3	25.9	7.7	210

Note. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to missing data.

Government was the only stakeholder whose support any appreciable number of respondents felt was not needed.

Giving patterns to the University were further explored by asking alumni about the frequency of the requests from the University for financial support and the frequency of their own support. The results are presented in Table 18.

Table 18

Psychographic Items—Financial Support of the University—Frequency of University Requests and Gifts: Descriptive Statistics

Psychographic	Response	%
Frequency of University request for financial support ^a	Never	2.9
	Once	5.0
	Sometimes	67.6
	Often	24.5
Giving frequency to University ^b	Never	2.6
	Rarely	14.5
	Occasionally	25.6
	Regularly	31.3
	Continuously	26.0

^a $n = 241$. ^b $n = 227$.

Almost all of the alumni reported that the University requested financial support sometimes or often. More than half reported that they were regular or continuous donors to the University. Only a very few reported that they never gave to the University.

Alumni were asked how they responded to the various methods of solicitation by the University. Due to the small number of participants (n), for analysis purposes three responses, (a) immediately positive, (b) later positive, and (c) negative, but later positive, were combined into one—positive. The specific descriptive statistics, in order of the most personalized to the least personalized method of solicitation, are presented in Table 19.

An alumnus was least likely to receive the most personalized method of solicitation, a visit. If he/she did, then chances were about equal that he/she would

Table 19

Psychographic Items—Financial Support of the University—Responses to Method of Solicitation: Descriptive Statistics

Psychographic	Not Received	Negative	Ignored	Positive	<i>n</i>
	%	%	%	%	
Response to visit solicitation	68.0	3.2	4.5	5.2	200
Response to phone solicitation	12.6	15.8	14.2	48.5	225
Response to letter solicitation	1.6	3.2	43.3	38.8	215
Response to publication solicitation	13.8	3.6	44.1	21.5	196
Response to advertisement solicitation	24.7	2.8	42.1	9.3	195

Note. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to missing data.

respond negatively, positively, or ignore the solicitation. Phone solicitation had the highest percentage of positive responses, but was also the method with the highest percentage of negative responses, and nearly the same number of alumni ignored the phone solicitation.

The three least personalized methods of solicitation (letter, publication, and advertisement) had the highest “ignore” response rates. Just under half the alumni reported that they ignored publication, letter, and advertisement solicitations. These three methods all received a similar low-level, negative response rate. As the degree of personalization of these three methods intensified, the positive response rate increased, highest for letter solicitation, lower for publication solicitation, and lowest for advertisement solicitation.

Finally alumni were also asked about the amount of input various individuals had

into their giving decisions to the University. The descriptive statistics for these responses are presented in Table 20.

Table 20

Psychographic Items—Financial Support of the University—Input Into Giving Decisions: Descriptive Statistics

Input From	Percentage of Actual Response						n
	Does not Apply	0	10-49%	50%	75-90%	100%	
Self	9.0	3.6	4.9	11.3	12.1	46.2	212
Spouse	30.0	20.2	8.9	12.1	2.4	1.6	160
Child	27.1	27.1	2.8	0	0.8	0.4	144
Close friend/s	25.5	29.1	3.2	0	0.4	0.4	145
Parent/s	26.3	30.0	0.8	0.4	0	0	142
Pastor	25.1	32.0	0.4	0	0	0	142
Other family member	23.9	32.4	2.0	0	0	0	144
Attorney	30.0	27.5	0	0	0	0	142
Accountant	30.0	26.7	0.8	0	0	0	142
Business partner	31.8	26.3	0.4	0	0	0	143

Note. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to missing data.

The data show that alumni tend to make decisions about giving to the University with limited input from others. For almost all of those who did get input from another individual, the input came from their spouses. The number of alumni who reported receiving input into their giving decisions from children, parents, other family, close friends, pastor, attorney, accountant, and business partner were so few that these variables were not analyzed for significant differences between donors and nondonors or

significant relationships with level and frequency of support.

General Giving Patterns

Alumni were asked to report their giving to nonprofit organizations and political causes. The number of respondents and valid percentages for these general giving psychographics are presented in Table 21.

Table 21

Psychographic Items—General Giving Patterns: Descriptive Statistics

Psychographic	Response	<i>n</i>	%
Number of nonprofit organizations supported	No organization	6	2.4
	1 organization	16	6.5
	2 organization	47	19.0
	3 - 6 organization	108	43.7
	> 7 organization	59	23.9
Frequency of giving to political cause	Never	14	5.7
	Once every few years	40	16.2
	Annually or more	170	68.8
Amount of giving to political cause	None or a little	14	5.7
	Some	43	17.4
	Considerable	24	9.7

Note. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to missing data.

Most alumni supported more than two nonprofit organizations. Most of the alumni who gave to political causes gave at least annually. Of the alumni who answered the question, most gave at least some funds to political causes.

Alumni were also asked about their financial support of and volunteer support at various categories of nonprofit organizations. The nonprofit organization categories are those generally used for national giving reports such as Giving USA. Alumni reported supporting nonprofit organizations in certain categories and not in others. The specific descriptive statistics, in order of largest amount given, are presented in Table 22.

Table 22

Psychographic Items—General Giving Patterns—Gift and Volunteer Support of Various Types of Nonprofits: Descriptive Statistics

	None	Little	Some	Much	
	%	%	%	%	<i>n</i>
Support to Nonprofit Organizations					
Gift amount to religion	3.6	5.3	20.2	64.4	231
Gift amount to education	13.0	17.8	38.5	23.1	228
Gift amount to social services	22.7	20.2	38.1	7.7	219
Gift amount to health	33.2	29.1	25.9	1.2	221
Gift amount to arts	55.1	16.2	14.2	1.2	214
Gift amount to youth	55.5	17.8	11.3	2.4	215
Gift amount to service clubs	69.6	8.5	6.1	2.4	214
Gift amount to environment	64.4	16.2	5.3	0.8	214
Volunteer amount to religion	17.8	10.1	27.9	36.8	229
Volunteer amount to education	35.6	14.2	21.9	17.8	221
Volunteer amount to social services	63.6	10.5	8.5	3.6	213
Volunteer amount to health	66.4	9.3	9.7	2.0	216
Volunteer amount to arts	68.4	8.5	5.3	4.9	215
Volunteer amount to youth	71.7	7.3	5.7	2.8	216
Volunteer amount to service clubs	74.1	5.3	2.8	2.4	209
Volunteer amount to environment	74.9	7.7	3.2	0	212

Note. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to missing data.

Alumni reported giving the greatest amount of both financial and volunteer support to religion and education nonprofit organizations. The majority of alumni

contributed to and volunteered at religious and educational nonprofit organizations at least a little. A majority also reported that they contributed to nonprofit organizations in the social services and health sectors, but that they did not volunteer at these health and social services nonprofit organizations. Few alumni reported any financial or volunteer support to the arts, youth, service club, or environmental nonprofit organizations.

The similar patterns of response for the gift and volunteer amounts to social services, health, arts, youth, service clubs and environment indicated that fewer alumni supported these types of nonprofits and their support was much smaller than the support to religion and education nonprofits. Therefore these variables were combined into two scales, "financial support of other nonprofits" and "volunteer support of other nonprofits," for further analysis. The descriptive statistics are presented in Table 23.

Table 23

Psychographic Scales—General Giving Patterns: Descriptive Statistics

Psychographic	<i>n</i>	Scale Range	Mean	Standard Deviation
Financial support of nonprofits other	239	1.00-4.00	1.62	.50
Volunteer support of nonprofits other	239	1.00-4.00	1.29	.47

Note: "Other" includes social services, health, arts, youth, service clubs, and environment.

As measured by the mean for both scales, alumni tended to provide little financial and even less volunteer support to nonprofits that were not either religious or educational organizations.

Religious Life

Alumni were also asked about religious affiliation, attendance, participation, and selected beliefs. The majority of the alumni demonstrated their involvement in church life by attending worship services at least weekly, attending a Bible study group at least monthly, and participating at least moderately in church activities. A scale called "church involvement" was created using these three variables. The descriptive statistics are presented in Table 24.

Table 24

Psychographic Scales—Religious Life: Descriptive Statistics

Psychographic	<i>n</i>	Scale Range	Mean	Standard Deviation
Church involvement	219	0.00-6.00	4.30	1.63

The descriptive statistics for all of the religious life variables as separate items are presented in Table 25.

Most alumni were: Adventists while at the University, currently Adventists, believers in God, and believed that tithing is an important practice.

Alumni were also asked about their designation of offering funds. Of the six offering categories, most alumni reported giving to each. The descriptive statistics, in order of largest amount given, are presented in Table 26.

Table 25

Psychographic Items—Religious Life: Descriptive Statistics

Psychographic	Response	<i>n</i>	%
Current belief in God	Believe	221	89.5
	Uncertain	6	2.4
	Don't believe	2	0.8
Opinion on tithing	Obligatory and important	167	67.6
	Obligatory but not important	4	1.6
	Optional and important	44	17.8
	Optional and not important	13	5.3
Religious preference while at the University	Adventist	223	90.3
	Other Christian	7	2.8
	Non-Christian	2	0.8
Current religious preference	Adventist	200	81.0
	Other Christian	24	9.7
	Non-Christian	5	2.0
	None	5	2.0
Frequency of attendance at worship services	Never	2	0.8
	Monthly or less	30	12.2
	Weekly or more	186	75.3
Frequency of attendance at Bible study	Never	58	23.5
	Monthly or less	61	25.1
	Weekly or more	98	39.7
Current participation in church life	Not involved	40	16.2
	Moderately	76	30.8
	Continually	103	41.7

Note. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to missing data.

Table 26

Psychographic Items—Religious Life—Offering Amounts: Descriptive Statistics

Offering Amount Type	None %	Little %	Some %	Much %	<i>n</i>
Amount of offering to local church operations	5.3	6.5	27.1	47.4	213
Amount of offering to local missions	9.3	12.1	33.2	30.8	211
Amount of offering to global missions	9.7	19.4	30.4	24.3	207
Amount of offering to local church education	23.1	14.2	24.3	21.1	204
Amount of offering to local region	16.2	19.4	30.0	17.8	206
Amount of offering to independent ministries	25.5	20.6	21.9	14.2	203

Note. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to missing data.

The majority of alumni gave much to local church operations. Alumni gave or did not give in about the same proportions to local and global missions. The number of alumni giving to local church education was fairly evenly spread through the four categories—none, little, some, and much. Alumni also gave or did not give in about the same proportions to local church education and the local region. Independent ministries were supported by the fewest number of alumni.

Reasons for Giving Items

Alumni were asked to rank the importance of 48 reasons for giving items on a 4-point scale: not important, somewhat important, important, and very important. To highlight the trends for the majority of alumni, the descriptive statistics for the reasons for giving are reported within clusters according to how many rated each item as very important. The descriptive statistics for the reasons for giving items are presented in Table 27.

Table 27

Reasons for Giving Items: Descriptive Statistics

Reason for Giving	Not Important %	Somewhat Important %	Important %	Very Important %	n
Communities of Participation					
Sense of pride in partnership	27.1	27.1	14.2	5.3	182
Involvement in programs and activities	36.8	21.5	9.3	4.5	178
Family ties to the University	48.2	13.0	6.9	4.0	178
Immediate/past involvement in University fundraising efforts	51.8	12.6	5.7	2.0	178
Serve on the board or other official body	59.1	6.1	3.2	1.6	173
Discretionary Resources					
Have available funds	7.3	14.6	24.3	26.3	179
Frameworks of Consciousness					
Believe in the mission	4.0	12.1	27.9	36.4	199
Religious affiliation as an Adventist University	10.1	12.1	24.3	30.3	189
Preserve spiritual environment	10.5	10.9	25.9	27.9	186
Give something back	14.6	21.5	23.1	17.0	188
Preserve critical thinking environment	15.4	16.2	24.7	17.0	181
Have a sense of loyalty	14.6	23.5	23.9	15.0	190
Personal or spiritual commitment	10.5	23.5	27.1	13.8	185
Need this type of University	20.2	23.5	17.4	12.6	182
Preserve academic environment	13.8	20.6	27.5	11.1	181
Giving is a responsibility	19.4	19.8	23.9	10.5	182
Desire to help bring about change	15.0	27.1	22.3	8.9	181
Fiscal stability of the University	19.0	24.7	19.4	8.9	178
Set an example	36.8	21.5	9.7	4.0	178
Community responsibility and civic pride	36.8	22.3	10.9	1.2	176
Guilt feelings	62.3	7.3	2.4	0.4	179
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards					
Prepared me for my career	9.7	21.1	22.7	21.5	185
Receive the joy of giving	22.3	23.9	20.2	10.5	190
Ability to designate fund use	30.0	19.4	12.1	10.5	178
Tax considerations	25.1	28.3	15.0	6.5	185
Ability to create a lasting memorial	44.5	15.8	6.5	4.5	176
Makes good business sense	37.7	18.2	13.4	4.5	182
Opportunity to honor an individual	40.9	20.2	7.7	4.0	180
Expand University's economic benefits to the community	28.7	24.7	15.0	4.0	179
Recognition of gifts	50.6	10.5	7.7	4.0	180

Table 27—*Continued.*

Reason for Giving	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important	<i>n</i>
	%	%	%	%	
Match a gift made by others	49.0	17.0	4.0	2.0	178
Challenge others to give	44.9	21.1	4.0	0.4	174
Invitation to Participate					
Asked to give	23.1	27.9	17.0	6.5	184
Appeal of the requesting materials	35.2	19.8	11.3	3.6	173
Influence of the gift solicitors	46.6	15.0	7.7	2.4	177
Peer influence	61.9	6.9	1.6	0.4	175
Urgency and Effectiveness					
Advance the excellence and reputation of University	15.0	19.4	20.6	18.2	181
Help the less fortunate	12.6	22.7	23.1	16.2	184
Enhance the educational environment	13.8	20.2	25.9	13.0	180
University needs funds	13.4	25.5	23.9	11.3	183
Interest in a specific program	27.9	19.0	10.1	8.9	163
Respect for the administrative leadership	27.9	18.6	17.8	8.5	180
Uniqueness of the project/program	23.9	24.7	17.4	7.3	181
Respect for the current faculty	30.8	18.6	16.2	7.3	180
Respect for volunteer leadership	34.0	21.5	14.2	2.4	178
Youth Models and Experiences					
Respect for the past faculty	19.4	21.9	21.5	13.8	189
Return help as I was helped	23.9	18.6	18.2	12.6	181
My philanthropic culture	27.1	19.8	17.8	6.9	177

Note. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to missing data.

Reasons for Not Giving Items

Alumni were asked to rank the importance of 15 reasons for not giving items on a 4-point scale: not consider, some influence, major influence, and deciding factor. The descriptive statistics for the reasons for not giving items are listed by cluster and presented in Table 28.

Table 28

Reasons for Not Giving Items: Descriptive Statistics

Reasons for Not Giving	Not Consider %	Some Influence %	Major Influence %	Deciding Factor %	<i>n</i>
Communities of Participation					
University excludes me	54.7	5.7	3.6	6.1	173
Discretionary Resources					
Unable to give	29.1	11.7	9.3	19.0	171
Give to other nonprofit organizations	24.7	17.4	22.7	12.1	190
Only contribute an insignificant amount	32.0	20.2	8.1	9.3	172
Give to other institutions, my degree	41.7	15.8	9.7	6.1	181
Give to spouse alma mater	53.0	10.9	4.9	2.4	176
Still intend to give	49.4	7.7	3.2	2.0	154
Frameworks of Consciousness					
Differ with the policies	49.8	7.3	8.1	4.9	173
Not the school it was when I attended	55.5	8.1	2.8	3.6	173
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards					
Emphasis on diversity in mission	51.8	10.1	6.1	1.2	171
Insufficient diversity in some levels	57.9	7.3	2.0	2.0	171
Insufficient diversity at all levels	57.9	7.3	2.4	2.4	173
Invitation to Participate					
Have not been asked to give	56.7	6.9	2.4	2.8	170
Urgency and Effectiveness					
Gifts not needed	51.7	12.6	2.0	1.6	167
Youth Models and Experiences					
My student experience	41.7	10.5	11.3	9.3	180

Note. Percentages may not add up to 100% due to missing data.

Most Important Reasons for Giving

Alumni were also asked to choose 3 (from the 48) reasons for giving that were the most important to them. Because most (34) variables were chosen by fewer than 10% of the alumni, I decided not to test them for significance with any of the dependent variables.

The comparison of the rating of the most important reasons for giving by donors and nondonors rated from highest to lowest by donor percentage within the seven reasons for giving clusters, are presented in Table 29.

One reason for giving item, "have a sense of loyalty," had a difference in rating by donors and nondonors of more than 10%.

Least Important Reasons for Giving

Alumni were also asked to choose the 3 (of 48) least important reasons for giving. Because most variables (35) were chosen by fewer than 10% of the respondents, I decided not to test such items for significance with any dependent variables. The comparisons of the rating of the least important reasons for giving items by donors and nondonors within the seven clusters used throughout the study, rated from highest to lowest by donor percentage, are presented in Table 30.

For three least important reasons for giving, the difference in rating between donors and nondonors was more than 10%. The range of differences was 10.8% to 12.6%. These reasons were in the Communities of Participation and Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards clusters.

Table 29

Most Important Reasons for Giving of Donors and Nondonors: Rating

Reasons for Giving	Donor		Nondonor	
	n	%	n	%
Communities of Participation				
Sense of pride in partnership	4	2.9	0	0.0
Involvement in programs and activities	4	2.9	0	0.0
Family ties to the University	3	2.2	1	2.4
Immediate or past involvement in University fund-raising efforts	3	2.2	0	0.0
Serve on the board or other official body	1	0.7	1	2.4
Discretionary Resources				
Have available funds†	42	30.9	16	39.0
Frameworks of Consciousness				
Believe in the mission	64	47.1	16	39.0
Preserve spiritual environment	33	24.3	11	26.8
Give something back	31	22.8	7	17.1
Have a sense of loyalty†	27	19.9	2	4.9
Religious affiliation—an Adventist university	22	16.2	6	14.6
Personal or spiritual commitment	18	13.2	4	9.8
Giving is a responsibility	14	10.3	1	2.4
Fiscal stability of the University	11	8.1	4	9.8
Preserve critical thinking environment	11	8.1	3	7.3
Desire to help bring about change	11	8.1	5	12.2
Need this type of University	10	7.4	1	2.4
Preserve academic environment	4	2.9	1	2.4
Set an example	3	2.2	1	2.4
Community responsibility and civic pride	1	0.7	0	0.0
Guilt feelings	0	0.0	0	0.0
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards				
Tax considerations	11	8.1	4	9.8
Receive the joy of giving	9	6.6	1	2.4
Ability to designate fund use	8	5.9	2	4.9
Prepared me for my career	7	5.1	3	7.3
Ability to create a lasting memorial	4	2.9	1	2.4
Makes good business sense	4	2.9	0	0.0
Expand University's economic benefits to the community	4	2.9	0	0.0
Recognition of gifts	4	2.9	0	0.0
Opportunity to honor an individual	2	1.5	1	2.4
Match a gift made by others	1	0.7	0	0.0
Challenge others to give	1	0.7	0	0.0
Invitation to Participate				
Asked to give	12	8.8	3	7.3
Appeal of the requesting materials	4	2.9	1	2.4
Influence of the gift solicitors	3	2.2	2	4.9
Peer influence	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table 29—*Continued.*

Reasons for Giving	<u>Donor</u>		<u>Nondonor</u>	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Urgency and Effectiveness				
Help the less fortunate	20	14.7	6	14.6
Advance the excellence and reputation of University	14	10.3	2	4.9
Respect for the administrative leadership	9	6.6	1	2.4
University needs funds	8	5.9	2	4.9
Enhance the educational environment	8	5.9	6	14.6
Uniqueness of the project/program	7	5.1	2	4.9
Interest in a specific program	7	5.1	1	2.4
Respect for volunteer leadership	3	2.2	0	0.0
Respect for the current faculty	2	1.5	0	0.0
Youth Models and Experiences				
Help students finance their education as I was	16	11.8	6	14.6
My philanthropic culture	14	10.3	2	4.9
Respect for the past faculty	14	10.3	1	2.4

† Reasons with a difference of 10 or more percentage points between donor and nondonor rating.

Table 30

Least Important Reasons for Giving of Donors and Nondonors: Rating

Reasons for Giving	Donor		Nondonor	
	n	%	n	%
Communities of Participation				
Family ties to the University	23	16.1	4	9.5
Serve on the board or other official body†	18	12.6	0	0.0
Immediate or past involvement in University fundraising efforts	12	8.4	2	4.8
Involvement in programs and activities	8	5.6	2	4.8
Sense of pride in partnership	7	4.9	3	7.1
Discretionary Resources				
Have available funds	8	5.6	1	2.4
Frameworks of Consciousness				
Guilt feelings	83	58.0	24	57.5
Set an example	15	10.5	51	11.9
Community responsibility and civic pride	13	9.1	2	4.8
Have a sense of loyalty	8	5.6	3	7.1
Believe in the mission	6	4.2	3	7.1
Give something back	6	4.2	3	7.1
Fiscal stability of the University	6	4.2	2	4.8
Preserve critical thinking environment	6	4.2	1	2.4
Giving is a responsibility	5	3.5	2	4.8
Need this type of University	5	3.5	1	2.4
Desire to help bring about change	5	3.5	0	0.0
Preserve academic environment	4	2.8	1	2.4
Preserve spiritual environment	4	2.8	3	7.1
Personal or spiritual commitment	4	2.8	0	0.0
Religious affiliation—Adventist University	3	2.1	2	4.8
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards				
Recognition of gifts	53	37.1	13	31.0
Ability to create a lasting memorial†	29	20.3	4	9.5
Tax considerations†	27	18.9	3	7.1
Makes good business sense	25	17.5	9	21.4
Opportunity to honor an individual	17	11.9	4	9.5
Match a gift made by others	16	11.2	4	9.5
Receive the joy of giving	13	9.1	4	9.5
Challenge others to give	13	9.1	2	4.8
Ability to designate funds' use	12	8.4	1	2.4
Expand University's economic benefits to the community	6	4.5	1	2.4
Prepared me for my career	5	3.5	0	0.0
Invitation to Participate				
Peer influence	43	30.1	13	31.0
Influence of the gift solicitors	22	15.4	4	9.5
Appeal of the requesting materials	16	11.2	5	11.9
Asked to give	14	9.8	5	11.9

Table 30—*Continued.*

Reasons for Giving	<u>Donor</u>		<u>Nondonor</u>	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Urgency and Effectiveness				
Respect for the administrative leadership	9	6.3	5	11.9
University needs funds	8	5.6	4	9.5
Respect for the current faculty	8	5.6	3	7.1
Respect for volunteer leadership	7	4.9	2	4.8
Uniqueness of the project/program	6	4.2	2	4.8
Advance the excellence and reputation of University	5	3.5	1	2.4
Interest in a specific program	5	3.5	0	0.0
Help the less fortunate	4	2.8	3	7.1
Enhance the educational environment	4	2.8	0	0.0
Youth Models and Experiences				
My philanthropic culture	11	7.7	3	7.1
Return help as I was helped	6	4.2	0	0.0
Respect for the past faculty	5	3.5	2	4.8

† Reasons with a difference of 10 or more percentage points between donor and nondonor rating.

Most Important Reasons for Not Giving

Alumni were also asked to choose 3 (of 15) of the most important reasons for not giving. Since more than half (8) of the variables were chosen by fewer than 10% of the alumni, I did not test for significance with any of the dependent variables. The comparison of the most important reasons for not giving items within the seven clusters rated from highest to lowest by donor percentage is presented in Table 31.

There were four reasons for not giving for which the number of donors and nondonors rating differed by more than 10% as the most important reasons for not giving. These differences ranged between 16.4% and 26.0%. These reasons for not giving were in the Communities of Participation, Discretionary Resources, and Youth Models and Experiences clusters.

Table 31

Most Important Reasons for Not Giving of Donors and Nondonors: Rating

Reasons for Not Giving	<u>Donor</u>		<u>Nondonor</u>	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Communities of Participation				
University excludes me†	7	6.1	9	22.5
Discretionary Resources				
Give to other nonprofit organizations†	62	54.4	14	35.0
Unable to give	58	50.9	17	42.5
Only contribute an insignificant amount†	40	35.1	4	9.1
Give to other institutions, my degrees	30	26.3	11	27.5
Give to spouse alma maters	13	11.4	2	5.0
Still intend to give	10	8.8	4	10.0
Frameworks of Consciousness				
Differ with the policies	19	16.7	8	20.0
Not the school it was when I attended	11	9.6	5	12.5
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards				
Emphasis on diversity in mission	9	7.5	3	7.5
Insufficient diversity in some levels	7	6.1	2	5.0
Insufficient diversity at all levels	6	5.3	2	5.0
Invitation to Participate				
Have not been asked to give	10	8.8	5	12.5
Urgency and Effectiveness				
Gifts not needed	6	5.3	1	2.5
Youth Models and Experiences				
My student experience†	25	21.9	15	37.5

† Reasons with a difference of 10 or more percentage points between donor and nondonor rating.

Least Important Reasons for Not Giving

Respondents also rated the reasons for not giving as least important. Since about half (7) of the variables were chosen by 13.5% or fewer respondents, I did not test for significance with any of the dependent variables. The comparison of the least important reasons for not giving listed by the seven clusters, rated from highest to lowest by nondonor percentage, is presented in Table 32.

For five least important reasons for not giving, the difference in rating between donors and nondonors was more than 10%. The range was from 12.6% to 20.8%. These reasons for not giving were in the Communities of Participation, Discretionary Resources, Frameworks of Consciousness, and Youth Models and Experiences clusters. A greater proportion of donors than nondonors rated all but two reasons for not giving, "give to spouse alma mater," and "give to other nonprofit organizations," least important.

Dependent Variables

In this study there were three dependent measures: donor status, level of support, and frequency of support that were obtained from the database of the Universities under study. "Donor status" was measured by whether or not the respondent had made a gift of any size to the Universities under study. Of the 247 alumni respondents, 65 (26%) were nondonors who had never given a gift to the University, while 182 (74%) were donors who had made at least one gift.

Two dependent variables comprised the level of support measure: "largest gift"

Table 32

Least Important Reasons for Not Giving of Donors and Nondonors: Rating

Reasons for Not Giving Items	<u>Donor</u>		<u>Nondonor</u>	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Communities of Participation				
University excludes me†	33	29.7	6	16.2
Discretionary Resources				
Give to spouse alma mater†	37	33.3	20	54.1
Give to other nonprofit organizations	21	18.9	10	27.0
Give to other institutions, my degree	27	24.3	8	21.6
Only contribute an insignificant amount	14	12.6	6	16.2
Unable to give	11	9.9	2	5.4
Still intend to give†	18	16.2	1	2.7
Frameworks of Consciousness				
Not the school it was when I attended	22	19.8	7	18.9
Differ with the policies†	26	23.4	4	10.8
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards				
Insufficient diversity at all levels	41	36.9	13	35.1
Emphasis on diversity in mission	39	35.1	12	32.4
Insufficient diversity in some levels	33	29.7	10	27.0
Invitation to Participate				
Have not been asked to give	15	13.5	3	8.1
Urgency and Effectiveness				
Gifts not needed†	23	20.7	3	8.1
Youth Models and Experiences				
My student experience†	30	27.0	3	8.1

† Reasons with a difference of 10 or more percentage points between donor and nondonor rating.

and "cumulative gifts." If the respondent was married and reported on the survey that as a couple they gave jointly, "largest gift" was the largest single gift recorded by the University given by either the spouse or the respondent. Likewise, "cumulative gifts" was the total dollar amount of all gifts recorded by the University since the year of graduation given by both the spouse and the respondent. If the respondent was single, widowed or divorced, or married and reported giving separately from their spouse, both "largest gift" and "cumulative gifts" were calculated only from the respondent's giving record. Although alumni donors have given both Universities many large, single (greater than \$100,000) gifts and therefore have large cumulative gift totals, no such alumni responded to the survey.

The frequency of support of alumni was measured with one variable, "percentage gift years." This was calculated by dividing the number of years in which one or more gifts were given by the total number of years from the year of the respondent's first gift to 2006.

When the frequencies of the four dependent variables were studied, an outlier case was discovered. The donor's largest gift was \$10,000, and the cumulative gift total was \$22,310. (The next largest gift was only \$1,500 with the cumulative gift total of \$9,915.74.) Since this outlier would unduly influence results, for statistical analysis, this outlier case was removed from these two variables. The sample size, range, means, and standard deviation for "cumulative gifts," "largest gift," and "percentage gift years" are presented in Table 33.

Table 33

Dependent Variables: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	<i>n</i>	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Largest gift	246	0	1500.00	105.79	227.03
Cumulative gifts	246	0	9915.74	456.59	117.90
Percentage gift years	247	0	96.88	26.98	24.87

Results for Research Question 1

Each of the 19 demographics and 44 psychographics was analyzed as a separate, independent variable with "donor status" in order to provide an answer to the first research question: "How do the demographics and psychographics of alumni donors and nondonors differ?" Thus, 65 tests were conducted with independent variables against "donor status." There were significant differences between donors and nondonors for 26 demographics and psychographics.

Chi-square was used to analyze the difference between donors and nondonors for the categorical, independent demographic and psychographic variables and analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the interval, independent psychographic variables. Cramer's V was calculated for the categorical variables and effect size for the interval variables in order to provide comparable measures to allow interpretation of how important or large the differences were. (See chapter 3.)

Demographics and Donor Status

Significant differences were noted between donors and nondonors for 6 of the 19 demographics. The details of the significant differences between demographics and "donor status" are presented in Table 34.

The detailed results for 13 demographics for which there were no significant differences between donors and nondonors are in Appendix B, Table 77.

Psychographics and Donor Status

Significant differences existed between donors and nondonors for 11 of the 14 categorical psychographics where Chi-Square was the statistical analysis technique. However, since the number of respondents for 2 of the significant psychographics was small, I did not interpret them. These 2 were: amount given to political cause ($n = 81$), and response to visit solicitation ($n = 32$). The detailed results for these 2 categorical psychographics and the 3 categorical psychographics for which there were no significant differences between donors and nondonors are in Appendix B, Table 78.

The details of the significant differences between the nine psychographics and "donor status" are presented in Table 35.

Significant differences were noted between donors and nondonors for 11 of the 30 interval psychographics where analysis of variance (ANOVA) was the statistical methodology used. The results for the significant differences are presented in Table 36.

Table 34

Donor Status and Demographics: Significant Differences—Chi-Square

Demographic		Nondonor		Donor		χ^2	<i>p</i>	Cramer's
		<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%			V
Age	46 years or younger	17	27.4	22	12.3	17.108	.002**	.266
	47-56 years old	22	35.5	48	26.8			
	57-66 years old	15	24.2	42	23.5			
	67-76 years old	6	9.7	38	21.2			
	77 years or older	2	3.2	29	16.2			
Ethnicity	Caucasian	41	65.1	148	84.1	10.136	.001**	.206
	Minority	22	34.9	28	15.9			
Employment status	Employed	50	78.1	109	61.2	7.673	.006**	.183
	Retired	10	15.6	61	34.3			
Gender	Female	34	59.6	74	41.8	5.522	.019*	.154
	Male	23	40.4	103	58.2			
Highest degree years since graduation	Less than 16 years ago	30	47.6	37	20.8	20.746	.000*	.293
	17 to 35 years ago	27	42.9	86	48.3			
	More than 36 years ago	6	9.5	55	30.9			
Spouse degree	Holds no degree	19	39.6	27	17.5	10.118	.001**	.224
	Holds degree	29	60.4	127	82.5			

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Table 35

Donor Status and Psychographics: Significant Differences—Chi-Square

Psychographic	Nondonor		Donor		χ^2	<i>p</i>	Cramer's <i>V</i>
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%			
Current religious preference							
Adventist	44	74.6	156	89.1	7.539	.006**	.179
Not Adventist	15	25.4	19	10.9			
Religious preference while at University							
Adventist	52	88.1	171	98.8	13.53	.000**	.241
All other	7	11.9	2	1.2			
Respondent recommends attendance							
Disagree	17	27.4	15	8.4	14.569	.001**	.245
Agree	32	51.6	113	63.1			
Strongly agree	13	21.0	51	28.5			
Number of nonprofit organizations supported							
Less than two	30	48.4	39	22.4	18.714	.000**	.282
Three to six	26	41.9	82	47.1			
More than seven	6	9.7	53	30.5			
Frequency of University request for financial support							
Once or never	11	17.7	8	4.5	12.696	.002**	.230
Sometimes	41	66.1	122	68.2			
Often	10	16.1	49	27.4			
Response to letter solicitation							
Negative	4	7.4	4	2.5	19.196	.000**	.302
Ignore	39	72.2	68	43.3			
Positive at some time	11	20.4	85	54.1			
Response to phone solicitation							
Negative	13	31.7	26	17.0	25.089	.000**	.360
Ignore	16	39.0	19	12.4			
Positive at some time	12	29.3	108	70.6			
Response to publication solicitation							
Negative	6	13.6	3	2.5	8.21	.016*	.225
Ignore	25	56.8	84	71.2			
Positive at some time	13	29.5	31	26.3			
Response to advertisement solicitation							
Negative	5	13.9	2	2.0	9.003	.011*	.259
Ignore	23	63.9	81	82.7			
Positive at some time	8	22.2	15	15.3			

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

The detailed results for the 19 interval psychographics for which there were no significant differences between donors and nondonors are in Appendix B, Table 79.

Summary for Research Question 1

In summary, as noted in Table 33, donors tended to be older, Caucasian, retired, and male. Donors also graduated with their highest degree earlier than nondonors, and had spouses who held a degree. As noted in Table 34 donors tended to be Adventist both when attending the University and at present. Donors also were more likely to: recommend attendance at the University; respond more positively to the personal types of solicitations that they received (letter and phone); ignore the less personal solicitations (publication and advertisement), and report solicitations more often than nondonors were. As noted in Table 35, donors had more input from self, were more loyal to and involved in the University, and believed the University needs and deserves more alumni support than nondonors. Donors also were more likely than nondonors to believe that the University had a positive reputation and that their family, friends, and alumni believed that the University has a positive reputation. Tables 34 and 35 also show that donors tended to support more nonprofits and nonprofits in education, and gave more offering to global missions than nondonors did. The effect sizes for all of these differences ranged from very small to medium.

Results for Research Question 2

Three dependent variables were used to answer the research question, "To what extent are demographics and psychographics of alumni donors, when studied

individually, related to the level of support and frequency of support to the institution?" Alumni level of support was measured using two variables—"largest gift" and "cumulative gifts." Alumni frequency of support was measured using one variable—"percentage gift years." Each of 19 demographics and 44 psychographics was analyzed as an individual, independent variable against each of the dependent variables "largest gift," "cumulative gifts," and "percentage gift years." Of the 189 tests, significant relationships existed between 6 demographic and 23 psychographic variables and at least one of the three dependent variables. An effect size was calculated in order to provide comparable measures to allow interpretation of how significant the differences were. (See chapter 3.)

The sample size was reduced for this question because the dependent variables, "largest gift," "cumulative gifts," and "percentage gift years" were relevant only for respondents who were also donors. Thus, the number of respondents was $n = 186$ for "largest gift" and "cumulative gifts" and $n = 187$ for "percentage gift years."

It is logical to assume that alumni donors who gave within specific dollar amount ranges (very small, little, some, and large) and a specific frequency range (those who gave rarely, occasionally, often, and regularly) would be described by the same demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving. Creating gift level and frequency ranges also lessens the likelihood of an odd or skewed gift amount or frequency, artificially affecting the results of the analysis. The range for the variables when not grouped was (a) "largest gift" from \$1.00 to \$1,500.00, (b) "cumulative gifts" from \$1.00 to \$9,915.74, and (c) "percentage gift years" from 3.23% to 96.88%. Thus,

prior to conducting the analysis in research questions 2, 4, 6, and 7 the cases for the dependent variables were grouped into four groups, thus effectively categorizing the level of support into a 4-point scale. The frequency details for the three variables are shown in Table 37.

Table 37

Dependent Variables: Frequencies

Dependent Variable	Value	Value Label	Frequency	%
Grouped Largest Gift	\$1 to \$49	Very small	76	42.0
	\$50 to \$99	Little	36	19.9
	\$100 to \$499	Some	52	28.7
	>\$500	Much	17	9.4
Grouped Cumulative gifts	\$1 to \$99	Very small	57	31.5
	\$100 to \$249	Little	40	22.1
	\$250 to \$999	Some	56	30.9
	>\$1000	Much	28	15.5
Grouped Percentage Gift Years	3 to 10%	Rarely	19	10.4
	11 to 30%	Occasionally	64	35.2
	31 to 59%	Often	63	34.6
	>60%	Regularly	36	19.8

Demographics and Level of Support

A significant difference was noted between the levels of support by donors for 1 of the 19 demographics. The details of the significant relationship between demographics and "largest gift," one measure of level of support, are presented in Table 38.

Table 38

Largest Gift and Demographics: Significant Relationships—ANOVA

Demographic		Largest Gift					Effect Size
		<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	
Graduate degree obtained at University	Yes	66	2.33	1.01	6.763	.010*	.39
	No	16	1.92	1.03			

* $p < .05$.

The detailed results for the 18 demographics for which there were no significant relationships with "largest gift" are in Appendix B, Table 80.

Significant differences were noted between the frequency of support by donors for 2 of the 19 demographics. The details of the significant relationships between demographics and "cumulative gifts," one measure of level of support, are presented in Table 39.

Table 39

Cumulative Gifts and Demographics: Significant Relationships—ANOVA

Demographic		Cumulative Gifts					Effect Size
		<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	
Ethnicity	Caucasian	148	2.42	1.08	7.505	.007**	.57
	Minority	27	1.81	0.92			
Number of children age 31 or older	None	115	2.17	1.07	2.828	.040*	.49
	One	13	2.15	1.34			
	Two	21	2.81	0.81			
	Three	32	2.53	1.47			

** $p < .01$. * $p < .05$.

Table 40

Percentage Gift Years and Demographics: Significant Relationships—ANOVA

Demographic	Percentage Gift Years					Effect Size
	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	
Age						
After 1960	22	2.32	.65	2.795	.028*	.64
1950 - 1959	48	2.35	.79			
1940 - 1949	42	2.45	.77			
1930 - 1939	38	2.74	.76			
Before 1929	29	2.83	.93			
Child is also an alumnus						
No children	147	2.46	.79	5.166	.024*	.43
1 or more children	35	2.80	.80			
Employment Status						
Employed	109	2.42	.71	5.092	.025*	.35
Retired	61	2.70	.91			

* $p < .05$.

Table 41

Measures of Level of Support and Psychographics: Significant Relationships—Correlations

Psychographic	Largest Gift	Cumulative Gift
University involvement	.201**	.179*
University loyalty	.181*	.206**
Extent alumni should support University		.158*
Respondent believes University has positive reputation	.161*	.157*
Amount of financial support to nonprofits in education		.165*
Amount of financial support to nonprofits in religion		.185*
Amount of financial support to nonprofits other	.175*	.165*
Financial support for local church operation		.168*
Financial support for independent ministries		.247*

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Significant differences were noted between the level of support by donors for 1 of the 14 psychographics. The details of the significant relationship between the psychographics that were categorical variables and "largest gift" are presented in Table 42.

Table 42

Largest Gift and Psychographics: Significant Results—ANOVA

Psychographics	Largest Gift			<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Effect Size
	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>			
Number of nonprofit organizations supported						
Less than two	38	1.71	1.04	3.806	.024*	.57
Three to six	82	2.06	1.07			
More than seven	53	2.32	1.00			

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Thirteen psychographics that were categorical variables had no significant relationships with "largest gift." The detailed results are in Appendix B, Table 84.

Significant differences were noted between the level of support by donors for 4 of the 14 psychographics. The details of the significant relationships between "cumulative gifts" and the psychographics that were categorical variables are presented in Table 43.

Table 43

Cumulative Gifts and Psychographics: Significant Results—ANOVA

Psychographics	Cumulative Gifts					Effect Size
	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	
Number of nonprofit organizations supported						
Less than two	38	2.03	1.17	4.986	.008**	.35
Three to six	82	2.22	1.01			
More than seven	53	2.68	1.01			
Respondent recommends attendance						
Disagree	15	1.73	1.22	3.121	.047*	1.08
Agree	112	2.29	1.00			
Strongly agree	51	2.51	1.16			
Response to letter solicitation						
Negative	4	1.75	1.50	4.104	.018*	.71
Ignore	67	2.06	1.10			
Positive at some time	85	2.52	1.00			
Response to phone solicitation						
Negative	26	2.04	1.28	3.324	.039*	.47
Ignore	19	2.00	1.24			
Positive at some time	108	2.50	0.94			

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Ten psychographics that were categorical variables had no significant relationships with "cumulative gifts." The detailed results are in Appendix B, Table 85.

Psychographics and Frequency of Support

Thirty psychographics that were interval independent variables had their relationship with "percentage gift years" analyzed by correlation. The detailed results for the 9 psychographics that had significant relationships with "percentage gift years" are presented in Table 44.

Table 44

Percentage Gift Years and Psychographics: Significant Relationships—Correlations

Psychographic	Percentage Gift Years
University loyalty	.332**
Extent alumni should support the University	.214**
Amount of alumni support the University needs	.217**
University reputation self	.180**
Amount of financial support nonprofit religion	.207**
Amount of financial support nonprofit education	.160*
Financial support for local region	.199*
Financial support of local church operation	.172*
Financial support for independent ministries	.213**

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

The detailed results for the 21 psychographics for which there were no significant relationships with "percentage gift years" are in Appendix B, Table 87.

Significant differences were noted between "percentage gift years" and 6 of the 14 psychographics that were categorical variables that were analyzed using ANOVA. Since the number of respondents for one significant psychographic "response to visit solicitation" was small ($n = 20$), it was not interpreted. Its detailed results are with those for variables for which there were no significant relationships with "percentage gift years." The details for the significant relationships between six psychographics and "percentage gift years" are presented in Table 45.

The detailed results for the other eight psychographics that had no significant relationships with "percentage gift years" are in Appendix B, Table 86.

Table 45

Percentage Gift Years and Psychographics: Significant Relationships—ANOVA

Psychographic	Percentage Gift Years					Effect Size
	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	
Number of nonprofit organizations supported						
Less than two	39	2.26	0.88	6.670	.002**	.71
Three to six	82	2.46	0.82			
More than seven	53	2.83	0.61			
Opinion on tithe paying						
Obligatory	127	2.60	0.79	5.675	.004**	.81
Optional and important	33	2.48	0.83			
Optional and not important	7	1.57	0.53			
Current religious preference						
Adventist	156	2.58	0.78	4.737	.031*	.80
Other	19	2.16	0.90			
Respondent recommends attendance						
Disagree	15	2.00	0.85	4.164	.017*	.83
Agree	113	2.54	0.72			
Strongly agree	51	2.67	0.91			
Response to letter solicitation						
Negative	4	2.00	1.15	9.527	.000**	.94
Ignore	68	2.24	0.77			
Positive at some time	85	2.74	0.71			
Response to phone solicitation						
Negative	26	2.23	0.91	6.115	.003**	.60
Ignore	19	2.21	0.85			
Positive at some time	108	2.71	0.75			

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Summary for Research Question 2

“Largest gift” was bigger when donors obtained their graduate degree at the study university. “Largest gift” was also bigger when donors were involved, loyal, believed the university had a positive reputation, gave to a larger number of nonprofits and gave more financial support to nonprofits in areas other than religion and education (i.e., arts, environment, health, service clubs, social services, and youth). (See Tables 38, 41, and 42.)

“Cumulative gifts” were bigger when donors were Caucasian and had two or three children aged 31 or older. “Cumulative gifts” were also bigger when donors were involved, loyal, recommended attendance at the University, believed alumni should support the University, believed the University has a positive reputation, and responded to letter and phone solicitations. Donors also gave bigger “cumulative gifts” when they gave to larger numbers of nonprofits, more financial support to nonprofits in religion, in education, and in other areas as well as local church operation and independent ministries. (See Tables 39, 41, and 43.)

The “percentage gift years” was higher for alumni who were older, retired, and who had one or more children who were alumni. The “percentage gift years” was also higher under the following circumstances: the more nonprofit organizations that donors supported, the more financial support that donors gave to religious and educational nonprofits, the local church region, local church operation and independent ministries as well as when donors believed tithe paying was obligatory. The percentage of gift years

was higher when donors: were currently Adventists, loyal, recommended attendance at the University, believed that the University had a positive reputation, alumni support was needed, and should be given, as well as when they responded positively to letter and phone solicitations. (See Tables 40, 44, and 45.)

Results for Research Question 3

Research question 3 asked: "How do the reasons for giving and reasons for not giving differ between alumni donors and nondonors?" Six reasons for giving scales and 48 reasons for giving items, and 3 reasons for not giving scales and 15 reasons for not giving items were analyzed as individual, independent variables for differences in "donor status." In all, 72 tests were conducted. Significant differences existed between "donor status" and 25 independent variables.

Reasons for Giving Scales and Donor Status

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed that four of the six reasons for giving scales had significant statistical differences between donors and nondonors. The detailed results of the significant differences between reasons for giving scales and "donor status" are presented in Table 46.

The detailed results for two reasons for giving scales that had no significant relationships with "donor status" are in Appendix B, Table 88.

Table 46

Donor Status and Reasons for Giving Scales: Significant Differences—ANOVA

Reasons for Giving Scales		<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Effect Size
Frameworks of consciousness	Nondonor	41	2.18	.651	4.554	.034*	.38
	Donor	121	2.41	.579			
Invitation to participate	Nondonor	43	1.42	.493	6.680	.011*	.45
	Donor	126	1.66	.526			
Urgency and effectiveness	Nondonor	39	2.02	.696	4.736	.031*	.39
	Donor	117	2.28	.646			
Youth models and experiences	Nondonor	42	1.87	.729	12.827	.000**	.61
	Donor	132	2.31	.677			

Note. Scale 1 = Not Important, 2 = Somewhat Important, 3 = Important, and 4 = Very Important.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Reasons for Giving Items and Donor Status

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed that 14 of the 48 reasons for giving items had significant statistical differences between donors and nondonors. The detailed results of the significant differences between reasons for giving items and donor status are presented within clusters in Table 47.

The detailed results for the 34 reasons for giving items that had no significant relationships with donor status are in Appendix B, Table 88.

Reasons for Not Giving Scales and Donor Status

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed that one of the three reasons for giving scales had a significant statistical difference between donors and nondonors. The

Table 47

Donor Status and Reasons for Giving Items: Significant Differences—ANOVA

Reasons for Giving		<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Effect Size
Communities of Participation							
Sense of pride in partnership	Nondonor	46	1.65	.766	7.437	.007**	.46
	Donor	136	2.07	.948			
Frameworks of Consciousness							
Have a sense of loyalty	Nondonor	46	2.11	1.02	10.031	.002**	.52
	Donor	144	2.64	.98			
Giving is a responsibility	Nondonor	44	1.98	.90	7.840	.006**	.47
	Donor	138	2.46	1.03			
Preserve spiritual environment	Nondonor	45	2.63	1.18	5.800	.017*	.40
	Donor	140	3.05	.97			
Preserve critical thinking environment	Nondonor	45	2.31	1.06	4.224	.041*	.35
	Donor	36	2.68	1.05			
Give something back	Nondonor	49	2.29	1.05	4.647	.032*	.35
	Donor	139	2.65	1.02			
Believe in the mission	Nondonor	47	2.98	.94	4.022	.046*	.10
	Donor	152	3.27	.85			
Invitation to Participate							
Asked to give	Nondonor	45	1.58	.84	19.712	.000**	1.04
	Donor	139	2.26	.91			
Urgency and Effectiveness							
Respect for the current faculty	Nondonor	46	1.59	.93	10.574	.001**	.53
	Donor	134	2.14	1.02			
Respect for volunteer leadership	Nondonor	45	1.47	.73	8.709	.004**	.49
	Donor	133	1.90	.90			
Advance the excellence and reputation of the University	Nondonor	45	2.18	1.05	8.490	.004**	.49
	Donor	136	2.71	1.06			
Respect for the administrative leadership	Nondonor	45	1.76	.88	6.507	.012*	.43
	Donor	135	2.21	1.07			
Youth Models and Experiences							
Respect for the past faculty	Nondonor	46	1.91	1.07	13.042	.000**	.60
	Donor	143	2.54	1.00			
My philanthropic culture	Nondonor	43	1.79	.91	4.206	.042*	.36
	Donor	134	2.15	1.02			

Note. Scale 1 = Not Important, 2 = Somewhat Important, 3 = Important, and 4 = Very Important.

p* < .05. *p* < .01.

details of the significant difference between the one reason for not giving scale and “donor status” are presented in Table 48.

Table 48

Donor Status and Reasons for Not Giving Scales: Significant Differences—ANOVA

Reasons for Not Giving		<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Effect Size
Intrinsic and extrinsic rewards	Nondonor	45	1.45	.73	5.204	.024*	.40
	Donor	119	1.22	.50			

Note. Scale 1=Not a Consideration, 2=Somewhat Influential, 3=Major Influence and 4=Deciding Factor.

* $p < .05$.

The detailed results for the two reasons for not giving scales, “discretionary resources” and “frameworks of consciousness,” that had no significant differences with “donor status” are in Appendix B, Table 89.

Reasons for Not Giving Items and Donor Status

The detailed results of the ANOVA that showed the significant differences between 6 of the 15 reasons for not giving items and “donor status” are presented within clusters in Table 49.

The detailed results of the nine reasons for not giving items that had no significant differences with “donor status” are in Appendix B, Table 89.

Summary for Research Question 3

As shown in Table 47, donors were more likely than nondonors to rate all the

Table 49

Donor Status and Reasons for Not Giving Items: Significant Differences—ANOVA

Reasons for Not Giving		<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Effect Size
Communities of Participation							
University excludes me	Nondonor	49	1.92	1.27	4.047	.046*	.70
	Donor	124	1.45	0.69			
Frameworks of Consciousness							
Differ with the policies	Nondonor	46	1.80	1.17	4.845	.029*	.37
	Donor	127	1.45	0.84			
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards							
Insufficient diversity at all levels	Nondonor	46	1.50	.94	6.669	.011*	.43
	Donor	127	1.20	.56			
Insufficient diversity at some levels	Nondonor	47	1.45	.904	5.996	.015*	.41
	Donor	124	1.18	.511			
Urgency and Effectiveness							
Financial support not needed	Nondonor	43	1.58	0.82	10.071	.002**	.54
	Donor	124	1.23	0.55			
Youth Models and Experiences							
My student experience	Nondonor	50	2.22	1.25	8.594	.004**	.48
	Donor	130	1.69	1.01			

Note. Scale 1=Not a Consideration, 2=Somewhat Influential, 3=Major Influence, and 4=Deciding Factor.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

significant reasons for giving items as more important. The effect sizes for the differences between reasons for giving items and "donor status" ranged from very small to large.

Donors were more likely than nondonors to believe in the mission and want to preserve the critical thinking and spiritual environment of the University as well as have a sense of loyalty and partnership to advance the excellence and reputation of the University. Donors were more likely than nondonors to respect administrative and volunteer leadership as well as past and current faculty. Alumni were also more likely to be donors than nondonors when philanthropic culture is important, giving is a responsibility, and they want to give something back.

As shown in Table 49, nondonors were more likely than donors to rate all the significant reasons for not giving items as more influential. The effect sizes for the differences between the reasons for not giving items and "donor status" ranged from small to medium. Specific reasons that were more influential to nondonors than donors were: insufficient diversity at some or all levels of the University, being excluded, differing with the policies, student experience, and the belief that financial support is not needed.

As shown in Table 46, four of the six reasons for giving scales—"frameworks of consciousness," "invitation to participate," "urgency and effectiveness," and "youth models and experiences"—were significantly different for donors and nondonors. As shown in Table 48, one of the three reasons for not giving scales, "intrinsic and extrinsic rewards," were significantly different for donors and nondonors.

Results for Research Question 4

As in research question 2, the sample size was reduced for this question because the dependent variables, "largest gift," "cumulative gifts," and "percentage gift years," were only relevant for respondents who were also donors. Thus, the number of respondents was $n = 186$ for "largest gift" and "cumulative gifts," and $n = 187$ for "percentage gift years." The cases for the three dependent variables were also grouped into four categories. (See research question 2.)

This research question asked: "In what ways are the reasons for giving and reasons for not giving by alumni donors, when studied individually, related to the level of support and frequency of support to the institution?" Forty-eight reasons for giving items, 6 corresponding scales, 15 reasons for not giving items, and 3 corresponding scales were used to measure the relationships. The reasons for giving items, the reasons for not giving items, and their corresponding scales were analyzed as separate, independent variables for relationships with each of the three dependent variables, "largest gift," "cumulative gifts," and "percentage gift years" in order to provide an answer to the fourth research question. Of the 198 tests conducted, significant relationships were found between 14 independent variables and one or more of the three dependent variables.

Reasons for Giving and Level and Frequency of Support

Significant relationships existed with one or more of the three measures of support variables—"largest gift," "cumulative gifts," and "percentage gift years"—and one reasons for giving scale and six reasons for giving items. The detailed results of these significant relationships are presented within clusters in Table 50.

Table 50

Measures of Support & Reasons for Giving: Significant Relationships—Correlations

Reasons for Giving	Largest Gift	Cumulative Gift	Percentage Gift Years
Communities of Participation			
Sense of pride in partnership			.191*
Discretionary Resources			
Have available funds		-.201*	-.192*
Frameworks of Consciousness			
Have a sense of loyalty			.256**
Invitation to Participate			
Asked to give	-.178*		
Youth Models and Experiences			
Youth models and experiences scale		.172*	
My philanthropic culture		.182*	
Return help as I was helped		.178*	.199*

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

The detailed results of the relationships between the 48 reasons for giving items and at least one of the three variables—"largest gift," "cumulative gifts," and "percentage gift years"—that were not significant are in Appendix B, Table 90.

Reasons for Not Giving and Level and Frequency of Support

Significant relationships existed between the one reason for not giving scale and 5 of the 15 reasons for not giving items with one or more of the three measures of support variables: "largest gift," "cumulative gifts," and "percentage gift years." The details of these significant relationships are presented within clusters in Table 51.

Table 51

Measures of Support and Reasons for Not Giving: Significant Relationships
—Correlations

Reasons for Not Giving	Largest Gift	Cumulative Gift	Percentage Gift Years
Communities of Participation			
University excludes me			-.188*
Discretionary Resources			
Discretionary resources scale		-.250*	
Only contribute an insignificant amount	-.300**	-.252**	
Still intend to give		-.353**	-.303**
Unable to give		-.370**	-.315**
Give to spouse alma mater			.224*

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

No significant relationships existed between 14 reasons for not giving items and two reasons for not giving scales and at least one of the measures of support: "largest gift," "cumulative gifts," and "percentage gift years." The details are presented in Appendix B, Table 91.

Summary for Research Question 4

A summary of the significant relationships between reasons for giving items and scales, reasons for not giving items and scales with "largest gift," "cumulative gifts," and "percentage gift years" that are shown in Tables 50 and 51 follows.

Single largest gifts decreased in size when "asked to give" was an important reason for giving and "only contribute an insignificant amount" was an important reason for not giving.

Cumulative gift total decreased in size when donors believed that "have available funds" was an important reason for giving and "only contribute an insignificant amount," "still intend to give," "unable to give" and thus "discretionary resources scale" were influential reasons for not giving. However, cumulative gift total increased in size when donors believed their philanthropic culture, returning help as they were helped, and thus the "youth models and experiences scale" were important reasons for giving.

Donors gave more often when they believed influential reasons for giving were a sense of pride in partnership with and loyalty to the University, as well as return help as they were helped. They also gave more often when giving to a spouse's alma mater was an influential reason for not giving. Donors gave less often when "have available funds," "University excludes me," "still intend to give," and "unable to give" were important reasons for not giving.

Results for Research Question 5

Research question 5 asked, "How do selected demographics and psychographics and reasons for giving and reasons for not giving, when combined, differ between alumni donors and nondonors?" The statistical technique of multiple regression analysis was used to determine which independent variables (demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving and not giving) predicted the dependent variable, "donor status," when controlled for the other selected independent variables in the model.

Variables were only selected for a model when there was either a compelling theoretical reason to include them or they had acceptable *n* when all variables were

included with listwise deletion. Variables also had to be statistically significant in at least two of four tests—analyzed individually, in simultaneous regression, or in forward or backward stepwise regression. Five models were created for analyses with “donor status.” The models were composed as follows: model one—four demographics; model two—five psychographics; model three—two reasons for giving scales; model four—nine reasons for giving items; and model five—four reasons for not giving items. Because no reasons for not giving scales met the criteria for a model, none was created.

In order to deal with missing data for the multiple regression analysis and decide which analysis was most suitable for the models in research questions 5, 6, and 7, three preliminary regression analyses (listwise, pairwise, and mean substitution) were conducted. The listwise correlation matrix included only the cases with complete data. Since it excluded cases not containing all values, the sample size was the smallest of the three analyses. The pairwise correlation matrix included all the data given by respondents, but each correlation was based on different cases. The mean substitution correlation matrix included all the cases so had the largest sample size, but included imputed data.

Due to the similarity of the *R* squared, the similar significant predictors, similar part correlation coefficients, and the similarity of *n* in the listwise, pairwise, and mean substitution regression analyses, the results of the listwise analysis were chosen as the best and were used for all five models in this research question.

The unique variance predicted by each variable was calculated by squaring its part correlation coefficient.

Several variables met the criteria for inclusion in a model, but did not reach a conventional level of significance ($p = .05$) in the model. If the part correlation was low and the variable did not explain much variance in the model, it was not included in further interpretation.

To answer research question 5, listwise regression tests were conducted for each of five models. The results for the analysis of the five models of independent variables, demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving items, reasons for not giving items, and the reasons for giving scales with the dependent variable, "donor status," follow.

Demographics and Donor Status

The results of the regression analysis of the demographics model predicting "donor status" are presented in Table 52.

Table 52

Demographics Model and Donor Status: Multiple Regression

Demographic	<i>B</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Correlations		Part ² x 100
					Part	Zero-order	
Spouse holds a degree	.286	.282	4.236	.000**	.277	.218	7.6
Age	.086	.250	2.633	.009**	.172	.272	3.0
Length of attendance	.061	.157	2.292	.023*	.150	.051	2.3
Highest degree, years since graduation	.095	.159	1.705	.090	.112	.256	1.3

Note. $R^2 = .178$, $df = 4,192$, $p = .000$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Alumni were more likely to be donors than nondonors if they had a spouse with a degree, were older, attended the University the longest, and their year of graduation from their highest degree was the earliest. In the model, the demographic, "spouse holds a degree," uniquely accounted for the largest share (7.6%) of the variance.

Psychographics and Donor Status

The results of the regression analysis on the psychographics model predicting "donor status" are presented in Table 53.

In this model, two psychographics—"religious preference at University," and "number of nonprofit organizations supported"—were large, unique contributors to the variance.

While one psychographic, "willing to recommend attendance," met the criteria for inclusion in the model, it had a low (the lowest of the five variables) part correlation and did not explain much variance in the model (0.7%), therefore is not included in further interpretation.

Table 53

Psychographics Model and Donor Status: Multiple Regression

Psychographic	B	Beta	t	p	Correlations		Part ² x 100
					Part	Zero-order	
Religious preference at University	.535	.251	3.742	.000**	.267	.248	7.1
No. of nonprofit organizations supported	.137	.230	3.303	.001**	.218	.283	4.8
Response to letter solicitation	.106	.137	1.883	.061	.124	.250	1.5
University involvement	.072	.130	1.884	.061	.124	.224	1.5
Willing to recommend attendance	.108	.087	1.232	.219	.081	.167	0.7

Note. $R^2 = .205$, $df = 5,183$, $p = .000$.

** $p < .01$.

Alumni were more likely to be donors than nondonors if they were Adventists while attending the University, had given to a greater number of nonprofit organizations, responded positively at some time to a letter of solicitation, and been involved with the University.

Reasons for Giving Scales and Donor Status

The results for the analysis of the reasons for giving scales model predicting "donor status" are presented in Table 54.

Table 54

Reasons for Giving Scales Model and Donor Status: Multiple Regression

Reasons for Giving Scale	B	Beta	t	p	Correlations		Part ² x 100
					Part	Zero-order	
Youth models and experiences	.148	.244	3.417	.001**	.242	.223	5.8
Discretionary resources	-.062	-.154	-2.158	.032*	-.153	-.120	2.3

Note. $R^2 = .073$, $df = 2, 185$, $p = .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

In this model, one scale, "youth models and experience," uniquely accounts for most of the variance. Donors were more likely than nondonors to feel that the reason for giving scale "youth models and experiences" was important, but less likely to report the reason for giving scale "discretionary resources" was important.

Reasons for Giving Items and Donor Status

The results of the listwise analysis for the nine reasons for giving items predicting "donor status" are presented in Table 55.

Table 55

Reasons for Giving Items Model and Donor Status: Multiple Regression

Reason for Giving	B	Beta	t	p	Correlations		Part ² x 100
					Part	Zero-order	
Asked to give	.128	.279	4.148	.000**	.268	.285	7.2
Giving as a responsibility	.121	.293	3.611	.000**	.233	.193	5.4
Set an example	-.112	-.230	-2.958	.004*	-.191	-.041	3.6
Prepared for career	-.076	-.184	-2.471	.014*	-.160	-.008	2.6
Respect current faculty	.093	.221	2.479	.014**	.160	.207	2.6
Enhance educational environment	-.086	-.203	-2.381	.018**	-.154	.025	2.3
Believe in mission	.080	.169	2.221	.028*	.143	.120	2.0
Respect for past faculty	.073	.179	2.088	.038**	.135	.245	1.8
Promote change	-.074	-.162	-2.039	.043*	-.132	-.033	1.7

Note. $R^2 = .257$, $df = 9,178$, $p = .000$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

In this model, two reasons for giving items, "asked to give" and "giving as a responsibility," were the largest unique contributors to the variance.

Donors were more likely than nondonors to report that "asked to give," "giving as a responsibility," "respect for current faculty," "believe in the mission," and "respect for past faculty" were important reasons for giving.

Finally, four reasons for giving items, "set an example," "prepared for career," "enhance the educational environment," and "promote change," had significant part correlations in the model but very small, negative, or positive zero-order correlation coefficients, effectively zero. This would suggest that these reasons for giving in combination with other reasons for giving are considerations for donors, but alone they are not considerations.

Reasons for Not Giving Scales and Donor Status

Three reasons for not giving scales, formed from the 15 reasons for not giving items—"discretionary resources," "frameworks of consciousness," and "intrinsic and extrinsic rewards"—did not meet the criteria for inclusion in a model for reasons for not giving scales and therefore they were not tested.

Reasons for Not Giving Items and Donor Status

The results of the analysis of the two reasons for not giving items predicting "donor status" are presented in Table 56.

Table 56

Reasons for Not Giving Items Model and Donor Status: Multiple Regression

Reasons for Not Giving Item	B	Beta	t	p	Correlations		Part ² x 100
					Part	Zero-order	
University excludes me	-.121	-.248	-3.279	.001**	-.244	-.286	6.0
Gifts are not needed	-.129	-.192	-2.531	.012*	-.188	-.241	3.5

Note. $R^2 = .117$, $df = 2, 160$, $p = .000$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

The reason for not giving, the "University excludes me," uniquely contributed almost double the variance of the other reason for giving, "gifts are not needed," in the model. The "University excludes me" and "gifts are not needed" were important reasons for not giving by nondonors.

Predictions of Donors and Nondonors

Multiple regression identifies variables that, when combined, explain the differences in "donor status" and how much the variance is explained by the variables or factors. Discriminant analysis is used to better predict whether or not an alumnus would be a donor or nondonor than if the prediction was random. Thus discriminant analysis was conducted after the listwise analysis to determine how well each of the five models predicted "donor status."

If I had assumed that every alumnus in the sample was a donor, without any analysis, I would have been correct for 74% of the cases. If I had assumed that every alumnus in the sample was a nondonor, I would have been correct for 26% of the cases. The models predicted nondonors much better than donors. The comparative prediction rates from the discriminant analysis of "donor status" in the five models of independent variables are presented in Table 57.

Results for Research Question 6

Research question 6 asked: "To what extent are selected demographics and psychographics and reasons for giving and reasons for not giving of alumni donors, when

Table 57

Prediction Rates for Donors and Nondonors: Discriminant Analysis

Model	Percentage of	
	Donors	Nondonors
Demographics	73.8	68.8
Psychographics	75.5	65.2
Reasons for giving items	76.1	80.4
Reasons for giving scales	62.7	67.4
Reasons for not giving items	73.3	55.8
Reasons for not giving scales	†	†

Note. † indicates that there was no model with reasons for not giving scales and donor status.

Donors comprised 74% of the sample and nondonors 26%.

combined, related to the level of support to the institution?" All the nondonor cases were excluded from this analysis, thus $n = 181$. To answer the research question, I created one model for each of the four types of variables: demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving items, and reasons for not giving items, with each of the two dependent variables, "cumulative gifts" and "largest gift," using the same steps and criteria as outlined for research question 5. This resulted in six models for research question 6. No demographics met the criteria for a model with either of the dependent variables measuring level of support, "largest gift" or "cumulative gifts."

For the same reasons delineated in research question 5, listwise, pairwise, and mean substitution regressions were used to analyze the data. The results of the listwise analysis were chosen as the best and were used for all six models in this research question. The three dependent variables were grouped as noted in research question 2. Significant relationships were found between each of the models and the dependent variables.

Demographics and Level of Support

All the zero-order correlation coefficients for the 19 demographics were below .200. In addition, no demographic was significant in at least two of the four tests: significant by itself, in the simultaneous regression model, in the forward, and in the backward stepwise regressions. It appears demographics were poor predictors of "largest gift" and "cumulative gifts" in a model and therefore no models were created.

Psychographics and Level of Support

The results of the regression analysis of the four psychographics in a model predicting "cumulative gifts" are presented in Table 58.

Table 58

Psychographics Model and Cumulative Gifts: Multiple Regression

Psychographic	B	Beta	t	p	Correlations		Part ² x 100
					Part	Zero-order	
Financial support for independent ministries	.246	.248	2.953	.004**	.235	.243	5.5
Response to letter solicitation	.417	.214	2.648	.009**	.211	.221	4.5
University involvement	.234	.152	1.894	.060	.151	.151	2.3
Amount of financial support to nonprofits in religion	.107	.075	.888	.376	.071	.174	0.5

Note. $R^2 = .145$, $df = 4, 135$, $p = .000$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

The psychographic "financial support for independent ministries" uniquely contributed the largest amount of the variance. The biggest "cumulative gifts" came from donors who financially gave the most support to independent ministries, were most likely

to respond positively when solicited by letter, and were most involved.

Although "the amount of financial support to nonprofits in religion" met the criteria for inclusion in the model, it had a low part correlation, and did not explain much variance in the model (0.5%), therefore was not included in further interpretation.

The results of the regression analysis of two psychographics in a model predicting "largest gift" are presented in Table 59.

Table 59

Psychographics Model and Largest Gift: Multiple Regression

Psychographic	B	Beta	t	p	Correlations		Part ² x 100
					Part	Zero-order	
No. of nonprofit organizations supported	.284	.194	2.616	.010**	.194	.206	3.8
University involvement	.242	.165	2.226	.027*	.165	.179	2.7

Note. $R^2 = .070$, $df = 2, 170$, $p = .002$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

The psychographic "number of nonprofit organizations supported" uniquely contributed the largest share of the variance. The biggest "largest gift" was given by donors who supported the most nonprofits and were most involved in the University.

Reasons for Giving Items and Level of Support

The results of the regression analysis of the four reasons for giving items in a model predicting "cumulative gifts" are presented in Table 60.

Table 60

Reasons for Giving Items Model and Cumulative Gifts: Multiple Regression

Reasons for Giving	B	Beta	t	p	Correlations		Part ² x 100
					Part	Zero-order	
Return help as I was helped	.267	.269	2.894	.004**	.232	.153	5.4
My philanthropic culture	.250	.233	2.782	.006**	.223	.183	5.0
Help the less fortunate	-.239	-.222	-2.326	.021*	-.187	-.055	3.5
Have available funds	-.168	-.163	-1.986	.049*	-.159	-.129	2.5

Note. $R^2 = .117$, $df = 4, 137$, $p = .002$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Two reasons for giving items, "return help as I was helped" and "my philanthropic culture," had approximately equal shares of unique contribution to the variance.

The donors with the bigger "cumulative gifts" felt that important reasons for giving were that they wanted to help students finance their education as they had been helped and giving was an important part of their philanthropic culture. However, donors with smaller "cumulative gifts" felt that helping the less fortunate and having available funds were more important reasons for giving.

Only one of six reasons for giving items ("my philanthropic culture") selected for the model with the dependent variable "largest gift" was also a reason for giving item selected for the model with the dependent variable, "cumulative gifts." The results of the regression analysis of the reasons for giving items in a model predicting "largest gift" are presented in Table 61.

Table 61

Reasons for Giving Items Model and Largest Gift: Multiple Regression

Reasons for Giving	B	Beta	t	p	Correlations		Part ² x 100
					Part	Zero-order	
Asked to give	-.304	-.272	-3.211	.002**	-.253	-.166	6.4
My philanthropic culture	.250	.246	2.749	.007**	.217	.124	4.7
Giving is a responsibility	-.263	-.268	-2.741	.007**	-.216	-.075	4.6
Ability to designate fund use	-.182	-.188	-2.339	.021*	-.184	-.129	3.4
University needs funds	.218	.205	2.185	.031*	.172	.099	3.0
Have a sense of loyalty	.175	.172	1.904	.059	.150	.123	2.2

Note. $R^2 = .161$, $df = 6, 135$, $p = .001$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

In this model, "asked to give" was the reason for giving item that uniquely contributed the largest amount of the variance. Donors who gave the bigger "largest gift" felt that: "my philanthropic culture," the "University needs funds," and "have a sense of loyalty" were important reasons to give. The donors who gave the smaller "largest gift" designated "asked to give," "giving is a responsibility," and "ability to designate fund use" as their important reasons to give.

Reasons for Not Giving Items and Level of Support

The results of the regression analysis of the four reasons for not giving items in a model predicting "cumulative gifts" are presented in Table 62.

The reason for not giving, "unable to give," had the largest share of unique contribution to the variance.

Table 62

Reasons for Not Giving Items Model and Cumulative Gifts: Multiple Regression

Reasons for Not Giving	B	Beta	t	p	Correlations		Part ² x 100
					Part	Zero-order	
Unable to give	-.262	-.286	-2.985	.004**	-.255	-.420	6.5
Give to spouse alma mater	.378	.230	2.607	.011*	.222	.248	4.9
Still intend to give	-.385	-.229	-2.411	.018*	-.206	-.356	4.2
My student experience	-.161	-.141	-1.617	.109	-.138	-.093	1.9

Note. $R^2 = .272$, $df = 4, 100$, $p = .000$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

The biggest "cumulative gifts" was given by donors for whom "give to spouse alma mater" was a deciding factor for not giving. The smallest "cumulative gifts" was given by donors for whom "unable to give," "still intend to give," and "my student experience" were the reasons that were deciding factors for not giving.

The only reason for not giving item that met the criteria for selection in the model with "largest gift" was "can only contribute an insignificant amount." Because "give to spouse alma mater" was, in the previous model with the dependent variable "cumulative gifts," close to significance in the simultaneous regression ($p = .076$), and the last excluded variable in backward regression, it was also included in the model with "largest gift." Both reasons for not giving items were in the Discretionary Resources cluster. The results of the regression analysis of the two reasons for not giving items in a model predicting "largest gift" are presented in Table 63.

Table 63

Reasons for Not Giving Items Model and Largest Gift: Multiple Regression

Reasons for Not Giving	B	Beta	t	p	Correlations		Part ² x 100
					Part	Zero-order	
Only contribute an insignificant amount	-.277	-.259	-2.875	.005**	-.259	-.255	.67
Give to spouse alma mater	.089	.063	.698	.486	.063	.045	0.4

Note. $R^2 = .069$, $df = 2, 115$, $p = .016$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

The reason for not giving, "only contribute an insignificant amount," uniquely contributed almost all of the variance in the model. The other reason for not giving, "give to spouse alma mater," although used because it was close to meeting the criteria for inclusion in the model, had a low part correlation, and did not explain much variance in the model (0.4%), therefore was not included in further interpretation.

The biggest "largest gift" was given by donors who believed that only contributing a little was not a consideration for not giving.

Results for Research Question 7

Research question 7 asked, "To what extent are selected demographics and psychographics and reasons for giving and reasons for not giving of alumni donors, when combined, related to the frequency of support to the institution?" To answer research question 7, tests were conducted on three models with the dependent variable, "percentage gift years," that measured frequency of support.

The statistical technique of multiple regression analysis was used to determine which independent variable, demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving items, and reasons for not giving items, when in a model, predicted frequency of donor support. All the nondonor cases were excluded from this analysis; thus $n = 182$.

The same four steps as outlined in research questions 5 and 6 comprised the process of forming prediction models for frequency of support by donors. One model for each of the three types of variables—psychographics, reasons for giving items, and reasons for not giving items—in relation to the dependent variable, “percentage gift years,” was created. The results for the listwise regression analyses of the three models of independent variables (psychographics, reasons for giving items, and reasons for not giving items) with the dependent variable, “percentage gift years,” follows.

Demographics and Frequency of Support

All the zero-order correlation coefficients for the 15 demographics were below .200. In addition, no characteristic was significant in at least two of the four tests: significant by itself, in the simultaneous regression model, in the forward, and in the backward stepwise regressions. It appears demographics were poor predictors of “percentage gift years” in a model and therefore no model was created.

Psychographics and Frequency of Support

The results of the regression analysis of four psychographics in a model predicting “percentage gift years” are presented in Table 64.

Table 64

Psychographics Model and Percentage Gift Years: Multiple Regression

Psychographic	B	Beta	t	p	Correlations		Part ² x 100
					Part	Zero-order	
Response to letter solicitation	.521	.308	3.614	.000**	.294	.330	8.6
Financial support for independent ministries	.138	.171	2.085	.039*	.169	.129	2.9
Amount of alumni support University needs	.168	.123	1.441	.152	.117	.195	1.4

Note. $R^2 = .148$, $df = 3, 129$, $p = .000$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

The psychographic "response to letter solicitation" uniquely contributed almost all of the variance in the model.

The donors who were most likely to respond positively when solicited by letter, supported independent ministries with their offerings, and believed the University needed alumni support were those most likely to give for the greatest number of years.

Reasons for Giving Items and Frequency of Support

The results of the regression analysis for the six reasons for giving items in a model predicting "percentage gift years" are presented in Table 65.

"Have a sense of loyalty" uniquely contributed the largest share of the variance. The donors with the highest "percentage gift years" considered the following reasons as important: "have a sense of loyalty," "return help as I was helped," and "ability to designate fund use." By contrast, donors with lowest "percentage gift years" considered "expand economic benefits," "interest in a specific program," and "have available funds" as important reasons for giving.

Table 65

Reasons for Giving Items Model and Percentage Gift Years: Multiple Regression

Reason for Giving Item	B	Beta	t	p	Correlations		Part ² x 100
					Part	Zero-order	
Have a sense of loyalty	.272	.304	3.686	.000**	.284	.243	8.1
Expand economic benefits	-.224	-.221	-2.614	.010**	-.201	-.096	4.0
Interest in a specific program	-.185	-.121	-2.523	.013*	-.194	-.174	3.6
Have available funds	-.181	-.210	-2.492	.014**	-.192	-.169	3.7
Return help as I was helped	.150	.181	2.172	.032*	.167	.143	2.8
Ability to designate fund use	.155	.181	2.106	.037*	.162	.039	2.6

Note. $R^2 = .200$, $df = 6,135$, $p = .000$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Reasons for Not Giving Items and Frequency of Support

The results of the regression analysis for four reasons for not giving items in a model predicting "percentage gift years" are presented in Table 66.

Table 66

Reasons for Not Giving Items Model and Percentage Gift Years: Multiple Regression

Reasons for Not Giving Items	B	Beta	t	p	Correlations		Part ² x 100
					Part	Zero-order	
Unable to give	-.225	-.294	-3.012	.003**	-.259	-.420	6.7
Give to spouse alma mater	.321	.233	2.621	.010**	.225	.250	5.1
Intend to give	-.260	-.185	-1.926	.057	-.166	-.311	2.8
University excludes me	-.257	-.159	-1.795	.076	-.154	-.131	2.4

Note. $R^2 = .260$, $df = 4,100$, $p = .000$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Two reasons for not giving items, "unable to give" and "give to spouse alma mater," uniquely contributed most of the variance. The other two reasons for giving items, though not significant in combination, were however close to significance ($p = .057$ and $.076$). In a mean substitution regression analysis where the sample size was larger ($n = 182$ rather than $n = 105$), both reasons for not giving were significant. In addition, they explained sufficient variance so I chose to interpret them.

The donors who gave more frequently were more likely to use giving to other institutions where a spouse obtained a degree as a reason for not giving and less likely to use "unable to give," "still intend to give," and "University excludes me" as reasons for not giving.

Results for Research Question 8

The last research question asked, "To what extent do level of support and frequency of support relate to each other?" Level of support was measured by "cumulative gifts" and "largest gift," and frequency of support was measured by "percentage gift years." The detailed results are presented in Table 67.

Table 67

Level of Support With Frequency of Support: Multiple Regression

Measure of Level of Support	<i>B</i>	Beta	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Correlations		Part ² x 100
					Part	Zero-order	
Cumulative gifts	.771	.902	11.193	.000**	.599	.669	36.0
Largest gift	-.275	-.312	-3.866	.000**	-.207	.364	4.3

Note. $R^2 = .491$, $df = 2, 178$, $p = .000$.

** $p < .01$.

In the model, the percentage of variance uniquely explained by "cumulative gifts" was huge compared to the amount of variance uniquely explained by the "largest gift." The amount of variance uniquely explained by "cumulative gifts" is also a large proportion of the total explained variance ($R^2 = .491$). For "largest gift" the change in sign from positive with the zero-order correlation coefficient to negative for the part correlation coefficient is due to the high correlation (Pearson coefficient $r = .709$) between "largest gift" and "cumulative gifts" as individual variables. Alumni donors who have the biggest "cumulative gifts" also have the highest "percentage gift years." However, assuming "cumulative gifts" are constant, the bigger the "largest gift" the lower the "percentage gift years." Since "largest gift" has both a small amount of uniquely explained variance in combination with "cumulative gifts" and is unreliable in predicting "percentage gift years," "cumulative gifts" is the better predictor of "percentage gift years."

Summary of Results

A summary of results for the analyses of the independent variables—demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving items, and scales and reasons for not giving items and scales—with the dependent variables of "donor status," "largest gift," "cumulative gifts" (both measures of level of support), and "percentage gift years" (the measure of frequency of support) follows.

The measure of explained variance was R squared and indicates the amount of variance explained by the combined variables in each of the models to the relationships

between the dependent variables "donor status," "cumulative gifts," "largest gift," and "percentage gift years" with the independent variables "demographics," "psychographics," "reasons for giving items," "reasons for giving scales," "reasons for not giving items," and "reasons for not giving scales." The results are presented in Table 68.

Table 68

Explained Variance Values for Tested Models

	Donor Status % R^2	Cumulative gifts % R^2	Largest Gift % R^2	Percentage Gift Years % R^2
Demographics	17.8	†	†	†
Psychographics	20.5	14.5	7.0	18.6
Reasons for giving items	25.7	11.7	16.1	20.0
Reasons for giving scales	7.3	†	†	†
Reasons for not giving items	11.7	27.2	6.9	26.0
Reasons for not giving scales	†	†	†	†

Note. † indicates that no models were tested for these variables.

Psychographics and reasons for not giving items were poor predictors for the dependent variable "largest gift."

The variables that best predicted "donor status" were reasons for giving items. The variables that best predicted "cumulative gifts" were the reasons for not giving items. The variables that best predicted "largest gift" were the reasons for giving items. The variables that best predicted "percentage gift years" were the reasons for not giving items.

To determine which specific variables—demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving—were the best predictors of donor status and level

and frequency of support, I first analyzed the relationships between the dependent variables and each independent variable alone. The number of variables that had significant relationships when examined alone was more than was practical to use. Some variables were more likely to be causal, while many more were only correlated. In order to eliminate similar or related variables, I analyzed the relationships between variables when combined in a model. This was consistent with the findings and procedures of other researchers, for example, Paul Schervish and John Havens (1997). The number of variables in the model was then practically useful and showed only the unique relationships with the dependent variables.

The variables that had significant relationships with "donor status," "largest gift," "cumulative gift total," and "percentage gift years" were divided into two categories. I decided to call the first type correlated variables. Correlated variables had to meet at least one of two conditions. Correlated variables had either a significant relationship with the dependent variable alone but not in a model, or they had a significant relationship only in a model and accounted for small unique variance. Correlated variables are not unimportant, they are just less definitive than predictor variables. Correlated variables may be precursors to or overlap with variables that predict conditions, thus will be less useful to practitioners than those variables that are predictors (Schervish, 1997a, p. 113). Correlated variables may also become predictors in different circumstances or under different conditions.

I called the second type predictor variables. Independent variables that met at least one of two conditions were predictor variables. The first condition was that the variable

had a significant relationship both alone and in a model with the dependent variable.

Second, if the variable was only significant in a model, the variable accounted for a large amount of unique variance in the model. A summary of the results, the significant relationships between dependent and independent variables, the size of the relationships, and the categorization of correlated and predictor variables follow.

Demographics

If demographics had significant relationships with one or more of the four dependent variables—"donor status," "largest gift," "cumulative gifts," and "percentage gift years"—either when studied alone or in the model or explained sufficient variance in the model, they warranted interpretation. The results of the 10 such demographics are presented in Table 69.

Table 69

Demographics That Were Significant Alone or Good-in-the-Model for Donor Status, Level of Support, and Frequency of Support

Demographic	Donor Status		Level of Support				Frequency of Support	
	Alone	Model	Largest Gift Alone	Largest Gift Model	Cumulative Gifts Alone	Cumulative Gifts Model	Alone	Model
Spouse holds a degree†	S	L						
Age†	S	S					M	
Highest degree, years since graduation†	S	S						
Years attended University		S						
Graduate degree from University			S					
Ethnicity	S				M			
Employment status	VS						S	
Gender	VS							
Children who are alumni							S	
Children over 31 years old					S			

Note. † indicates variable is classified as a predictor. Letters indicate the size of the difference or relationship. VS = very small size; S = small size; M = medium size; L = large size.

Donor Status

Three demographics were classified as predictors of donor status. Alumni who had a spouse who held a degree, were older, and had the earliest year of graduation from their highest degree were the most likely to be donors. Four demographics were classified as being correlated with donor status. Donors tended to be Caucasian, retired, male, and attended the University the longest.

Level of Support

No demographics met the criteria for predictor variables of level of support. Three demographics were classified as correlated with level of support. Higher levels of support came from donors who were Caucasian, had children who were over age 31, and a graduate degree that was from the University.

Frequency of Support

No demographics met the criteria as predictors of frequency of support. Three demographics were correlated with frequency of support. Higher levels of support were given by donors who were older, retired, and had children who were alumni.

Psychographics

If psychographics had significant relationships with one or more of the four dependent variables—"donor status," "largest gift," "cumulative gifts," and "percentage gift years"—either when studied alone or in the model or explained sufficient variance in the model, they warranted interpretation. The results for the 26 such psychographics are presented in Table 70.

Table 70

Psychographics That Were Significant Alone or Good-in-the-Model for Donor Status, Level, and Frequency of Support

Psychographic	Donor Status		Level of Support				Frequency of Support	
	Alone	Model	Largest Gift		Cumulative Gifts		Alone	Model
			Alone	Model	Alone	Model		
Number of nonprofit organizations supported†	S	M	M	M	M		M	
University involvement†	S	S	S	S	S	S		
Response to letter solicitation†	S	S			M	S	L	L
Response to phone solicitation	S				S		M	
University loyalty†	S		S		S		L	
Religious preference while at University†	S	L						
Respondent recommends attendance	S				L		L	
Amount of alumni support the University needs†	S						S	S
Current religious preference	VS						L	
Extent alumni should support University	S				VS		M	
Respondent believes University has positive reputation	M		S		VS		S	
Amount of financial support to nonprofits in education	S				S		S	
Amount of financial support to nonprofits other areas			S		S			
Amount of financial support to nonprofits in religion					S		S	
Financial support for local church region							S	
Financial support for local church operation					S		S	
Financial support for independent ministries†					M	M	S	S
Financial support for global missions	S							
Opinion on tithe							L	
Respondent believes friends believe University has positive reputation	M							
Respondent believes alumni believe University has positive reputation	M							
Respondent believes family believe University has positive reputation	S							
Input from self into gift decisions	S							
Response to advertisement solicitation	S							
Response to publication solicitation	S							
Frequency of University request for financial support	S							

Note. † indicates variable is classified as a predictor. Letters indicate the size of the difference or relationship.

VS = very small size; S = small size; M = medium size; L = large size.

Donor Status

Four psychographics met the criteria for and were classified as predictors of donor status. Alumni who financially supported three or more nonprofits, were involved at the University, responded positively to letter solicitations, and were Adventists while attending the University were the most likely to be donors. Sixteen other psychographics were correlated with donor status.

Level of Support

Four psychographics met the criteria for and were classified as predictors of level of support. Alumni who financially supported three or more nonprofits and were involved at the University were the most likely to give the biggest "largest gift." Alumni who were involved at the University, responded positively to letter solicitations, and gave the most offering support to independent ministries were the most likely to give the biggest "cumulative gifts." Nine other psychographics were correlated with level of support.

Frequency of Support

Three psychographics met the criteria for and were classified as predictors of level of support. Alumni who responded positively to a letter solicitation, believed the amount of alumni support that the University needs was great, and contributed financial support to independent ministries were the most likely to give the most frequently. Twelve other psychographics were correlated with frequency of support.

Reasons for Giving

If reasons for giving scales and reasons for giving items had significant relationships with one or more of the four dependent variables—"donor status," "largest gift," "cumulative gifts," and "percentage gift years"—either when studied alone or in the model or explained sufficient variance in the model, they warranted interpretation. The results for the 30 of 54 such reasons for giving scales and items are presented within clusters in Table 71.

Donor Status

Two reasons for giving scales met the criteria for and were classified as predictors of donor status. Alumni were more likely to be donors than nondonors for "models of youth experience" and were more likely to be nondonors than donors for "discretionary resources." Three reasons for giving scales were correlated with "donor status."

Five of the six reasons for giving items were classified as predictors were: "giving is a responsibility," "believe in the mission," "asked to give," "respect for the past faculty," and "respect for the current faculty." Alumni were more likely to be donors than nondonors when these were important reasons for giving. On the other hand, when the sixth predictor reason for giving item, "set an example," was important, alumni were more likely to be nondonors than donors. Thirteen other reasons for giving items were correlated with "donor status."

Table 71

Reasons for Giving That Were Significant or Good-in-the-Model for Donor Status, Level of Support, and Frequency of Support

Reasons for Giving	<u>Donor Status</u>		<u>Level of Support</u>				<u>Frequency of Support</u>	
	Alone	Model	<u>Largest Gift</u>		<u>Cumulative Gifts</u>		Alone	Model
			Alone	Model	Alone	Model		
Communities of Participation								
Sense of pride in partnership	S						S	
Discretionary Resources								
Discretionary resources scale		-S						
Have available funds†					-S	-M	-S	-S
Frameworks of Consciousness								
Frameworks of consciousness scale	S							
Giving is a responsibility†	S	M		-M				
Believe in the mission†	VS	S						
Have a sense of loyalty†	M			S			S	L
Preserve the spiritual environment	S							
Preserve critical thinking environment	S							
Give something back	S							
Set an example†		-S						
Desire to help bring about change		-S						
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards								
Prepared me for my career		-S						
Expand University's economic benefits to the community†								-M
Ability to designate funds' use				-S				S

Table 71—Continued.

Reasons for Giving	<u>Donor Status</u>		<u>Level of Support</u>				<u>Frequency of Support</u>	
	Alone	Model	<u>Largest Gift</u>		<u>Cumulative Gift</u>		Alone	Model
			Alone	Model	Alone	Model		
Invitation to Participate								
Invitation to participate scale	S							
Asked to give†	L	L	-S	-M				
Models of Youth Experiences								
Models of youth experiences scale†	M	M			S			
My philanthropic culture†	S			M	S	M		
Return help as I was helped†					S	M	S	S
Respect for the past faculty†	M	S						
Urgency and Effectiveness								
Urgency and effectiveness scale	S							
Respect for the current faculty†	M	S						
Enhance the educational environment		-S						
Respect for volunteer leadership	S							
Respect for the administrative leadership	S							
Advance the excellence and reputation of the University	S							
University needs funds				S				
Interest in specific program								-S
Help the less fortunate						-S		

Note. † indicates variable is classified as a predictor. “-” = negative correlation coefficient.

Letters indicate the size of the difference or relationship. VS = very small size; S = small size; M = medium size; L = large size.

Level of Support

No reasons for giving items nor the scale in the Communities of Participation cluster had significant relationships with either of the two variables that measured level of support.

"Largest gift" was smaller when two of the three reasons for giving items that were predictors (listed in order of effect size)—"asked to give" and "giving is a responsibility"—were important reasons for giving. "Largest gift" was bigger when the other reason for giving item that was a predictor was important—"my philanthropic culture." Two other reasons for giving items were correlated with smaller "largest gift" and one other reason for giving item was correlated with bigger "largest gift."

"Cumulative gifts" was larger when two of the three predictor reasons for giving items "my philanthropic culture" and "return help as I was helped" were important reasons for giving. By contrast, "cumulative gifts" was smaller when the other predictor reason for giving item, "have available funds," was an important reason for giving. One other reason for giving item was correlated with smaller "cumulative gifts."

Frequency of Support

None of the reasons for giving items in the Invitation to Participate cluster had significant relationships with "percentage gift years."

Two reasons for giving items were predictors of higher frequency of support. They were: "have a sense of loyalty" and "return help as I was helped." Three other

reasons for giving items were predictors of lower frequency of support: "have available funds," "expand the University's economic benefits to the community," and "interest in a specific program." One other reason for giving item was correlated with higher frequency of support.

Summary of All Result Categories for Reasons for Giving

In summary, six reasons for giving items—"giving is a responsibility," "believe in the mission," "set an example," "asked to give," "respect for the past faculty," "respect for the current faculty"—were predictors of donor status. Two reasons for giving scales—"discretionary resources" and "models of youth experiences"—were also predictors of donor status. Three reasons for giving items—"giving is a responsibility," "asked to give," and "my philanthropic culture"—were predictors of "largest gift." Three reasons for giving items—"have available funds," "my philanthropic culture," and "return help as I was helped"—were predictors of "cumulative gifts." Five reasons for giving items—"have available funds," "have a sense of loyalty," "expand University's economic benefits to the community," "return help as I was helped," and "interest in specific program"—were predictors of frequency of support.

An alternative representation of the results for reasons for giving follows in order of the importance of each reason for giving as rated by alumni. The clusters to which each reason for giving belongs and whether or not a particular reason for giving was a correlated or predictor reason for giving are also included in Table 72.

Table 72

Reasons for Giving in Order of Importance as Rated by Alumni

Reason for Giving	$\bar{x}$	Cluster	Predictor	Correlated
Believe in the mission	3.16	FC	PD	
Religious affiliation—Adventist University	2.91	FC		
Preserve spiritual environment	2.88	FC		CD
Have available funds	2.84	DR	PL PF	-CL
Discretionary resources scale	2.84			-CD
Prepared me for my career	2.69	IE		-CD
Personal or spiritual commitment	2.54	FC		
Preserve critical thinking environment	2.52	FC		CD
Help the less fortunate	2.52	UE		-CL
Advance the excellence and reputation of University	2.51	UE		CD
Give something back	2.50	FC		CD
Have a sense of loyalty	2.46	FC	PF	CD CL
Enhance the educational environment	2.46	UE		-CD
Preserve academic environment	2.44	FC		
University needs funds	2.39	UE		CL
Respect for the past faculty	2.37	MY	PD	
Frameworks of consciousness scale	2.32			CD
Giving is a responsibility	2.29	FC	PD -PL	
Desire to help bring about change	2.27	FC		-CD
Need this type of University	2.26	FC		
Receive the joy of giving	2.23	IE		
Return help as I was helped	2.20	MY	PL PF	
Fiscal stability of the University	2.18	FC		
Youth models and experiences scale	2.18		PD	CL
Urgency and effectiveness scale	2.17			CD
Uniqueness of the project/program	2.06	UE		
Asked to give	2.05	IP	PD -PL	
Respect for the administrative leadership	2.04	UE		CD
Tax considerations	2.01	IE		
My philanthropic culture	1.99	MY	PL	CD
Ability to designate fund use	1.99	IE		-CL CF
Respect for the current faculty	1.96	UE	PD	
Sense of pride in partnership	1.93	CP		CD CF
Expand University's economic benefits to the community	1.88	UE	-PF	
Interest in a specific program	1.87	IE		-CF
Intrinsic and extrinsic rewards scale	1.82			
Makes good business sense	1.76	IE		
Respect for volunteer leadership	1.75	UE		CD
Involvement in programs and activities	1.70	CP		
Appeal of the requesting materials	1.70	IP		
Set an example	1.70	FC		-CD
Opportunity to honor an individual	1.63	IE		
Community responsibility and civic pride	1.63	IE		
Invitation to participate scale	1.60			CD

Table 72—Continued.

Reason for Giving	$\bar{x}$	Cluster	Predictor	Correlated
Ability to create a lasting memorial	1.55	IE		
Communities of participation scale	1.55			
Family ties to the University	1.51	CP		
Recognition of gifts	1.49	IE		
Influence of the gift solicitors	1.49	IP		
Match a gift made by others	1.49	IP		
Challenge others to give	1.40	IE		
Immediate/past involvement in University fundraising efforts	1.39	CP		
Serve on the board or other official body	1.23	CP		
Guilt feelings	1.17	FC		
Peer influence	1.15	IP		

Note. Scale = $\bar{x}$ = 1-4.

Cluster:	CP = Communities of Participation,	DR = Discretionary Resources,
code	FC = Frameworks of Consciousness,	IE = Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation,
	IP = Invitation to Participate,	MY = Models of Youth Experiences,
	UE = Urgency and Effectiveness.	
Predictor	PD = predictor of donor.	-PD = predictor of nondonor.
code:	PL = predictor of higher level of support.	-PL = predictor of lower support.
	PF = predictor of higher frequency of support.	-PF = predictor of lower frequency of support.
Correlated	CD = correlated with donor.	-CD = correlated with nondonor.
code:	CL = correlated with higher level of support.	-CL = correlated with lower level of support.
	CF = correlated with higher frequency of support	-CF = correlated with lower frequency of support.

An indicator of the importance of specific reasons for giving items to alumni was the mean for each item which ranged from least important (1.15), "peer influence," to most important (3.16), "believe in the mission." The means for the reasons for giving scales ranged from least important (1.55), "communities of participation," to most important (2.84), "discretionary resources." Each variable is classified as a predictor or as correlated with either donor status, or level of support, or frequency of support. Whether or not a variable is associated with a donor or nondonor is also indicated.

Reasons for Not Giving

If reasons for not giving scales and reasons for not giving items had significant relationships with one or more of the four dependent variables— “donor status,” “largest gift,” “cumulative gifts,” and “percentage gift years”—either when studied alone or in the model or explained sufficient variance in the model, they warranted interpretation. The results for the 12 of 18 such reasons for giving scales and items are presented within clusters in Table 73.

Donor Status

Two reasons for not giving items met the criteria for and were classified as predictors of donor status—“University excludes me” and “gifts not needed.” Alumni were more likely to be nondonors than donors for both reasons. Four other reasons for not giving items were correlated with donor status. Alumni were more likely to be nondonors than donors when the correlated reason for not giving scale, “intrinsic and extrinsic rewards,” was an influential reason for not giving.

Level of Support

All but one of the reasons for not giving items that had a significant relationship with either “largest gift” or “cumulative gifts” were in the Discretionary Resources cluster.

“Largest gift” was smaller when one reason for not giving item that was a predictor —“only contribute an insignificant amount”—was an influential reason for not

Table 73

Reasons for Not Giving That Were Significant or Good-in-the-Model for Donor Status, Level of Support, and Frequency of Support

Reasons for Not Giving	<u>Donor Status</u>		<u>Level of Support</u>				<u>Frequency of Support</u>	
	Alone	Model	<u>Largest Gift</u> Alone	<u>Largest Gift</u> Model	<u>Cumulative Gifts</u> Alone Model		Alone	Model
Communities of Participation								
University excludes me†	M	-M					-S	-S
Discretionary Resources								
Discretionary Resources Scale						-M		
Only contribute an insignificant amount†			-M	-L		-M		
Unable to give†			-S			-L	-M	-L
Still intend to give†						-L	-M	-S
Give to spouse alma mater†						M	M	M
Frameworks of Consciousness								
Differ with the policies	S							
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards								
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards Scale	S							
Insufficient diversity at all levels	S							
Insufficient diversity at some levels	S							
Youth Models and Experiences								
My student experience	S					-S		
Urgency and Effectiveness								
Gifts not needed†	M	-S						

Note. † indicates variable is classified as a predictor. Letters indicate the size of the difference or relationship:

VS = very small size; S = small size; M = medium size; L = large size. "-" = negative correlation coefficient.

giving. One other reason for not giving item was correlated with smaller "largest gift."

"Cumulative gifts" was smaller when two of the three reasons for not giving items that were predictors—"unable to give" and "still intend to give"—were more influential reasons for not giving. "Cumulative gifts" was larger when the reason for not giving item that was classified as a predictor—"give to spouse alma mater"—was an influential reason for not giving. Two reasons for not giving items and one reason for not giving scale were classified as correlated with "cumulative gifts."

Frequency of Support

All but one of the four reasons for not giving items that had a significant relationship with "percentage gift years" was in the Discretionary Resources cluster.

Three reasons for not giving items were classified as predictors of lower frequency of support. They were: "University excludes me," "unable to give," and "still intend to give." One other reason for not giving item was a predictor of higher frequency of support—"give to spouse's alma mater." No reasons for not giving items or scales were classified as correlated reasons for not giving.

Summary of All Result Categories for Reasons for Not Giving

An alternative representation of the results for reasons for not giving follows in order to highlight the importance of various reasons for not giving as rated by alumni. The clusters to which each reason for giving belongs and whether or not a particular reason for giving was a correlated or predictor reason for giving are also included in Table 74.

Table 74

Reasons for Not Giving in Order of Importance

Reason for Giving	$\bar{x}$	Cluster	Predictor	Correlated
Give to other nonprofit organizations	2.29	DR		
Unable to give	2.26	DR	-PL -PF	-CL
Only contribute an insignificant amount	1.92	DR	-PL	-CL
My student experience	1.84	MY		-CL CD
Youth models and experiences scale	1.84			
Give to other institutions, my degree	1.73	DR		
Discretionary resources scale	1.73			-CL
Differ with the policies	1.54	FC		CD
University excludes me	1.45	CP	-PD -PF	
Communities of participation scale	4.45			
Give to spouse alma mater	1.39	DR	PL PF	
Frameworks of consciousness	1.38			
Emphasis on diversity in mission	1.37	IE		
Not the school it was when I attended	1.35	FC		
Still intend to give	1.32	DR	-PL -PF	
Gifts not needed	1.32	UE	-PD	
Urgency and effectiveness scale	1.32			
Have not been asked to give	1.29	IP		
Invitation to participate scale	1.29			
Intrinsic and extrinsic rewards scale	1.29			CD
Insufficient diversity at all levels	1.28	IE		CD
Insufficient diversity in some levels	1.25	IE		CD

Note. Scale = $\bar{x}$ = 1-4.

Cluster code: CP = Communities of Participation,
FC = Frameworks of Consciousness,
IP = Invitation to Participate,
UE = Urgency and Effectiveness.

DR = Discretionary Resources,
IE = Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation,
MY = Models of Youth Experiences,

Predictor code: PD = predictor of donor.
PL = predictor of higher level of support.
PF = predictor of higher frequency of support.

-PD = predictor of nondonor.
-PL = predictor of lower support.
-PF = predictor of lower frequency of support.

Correlated code: CD = correlated with donor.
CL = correlated with higher level of support.
CF = correlated with higher frequency of support

-CD = correlated with nondonor.
-CL = correlated with lower level of support.
-CF = correlated with lower frequency of support.

An indicator of the importance of each reason for not giving items to alumni was its mean, which ranged from least important (1.25), "insufficient diversity in some levels," to most important (2.29), "give to other nonprofit organizations." The means for the reasons for not giving scales ranged from least important (1.29), "intrinsic and extrinsic rewards," to most important (1.84), "youth models and experiences."

In summary, two reasons for not giving items were predictors of nondonors—"University excludes me" and "gifts not needed." One reason for not giving item was a predictor of smaller "largest gift"—"only contribute an insignificant amount." No reasons for not giving items were predictors of bigger "largest gifts." Two reasons for not giving items were predictors of smaller "cumulative gifts"—"unable to give" and "still intend to give." One reason for not giving item was a predictor of bigger "cumulative gifts"—"give to spouse's alma mater." Three reasons for not giving items were predictors of lower frequency of support—"University excludes me," "only contribute an insignificant amount," and "still intend to give." One reason for not giving item was a predictor of higher frequency of support—"give to spouse's alma mater."

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Adventist colleges and universities rely increasingly on stakeholder support. This is due to ongoing and increasing capital and programmatic needs for resources that give universities an edge of excellence for students in a competitive world, and the need to complement the traditional and alternative streams of revenue that are simply just not sufficient for operating costs. In addition, some other revenue streams (e.g., a church subsidy) are stable or lower in inflationary terms although operating costs are rising.

The most common source of stakeholder support is the philanthropy of alumni. Five factors affect alumni philanthropy in support of Adventist higher education. They are: intense competition for gifts among nonprofits in general (Rooney, 2006); a plethora of religious, including Adventist, nonprofit organizations that appeal for gifts; being relatively new to the philanthropic world; having small endowments; and a pool of alumni that overlaps with alumni of other competing Adventist institutions of higher education.

The staff of the university advancement office are charged with connecting with

and facilitating the alumni philanthropic support. In order to effectively deploy and prioritize resources, optimize service to alumni, decrease donor fatigue and apathy, and increase and sustain alumni giving more efficiently, advancement staff need a profile of alumni donors and knowledge of influences on their giving behavior. The ability to predict and influence the giving of Adventist alumni will serve to maximize the philanthropic efforts of both alumni and development staff, resulting in benefit to the university. Documented knowledge about Adventist alumni and their philanthropic attitudes will also help advancement staff provide better philanthropic education and service to alumni.

Currently, advancement staff rely on information about Adventist alumni that is either anecdotal, deduced from practitioners, or extrapolated from other studies. Therefore, my study addressed this void and provides a description of the alumni of two Adventist Universities comprised of the demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving that were correlated with and were also predictors of alumni giving behavior.

Overview of the Literature

After reviewing the demographic descriptors, psychographic (values and attitudes) characteristics, and their reasons for giving and reasons for not giving of donors in the studies of the general and wealthy populations as well as the alumni of faith-based and independent colleges and universities, I selected factors to use in my study. Three studies of the giving behavior of Adventists were helpful (Dudley et al., 1982; Dudley &

Melgosa, 1985; Stockton-Chilson, 2003).

It was clear from my review of the literature that just a few demographics are consistently associated with giving behavior in the general and wealthy populations. They were: age, income or capacity, education level, and marital status (Havens et al., 2006, p. 545).

Only a few demographics also consistently indicated alumni giving behavior as reported in the studies on alumni giving for independent and faith-based institutions of higher education (Cascione, 2000; Cristanello, 1992; Haddad, 1986; Koole, 1981; Korvas, 1984; Nirschel, 1997; Oglesby, 1991; Thomas, 2005; Van Horn, 2002; Wetta, 1990). The demographics that almost all the studies reported as indicative of donors to higher education were: age, year of graduation, education level, and the number of years that the alumnus attended the University. (See chapter 2, Table 1.)

Other demographics were inconsistent indicators of donors. These demographics were: occupation, marital status, parenthood, age and grade level of children, number of children, spouse is alumni, family also alumni, income or capacity, receipt of financial aid, degrees from other institutions, and academic major. Six demographics fairly consistently were not indicative of donors: gender; geographic location; receipt of a grant or scholarship; repayment and receipt of loans; academic achievement; and undergraduate residence location. Other demographics (employment status, ethnicity, father's occupation, high-school GPA, involvement in high-school activity) were studied in only one study and were not predictors of donors. (See chapter 2, Table 1.)

The demographics that were indicators for giving level were in general similar to

those for donors. Several notable exceptions were that gender was an indicator of giving level. Rather than being inconsistent indicators, two demographics, marital status and academic major, were not indicators of giving level and two others, income and number of children, were. Birthplace, which was not studied in relation to donor status, was studied by one researcher and was not an indicator of giving level. (See chapter 2, Table 2.)

Only a few psychographics were also consistent indicators of donors in the studies on the general and wealthy populations. They were: involvement in the nonprofit, religious participation, volunteerism, and religious affiliation (Havens et al., 2006). Participation in general and co-curricular activities as a student, involvement in the University as alumni, and church affiliation were the fairly consistent psychographic indicators in studies of alumni of independent and faith-based institutions of higher education. Eight other psychographics were reported in only three or fewer studies. Participation in student government, receipt of publications, and volunteerism were indicative of donors. Involvement in athletics, involvement in honor societies, and planned campus visits were inconsistent indicators of donor status. Impact of the institution's strictness and religious involvement were not indicators of donor status. (See chapter 2, Table 1.)

The same psychographics, plus receipt of honorary degree, were studied in relationship to giving levels. Only two psychographics were tested in more than three studies. Alumni involvement indicated giving levels and planned campus visits was an inconsistent indicator of giving level.

In the general population, core reasons for giving are "altruism, gratitude, and desire to make the world a better place" (Kaminski, 2002, p. 188). In their conclusions for the factors that are directly related to the giving behavior of the general population, Schervish et al. (1998) note that "within community of participation, religious commitment and participation in religious organizations have a strong influence on general giving behaviour" (p. 11). Additional research showed "that the most important predictor of charitable giving is 'communities of participation'" (Havens et al., 2006, p. 545).

Several landmark studies on the reasons that wealthy donors give, notably Odendahl (1990), Panas (1984), Prince and File (1994), Sargeant and Jay (2004), and Schervish et al. (1998), have posited numerous reasons for giving. In summary, the most common reasons for giving seem to be: association including participation and involvement in a community, devotion and altruism, social status and expectation, desire for change, and sympathy or empathy. (See chapter 2, Tables 3 & 4.)

Less emphasis was placed on reasons for giving than demographics and psychographics in studies on alumni in higher education. Although 39 reasons for giving were cited in the 11 studies that considered alumni giving behavior to independent and faith-based institutions for higher education, only 9 reasons for giving were tested by more than three researchers. In general, researchers agreed that these 9 reasons for giving affected or indicated either donor status or giving level or both. They were: participation as an alumnus; pride of association; emotional involvement or loyalty to the University; alumni opinion of academic quality and being proud of the degree; giving is a duty or

responsibility; prepared for career; tax benefits; helping students as respondent was helped; and satisfaction with student experience. (See chapter 2, Tables 5 & 6.)

Except for one, each of the 21 reasons for not giving that affected the giving behavior of alumni of independent and faith-based institutions of higher education was considered by only 1 or 2 researchers. The reasons for not giving could be divided into two categories, those having to do with discretionary resources and those having to do with negative attitudes, experiences, and perceptions. Most affected donor status. One reason for not giving, give to other educational institutions or charities, indicated donor status in two of four studies. Another, feeling excluded, was not indicative of donor status and in one study was found to deter giving. (See chapter 2, Table 7.)

Six demographics, 3 psychographics, 8 reasons for giving, and 4 reasons for not giving were considered in 4 studies of the giving behavior of the general Adventist population. (See chapter 2, Table 8.) Most affected or were indicative of giving behavior, although only two were included in more than 1 study (income and number of purposes of giving). The 3 studies contradicted each other as to whether or not income indicated giving behavior. Number of purposes for giving affected giving behavior in the 2 studies in which it was reported. Being a member of a growing church and giving back to society as one has benefitted were not indicative of giving behavior.

Methodology

This study used a survey design. The population was the alumni of two comprehensive, doctoral degree-granting Adventist universities. The sample ($n = 1,200$)

was randomly selected. The response rate was 21%.

The data were collected from two sources. The information from which the independent variables (demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving) were created was collected on a survey that I constructed to which alumni responded. The data from which the dependent variables of: "donor status," "largest gift," "cumulative gifts," and "percentage gift years" were constructed (the number of years of giving, the number of gifts, and gift amounts) were supplied by the two Universities from their databases.

After the data were collected, I discovered that no donors responded who had given either large single gifts or large cumulative gift totals to either University. Although "giving by elites is typically missed in random samples" a check of my sample indicated that donors who had given large gifts were included in the sample (Rooney et al., 2001, p. 566). One possible explanation is that "wealthy" donors do not respond to surveys as well as other donors do. Typically the studies of wealthy or large gift donors have used the personal interview as the data collection method (Odendahl, 1990; Panas, 1984; Prince & File, 1994; Schervish & Hermann, 1988).

Each of the independent variables, demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving, was analyzed individually with the dependent variables. In addition, groups of these independent variables were selected using theory and hierarchical (simultaneous, forward, and backward) regression analysis for inclusion in models that were then analyzed using multiple regression.

General Results

This study found significant relationships between independent variables and one or more dependent variables for all eight of the research questions when the significance level for all analyses was set at $p = .05$.

Using any one group of factors—demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, or reasons for not giving—to predict, the study showed that donor prediction is about the same (63%-76%) as a random sample prediction (74%), but the prediction of nondonors is much better (56%-80%) than a random sample rate (26%).

There were no demographic predictors of level of support, although it was measured by two dependent variables, "largest gift" and "cumulative gifts." There were also no demographic predictors of frequency of support. There were very few correlated variables or predictor reasons for giving common to both measures of level of support. These differences in reasons for giving and reasons for not giving may be attributed to the fact that "cumulative gifts" more than likely represents the results of habit rather than being an isolated one-time event, which more likely results in a largest gift.

The alumni in this study had homogeneous tendencies, five examples of which follow.

1. More than 90% of the sample believed that the University needs some or much support, were Adventists while attending the University, and believed in God.
2. More than 85% believed that tithing was important and attended church at least monthly and over 80% were currently Adventists.

3. Slightly fewer (65%) attended a Bible study at least monthly and were at least moderately active participants in church life (73%).

4. Very few (less than 4%) reported that they received input from anyone other than their spouse for giving decisions. Only 25% reported that they even received input from their spouse for giving decisions.

5. Alumni reported similar attitudes on the extent that various stakeholders (e.g., church, business, and government) should support the University.

Interpreting Results

To determine which variables—demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving—were most likely to be predictors of donor status, level, and frequency of support, I first analyzed the relationships between the dependent variables and each independent variable individually. I then analyzed the relationships between variables when combined in a model. Finally, I divided the variables that had significant relationships with “donor status,” “largest gift,” “cumulative gifts,” and “percentage gift years” into two categories—correlated variables and predictor variables.

Correlated variables had to meet at least one of two conditions. Correlated variables either had a significant relationship with the dependent variable alone but not in a model, or they had a significant relationship only in a model and accounted for small unique variance. Independent variables that met at least one of two conditions were classified as predictor variables. The first condition was that the variable had a significant relationship both alone and in a model with the dependent variable. Second, if the

variable was only significant in a model, the variable accounted for a sizeable amount of unique variance in the model.

When practitioners want to discover whether an alumnus would likely be a donor or not, they may have to choose to make the tradeoff between a practical, simple, and easy procedure (using just predictor variables) versus a resource intensive and complicated procedure (measuring all of the predictor and correlated variables). The resource intensive procedure will usually not be worth the effort, nor will practitioners be correct that much more often in their prediction of donor status than if they use the practical, simple, and less resource intensive procedure. For example, if practitioners decided donor status based on the measurements of the four predictor psychographics (religious preference while at University, number of nonprofit organizations supported, University involvement, and response to letter solicitation), they would be taking into account 20% of the unique variance between donors and nondonors. If practitioners used all of the 20 predictive and correlated psychographics that included the four items mentioned and such items as the amount of financial support for global missions, the amount of financial support for nonprofits in education, or whether or not the respondent believes that the alumni believe the University has a positive reputation, they would be taking into account only 8% more variance. It would also be a much more resource intensive process.

There were 24 possible model analyses: (a) four with demographics and "donor status," "largest gift," "cumulative gifts," or "percentage gift years," (b) four with psychographics and "donor status," "largest gift," "cumulative gifts," or "percentage gift

years,” (c) four with reasons for giving items and “donor status,” “largest gift,” “cumulative gifts,” or “percentage gift years,” (d) four with reasons for giving scales and “donor status,” “largest gift,” “cumulative gifts,” or “percentage gift years,” (e) four with reasons for not giving items and “donor status,” “largest gift,” “cumulative gifts,” or “percentage gift years,” (f) four with reasons for not giving scales and “donor status,” “largest gift,” “cumulative gifts,” or “percentage gift years.” There were no demographics that met the criteria for the three models with “largest gift,” “cumulative gifts,” and “percentage gift years.” There were also no reasons for giving scales that met the criteria for the three models with “largest gift,” “cumulative gifts,” and “percentage gift years.” There were also no reasons for not giving scales that met the criteria for the four models with “donor status,” “largest gift,” “cumulative gifts,” and “percentage gift years.” So, I tested 14 models. A summary of the results follows. (See chapter 4.)

Donor Status

The demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving items and scales, and reasons for not giving items that differentiated between donors and nondonors as predictors follow. No reasons for not giving scales were predictors for donor status.

Results for Demographics With Donor Status

The study found that the three demographics that met the criteria for predictors of donors were: “spouse holds a degree,” “age,” and “year of graduation from highest degree.”

Results for Psychographics and Donor Status

The study found four psychographics that met the criteria for predictors of donors. They were: "religious preference while at University," "number of nonprofit organizations supported," "University involvement," and "response to letter solicitation."

Results for Reasons for Giving Items and Donor Status

The study found six reasons for giving items that met the criteria for predictors of donors. Five were important influences for giving for donors. They were: "asked to give," "giving is a responsibility," "believe in the mission," "respect for past faculty," and "respect for current faculty." When the sixth reason for giving item "set an example" was important, alumni were more likely to be nondonors than donors. Predictor reasons for giving items for donors occurred in the Frameworks of Consciousness, Invitation to Participate, Youth Models and Experiences, and Urgency and Effectiveness reasons for giving clusters.

Results for Reasons for Not Giving Items and Donor Status

The study found two reasons for not giving items ("University excludes me" and "gifts not needed") that met the criteria for predictors of "donor status." Nondonors were more likely than donors to believe these reasons for not giving were important.

Results for Reasons for Giving Scales With Donor Status

Two reasons for giving scales were predictors of "donor status." Donors were more likely than nondonors to believe "youth models and experiences" was important.

However, nondonors were more likely than donors to believe "discretionary resources" was important.

Level of Support

The psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving that were related to the two measures of level of support—"largest gift" and "cumulative gifts"—follow. No demographics, reasons for giving scales, or reasons for not giving scales met the criteria for predictors of either measure of level of support.

Results for Psychographics and Level of Support

Two psychographics met the criteria for predictor psychographics of "largest gift." They were: "number of nonprofit organizations supported" and "University involvement."

Three psychographics met the criteria for predictor psychographics of "cumulative gifts." They were: "University involvement," "response to letter solicitation," and "financial support for independent ministries."

Results for Reasons for Giving Items and Level of Support

Three predictor reasons for giving of "largest gift" were: "giving is a responsibility," "my philanthropic culture," and "asked to give." If "asked to give" and "giving is a responsibility" were predictors, then "largest gift" was smaller. If "my philanthropic culture" was a predictor, then "largest gift" was bigger.

Three reasons for giving items were predictors of "cumulative gifts." When "my

philanthropic culture" and "return help as I was helped" were reasons for giving that were important, then bigger "cumulative gifts" were predicted. "Cumulative gifts" was smaller when "have available funds" was an important reason for giving. Predictor reasons for giving items of "largest gift" or "cumulative gifts" occurred in the Discretionary Resources, Frameworks of Consciousness, Invitation to Participate, and Youth Models and Experiences reasons for giving clusters.

Results for Reasons for Not Giving Items and Level of Support

No reasons for not giving items were predictors of "largest gift."

Three reasons for not giving items met the criteria for predictors of "cumulative gifts" by donors. Bigger "cumulative gifts" were predicted when "give to other institutions where my spouse obtained their degree" was an important reason for not giving. Smaller "cumulative gifts" were predicted when "unable to give" and "still intend to give" were influential reasons for not giving. All of the predictor reasons for not giving items of level of support were in the Discretionary Resources cluster.

Frequency of Support

The predictor psychographics, reasons for giving items, and reasons for not giving items that were related to frequency of support follow. No demographics, reasons for giving scales, and reasons for not giving scales met the criteria for predictors of frequency of support.

Results for Psychographics and Frequency of Support

Three psychographics, "response to letter solicitation," "amount of alumni support

the University needs,” and “financial support for independent ministries,” met the criteria for predictor variables of higher frequency of support.

Results for Reasons for Giving Items and Frequency of Support

Five reasons for giving met the criteria for predictors of “percentage gift years.” Two reasons for giving that were predictors of higher “percentage gift years” were “have a sense of loyalty” and “return help as I was helped.” Three other reasons for giving were predictors of lower “percentage gift years”—“have available funds,” “expand University’s economic benefits to the community,” and “interest in a specific program.” Each of the reasons for giving items was in a different cluster: Discretionary Resources, Frameworks of Consciousness, Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards, Youth Models and Experiences, or Urgency and Effectiveness.

Results for Reasons for Not Giving Items and Frequency of Support

Four reasons for not giving items were predictors of “percentage gift years.” One could predict a higher frequency of support when “giving to other institutions from which their spouse graduated” was an influential reason for giving. One could predict less frequent support by donors when “only able to contribute an insignificant amount,” “still intend to give,” and “the University excludes me” were influential reasons for not giving. Three of the predictor reasons for not giving were in the Discretionary Resources cluster and the fourth was in the Communities of Participation cluster.

Summary of Results

Adventist alumni donors were older, had a spouse with a degree, and had earlier

dates of graduation with their highest degree.

Giving behavior was more likely than non-giving behavior when alumni financially supported three or more nonprofits, were involved in the University, responded positively to letter solicitation, were Adventists while attending the University, believed the amount of support from the alumni that was needed by the University was great, and gave much to independent ministries.

Giving behavior was also predicted when believing in the mission, respecting current faculty, respecting past faculty, returning help as one was helped, having a philanthropic culture being important, and having a sense of loyalty were important reasons for giving items. "Giving is a responsibility" and "asked to give" were reasons for giving that predicted alumni donors. However the same reasons for giving were predictors of smaller largest gifts. Giving behavior was likely to be at lower levels and less frequent when having available funds, setting an example, and expanding the University's economic benefits to the community were important reasons for giving.

Five reasons for not giving were predictors of alumni being nondonors and giving less and less frequently than more and more often. They were: "gifts not needed," "University excludes me," "unable to give," "still intend to give," and "only contribute an insignificant amount." However, more frequent giving by alumni donors was predicted when "give to spouse alma mater" was an important reason for not giving.

The predictor demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving of giving behavior—donor status, level of support, and frequency of support—are listed in Table 75. (See chapter 4 for additional details.)

Table 75

Predictors of Giving Behavior

Predictor	Donor	Level of Support		Frequency of Support
	Status	Largest Gift	Cumulative Gift	
Demographic				
Spouse holds a degree	P			
Age	P			
Highest degree, years since graduation	P			
Psychographic				
Number of nonprofit organizations supported	P	P		
University involvement	P	P	P	
Response to letter solicitation	P		P	P
Religious preference while at University	P			
Amount of alumni support the University needs				P
Financial support for independent ministries			P	P
Reason for Giving Item				
Giving is a responsibility	P	-P		
Believe in the mission	P			
Asked to give	P	-P		
Respect for the current faculty	P			
Respect for the past faculty	P			
Set an example	-P			
Return help as I was helped		P	P	P
My philanthropic culture			P	
Have available funds			-P	-P
Have a sense of loyalty				P
Expand University's economic benefits to the community				-P
Reason for Giving Scale				
Discretionary resources scale	-P			
Youth models and experiences scale	P			
Reason for Not Giving Item				
Gifts not needed	-P			
University excludes me	-P			-P
Unable to give			-P	-P
Still intend to give			-P	-P
Only contribute an insignificant amount		-P		
Give to spouse alma mater				P

Note. P = predictor of donor or higher level or frequency of support. -P = predictor of nondonor or lower level or frequency of support.

Discussion

In this section, both differences and similarities are noted between Adventist alumni in my study and four other specific populations. The four populations were: the wealthy and general populations (Schervish et al., 1993; Schervish et al., 1998), the alumni from independent and faith-based institutions of higher education (Burnett et al., 1974; Cascione, 2000; Cristanello, 1992; Gibbons, 1992; Haddad, 1986; Hunter, 1997; Koole, 1981; Korvas, 1984; Nirschel, 1997; Oglesby, 1991; Smith, 1998; Thomas, 2005; Van Horn, 2002; Violand, 1998; Wetta, 1990), and Adventist church members (Dudley et al., 1982; Dudley & Melgosa, 1985; Stockton-Chilson, 2003). This is followed by observations on the findings for the relationships between the independent variables and level of and frequency of support. The section ends with a brief review of the alignment of three theories, Social Exchange, Obligation, and Identification Theory, and the findings in this study.

Differences From Other Studies

Adventist alumni differed from other populations in nine obvious ways, especially the populations of the independent and faith-based institutions. These ways and some possible reasons for the differences follow. First, income did not differentiate between donors and nondonors as is typical of other populations (Havens et al., 2006). Income also was not indicative of the level or frequency of support of donors. This may be explained by the fact that it is really capacity to give that affects giving behavior and annual income is not the best measure of capacity to give. The ideal measure of capacity

to give would take into account a combination of several factors such as annual income, assets, expenses, and even perceived need for income in the future. However, since many studies have used income, and an ideal capacity to give variable as described was too expensive to measure in this study, I chose to use annual income.

Second, educational level did not differentiate between donors and nondonors. I speculate that this is because the study population is more homogeneous than other populations. Only 3% had an associate degree, 85% had a baccalaureate degree, and 68% had at least a master's-level degree. In addition, Adventists in the general population also reported higher levels of education overall than individuals of other Christian identities (Stockton-Chilson, 2003, p. 189).

Third, alumni in other studies are more likely to support the university where they obtained their undergraduate degree rather than the university from which they obtained their graduate degree (Kaplan, 2008). In this study, however, whether or not an alumnus had an undergraduate or graduate degree from the University did not differentiate between donors or nondonors. Although not a predictor, having a graduate degree from the University was correlated with one measure of giving level, "largest gift."

Fourth, Adventist alumni also differed from both general and faith-based alumni populations since church participation and involvement did not predict donors or giving behavior. Church affiliation was correlated with donors and frequency of giving but did not rise to the level of a predictor for giving behavior of Adventist alumni. Again, possibly the reason was because the Adventist population is more homogeneous than the general population. (Seventy-three percent of respondents reported at least moderate

church participation and 75% reported that they attended worship services at least weekly. Eighty-one percent were currently Adventists.) (See chapter 4, Table 23.)

Fifth, the number of non-profits supported and having a spouse with a degree, which were predictors for Adventist alumni donors, did not appear as predictor psychographics of giving behavior in other studies of alumni at independent and faith-based institutions. Why these seem to be unique to this population is not readily apparent.

Sixth, neither Communities of Participation as a scale nor most of the reasons for giving items in that cluster predicted Adventist donors or level or frequency of support as they have in other populations. Of the five reasons for giving items in the cluster, only one reason for giving item, "sense of pride in partnership," was correlated with donors and frequency of support; none were related to levels of support. In the wealthy and general populations on which the Identification Theory has been tested, the research confirms "the primacy of associational variables in increasing the percentage of income contributed" (Schervish & Havens, 1998, p. 12). Schervish and Havens (1997) also conclude "that the level of measured charitable giving . . . depends on the factors that generate the individual's and household's communities of participation, namely the density and mix of opportunities and obligations of voluntary association" (p. 256).

Seventh, most of the four reasons for giving items in the Invitation to Participate cluster did not differentiate between Adventist alumni donors and nondonors although they have for other populations (Panas, 1984; Prince & File, 1994). The support for this cluster in this study seems to be more like that in two other studies, where the statistical support for the Invitation to Participate cluster was very weak (Schervish & Havens,

1997, p. 6). In another study, three variables in the Invitation to Participate cluster that were personal contact led to higher levels of contributions. The three variables of less intimate contact led to smaller contributions (Schervish et al., 1998, pp. 247, 248). I believe these findings point to an inconsistency across populations for these reasons for giving. It appears that for the Adventist alumni, how they are asked is not influential to giving behavior, but whether they are asked is.

Eighth, the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards scale and more than half of the 11 reasons for giving in the cluster were also neither correlated with nor predictive of donors, level, and frequency of support. Since these are the most logical supporting reasons for the social exchange theories that are foundational to the most prevalent models that explain giving behavior as well as the fact that practitioners use these reasons for giving constantly, this was a surprise. It seems that Adventist alumni giving behavior is either not affected by the exchange theories or both donors and nondonors are affected in the same way. Perhaps one explanation is that giving behavior is not a simple cause and effect—an obvious “give to get.”

Ninth, it was also somewhat unexpected to discover in this study that the one reason for giving, “have available funds,” in the Discretionary Resources cluster was neither correlated with nor a predictor of “donor status.” This finding however is consistent with another unexpected finding in this study—“income” did not significantly differentiate between donors and nondonors. I speculate that this is because when alumni donors feel this is an important reason for giving they also do not have, or do not think they have, spare funds. Perhaps for many individuals, having enough income with spare

to give is not a reality or even a perceived reality.

Findings That Were Similar to Other Studies

Age was the obvious demographic and alumni involvement in the University was the obvious psychographic that predicted donors in my study as well as studies on other populations. There were also similarities of predictor reasons for giving with research on other populations. First, as in other research, the scales for Frameworks of Consciousness, Invitation to Participate, and Urgency and Effectiveness were correlated with Adventist alumni donors. In addition, and like other studies, the Frameworks of Consciousness, Youth Models and Experiences, and Urgency and Effectiveness clusters included a number of predictor reasons for giving items for Adventist alumni (Schervish, 1997b). The Youth Models and Experiences scale was also a reasonably strong predictor of donors.

Second, "frameworks of consciousness" was one of the three scales that one would expect should significantly differentiate between donors and nondonors. It was correlated, but not a predictor. Eight of the 15 reasons for giving items in this cluster were correlated with or predictors of donors. The reasons for giving items in this cluster tend to be important values and beliefs especially when religion is important. Since they may often be formed in the earlier years of life, the fact that this scale is logically related to one of the two predictor scales, Youth Models and Experiences, may be the explanation that "frameworks of consciousness scale" was only correlated with "donor status."

Third, "asked to give" is a consistent predictor in the literature for the general

population (Schervish, 1997a, p 114) and alumni of faith-based and independent institutions (Wetta, 1990). "Asked to give" was the only one of the four reasons for giving in the Invitation to Participate cluster that was a predictor reason for donors. The "invitation to participate" scale met the criteria for correlation with "donor status." Since peer solicitors, solicitor influence, and appeal of the requesting materials were not predictor or correlated reasons for giving behavior, development staff may be less concerned with who asks, than that an alumnus is asked to give.

Fourth, "discretionary resources" was a predictor scale of donors, which is consistent with other studies. However the finding that having discretionary resources was an unimportant reason for giving for donors is a subtle difference. Although not a correlated scale (significant alone) when combined with other scales, it became a predictor. I speculate then that having available income is not a primary reason that influences donors to give. Donors probably give for other reasons that they believe are more important reasons, and the availability of income or assets is secondary. It may also be that when donors articulate that discretionary income is a reason for giving, it may be a cover for the other reasons that they do not wish to articulate, or they may perceive it as an acceptable or easy excuse for not giving.

Fifth, the most influential predictor reason for not giving was the belief by the alumnus that the University excludes him or her. Independent of the "University excludes me" correlated reasons for not giving—"differ with policies," "student experience," and "insufficient diversity at some and all levels"—were not a direct influence for nondonors. These correlated and predictor reasons for not giving items were also correlated with

nondonors or nongiving in research on alumni for faith-based and independent institutions of higher education (Burnett et al., 1974; Smith, 1998; Wetta, 1990).

Level and Frequency of Support

There were two measures of level of support: "largest gift" and "cumulative gifts." It is noteworthy that, except for "return help as I was helped," all the predictor reasons for giving and reasons for not giving were different for "largest gift" and "cumulative gifts." I speculate that this could be because the single largest gifts are more likely the result of a single decision or event rather than a series of events over a period of time or a giving habit. Another explanation for the differences may be the fact that alumni have permanent and temporary reasons for giving (Sargeant & Jay, 2004, p. 13). The permanent reasons could be associated with "cumulative gifts" and the temporary reasons with "largest gift."

The reasons for not giving that predicted level and frequency of support were almost all in the Discretionary Resources cluster. This may be an indication that although the decision to give a gift was not necessarily affected by disposable resources, the size of a gift and how often a gift was given were related to the availability of resources or social capital. This has obvious implications regarding the timing of a request for a gift. For example, if a donor is asked when he or she has just received a bonus, it is more likely that they will give at a higher level than if they are asked when their taxes are due to be paid.

Alignment With Theories

Although only sometimes classified as a theory, it is worth noting that the evidence was inconsistent in my study as to whether Adventist alumni were influenced by obligation in their giving whereas it is influential for Jewish alumni (Nirschel, 1997, p. 89; Odendahl, 1990, p. 151). Some of the reasons for giving indicative of this profile that would be expected to predict giving behavior did (e.g., "giving is a responsibility," "my philanthropic culture," "set an example," and "have a sense of loyalty") while other reasons for giving had no significant relationships with any of the measures of giving behavior (e.g., "guilt feelings," "need this type of University," "religious affiliation," and "community responsibility and civic pride").

The very few correlated and predictor relationships between donor status, level of support, and frequency of support and the reasons for giving in the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards cluster suggest that the Social Exchange Theory does not explain the giving behavior of Adventist alumni

The Identification Theory (Schervish, 1997a; Schervish & Havens, 1997; Schervish et al., 1998; Schervish & Hermann, 1988) seems to be the best fit to the Adventist population of three dominant theories. There were two clusters of reasons for giving that strongly predicted giving behavior (Discretionary Resources and Youth Models and Experiences), three clusters that were less effective in predicting giving behavior (Frameworks of Consciousness, Invitation to Participate, and Urgency and Effectiveness), and two clusters (Communities of Participation and Intrinsic and Extrinsic

Rewards) that were least likely to predict giving behavior. Unlike Schervish and Havens's consistent findings across populations, Communities of Participation was not the dominant determinant cluster of reasons for giving. For Adventist alumni, the Youth Models and Experiences and Discretionary Resources clusters of reasons for giving had the strongest relationships with giving behavior. Their scales were predictors and all the reasons for giving items in each cluster were predictors of one or more of the four measures of giving behavior. However, since there is allowance in the theory for the importance of the clusters (relational determinants) to shift in the causal chain for different types of populations (e.g., wealthy, general, religious, non-religious, tax-motivated, and need-motivated) and for type of gift (e.g., first or largest), I conclude that it is the best theoretical explanation of Adventist giving behavior (Schervish, 1997a; Schervish et al., 1998, pp. 6, 8).

Recommendations

My recommendations are classified by the three groups of individuals who could implement them: the development staff at Adventist universities, the administrators at Adventist Universities, and researchers in the field of advancement and philanthropy, especially those who have an interest in the Adventist population.

Implications for Development Staff

Development staff should incorporate the documented predictor demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving for giving behavior into their fundraising practices. The obvious results would be increased and sustained

fundraising capabilities of the University and the enhanced satisfaction value of interactions with the alumni regarding their philanthropy. Examples of four specific ways development staff can use the results to optimize the use of resources and achieve better outcomes follow.

1. Development staff can formulate questions to ask alumni based on the predictive demographics and psychographics that will help the staff predict whether or not alumni will be donors or nondonors. This would help fundraisers prioritize their always limited resources for the most effective use and avoid wasting alumni's time. For example, a staff member who ascertained whether or not a nondonor alumni's spouse held a degree, the number of nonprofit organizations that a nondonor alumni supported financially, including the type of organization; and whether or not a nondonor alumnus was an Adventist while attending could anticipate whether or not the alumnus would likely be a potential donor or not.

2. The number of donors could be increased by segmenting the population and using targeted solicitations to alumni that included specific predictive reasons for giving and reasons for not giving. For example, a solicitation directed to donors could include a rationale for giving based on one or more of the following three reasons for giving: "believe in the mission," "respect for the past faculty," and "respect for the current faculty."

3. The number of nondonors could be decreased by sensitively and proactively addressing the predictor reason for not giving by alumni—"the University excludes me." For some this might be possible by clearing up a misconception by addressing the issue in

proposals or requests for gifts. For others, this might include discovering the reasons behind the belief, through a survey or an individual visit and working to solve the cause. The solution might be as simple as a demonstration of inclusion or as complicated as a policy change.

4. In solicitations, Universities could highlight the reasons for giving for which alumni give the highest and most frequent levels of support, such as: "return help as I was helped," "my philanthropic culture," and "have a sense of loyalty." Proposals could also be structured to counter or minimize the reasons for giving that are predictably related to lower and less frequent levels of support. These reasons include: "have available funds," "help the less fortunate," "still intend to give," and "the University excludes me."

Implications for University Administrators

Significant predictive psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving were found in my study that differentiated between alumni donors and nondonors that the Universities cannot directly influence or cannot influence after students become alumni (e.g., "religious preference at the University," "spouse holds a degree," and "have available funds"). However, some predictive factors exist that differentiate between alumni donors and nondonors and their giving behavior that the University can influence. Some examples of these predictive psychographics and reasons for giving discovered in my study were: "University involvement," "response to letter solicitations," "asked to give," "giving is a responsibility," and "gifts not needed." Where possible, the University should address these factors to positively affect giving behavior.

University administrators should continue to create and capitalize on opportunities to at least showcase four reasons for giving in educational marketing and fundraising information that is available to alumni. These predictor reasons for giving are: "amount of alumni support the University needs," "respect for current faculty," "respect for past faculty," and "return help as I was helped."

This study reinforces the necessity of having the Universities educate students well. Some of the factors that were predictive were likely to have been formed during the stay at the University. Administrators should identify and reduce negative experiences of students while they attend as well as form policies and implement practices that positively affect the experience of students not only because this is right and good institutional behavior, but also because it affects the giving behavior of future alumni. Some examples were: "have a sense of loyalty," "religious preference while at University," and "respect for past faculty." Treating students as alumni-in-waiting may not only help retain students, an important goal, but should also pay development dividends in the future.

Implications for Researchers

I recommend that further study be conducted on factors that are formed or happen during the 'youth' part of an alumni's life. Such a study would include: data collection and analysis of factors that were not included in my study and the relationships between these demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving and at least "donor status." At least three reasons justify such a study. First, my study showed that some values, culture, and practices formed early in life were predictors of giving behavior, that is, the values in the Frameworks of Consciousness cluster and the reasons

for giving in the Youth Models and Experiences cluster. Second, I delimited my study and excluded almost all the demographics and psychographics that happened during college (e.g., participation in sports, honors participation, and living on or off campus) from the research. Yet, both of the exceptions that were in my study were significantly related to donor status; religious affiliation while at the University was a predictor of donors, and number of years attended was correlated with donors. Third, other studies found that a number of these during-school factors were correlated or predictive of donors (Haddad, 1986; Hunter, 1997; Koole, 1981; Oglesby, 1991; Violand, 1998; Wetta, 1990).

My study has focused on a broad landscape view of who donors and nondonors are and why they give or do not give. I recommend that a further study be conducted using an interview protocol for data collection. A study using this methodology would have the advantage of allowing for a qualitative methodology and focusing on particular instances to illustrate and illuminate the statistical findings. It would tell the stories of donors that in my experience they consistently recite when asked why they give. Finally, it would be more likely to capture the opinions of donors of sizeable "largest gifts" and "cumulative gifts."

I also recommend study on the interrelationships between specific predictor and other selected demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving that were outside of the scope of this study. For example, since age is a predictor in this and other studies, it would be useful to study whether or not Adventist alumni of different age groups have significant differences and similarities in their reasons for giving and not giving. (This could allow development staff to segment solicitations based

on demographics and psychographics and include influential and specific reasons for giving or counter influential and specific reasons for not giving.) I believe it would also be useful to find what, if any, connections there are between logically related predictor and correlated independent variables in my study such as: "spouse holds a degree," "input from spouse into gift decisions," and "give to other institutions, spouse degree."

Conclusions

Five conclusions emerge from my study. First, three demographics, six psychographics, 11 reasons for giving, 2 reasons for giving scales, and 6 reasons for not giving predicted Adventist alumni donor behavior. Development staff can use these to effectively increase giving and maximize the use of resources.

Second, the Adventist population of this study differed from the general, wealthy, and faith-based alumni populations in regard to unique predictor characteristics and reasons for giving sufficiently so that care should be taken in extrapolating specific predictor demographics, psychographics, reasons for giving, and reasons for not giving from other populations to the Adventist alumni.

Third, this study corroborates the findings of earlier research on the alumni population in the faith-based and independent higher education (15 studies), in that each population seems to have some donor predictor demographics and psychographics that are common to all or most groups (e.g., age, involvement, loyalty, student experience, and years attended) and some that are unique (e.g., spouse holds degree and number of nonprofits supported).

Further, some commonalities were found in a brief comparison of the one study that described the giving and volunteering behavior of Adventists in general and in my study. Many of the factors related to giving behavior in my study were not studied by Stockton-Chilson (2003) and vice versa. For the few common factors, both studies suggested that: youth models and experiences were influential in shaping giving behavior (p. 192); being asked for a gift and wanting to help others correlated with giving; and giving is a complex behavior (p. 199). Also, in both studies, judged by amount and frequency of giving, Adventists' highest priorities for giving were religious, educational nonprofits, and international organizations. Lower priorities were public-society benefit and environment-based nonprofits (Stockton-Chilson, 2003, p. 190). (This is consistent with the general emphasis placed on these areas by the Adventist denomination.)

Fourth, while there were clearly reasons for giving that were correlated with donor status, and I have identified some as predictors, I recommend being conservative and tentative in the use of reasons for giving to categorize or pigeon-hole donors. Giving behavior is a complex and multiple, not a simple and single, cause-and-effect relationship. Both individual-level factors and macro-level factors, such as economic, political, and sociocultural contextual factors, impact giving behavior (Bielefeld, Rooney, & Steinberg, 2005, p. 139). Reasons for giving that influence giving behavior are also combined, twisted, and knitted together like a garment and are not easily separated, isolated, or disentangled. I believe that the predictor reasons for giving and reasons for not giving will be more effective when used to encourage giving behavior, and as starting points in relationships rather than to define donors and nondonors or mandate

interactions. Proactively addressing or mediating the effect of the predictor reasons for not giving should also enhance giving behavior. The study has showed which pieces belong in two jigsaw puzzles—the reasons for giving and the reasons for not giving that were influential for donors or nondonors. The pieces look different, but have similar shapes, and the overall picture does not have as many defining and unique shapes or colors as we might wish. So while it is clear that certain pieces belong to the puzzle, it is not altogether clear exactly how they fit together.

Fifth, development staff can perhaps be less concerned about causes to which alumni give than that they give. If an alumnus gave to three or more nonprofit organizations one could predict that he or she would be a donor and give sizable “largest gifts.” In addition, if an alumnus gave generously to independent ministries, it would be likely that he or she would give larger cumulative gifts and more frequently to the University. Apparently generosity begets generosity. Encouraging and educating alumni to give (to other organizations as well as one’s own) is a form of service that is not only an integral part of the mission of any Adventist university, it also appears to result in direct philanthropic benefit to the University.

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHICS AND PSYCHOGRAPHICS NOT CHOSEN FOR THE SURVEY

Table 76

Demographic Descriptors and Psychographic Characteristics not Chosen for the Survey

Author's Last Name	Burnett	Koole	Korvas	Haddad	Wetta	Oglesby	Christanello	Hunter	Nirschel	Violand	Cascione	Van Horn
Year of Study	1974	1981	1984	1986	1990	1991	1992	1997	1997	1998	2001	2002
Denomination	LSD	Baptist		IND	RC+	Baptist	RC	JEW	RC	IND	RC	Baptist
Demographic												
Occupation	NP	P		NP	NP	NP	NP	NP		P		
Geographic location		NP	NP	P	NP			NP		P	P	
Veteran									P			
Birthplace									P	NP		
Major	NP	P	NP	P	P	NP		NP				
Undergrad residence			NP	NP	NP	NP						
Father's occupation		NP										
High school success		NP	NP									
Involved in high school activity		NP										
Annual gift	P											
Receipt grant or scholarship		NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	NP	P	P			
Receipt financial aid				P		NP			NP			
Loan factors		NP	NP									
Psychographic												
Co-curricular participation			NP	P	P		NP					A
Student government		P				P						
Athletics		P				P						
Honor societies		NP		P		P		P		P		
Other						P						
Volunteerism								P				
Institution's strictness		NP										

APPENDIX B
NONSIGNIFICANT RESULTS

Table 77

Donor Status and Demographics: Nonsignificant Differences

Demographics	<u>Nondonor</u>		<u>Donor</u>		χ^2	<i>p</i>
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Marital status						
Married	44	71.0	144	80.9	3.401	.183
Single	10	16.1	15	8.4		
Had a partner	8	12.9	19	10.7		
Income						
Less than \$26,000	6	10.0	18	10.6	2.024	.846
\$26,000 - \$50,000	17	28.3	40	23.5		
\$51,000 - \$75,000	9	15.0	37	21.8		
\$76,000 - \$100,000	11	18.3	24	14.1		
\$101,000 - \$200,000	12	20.0	35	20.6		
More than \$200,000	5	8.3	16	9.4		
Number of children						
None	14	21.9	23	13.0	5.898	.207
1 child	8	12.5	14	7.9		
2 children	19	29.7	65	36.7		
3 children	18	28.1	49	27.7		
4 or more children	5	7.8	26	14.7		
Number of children ages less than 18						
None	15	60.0	46	65.7	.609	.894
1 child	4	16.0	8	11.4		
2 children	4	16.0	9	12.9		
3 or more children	2	8.0	7	10.0		
Number of children ages 19-30						
None	12	33.3	60	40.0	4.003	.261
1 child	11	30.6	22	22.0		
2 children	8	22.2	32	32.0		
3 or more children	5	13.9	6	6.0		
Number of children ages more than 31						
None	17	56.7	48	42.1	4.413	.220
1 child	4	13.3	13	11.4		
2 children	6	20.0	21	18.4		
3 or more children	3	10.0	32	28.1		
Number of children are alumni of University						
None	59	90.8	147	80.8	3.460	.063
1 or more	6	9.2	35	19.2		

Table 77—Continued.

Demographics	<u>Nondonor</u>		<u>Donor</u>		χ^2	<i>p</i>
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%		
Other relatives are alumnus of the University						
Yes	28	44.4	78	43.6	.014	.905
No	35	55.6	101	56.4		
Spouse degree location						
Degree from study university	7	24.1	37	29.1	.291	.590
Degree from other institution	22	75.9	90	70.9		
Number of years attended Study University						
Less than 2 years	18	28.1	50	28.2	3.135	.371
3 years	15	23.4	30	16.9		
4 years	23	35.9	59	33.3		
More than 4 years	8	12.5	38	21.5		
Highest degree level						
None or Associate	4	6.2	11	6.0	1.712	.634
Baccalaureate	18	27.7	47	25.8		
Masters	23	35.4	80	44.0		
Doctorate/EdS	20	30.8	44	24.2		
Undergraduate degree obtained at University						
Study University	44	68.8	129	72.1	.253	.615
Other University	20	31.2	50	27.9		
Graduate degree obtained at University						
Study University	25	39.1	66	36.9	.097	.756
Other University	39	60.9	113	63.1		

Table 78

Donor Status and Psychographics: Nonsignificant Differences

Psychographics	Nondonor		Donor		χ^2	p
	n	%	n	%		
Frequency of gift to political cause						
Never	3	5.3	11	6.6	.210	.900
Once every few years	11	19.3	29	17.4		
Annually or more often	43	75.4	127	76.0		
Current belief in God						
Believe	56	96.6	165	96.5	.000	.983
Uncertain or not believe	2	3.4	6	3.5		
Opinion on tithe paying						
Obligatory	40	70.2	127	76.0	3.140	.208
Optional and important	11	19.3	33	19.8		
Optional and not important	6	10.5	7	4.2		
Amount given to political cause						
A little	0	0.0	11	23.9	7.268	.026
Some	11	50.0	22	47.8		
Considerable	11	50.0	13	28.3		
Response to visit solicitation						
Negative	5	41.7	3	15.0	8.425	.015
Ignore	6	50.0	5	25.0		
Positive at some time	1	8.3	12	60.0		

Table 79

Donor Status and Psychographics: Nonsignificant Differences

Psychographics	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Input into giving decisions by spouse					
Nondonor	31	17.90	30.63	.062	.804
Donor	136	16.58	25.78		
Amount of financial support to nonprofits in other ^a categories					
Nondonor	65	1.51	.48	2.365	.125
Donor	182	1.62	.51		
Amount of financial support to nonprofits in religion					
Nondonor	65	3.26	1.05	1.497	.222
Donor	182	3.43	.95		
Amount of volunteer support to nonprofits in the other ^a categories					
Nondonor	65	1.25	.41	.283	.595
Donor	182	1.29	.41		
Amount of volunteer support to nonprofits in education					
Nondonor	65	2.06	1.25	.170	.680
Donor	182	2.13	1.15		
Amount of volunteer support to nonprofits in religion					
Nondonor	65	2.86	1.10	.574	.449
Donor	182	2.73	1.23		
Financial support local church ministries					
Nondonor	52	2.92	1.05	.432	.512
Donor	159	3.03	.95		
Financial support local region					
Nondonor	51	2.45	1.11	1.275	.260
Donor	155	2.64	1.00		
Financial support local church education					
Nondonor	51	2.37	1.11	1.187	.277
Donor	153	2.58	1.16		
Financial support local church operation					
Nondonor	53	3.23	.97	1.494	.223
Donor	160	3.39	.83		
Financial support independent ministries					
Nondonor	50	2.12	1.06	1.837	.177
Donor	153	2.36	1.09		

Table 79—*Continued.*

Psychographics	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Church involvement					
Nondonor	56	6.72	1.41	.233	.630
Donor	163	6.62	1.32		
Respondent believes community believes University has positive reputation					
Nondonor	41	2.30	.58	.041	.841
Donor	109	2.32	.48		
Extent board should support University					
Nondonor	53	3.74	.486	.032	.859
Donor	168	3.75	.510		
Extent corporations should support University					
Nondonor	53	3.15	.690	.032	.858
Donor	160	3.13	.692		
Extent church should support University					
Nondonor	53	3.68	.581	1.435	.232
Donor	165	3.78	.486		
Extent community should support University					
Nondonor	53	3.00	.650	.976	.324
Donor	160	3.11	.688		
Extent faculty and staff should support University					
Nondonor	53	3.68	.510	.069	.793
Donor	168	3.70	.575		
Extent government should support University					
Nondonor	51	2.14	1.00	.060	.806
Donor	159	2.18	.978		

Table 80

Largest Gift and Demographics: Nonsignificant Differences

Demographics	Largest Gift				
	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Gender					
Female	73	1.96	1.02	1.117	.292
Male	103	2.12	1.04		
Marital status					
Married	143	2.09	1.03	.733	.482
Single	15	2.13	1.19		
Had a partner	19	1.79	1.03		
Ethnicity					
Caucasian	148	2.14	1.08	2.684	.103
Minority	27	1.78	.80		
Employment status					
Employed	109	2.10	1.04	.494	.483
Retired	61	1.98	1.04		
Income					
Less than \$26,000	18	2.00	1.14	2.115	.066
\$26,000 - \$50,000	40	2.00	.91		
\$51,000 - \$75,000	37	1.92	1.06		
\$76,000 - \$100,000	24	2.21	.98		
\$101,000 - \$200,000	34	1.94	1.13		
More than \$200,000	16	2.81	.83		
Age					
46 years or younger	21	1.95	.92	.258	.904
47 - 56 years old	48	2.15	.99		
57 - 66 years old	42	2.14	1.16		
67 - 76 years old	38	1.97	1.08		
77 years or older	29	2.07	1.04		
Number of children					
None	23	2.04	1.11	.395	.812
1 child	14	2.36	1.08		
2 children	64	1.98	1.05		
3 children	49	2.10	1.05		
4 or more children	26	2.12	.99		

Table 80—*Continued.*

Demographics	Largest Gift				
	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Number of children ages less than 18					
None	138	2.01	1.07	.620	.603
1 child	15	2.40	.99		
2 children	18	2.06	.73		
3 or more children	10	2.10	1.20		
Number of children ages 19-30					
None	121	2.02	1.07	.566	.638
1 child	22	2.27	.94		
2 children	32	1.97	1.00		
3 or more children	6	2.33	1.21		
Number of children ages over 31					
None	115	2.00	1.02	.324	.808
1 child	13	2.23	1.17		
2 children	21	2.14	1.24		
3 or more children	32	2.13	.98		
Number of children are alumni of University					
None	146	2.03	1.04	.306	.581
1 or more children	35	2.14	1.06		
Other relatives are alumni of University					
Yes	78	2.00	1.01	.577	.449
No	100	2.12	1.08		
Spouse degree					
No degree	27	2.19	1.00	.351	.554
Holds a degree	126	2.06	1.04		
Spouse degree location					
Other institution	90	2.04	1.04	.036	.850
Study university	36	2.08	1.05		
Number of years attended University					
Less than 2 years	50	1.98	1.06	.535	.659
3 years	30	2.00	.98		
4 years	59	2.17	1.12		
More than 4 years	37	1.92	.95		
Highest degree year of graduation					
Less than 16 years	36	2.03	0.94	.740	.479
17 to 35 years	86	2.17	1.09		
More than 36 years	55	1.96	1.04		

Table 80—*Continued.*

Demographics	Largest Gift				
	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Undergraduate degree location					
Study University	128	2.16	1.06	3.530	0.62
Other University	50	1.84	0.96		
Highest degree level					
None or Associate	7	2.14	.90	2.383	.071
Baccalaureate	47	1.97	1.09		
Masters	80	1.94	.93		
Doctorate/EdS	44	2.43	1.15		

Table 81

Cumulative Gift and Demographics: Nonsignificant Results

Demographics	Cumulative Gift				
	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Marital status					
Married	143	2.39	1.06	1.585	.208
Single	15	2.00	1.13		
Had a partner	19	2.05	1.08		
Employment status					
Employed	109	2.28	1.08	.618	.433
Retired	61	2.41	1.05		
Income					
Less than \$26,000	18	2.33	1.03	6.86	.635
\$26,000 - \$50,000	40	2.50	1.43		
\$51,000 - \$75,000	37	2.16	1.14		
\$76,000 - \$100,000	24	2.17	1.13		
\$101,000 - \$200,000	34	2.24	1.07		
More then \$200,000	16	2.31	1.07		
Age					
46 years or younger	21	1.86	1.01	1.823	.127
47 - 56 years old	48	2.19	1.07		
57 - 66 years old	42	2.50	1.09		
67 - 76 years old	38	2.42	1.03		
77 years or older	29	2.52	1.09		
Number of Children					
None	23	2.04	1.26	.620	.649
1 child	14	2.36	1.15		
2 children	64	2.36	.98		
3 children	49	2.45	1.12		
4 or more children	26	2.23	1.03		
Number of children ages less than 18					
None	138	2.34	1.10	.1.072	.362
1 child	15	2.53	1.06		
2 children	18	2.06	.80		
3 or more children	10	1.90	1.10		
Number of children ages 19-30					
None	121	2.30	1.10	.524	.666
1 child	22	2.55	1.01		
2 children	32	2.19	1.00		
3 or more children	6	2.17	1.33		

Table 81—*Continued.*

Demographics	Cumulative Gift				
	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Gender					
Female	73	2.16	1.11	2.603	.292
Male	103	2.43	1.03		
Child also alumnus					
None	146	2.23	1.06	3.331	.070
1 or more children	35	2.60	1.09		
Relative as alumnus					
Yes	78	2.28	1.03	.127	.722
No	100	2.34	1.11		
Spouse degree					
No degree	27	2.48	0.98	.469	.494
Holds a degree	126	2.33	1.09		
Spouse degree location					
Other institution	90	2.32	1.04	.003	.959
Study University	36	2.33	1.24		
Number of years attended University					
Less than 2 years	50	2.34	1.06	.831	.479
3 years	30	2.17	1.09		
4 years	59	2.42	1.08		
More than 4 years	37	2.11	1.05		
Highest degree year of graduation					
Less than 16 years	36	1.97	1.06	2.628	.075
17 to 35 years	86	2.42	1.05		
More than 36 years	55	2.59	0.91		
Highest degree level					
None or Associate	7	2.29	1.11	1.364	.255
Baccalaureate	46	2.26	1.12		
Masters	80	2.23	1.02		
Doctorate/EdS	44	2.61	1.08		
Undergraduate degree location					
Study University	128	2.37	1.10	.678	.412
Other University	50	2.22	1.00		
Graduate degree location					
Study University	66	2.50	1.03	2.801	.096
Other University	112	2.2	1.09		

Table 82

Percentage of Gift Years and Demographics: Nonsignificant Results

Demographics	Percentage Gift Years				
	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Gender					
Female	74	2.49	.81	.296	.587
Male	103	2.55	.80		
Marital status					
Married	144	2.58	.77	1.986	.140
Single	15	2.20	.86		
Had a partner	19	2.37	.96		
Ethnicity					
Caucasian	148	2.58	.81	3.199	.075
Minority	28	2.29	.76		
Income					
Less than \$26,000	18	2.78	.94	.940	.456
\$26,000 - \$50,000	40	2.60	.87		
\$51,000 - \$75,000	37	2.49	.77		
\$76,000 - \$100,000	24	2.29	.75		
\$101,000 - \$200,000	35	2.46	.65		
More then \$200,000	16	2.56	.73		
Number of children					
None	23	2.17	.94	1.702	.152
1 child	14	2.50	.85		
2 children	65	2.54	.73		
3 children	49	2.70	.85		
4 or more children	26	2.50	.65		
Number of children ages less then 18					
None	138	2.57	.84	.511	.675
1 child	15	2.47	.74		
2 children	19	2.42	.69		
3 or more children	10	2.30	.48		
Number of children ages 19-30					
None	122	2.57	.83	.326	.806
1 child	22	2.45	.74		
2 children	32	2.47	.72		
3 or more children	6	2.33	.82		

Table 82—*Continued.*

Demographics	Percentage Gift Years				
	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Number of children ages over 31					
None	116	2.43	.79	1.883	.134
1 child	13	2.54	.97		
2 children	21	2.67	.66		
3 or more children	32	2.78	.79		
Relative as alumnus					
Yes	78	36.74	21.66	.100	.921
No	101	36.41	22.65		
Spouse degree					
No degree	27	2.78	0.70	.410	.523
Holds a degree	127	2.65	0.95		
Spouse degree location					
Other institution	90	2.69	0.92	.422	.517
Study University	37	2.57	1.04		
Number of years attended University					
Less than 2 years	50	2.60	.83	1.860	.138
3 years	30	2.40	.77		
4 years	59	2.66	.76		
More than 4 years	37	2.32	.80		
Highest degree year of graduation					
Less than 16 years	36	2.03	0.94	.740	.479
17 to 35 years	86	2.17	1.09		
More than 36 years	55	1.96	1.04		
Highest degree level					
None or Associate	7	3.00	1.00	1.004	.392
Baccalaureate	47	2.55	.80		
Masters	80	2.46	.79		
Doctorate/EdS	44	2.55	.79		
Undergraduate degree location					
Study University	129	2.67	2.58	.318	.574
Other University	50	2.58	0.88		
Graduate degree location					
Study University	66	2.76	0.91	1.638	.202
Other University	113	2.58	0.92		

Table 83

Measures of Support and Psychographics: Nonsignificant Results

Psychographics	Largest Gift	Cumulative Gift
Amount of financial support nonprofit education	.139	
Amount of financial support nonprofit religion	.077	
Volunteer financial support nonprofit other ^a	.055	-.016
Volunteer financial support nonprofit education	.008	-.066
Volunteer financial support nonprofit religion	.099	.085
Input from self	.057	.031
Input from spouse	.096	.128
Religious financial support missions	-.016	.091
Religious financial support local church ministries	.010	.095
Religious financial support local region	-.057	.076
Religious financial support local church education	-.015	.018
Religious financial support local church operation	.133	
Religious financial support independent ministries	.110	
Extent alumni should support University	.088	
Church involvement	-.043	.037
Level alumni financial support University needs	.115	.139
Respondent believes family believe University reputation	.086	.045
University reputation friends	.033	.052
University reputation alumni	.056	.048
University reputation community	.016	.078
Board should support	-.064	.001
Corporate should support	-.051	.022
Church should support	.058	.033
Community should support	-.020	.021
Faculty and staff should support	-.047	.033
Government should support	.040	.048

^a Other includes health, youth, arts and cultural, environmental, social services and service clubs.

Table 84

Largest Gift and Psychographics: Nonsignificant Results—ANOVA

Psychographics	Largest Gift				
	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Frequency of gift to political cause					
Never	11	1.64	.92	1.122	.328
Once every few years	29	1.93	.92		
Annually or more often	126	2.09	1.07		
Amount given to political cause					
A little	11	2.36	1.03	.399	.673
Some	22	2.05	1.00		
Considerable	13	2.00	1.29		
Current belief in God					
Believe	165	2.04	1.03	.010	.921
Uncertain or not believe	6	2.00	1.26		
Current religious preference					
Adventist	155	2.06	1.04	.000	.983
Other	19	2.05	1.13		
Respondent recommends attendance					
Disagree	15	1.60	.83	2.956	.055
Agree	112	2.00	1.06		
Strongly agree	51	2.29	1.04		
Opinion on tithe					
Obligatory	126	2.01	1.02	.672	.512
Optional and important	33	2.24	1.12		
Optional and not important	7	2.00	1.00		
Frequency of University request for financial support					
Once or never	8	1.50	.76	1.273	.282
Sometimes	121	2.11	1.07		
Often	49	2.06	1.01		
Response to letter solicitation					
Negative	4	1.75	1.50	1.027	.360
Ignore	67	1.96	1.01		
Positive at some time	85	2.18	1.06		
Response to phone solicitation					
Negative	26	1.85	1.19	.771	.464
Ignore	19	2.05	1.18		
Positive at some time	108	2.13	.99		

Table 84—*Continued.*

Psychographics	Largest Gift				
	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Response to visit solicitation					
Negative	3	2.00	1.00	.328	.725
Ignore	5	2.60	1.14		
Positive at some time	12	2.25	1.06		
Response to publication solicitation					
Negative	3	1.00	.00	1.970	.144
Ignore	83	2.16	1.08		
Positive at some time	31	2.00	.93		
Response to advertisement solicitation					
Negative	2	1.00	.00	1.693	.190
Ignore	80	2.14	1.08		
Positive at some time	15	1.80	.94		
Religious preference while at University					
Adventist	170	2.06	1.05	.574	.450
Other	2	1.50	.71		

Table 85

Cumulative Gift and Psychographics: Nonsignificant Results—ANOVA

Psychographics	Cumulative Gift				
	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Frequency of gift to political cause					
Never	11	2.09	.70	.835	.436
Once every few years	29	2.10	1.05		
Annually or more often	126	2.35	1.09		
Amount given to political cause					
A little	11	2.45	1.21	.142	.868
Some	22	2.23	1.11		
Considerable	13	2.31	1.18		
Current belief in God					
Believe	165	2.30	1.06	.471	.494
Uncertain or not believe	6	2.00	1.26		
Current religious preference					
Adventist	155	2.32	1.06	.398	.529
Other	19	2.16	1.21		
Opinion tithe					
Obligatory	126	2.29	1.04	.497	.609
Optional and important	33	2.42	1.15		
Optional and not important	7	2.00	1.15		
Frequency of University request for financial support					
Disagree	8	2.00	.53	.519	.495
Agree	121	2.31	1.10		
Strongly agree	49	2.41	1.08		
Response to visit solicitation					
Negative	3	1.67	1.15	.640	.540
Ignore	5	2.40	1.52		
Positive at some time	12	2.58	1.16		
Response to publication solicitation					
Negative	3	1.00	.00	2.21	.113
Ignore	83	2.33	1.12		
Positive at some time	31	2.29	.97		
Response to advertisement solicitation					
Negative	2	1.00	.00	1.341	.267
Ignore	80	2.29	1.13		
Positive at some time	15	2.20	1.01		
Religious preference while at University					
Seventh-day Adventist	170	2.31	1.08	1.124	.291
Other	2	1.50	.71		

Table 86

Percentage Gift Years and Psychographics: Nonsignificant Results

Psychographics	Percentage Gift Years				
	<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Frequency of gift to political cause					
Never	11	2.73	.79	1.148	.320
Once every few years	29	2.34	.72		
Annually or more often	127	2.54	.80		
Amount given to political cause					
A Little	11	2.45	1.04	.033	.968
Some	22	2.50	.67		
Considerable	13	2.54	.78		
Current belief in God					
Believe	165	2.55	.79	2.786	.097
Uncertain or not believe	6	2.00	.89		
Frequency of University request for financial support					
Once or never	8	2.75	.71	.448	.639
Sometimes	122	2.50	.82		
Often	49	2.57	.79		
Response to visit solicitation					
Negative	3	1.33	.58	5.114	.018
Ignore	5	3.00	.85		
Positive at some time	20	2.83	.75		
Response to publication solicitation					
Negative	3	1.67	.58	1.556	.215
Ignore	84	2.51	.86		
Positive at some time	31	2.52	.72		
Response to advertisement solicitation					
Negative	2	1.50	.71	1.664	.195
Ignore	81	2.47	.88		
Positive at some time	15	2.67	.72		
Religious preference while at the University					
Seventh-day Adventist	171	2.54	.81	.885	.348
All other	2	2.00	.00		

Table 87

Percentage Gift Years and Psychographics: Nonsignificant Results

Psychographics	Percentage Gift Years
University involvement	.142
Amount of financial support nonprofit other ^a	.139
Volunteer financial support nonprofit other ^a	-.035
Volunteer financial support nonprofit education	.032
Volunteer financial support nonprofit religion	.135
Input from self	.037
Input from spouse	.110
Religious financial support missions	.131
Religious financial support local church ministries	.099
Religious financial support local church education	.019
Church involvement	.083
University reputation family	.072
University reputation friends	.119
University reputation alumni	.075
University reputation community	.074
Board should support	.044
Corporate should support	.070
Church should support	-.006
Community should support	.061
Faculty and staff should support	.008
Government should support	.021

^a Other includes health, youth, arts and cultural, environmental, social services and service clubs.

Table 88

Donor Status and Reasons for Giving: Nonsignificant Results

Reasons for Giving		<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Communities of Participation						
Communities of Participation Scale	Nondonor	44	1.45	.496	1.76	.186
	Donor	122	1.54	.516		
Family ties to the University	Nondonor	45	1.33	.603	3.315	.070
	Donor	133	1.61	.952		
Involvement in programs etc.	Nondonor	45	1.64	.857	0.687	.408
	Donor	133	1.77	.926		
Immediate or past involvement in University fund-raising efforts	Nondonor	45	1.27	.580	2.358	.126
	Donor	133	1.47	.803		
Serve on the board or other official body	Nondonor	44	1.36	.750	1.868	.173
	Donor	129	1.12	.608		
Discretionary Resources						
Have available funds	Nondonor	47	3.13	1.01	1.835	.177
	Donor	132	2.90	0.97		
Frameworks of Consciousness						
Community responsibility/civic pride	Nondonor	44	1.66	.78	0.012	.913
	Donor	132	1.67	.81		
Set an example	Nondonor	45	1.78	.97	0.130	.719
	Donor	133	1.72	.87		
Fiscal stability of the University	Nondonor	44	2.02	1.05	3.231	.074
	Donor	134	2.33	.96		
Need this type of University	Nondonor	45	2.11	1.09	1.982	.161
	Donor	137	2.36	1.04		
Preserve academic environment	Nondonor	45	2.29	1.01	2.792	.096
	Donor	136	2.57	.95		
Guilt feelings	Nondonor	46	1.09	.29	2.345	.127
	Donor	133	1.22	.56		
Personal or spiritual commitment	Nondonor	45	2.44	.92	1.394	.239
	Donor	140	2.64	.95		

Table 88—*Continued.*

<i>Reasons for Giving</i>		<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Religious affiliation/ Adventist university	Nondonor	45	2.71	1.12	3.653	.057
	Donor	144	3.05	1.01		
Desire to help bring about change	Nondonor	45	2.33	.91	0.006	.940
	Donor	136	2.35	.95		
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards						
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards Scale	Nondonor	42	1.81	.575	0.032	.858
	Donor	120	1.83	.477		
Challenge others to give	Nondonor	44	1.32	0.56	1.899	.170
	Donor	130	1.47	0.65		
Expand University's economic benefits to the community	Nondonor	45	1.80	0.94	1.081	.300
	Donor	134	1.96	0.90		
Tax considerations	Nondonor	47	2.15	0.91	0.879	.350
	Donor	138	2.00	0.95		
Ability to designate how and where the funds will be used	Nondonor	44	1.98	1.13	0.227	.364
	Donor	134	2.07	1.07		
Opportunity to honor an individual	Nondonor	46	1.59	0.93	0.374	.542
	Donor	134	1.68	0.86		
Receive the joy of giving	Nondonor	47	2.19	1.04	0.186	.667
	Donor	143	2.27	1.02		
Match a gift made by others	Nondonor	46	1.46	0.81	0.067	.796
	Donor	132	1.42	0.70		
Recognition of gifts	Nondonor	46	1.50	0.86	0.038	.846
	Donor	134	1.53	0.91		
Prepared me for my career	Nondonor	45	2.73	1.18	0.009	.924
	Donor	140	2.75	0.96		
Ability to create a lasting memorial	Nondonor	45	1.60	0.94	0.006	.937
	Donor	131	1.59	0.89		
Makes good business sense	Nondonor	45	1.80	0.89	0.005	.943
	Donor	137	1.79	0.97		

Table 88—*Continued.*

<i>Reasons for Giving</i>		<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Invitation to Participate						
Influence of the gift solicitors	Nondonor	46	1.50	.89	0.06	.808
	Donor	131	1.53	.80		
Peer Influence	Nondonor	46	1.12	.47	0.018	.895
	Donor	129	1.16	.46		
Appeal of the requesting materials	Nondonor	44	1.66	.91	0.775	.380
	Donor	129	1.80	.91		
Urgency and Effectiveness						
Uniqueness of the project/program	Nondonor	45	2.00	1.02	0.765	.383
	Donor	136	2.15	0.96		
University needs funds	Nondonor	46	2.30	0.99	1.384	.241
	Donor	137	2.50	0.95		
Enhance the educational environment	Nondonor	45	2.44	1.09	0.366	.546
	Donor	135	2.55	0.96		
Great interest in a specific program	Nondonor	40	2.08	1.02	0.264	.608
	Donor	123	1.98	1.08		
Help the less fortunate	Nondonor	46	2.48	1.07	0.573	.450
	Donor	138	2.61	0.99		
Youth Models and Experiences						
Help students finance their education as I was	Nondonor	44	2.09	1.07	1.48	.225
	Donor	137	2.32	1.10		

Note. Scale 1=Not Important, 2=Somewhat Important, 3=Important, and 4=Very Important.

Table 89

Donor Status and Reasons for Not Giving: Nonsignificant Results

Reasons for Not Giving		<i>n</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Discretionary Resources						
Discretionary Resources scale	Nondonor	42	1.76	.48	0.278	.599
	Donor	103	1.72	.48		
Only contribute an insignificant amount	Nondonor	44	1.93	1.13	0.003	.957
	Donor	128	1.92	1.03		
Still intend to give	Nondonor	43	1.44	0.88	1.577	.211
	Donor	111	1.28	0.65		
Unable to give	Nondonor	49	2.35	1.33	0.301	.584
	Donor	122	2.23	1.24		
Give to other non-profit organizations	Nondonor	49	2.35	1.13	0.186	.667
	Donor	141	2.27	1.07		
Give to other institutions where I obtained other degrees	Nondonor	47	1.62	0.97	0.828	.364
	Donor	134	1.77	0.99		
Give to other institutions where spouse obtained degrees	Nondonor	48	1.33	0.78	0.389	.534
	Donor	128	1.41	0.76		
Frameworks of Consciousness						
Frameworks of Consciousness scale	Nondonor	42	1.56	.84	3.611	.059
	Donor	123	1.33	.63		
Not the school it was when I attended	Nondonor	46	1.46	0.94	1.083	.299
	Donor	127	1.31	0.73		
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards						
Emphasis on diversity in mission	Nondonor	46	1.50	.89	1.931	.166
	Donor	125	1.33	.66		
Invitation to Participate						
Have not been asked to give	Nondonor	45	1.38	0.91	0.810	.369
	Donor	125	1.26	0.65		

Note. Scale 1=Not a Consideration, 2=Somewhat Influential, 3=Major Influence and 4=Deciding Factor.

Table 90

Measures of Support and Reasons for Giving: Nonsignificant Results

Reasons for Giving	Largest Gift	Cumulative Gift	Percentage Gift Years
Communities of Participation			
Communities of Participation scale	.126	.122	.174
Family ties to the university	.139	.150	.142
Sense of pride in partnership	.078	.133	
Involvement in programs etc	.053	.016	.031
Immediate or past involvement in university fund-raising efforts	-.090	-.022	-.006
Serve on the board or other official body	.064	-.005	.041
Discretionary Resources			
Have available funds	-.095		
Frameworks of Consciousness			
Frameworks of Consciousness scale	.016	.043	.135
Set an example	.089	.106	.029
Fiscal stability of the university	.019	.040	.137
Giving is a responsibility	-.078	-.014	.128
Guilt feelings	-.154	-.109	-.021
Personal or spiritual commitment	-.035	.058	.110
Believe in the mission	.023	.035	.095
Give something back	.099	.070	.119
Community responsibility and civic pride	.062	.093	.130
Have a sense of loyalty	.111	.144	
Need this type of university	.040	.092	.105
Preserve academic environment	-.047	-.010	.041
Preserve spiritual environment	-.016	.029	.147
Preserve critical thinking environment	-.023	.003	-.017
Religious affiliation as an Adventist university	-.026	.004	.068
Desire to help bring about change	-.058	-.022	.077
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards			
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards scale	.000	.016	.048
Match a gift made by others	-.023	.060	-.025
Challenge others to give	.054	.043	.069
Opportunity to honor an individual	-.030	-.080	-.058
Ability to create a lasting memorial	-.013	-.008	.046
Receive the joy of giving	-.021	.044	.080
Makes good business sense	.011	-.004	.000
Prepared me for my career	.047	.074	.160
Expand university's economic benefits to the community	.007	-.002	-.061
Ability to designate how and where the funds will be used	-.137	-.065	.014
Recognition of gifts	.003	.009	-.047
Tax considerations	.000	-.063	-.010

Table 90—*Continued.*

Reasons for Giving	Largest Gift	Cumulative Gift	Percentage Gift Years
Invitation to Participate			
Invitation to Participate scale	-.154	-.040	.107
Influence of the gift solicitors	-.130	-.023	.036
Peer Influence	-.066	-.028	-.006
Asked to give		-.033	.146
Appeal of the requesting materials	-.096	-.064	.017
Urgency and Effectiveness			
Urgency and Effectiveness scale	-.092	-.086	-.028
Uniqueness of the project/program	-.013	-.038	.013
Respect for volunteer leadership	-.057	-.027	.023
Respect for the current faculty	-.034	-.042	.035
Respect for the administrative leadership	-.007	.026	.015
Advance the excellence and reputation of university	.000	.017	.009
University needs funds	.063	.033	.106
Enhance the educational environment	-.073	-.068	.034
Great interest in a specific program	-.072	-.063	-.137
Help the less fortunate	-.117	-.065	-.025
Youth Models and Experiences			
Youth Models and Experiences scale	.060		.168
My philanthropic culture	.095		.109
Help students finance their education as I was	.005		
Respect for the past faculty	-.013	-.003	.066

Table 91

Measures of Support and Reasons for Not Giving: Nonsignificant Results

Reasons for Not Giving	Largest Gift	Cumulative Gift	Percentage Gift Years
Communities of Participation			
University excludes me	-.082	-.157	
Discretionary Resources			
Discretionary Resources Scale	-.089		-.179
Only contribute an insignificant amount			-.108
Still intend to give	-.169		
Give to other nonprofit organizations	-.003	-.080	-.057
Give to other institutions where I obtained other degrees	-.104	.029	.047
Give to other institutions where spouse obtained degrees	.082	.145	
Frameworks of Consciousness			
Frameworks of Consciousness Scale	-.053	-.041	-.034
Not the school it was when I attended	-.078	-.062	.033
Differ with the policies	-.035	.014	-.014
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards			
Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards Scale	-.022	-.017	.005
Emphasis on diversity in mission	-.019	.017	.026
Insufficient diversity at all levels	-.073	-.054	-.032
Insufficient diversity in some levels	-.054	-.039	.004
Invitation to Participate			
Have not been asked to give	-.067	-.120	.003
Urgency and Effectiveness			
Gifts not needed	.017	.001	-.115
Youth Models and Experiences			
My student experience	-.155	-.163	-.145

APPENDIX C

COPY OF THE SURVEYS

■ Directions: Please use a dark (No. 2) pencil to complete this survey.

Section A - Experiential Characteristics

- 1. How many years did you attend [redacted]
1 2 3 4 more than 4
- 2. Which of the following [redacted] publications do you currently receive?
[redacted] info Insert/Other
Newsletters (such as [redacted] church bulletin insert
[redacted] None
[redacted] Annual Report Other _____
Academic Bulletin
3. Which of the following [redacted] web sites do you access?
[redacted] News [redacted] Alumni Online Community
[redacted] Home None
[redacted] Alumni Home Other _____
4. On which of the following groups have you served (past or present)?
Board of Trustees Business Advisory Council
[redacted] Foundation Center Advisory Councils (e.g., [redacted]
Alumni Board Center, [redacted] Center)
Campaign Committee None
[redacted] Advisory Board Other _____
5. How many on-campus [redacted] activities do you attend per year?
Examples: Homecoming, Graduation, President's Reception, Concerts,
Drama Productions, Athletic Events, Spiritual Events (excluding [redacted]
Church), Lectures (e.g., [redacted]
[redacted])
None 1 2 3 4 5+
6. Which of the following off-campus [redacted] activities or sponsored
activities do you usually attend each year?
Regional alumni gatherings North American Division Retirees
Socialize with [redacted] alumni ASI
friends in my area None
Camp meeting reunions Other _____
7. Indicate if you have received any of the following formal honors given by
[redacted]?
Honored Alumni President's/Dean's Award
Honorary Degree Distinguished Faculty Award
Presidential Citation Other _____

Survey of ██████████ University Alumni

8. I feel a sense of loyalty to ██████████

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------	-------------------

9. I would recommend attending ██████████ to others planning on university.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
----------------	-------	----------	-------------------

10. How do you think individuals in the following groups do or would respond to the statement: "██████████ has a positive reputation."

	Enthusiastically	Neutral	Negatively	No basis to judge
Yourself				
Among my family				
Among my friends				
Among other alumni				
In the local community				
Statewide				
Nationally				

11. To what extent should the following stakeholders support ██████████?

	Essential	Helpful	Optional	Not Needed
Alumni				
Board Members				
Business				
Church				
Community				
Faculty/Staff				
Government				
Other _____				

12. How much financial support do you think ██████████ needs from alumni?

Much	Some	Little	None
------	------	--------	------

13. How frequently does ██████████ ask you for financial support?

Often	Sometimes	Once	Never
-------	-----------	------	-------

If you have never been asked for support, skip to question 15.

14. When ██████████ asked you for financial support, how did the following methods of solicitation cause you to respond?

	Immediately Positive	Later Positive	Ignore	Negative Later Positive	Negative	Have Not Received
Letter						
Phone call						
Visit						
Publication						
Advertisement						
Other _____						

15. Other than ██████████ annually how many non-profit or charitable organizations do you support financially (e.g., United Way, local church)?

None	1	2	3-6	7+
------	---	---	-----	----

16. How much do you give financially to the following types of non-profits or charitable organizations? (Note all that apply)

	Much	Some	Little	None
Health agencies (e.g. Heart Association)				
Youth Agencies (e.g. YWCA, Boys Club)				
Arts/Cultural (e.g. museum, symphony)				
Education (e.g. school)				
Religion (e.g. church, missions)				
Environmental (e.g. Sierra Club)				
Social Services (e.g. Disaster/Emergency relief, United Way)				
Service Clubs (e.g. Rotary, Kiwanis)				
Other _____				

17. How much time do you volunteer at the following types of non-profits or charitable organizations? (Note all that apply)

	Much	Some	Little	None
Health agencies (e.g. Heart Association)				
Youth Agencies (e.g. YWCA, Boys Club)				
Arts/Cultural (e.g. museum, symphony)				
Education (e.g. school)				
Religion (e.g. church, missions)				
Environmental (e.g. Sierra Club)				
Social Services (e.g. Disaster/Emergency relief, United Way)				
Service Clubs (e.g. Rotary, Kiwanis)				
Other _____				

Section B

18a. In the left columns below, indicate how important the following reasons are for your giving or willingness to give financial support to [REDACTED]

18b. In the two right columns, indicate the three (3) Most and three (3) Least important reasons.

Very Somewhat Not Most Least
Important Important Important Important Important Important

Believe in the mission of [REDACTED]
 Receive the joy of giving, feels good
 Makes good business sense
 Desire to help bring about change
 Help the less fortunate
 Meaningful acceptance or recognition of my gifts
 Tax considerations
 Appeal of the materials requesting the gift
 Have available funds
 Set an example
 Philanthropy is an important part of my culture
 Fiscal stability of [REDACTED]
 Giving is a responsibility
 Guilt feelings
 Personal or spiritual commitment
 Influence of the people who solicited my gift
 Peer influence
 Match a gift or gifts made by others
 Challenge or encourage others to give
 Opportunity to honor an individual
 Ability to create a lasting memorial or legacy
 Give something back
 Help students finance their education as I was
 Community responsibility and civic pride
 Have family ties to the university
 Have a sense of loyalty to [REDACTED]
 Like the uniqueness of the project or the program
 Have been asked to give
 Need [REDACTED]'s type of university
 Have a sense of pride in partnering with [REDACTED]
 Respect for [REDACTED] volunteer leadership
 Respect for the current faculty of [REDACTED]
 Respect for the past faculty of [REDACTED]
 Regard for the administrative leadership of [REDACTED]
 Advance the excellence and reputation of [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED] needs funds
 Enhance the educational environment
 Wish to preserve academic environment
 Wish to preserve spiritual and moral environment
 Wish to preserve critical thinking environment

- Attitudes Towards Giving

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Most Important	Least Important
Involvement in programs and activities at [redacted]					
Religious affiliation of [redacted] as an Adventist university					
Believe [redacted] adequately prepared me for my career					
Expand [redacted]'s economic benefits to the community					
Immediate or past involvement in [redacted]'s fund-raising efforts					
Ability to designate how and where the funds will be used					
Serve on the board of trustees, the alumni board, an advisory council, or other official body of [redacted]					
Great interest in a specific program within [redacted] (e.g. scholarships, athletics, fine arts, faculty enrichment, religious or student life activities, building, centers, academic department)					
Other reasons that influence your giving to [redacted]?					
a. _____					
b. _____					
c. _____					

19a. In the left columns, how influential are the following factors for not contributing financial support to [redacted]?

19b. In the two right columns, indicate the three (3) Most and three (3) Least influential reasons.

	Deciding Factor	Major Influence	Somewhat Influential	Not a Consideration	Most Influential	Least Influential
Give or am loyal to other non-profit organizations						
Give or am loyal to other institutions where I obtained other degree/s						
Give or am loyal to other institutions where my spouse obtained his/her degree/s						
The emphasis on diversity in the [redacted] mission						
Sufficient diversity representation at all levels of [redacted] is not yet achieved						
Sufficient diversity representation in certain departments at [redacted] is not yet achieved						
The [redacted] family does not include me						
My student experience						
Differ with policies or the philosophical direction of [redacted]						
[redacted] is not the school it was when I attended						
My financial support is not needed						
Have not been asked to give						
Can only contribute an insignificant gift amount						
Intend to give, but have not yet						
I am unable to give due to other financial commitments (e.g. loans)						
Other reasons that deter your giving to [redacted]?						
a. _____						
b. _____						
c. _____

20. What best describes your giving to _____?

Continuously (76-100%)

Occasionally (11-30%)

Never (0%)

Regularly (31-75%)

Rarely (1-10%)

21. Many people decide to make their gifts based on input from others. What percent of your giving decisions to _____ was influenced by each of the following? (Have your percentages total to approximately 100%)

	100%	90%	75%	50%	25%	10%	0%	Not Applicable
Yourself								
Spouse								
Child								
Parent								
Other family member								
Close friend								
Pastor								
Attorney								
Accountant								
Business Partner								
Other _____								

22. How often do you contribute financially to any political parties or candidates (include both state and federal)?

Several times a year

Never

Annually

Once every few years

Other _____

If you do not contribute to any state or federal political parties or candidates, skip to question 24.

23. How much do you contribute to any political parties or candidates (include both state and federal)?

Considerable

A little

Some

None

24. Which of the following statements best describes your current beliefs?

Believe in God

Am uncertain about the existence of God (agnostic)

Do not believe in God (atheist)

25. Do you consider the religious practice of tithing as:

Obligatory and Important

Optional but Important

Obligatory but Not Important

Optional and Not Important

26. What was your religious preference while attending _____?

Adventist Other Christian Non-Christian None

27. What is your religious preference now?

Adventist Other Christian Non-Christian None

If you do not profess a religious affiliation now, skip to Section C on the back of this sheet.

28. How often do you attend religious worship services?

Daily Weekly Monthly Rarely Never

29. How often do you attend a formal Bible study or cell group?

Daily Weekly Monthly Rarely Never

30. How would you rate your current participation in activities centered on religious life?

(e.g., Christian Education-Vacation Bible School, Pathfinders, Ministries-Soup Kitchen,
Church Officer, Community Service)

Continually Involved Moderately Involved Not Involved

31. How much do you support the following church activities with offerings?

Much Some Little None

Denominational Global Outreach or Missions

Local Church Outreach or Ministries

Local Conference/Union/Region

Local Church K-12 education excluding tuition

Local Church Expenses

Independent Ministries

Please complete the back of this sheet.

Section C - Background Information

32. Birth year:

before 1919	1930-39	1950-59	1970 or later
1920-29	1940-49	1960-69	

33. Gender: Female Male

34. Total annual household income (before taxes):

less than \$26,000	\$51,000-75,000	\$101,000-\$200,000	\$301,000-\$500,000
\$26,000-\$50,000	\$76,000-\$100,000	\$201,000-\$300,000	\$501,000+

35. Marital Status:

Married Single Divorced/separated Widowed

If married:

a. From which of the following institutions did your spouse receive a degree (indicate all that apply)?

University

Other Adventist institution

Other private/public institution

None

b. When you and your spouse give contributions to how are the gifts usually made?

Individually

Jointly

Other

36. How many children do you have?

0 (skip to question 38)	2	4
1	3	5+

37. How many children are: (check all that apply)

None	1	2	3	4	5+
------	---	---	---	---	----

Living at home

Financial dependents

12 years old or under

13-18 years old

19-30 years old

31 years old or older

Alumni of

38. Do you have any other relatives (e.g., parents, siblings, grandchildren) who attended or graduated from

39. Employment status: (Indicate all that apply)

Full-time	Part-time	Retired	Self-employed	Not employed
-----------	-----------	---------	---------------	--------------

40. Ethnic background:

African-American	Native American/Alaska native
Asian (including sub-continent Asia)	Pacific Islander
Caucasian	Multi-ethnic
Hispanic	Other

41. First degree received

a. Type of degree

Associate	Baccalaureate
-----------	---------------

b. Place

	Other Adventist	Other private/public
--	-----------------	----------------------

c. Year of graduation

before 1950	1960-69	1980-89
1950-59	1970-79	1990+

d. Approximate grade point average

<2.50	2.50-2.99	3.00-3.49	3.50+
-------	-----------	-----------	-------

42. Second degree received

a. Type of degree

Baccalaureate	Masters	Ed Specialist	Doctorate
---------------	---------	---------------	-----------

b. Place

	Other Adventist	Other private/public
--	-----------------	----------------------

c. Year of graduation

before 1950	1960-69	1980-89
1950-59	1970-79	1990+

d. Approximate grade point average

<2.50	2.50-2.99	3.00-3.49	3.50+
-------	-----------	-----------	-------

43. Third (or highest) degree received

a. Type of degree

Masters	Ed Specialist	Doctorate
---------	---------------	-----------

b. Place

	Other Adventist	Other private/public
--	-----------------	----------------------

c. Year of graduation

before 1950	1960-69	1980-89
1950-59	1970-79	1990+

d. Approximate grade point average

<2.50	2.50-2.99	3.00-3.49	3.50+
-------	-----------	-----------	-------

For Office Use

- Directions: Please use a dark (No. 2) pencil to complete this survey.

Section A - Experiential Characteristics

- 1. How many years did you attend [redacted]?
 1 2 3 4 more than 4
- 2. Which of the following [redacted] publications do you currently receive?
 [redacted] Calendar
 School and Departmental None
 Newsletters Other _____
3. Which of the following [redacted] web sites do you access?
 PR Listserv ([redacted] e-mail) None
 [redacted] Alumni Webpage
 [redacted] News Web page Other _____
4. On which of the following groups have you served (past or present)?
 Board of Trustees Business Advisory Council
 Center Advisory Councils President's Circle
 Alumni Board [redacted] Executive Committee
 Campaign Committee None
 [redacted] Other _____
 Center Community Council
5. How many on-campus [redacted] activities do you attend per year?
 Examples: Homecoming, Graduation, Athletic Events, Spiritual Events
 (e.g. [redacted]), [redacted] Events, International
 Student Week, Lectures (e.g. [redacted])
 None 1 2 3 4 5+
6. Which of the following off-campus [redacted] activities or sponsored activities do you usually attend each year?
 Regional alumni gatherings North American Division Retirees
 Socialize with [redacted] alumni ASI
 friends in my area None
 Camp meeting reunions Other _____
7. Indicate if you have received any of the following formal honors given by [redacted]:
 Honored Alumni Faculty Award for Teaching
 Honorary Degree Excellence
 President's Medallion [redacted] Medallion
 Teacher of the Year Other _____
 Advisor of the Year

Survey of ██████████ University Alumni

8. I feel a sense of loyalty to ██████████

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

9. I would recommend attending ██████████ to others planning on university.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

10. How do you think individuals in the following groups do or would respond to the statement: "██████████ has a positive reputation."

Enthusiastically Neutral Negatively No basis to judge

Yourself
Among my family
Among my friends
Among other alumni
In the local community
Statewide
Nationally

11. To what extent should the following stakeholders support ██████████

Essential Helpful Optional Not Needed

Alumni
Board Members
Business
Church
Community
Faculty/Staff
Government
Other _____

12. How much financial support do you think ██████████ needs from alumni?

Much Some Little None

13. How frequently does ██████████ ask you for financial support?

Often Sometimes Once Never

If you have never been asked for support, skip to question 15.

14. When ██████████ asked you for financial support, how did the following methods of solicitation cause you to respond?

Immediately Positive	Later Positive	Ignore	Negative, Later Positive	Negative	Have Not Received
Letter					
Phone call					
Visit					
Publication					
Advertisement					
Other _____					

15. Other than ██████████, annually how many non-profit or charitable organizations do you support financially (e.g., United Way, local church)?

None 1 2 3-6 7+

16. How much do you give financially to the following types of non-profits or charitable organizations? (Note all that apply)

Much Some Little None

Health agencies (e.g. Heart Association)
Youth Agencies (e.g. YWCA, Boys Club)
Arts/Cultural (e.g. museum, symphony)
Education (e.g. school)
Religion (e.g. church, missions)
Environmental (e.g. Sierra Club)
Social Services (e.g. Disaster/Emergency relief, United Way)
Service Clubs (e.g. Rotary, Kiwanis)
Other _____

17. How much time do you volunteer at the following types of non-profits or charitable organizations? (Note all that apply)

Much Some Little None

Health agencies (e.g. Heart Association)
Youth Agencies (e.g. YWCA, Boys Club)
Arts/Cultural (e.g. museum, symphony)
Education (e.g. school)
Religion (e.g. church, missions)
Environmental (e.g. Sierra Club)
Social Services (e.g. Disaster/Emergency relief, United Way)
Service Clubs (e.g. Rotary, Kiwanis)
Other _____

Section B - Attitudes Towards Giving

18a. In the left columns below, indicate how important the following reasons are for your giving or willingness to give financial support to [redacted]

18b. In the two right columns, indicate the three (3) Most and three (3) Least important reasons.

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Most Important	Least Important
Believe in the mission of [redacted]					
Receive the joy of giving, feels good					
Makes good business sense					
Desire to help bring about change					
Help the less fortunate					
Meaningful acceptance or recognition of my gifts					
Tax considerations					
Appeal of the materials requesting the gift					
Have available funds					
Set an example					
Philanthropy is an important part of my culture					
Fiscal stability of [redacted]					
Giving is a responsibility					
Guilt feelings					
Personal or spiritual commitment					
Influence of the people who solicited my gift					
Peer influence					
Match a gift or gifts made by others					
Challenge or encourage others to give					
Opportunity to honor an individual					
Ability to create a lasting memorial or legacy					
Give something back					
Help students finance their education as I was					
Community responsibility and civic pride					
Have family ties to the university					
Have a sense of loyalty to [redacted]					
Like the uniqueness of the project or the program					
Have been asked to give					
Need [redacted] type of university					
Have a sense of pride in partnering with [redacted]					
Respect for [redacted] volunteer leadership					
Respect for the current faculty of [redacted]					
Respect for the past faculty of [redacted]					
Regard for the administrative leadership of [redacted]					
Advance the excellence and reputation of [redacted]					
[redacted] needs funds					
Enhance the educational environment					
Wish to preserve academic environment					
Wish to preserve spiritual and moral environment					
Wish to preserve critical thinking environment					

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Most Important	Least Important
Involvement in programs and activities at [redacted]					
Religious affiliation of [redacted] as an Adventist university					
Believe [redacted] adequately prepared me for my career					
Expand [redacted] economic benefits to the community					
Immediate or past involvement in [redacted] fund-raising efforts					
Ability to designate how and where the funds will be used					
Serve on the board of trustees, the alumni board, an advisory council, or other official body of [redacted]					
Great interest in a specific program within [redacted] (e.g. scholarships, athletics, fine arts, faculty enrichment, religious or student life activities, building, centers, academic department)					
Other reasons that influence your giving to [redacted]?					
a. _____					
b. _____					
c. _____					

19a. In the left columns, how influential are the following factors for not contributing financial support to [redacted]?

19b. In the two right columns, indicate the three (3) Most and three (3) Least influential reasons.

	Deciding Factor	Major Influence	Somewhat Influential	Not a Consideration	Most Influential	Least Influential
Give or am loyal to other non-profit organizations						
Give or am loyal to other institutions where I obtained other degree/s						
Give or am loyal to other institutions where my spouse obtained his/her degree/s						
The emphasis on diversity in the [redacted] mission						
Sufficient diversity representation at all levels of [redacted] is not yet achieved						
Sufficient diversity representation in certain departments at [redacted] is not yet achieved						
The [redacted] family does not include me						
My student experience						
Differ with policies or the philosophical direction of [redacted]						
[redacted] is not the school it was when I attended						
My financial support is not needed						
Have not been asked to give						
Can only contribute an insignificant gift amount						
Intend to give, but have not yet						
I am unable to give due to other financial commitments (e.g. loans)						
Other reasons that deter your giving to [redacted]?						
a. _____						
b. _____						
c. _____						

20. What best describes your giving to [redacted]?

Continuously (76-100%)

Occasionally (11-30%)

Never (0%)

Regularly (31-75%)

Rarely (1-10%)

21. Many people decide to make their gifts based on input from others. What percent of your giving decisions to [redacted] was influenced by each of the following? (Have your percentages total to approximately 100%)

	100%	90%	75%	50%	25%	10%	0%	Not Applicable
Yourself								
Spouse								
Child								
Parent								
Other family member								
Close friend								
Pastor								
Attorney								
Accountant								
Business Partner								
Other _____								

22. How often do you contribute financially to any political parties or candidates (include both state and federal)?

Several times a year

Never

Annually

Once every few years

Other _____

If you do not contribute to any state or federal political parties or candidates, skip to question 24.

23. How much do you contribute to any political parties or candidates (include both state and federal)?

Considerable

A little

Some

None

24. Which of the following statements best describes your current beliefs?

Believe in God

Am uncertain about the existence of God (agnostic)

Do not believe in God (atheist)

25. Do you consider the religious practice of tithing as:

Obligatory and Important

Optional but Important

Obligatory but Not Important

Optional and Not Important

26. What was your religious preference while attending _____?

Adventist Other Christian Non-Christian None

27. What is your religious preference now?

Adventist Other Christian Non-Christian None

If you do not profess a religious affiliation now, skip to Section C on the back of this sheet.

28. How often do you attend religious worship services?

Daily Weekly Monthly Rarely Never

29. How often do you attend a formal Bible study or cell group?

Daily Weekly Monthly Rarely Never

30. How would you rate your current participation in activities centered on religious life?
(e.g., Christian Education-Vacation Bible School, Pathfinders, Ministries-Soup Kitchen,
Church Officer, Community Service)

Continually Involved Moderately Involved Not Involved

31. How much do you support the following church activities with offerings?

 Much Some Little None

Denominational Global Outreach or Missions

Local Church Outreach or Ministries

Local Conference/Union/Region

Local Church K-12 education excluding tuition

Local Church Expenses

Independent Ministries

Please complete the back of this sheet.

Section C - Background Information

32. Birth year:
 before 1919 1930-39 1950-59 1970 or later
 1920-29 1940-49 1960-69

33. Gender: Female Male

34. Total annual household income (before taxes):
 less than \$26,000 \$51,000-75,000 \$101,000-\$200,000 \$301,000-\$500,000
 \$26,000-\$50,000 \$76,000-\$100,000 \$201,000-\$300,000 \$501,000+

35. Marital Status:
 Married Single Divorced/separated Widowed
 If married:
 a. From which of the following institutions did your spouse receive a degree (indicate all that apply)?
 University
 Other Adventist institution
 Other private/public institution
 None
 b. When you and your spouse give contributions to , how are the gifts usually made?
 Individually
 Jointly
 Other

36. How many children do you have?
 0 (skip to question 38) 2 4
 1 3 5+

37. How many children are: (check all that apply)
 None 1 2 3 4 5+

Living at home
 Financial dependents
 12 years old or under
 13-18 years old
 19-30 years old
 31 years old or older
 Alumni of

38. Do you have any other relatives (e.g., parents, siblings, grandchildren) who attended or graduated from ?

39. Employment status: (Indicate all that apply)
 Full-time Part-time Retired Self-employed Not employed

40. Ethnic background:
 African-American Native American/Alaska native
 Asian (including sub-continent Asia) Pacific Islander
 Caucasian Multi-ethnic
 Hispanic Other

41. First degree received
 a. Type of degree
 Associate Baccalaureate
 b. Place
 Other Adventist Other private/public
 c. Year of graduation
 before 1950 1960-69 1980-89
 1950-59 1970-79 1990+
 d. Approximate grade point average
 <2.50 2.50-2.99 3.00-3.49 3.50+

42. Second degree received
 a. Type of degree
 Baccalaureate Masters Ed Specialist Doctorate
 b. Place
 Other Adventist Other private/public
 c. Year of graduation
 before 1950 1960-69 1980-89
 1950-59 1970-79 1990+
 d. Approximate grade point average
 <2.50 2.50-2.99 3.00-3.49 3.50+

43. Third (or highest) degree received
 a. Type of degree
 Masters Ed Specialist Doctorate
 b. Place
 Other Adventist Other private/public
 c. Year of graduation
 before 1950 1960-69 1980-89
 1950-59 1970-79 1990+
 d. Approximate grade point average
 <2.50 2.50-2.99 3.00-3.49 3.50+

For Office Use

APPENDIX D

CORRESPONDENCE

[Letterhead]

March 14, 2005

Dear Alumnus/Alumna:

At [university name] we are committed to serving the needs and interests of both present students and our alumni, as well as fostering mission critical research. Carol Bradfield, a doctoral student at Andrews is surveying alumni from [university name] to gain a better understanding of their present status and experience.

This study will provide a profile of graduates and their attitudes that will be vital to [university name]'s successful future. The University has discussed the project from its inception with Carol, the Development staff have reviewed the survey very carefully. I endorse the project, and encourage you to complete and return the survey. Thank you in advance for sharing both your time and your opinions.

If you are concerned about privacy, let me assure you that the information you send will remain completely confidential. Neither I nor my staff will know who is selected nor who responds. Like you, Carol is an alumnus and a person of integrity who has your best interests at heart. She is adhering to Andrews strict research protocol policies. In addition, she has chosen to work through the Center for Statistical Services who will receive and process the data, as an extra layer of protection for respondents. Only group and aggregate data processed from the survey will be released.

Thank you for contributing to improvement and progress at your alma mater.

Yours sincerely,

[name}
President

[Letterhead]

March 10, 2005

Dear Alumnus/Alumna:

At [university name] we are committed to our mission, that includes serving our students and alumni better, and seeking knowledge. For this reason we have agreed to participate in a special study conducted by [qualifier], Carol Bradfield. She is completing a doctoral study at [university name]. Her dissertation includes a confidential survey of our alumni to gain a better understanding of their present status and experience.

This study will provide a profile of graduates and their attitudes that will help the university and help us to be responsive to you. [name of person], Vice President for Advancement, his staff and I have reviewed the survey carefully. We wholeheartedly endorse the project. We strongly encourage you to complete and return the survey, thus giving us two anonymous gifts we always treasure - your time and your opinion.

If you are concerned about privacy, let me assure you that the information you send will remain completely confidential. We will not know who is selected nor who responds. Carol is adhering to Andrews' strict research protocol policies. In addition, she has chosen to work through the Center for Statistical Services which will receive and process the data, as an extra layer of protection for respondents. Only group and aggregate data processed from the survey will be in the dissertation and given to us. We plan to share a summary of the results with you.

Thank you for helping us continue to create the transformational experience of a lifetime at your alma mater.

Yours sincerely,

[name]

President

Thank You!

Many thanks to the over 225 individuals who have completed and returned their Alumni survey.

THERE IS STILL TIME TO BE INCLUDED IN THIS STUDY!

If you have not returned a survey, please complete and send in the form right away. The more alumni that respond, the more meaningful the results will be.

If you need another survey form or additional information, please contact the Center for Statistical Services at 1-800-253-2874, Ext. 6214 and ask for the Alumni Survey.

☐ - Or check the box and return this card to *Center for Statistical Services, School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI 49104* and another survey will be sent to you.

Again, thank you very much!

Carol Bradfield, Graduate Student, Andrews University

Andrews University
Center for Statistical Services
Berrien Springs, MI 49104-0109
Bradfield

University Alumni Survey

[Personal Letterhead]

[date]

[name]

[address]

Dear [name]:

You are one of approximately 600 [name of university] graduates selected at random to participate in a study of philanthropy in Seventh-day Adventist higher education. This study is description of the demographic, experiential and attitudinal characteristics of alumni donors and non-donors. Your response will contribute to the philanthropic literature, provide your alma mater with current information and assist in the completion of my doctoral dissertation at Andrews University.

As a stakeholder, **your** opinion counts and can make an immeasurable difference. Though I am sure you are a very busy person, I hope that you will find a half hour during the next two weeks to fill out the enclosed survey. You received this survey as a degree holding graduate of [name of university] or one of its predecessors, [names]. The three sections of the survey address experiential characteristics, attitudes of giving, and background information. Please answer the survey questions for yourself using a dark (no.2) pencil. For your convenience a pencil is enclosed. After completion, return the survey in the enclosed reply paid postage envelope. Your participation is, of course, completely voluntary and returning the completed survey will be understood as your consent to participate in this study.

Know that your answers will be kept completely confidential. The **only** reporting of data will be by group. There is no known risk to you for your involvement. To ensure confidentiality, the reply paid postage envelope goes directly to the Center for Statistical Services in Michigan. The Center has a perfect track record of maintaining anonymity and has conducted several telephone surveys on sensitive issues for Seventh-day Adventist conferences and other institutions in order to preserve an independent and safe environment for respondents. If you have any questions about confidentiality and authority please feel free to contact [name], Director, Center for Statistical Services at [phone number].

Please feel free to contact me by letter, [address] e-mail [address] or phone [number]. In order to keep you informed, the results of the study will be reported in university publications.

Thank you for your assistance and for the gifts of time and opinion that will help your alma mater.

Gratefully,

Carol Ann Bradfield
Graduate Student

REFERENCE LIST

REFERENCE LIST

- Andrews, F. E. (1950). *Philanthropic giving*. New York: Sage.
- Arnold, R. (2004). *Meet Teresa's wealthy friends: The Heinz Foundations and the Kerry campaign*. Retrieved April 19, 2004, from <http://www.humaneventsonline.com/article.php>
- Ashcraft, R. F. (1995). *An analysis of alumni donation and nondonation related to selected personal, involvement and outcome factors*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University.
- Bartlett, L. R. (1989). *The role of institutional advancement in Seventh-day Adventist colleges in North America*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Berdie, D. R., & Anderson, J. F. (1974). *Questionnaires: Design and use*. Metuchen: Scarecrow Press.
- Bielefeld, W., Rooney, P., & Steinberg, K. (2005). How do need, capacity, geography, and politics influence giving? In A. C. Brooks (Ed.), *Gifts of time and money* (pp. 127-157). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bissell, L. J. (1990). *Seventh-day Adventist secondary school board members' responsibilities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA.
- Briechele, P. (2001). *Alumnae supporting higher education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York, Buffalo.
- Brittingham, B. E., & Pezzullo, T. R. (1990). *The campus green: Fund raising in higher education* (No. 0-9623882-8-9). Washington, DC: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.
- Buchanan, P. M. (Ed.). (2000). *Handbook of institutional advancement* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: CASE.

- Buchanan, W. W. (1993). *A study of predictor variables for alumni giving in a school of engineering and technology using a phonathon as a vehicle for analysis (Fund-Raising)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Burgess-Getts, L. (1992). *Alumni as givers: An analysis of donor nondonor behavior at a comprehensive I institution*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA.
- Burnett, M. D., Peterson, E. T., Wright, N. D., & Parsons, R. J. (1974). *A survey of attitudes of Brigham Young University alumni*. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Survey Research Center.
- Capeloto, A. (2003). *Economic troubles trickle down: Nonprofits go elsewhere as usual sources squeezed*. Retrieved February 7, 2003, from http://www.freep.com/news/metro/give5_20030205.htm
- Carnegie. (1993). *The gospel of wealth*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Center on Philanthropy.
- Cascione, G. L. (2000). *Religion, motivation, and philanthropy to higher education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Caulkins, J. P., Cole, J., Hardoby, M., & Keyser, D. J. (2002). *Intelligent giving: Insights and strategies for higher education donors*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- The Center on Philanthropy. (1999). *Giving USA 1999*. Indianapolis: AAFRC Trust for Philanthropy.
- The Center on Philanthropy. (2000). *Giving USA 2000*. Indianapolis: AAFRC Trust for Philanthropy.
- The Center on Philanthropy. (2001a). *The fundraising school syllabus*. Indianapolis: The Center on Philanthropy.
- The Center on Philanthropy. (2001b). *Giving USA 2001*. Indianapolis: AAFRC Trust for Philanthropy.
- The Center on Philanthropy. (2002). *Giving USA 2002*. Indianapolis: AAFRC Trust for Philanthropy.
- The Center on Philanthropy. (2003). *Giving USA 2003*. Indianapolis: AAFRC Trust for Philanthropy.

- The Center on Philanthropy. (2004). *Giving USA 2004*. Indianapolis: AAFRC Trust for Philanthropy.
- The Center on Philanthropy. (2005). *Giving USA 2005*. Indianapolis: AAFRC Trust for Philanthropy.
- The Center on Philanthropy. (2006). *Giving USA 2006*. Indianapolis: AAFRC Trust for Philanthropy.
- The Center on Philanthropy. (2007). *Giving USA 2007*. Indianapolis: AAFRC Trust for Philanthropy.
- Clotfelter, C. T. (2001). Who are the alumni donors? Giving by two generations of alumni from selective colleges. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 12(2), 119-138.
- Clotfelter, C. T. (2003). Alumni giving to elite private colleges and universities. *Economics of Education Review*, 22(2), 109-120.
- Cook, W. B., & Lasher, W. F. (1996). Toward a theory of fund raising in higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 20(1), 33-51.
- Cristanello, D. A. (1992). *Characteristics describing giving behavior of alumni of three historically Roman Catholic colleges: Canisius College, D'Youville College and St. John Fisher College*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Dial, D. D. (1993). *The role status and qualifications of the chief advancement officer in selected institutions of higher education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, La Sierra University, Riverside, CA.
- Dudley, R. L., Fogelquist, G., & Cummings, D., Jr. (1982). *A study of factors relating to tithe and mission giving in the Washington Conference of Seventh-day Adventists*. Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Dudley, R. L., & Melgosa, A. (1985). *A study of attitudes toward giving among Seventh-day Adventists in the North American Division*. Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Ferguson, J. E. (1981). *Giving more than a damn: A study of household and individual charitable contributions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan.

- File, K. M., & Prince, R. A. (1995). Cause-related marketing, philanthropy, and the arts. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 5(3), 249-260.
- Gaona, S. (1992). *Trustee and trusteeship of selected private universities and colleges in the United States of America and Canada*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA.
- Gibbons, L. (1992). *Philanthropy in higher education: Motivations of major donors to two Utah universities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, Salt Lake City, UT.
- Gladwell, M. (2000). *The tipping point*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Grace, K. S., & Wendroff, A. L. (2001). *High impact philanthropy: How donors, boards, and nonprofit organizations can transform communities*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Grohar, A. H. (1989). *An assessment of effective fund-raising policies used at private, church-related undergraduate colleges*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Gustavsson, J. A. (2000). *Institutional activities in international higher education: An assessment of advancement strategies used at selected small church-related colleges and universities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Haddad, F. D., Jr. (1986). *An analysis of the characteristics of alumni donors and non-donors at Butler University*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, Morgantown.
- Havens, J. J., O'Herlihy, M. A., & Schervish, P. G. (2006). Charitable giving: How much, by whom, to what, and how? In W. W. Powell & R. Steinberg (Eds.), *The non-profit sector: A research handbook* (pp. 542-567). New Haven: Yale University.
- Havens, J. J., & Schervish, P. G. (1999). *Millionaires and the millennium: New estimates of the forthcoming wealth transfer and the prospects for a golden age of philanthropy*. Retrieved December 25, 2003, from http://www.bc.edu/research/cwp/meta-elements/pdf/m_m.pdf

- Havens, J. J., & Schervish, P. G. (2001). The identification theory, financial security, and the allocation of transfers between family and philanthropic organizations. A paper prepared for the Center for Retirement Research "The role and impact of gifts and estates: October 22-23, 2001. Woodstock, Vermont. Social Welfare Research Institute, Boston College.
- Hopkins, E. H. (Ed.). (1958, February 27-March 1). *The Advancement of understanding and support of higher education*. Paper presented at the A Conference on Organizational Principles and Patterns of College and University Relations, White Sulphur Springs, WV.
- Howell, D. C. (2002). *Statistical methods for psychology* (5th ed.). Pacific Grove: Thompson Learning, Inc.
- Hunter, C. S. (1997). *A study of the relationships between alumni giving and selected characteristics of alumni donors of Livingstone College*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fayetteville State University, Fayetteville. LA.
- Jarrell, A. (2004). Full tilt: Private higher education's increasingly "wicked problem" might require saintly solutions. *Currents*, 30(6), 21-27.
- Kaminski, A. (2002). Women as philanthropists. In M. J. Worth (Ed.), *New strategies for educational fund raising* (pp. 187-196). Westport: Praeger Publishers.
- Kaplan, A. E. (Ed.). (2002). *2001 voluntary support of education*. New York: Council for Aid to Education.
- Kaplan, A. E. (Ed.). (2003). *2002 voluntary support of education*. New York: Council of Aid to Education.
- Kaplan, A. E. (Ed.). (2004). *2003 voluntary support of education*. New York: Council for Aid to Education.
- Kaplan, A. E. (Ed.). (2005). *2004 voluntary support of education*. New York: Council for Aid to Education.
- Kaplan, A. E. (Ed.). (2006). *2005 voluntary support of education*. New York: Council of Aid to Education.
- Kaplan, A.E. (2007, February 21). *Contributions to colleges and universities up by 9.1 percent to \$28 billion; Strong growth driven by personal giving*. Retrieved January 20, 2009, from <http://www.cae.org/content/pdf/VSE.2006.Press.Release.pdf>

- Kaplan, A. E. (Ed.). (2008). *2007 voluntary support of education*. New York: Council for Aid to Education.
- Keenan, J. E. (1994). *An investigation of different motivations for donating to athletics between alumni and non-alumni donors*. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Long Beach.
- Kelly, K. S. (1991). *Fund raising and public relations A critical analysis*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kelly, K. S. (1994). *Building fund-raising theory: An empirical test of four models of practice*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Center on Philanthropy.
- Kelly, K. S. (1997). From motivation to mutual understanding: Shifting the domain of donor research. In D. F. Burlingame (Ed.), *Critical issues in fundraising* (pp. 139-162). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Kelly, K. S. (2002). The state of fund-raising theory and research. In M. J. Worth (Ed.), *New strategies for educational fund raising* (pp. 39-55). Westport: Praeger.
- Knott, R. (1992). *Makings of a philanthropic fund raiser: The instructive example of Milton Murray*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Koole, R. S. (1981). *A study of financially supportive and financially nonsupportive alumni of Los Angeles Baptist College*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo.
- Korvas, R. J. (1984). *The relationship of selected alumni characteristics and attitudes to alumni financial support at a private college*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Kansas City.
- Leslie, L. L., & Ramey, G. (1988). Donor behavior and voluntary support for higher education institutions. *Journal of Higher Education*, 59(2), 115-131.
- Maude, M. R. (2002, August). *Older donors give more (Partners Advisory Series)*. Retrieved March 4, 2003 from Partners in Philanthropy, 2003, from <http://www.develop-net.com/adv-0802.html>
- Monks, J. (2003). Patterns of giving to one's alma mater among young graduates from selective institutions. *Economics of Education Review*, 22(2), 121-130.

- Montgomery, D. (2004, March 27). The McDonald's billionaire who gave it all away. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved April 4, 2004, from <http://www.smh.com.au/cgi-bin/common/popupPrintArticle>
- Myers, J. A. T., & Mallaboone, E. H. G. (2001). Significant difference. *Currents*, 28(8), 41-44.
- Newell, E. P. (2005). High rise: Well-funded higher education institutions help societies soar. *Currents*, 31(2), 63,64.
- Nichols, J. E. (2002). The impact of demographics. In M. J. Worth (Ed.), *New strategies for educational fund raising* (pp. 179-186). Westport: Praeger.
- Nicolanti, D. R. (1991). *Characteristics, experiences, attitudes, and other factors related to alumni who provide financial support to their podiatry colleges*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, Kent, OH.
- Nirschel, R. J. (1997). *Charitable giving as obligation or option: An analysis of Cuban alumni and Jewish alumni at a private research university*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, Coral Gables.
- Oates, M. J. (1994). *Saint Katharine Drexel: Salvation, education, and philanthropy* (Vol. 30). Indianapolis: The Center on Philanthropy.
- Odendahl, T. (Ed.). (1987). *America's wealthy and the future of foundations*. New York: Foundation Center.
- Odendahl, T. (1990). *Charity begins at home: Generosity and self-interest among the philanthropic elite*. New York: Basic Books.
- Oglesby, R. A. (1991). *Age, student involvement, and other characteristics of alumni donors and alumni non-donors of Southwest Baptist University*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia.
- Palmer, T. (2003). Forever in your debt. *Currents*, 29(1), 31-33.
- Panas, J. (1984). *Mega gifts who gives them, who gets them*. Chicago: Bonus Books.
- Pauner, G. A. (1996). *Marketing Seventh-day Adventist higher education in Southeast Asia*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.

- Pepin, J. (2005). Venture capitalists and entrepreneurs become venture philanthropists. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 10(3), 165-173.
- Perlman, J. (2004). *Former President Clinton urges private philanthropy in May Worth magazine*. Retrieved April 19, 2004, from <http://www.marketwire.com/mw/release>
- Pezzullo, T. R., & Brittingham, B. E. (1993). Characteristics of donors. In M. Worth (Ed.), *Educational fund raising: Principles and practice* (pp. 31-38). Phoenix: Oryx Press.
- Pizarro, M. E. R. (1985). *Leadership and finances for Seventh-day Adventist colleges*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loma Linda University, Loma Linda, CA.
- Powell, W. W., & Steinberg, R. (Eds.). (2006). *The Nonprofit sector: A research handbook* (2nd ed.). New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Prince, R. A., & File, K. M. (1994). *The seven faces of philanthropy: A new approach to cultivating major donors*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Richardson, L. (2003, April 10). A fund-raiser who bridges racial borders. *The New York Times*. Retrieved April 14, 2004, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/04/nyregion/10PROF.html>
- Roda, A. P. (1972). *Financing Seventh-day Adventist institutions of higher education in the United States, 1959-60 through 1969-70*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Rooney, P. M. (2006). Four trends in giving. *Philanthropy Matters*, 14(2), 12,13.
- Rooney, P. M. (2007). Individual giving. In D. R. Young (Ed.), *Financing nonprofits: Putting theory into practice* (pp. 23-44). Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- Rooney, P. M., Steinberg, K. S., & Schervish, P. G. (2001). A methodological comparison of giving surveys: Indiana as a test case. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30(3), 551-568.
- Rooney, P. M., Mesch, D. J., Chin, W., & Steinberg, K. S. (2005). The effects of race, gender, and survey methodologies on giving in the US. *Economics Letters*, 86, 173-180.

- Ryan, P. C. (1990). *A cross-cultural study of philanthropic attitudes of graduate students: A case study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, University Park.
- Ryan, R. R. (1997). *Impact of donor motivations and characteristics on giving to higher education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, Norman.
- Sargeant, A., & Jay, E. (2004). *Building donor loyalty: The fundraiser's guide to increasing lifetime value*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sargeant, A., & Kahler, J. (1999). Returns on fundraising expenditures in the voluntary sector. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 10(1), 5-19.
- Schervish, P. G. (1997a). Inclination, obligation, and association: What we know and what we need to learn about donor motivation. In D. F. Burlingame (Ed.), *Critical issues in fundraising* (pp. 110-138). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Schervish, P. G. (1997b, Summer). Major donors, major motives: The people and purposes behind major gifts. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, 16, 85-112.
- Schervish, P. G. (2006). Philanthropy's Janus-faced potential: the dialectic of care and negligence donors face. In W. Damon & S. Verducci (Eds.), *Taking philanthropy seriously: Beyond noble intentions to responsible giving* (pp. 175-187). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Schervish, P. G., Benz, O., Dulany, P., Murphy, T. B., & Salett, S. (1993). *Taking giving seriously*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Center on Philanthropy.
- Schervish, P. G., Coutsoukis, P. E., & Havens, J. J. (1998). *Social participation and charitable giving revisited: Replication of a multivariate analysis*. Center on Wealth and Philanthropy, Boston College.
- Schervish, P. G., & Havens, J. J. (1997). Social participation and charitable giving: a multivariate analysis. *Voluntas: International journal of voluntary and nonprofit organizations*, 8(3), 235-260.
- Schervish, P. G., & Havens, J. J. (2000). *The modern medici: Patterns, motivations and giving strategies of the wealthy*. Paper presented at the What's 'New' About the New Philanthropy, Los Angeles, CA.

- Schervish, P. G., & Havens, J. J. (2001). *The Boston area diary study and the moral citizenship of care*. Unpublished manuscript, Chesnut Hill, MA.
- Schervish, P. G., & Havens, J. J. (2002). *The mind of the millionaire: Findings from a national survey on wealth with responsibility*. Boston: Boston College.
- Schervish, P. G., & Hermann, A. (1988). *The study on wealth and philanthropy: Final report*. Chestnut Hill: Social Welfare Research Institute.
- Shifrin, T. (2003, May). *Charities fail to nurture major donors*. Retrieved January 18, 2009, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2003/may/15/charities.fundraising>.
- Smelser, N. J., & Baltes, P. B. (Eds.). (2001). *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences* (Vol. 17). New York: Elsevier.
- Smith, L. J. (1998). *Factors which promote or limit minority alumni support of a predominantly White private church-associated university*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Marquette University, Milwaukee. WI.
- Snyder, R. A. (1993). *An analysis of charitable giving practices of recent optometry alumni at selected institutions and their alumni donor support*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University. Lansing.
- Steinberg, R., & Wilhelm, M. (2003). *Patterns of giving in COPPS 2001*. Paper presented at the Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action (ARNOVA), Denver, CO.
- Stockton-Chilson, K. E. (2003). *A comparative study of giving and volunteering patterns among adults with Seventh-day Adventist and other Christian religious identities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI.
- Sturtevant, W. T. (1997). *The artful journey: Cultivating and soliciting the major gift*. Chicago: Bonus Books.
- Tamari, M. (1995). *The challenge of wealth*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson.
- Thomas, J.A. (2005). *The relationship between personal and social growth and involvement in college and subsequent alumni giving*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Memphis.
- Toscano, J. (2003). *To give ... and to receive: Examining the 'exchange' process*. Retrieved March 8, 2003, from <http://charitychannel.com>

- Van Horn, D. L. (2002). *Satisfaction with the undergraduate experience as motivation for smaller dollar alumni donations*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
- Violand, L. T. (1998). *An analysis of donors of \$10,000 or more to the \$75 million campaign at The George Washington University*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The George Washington University. Washington, DC
- Wedgeworth, R. (2000). Donor relations as public relations: Toward a philosophy of fund-raising. *Library Trends*, 48(3), 530-540.
- Weiner, B. (1992). *Human motivation; Metaphors, theories, and research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Weiner, S. (2001). *Giving and volunteering in the United States*. Waldorf, MD: The Independent Sector.
- Weitzman, M. S., Jalandoni, N. T., Lampkin, L. M., & Pollak, T. H. (Eds.). (2001). *The new nonprofit almanac and desk reference: The essential facts and figures for managers, researchers, and volunteers*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wetta, T. C. (1990). *A study of characteristics and attitudes which distinguish financial donors from nondonors among baccalaureate graduates of selected Kansas independent colleges*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston College.
- Wolpert, J. (1997). The demographics of giving patterns. In D. F. Burlingame (Ed.), *Critical issues in fund raising* (pp. 75-80). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Worth, M. (1993). *Educational fund raising principles and practice*. Phoenix: Oryx Press.

VITA

CAROL ANN BRADFIELD
Riverside, CA

FORMAL EDUCATION

2009	Doctor of Philosophy in Leadership Candidate
School of Education, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI
1980	Master of Arts in Teaching (English & Education)
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI
1974	Bachelor of Arts (English & Mathematics)
Pacific Union College, Avondale Campus, Angwin, CA
1974	Diploma of Secondary Education
Avondale College, Cooranbong, NSW, Australia

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2001 - present	Associate Vice President, University Advancement
La Sierra University, Riverside, CA
1998 -2001	Director, Development and Industrial Relations,
College of Engineering and Technology, NAU, Arizona
1997 -1998	Director of Grants and Industrial Relations
College of Engineering and Technology, NAU, Arizona
1995 - 1996	Secretary, Allied Health Department
Contract Teacher, School of Business
Andrews University
1990 - 1994	Head of English and Career Guidance Officer,
Betikama Adventist High School, Solomon Islands
1989	Senior English Teacher
Betikama Adventist High School, Solomon Islands
1983 - 1988	Teacher/Coordinator, Multi-grade elementary/middle school,
Lubumbashi, Democratic Republic of Congo
1982 - 1983	Textbook Buyer, Andrews University
1976 - 1982	General Book Buyer, Andrews University