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ABSTRACT

Motives and Characteristics of Gift-Giving at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas

by

Judy M. Belanger

Dr. Teresa S. Jordan, Examination Committee Chair
Dean, College of Education
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Public institutions of higher learning need to increase reliance on private financial support for a portion of their revenue stream due to decreases in public financial support and increases in institutional needs. To help meet university demands for private funding, fundraising bodies, such as university foundations, need to target their limited resources in directions that will yield the greatest financial results. One way to do this is to identify individuals who are more likely to provide monetary gifts to the university and target fundraising efforts toward them.

The purpose of this study was to build a predictive model that was based on the motives and characteristics of gift-giving by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas alumni. The study would determine the relationship among these variables to the level of gift-giving. In total, 18 variables were selected and used in this study.

Descriptive statistics were used to demonstrate the frequency distribution and the measure of central tendency for each variable being studied. The relationships among various variables to the level of gift-giving were determined by utilizing artificial neural
network technology. This study was delimited to a sample of the total population of over 35,000 alumni at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The sample consisted of three study groups: (1) a sub-sample of alumni who contributed $10 to $1,000 at least one time, (2) a sub-sample of alumni who were non-contributors, and (3) all alumni who contributed over $1,000 at least one time.

Overall, the study demonstrated that there were small differences between the three study groups. There is little evidence to support the ability to predict gift-giving at various levels of giving, using the motives and characteristics that were under review in this study. There is moderate predictive ability, in terms of repeat giving for contributors of over $1,000, with six predictive variables: the academic college from which one has received their degree, the number of years following graduation before giving for the first time, the desire for a tax deduction, the amount contributed, giving to another higher educational institution, and marital status.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

For the past decade, funding for higher education from governmental sources has eroded. In the early 1990's, most states experienced a dramatic downturn in higher education funding as compared to prosperous times in the 1980s (Hines, 1994). According to Hines, in 1994, $40.8 billion was appropriated by the states to higher education. This was about the same in dollar value from prior years but a reduction in buying power and a reduction in annual increases that occurred in the 1980s: $39.5 billion in 1993, $40.1 billion in 1992, and $39.9 billion in 1991. Hines pointed out that the 1990's funding has not kept pace with inflation, enrollment increases and general facilities and equipment needs.

The United States spent more of its total resources on higher education than any other industrialized nation, but targeted less public funding for this purpose than any other industrialized country (Longanecker, 1993). According to Longanecker, this nation, along with Japan, relied heavily on private funds to supplement higher education public funds. These private funds, from student tuition and donor gifts, allowed this nation to provide "...high-quality education with higher participation rates than exist in any other country" (p. 38). Longanecker cited a 1990 report by Halstead that indicated state support for higher education peaked at 8.3% of state funds in 1982 and slowly
decreased to 6.9% in 1990 (p. 44). States provided about 50% of research institutions' revenue, with New York providing the highest amount at 70% and Vermont providing the lowest amount at 18% (Longanecker, 1993). Longanecker wrote that states differ in terms of how they finance higher education, some expect state support, others expect students to finance the costs, and yet some aggressively search for private gifts. Popplewell (1997) pointed out that institutions can no longer increase student tuition to enlarge revenues because public institution tuition rates have reached levels where attending a public institution is difficult for many students, reducing accessibility; instead, institutions must look to private sources.

According to Longanecker (1993), the federal government's role is limited to two goals: (1) ensure equal opportunity, which is addressed with federal student financial aid, and (2) improve the nation's competitive edge, which is addressed with federal research funding. Universities are viewed as a vehicle for meeting a national agenda, "...achieving social justice, enhancing national economic competitiveness, and advancing technological and medical knowledge, among other goals" (Worth, 1993d, p. 27). Worth emphasized that fulfilling these goals requires additional funds to offset increases in facilities, equipment, faculty salaries, medical insurance, and all other aspects of a university budget; at the same time governmental funding for higher education has become a lower priority than it had been prior to the 1960s.

In 1993, Barringer noted that public institutions are becoming state-assisted rather than state-supported (as cited in Bremner, 1994). According to Barringer, institutions nationally are receiving less financial support from federal and state sources and must look at private revenue generating avenues, such as private donations, to meet academic
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and programmatic funding needs. Also, public colleges and universities are competing for state funds along with prisons, K-12, and health care (Meredith, 1997). According to Meredith, citing the *Chronicle of Higher Education* October 19, 1994 issue, this competitive trend began in the early 1980s and became more prevalent in the 1990s. Meredith implied that the solution is private gifts.

Historically, private gifts from private donations have been a small percentage of the overall funding source for most public institutions. Public institutions have not had to rely on private gifts because of their state-funding source. The Commission on National Investment in Higher Education (1995) demonstrated that in the past, private or corporate gifts were used to help public institutions with new initiatives or to take risks; however, private gifts are now being used for routine institutional expenses. Meredith (1997) noted that the Council for Aid to Education reported that private gifts to public institutions quadrupled in ten years—from 1976 to 1986—and that about 33% of all gifts reported, went to public institutions, an increase from 25% prior to 1976.

Barringer (as cited in Bremner, 1994) stated that institutions that are state-assisted rather than state-supported are looking to increase contributions from private individuals. Barringer stated that these institutions are increasing their fundraising staff levels while reducing their academic programs. Barringer contended that the reduction in state assistance has forced institutions to increase their efforts in generating private revenue sources to offset state funding shortages and meet their resource needs. In 1994, the American Council of Education surveyed institutions and found that about 80% of the institutions increased fundraising efforts to increase revenues (National Association of College and University Business Officers [NACUBO], 1994, September). About 93% of
doctoral granting institutions and 89% of research and comprehensive institutions have increased their fundraising efforts (Knopp, 1995). A study conducted by the Council for Aid to Education (NACUBO, 1994, July), found that private giving has actually increased over the years at a rapid pace. The CAE study found that in just one year from 1991-92 to 1992-93 private giving increased 1.5% (net increase after inflation adjustment) to $11.2 billion. Alumni provided 27% of the total, non-alumni 23%, corporations 21%, foundations 20%, and religious or other organizations 9%. The CAE study also found that over the past 20 years, alumni have increased their giving by 92%, other individuals by 49%, corporations by 122%, foundations by 35%, and religious or other organizations by 25%.

These private sources can provide short-term funding and long-term funding in the form of yearly gifts, capital, or endowments. The CAE survey (NACUBO, 1994, July) found that gifts for capital and for operations increased dramatically over the past 20 years; and, that gifts for capital are linked to the wealth of the populace and gifts for operations are linked to the current state of the economy. The CAE study also noted that about 14.8% of all gifts are deferred gifts such as bequests—estate settlements. These gifts provide an institution with little immediate help but provide for great long-term benefits (NACUBO, 1994, July).

Most institutions have a separate arm of the institution that is responsible for fundraising of non-governmental resources. These are usually called foundations and are governed by private citizens with the university president overseeing all functions (Patton, 1993). A foundation's operating resources, both in terms of human resources and material resources, can be funded by the state or from private funds generated and
invested (Simic, 1993). Simic indicated that institutions have limited fundraising resources and must utilize those resources wisely. Consequently, foundations must operate in a cost-effective manner and target fundraising activities prudently (Fogal, 1994).

By understanding its constituency base—the donor population—a foundation can more effectively target its fundraising resources, thereby increasing its revenue generating potential. That is, fundraising can be targeted to populations that are more likely to contribute to the institution. Directing fundraising resources and activities to large untargeted populations may not be cost-effective; the money used to fundraise may not pay for itself in terms of donor gifts, now or in the future (Fogal, 1994). However, identifying the population that is more likely to donate funds to higher education should assist higher education foundations; they could target their fundraising resources and activities and increase donor contributions. This study examined the motives and characteristics of alumni (a segment of the total donor population) and their participation in donating financial support to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Statement of the Problem

Public institutions of higher learning need to increase reliance on private financial support for a portion of their revenue stream due to decreases in public financial support and increases in institutional needs (Worth, 1993). To help meet university demands for private funding, private fundraising bodies, such as university foundations, need to target their limited resources in directions that will yield the greatest financial results. One way to do this is to identify individuals who are more likely to provide monetary gifts to the
university and target fundraising efforts toward them. However, foundations know very little about their donor population making it difficult to target fundraising activities (Grace, 1993). Grace noted a 1987 study by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education, the Center on Philanthropy at the Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis, and the University of Arizona, which examined national databases on donor characteristics. The study found that donor files at institutions nationally were “...so idiosyncratic that they could not be used for general analysis....Existing data files are not comparable; many lack basic characteristics such as gender....research is inevitably limited” (p. 393).

There are limited data on the motives and characteristics of donors who give to universities. Data that would provide information on the motives and characteristics of these individuals would help university foundations identify the population most likely to contribute and target fundraising activities toward those individuals rather than engaging in non-targeted broad-based fundraising activities that may be less cost-effective.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to build a predictive model that was based on the motives and characteristics of gift-giving by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas alumni. The study would determine the relationship among these variables to the level of gift-giving.

A list of 23 variables (10 motives and 13 characteristics) to be studied was identified based on a review of the literature on this topic. The Executive Director of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas Foundation (J. Gallagher, personal communication,
June 25, 1997). reviewed the list and ranked the variables from 1 to 4, with 1 being the highest rank, in terms of importance and usefulness in targeting fundraising activities. Twelve of the 23 variables were ranked as 1, and Gallagher identified four additional variables that would be of value in targeting fundraising activities that were not among the initial 23 variables listed: number of years before giving, foundation or alumni sponsored cultural events for donors, repeat giving, and giving to another institution. The doctoral committee added two additional variables (academic college from which the individual received their degree and involvement in university-organized activities). In total, 18 variables to be studied were selected and used in this study.

The motives for contributing to the university include a desire for status/prestige (Clark, 1993), a desire for recognition and publicity (Williams, 1993; Hillman, 1980; Lippincott & Martin, 1997), a tax deduction (Hillman, 1980; Sapp, 1993; Pezzullo & Brittingham, 1993), an increase in community cultural activities (Hillman, 1980; Lippincott & Martin, 1997), elevated reputation of the city (Hillman, 1980), participation in foundation or alumni sponsored sporting events for donors (Pezzullo & Brittingham, 1993), or participation in foundation or alumni sponsored cultural events for donors (Lippincott & Martin, 1997; J. Gallagher, 1997).

The donor characteristics studied included income level (Shao, 1995; Pezzullo & Brittingham, 1993), age (Lippincott & Martin, 1997; Pezzullo & Brittingham, 1993), educational level attained (Pezzullo & Brittingham, 1993), religious preference (Pezzullo & Brittingham, 1993), occupation (Pezzullo & Brittingham, 1993), marital status (Pezzullo & Brittingham, 1993), number of years before giving for the first time (J. Gallagher, 1997), repeat giving (Louden, 1993; Pezzullo & Brittingham, 1993; Lippincott
& Martin, 1997; Bremner, 1994; J. Gallagher, 1997), giving to another higher educational institution (Pezzullo & Brittingham, 1993; J. Gallagher, 1997), involvement in university-organized activities (Webb, 1993), and academic college (Webb, 1993).

Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to build a predictive model that was based on the motives and characteristics of gift-giving by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas alumni. This study determined the relationship among these variables to the level of gift-giving. The following questions guided this study:

1. What set of motives and characteristics predict alumni participation at various levels of giving?
2. What set of motives and characteristics predict repeat participation?
3. What factors characterize the alumni non-donor?

Definition of Terms

The variables used to study donor motives included the following:

1. Desire for prestige: Desire to be recognized as having high prestige (Clark, 1993).
2. Desire for recognition: Desire for publicity about a philanthropic deed which "...reflects well on the donor" (Lippincott & Martin, 1997).
4. Increase community cultural activities: Activities that involve developing the intellectual and aesthetic understanding of the arts such as theater, dance, music, visual arts and lectures (National Endowment for the Arts, 1998).
5. **Elevate the reputation of the city:** Improve the overall quality as viewed or judged by people; improve the reputation of Las Vegas from that of sin-city or tinsel-city to cultural-community or entertainment-capital-of-the-world and a good place to do business (J. Gallagher, 1997; Hillman, 1980; Martin, 1998).

6. **Participate in foundation or alumni sponsored sporting events:** Events related to sports, funded by a foundation or booster club such as tailgate parties or receptions for sports figures (J. Gallagher, 1997).

7. **Participate in foundation or alumni sponsored cultural events:** Events related to cultural events, funded by a foundation or alumni association such as lectures, dinners, or receptions with national figures (J. Gallagher, 1997).

The variables used to study donor characteristics included the following:

1. **Income level:** Total annual income and earnings, such as wages, interest, dividends, pensions, and annuities, before deductions for personal income taxes (U.S. Census Bureau, 1990).

2. **Age:** Age of the respondent in complete years as of the date of completion of the questionnaire (U.S. Census Bureau, 1990).

3. **Educational level attained:** Completion of a baccalaureate degree, master's degree, professional degree, or doctorate degree. To include education beyond one degree level but less than next degree level. Examples of professional degrees include medicine, dentistry, chiropractic, optometry, osteopathic medicine, pharmacy, podiatry, veterinary medicine, law, and theology (U.S. Census Bureau, 1990).

4. **Religious preference:** Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Mormon, Muslim, no religion, or other (U.S. Census Bureau, 1990; World Almanac, 1998).
5. **Occupation**: Kind of work done on the job (U.S. Census Bureau, 1990).

6. **Marital status**: Status at time of the questionnaire completion. To include “now married,” “widowed,” “divorced,” “separated,” or “never married” (U.S. Census Bureau, 1990).

7. **Number of years before giving for the first time**: Number of years following graduation before donating for the first time to a college or university (J. Gallagher, 1997).

8. **Repeat giving**: Donation made to the same organization more than once (Louden, 1993).

9. **Giving to another higher educational institution**: Donation made to another college or university at least one time (Pezzullo & Brittingham, 1993).

10. **Involvement in university activities**: Involved, as a student or alumnus, in university-organized activities (Webb, 1993).

11. **Academic college**: University academic college from which one has graduated and received their degree (Webb, 1993).

**Analysis of the Data**

Relationships among various variables to the level of gift-giving were made utilizing artificial neural network technology. The neural network was utilized to (1) identify relationships between and among variables from the study data and (2) provide the framework for adding additional data in the future by the UNLV Foundation. The design of the neural network was expected to allow new data to be added to the existing study data, thereby creating the ability to conduct future trend analysis. By utilizing a
neural network for this study, the study would become a dynamic and useful tool to the
UNLV Foundation rather than a static study.

Limitations

This study was limited to the respondents responding to the questions in a manner
they thought would place them in a more favorable light (Hillman, 1980). Also, the
University of Nevada, Las Vegas is a young university, established in 1957, with a
relatively young alumni base (UCCSN Board of Regents, 1998). The university is the
sole four-year public institution located in the metropolitan area with over one million
citizens (Clark County Assessor, 1998).

Delimitation

This study was delimited to a sample of the total population of over 35,000
alumni at the University of Nevada. Las Vegas. Names of individuals who were
deceased or who had unknown addresses were excluded (which reduced the population to
30,030). The sample consisted of (1) a sub-sample of alumni who contributed $10 to
$1,000 at least one time, (2) a sub-sample of alumni who were non-contributors, and (3)
all alumni who contributed over $1,000 at least one time.

Conceptual Rationale for the Study

The reduction in state revenue for state operated institutions requires that state
institutions rely more heavily on private donations for revenue (Herman & Heimovics,
1991). The purpose of this study was to gain a broader understanding of higher education
gift-giving to assist the University of Nevada, Las Vegas target fundraising initiatives that
could identify potential donors and, thereby, increasing revenue for the institution. There has been very little prior research conducted on the topic of higher educational gift-giving. Grace (1993) noted that there is little research and information "...on the traits of donors and potential donors....On the national level, these data are meager" (p. 383). Therefore, this study would be exploratory in nature.

The variables that were examined were selected based on the minimal research previously conducted on this topic and on discussions with the Executive Director of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas Foundation (J. Gallagher. 1997). A multitude of possible variables was discussed with the Executive Director and the variables selected for inclusion in this study were based on the usefulness of each variable's results to the UNLV Foundation, as determined by the expert opinion of the Executive Director. To narrow the number of variables to a manageable number, variables were eliminated from inclusion in the study based on the premise that research findings on the particular variables would be of little value to the UNLV Foundation as determined in consultation with the Executive Director.

Based on previous research, the motives and characteristics of alumni gift-giving should indicate that alumni tend to donate to institutions because of what the donor, in return, will receive rather than for altruistic or humanitarian reasons (Bremner, 1994). The study was expected to show that donors tend to be involved with university activities (Webb, 1993; Van Til, 1994); that Protestants give more than Catholics, those who are widowed or married give more than single people, and those with higher levels of education give more than others (Jencks as cited in Pezzullo & Brittingham, 1993, p. 32).
Also, the study should show that alumni with higher incomes give more as do repeat
givers, and people give more as they age (Pezzullo and Brittingham, 1993).

This study was intended to help advance the University of Nevada, Las Vegas' understanding of the motives and characteristics of gift-giving which would assist the university target fundraising efforts in an attempt to increase revenue for the institution.

Summary

The study of fundraising to develop donor profiles, to determine the impact of tax laws, to investigate ethical issues, and to identify effective organizational practices has become an interest of institutions nationally (Grace, 1993). Grace suggested that scholarly activity in these areas would encourage future research in educational fundraising, which has become a higher priority at institutions of higher learning.

As early as the 1900s, Indiana University's president, initiated its first fundraising campaign and "...knew that donor dollars were essential to the quality and success of the educational enterprise" (Simic, 1993, p. 180).

Because state higher educational institutions are receiving a smaller proportion of government revenues to meet their financial needs, institutions must rely on private support to supplement government funding. Because of limited data, university foundations and development offices, that generate private support, have a limited understanding of the motives and characteristics of donors. Furthering the understanding of donor motives and characteristics would advance the knowledge base from which prudent fundraising practices could be established, including the knowledge base for the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

There is minimal literature on motives and characteristics of gift-giving. The literature review conducted for this study will include writings that pertain to higher education, and also will include other basic concepts of donor gift-giving to non-higher educational institutions that may have applicability to higher education.

History of Private Giving

According to Bremner (1994), giving includes both charity and philanthropy, and these terms are used interchangeably. He stated:

What we give to alleviate the need, suffering and sorrow of others, whether we know them or not, is charity. What we give to prevent and correct social and environmental problems and improve life and living conditions for people and creatures we don’t know and who have no claim on us is philanthropy. (p. xi)

The word, charity, was translated originally from the Latin word, caritas, to mean love of neighbor, concern for others, and generously giving of one’s means because of a concern for others, not because of pity (Jeavons, 1994). Bremner (1994) stated that in 44 B.C., Cicero, a philosopher and statesman, wrote *On Moral Obligations* and offered three warnings on giving:
First, the gift should not be prejudicial to the recipient or others; second, the gift should not exceed the donor's means or impoverish his family; and third, it should be in keeping with the merits of the recipients, taking into consideration character, relationship, and attitude to and services to the donor....No action can be at the same time generous and unjust. (p. 7)

Bremner (1994) pointed out that Cicero bemoaned those who gave in order to obtain status and recognition by hosting or sponsoring large events.

The concept of philanthropy has changed over the centuries. Bremner (1994) contended that in the seventeenth century, philanthropy was associated with kindness; in the eighteenth and nineteenth century it pertained to reforms of humanitarian issues, “to improve the treatment of prisoners and the insane, abolish slavery, and obtain rights for women and workers”; during the end of the nineteenth century, philanthropy meant giving money to causes that helped all people; and in recent years, philanthropy has taken the position that it is the responsibility of the government to help those in the lower socio-economic levels (p. xii).

In the nineteenth century, philanthropy meant advocating humanitarian efforts such as improving the conditions in prisons, removing slavery, and advocating the rights of minorities, and, therefore, was frequently unpopular (Bremner, 1994). Bremner held that in the 1880's charity, in the traditional sense of giving to the poor, was becoming less attractive. Organizations previously giving to the poor were changing their focus by looking to eliminate redundancies of giving and by developing methods to determine worthy applicants of the gifts from those who were unworthy of the gift. Bremner also stated that, during this time of transition, many viewed the new approach to philanthropy as self-serving by the donors and that the ambitious poor were not in need of the monetary gift and would be offended by the gift. Yet others, according to Bremner,
thought that taking care of the undeserving poor was government’s social responsibility
and philanthropists should not assume this responsibility.

The focus of philanthropy, according to Bremner (1994), changed between 1885
and 1915 during the time of Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller when wealthy
people use their excess wealth in a manner that they perceived to be more useful. They
were unable to use their huge wealth toward smaller endeavors like assisting
impoverished families; therefore, they preferred to make an investment in the future and
funneled their wealth to institutions of higher learning, research, or cultural training.
Carnegie thought that it was best to assume power and responsibility for giving wealth,
and not give money to the poor. According to Hall (1994) Carnegie challenged the
notion of charity, indicating that giving to charity perpetuated the problem of poverty,
and that funds targeted to charity were unwisely spent. Carnegie indicated that he
preferred investing his wealth “to stimulate the best and most aspiring of the poor...to
further efforts for their own improvement” (as cited in Bremner, 1994, p. 159).

According to Hall (1994), Carnegie encouraged his millionaire peers and stated,
“The best means of benefiting the community is to place within its reach the ladders upon
which the aspiring can rise” (p. 15). Although Carnegie urged his peers to give to other
than charity, the manner in which this could be done was not obvious. As Hall pointed
out, Carnegie, Rockefeller and others made contributions to libraries, universities,
churches which were ill equipped to handle the private contributions. Therefore, a new
philanthropic mechanism evolved—the grantmaking foundation—that utilized different
tax laws and allowed for the targeting of funds (via their trustees) toward societal issues
such as political, social and economic reform (Hall, 1994).
In the early 1900's, the way in which the wealthy accumulated their wealth—such as through corruption or extreme business competitiveness—was a source of concern for the institutions accepting a philanthropic gift (Bremner, 1994). Bremner indicated that institutions were concerned with the notion that, by accepting the gift, they were condoning the behaviors of the wealthy. Yet, in 1960, Shaw thought that all money one gives as a philanthropic deed was "tainted" (as cited in Bremner, 1994, p. 162). In 1995, White stated, "So it is with groping for an answer to our question of whether charities should judge their donors on the basis of how those donors earned their money. My answer, for what it is worth, is no" (p. 347).

In 1968, Ross held to a belief in terms of class issues and suggested that, "Philanthropy has always been the reflection of a class society because it has depended on a [continued] division of rich givers and poor recipients" (as cited in Ostrander, 1995, p. 165). Ostrander stated that most philanthropy in the United States has "been an expression of white upper-class power and has played a significant part in maintaining class and race power" (p. 8).

Usually, wealthy upper-class white people do not see it in their interest to give away money to support activities that challenge existing structures of class and race power. And when they do give away their money, they usually want to retain control over where it goes. Usually, people of color and white people, women and men, and working-class people and upper-class people do not come together to challenge one another and fundamentally restructure organizations so they can work toward common political and social goals. (Ostrander, 1995, p. 161)

In 1989 Jenkins, conducted a survey of funding by private foundations, and found that they were no longer funding organizations involved in social change. Foundations preferred to give their money to established charities or non-profit institutions, and in
1991, less than 1% of foundation funding was given to social change organizations (as cited in Ostrander, 1995, p. 3). Foundations tend not to fund social change groups in the United States because,

(1) it is not in the class interest of wealthy donors, whose influence prevails in most foundations, to fund social movements that seek to redistribute wealth and power; (2) the general public has deeply divided opinions about what foundations should and should not do in regards to “political” activity; (3) the historical role of the U.S. government has been to use tax law to circumscribe foundation support for activities considered “political.” (Ostrander, 1995, p. 183)

In terms of higher education, Worth (1993d) noted that in 1641 three Americans—Williams Hibbens, Hugh Peters, and Thomas Weld—requested money from wealthy British, who viewed their request as worthwhile, to help “educate the heathen Indian” and attend an American college (p. 18). Their request, according to Worth, was the first organized fundraising effort by an American institution. Worth noted that prior to this time, fundraising by colleges was associated with religious purposes. The first organized fundraising program, according to Worth, occurred in 1643 when Harvard alumni gathered together for an annual giving program.

During the early 1980s, when government funding for social service agencies was reduced, these agencies competed with higher education for private gifts. They received increases in private gifts, causing a reduction to higher education (Smith, 1993). However, as Smith pointed out, this trend was temporary. Because higher education was attractive to grantmakers and foundations, in 1989 foundation funding for higher education increased dramatically, more than the cost of living. According to the Council for Aid to Education, in 1989 foundations gave $1.74 billion, almost 20% of all private
giving, to higher education (Smith, 1993, p. 193). In terms of the proportion of foundation gifts to public and private colleges and universities, Smith indicated that a shift occurred. Prior to 1983 public institutions only received one-third of the higher education grant funds; in 1993 public institutions received almost one-half of the amount of grant funds to higher education. Also, Smith illustrated that between the years of 1984 to 1988, higher education grants targeted to programs increased from 27% to 38% of the total and grants targeted to research increased to 22% of the total.

**Philanthropic Tax Laws**

Tax laws have a large impact on gift-giving (Bremner, 1994). Most individuals are allowed an income tax deduction for charitable gifts, in the year they are given and based on the individual’s adjusted gross income (Sapp, 1993). Sapp indicated that gifts in the form of cash are allowed at 50% of one’s adjusted gross income; gifts in the form of appreciated property, such as real estate, are limited to 30% of one’s adjusted gross income and are deductible at the fair market value; gifts that exceed these maximums can be carried forward into the next five years. Sapp also stated that people who give to institutions long-term appreciated securities such as common stocks and bonds can receive significant tax benefits: that is, one can receive an income tax deduction on the fair market value of the security (as long as the individual has owned them for at least one year), and one does not need to pay tax on the capital gains as they would if they sold the security.
In 1993, Sapp indicated that people could receive large tax benefits with real estate gifts to colleges, such as a home, farm, ranch, building, or undeveloped land and with personal property such as art, antiques, books, and vehicles.

The ability to reduce an individual’s income tax liability for charitable giving first began in 1917 (Fink, 1993). Then, in 1919, Congress expanded the individual income tax deductibility to include the estate tax deduction for charitable bequests. The 1926 tax laws included “...the gift tax deduction in favor of gifts to charity” (Fink, 1993, p. 392). Fink stated that in 1935, corporations were allowed a tax advantage for charitable giving and since that time, significant and ongoing changes to charitable contribution tax incentives have occurred.

“At the root of the issue of tax incentives to charitable giving in the United States is the question of whether philanthropic institutions and agencies are providing and performing in the country’s highest interest” (Fink, 1993, p. 393). According to Fink, the answer was unclear; some people believed that these agencies were performing in the country’s highest interest with “pure” intent, while others believed “…philanthropy as an unjust method for the gathering and distribution of funds and services dictated by the wealthy, who are the establishment and resistant to the dynamics of a changing society” (p. 393). Fink indicated that arguments continue about whether or not charitable giving favors the wealthy. As an example, Fink specified that 80% of people “…who file the simplified federal tax return cannot itemize charitable deductions” (p. 393). Fink suggested that this congressional act would imply that the federal government perceives nonprofit institutions not acting in the country’s highest interest and discourages charitable giving by the largest group of taxpayers. However, Fink mentioned that the
general notion of charitable-giving tax incentives favors the elite is inaccurate because of widespread philanthropic volunteerism: an essential element of all philanthropic institutions, which carries no tax penalties or tax incentives.

Prior to 1986, tax laws allowed donors to deduct from their taxes the current market value of real estate, paintings and securities (Bremner, 1994). However, the Tax Reform Act of 1986, according to Bremner, changed this and allowed a donor to use only the original purchase price, which is usually lower than the current market value. Pezullo and Brittingham (1993) indicated that the 1986 law caused a rush of private giving to higher education late in the year. Individuals who planned not to itemize their returns in the future also made contributions in 1986. Pezullo and Brittingham indicated that this tax reform also increased the cost of charitable giving, “A $1 gift, which before 1987 had a real cost of only 50 cents for those in the highest tax bracket, now costs 67 cents” (p. 34). The authors suggested that the tax law appeared to have reduced the level of gift-giving at higher educational institutions, particularly those gifts over $5,000 or those of appreciated property.

Bremner (1994) illustrated that since 1990 efforts have been made to reverse the trend of restricting benefits of philanthropic giving, and instead, efforts were emerging to encourage individuals to donate to agencies rather than selling their goods. As an example, he recounted that in 1993, President Clinton supported the tax break for charitable gifts. However, donors “...never personally benefit economically from making a charitable gift” (White, 1995, p. 16). White suggested that although most people have benefited from charity, most people do not see the need to give to charity.
Lippincott and Martin (1997) pointed out that state laws also impact tax issues and that laws governing philanthropy vary greatly between states.

Corporations do receive a tax advantage but not at the level that is perceived by some fundraisers (Hillman, 1980). Hillman said it costs a corporation to make a donation; however, a corporation can make a charitable gift and receive benefit for its portion as well as the portion they would normally pay in taxes, which is almost one-half of the amount. They can, therefore, almost double their contribution, "...creating sort of a matching-gift..." with the federal government (Hillman, 1980, p. 4). Hillman did indicate that tax laws provide an inducement, are considered a motive for corporations to contribute to philanthropic efforts, and that if the tax write-off was eliminated most corporations would quickly reduce or eliminate their philanthropic budgets. Hillman indicated that philanthropic costs are treated as a business expense and can therefore be "...deducted from pretax earnings" (p. 38).

Corporate philanthropic activities began in the early 1920s; tax deductions of these contributions, allowed in 1935, along with its legality, in 1950, encouraged the expansion of corporate giving for the future (Withers, 1993).

Corporate philanthropic tax benefits are applicable only if an organization holds an IRS tax-exempt status (Hillman, 1980). Hillman suggested that this tax-exempt status also serves to provide corporations a barometer for determining the legitimacy of the organization as a recipient of their contribution.

According to Van Til (1994), government decides which nonprofit organizations will receive the tax-exempt status and those eligible to receive charitable gifts; therefore, the government plays a major role in the nonprofit world. Fink (1993) stated that the
IRS Annual Report indicated there were over 400,000 tax-exempt organizations in this nation. The IRS defines the role nonprofits play in the economy; the IRS defines the rules associated with a nonprofit status that outline the corporate income tax exemption, eligible tax deductions for contributions made, the type of lobbying efforts allowable, and the type of revenue allowed (Herman & Heimovics, 1991).

According to Pezzullo and Brittingham (1993), studies indicated that tax deductibility is a greater incentive for higher-income individuals, and the price of gift-giving is reduced as one’s income increases. These studies also indicated that gifts to education and hospitals “…appear particularly price-sensitive” and gifts would decline significantly if the tax deductibility were reduced or eliminated (p. 35). Gallup polls, the IRS, and the Federal Reserve data suggested two motives of gift-giving: “paying your dues and giving away your surplus” (p. 35). Paying one’s dues is done by contributing to churches, and giving away one’s surplus is done by giving to colleges and hospitals (Pezzullo & Brittingham, 1993). Pezzullo and Brittingham suggested that high-income level alumni give to private institutions and that most contributions to higher education come from nonalumni who give toward buildings or endowing chairs; thus, one’s surplus tends to be given to colleges and hospitals and changes to tax laws can greatly impact the level of giving to higher education.

The long history of significant philanthropic support for colleges and universities prior to the introduction of tax incentives, during changes to tax laws, and during times of war or recession suggest that it is a tradition which is part of our culture (Worth, 1993b). Although history might indicate that nothing could negatively impact the level of giving to higher education, Worth noted a concern for future philanthropic support to
universities. The concern was "...the increasing acceptance of fund raising as a form of 'marketing'" (p. 404). According to Worth, in citing Kathleen Kelly,

...marketing implies a *quid pro quo* in which the donor exchanges money for some product or benefit. Donors may receive something intangible in return for their gifts, such as satisfaction and recognition, but the primary benefit of their gifts is to society, not to themselves. (p. 404)

Worth also stated that, "The use of a commercial term and concept like 'marketing' to describe fund raising implies a *quid pro quo* similar to that in commercial exchanges. Such an implication.... invites the eye of government on our tax-exempt status" (p. 404). Over 460,000 organizations have a tax-exempt status, according to the IRS (Fink, 1993, p. 396).

According to Pezzullo and Brittingham (1993), philanthropy will increase, as more money is accessible and decrease when less is accessible. Likewise, private giving will grow as the cost to give is lower, and decline as the cost increases. And the element that most impacts the cost of giving is charitable-gift tax deductions. Pezzullo and Brittingham contended that changes in the economy or tax laws would have a direct impact on private giving.

**Evolution of Non-Profit Organizations**

This country has approximately one million nonprofit organizations; half of these are tax-exempt organizations that receive funds from individuals and corporations. Others receive funds from government, investment income and charge user fees (Bremner, 1994). According to the American Association of Fund Raising Counsel Trust for Philanthropy, $103 billion was given to non-profit organizations in 1988; in 1990 it reached $122.7 billion (Fink, 1993, p. 396). In 1992, a study conducted by Giving USA.
indicated that over $125 billion was given to charitable organizations (as cited in White, 1995, p. 9).

Van Til (1994) suggested that these million organizations employ about 10% of the workers in this nation. Organizations under the name of nonprofit, voluntary, charitable, or third sector are increasing and significantly contributing to the quality of life in this nation (Herman & Heimovics, 1991). Herman and Heimovics suggested that although these organizations have been an important element of our society, only recently have they been studied. These non-profit organizations serve social ills such as caring of AIDS patients, assisting drug abusers, assisting the poor and homeless, helping the elderly and teaching illiterate adults, “...and otherwise compensate for failing educational and social systems” (p. 2).

According to White (1995), non-profit organizations offer services for which the public is unwilling to pay, and these services are considered beneficial to society by Congress, thus, the IRS exemption. White contended that non-profit organizations have become the third segment of our society, along with business and government. People are unwilling to pay for these services, according to White, because “Most people are too concerned with their own household budgets and savings to be concerned about charity” (p. 9).

During the last decade of the nineteenth century, private charitable corporations grew tremendously (Hall, 1994). Hall indicated that big business and private wealth assisted libraries, colleges, hospitals, welfare organizations, and museums while the middle and lower income families assisted labor unions, volunteer fire departments, and loan and building associations. During the early twentieth century, a new trend emerged
whereby large bureaucratic organizations run by trained experts were being utilized to help with national social, political, and economic reform. And by 1980, according to Hall, nonprofit organizations were becoming “commercial enterprises” competing with for-profit companies, exempt from taxes, and moving away from the traditional nonprofit purposes (p. 27). As the fastest growing type of organization in the nation, with over 90% of the existing nonprofit organizations forming after World War II, the nonprofit organizations involved most people in this nation, as donors, employees, consumers, and citizens, which resulted in increased inspection from the public. Hall noted examples of increased scrutiny with the United Way scandal, whereby executives were paid high salaries, or the televangelists who received personal gain from a nonprofit status, which decreased the credibility of nonprofit organizations.

Non-profit organizations receive funding from the government in the form of contracts and grants, sales of services or goods, and donations. These various revenue options are broader than that of business or government; yet, financial support from these various sources has become more difficult (Herman & Heimovics, 1991). According to Herman and Heimovics, the federal government has been a major supporter of non-profit organizations. With recent trends on reducing federal subsidies to non-profit organizations, these organizations have sought out funding from state and local governments as well as the private sector. Although state and local governmental support and private support have increased, Herman and Heimovics speculated that they would be unable to make up the difference to support these organizations. In addition, Herman and Heimovics indicated that non-profit organizations—especially in the health and recreational services—are competing with businesses that offer similar services. Herman
and Heimovics surmised that these competing forces are part of national economic debates about the place in this nation for non-profit organizations.

Bremner (1994) indicated that public radio or television stations, museums, libraries, and parks have private funds to augment their public appropriations. These entities, according to Bremner, are all vying for prospective donors, making the practice very competitive, similar to that of business and religion. Donors need to pick and choose between entities. White (1995) contended that agencies rely heavily on gift-giving to balance their operating budget. White also implied that the gift-giving process has changed to one of big business that includes tax attorneys and accountants.

"Nonprofit organizations are not businesses. If they behave only like businesses, they should not be nonprofit" (Herman & Heimovics, 1991, p. 29). Yet, nonprofit organizations need effective leaders with skills comparable to business. These leaders are expected to manage accounts, control processes, conduct financial analysis, and incorporate human resource management (Herman & Heimovics, 1991).

Hall (1994) indicated that describing what nonprofit organizations do is difficult. According to Hall, nonprofit organizations have various funding patterns and various methods of governance.

They vary enormously in scope and scale, ranging from community and neighborhood organizations with no assets and no employees through multibillion-dollar foundations, universities, and healthcare complexes with thousands of employees. They vary enormously in what they do, from offering traditional charitable assistance to the need to carrying out manufacturing and advanced research. (p. 3)
Evolution of Foundations

The tax laws of 1943 allowed the creation of two different types of foundations that exist today, private and public (Ostrander, 1995). Ostrander stated that private foundations usually are part of an endowment from wealthy families. In contrast, public foundations, according to Hall, usually receive funding from various sources on a continuous basis. have larger representation due to better tax benefits, and are more accountable to a constituency base (as cited in Ostrander, 1995, p. 181).

In 1994, Bremner wrote that in the past, foundations helped specific people in specific locations such as the poor in a local community and that recent foundations promote research, have a specific mission, and function on a more global nature. The public is interested in foundations because "...of public fascination with wealth and the way it is used and because foundation grants may set trends in giving" (p. 169). Bremner also indicated that the Rockefellers set the tone for foundations and for the distribution of money; foundation money was to be managed and spent in a manner similar to what one would do for one's own family's future, given to existing institutions to foster additional gift-giving by others, and given to activities that would sustain after the gift ended.

Bremner suggested that in the 1950's and 1960's, philanthropists main purpose in setting up foundations was to reduce their federal and state tax liability. A secondary motive was to benefit society. Several foundations since 1956 have been established to "promote conservative doctrines in education and to influence public opinion on economic and social policy...along conservative lines" (Bremner, 1994, p. 173).

There are over 30,000 foundations with those categorized as independent foundations giving mostly to higher education (Smith, 1993). Smith pointed out that
these independent foundations were initiated by one individual, by a group of individuals, or by a family and are managed by a member of the donor's family or a board of directors. According to Smith, the large independent foundations such as Rockefeller, Ford, and Kellogg are considered leaders and trendsetters in the foundation field.

Kelly implied that fundraising activities have been held in low esteem, which is the reason why several organizations have changed from fundraising to development (as cited in Ostrander, 1995, p. 204). According to Worth (1993a), fundraising is episodic and begins at the time of asking for a gift, whereas development is continuous and refers to a process—from developing an academic plan, to cultivating donors.

Evolution of Higher Education Foundations

According to Phelan and Shufflebarger (1997) higher educational institutions are receiving a smaller portion of state revenues, are asked to do more, and are asked to do better; this suggests the need for higher standards of quality and a need to increase private support. "Raising private resources for a public college or university is a relatively new phenomenon, which contributes to the frequent absence of definition and intent" (Hedgepeth, 1997, p. 22). Hedgepeth (1993) stated that private fundraising by public institutions is a 1980s phenomenon. Hedgepeth indicated that, except for a few noteworthy exceptions, such as University of Michigan and Kansas Endowment Association, established before the 1980s, private fundraising by public institutions was minimal; widespread aggressive efforts for private funds is a relatively new component of American philanthropy. Hedgepeth (1993) suggested that the reasons for this surge of solicitation for private gifts were due to competition for smaller state revenue shares, state
funding not keeping pace with institutional needs (providing a smaller percentage of total institutional revenue), federal funding decreases, and the inability to dramatically increase student tuition. According to Hedgepeth, a few large public institutions were successful in competing for private support, thus creating another driving force behind the surge of fundraising activities—other institutions viewed these successes as something they could attain as well. The most dramatic growth in terms of all philanthropic efforts nationally was in the area of public university support during the 1980s; this caused increase scrutiny and focus on institutionally-related foundation practices and structures. (Hedgepeth, 1993).

Phelan & Associates (1997) stated that foundations enhance an institution by generating gifts and endowments, and that “A well-structured and well-run foundation is an asset to any public college or university” (p. xii). Phelan (1997), contended that a university foundation “serves as an icon” to demonstrate the institution’s intention to obtain private support, and that “The very word ‘foundation’ implies permanency and strength” (p. 9).

Lippincott and Martin (1997) suggested that people who give to higher educational institutions are concerned about having their gift managed by the state. believe that the state will poorly invest their gift or direct the funds in a manner not intended by the donor, and fear that private giving will reduce state appropriations. Because of these donor beliefs, higher education foundations need to reassure donors that their gift is properly invested and managed. “The best reassurance is a personal one from a board member who also is a donor and a person of stature in the community” (Lippincott & Martin, 1997, p. 73). Some donors believe, as Phelan (1997) implied, that
a donation to a state institution would cause legislators to offset the donation with a reduction in state support. Consequently, donors prefer to keep their donations from state hands and give directly to an institution’s private foundation.

More than 1,000 public higher educational institutions have an independent foundation that supports private philanthropy. These independent foundations utilize the tax laws that encourage private giving (Ransdell, 1997). According to Meredith (1997), university nonprofit foundations have more flexibility than states or public institutions to invest funds in a manner that is more lucrative by utilizing aggressive investment methods. Phelan (1997) stated that foundations accept the fiduciary responsibility of managing other people’s money in an effective manner, and that they can be less conservative with investment options and can follow the advice of its expert investment committees. Phelan also indicated that a foundation could protect an institution from accepting an unwanted gift. College presidents can feel pressured to accept a gift such as “...a used car, a lame horse, a wooden boat, or real estate that come with hidden or apparent environmental liabilities” (p. 10). However, Phelan pointed out that a foundation, on the advice of its advisory committee, could reject such gifts that would prove to be a liability rather than an asset to the institution and can prevent the president from being the messenger of the rejection. Phelan argued that a foundation cannot be forced to accept such gifts or intimidated by the potential political consequence of its rejection, whereas, an institution could be subject to political consequences. Also, Legon (1997) cautioned about accepting gifts, such as certain real estate, animals, and other gifts that would require ongoing financial obligations, “Be leery of a gift that eats” (p. 240).
Hedgepeth (1997) believed that institutional foundations were established for practical reasons to buy and hold property that would be on the market for a short time, too short to wait for state institutions to purchase the property under a state’s lengthy acquisition processes. Meredith (1997) implied that there are a myriad of advantages for establishing institutionally-related foundations with the most important reason being the ability to prevent the commingling of private and state funds. “Every public institution president’s nightmare is to discover that public dollars have been used for something that should have been purchased with private funds” (Meredith, 1997, p. 220). According to Meredith, major gifts are frequently given for purposes not considered necessary by state supporters. Simic (1993) emphasized another advantage of a foundation, donor confidentiality. Donors can discuss their wills, trust agreements and personal information with foundation personnel and keep their affairs from public scrutiny.

Buck, Haskell and Ross had another perspective on the evolution of higher education foundations (as cited in Hall, 1994, p. 13). They believed that since 1865 “private power” focused on building businesses that could operate on a national scale and on building a cultural infrastructure that would support the businesses (p. 13). These large-scaled businesses required a new type of manpower, new technologies, and the capability to utilize economic and social information. Hall also cited Sears who suggested that colleges could supply these needs to businesses with the support of private money to expand facilities, recruit international students and faculty, and develop new curricular and research (p.13). University leaders and businesses worked together; businesspeople became involved with university affairs in a manner expressed by Veblen, in 1918, “men of affairs have taken over direction of the pursuit of knowledge” (Hall.
1994, p. 13). According to Hall, universities began training students for careers in large businesses and businesspeople built new partnerships between non-profit and profit organizations, in the “...context of mutual concern” (p. 13).

Private support for higher education has grown substantially over the last three centuries beginning with three clergymen soliciting funds for Harvard, to over 9,000 fundraisers, currently, in North America (Brown, 1997). Brown contended that not only have institutionally-related foundations increased dramatically over the last few decades, but also the structures to manage the foundations have expanded, leading to controversy in terms of the expense and resource utilized to sustain large institutionally-related foundations.

Higher Education Foundation Structures

Most higher education institutions' foundations have mission statements; these mission statements describe the foundations' responsibilities including the acceptance of contributions, the delivery of funds to students, faculty and educational programs, and their responsibility to strengthen their host institution's welfare (Bahlmann, 1997). Periodically, the host institution must articulate to the foundation board its vision for the future, ways in which that vision may influence the foundation's role, and the relevance of the foundation’s affairs to the institution’s affairs (Popplewell, 1997). Popplewell indicated that the foundation’s board must develop its mission statement that is “...totally compatible with the institution’s purpose and direction” (p. 163). Legon (1997) also noted that foundation board members might want to steer institutional priorities, viewing this as their right. However, Legon cautioned board members, asserting that they should
not overstep their authority nor attempt to influence institutional priorities. Doing so would confuse public policy makers, and cause conflict with the institutional president and governing bodies.

Several higher education foundations have several staff with millions of dollars in operating funds, but follow no plan for development with organizational structures varying greatly (Hedgepeth, 1997). Hedgepeth noted that there exists no general principles or guidelines for creating successful higher education foundations—although there are common factors in successful foundations, the application of the factors are institutionally specific. Popplewell (1997) indicated that fundraising functions are usually conducted by both development and foundation staff. However, the coordination of these functions, as Popplewell noted, remains a challenge especially when the foundation is not directly managed by the institution. Popplewell also indicated that strong coordination efforts are needed in the solicitation and stewardship of gifts, although institutions have found that the division of responsibilities between a foundation and development office has been difficult and problematic.

In 1997, Shufflebarger wrote about foundation ties with the alumni associations. These dual functions can either be effective partnerships or rivalries—competing for the same donor base. When various campus departments solicit donors, it is perceived negatively by donors and gives the appearance that the institution is unaware of where it is going or is out of control (Nahm & Zemsky, 1993). According to Shufflebarger, both entities must have specific missions that support the institution, and must work as partners, with each having clearly defined fundraising roles. The same holds true for athletic fundraising efforts. Shufflebarger suggested that athletic fundraising and
foundation fundraising should work as partners because athletic fundraising initiatives can be the avenue for athletic donors to learn about the institution. Shufflebarger pointed out that many private donors and corporations have initially contributed because of athletics and then later made larger contributions to academic initiatives. In terms of costs-savings, Shufflebarger suggested that alumni associations, athletic foundations, and the campus-wide foundation could reduce costs by sharing certain services such as accounting, insurance, audit firms, and management of endowment funds.

Foundation board members are "...characterized by affluence and influence—people who have the capacity to give and to persuade others to give" (Kuzneski and Panaia, 1997, p. 126). Those who comprise traditional foundations are board of trustee members and staff. Colwell, Odendahl, Nielson, and Jenkins stated that foundation members are the decision-makers, made up of donors, and are heavily influenced or controlled by the donors (as cited in Ostrander, 1995, p. 6, 29). Data from Phelan and Associates (1997) illustrated that there are over 20,000 higher education foundation board members, serving on 1,000 boards nationally, with an average of 27 members on each board.

According to Herman and Heimovics (1991), "Foundation leadership is intricately connected to the social and political leadership of the community" (p. 22). Hillman (1980) suggested that foundation boards members include presidents of the most successful, most respected, and largest local companies in banking, manufacturing, law, and retailing. As Hillman noted, enticements to join a foundation board usually include the ability to meet and interact with other highly influential community leaders; this is especially inviting to newly relocated executives who are looking to meet community
leaders or to executive spouses who are looking to remain active. Herman and Heimovics (1991) added that, "Our personal views are that there is nothing inherently objectionable in attempting to add prestigious, powerful, or wealthy people to a board, so long as such individuals are willing to meet the expectations that apply to other board members" (p. 84). However, Herman and Heimovics believed that foundations that focus on improving the performance of their boards, rather than increasing the number of powerful board members, are likely to create more effective and "hard-working" foundation boards (p. 84). The board's strength and effectiveness are directly related to the success of its organization (Axelrod, 1994).

The institution's president is usually also a member of the board of trustees (Patton, 1993). The president's role in nurturing the relationship between the institution and the foundation is crucial (Popplewell, 1997). Popplewell stated that with most foundations, the institutional president serves as an ex officio non-voting member of the foundation and foundation members look to the president for leadership. According to Popplewell, the president's role must be clearly defined and is usually included in the foundation's bylaws. The foundation's chief executive officer usually reports to the foundation but is subordinate to the institutional president. Popplewell implied that that the president and the chief executive officer's relationship will determine the level of institutional control over the foundation.

The president's involvement in fund raising is the model that the board members will follow (Patton, 1993). According to Patton, "If that involvement is positive, enthusiastic, and firmly tied to the institutional priorities, trustees are likely to follow suit" (p. 53). Patton also stated that the president's role is complex because he or she is...
"...the interpreter of the educational environment in general and the standard bearer for his or her institution's unique mission within that environment” (p. 53).

Patton (1993) indicated that board members can serve as “…authenticators” (p. 55) to those outside the academic world of the institution’s assertion of importance. Patton suggested that board members could serve as authenticators because of their broad perspectives, professional achievements, contributions of their time and resources, and ability to attract strong support for the institution. Herman and Heimovics (1991) indicated that the organization’s visibility and credibility by prospective donors, along with the chief executive’s “track-record” is most important for foundations.

Directors and trustees of foundations usually serve without pay (White, 1995). White pointed out that they donate their money and also their time, “…they donate services and time that remain largely unappreciated by the larger constituency. Yet when the fund-raising challenge comes the trustees will usually look inward to start things off” (p. 10). Foundation board members are expected to contribute and do so in larger amounts during fundraising campaigns (Legon, 1997). Legon pointed out that it is crucial to select board member who have the financial capacity to contribute and who can invite others, with similar wealth, to do so as well.

Foundations are comprised of development staff. Bremner (1994) emphasized that higher educational institutions are now considered tax-assisted rather than tax-supported and rely on contributions from private donors thus increasing their development staffs while reducing their academic staff. These staffs have increased dramatically over the years. In 1949, the American College Public Relations Association indicated that at higher educational institutions only two people had a title of
development director (Worth, 1993d). Worth indicated that by 1993, almost all higher education institutions had at least one development staff person with some institutions having several dozen staff with the sole responsibility of fundraising and development. Worth also stated that although fundraisers are a part of nearly every institution, there continues to be a "...perceived cultural gap between them and members of the academic community, particularly faculty." (p. 22). According to Worth, faculty are skeptical of fundraisers; they are perceived as uncommitted to the institution and separate from academics. Simic and Coffman (1997) noted that, to the faculty, foundation functions look like parties, foundation publications appear extravagant, and constant traveling by fundraisers appear like "junkets" (p. 145). Although fundraisers are perceived in this manner by faculty, fundraisers who are considered outstanding tend to have certain characteristics and attributes. Research by Jerold Panas illustrated the following characteristics and attributes, "...impeccable integrity. ability to listen well. ability to motivate, high energy. concern for people. high expectations. love of the work, perseverance, presence, and quality of leadership" including innate intelligence (as cited in Osborne. 1993, p. 242).

Donor research has grown considerably over the past decade (Worth, 1993b). Worth emphasized that development or foundation departments have at least one researcher with some employing several researchers. Worth noted that research data are utilized to design fundraising strategies. Siegel (1993) stated that fundraising research has evolved to include "...a multifaceted process of information retrieval. analysis, maintenance, and dissemination that forms the foundation for identifying, cultivating, and soliciting major gift prospects" (p. 251).
Murray and Tassie (1994) argued that, the pressures concerning accountability and effectiveness, "...often sound somewhat simplistic" (p. 304), but they are not. According to Fogal (1994), fundraising involves, "...analysis, planning, execution, control, and evaluation" (p. 372), the elements of classical management proceedings. To assist their foundations, institutions frequently provide resources to them in the form of free space and utilities (Popplewell, 1997). Popplewell found that institutions frequently fund their foundation's operating costs for a short time until they can become self-sufficient. Phelan and Shufflebarger (1997) stated that one attraction of institutionally-related foundations is that they will eventually generate enough money to cover the fundraising costs and become financially independent from its institution. However, Popplewell pointed out that institutions may have difficulty targeting scarce funds toward fundraising efforts that can meet the institution's expectations, whether that be for seed money or to help sustain an existing foundation.

In 1995, the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges and the Council for Advancement and Support of Education surveyed 827 public university foundations with a 252 response rate and found that most foundation executives serve in two roles—foundation staff and university staff (Phelan & Associates, 1997). The study also found that almost 43% of the foundations pay at least part of their employees’ salaries, about 85% included the institutional president on the board. Board members serve an average of 3.11 years, over half of the boards participate in fundraising activities, and over 94% personally contribute to the foundation and solicit others to do so as well.

Institutionally-related foundations have two missions. The external mission is to raise money, enlist advocates, strengthen image, protect donor rights and the internal
mission is to manage resources, promote institutional flexibility, buy time, and steward gifts (Hedgepeth, 1997). Hedgepeth noted that,

Private giving through foundations will not solve all problems of public colleges and universities. Many problems, however, never will be solved without substantial and ever-increasing private support. Well-constructed and properly managed foundations can help uphold the host institution’s standards of quality, contribute to its excellence (which helps keep the institution healthy and competitive), and rekindle public confidence in higher education—a confidence now lacking but so crucial in the demanding work colleges and universities serve. (p. 29)

Hedgepeth, (1993) also stated that, “Foundations are now managing large, rapidly expanding endowments, running large campaigns, and engaging in comprehensive programs involving large staffs and multi-million dollar budgets” (p. 324).

Higher Education Foundation Financing and Fiduciary Responsibilities

Hedgepeth (1997) indicated that “No easy solutions have been identified for funding the costs of fund-raising” (p. 21). Boardman (1993) stated that reviewing literature on fundraising costs and evaluation over the past 35 years, “…one won’t find much…. No reliable data exist on fund-raising costs over the years. Still, as one looks at how the world of philanthropy has grown in size and complexity, it is obvious that costs have risen considerably” (p. 268). A review of articles and publications by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education demonstrated that there is ample “…advice but few hard facts” (p. 268). The reason, according to Boardman, is that until recently, there was no need for it.

The cost and effectiveness of fundraising programs are paramount to foundation leaders (Fogal, 1994). Fogal indicated that donors only want to contribute funds to foundations that are considered credible and will want to know fundraising costs. Fogal
also added that there are no standards in terms of fundraising costs; yet fundraisers utilize
general guidelines. Boardman (1993) stated that institutions report gift revenues annually
to the Council for Aid to Education. The Council reported, according to Boardman, that
fund-raising costs are usually 15% of the total amount raised. However, the Council
cautioned that a good fund-raising program is not necessarily one that costs less, and that
efficiency in fund-raising should not equate to effectiveness (p. 269). Boardman also
reviewed findings from a 1990 study conducted by the Council for Advancement and
Support of Education and the National Association of College and Business Officers
(CASE/NACUBO) that indicated the cost for fund-raising is about 16% of the amount
raised and 50% of the institutions surveyed indicated a range between 8% and 16%. The
study also pointed out that an institution should distinguish the cost of fundraising,
alumni relations, and other institutional relations programs. The study indicated that
some institutions include all costs as part of fundraising costs. CASE/NACUBO
cautioned institutions from combining these costs, suggesting that the costs of the
“complementary programs” vary depending on size and purpose. The study noted that a
long-standing private institution may spend less on public relations than would a state
institution, and a private institution may spend more on donor relations whereas a public
institution may spend more on state legislature relations (Boardman, 1993).

Worth (1993b) stated that due to the increase in institutional fundraising costs
both in terms of number of staff and operational costs, along with institutional budget
constraints, the need to effectively manage resources for maximum utilization is being
emphasized at institutions; issues surrounding management and organization are
appearing in professional literature where they had not in the past. “We will need to
demonstrate the effectiveness of our programs, the efficiency of our organizations, and
the soundness of our management if we are to receive the confidence and support of our
institutions in the years ahead” (Worth, 1993b, p. 238).

According to Loessin and Duronio (1993), an institution can determine
fundraising potential based on its “environmental position” such as size, wealth, and
perceived quality (p. 41): the location of an institution is not as significant. Loessin and
Duronio found that size is more of a factor for public institutions and wealth for private
institutions. However, they also found that, when institutions are sorted by type (private
research, public research, private comprehensive, public comprehensive) and donor
groups are sorted by type (alumni, nonalumni, individuals, corporations, foundations),
there is little to support the general notion that the wealthiest and most prestigious
institutions have the best fundraising programs.

Loessin and Duronio (1993) also found that institutions that have the same
amount of fundraising resources do not always have the same success in terms of raising
funds from specific donor groups. Loessin and Duronio indicated that their quantitative
analysis showed no statistical relationship between the characteristics of an institution
and the level of private giving for all donor groups. This holds true across types and
within types of institutions. Their studies showed that some institutions that were raising
funds above the average for their institutional type were raising funds below what was
expected using statistical procedures to determine predicted giving levels. Others, below
the average were raising more than amounts predicted, which suggested their better use of
their resources. These results implied that ranking institutions by the amount raised does
not indicate fundraising performance. Loessin and Duronio surmised that “…institutional
characteristics alone do not adequately explain why some institutions raise considerably more money in voluntary support than do others with similar resources” (p. 46).

Another aspect that needs to be considered is “…efficiency (the cost per dollar raised) versus effectiveness (the net total amount raised)” (Fogal, 1994. p. 377).

According to Fogal, a foundation could raise $400,000 at a cost of $100,000, netting $300,000 which is a $0.25 cost for every dollar raised. Yet, another foundation could raise $600,000 with a cost of $200,000, netting $400,000 which is a $0.33 cost for every dollar raised. The first foundation would appear more efficient but the second would appear more effective. Fogal urged foundation boards to consider the issues of efficiency and effectiveness when determining their organizational budgets.

Loessin and Duronio (1993) found certain elements necessary for a successful fund-raising program: institutional presidential leadership, institutional commitment to fund-raising, the chief development officer’s role in developing the institutional mission, and entrepreneurial nature of the fund-raising programs (p. 48). Of lesser importance was the board of trustees’ involvement and volunteers’ role, which were shown to be insignificant in achieving a successful fund-raising program. Overall, Loessin and Duronio’s qualitative studies demonstrated that the success of fund-raising is dependent on “…deliberate, sustained efforts to raise money,” leadership, and institutional commitment (p. 48). Yet, Loessin and Duronio illustrated that a formula or models for fund-raising are nonexistent and that certain factors that insignificantly impact fund-raising at one institution could significantly impact another institution.

It can cost more money than is raised because major donors have high expectations in terms of their gift (Nahm & Zemsky, 1993). According to Nahm and
Zemsky, donors want "...to leave his or her mark on the institution." (p. 57). Donors are willing to give a lead gift—the first dollar—for their name on a building but only give a portion of the construction costs and never any funding for operational costs. Nahm and Zemsky suggested that because of this circumstance institutions cannot rely solely on fund-raising to establish long-term financial security; institutions need to realize that fund-raising adds donor expectations which result in additional strain on institutional budgets and operating costs.

The lead gift is one category of gift-giving. Other categories include the annual gift, the major gift, the regular gift (sometimes called the annual gift), the special gift, and the ultimate gift (Worth, 1993b; Dunlop, 1993).

The annual gift program invites new donors by identifying who has interest in the institution and then "...developing their habit of giving" (Worth, 1993b, p. 67). The annual program can be the catalyst for generating a major gift. Dunlop (1993) stated that a major gift is one that is defined by the institution as the highest level of giving. A major gift is further defined as one that is "...relative to the institution, its fund-raising history, and the financial capacities of its constituency" (Worth, 1993c, p. 16). Worth adds that a new fundraising program at a small institution may consider $10,000 as a major gift whereas a larger institution may define it as at least $100,000.

According to Worth (1993b, p. 67), the annual fund and major gift programs complement one another. Although 90% of all money raised comes from 10% of the donors, the greatest number of gifts come from annual gifts (Louden, 1993). Recent data, according to Lippincott and Martin (1997), demonstrated that the ratio is becoming even larger with 95% of money raised coming from 5% of the donors. Private giving at
higher educational institutions is pyramid in nature. According to Louden (1993), the base of the pyramid is composed of an annual fund—the largest number of donors giving small gifts—and serves as a critical element of any institution. This base promotes general interest in the institution, identifies potential donors for special gifts, advocates for the institution, serves as a barometer of public opinion about the institution, and builds an institutional image.

Other gift categories include the regular gift, sometimes called annual gifts: gifts people make to their college at the same time each year (Dunlop, 1993). Another gift category is the special gift: gifts for special needs that are five to ten times larger than regular gifts (at times large enough to reach the major gift category) and paid over several years. Dunlop indicated that the largest gift a donor is able to contribute is called the ultimate gift: 1,000 to 10,000 times larger than the amount the donor previously gave to the institution and usually in the form of a trust or bequest. Dunlop suggested that these ultimate gifts are the donor's "...greatest and most significant philanthropic expression" and the method by which they are given is usually in the form of a planned or deferred gift (p. 99).

Sapp (1993) stated that planned giving is the method used by a donor to contribute an asset to an institution by using a specific method that will benefit both parties; planned giving "...integrates 'how' people give with 'why' people give" (p. 117). An asset can consist of assets such as cash, real estate, stocks, life insurance policies, and antiques. The method used to make the contribution can be made in various ways such as with a trust, deed, or contract. Lippincott and Martin (1997) defined a bequest to be a planned gift where a donor specifies in their will what portion of their estate is to be...
given to an institution and *charitable remainder trusts* are gifts whereby the foundation manages a donor’s asset in an account. Withers (1993) indicated that other gifts corporations can give are *capital gifts* which are multi-year pledges, and *gifts-in-kind* as materials or services. According to Sapp (1993), the donor benefits with savings in income tax, fulfilling a need to provide a charitable contribution or with various other possible benefits, while the institution benefits with increased financial support.

Although institutions prefer major gifts, Worth (1993c) stated that institutions with a young alumni base, under the age of 40, should focus on annual gifts rather than on elaborate planned giving programs, whereas revered and prestigious institutions would be better served to focus on planned giving programs. Yet, Lippincott and Martin (1997) appeared to disagree, and indicated that major gifts are more cost-effective costing $0.10 per dollar raised in comparison to $0.50 per dollar raised for annual gifts. Lippincott and Martin encouraged foundation to focus on major gifts and dedicate staff exclusively to acquire major gifts. Simic and Coffman (1997) agreed with both, implying that the costs are higher for annual gifts—at the bottom of the pyramid—but are needed to develop a new and continuing donor base who will move up the pyramid to contribute major gifts at a substantially smaller cost. Simic and Coffman noted that the next three levels in the pyramid are the “found donors” (p.153) who give annually and may give to special projects, costing about $0.20 to $0.25 for every dollar raised; the next level being the major gift category costing $0.10 for every dollar raised; and the highest level in the planned gift category with a cost of $0.02 to $0.03 for every dollar raised.
Worth (1993c) noted that donors tend to contribute first to universities through participation in annual funds, followed by major gifts earmarked for specific purposes, and finally as part of their wills.

Boardman (1993) cited a 1990 study conducted by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education and the National Association of College and University Business Officers (CASE/NACUBO) noting benchmarks for establishing fundraising staff goals in terms of dollars raised. The study indicated that “On the average, each full-time professional staff member raised more than $900,000 per year” (p. 273). The institutions varied widely: 50% of the institutions had a range between $550,000 and $1,100,000. The study suggested that the benchmarks provide a means to ensure that enough time is spent cultivating donors and keeping other costs not directly related to fundraising activities to a minimum. The study also illustrated benchmarks for overall expenditures: personnel costs utilized almost two-thirds of the operating budget with the remaining budget earmarked for supplies, travel, and support services. Although benchmarks exist which can be utilized by fundraising chief development officers, Boardman cautioned that fundraising involves many factors that cannot be measured in bottom-line numbers. For example, Boardman indicated that effort must be placed persuading administrators, governing boards, and volunteers to become involved with fundraising initiatives and needs must be presented to possible donors with results appearing in the distant future.

Boardman (1993) advised that fundraising staff should be evaluated on dollars raised, effective fund-raising strategies, and on their “…ability to manage a process involving a variety of important individuals who would rather be doing something else”
Worth (1993c), stressed that as budgetary pressures and accountability increase, so will the need for strategic allocation to ensure fundraising programs are not stretched to the point of trying to do everything which would result in “...insufficient effort devoted to those elements of the program most likely to produce revenue or those most relevant to the institution’s real need...” (p. 17).

As Simic and Coffman (1997) stated, “The greatest paradox of fund-raising is that while everyone delights in gifts, no one at the college and university level wants to pay the costs associated with making gifts a reality” (p. 143). However, Simic and Coffman pointed out that “Returns on investment in fund-raising are phenomenal” (p. 145). In the past 30 years, institutions that have invested seed money for university foundations have seen returns in ratios from 20-to-1 to over 100-to-1. Coupled with this, Shufflebarger (1997) illustrated that in the next 10 to 15 years, this nation will “…experience the greatest intergenerational transfer of wealth in its history, variously estimated between $7 trillion to $9 trillion” (p. 252). Of this, about $3 trillion is expected to be allocated to charitable trusts and bequests. [Lippincott and Martin (1997) estimated the wealth transfer between 1995 and 2010 to be $13 trillion.] Shufflebarger indicated that the majority of this money will be targeted to higher education and suggested public universities pursue this “…extraordinary transfer of assets” (p. 252).

Shufflebarger (1997) stated that institutions with long-range planning, with clear visions and plans for the next century, are in the best position to obtain this funding because they have obtained the confidence of donors who are considering long-term investments. And, those institutions that have included donors and foundation volunteers in the long term planning process “…will fare well” (p. 252). Shufflebarger also noted
that along with long-term planning, institutions must demonstrate good stewardship of private funds, and must involve foundation volunteers in the cultivation and solicitation of those donors who are able to make significant contributions in order to obtain a large component of this wealth. Also, public higher education institutions, that have built strong fundraising programs to offset reductions in state funding, will need to compete with the nation's public schools for private gifts, thus creating an increased role of "...educational fund raising in our society" (Worth, 1993d, p. 26).

Foundation Fundraising Efforts and Practices

Charles Summer Ward, a Chicago YMCA executive has been claimed to be the founder of current fundraising practices in higher education today (Worth, 1993d). Worth wrote that the University of Pittsburgh hired Ward in 1914 to raise $3 million, based on his successful fundraising approach with the YMCA. Ward introduced new fundraising techniques that included "...a carefully prepared list of prospects..." and included professional people who develop strategies and managed the program—who were not solicitors themselves but recruited volunteers to solicit (p. 20). According to Worth, Ward's new fundraising method was a dramatic change to the current practices of fundraising in higher education, which, at that time, utilized the "...personal appeal of charismatic individual solicitors" (p. 21).

According to Worth (1993a), the words development and fundraising are used interchangeably. However, Worth indicated that the term development usually refers to the process: developing an academic plan, developing financial needs, identifying potential donors, and cultivating potential donors. Then, fundraising begins—the time to
ask for the gift. After the gift is received, according to Worth, the next step involves stewardship which includes carrying out the purposes of the contribution, continuing to interact with the donor, sharing with them the impact of their gift on institutional goals; these acts lead to the cultivation for the next gift from the donor. Worth defined fundraising as episodic and development as continuous; fundraising requires interpersonal and communication skills, while development requires patience, judgement, and an understanding of the institution’s mission. Worth stated that a fundraiser is one who has the skill in soliciting gifts, and a development officer can be a fundraiser but is the one who manages the entire process. Worth (1993b) also implied that fundraising has not established research-based theory and that fundraising remains “...a blend of science and art” (p. xii).

In higher education, Bremner (1994) suggested that presidents of older and wealthy institutions of higher learning do not need to fundraise because alumni willingly contribute to the institution. However, at other institutions, Bremner noted that the president’s fundraising efforts are necessary to provide funding for facilities, research, and students. Lippincott and Martin (1997) believed that the institutional president must “...develop a personal relationship with major prospects and major donors and treat them as special members of the institution’s family” (p. 74).

In terms of a college or university’s fundraising success connected to the institution’s athletic achievements, Pezzullo and Brittingham (1993) revealed that only a few studies found a positive association, while almost as many studies revealed a negative association.
Worth (1993b) observed that, in the past, about 80% of the private funds to higher education came from 20% of the donors, which then changed to 90% of the funds coming from 10% of the donors, and now, 95% of the money comes from 5% of the donors. This implies that colleges will rely, more and more, on a few relatively large, major donors. Worth described the fund-raising pyramid used in developing solicitation programs: the bottom of the pyramid consisting of those potential donors who comprise the largest group, followed by current donors who contribute annually, and finally to the smallest number of donors who contribute the most, at the top of the pyramid. Worth noted that the most successful fund-raising programs are those that focus on the top of the pyramid for major gifts.

Bloland and Bornstein stated that fundraising activities are labor-intensive and include the following: donor research, cultivation, and solicitation; organization of people to solicit and to understand tax laws; donor recognition including acknowledging and the processing of gifts (as cited in Ostrander, 1995, p. 197). Sapp (1993) wrote that fundraisers need to be familiar with charitable giving tax laws because these laws make various giving options attractive to potential donors and fundraisers can help donors determine giving plans that will be most advantageous to the donor. The management of a fundraising program requires specific strategies and action plans that are jointly designed by the chief development officer and their development and fundraising staff (Patton, 1993).

Payton, Rosso, & Tempel, stated that fundraising includes the concept of making donors feel that they belong to the organization. "The process of asking for a gift begins with informing potential contributors of the need being met by the organization, goes on
to involve them in the work of the organization, and ends with an invitation to invest in that work” (as cited in Ostrander, 1995, p. 14). Dunlop (1993) agreed, and stated that, in the beginning, prospective donors speak of the institution in the third person and use “they” or “them.” To receive major gifts from potential donors, fundraisers must help the potential donors change their perspective toward the institution, feel a part of the institution, and speak about it in the first person using “we” and “us” (p. 102). White, 1995, stated that Dartmouth College alumni are shown, “how to love their college from the day they first step on campus as freshman” (p. 19). White continued to suggest that they are involved with the campus’s traditions and experiences from the first day they step onto the campus and continue as alumni to instill a sense of community and family even when campus difficulties surface. “Even during 1987 when donors expressed their vehement opposition of Dartmouth’s practice of investing in South Africa during the days of apartheid, donors who were told by friends to discontinue giving, responded with, ‘You mean stop supporting the place I love so much? Never!’” (White, 1995, p. 19).

Fundraising practices “rely on cultivating relationships and building community” (Ostrander, 1995, p. 78). Ostrander cited Rosso and Panas to illustrate three principles that are most prevalent in fundraising practices: Rosso indicated that one principle is cultivating relationships with donors particularly when seeking large gifts (but this could be inappropriate in some cases). Panas indicated two other principles—having the donor become fully aware and committed to organizational goals, and having the donor actively involved in the organization (as cited in Ostrander, 1995, p. 82).

Ostrander (1995) suggested that there are political issues in fundraising and cautioned the acceptance of donor gifts that are given because of personal relationships.
with fundraisers or gifts that are given without understanding the organization's goals or the recipient of the funds. Nicklin (1997) agreed and pointed out, as an example, that courting donors and befriending donors could have consequences. Families have sued institutions alluding that a planned-giving fundraiser pressured the deceased into giving their estate to the institution.

Fundraisers gather as much information on donors as possible, making a separate confidential file for each donor, that includes personal demographics, their history, their likes and dislikes, their friends and family, their personal and company finances, or "the kind of scandal that a potential donor might want to make retribution for by making a large and public gift" (Ostrander, 1995, p. 198).

The data collected on prospective donors (individuals or corporations) should be relevant and reliable (Lippincott & Martin, 1997). "Good research makes the difference between scattershot staff work yielding a few lucky hits and targeted solicitations that have a high 'P/E' (payoff to effort) ratio" (p. 66). Siegel (1993) indicated that foundation researchers develop profiles of potential major donors; they include information about their worth and ability to give, interests in contributing, relationships with people associated with the institution, and opinions about the institution. These data formulate a tracking system that is kept up-to-date as new information about the individual comes forward. According to Siegel, the research of donors is labor-intensive especially when the institution is looking for a number of major donors.

Many major giving prospects are needed to generate a few major contributions. To garner information about prospects, foundation researchers also utilize resources such as *Who's Who in America, Who's Who in Finance and Industry, Martin-Hubbell Law*
Directory, Standard and Poor's Register, and the Million Dollar Directory (Siegel, 1993). According to Siegel, other reference materials can also be used: public information literature, court probate information, divorce settlements, and civil suits. Siegel also warned that these sources should be used cautiously, only when a prospect has the potential to contribute large amounts of money and other data have not been found to support that premise. The potential downfall in using this strategy is that ethics of fundraisers will be questioned. They will be viewed as prying into people’s lives for money, resulting with the perception that fundraising is not a noble profession (Siegel, 1993). Siegel advised fundraisers to “police themselves” and have “a respect for the privacy of donor prospects” (p. 263).

According to Lippincott and Martin (1997), the Council for Aid to Education reported that in 1993-94 alumni provided 28% of all contributions to higher education and represent a group to target for long-term major gift giving. Louden (1993) made similar statements and indicated that alumni are the largest supporters of an institution and that their support is a vote of confidence for the institution as well as a desire on their part to have their institution progress, to strengthen their own degrees. Alumni, according to Webb (1993), usually give of their time and money, and facilitate the philanthropic support from corporations and friends.

Lippincott and Martin (1997) stated that the Council for Aid to Education report demonstrated that repeat givers are the best candidates from which to look for future major gifts. Lippincott and Martin advised fundraisers to develop good computer databases on their prospective and current donors to include biographical information, frequency of participation in campus events, service on committees and boards, prior...
giving to the institution or to other institutions, financial ability to give, all correspondence, face-to-face contacts, expressed interests in the institution or special projects, and memories of those people already involved with the campus or foundation (current donors, faculty, staff). These data can be used to identify people who can be considered for targeted solicitation based on their income, lifestyle, or other criteria (Lippincott & Martin 1997).

Following the research stage comes the “cultivation” stage (Lippincott & Martin, 1997, p. 72). Good research about a prospective donor provides the fundraiser with information necessary to educate the prospective donor about the institution: developing a strategy for educating the prospective donor and maintaining contact over a long period of time. To demonstrate a strategy based on research, Lippincott and Martin stated,

...if the prospective donor’s most recent contact is more than a decade old, then cultivation should begin with an invitation, not with a solicitation. The invitation may be to any institutional event—social, athletic, cultural, academic, or alumni-sponsored—and it should be compatible with the individual’s known interests. Alternatively, an institution official and a volunteer first may make a courtesy call on the prospective donor’s own ‘turf.’ Perhaps in the home or office. (p. 72)

Jerold Panas, in Mega Gifts, stated that the cultivation period for a large gift is about seven years (as cited in Adams, 1993, p. 135). Adams believed that cultivation is the process of developing relationships that are built, “…over quiet dinners, at frenetic football finishes, in somber lecture halls, or amid the excitement of a laboratory discovery” and that major donors have had these long relationships with the institution as well as the people representing the institution (p. 135). Adams also intimated that fundraising techniques are important but overrated; and that the fundraiser’s perspective, readiness, and relationship to the donor are usually more important than techniques used.
However, Adams did state that a poorly handled phone call could ruin years of developing that relationship.

Following the cultivation stage is the asking stage. Louden (1993) suggested that “…face-to-face contact is always the most effective way to solicit a gift” (p.77). Louden also indicated that the telephone is the next effective with mail being the least effective. Because of the labor-intensive time it takes to visit or call potential donors, Louden recommended the use of volunteers for this purpose. rather than utilizing paid staff resources. The use of a personal call will generate 50% of what was asked 75% of the time, the use of a general phone request (not personalized) will generate 25% of what was asked 50% of the time. and mail will generate small gifts 2% to 10% of the time (Louden. 1993). Louden also implied that “…solicitation should begin with the prospects closest to the institution” and suggested personal visits to selected groups: board members, the top 10% of alumni and parent donors, the top local corporations, foundations that gave in the past, and friends who previously provided a substantial gift. Louden suggested the combination of a phone call and mail to the next group—current and prior donors—and only mail to those who have not yet contributed but have been asked before. According to Clark (1993), the use of a direct mail needs to restate, in lay terms, the institution’s mission statement in a manner that will create an emotional connection. for the prospective donor. about the people who are assisted by the institution. And many letters of successful fund-raising programs emphasize the outcome to one or several individuals should private gifts not be forthcoming. Clark also wrote that direct mail letters should accentuate an institution’s accomplishments and good reputation to demonstrate a sense of prestige, because alumni are proud to be a part of a reputable institution.
According to Dunlop (1993), there are three types of fundraising. First, is “speculative” fundraising which is considered project-oriented for general needs or specific need such as a scholarship, and success is measured on the amount raised over a specific period of time (p. 99). This method utilizes direct mail, phonathons, and face-to-face requests without knowing the prospects willingness and readiness to give. The second type of fundraising is campaign/project fundraising that involves preparing the prospect and investing the time needed to help the individual understand and commit to the intent of the gift. The third type is nurturing fundraising used for prospective donors who are considered potential major givers. This type of fundraising is considered prospect-oriented as opposed to project-oriented and is used to raise funds for special gifts. This strategy involves an enormous amount of effort to nurture the individual to establish a commitment to the institution and to the purposes of the gift; the time to ask for the gift will be dependent on the individual’s readiness, not the institution’s need. Although the costs to nurture a prospective donor are high, the outcome with large gifts makes this strategy the most cost-effective method of fundraising (Dunlop, 1993).

There is no precise time to ask a donor for a gift, according to Lippincott and Martin (1997). Timing rests mostly with the prospective donor’s “comfort level” as determined by the fundraiser; other factors can include the tax calendar and public announcements about the individual’s income or asset changes, said Lippincott and Martin. Lippincott and Martin also advised that asking for a major gift requires a visit to the prospective donor. They also suggested that the amount for which a fundraiser should ask is, “…somewhere between ‘a gulp and a gasp’” with the lowest amount at least 10% above the individual’s previous gift to an organization, and the highest amount 10%
below an amount that would negatively impact the individual’s financial safety or lifestyle (p. 77). Ostrander (1995) suggested that fundraisers approach donors with a marketing plan that sells the organization to the donor, making the donor view a contribution as an investment that will benefit the donor. Yet, Adams (1993) suggested—based on an exhaustive review of fundraising literature and on the author’s personal experience—that success of face-to-face solicitation is based on “1. The solicitor’s perspective on asking; 2. The solicitor’s preparation for the ask; 3. The donor’s relationship to the institution and its people; and 4. The solicitor’s technique” (p. 132).

Adams (1993) stated that the best fundraisers are those who love other people, love their cause, know they are asking for a gift not for themselves, and know they have treated the prospect appropriately. Fundraisers need to know a prospective donor’s perspective on giving which would necessitate that the fundraisers spend hours with the donor, listening in order to learn about the prospect’s “…habits, likes and dislikes, family situation, favorable and unfavorable impressions of the institution, and perhaps most important of all, donor intent” (p. 134). Adams also asserted that nurturing a feeling is a key element to obtain donor gifts. For example, donors have stated reasons for their gifts, “The students looked nice and smiled at me while I was on campus” and “I really like the way you keep the buildings and grounds here; it shows a care and concern that I admire” (Adams, 1993, p. 133). Overall, Adams advised that the best solicitation involves good donor research and “…an intimate knowledge of the prospect that leads to a sixth sense about the prospect’s likes and desires, and an unusual capacity to listen” (p.135). White (1995) contended that a fundraiser must approach a donor with a smile, shining personality, and technical ability.
The next stage, after a gift has been given to an institution, is stewardship (Worth, 1993c). whereby fundraisers follow up and remain in contact with the donor. Lippincott and Martin (1997) define stewardship as "...a term that covers obligations to and recognition of donors. It begins and ends with acknowledging the donor's generosity of spirit" (p. 83). Worth cautioned fundraisers that this is a neglected component of many fundraising programs. Worth demonstrated that many donors make a gift to an institution never to hear from the institution again until the next solicitation. The better approach, according to Worth, is to invest in professional staff who will develop "donor relations" that must be in place to ensure trust and confidence by the donor resulting in increased fundraising performance (p. 13). Lippincott and Martin listed methods of acknowledgements such as thank-you notes from foundation leadership, periodic reports to major donors regarding the usage and impact of their gift, and direct contact with recipients such as students or faculty. Lippincott and Martin further stated that donor recognition is important in generating repeat giving and that the method of recognition should be discussed with the donor because some donors prefer anonymity while others prefer fanfare.

In 1995, Ostrander wrote that the more donors become close to an organization—like working on conferences, asking other wealthy people for money, and being accountable for involvement—the more they give. The concept of building partnerships is meaningless unless there is an active working relationship and face-to-face meetings with donor and fundraisers to gain a sense of connectedness. According to Lippincott and Martin (1997), the institution can invite prospective donors to serve on institutional or foundation boards, join advisory groups in their area of expertise, participate in
institutional planning discussions, serve as an institutional advocate to state legislative bodies, interact with the media, and encourage other prospective donors to give. The institution can honor these individuals for their contributions in ways such as, “...bestowing special privileges, holding public receptions, hosting private dinner parties, and awarding honorary degrees” (p. 73). However, Ostrander (1995) contended that some donors prefer to keep to themselves because of physical safety or to prevent ongoing solicitations from outsiders with a deluge of requests for money.

For those who want recognition, Lippincott and Martin (1997) illustrated a few examples of institutional donor clubs: special giving clubs associated with donor contribution levels, donor contributions for special projects, or donor planned gifts or wills. These special giving clubs are published in institutional and foundation literature, and also in local newspapers. These donors, according to Lippincott and Martin, usually receive special institutional privileges, as well as small token-of-appreciation gifts, and entrance to institutional athletic and cultural events. Lippincott and Martin also listed other types of major donor recognition such as large public dinners and receptions with the donor as guest of honor, press conferences, news releases, or a facility or program in the donor’s name. “Publicity about gifts reflects well on the donor and the institution and may serve as an inspiration to other prospective donors” (p. 86). However, Hillman (1980) noted a concern for naming a facility and stated, “‘Tombstone philanthropy’ is an apt epithet for this money-for-ego-fulfillment trade-off” (p. 75).

The use of newsletters has another benefit. According to White, 1995, donors learned about giving options of which they were previously unaware, and have given
land, in exchange for a life income, because they read in a newspaper that someone else
did.

Lippincott and Martin (1997) cautioned the use of honorary degrees to donors. They suggested that academic personnel should be included in the selection process because these degrees should be affiliated with mission of the institution. “The wisest course is to reserve honorary degrees for exceptional achievement, service or heroism. A donor should be honored for such reasons, not as a form of recognition for a gift” (p. 86).

According to Ostrander (1995), some donors continue to give more year after year even though fundraisers passively solicit for funds. Yet, other donors prefer to be asked directly. One donor stated, “I’ve [only] been fundraised once, and I’m dying to be more involved” (Ostrander, 1995, p. 85).

Ostrander (1995) suggested that wealthy donors like to be challenged by each other to give more. They do not want to be challenged to give more by a person of another class background. Ostrander wrote that a donor stated, “I feel really scared when a working-class person challenges me, but I feel fine if another wealthy person does” (p. 152). Another donor indicated, “I [don’t want to have to] defend my class. I don’t want to have to be put in a situation where I have to feel badly about myself” (p. 153).

Ostrander (1995) had a unique view about issues of gender; Ostrander stated that developing close personal relationships between women fundraisers and women donors for social events is beneficial and that social connections that include “emotional labor and sociability work” (p. 155) are usually associated with women. Von Schlegell and Fisher suggested that qualities with which women tend to be associated are those that are
utilized in effective fundraising (as cited in Ostrander, 1995 p. 204). Mixer (also cited in Ostrander, 1995, p. 204), suggested that staff fundraisers would soon be mostly women.

In terms of corporate solicitation. Withers (1993) outlined a few key guidelines: do not send a form letter to a company, to the chief executive officer, or the company's officer who gives corporate donations; look for companies close to the institution; and find someone who knows the corporation to make the initial call. Withers also suggested that institutions build relationships with corporations. An institution, as Withers advised, can check local news for promotions and send notes of congratulations to alumni working in the corporation who have been promoted, meet with the company's donation officer to talk about the institution's plans with the company, send them annual institutional reports or magazines, and develop institutional newsletters that describe the institution's ties with the corporation and send them to company prospects. Withers also suggested that the corporation be frequently reminded what it would receive in return for supporting the institution with a donation: corporations are not interested in emotional solicitations, or tickets to events.

Schumacher (1992) indicated that corporations will frequently point out that they can legally spend money only on institutional research, for example, that is tied to the interest of their company, and that institutions should look for compatibility between the institution and the corporation. Hillman (1980) emphasized this and stated, “Contrary to what some corporate PR departments would have you believe, corporations seldom if ever give for purely altruistic reasons. For a grant-seeker to hold such a Pollyanna notion is a counterproductive self-delusion of the first rank” (p. 3). Hillman added, “To approach a corporation on the assumption that it will fund you simply because you have a good
cause is naïve” (p.3). Institutions should approach corporations only after conducting its research and asking itself, “In which ways can a corporation selfishly benefit from our project?” (Hillman, 1980, p. 69). Hillman asserted that developing creative connections with corporations and focusing on corporate benefits rather than focusing on the corporation’s philanthropic responsibility could generate unlimited amounts of money to the institution. Schumacher (1992) suggested that faculty be allowed to directly access corporations for creating tie-ins because faculty “are the best emissaries a university can have. They represent the creative talent, the intellectual resources, the source of education, training, and research—the reasons companies need the university in the first place” (p. 243).

Traditional notions of fundraising, and the psychology of giving, include looking at donors’ interests and motives, and enticing them to contribute (Ostrander, 1995). According to Payton, Arnaud Marts, a founder of recent fundraising principles, indicated that the most effective fundraising happens when one pays attention to the motivations and interests of donors, and connects them to organizational goals (as cited in Ostrander, 1995, p. 207). Panas stated that “People do not give because there is a need” indicating that donor giving for the organization has secondary priority over their own needs (as cited in Ostrander, 1995, p. 207).

More recent concepts of fundraising oppose the notion of catering to donor motives; catering to donor motives is viewed as detrimental to the organization and its mission (Ostrander, 1995). In utilizing this newer concept, Ostrander suggested that fundraisers look to the organizational mission and goals. “While donor interest, benefits,
and concerns are certainly not—and should not be—ignored. This approach sees fundraising in social and organizational contexts" (p. 167).

However, Pezzullo and Brittingham (1993) disagreed and stated, “Knowledge of donor behavior and motivation is crucial to the practicing fund raiser. This knowledge helps determine the timing of solicitations, the types of appeals, and the sizes of requests, among many other things” (p. 31).

Ostrander (1995) also suggested that fundraisers view their own success, not by the amount of money they develop, but by their fundraising efforts that contribute to the organizational goals, by the development of “social exchange” relationships between donors and recipients, and by the creation of opportunities for donors to be with others who are committed to achieving shared goals (p. 167). Ostrander believed that this new concept in fundraising supports complete partnerships among all those involved, making the division invisible between donor and fundraiser. They are viewed as the same with the same shared goals, all part of the fundraising efforts, and all part of the overall plan to meet organizational goals.

Too frequently, many trustees and development staff do not spend enough time understanding their charity’s mission or understanding their constituencies (White, 1995). The mission statement needs to be clear and concise—one or two pages in length—and should not be everything to everyone, which means the statement would need to exclude some element of the university from its mission. “The more precise about who you are, the more clear you are about who you are not” (White, p. 221). White stated, “it is necessary to admit what is true if you are to convey why people should support your charity” (p. 221). White also indicated that advertisements for solicitations should first
emphasize the mission and then briefly mention the tax or income benefit. In 1993, Williams wrote that institutions should market themselves as they would like the public to view them because, as numerous studies implied, an institution’s reputation and prestige is the most important variable in fundraising. A 1986 study published in the *AGB Reports*, found that “...prestige far overrode the institution’s status as public or private” (Williams, 1993. p. 292)

Rosso (as cited in Ostrander, 1995, p.208) emphasized the need to combine organizational goals with that of fundraising and providing donors with information and knowledge about the organization to generate donor interest. Dorsey stated, “A sense of community must be developed among fundraisers, [donors], and those who benefit from the funds” (as cited in Ostrander, 1995. p. 208). Ostrander also quoted Kelly who indicated that fundraisers should not use a marketing approach to fundraising. fundraising should not focus on the benefits to donors as consumers, fundraising should be evaluated “by the impact those dollars have on the success of the organization” (1995. p. 208).

In regards to a specific type of giving, planned gifts also known as deferred gifts (including gifts that are given in return for a life income), occur after the donor is deceased. Nicklin (1997) indicated that donors tend to make planned gifts only after a major circumstance has happened in their life such as the death of a loved one, retirement, or an unexpected accumulation of money. According to Nicklin, in 1995, 25.3% of all gifts to institutions by individuals were in the form of planned gifts as bequests, and 15.8% were in the form of other types of deferred gifts. Nicklin stated that because planned gifts can prove to be large sums of money and are popular with people who cannot afford a major donation, institutions are placing emphasis on identifying these
sources of gifts. White (1995) stated that it takes about 18 months to arrange a planned gift. Also, Lippincott and Martin (1997) demonstrated that the group of individuals ages 65 to 70 will grow dramatically over the next 20 years and will have a longer life expectancy. Lippincott and Martin advised fundraisers to target this group by aggressively marketing annual giving programs, knowing that a large pool of annual donors will provide a larger base from which solicitation can be made for major gifts in the form of planned giving. Lippincott and Martin also suggested that women are a growing segment of donors and fundraisers should target that group as well. Although the potential to increase the planned giving pool will be larger, White (1995) cautioned fundraisers about donors' intent.

If they are looking more to earn income than to make a gift, they are not donors. Turn down the offer, for it is in fact not an offer and will not magically transform itself into a gift. As difficult as it might be to refuse a gift, dealing with a bad gift over the next few decades will be much more difficult. The payout issue is the most revealing of many matters with which the planned giving officer must deal. Donors in their sixties who demand a high trust payout quickly expose their lack of donative intent. (p. 142)

According to Lippincott and Martin (1997), most major gifts come from donors who have given small amounts annually for a number of years; the University of Iowa reported that those who gave a gift of at least $1 million had given to the university over a 20-year period. Louden (1993) held that a yearly request for a gift from a donor is needed to place the donor in the habit of giving; the donor expects to be asked and sees their giving as a responsibility.

White (1995) found that the most successful annual campaigns in higher education demonstrated a 50% level of participation. He believed that this could be
viewed as the same people giving over and over again, meaning that most people do not give to charity:

Although most of us will hold doors open for others and in general try to get along with people even without a financial incentive to do so, being merely mannerly is quite different from being charitable. Charity usually requires sacrifice, sacrifice of time or sacrifice of money. Most of us, when confronted with the elderly woman who feebly asks for alms for the poor, will usually wonder. "Why should I be bothered? It's not my problem."

(p. 9)

Those who contribute to annual funds include governing board members, alumni, parents of past and current students, corporations, foundations, and friends (Louden, 1993). Louden contended that board members, parents, and alumni have a vested interest in the institution and are the groups that should be targeted. Louden also stated that the groups most difficult to target for annual funds are (1) people categorized as a friend because they are difficult to identify, (2) alumni for large gifts, as they tend to give small gifts, and (3) corporations and foundations located outside the community. Kavanagh (1993) suggested that parents, and grandparents, who are considered potential major contributors should be researched early to begin the cultivation process. Parents could serve on special advisory boards, meet with faculty and staff who can speak to the parents' area of interest. According to Kavanagh, "The long-term cultivation strategies used with alumni are not always as successful with parent prospects unless the institution has done a good job of attracting parents' special interest early in their relationship with the institution" (p. 214). As an example, asking parents to give because of an obligation is not effective because parents are paying tuition. Instead, ask them to give as a part of a tradition that helps strengthen the institution. Kavanagh believed that parents want a
good education for their child, want accountable and approachable faculty and staff, and want to feel proud about the institution.

Professional and graduate school alumni are more interested in improving the quality and reputation of their institution which will increase the value of their credentials. They are not as interested in emotional ties as are undergraduate alumni (Ashton, 1993). Consequently, fundraising strategies for these alumni, according to Ashton, should focus on donating for the purpose of improving the quality and reputation of the institution.

White (1995) suggested too much time is spent learning about the mechanics of planned giving as it relates to tax advantages when fundraisers still do not understand the role of charity in our society nor do they understand why donors donate. "For what feeble reason can the executive of a charity offer in defense of a planned giving program, or, for that matter, any fundraising effort, than its tax deductible status? Or the income benefits derived from deferred gifts?" (p. ix). White also stated that "And make no mistake: As challenging as understanding the technical aspects of planned giving is, it pales by comparison with understanding what makes donors donate" (p. 7). White made it clear that philanthropy is complex and stated:

Philanthropy is the result of a long and good relationship. It cannot be bought or quickly manufactured in response to tax laws, financial gimmicks, or even a good marketing program. Like the love between a married couple, or between a child and a parent, the love and altruism in philanthropy take time to nurture. A mother loves her son because of a mature sense of pride and relationship. After years of trust, the mother spends—invests—what is needed to educate him and further his responsible goals. She would normally have no such desire to do the same for the neighbor's child. (p. 16)
Lippincott and Martin (1997) agreed and added, "The relationship with a donor should be treated as a lifetime relationship of mutually satisfying interactions, not a lifetime of pestering" (p. 74).

Recent Trends, Motives and Practices of Private Giving

"Why do people give money? While that question has no definitive answer, two major factors are evident: A desire to help other people, and a desire to gain a sense of belonging, prestige, or identity" (Clark, 1993, p. 90).

Gilbert and Kahl indicated that in 1990, about 1% of the United States' population had 33% of the wealth (as cited in Ostrander, 1995, p. 166). A 1990 study by Bremner (1994) showed that the poor in this country tended to give more than the rich; the poor, with an annual income of less than $10,000, gave 5.5% to charity—most to religion—while the wealthy gave 2.9% to charity and non-profit organizations. Pezzullo and Brittingham (1993) presented similar information indicating that private giving is in the form of a "...U-shaped curve, with the poorest and most affluent giving the largest amounts, measured as a percentage of income" and that the wealthy tend to give a larger proportion of their contributions to higher education while others give to religion (p. 32). Schervish and Havens (1995) stated that people in the lower income category give considerably less in absolute terms than those in the higher income category but stated, "Hence, while we can compare upper- and lower-income households, we cannot use the data to compare wealthy and poor households" (p. 83).

According to Fogal (1994), people who volunteered usually gave more monetarily. Fogal cited a 1991 survey by the Independent Sector that showed 46% of the
households in this country volunteered and gave about $1,155, which was 2.6% of the family income. Whereas only 26% of the households did not volunteer and gave about $477, which was 1.4% of the household income. Fogal also emphasized that in a more recent study, those who volunteered and contributed money had an average family income over $44,000, and those who did not volunteer but contributed monetarily had an average of about $34,000 family income. A Gallup poll for the Independent Sector, conducted in 1988, found that those who volunteered donate almost twice as much as those who do not volunteer (Lippincott and Martin, 1997).

Shao (1995) cited a study by Tonai illustrated that Asians in the San Francisco-Oakland area gave 2.7% of their household income to charity: the Independent Sector defines substantial givers as those who give 2.5% of their household income (p. 57). The study also illustrated that Asian-Americans give more than the general population and contribute to non-Asian groups such as education and United Way.

Jencks examined early studies and data from Gallup, IRS and Federal Reserve and discovered the following: men give less than women, Catholics give less than Protestants, single people give less than those who are widowed or married, people give more as they age, people (regardless of income) with dependent children give more than others, people increase their giving by 5% for every year of additional schooling, and those who annually contribute at least $500 give larger gifts to higher education than to any other group (as cited in Pezzullo & Brittingham, 1993, p. 32).

Most gift-giving is in the form of sending money to an organization rather than in the form of providing a service or volunteering time (Bremner, 1994). Bremner wrote that in recent years, the concept of charitable-giving has changed from one of sacrifice to
one with fun and profit. Bremner referred to the PGA Seniors Championship literature that stated, “When the snowbirds leave...year-round residents, in return for $25 donation to the Cancer and Lung Societies or $15 to the Arthritis Foundation, receive golf privilege cars good for free or reduced green fees at participating golf courses” (as cited in Bremner, 1994, p. 209).

Bremner (1994) stated that philanthropy has been viewed as self-serving devices by donors rather than as assisting those who receive benefit from the gifts. Bremner also indicated that many authors on gift-giving are “...quick to point out self-interest in the guise of altruism as stinginess hiding behind high principles” (p. xii). White (1995) agreed and stated, “Motives of some sort drive every major gift....We like to think of the 'goodness' factor in those who give, and undoubtedly most donors are compelled by virtue. But some virtue is more Machiavellian than praiseworthy” (p. 10). Yet, Worth (1993b) suggested that donors do not give solely for financial or tax advantages.

Pezzullo and Brittingham (1993) made the distinction that, according to the studies by Jerold Panas, the motives of ordinary giving are varied while the motives of large gifts are very complex, and are not understood by the researcher nor the donors themselves. These studies did indicate that donors of large gifts had been giving over their lifetime, donated because it was important to their lives and the joy it gave them, donated because they supported the mission of the particular organization, and felt their gift would make a difference. The studies also implied that these large donors would not contribute to organizations broiled in controversy, would resist being sold by the organization, but enjoyed being thanked repeatedly for their gifts (p. 37).
Various studies indicated that donors' motives for giving are not because of the agency's needs (White, 1995). White suggested that donors want to give to those who use their money wisely, who already have money, and who will benefit from the donated gift.

It is best to ask donors to invest in the agency:

This should surprise only those intellectually lazy enough to actually believe that people of means will throw their money to a failing cause. Say to someone with even the slightest hint of desperation that you need the money, and you will most certainly be denied. The need for a new library should translate to an opportunity for students, a gateway to the future. Thus the need does not suffer a loneliness, which makes it negative, but is directly linked to an opportunity, which makes it positive. This line of thinking is not mere euphemism; it conveys an attitude. We instinctively reject beggars. (White, 1995, p. 12)

People who inherit large amounts of money have difficulty comprehending and coping, thus develop feelings of "isolation, pain, confusion, and even feelings of powerlessness" (Ostrander, 1995, p. 67). Domini (as cited in Ostrander, 1995, p. 68) found that people feel ashamed and overwhelmed, compelled to reassess their lives, and confused about how to spend their money. Yet, Aldrich stated that most people will not give away this money; they are concerned about losing their "freedom and independence" (as cited in Ostrander, 1995, p. 70). Also, people feel family loyalty. They feel that the money does not belong to them, and that older members of the family view the need for family loyalty and the need to keep the inheritance for future family generations (Ostrander, 1995).

Ostrander (1995) found that women tend to have less knowledge about managing family wealth and that particular foundations, that help women with wealth learn more about managing funds, have increased donorship by women. Also, Ostrander and Fisher (1995) pointed out various studies on female philanthropy. They cited that, according to
the 1994 report by the National Council for Research for Women. the Internal Revenue Service claimed that 60% of the national wealth is owned by women, that 48% of wealthy women make charitable bequests as opposed to only 35% of the wealthy men, and that younger women tend to give money to “social action causes” (p. 67). Ostrander and Fisher also stated that the 1994 report by the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy illustrated that 81% of women and 69% of men are likely to give to charitable organizations. Mixer’s 1994 report showed that during the 1991 recession women increased their giving by 2.4% and men reduced their giving by 20% (as cited in Ostrander & Fisher, 1995, p. 68).

Peoples’ emotions impact gift-giving (Bremner, 1994). Bremner stated that the death of a loved one prompts gifts to organizations and colleges that conduct research on disease prevention, and people who are regretful of past deeds as a child may be more charitable as adults. He also indicated that most people tend to give due to “sentiment, habit, or impulse” (p. 204).

Some people need to be persuaded to give (White, 1995). Other have already been persuaded and are willing to give because they felt the need to give decades ago, some want to relive their youth, some want the youth to enjoy similar experienced they experienced, and other want to give back to society. According to White, “The subjective, internal, and highly personal feelings donors have for their preferred causes, untraceable to any tangible activity or effort, are important elements in the decision-making process” (p. 76).

Why are some people charitable? Why do many people—busy, budget-conscious people—give away their money when nothing tangible is returned? Who knows? Ask some donors. They may say they feel
obligated to help those institutions that helped them. The stories that surface when charitable representatives ask their donors why they made a gift are endless and usually anecdotal, each with its own personal drama. (White, 1995, p. 9)

Lippincott and Martin (1997) stated that people tend to make their largest private gift at the age of 65 to 70. Lippincott and Martin also noted that a shift occurred in philanthropy in the last 30 years. Major donors gave old money, now major donors give money that has accumulated during their own lifetime, implying that these donors will make contributions “...less from a tradition of giving and more from a sense of gratitude for their own success” (p. 66).

In terms of higher education, Grace (1993) stated that there are limited national data to study donor characteristics. Grace cited a study by the Center on Philanthropy in 1987 that found that institutional donor databases and files “...were so idiosyncratic that they could not be used for general analysis.... Existing data files are not comparable; many lack basic characteristics such as gender” (p. 383). Although national data are sketchy there are certain findings worth noting.

Simic and Coffman (1997) found that donors give to higher education to realize their dreams for higher education and that their gifts are “...expressions of hope moved toward reality by the donor’s values and largess” (p. 144). Simic and Coffman believed that discussion with donors and fundraisers about such aspects as tax savings and investment returns, only happen after the donor has made an emotional decision about the institution.

Pezzullo and Brittingham (1993) cited Christopher Jencks research, which found that donors to private institutions—in comparison with donors to public institutions—
tend to give to other institutions as well. Donors to private institutions also give more of their charitable gifts to higher education. Also, private institutions receive a larger percentage of the larger gifts with over 75% of their gifts over $5,000 whereas about 66% of public institutions’ gifts are over that amount (p. 32). Pezzulo and Brittingham also noted that their national survey of 1990 suggested that about 25% of college attendees made a contribution to their institution; another 25% did not contribute because they were not asked; those with a baccalaureate degree contribute larger gifts than those who had not attained the degree; alumni who are more likely to contribute attended religious institutions followed by independent institutions then public institutions: loyalty is an important factor in giving to one’s institution, especially for alumni who attended an independent institution; and women were more likely to give with the frequency increasing as income level increased.

Corporations donate to institutions not because they are interested in the well being of the institutions, but rather to advance their own goals (Worth. 1993c). Worth suggested that corporations tend to support particular projects that are of interest to them. Withers (1993) asserted that corporations today are “...far, far more interested in *quid pro quo*—what is in it for them” (p. 181). Withers argued that corporations look to support causes that make them look good or offer an advantage and operate their philanthropic efforts in a business-like fashion—with specific objectives, accountable to share holders about their decision on philanthropic expenditures, gaining the best return on their “investment,” and wanting to appear as “...good corporate citizens for their stockholders” (p. 189). Pezzullo and Brittingham (1993) implied that corporations give toward research that benefits their company and also educates their future prospective
employees. Other benefits of corporate giving to higher education include, "...enhanced image, improved employee morale, and a sense of corporate social responsibility" (p. 37). Pezzullo and Brittingham also contended that there is a tremendous difference among cities in terms of their corporate giving to higher education due to competition: corporations create high levels of peer pressure within a community, forcing them to respond and set general levels of support.

Hillman (1980) stated that corporate chairpersons and presidents say they are involved in philanthropy for "good corporate citizenship" (p. 4). Hillman believed their statements are biased because, "The executives naturally wanted to present their companies to the public in a favorable light, so the self-assessments tended to be in a self-congratulatory vein" (p. 4). According to Hillman, corporations have certain motives for philanthropic endeavors: gain a tax advantage, create a positive image, persuade opinion-makers, build community and business relations, repay a favor, stay ahead of competitive corporate philanthropy, encourage employee training, attract potential employees, prevent losses, identify with quality, and appease the wishes of executives. Corporations can build a "saintly" image to the public and Hillman offered as an example,

Consider your different reactions as John Q. Public if you heard that Chevrolet was lowering the price of 10,000 of its cars by $100 each, as opposed to being informed that Chevrolet was donating the equivalent amount ($1 million) to the Boy Scouts of America. (p. 5)

Hillman (1980) emphasized that corporations want to persuade opinion-makers to ensure their own protection. According to Hillman, about 1% of the people in this country have a lot of clout and influence the nation's thinking in terms of the environment, increases in pricing, and other complex issues. Corporations use the Public
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Broadcasting System to reach the 1% (who watch PBS). Corporations use PBS because they know that if they raise prices or have an oil spill, for example, the 1% will not be as severe with the corporation because they are accustomed to hearing the PBS ad—funding made possible by the X corporation—and will say, "those are the good guys who sponsor Shakespeare plays on TV" (Hillman, 1980, p. 5). The corporation can "...get its money's worth if it can just neutralize the one-percenters, that is, keep them from thinking badly of it" (p. 5).

Corporations can use philanthropy to build relations with businesses. Hillman (1980) cited the example of a corporation needing a bank loan. Although the bank may view the loan as a risk, the bank may approve the loan because the corporation is known to support local charities. Corporations also utilize philanthropy to repay a favor. "I supported yours, now you support mine" (p. 7). According to Hillman, corporations also want to stay ahead of their competitor in terms of gift-giving, and they want to get their employees trained—the reason for their college donations. Corporations want to attract top employees in the nation and know that talented employees will only move to a location that has sufficient cultural and intellectual activities. Consequently, corporations "...will donate money to cultural organizations in the hope of upgrading the community's cultural environment" (Hillman, 1980, p. 8). Hillman also stated that prospective employees also look more favorably to organizations that contribute to the community.

Hillman (1980) suggested that corporations prevent losses with "philanthropic insurance" whereby philanthropy can protect a corporation from government sanctions for its misdeeds (p. 9). Also, corporations use philanthropy as a tool to be viewed as reputable. As Hillman demonstrated, Texaco sponsored the PBS Metropolitan Opera for
decades "...basking in the light of another's respectability. It works" (p. 9). Corporate executives use philanthropy "to play god," to meet business contacts that will help them advance their careers, and to gain publicity (p. 9). Hillman stated that executives and their spouses enjoy charity affairs and cultural events and will donate in order to attend these functions and meet famous people. Hillman also cited an example of corporate giving that appeared altruistic to the public but was not:

...the gift of money to purchase bullet-proof vests for a police department. Even if a corporation's executives are thoroughly convinced of the life-saving urgency of that equipment, the dollars probably will not leave the corporate treasury until the decision-making executives foresee a symbiotic benefit such as favorable press. (p. 10)

Corporations do not give to religious organizations or projects (Hillman, 1980). Hillman added that corporations give more than others to health and welfare: 38.3% of their donations compared to 23.8 for all private giving. Corporations know that health and welfare donations are beneficial to their employees. Corporations give more than the general public to education and civic events because education trains their future employees and civic activities help build community relations. Hillman also noted that corporations prefer to give small donations to various organizations to satisfy everyone. And, according to Hillman, the larger corporation, with larger budgets, will give larger donations, while the smaller company, with at least 25 employees, will give more in terms of its pretax income percentage. Hillman also pointed out that corporations do not want to give to long-term projects, general operating expenses, or newly formed non-profit organizations.

Alumni "...want to see the institution they love prosper and want others to share in the excitement they felt and the opportunities they had....They want to give something
back to society” (Simic, 1993, p. 179). Adams (1993) confirmed that major donors who have good memories of the institution and understand the institution’s vision are more likely to give. Webb (1993) contended that as alumni involvement with an institution increases, so will the level of gift-giving. In citing a 1989 Massachusetts Institute of Technology Alumni Association study, Webb indicated that alumni—regardless of their date of graduation, their major, or their current place of residence—who were involved with the institution gave 3 to 1 over those who were not active and their level of involvement was directly related to their level of giving at $500, $1250, or $5000. The study also showed that attending class reunions and centennial functions were more of a factor than volunteering (p.304). These findings were similar to the study conducted by Ohio State University in 1983 which revealed that more than 66% of the donors were alumni association members, as opposed to non-association members, who provided 85% of the donations (Webb, 1993, p. 305).

Pezzullo and Brittingham (1993) stated that, according to a 1988 ten-year study by the Women’s College Coalition, alumnae of women’s colleges are twice as likely to give to their institution in comparison to alumni from co-ed institutions. And, the alumnae gifts are 26% larger. The study concluded that the reasons for this behavior are loyalty, higher incomes, higher level of financial sophistication, control over income, and more effective fundraising programs at the women’s institutions (p. 38).

According to Pezzullo and Brittingham (1993) behaviors of alumni while in college, “…such as patterns of attendance, participation in student organizations, place of residency, choice of major, or grade point average—are not strong predictors of future giving” (p. 33). They found that students who receive no financial aid or receive
scholarships are more likely to give than students who received loans. Pezzullo and Brittingham suggested. "It may be that students who do not feel that college attendance put them at an economic disadvantage are less reluctant to give later" (p. 33).

Pezzullo and Brittingham (1993) stated that alumni variables such as age, sex, marital status, occupation, and children were poor predictors of giving while alumni variables such as current status, beliefs, behaviors, earning at least one degree, and alumni in higher-paying careers were better predictors their gift-giving behavior (p. 34). Pezzullo and Brittingham indicated that the best predictors of giving are, "...an emotional attachment to the institution, participation in alumni events, and participation in and giving to other volunteer and religious groups" (p. 34). Although these variable are the best predictors of alumni giving, Pezzullo and Brittingham stated that these elements are not usually part of an alumni database used for fundraising. They contended that emotional ties to one's institution impact giving—especially with athletics. Pezzullo and Brittingham also asserted that there is little evidence to support a connection between an institution's athletic success and alumni giving, yet, "...the search for evidence will no doubt continue as long as intuition suggests that the link must exist" (p. 36).

Bremner (1994) believed that donor motives for giving to higher education are unknown, "Who knows what considerations may induce donors to respond favorably to a college's or university's appeal for funds--love, loyalty, hate, fear, pride, prudence, religious convictions, political orientation, self-interest?" (p. 174).
Summary

The literature review covered the history of philanthropy, its complexities in terms of tax laws, the purposes behind higher education foundations, the complexities of foundation structures and fundraising efforts, the notion that fundraising has become a critical and necessary aspect of higher education nationally, and the various beliefs (with minimal data) about the motives underlying donor philanthropy.

The literature indicated that data on donor motives and characteristics are limited, with a few general themes. Tax laws were an incentive for corporations and high-income individuals. The poor gave more than the wealthy and they gave to religion whereby the wealthy gave to charity and non-profit organizations. The wealthy gave more to higher education than to other organizations. Repeat givers were more likely than others to make major gifts. Alumni tended to give smaller gifts than nonalumni. Poor predictors of alumni giving behavior were attendance, involvement in student organizations, residency, major, grade point average, age, sex, marital status, occupation and children. Better predictors were beliefs, behaviors, higher income careers, emotional attachment to the institution, and participation in alumni events. Alumnae of women's colleges gave more than alumni from co-ed institutions.

The literature also revealed that certain individuals tended to give more than others: Asian-Americans, women, Protestants, those who were married or widowed, and individuals with dependent children. People gave more as they aged, increased their giving for every year of additional schooling, and for those who gave at least $500 annually, gave larger gifts to higher education than to other organizations. Also, donors to private institutions tended to give more to other institutions than donors to public
institutions. The literature suggested that people gave to help others, and to gain a sense of prestige and identity. Also, donor giving for an organization had a second priority over their own needs, and that motives for ordinary giving are varied while motives for larger gifts are complex.

Pezzullo and Brittingham (1993) had a specific view on higher education philanthropy that encapsulates many views:

But philanthropy alone is insufficient to account for giving behavior. Giving may also be motivated by such factors as the desire to buy acclaim and friendship, the need to assuage feelings of guilt, the wish to repay society for advantages received (such as college alumni might want to do), or simply egotism. Some giving may constitute an investment in activities that have indirect utility to the donor (such as support of an institution's research and service activities). And some people give to obtain tangible perquisites (such as an honorary degree or a name on a building. (p. 31)

Yet, Clark (1993) stated that people, “...do not give to a nonprofit organization to advance an abstract cause or to build a building for its own sake. Rather, people are motivated to give in order to help other individuals with whom they empathize” (p. 91).

Van Til (1994), suggested another perspective on philanthropy and stated,

The question of the attitude underlying giving has long concerned social scientists. After many studies of the subject, it appears clear that giving is performed for a variety of motives. Some are largely altruistic: some people find it rewarding to assist others without receiving any evident reward themselves. But, of course, they do receive a psychic reward in the form of their feeling of having done the right thing. So have they acted entirely without concern for their own well-being? (p. 57)

The review of the literature presented mixed views on the motives behind donor philanthropy. The data on the topic are non-conclusive and leave much room for future research.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this exploratory study was to build a predictive model that looks at the motives and characteristics of gift-giving by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas alumni. This study determined the relationship among these variables to the level of gift-giving. The University of Nevada, Las Vegas Foundation houses minimal information on all alumni, which was used in this study. A survey questionnaire given to a select group of alumni was used to gather information about the variables being studied.

Selection of Subjects

The University of Nevada, Las Vegas Foundation provided information on the target population of over 35,000 UNLV alumni. Individuals who were deceased or who had unknown addresses were excluded from the list (which reduced the accessible population to 30,030). The list of individuals was divided into three groups: those who have contributed $10 to $1000 (excluding alumni dues), those who were non-contributors, and those who have contributed over $1,000 (excluding alumni dues). About 14% of the 30,030 (4,174 alumni) contributed at least $10 to the university; of the 14% who contributed, 95% (3,969 alumni) contributed $10 to $1,000 at least once, and
the remaining 5% (205 alumni) contributed over $1,000 at least once. About 86% of the 30,030 (25,856 alumni) were non-contributors.

This study included (1) a 5% sub-sample of alumni who contributed $10 to $1,000, (2) a 1% sub-sample of alumni who were non-contributors, and (3) all of the alumni who contributed over $1,000. Three alumni from each group were used for the pilot study and subsequently excluded from the survey group. A total of 602 alumni were selected for the survey group: 200 (5%) of those who contributed $10 to $1,000; 200 (1%) of those who were non-contributors; and 202 (100%) of those who contributed over $1000.

Sampling Procedures

Systematic sampling procedures were used (Gall, Borg & Gall. 1996). For the first group, the procedure was 3,969 divided by 200 = 20. Beginning with the 15th name on the total list, every 20th name was subsequently drawn. The second group procedure was 25,856 divided by 200 = 129. Beginning with the 50th name on the total list, every 129th name was subsequently drawn. The entire third group was surveyed. The sampling frame was the University of Nevada, Las Vegas Foundation records of UNLV alumni, listed in chronological order by date of graduation.

Data Collection Procedures

Data for this study were gathered from two sources: (1) the University of Nevada, Las Vegas Foundation and (2) a survey questionnaire to the sample study group. The UNLV Foundation provided information on alumni who had a good address; good address as defined by having deliverable mail. The survey questionnaire, mailed to 602
alumni, was developed specifically for this study because none currently existed that met
the needs of this study. The survey questionnaire was designed to obtain data on each of
the variables being examined.

The questionnaire, cover letter, follow-up mailings, and all processes were
developed using Dillman's (1978) Total Design Methods. The questionnaire and cover
letter were mailed to the sample population. The subjects were asked to complete and
return the questionnaire using an enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. One week
later, a follow up postcard was mailed to all subjects. Two and one-half weeks following
the mailing of the postcard, a third contact was made to all non-respondents. They were
sent a second cover letter that strongly encouraged their participation, and another copy
of the questionnaire including a self-addressed stamped envelope.

Survey Questionnaire

A list of 23 variables (10 motives and 13 characteristics) to be studied was
identified based on a review of the literature on this topic. The Executive Director of the
University of Nevada, Las Vegas Foundation (J. Gallagher, personal communication,
June 25, 1997), reviewed the list and ranked the variables from 1 to 4, with 1 being the
highest rank, in terms of importance and usefulness in targeting fundraising activities.
Twelve of the 23 variables were ranked as 1, and Gallagher identified four additional
variables that would be of value in targeting fundraising activities that were not among
the initial 23 variables listed: number of years before giving, foundation or alumni
sponsored cultural events for donors, repeat giving, and giving to another institution. The
doctoral committee added two additional variables (academic college from which the
individual received their degree and involvement in university-organized activities). In total, 18 variables to be studied were selected and used in this study.

A Likert-type five-point scaled questionnaire was developed for this study—along with forced-choice and fill-in questions—to collect data on variables being examined. The questionnaire was designed using the suggested steps by Bishop (1996). An item pool was developed using samples from a prior dissertation (Ashcraft, 1995) and from Dillman (1978). A panel of five judges was used to evaluate each item. A pilot study was conducted on nine alumni, three from each of the three groups. Information from the judges and from the pilot study was used to modify the questionnaire. The final study was conducted by distributing the questionnaire to the selected sample.

Validity

Content validity was determined by using a panel of five judges. The judges included the university foundation executive director, the vice-president for development, the vice-president for finance, and two university alumni faculty donors. Each judge was provided with the items, the questionnaire, the cover letter and instructions on assessment. The judges were asked to evaluate each item for the variables to be studied; the variables were listed with a definition or intent. The judges were asked to (1) comment on each item meeting item intent, (2) comment on ways to improve each item, (3) comment on the cover letter, and (4) review the questionnaire as though they were a respondent. The judges' nonverbal behaviors were observed while reviewing the questionnaire to determine areas needing clarity or improved flow from question to question. Judges' comments were reviewed. Substantive item changes, that received
agreement among four judges, were made. Non-substantive item changes, that were suggested by at least two judges, were made.

Analysis of the Data

Descriptive statistics were used to demonstrate the frequency distribution and the measure of central tendency for each variable being studied. The count, percentage, and mean score or mode, for each variable were identified for appropriate categories. For levels of central tendency, the mean score was used for parametric scales of measurement, and the mode was used for non-parametric scales of measurement.

The relationships among various variables to the level of gift-giving were made utilizing artificial neural network technology. The neural network was utilized to (1) identify relationships between and among variables from the study data and (2) provide a framework for adding additional data in the future by the UNLV Foundation. The neural network was designed to answer the following research questions: 1. What set of motives and characteristics predict alumni participation at various levels of giving? 2. What set of motives and characteristics predict repeat participation? 3. What factors characterize the alumni non-contributor?

Respondent responses for each variable were coded in a Microsoft Excel 97 spreadsheet and converted into a common format for statistical calculations. Each possible response to each variable was converted to a number (a higher number representing a higher likelihood of gift-giving based on the small body of knowledge identified during the literature review). Variables left blank by the respondent were left blank in the spreadsheet. An exception was for those respondents who entered a question
mark (?) for the variable that asked for the amount of total contributions to the institution; for 19 cases, the minimum amount given to the institution (identified by the alumni database) was used as the minimum contribution the donor would have contributed to the institution. The Excel data were imported into the neural network process of data analysis.

The supervised learning algorithm, specifically the backpropagation method in the NeuroShell® 2, (correlation statistical analysis technique) was used to analyze the data and identify correlations among variables to various levels of gift-giving. Multiple regression was used to compare R² results.

The coded Excel data were divided into two groups: the test data and the training data. Ten percent of the data were used as test data: systematically selected using every 10th pattern (subject) selected. And the network had three layers consisting of the input, hidden, and output layers.

The backpropagation process passed data forward and backward between the input and output layer through the hidden layer (Bharath and Drosen, 1994). The learning rate was set at .01 with a momentum of .01, which controlled the weight adjustments. As the data passed through the hidden layer, the weight was adjusted by 10% to create a new weight. This weight adjustment made the sum of squares of the errors as small as possible. Bharath and Drosen indicated that backpropagation tries to adjust weights to reduce error and it does so by reducing the sum of squares of the errors.

The neural network modeling is similar to multiple regression, uses different terminology, and contains more highly complex non-linear equations (Ward Systems Group, 1998). The comparison terminology:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neural Networks</th>
<th>Multiple Regression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neurons</td>
<td>Variables (18 used in this study)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input layer</td>
<td>Independent variables (motives and characteristics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden layer</td>
<td>Processing layer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output layer</td>
<td>Dependent variables (levels of gift-giving)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterns</td>
<td>Observations (alumni/subjects)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each input (independent) variable, the neural network provided statistical numbers that represented the input (independent) variable's measure of importance in predicting the output (dependent) variable, in relation to the other input (independent) variables (Ward Systems Group, 1998). The neural network learned from the examples and provided the mean, variance of each variable, and relationships between the inputs and outputs (Bharath and Drosen, 1994).

The output statistical results were expressed with several statistical values: mean squared error, histogram to display all weights, and Pearson R coefficient for the output layer (Klimasauskas, 1993). Also, data analysis can be displayed with line charts and correlation scatterplots indicating their computed linear correlation coefficient (Ward Systems Group, 1998). $R^2$, the coefficient of multiple determination and statistical indicator in multiple regression, "compares the accuracy of the model to the accuracy of a comparison model where the prediction is the mean of the training outputs" (Weiner, Jordan, & Jordan, 1997, p. 16). Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996) defined the $R^2$ statistic as "the amount of variance in the criterion variable that is explained by a predictor variable or combination of predictor variables" (p. 439). The higher the $R^2$, "the more closely the predicted outputs match the training output" with the number ranging from 0 to 1, and the formula represented as follows (Weiner, et. al., p. 16):

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
\[ R^2 = 1 - \left( \frac{\sum (yp - ya)^2}{\sum (ya - yx)^2} \right) \]

\(yp\) = the predicted value  
\(ya\) = the actual value (training set)  
\(yx\) = the mean of all actual values

According to Weiner et. al (1997), the formula represented the residual sum of squares divided by the total sum of squares (p. 16).

General Concepts of Neural Network

Neural networks were developed from biological studies making them very different from conventional computers (Nelson and Illingworth, 1991). Nelson and Illingworth spoke of neural networks as though they were artificial brains rather than machines because neural networks are said to think, learn, forget, and remember; they used such terms as “behaves” or “reacts” or “self-organizing” or “generalizes” to describe the neural network processing (p. 42). According to Nelson and Illingworth, “Artificial neural networks exhibit a number of characteristics that are brainlike in nature: the ability to learn from experience, to make abstractions and generalizations, and even to make mistakes” (p. 228).

Warren McCulloch and Walter Pitts, two scientists in the early 1940s, began the development of artificial neurons from their work with brain functions (Bharath and Drosen, 1994). Psychologist Donald Hebb, also in the early 1940s, proposed that human learning occurs based on the fact that the connections or synapses between neurons are strengthened or weakened depending on whether they operate together or not in various operations of the brain. He saw association between them as the key to the association of ideas that is involved in human learning” (Bharath and Drosen, 1994, p. 95).
Neural networks work in a similar fashion to the brain's mental processes (Nelson and Illingworth, 1991). Medsker, Turban, and Trippi (1993) stated that the brain is made up of neurons that do not die which explains why they retain information. The neurons operate in groups, called networks, that have thousands of connected networks that are a multitude of neural networks. They also indicated that artificial neural networks are borrowing some of the features known in biological neural systems.

An artificial neural network processes information in a parallel manner that allows it to process information and develop solutions quickly (Nelson and Illingworth, 1991). Dr. David Rumelhart, a leading scientist in this field, stated that the best name for this type of computing is “brain-style computing” (Bharath and Drosen, 1994, p. xvii). Nelson and Illingworth indicated that these systems operate in a similar fashion to right-brain activities by learning in two ways: by being exposed to examples with expected results or by developing their own associations by themselves. They stated that the learning comes from generalizing. The networks determine solutions to problems and can recognize new and similar problems as being close to the first problem, and therefore will provide the same solution. The more data these systems have, the more accurate they become. According to Bharath and Drosen, this is the same way the brain operates.

In the 1970s, John Holland, a computer scientist, was interested in the biological theory of evolution and developed a computer algorithm to mimic evolution (Davis, 1994). Because evolution occurs with the encoding of chromosomes that are the strongest and with mutations, Holland attempted to use this same concept with computing. According to Davis, Holland utilized the survival-of-the-fittest principle and
designed genetic algorithms to keep that which is strongest and mutate randomly to introduce diversity, hence, the new genetic algorithms that are used in neural networks.

Nelson and Illingworth (1991) wrote that neural networks are powerful tools to solve problems that need pattern recognition. These networks are viewed as advisors to humans to help plan, design, schedule, train, diagnose, and trouble-shoot. In 1993, Hawley, Johnson and Raina stated that routine tasks and structured decision-making can be handled by conventional computer systems; unstructured problems that are unique and require intuition—those decisions usually made by chief executive officers—cannot be handled by conventional computers but can be handled by neural networks.

Nelson and Illingworth (1991) stated that artificial intelligence (AI) technologies are based on scientific mathematical principles and are considered fifth-generation computing. They indicated that neural networks are different in that they utilize heuristic or rules of thumb concepts and are considered sixth-generation computing.

According to Nelson and Illingworth (1991), "neural networks are good at figuring out what is, expert systems are good at figuring out what to do about it, and conventional programs are designed to do it" (p. 96). They also stated that expert systems are now being enhanced by the use of neural networks. Medsker et al. (1993) pointed out that in expert systems, classification occurs with rules that are entered. But neural networks can come up with the classifications without explicit rules, they are instead trained.

Expert systems have their drawbacks for financial decision-making (Hawley et al., 1993). They are difficult to program and maintain. Hawley et al. surmised that these expert systems usually cannot learn and cannot make "educated guesses" or employ
'common sense'" (p. 35). Whereas with neural systems, a predefined knowledge base is unnecessary and, therefore, changes in problems do not mean changes to programming. Hawley et al. specified that neural networks change on their own by adjusting their weights, and continue to improve as they see new information and can make educated guesses. Their educated guesses improve as they become more educated and they can exceed humans in this regard. Samdani's comparisons (as cited in Klemic, 1993, p. 127) of neural networks and expert systems provided a clearer distinction between the two systems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neural Networks</th>
<th>Expert Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example based</td>
<td>Rule based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain free</td>
<td>Domain specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds rules</td>
<td>Needs rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little programming needed</td>
<td>Much programming needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to maintain</td>
<td>Difficult to maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fault tolerant</td>
<td>Not fault tolerant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs (only) a database</td>
<td>Needs a human expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuzzy logic</td>
<td>Rigid logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive system</td>
<td>Requires reprogramming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The neural networks could be classified as "...information processing systems that are literally looking for reams of input data that require organizing and interpreting....Neural networks can organize the data, analyze statistics, spot trends, adapt and learn from the data, take corrective control action, and predict future product specifications. And do it in real time" (Nelson and Illingworth, 1991, p. 80).

Another way to look at neural networks is by thinking of the concept of chaos theory that involves the analysis of complex problems (Azoff, 1994). As Nelson and Illingworth (1991) stated:
Neural networks are providing a new conceptual framework for chaos theory. Chaos theory is a recently emerging body of knowledge sometimes called self-organizing theory. It has to do with systems stability and systems change: how systems are organized and how they can and do undergo fundamental changes. Sometimes small changes in input can produce widely divergent outputs, and a seemingly orderly system becomes chaotic. Although the chaos may appear to be totally random and unpredictable, it can be following strict mathematical rules. (p. 259)

Nelson and Illingworth (1991) implied that people wanting to look at chaotic systems (like weather, neurological activity, or cultural patterns) are finding that they can be complicated, yet neural networks may provide a new avenue to look at these systems.

"Neural networks are model-free, nonlinear, dynamic systems that learn from examples the relationships between inputs and outputs" (Deboeck, 1994, p. 192).

According to Deboeck, these systems are good at finding relationships, in large volumes of data, between variables that are input and one or more desired outputs even if the patterns between the two are not well defined or fuzzy.

Multivariate Statistical Techniques with Neural Networks

There is a close relationship between neural networks and multivariate statistical analysis (Bharath and Drosen, 1994). One needs to ascertain the mean and variance of each variable and relationships between them. Bharath and Drosen stated, “To put it another way, how is their variability connected? Do they seem to increase together, or is there a pattern of one increasing when another or others decrease, and so on?” (p. 154).

As Azoff (1994) stated:

To put neural networks in the context of traditional statistical methods, it can be considered as a 'multivariate nonlinear nonparametric inference technique that is data driven and model free.' Multivariate refers to the neural network input comprising many different variables whose interdependencies and causative influences are exploited in predicting future behaviour of a temporal sequence.
Nonparametric, model free is a consequence of the lack of any presumptions regarding the relation between input variables and extrapolations into the future. Rather the network is trained by adaptation of free parameters to discover any possible relationships, devoid of model constraints, driven and shaped solely by the input data. Here nonparametric, in a statistical model sense, describes the fact that no predetermined parameters are required to specify the mapping model, which leads to the most general approach in processing data; not to be confused with the network training algorithm parameters. The free parameters are weights associated with the signal communication lines between neurons, and which attenuated the passing signals, or data. (p. 1)

A neural network is “a highly flexible multivariate technique” that can look at data from a time series—a sequence of variables in time (Azoff, 1994, p. xii). The trained system can adapt with various data input from various times and detect a pattern for forecasting in a selected time series target. According to Azoff (1994) time series data are seen as follows:

...past values in the series may influence future values, depending on the presence of underlying deterministic forces. These forces may be characterized by trends, cycles and nonstationary behaviour in the time series and predictive models attempt to recognize the recurring patterns and nonlinear relationships. Whilst linear models, such as those based on regression techniques, have led to increased activity in nonlinear modeling. Neural networks are nonlinear models that can be trained to map past and future values of a time series, and thereby extract hidden structure and relationships governing the data. (p. 1).

Traditional statistical methods correctly classify about 70% of the time (Medsker et al., 1993) but neural networks are consistently increasing that percentage. Kimoto, Asakawa, Yoda, and Takeoka (1993) compared neural networks with multiple regression analysis and found that the network “produced a much higher correlation coefficient than multiple regression” to determine timing for buying and selling stock using relationships between economic indexes and technical indexes (p.351).

In regards to visual display of data, neural networks provide 3D representation of data. Multivariate data have been displayed as 2D images. Yet, 3D or 4D visualization is
usually the only practical way to make sense of large amounts of data to identify patterns and understand the data (Wright, 1995). The brain is better at understanding data and patterns by seeing images in 3D rather than numbers and letters. As Wright stated. “With 3D and 4D graphical representations, people can see more information, more quickly, with more comprehension” (p. 58).

Azoff (1994) believed that the advantage of neural networks over regression analysis techniques is that neural nets can generalize from patterns, are flexible to accommodate many tasks, are nonlinear—which allows them to deal with complex problems better than other conventional systems—and are easy to implement.

Types of Learning in Neural Networks

Neural networks learn by being trained in a similar fashion as animal training (Hawley et al., 1993). When the system responds correctly, the reward is to strengthen the weights to create a similar response in the future; when the system responds incorrectly, the punishment is to reduce the strength of the weights so that the next time it sees a similar input, it will change its response. “Desirable actions are thus progressively reinforced, while undesirable actions are progressively inhibited” (Hawley et al., 1993. p. 33).

According to Azoff (1994) there are several neural network designs all categorized into three different techniques:

- Supervised learning occurs when the output (desired target) is known during the training and the error to reach the output is adjusted. This is the backpropagation method. The network is trained by using examples. More input equates to increased
accuracy. Nelson and Illingworth (1991) indicated that supervised learning compares actual output to the desired output and weights are adjusted so that the actual output comes closer to the desired output. The network needs to be trained and after they learn, the weights can be “frozen” (Nelson and Illingworth, 1991, p. 132).

- Reinforcement learning occurs when the output is unknown for training. This type of learning is used for robotics designs.

- Unsupervised learning is implemented when training occurs by the network on its own by looking at input patterns and identifying correlations. The Kohonen self-organizing model fits within this technique. According to Nelson and Illingworth (1991) with unsupervised learning the network adjusts the weights on its own. It has no targets. It looks for trends and adapts. Medsker et al. (1993) stated that unsupervised learning only looks at inputs and the network self-organizes to look at groups of inputs, adjusting weights based on these groupings.

Downfalls of Neural Networks

Nelson and Illingworth (1991) cautioned that misuse of this technology has occurred when neural networks are used for easy problems that could be solved with any software. Neural networks generalize, they do not count well and do not give exact answers. These authors believed that neural networks are not useful if precise answers are needed. When the systems generalize, they can be wrong. It is difficult to justify the answer which makes them unable to provide any kind of audit trail. Nelson and Illingworth also indicated that errors and correct answers are spread out over the system which makes it difficult to determine where an error may rest.
Designing a neural network is difficult and it is best to utilize experts when designing a system (Nelson and Illingworth, 1991). For example, users of neural networks have a tendency to apply too many variables that cause “overfitting” (Wong and Tan, 1994, p. 245). Wong and Tan advised that the amount of data or input variables should be kept to a minimum.

Steven Grossberg identified another problem with neural networks called the “stability-plasticity dilemma” (Bharath and Drosen, 1994, p. 81). Plasticity is needed to adapt and learn new things. Yet, stability is needed to prevent distortion of what is already learned. If one attempts to add new patterns to a network that already has a learned pattern, then it negatively impacts their ability to utilize their previously learned pattern, called “catastrophic forgetting” (Bharath and Drosen, 1994, p. 81). Therefore, it is best if prior learned patterns are not easily changed in order to retain stability.

Designing Neural Networks

In designing a neural network, one must have a clear understanding of the problem (Nelson and Illingworth, 1991). O’Sullivan (1995) indicated that the best place to start the development of a network system is to define what is wanted from the network and how the output questions are to be asked. Different networks will be needed to answer different questions.

Medsker et al. (1993) suggested that in building a network, one must make the following decisions: determine the size of the training and test sets, determine the learning algorithms, determine the number of processing elements (layers), determine the
transfer function, determine the learning rate for each layer, and determine a diagnostic tool.

It is best to choose a simple network with fewer parameters rather than a complex network because, according to Occam’s Razor principle, the smaller network is better at generalizing than is a complex network (Azoff, 1994). The smaller network would have an increased likelihood that over-training did not occur. Yet, the network cannot be so small that it cannot perform in a meaningful way. The best method is to look at different network sizes to determine if “symmetry breaking phenomenon exist” and select the minimum network size (Azoff, 1994, p. 50).

According to Deboeck and Cader (1994), sampling techniques make the training of the network more efficient. A sample of about 100 records will create equal or better results than using 1000 records from four or five years of data. Also, training a network with 100 samples from four to five years of data will keep the network from memorizing the data.

According to Nelson and Illingworth (1991) developing quality training sets is crucial to the quality output of the network. It is usually better to use fewer training examples (Klimasauskas, 1994). The data should be split in two: a training set and a testing set (Deboeck and Cader, 1994). Training and test sets should be mutually exclusive, and commercial tools that automatically split the sets should be checked (Mendelsohn, 1995). If the tool splits the set, in an 80/20 split, for example, then caution should be taken to determine how the split occurred. Mendelsohn states that if the data were listed in chronological order by day of week, then all data for one day of the week could be in the test set and none in the training set. Therefore, data should be randomized.
before allowing the split to occur. Deboeck and Cader (1994) advised that about two-thirds should be used for training and the other third should be used for testing.

During the training stage, diagnostic tools help determine how the network is training (Klimasauskas, 1993). Klimasauskas asserted that those networks that are most useful are those measuring the output layer's mean square error, a histogram displaying all weights, and Pearson's R coefficient for the output layer.

Summary

Traditional research design methods were utilized for this study. Descriptive statistics were used to demonstrate the frequency distribution and the measure of central tendency for each variable being studied. Neural network technology was used for the data analysis component of this study to analyze the data and build a predictive model. The network was expected to answer a series of questions and allow for future data input to create a dynamic (rather than static) predictive trend-analysis model to study the motives and characteristics of alumni gift-giving at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas.
CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The purpose of this exploratory study was to build a predictive model that looks at the motives and characteristics of gift-giving by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas alumni. The study determined the relationship among these variables to the level of gift-giving. This chapter provides an analysis of the data collected through the mail survey to the sample group.

Sample Size and Response Rate

A total of 602 surveys were mailed to a random sample of 30,030 University of Nevada, Las Vegas alumni (individuals who were deceased or who had unknown addresses were excluded). This study included (1) a 5% sub-sample of alumni who contributed $10 to $1,000, (2) a 1% sub-sample of alumni who were non-contributors, and (3) all of the alumni who contributed over $1,000. A total of 602 alumni were selected for the survey group: 200 (5%) of those who contributed $10 to $1,000; 200 (1%) of those who were non-contributors; and 202 (100%) of those who contributed over $1000. Three contacts were made, which were (1) an initial cover letter with survey, (2) a reminder postcard, and (3) a second cover letter with survey.
Of the 602 total alumni contacted, 38 surveys were returned as undeliverable to the address indicated. This resulted with a possible return from 564 alumni who were contacted. A total of 268 were returned which represented a 47.5% response rate for the entire group. The response rates of the sub-groups are represented in Table 1; two respondents removed the mailing code, therefore, their group was unidentifiable.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alumni Group</th>
<th>Surveys Mailed</th>
<th>Surveys Undeliverable</th>
<th>Surveys Delivered</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent for the Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributors of over $1,000</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributors of $10 - $1,000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contributors</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>602</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>564</strong></td>
<td><strong>268</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the total 268 respondents, four surveys were returned with notations that the respondent chose not to complete the survey (one from the over $1,000 group, two from the $10 - $1,000 group, and one from the non-contributor group). Therefore, the four were unusable, leaving 264 usable survey responses. Of the 264 usable survey responses, contributors of over $1,000 provided 46.2% of the total usable survey responses; contributors of $10 - $1,000 provided 30.3% of the total usable responses; non-
contributors provided 22.7% of the total responses; and respondents who were unidentifiable by group provided .8% of the total usable responses.

After review of the respondents’ responses, a few of the respondents who initially fell within a particular category of gift-giving, changed category: respondents who indicated they had not contributed, and were initially within the $10 - $1000 category, were changed to the non-contributor category; and respondents who indicated they had contributed but were initially in the non-contributor category were changed to a contributor category. The alumni database used for this study only contained partial data on gift-giving. Therefore, the respondents’ responses were used to identify the gift-givers from the non-contributors for the data analysis. The results divided the groups with 126 alumni who contributed at least $1,000, 54 alumni who contributed between $10 - $1,000, and 84 alumni who had not contributed, for a total of 264.

Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive analysis of the study by the two major categories of variables (motives and characteristics) by the three alumni groups are identified in the following tables. The first set of tables illustrates the results of the respondents by each of the three alumni groups for each of the seven motive variables. The second set of tables illustrates the results of the respondents by each of the three alumni groups for each of the 11 characteristic variables.

The frequency, percentage, and mean score or mode, for each variable are identified for appropriate categories to determine frequency distribution. For measures of central tendency, the mean scores are used for parametric scales of measurement, and the mode for non-parametric scales of measurement.
Data on Motives

The respondents were asked to answer the motive questions in terms of (1) their reasons for currently contributing to the university or (2) their reasons for contributing should they decide to begin contributing in the future. The respondents were asked to respond with one of five options: strongly agree, agree, no opinion, disagree, or strongly disagree. Respondents may have chosen not to respond to the particular question, which is indicated as "blank" on the following tables. The tables show the frequency, percent, and overall mean score for each variable pertaining to motives, and include the specific question asked of each respondent. The overall mean score is based on a point scale—represented by a number within parenthesis.

Table 2

Question: I contribute (would contribute) because it is prestigious to be known as having contributed to UNLV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contributors of over $1,000</th>
<th>Contributors of $10 - $1,000</th>
<th>Non-Contributors</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree (5)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion (3)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree (1)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN SCORE 2.98 2.47 2.53 2.73
The alumni within the $1,000 and over group had a higher percent of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed (31%) that prestige was a reason for their contribution, with 28.5% indicating that they disagreed or strongly disagreed that prestige was a reason for their contribution. In comparison, only a small number of alumni (9.3%) who contributed between $10 and $1,000 agreed or strongly agreed that prestige was a reason for their contribution, while 40.8% indicated they disagree or strongly disagree that prestige was a reason for their contribution. Similarly, non-contributors (11.9%) indicated that prestige would be a reason for contributing with 41.7% indicating that prestige would not be a reason for contributing.

In this sample, the alumni who contributed over $1,000 were slightly different from other alumni in the other two categories: they more frequently (by about 20%) indicated that prestige was a reason for their contribution.
Table 3

Question: I contribute (or would contribute) because I receive recognition for contributing to UNLV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contributors of over $1,000</th>
<th>Contributors of $10 - $1,000</th>
<th>Non-Contributors</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree (5)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion (3)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree (1)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN SCORE 2.89 2.46 2.56 2.70

The alumni who contributed over $1,000 had a higher percent of respondents who indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that recognition was a reason for their contribution (33.3%), with 38.9% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that recognition was a reason for their contribution. In contrast, only 18.6% of those who contributed between $10 and $1,000 stated they agreed or strongly agreed that recognition was a reason for their contribution, with 48.1% who disagreed or strongly disagreed that recognition was a reason for their contribution. Only 13% of the non-contributors stated that recognition would be a reason for their contribution, with 40.5% stating they disagreed or strongly disagreed that recognition would be a reason for contributing.
The contributors of over $1,000 more frequently agreed or strongly agreed (by over 15%) that recognition was a reason for their contribution, in comparison to the other two study groups.

Table 4

**Question:** I contribute (would contribute) because I receive a tax deduction for contributing to UNLV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contributors of over $1,000</th>
<th>Contributors of $10 - $1,000</th>
<th>Non-Contributors</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree (5)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion (3)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree (1)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEAN SCORE**

|                      | 3.50 | 3.30 | 3.25 | 3.38 |

Over 64% of the over $1,000 contributors agreed or strongly agreed that a tax deduction was a reason for their contribution, with only 23.8% who indicated that they disagreed or strongly disagreed that a tax deduction was a reason for their contribution. Also, over 51% of the $10 to $1,000 contributors agreed or strongly agreed that a tax deduction was a reason for their contribution, with 24.1% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that a tax deduction was a reason for their contribution. The non-contributors (41.7%) agreed or strongly agreed that a tax deduction would be a reason for
contributing, whereas 16.6% disagreed or strongly disagreed that a tax deduction would be a reason for contributing.

Over half (54.5%) of the respondents, within all categories, stated that they agreed or strongly agreed that a tax deduction was a reason (or would be a reason) for making a contribution.

Table 5

Question: I contribute (would contribute) because UNLV helps improve the quality of cultural activities in the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contributors over $1,000</th>
<th>Contributors of $10 - $1,000</th>
<th>Non-Contributors</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree (5)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion (3)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN SCORE</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the respondents who contributed over $1,000, 88.9% stated that they agreed or strongly agreed that they contributed because UNLV helps improve the quality of cultural activities in the community. Also, 81.5% of the alumni who contributed between $10 and $1,000 agreed or strongly agreed that they contributed because UNLV helps improve the quality of cultural activities in the community. A high number of non-contributors...
(76.1%) stated the same. Overall, 83.4% of all respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they did (or would) contribute because UNLV helps improve the quality of cultural activities in the community, with only 4.1% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that this was or would be a reason for making a contribution.

Table 6

**Question:** I contribute (would contribute) because UNLV enhances the image and reputation of the Las Vegas area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contributors of over $1,000</th>
<th>Contributors of $10 - $1,000</th>
<th>Non-Contributors</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree (5)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion (3)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MEAN SCORE**

4.30 4.02 3.72 4.06

Of the respondents who contribute over $1,000, 89.6% stated that they agreed or strongly agreed that they contributed because UNLV enhances the image and reputation of the Las Vegas area. Similarly, 83.4% of the alumni who contributed between $10 and $1,000 agreed or strongly agreed that they contributed because UNLV enhances the image and reputation of the Las Vegas area. A high number of non-contributors (65.5%) responded in the same manner. Overall, 80.7% of all respondents agreed or strongly
agreed that they did (or would) contribute because UNLV enhances the image and reputation of the Las Vegas area, with only 6.4% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that this was or would be a reason for contributing.

Table 7

**Question:** I contribute (would contribute) because I can attend activities sponsored by the foundation or alumni association related to *sporting events* (tailgate parties, receptions, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contributors of over $1,000</th>
<th>Contributors of $10 - $1,000</th>
<th>Non-Contributors</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># # % M</td>
<td># # % M</td>
<td># # % M</td>
<td># # % M</td>
<td># # % M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree (5)</td>
<td>16 12.7 3 5.6</td>
<td>7 8.3</td>
<td>26 9.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>37 29.4 13 24.1</td>
<td>17 20.2</td>
<td>67 25.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion (3)</td>
<td>30 23.8 14 25.9</td>
<td>27 32.1</td>
<td>71 26.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>26 20.6 12 22.2</td>
<td>14 16.7</td>
<td>52 19.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree (1)</td>
<td>14 11.1 12 22.2</td>
<td>15 17.9</td>
<td>41 15.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>3 2.4 0 0.0</td>
<td>4 4.8</td>
<td>7 2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>126 100 54 100</td>
<td>84 100</td>
<td>264 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN SCORE</td>
<td>3.12 2.69 2.84 2.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the $1,000 or more contributors, 42.1% indicated that they contributed because they could attend activities sponsored by the foundation or alumni association related to *sporting events*. And, 29.7% of the $10 - $1,000 contributors stated that this was a reason for their contribution, with 28.5% of the non-contributors indicating that this would be a reason for contributing. Overall, only 35.3% of the respondents indicated that attending activities sponsored by the foundation or alumni association related to *sporting events*
was or would be a reason for making a contribution, while 35.2% disagreed or strongly disagreed that this was or would be a reason for contributing.

Table 8

Question: I contribute (would contribute) because I can attend functions sponsored by the foundation or alumni association related to cultural events (dinners, receptions, lectures, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contributors of over $1,000</th>
<th>Contributors of $10 - $1,000</th>
<th>Non-Contributors</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree (5)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (4)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion (3)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (2)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree (1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN SCORE</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the $1,000 or more contributors, 61.9% indicated that they contributed because they could attend activities sponsored by the foundation or alumni association related to cultural events. And, 29.6% of the $10 - $1000 contributors stated that this was a reason for their contribution, with 41.7% of the non-contributors indicating that this would be a reason for contributing. Overall, 48.9% of the respondents indicated that attending activities sponsored by the foundation or alumni association related to cultural events was
or would be a reason for contributing, while 23.1% disagreed or strongly disagreed that this was or would be a reason for contributing.

Data on Characteristics

The respondents were asked to respond to 11 questions related to alumni characteristic variables. They were asked to respond to one element for each question. Respondents may have chosen not to respond to the particular question, which is indicated as “blank.” The following tables represent the results of the respondents by each of the three alumni groups. The tables show the frequency, percent, and mean or mode, for each variable (as appropriate) pertaining to characteristics and include the specific question asked of each respondent. The overall mean score is based on a point scale—represented by a number within parenthesis.
**Table 9**

**Question:** Which of the following categories best describes your 1997 total household income from all sources before taxes, including taxable and non-taxable income?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Contributors of over $1,000</th>
<th>Contributors of $10 - $1,000</th>
<th>Non-Contributors</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300,000 or more (8)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000-$299,000 (7)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000-$199,000 (6)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000 - $99,000 (5)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 - $79,000 (4)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $59,000 (3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $39,000 (2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20,000 (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN SCORE</strong></td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contributors of over $1,000 had a mean score of 6.16 (the $100,000 to $199,000 income range), with 71.4% reporting that their household income was at least $100,000. In contrast, the $10 - $1000 contributors had a mean score of 4.45 (the $60,000 to $79,000 range), with 26% reporting a household income of at least $100,000. And the non-contributors had a mean score of 3.54 (the $40,000 to $59,000 range), with 13.1% indicating household incomes of at least $100,000.
Table 10

Question: Which of the following categories includes your age on the day you completed this survey?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Contributors of over $1,000</th>
<th>Contributors of $10 - $1,000</th>
<th>Non-Contributors</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 or above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - 59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean scores were: Contributors of over $1,000: 6.24, Contributors of $10 - $1,000: 5.70, Non-Contributors: 4.48.

The contributors of over $1,000 had a mean score of 6.24 (the 45 – 49 range) with 23.8% reporting an age of at least 55, and 3.9% reporting an age of 30 or below. The contributors between $10 and $1,000 had a mean score of 5.70 (the 40 – 44 range) with 22.2% reporting an age of at least 55, and 22.3% reporting an age of 30 or below. The non-contributors had a mean score of 4.48 (the 35-39 range) with 11.9% reporting an age of at least 55, and 38.1% reporting an age of 30 or below.
Table 11

Question: Which is the highest level of education that you completed at any institution?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Contributors of over $1,000</th>
<th>Contributors of $10 - $1,000</th>
<th>Non-Contributors</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate (6)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (5)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than masters (4)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters (3)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than bachelors (2)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors (1)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean score of each category indicated a relative similar level of education for respondents within each category; over half of the respondents indicated a level of education of more than a bachelor's degree or beyond. Respondents who indicated a master's degree or beyond were 46.1% for the greater than $1,000 contributors, 48.2% for the $10 to $1,000 contributors, and 40.5% for the non-contributors.
Table 12

**Question: What is your religious preference?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Preference</th>
<th>Contributors of over $1,000</th>
<th>Contributors of $10 - $1,000</th>
<th>Non-Contributors</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant (7)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mormon (6)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None – no preference (5)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish (4)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic (3)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim (2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contributors of over $1,000 more frequently indicated None – no preference as their religious preference. In contrast, contributors of $10 - $1,000 more frequently indicated Protestant as their religious preference, and non-contributors had an equal amount of respondents who indicated None – no preference, or Protestant as their religious preference, which were the highest in frequency. Overall, the study group more frequently indicated Protestant as their religious preference. 
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The highest frequency as reported by respondents within each group indicated their marital status as married. Those who indicated they had never married were 8.7% of the over $1,000 contributors, 13% of the $10 - $1,000 contributors, and 29.8% of the non-contributors.
Table 14

Question: How many times have you made a financial contribution to UNLV?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repeat Giving</th>
<th>Contributors of over $1,000</th>
<th>Contributors of $10 - $1,000</th>
<th>Non-Contributors</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave more than twice (3)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave twice (2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave only once (1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents in both groups more frequently indicated that they gave more than twice. However, only 11.9% of the over $1,000 contributors indicated they gave only once or twice, while 48.2% of the $10 - $1,000 contributors indicated they gave only once or twice.

Table 15

Question: Have you ever made a financial contribution, as a donor or alumni, to another college or university?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Giving to Another Institution</th>
<th>Contributors of over $1,000</th>
<th>Contributors of $10 - $1,000</th>
<th>Non-Contributors</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes (2)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No (1)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Most respondents in all three groups indicated that they had not made a
contribution to any other college or university. Yet, 42.9% of the over $1,000
contributors had made a contribution to another college or university, 30% of the $10 to
$1,000 contributors had also, and only 17.9% of the non-contributors had made a
contribution to another college or university.

Table 16

Question: As a student, or alum, were you involved in any university-organized activities
(examples: student clubs, teams, organizations, or alumni participant in organized events,
volunteer/advisor)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involved in University Activities</th>
<th>Contributors of over $1,000</th>
<th>Contributors of $10 - $1,000</th>
<th>Non-Contributors</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As student &amp; alum (4)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As alum only (3)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As student only (2)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved (1)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN SCORE                      2.38  1.77  1.44  1.95

Of the over $1,000 contributors, 38.8% indicated that they had been involved in
university-organized activities as a student and alum or as an alum only. In contrast, only
16.7% of the $10 to $1,000, and 3.6% of the non-contributors had been involved in
university-organized activities as a student and alum or as an alum only.
Table 17

Question: In what year did you receive your first degree from UNLV and from which academic college?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic College</th>
<th>Contributors of over $1,000</th>
<th>Contributors of $10 - $1,000</th>
<th>Non-Contributors</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>% M</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>% M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (8)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (7)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (5)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts (4)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences (3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science/Nursing (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine/Performing Arts (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the contributors of over $1,000, the largest percent was with business college alumni (40.5%). Of the contributors between $10 and $1,000, the largest percent was with business college alumni (29.6%), and then education college alumni at 27.8%. The business college alumni comprised the largest percentage of non-contributors.

The table above represents the respondents’ within each college and relative percent with all college groups within each gift-giving category. The following table illustrates the respondents’ within each college and relative percent with its own college group within each gift-giving category.
Table 18

Colleges by respondent group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic College</th>
<th>Contributors of over $1,000</th>
<th>Non-Contributors</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science/Nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine/Performing Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the four larger college group respondents (business, liberal arts, education, and hotel), business alumni more frequently contributed (73.6%), and did so at the larger giving group of over $1,000. The education alumni were the second highest in terms of the number who contributed (69.8%) with liberal arts alumni third at 60.8% who contributed, and hotel alumni fourth at 50% who contributed.

To determine the number of years before giving for the first time, the respondents were asked two questions. According to Dillman (1978), respondents should not have to calculate responses; the researcher should conduct the calculation based on questions asked of the respondent. Therefore, two questions were asked, as illustrated in Table 19, and the difference of the two was the number used as the number of years before giving for the first time. Table 19 indicates the mean score representing the average number of years from graduation before giving for the first time. Also represented is the minimum and maximum number of years from graduation before giving for the first time.
Table 19

Questions asked: (1) In what year did you receive your first degree from UNLV? (2) About what year did you make your first financial contribution to UNLV?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years before Giving</th>
<th>Contributors of over $1,000</th>
<th>Contributors of $10 - $1,000</th>
<th>Non-Contributors</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The over $1,000 contributors began contributing on an average of nine years following their date of graduation, with the respondents ranging from one to 33 years following the date of graduation. The $10 to $1,000 contributors began contributing on an average of eight years following their date of graduation, with the respondents ranging from one to 26 years following the date of graduation.

In terms of determining the respondents’ occupation, the survey asked for the respondents to list their title, kind of work they do, and kind of company/business. The responses were evaluated to determine their classification, within the U.S. Census Bureau occupation and industry classifications, specifically for the region. The industry category is included to gain a better understanding of the occupation of the respondents. The results of the occupation variable are described in Table 20.
### Table 20

**Question asked:** Please describe your general occupation. **Title. Kind of work you do.**

**Kind of company/business.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Contributors of over $1,000</th>
<th>Contributors of $10 - $1,000</th>
<th>Non-Contributors</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive/administrative/managerial</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/technical/specialty</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing, sales</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist, performer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, scientist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed forces</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODE</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel, gaming</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial/insurance/real estate/law</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/utilities/communications</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/public relations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail &amp; wholesale trade</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/forestry/fish/gaming/mining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service/public health</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODE</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Of the over $1,000 contributor group, the highest percent within an occupation and industry were within the executive/administrative/managerial occupation at 45.2% and within the financial/insurance/real estate/law industry at 36.5%. The second highest percent was within the professional/technical/specialty occupation at 20.6% and within the education or public service/public health industry (both at 13.5%).

Of the contributors who gave between $10 to $1,000, the highest percent was within the executive/administrative/managerial occupation (25.9%), and within the public service/public health industry (27.8%). The second highest percent was within the educator occupation (22.2%), and within the education industry (25.9%).

The highest percent within the non-contributor category was within the administrative support occupation at 26.2%, and within the financial/insurance/real estate/law industry at 21.4%. The second highest percent was within the educator occupation (16.7%), and within the public service/public health industry (17.9%).

The table above represents the respondents within each occupation/industry and relative percent within all occupation/industry groups for each gift-giving category. The following table illustrates the respondents’ within each occupation/industry and relative percent within its own occupation/industry group for each gift-giving category.
Table 21

Occupation/industry by respondent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Contributors of over $1,000</th>
<th>Contributors of $10 - $1,000</th>
<th>Non-Contributors</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive/administrative/managerial</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional/technical/specialty</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing, sales</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist, performer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, scientist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed forces</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel, gaming</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial/insurance/real estate/law</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/utilities/communications</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/public relations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail &amp; wholesale trade</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/forestry/fish/gaming/mining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service/public health</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the four larger respondent categories (executive/administrative/managerial, professional/technical/specialty, educator, and administrative support) the alumni within the executive/administrative/managerial occupation contributed more frequently (88.8%) than other occupations and did so at the over $1,000 contribution level (71.3%). Of the alumni within the professional/technical/specialty occupation, 73.5% contributed; and of
those within the educator occupation 61.1% contributed. Of the alumni who were in administrative support positions, 35.3% contributed.

The four industry groups with the highest number of respondents were financial/insurance/real estate/law, public service/public health, education, and hotel. Alumni within the financial/insurance/real estate/law contributed more frequently (74.7%), with 64.8% contributing at the over $1,000 category. Seventy percent of the alumni who were in the public service/public health industry contributed. And 68.9% of alumni in the education industry contributed; of the hotel alumni, 52.4% contributed.

To determine the amount of gift-giving, the respondents were asked two questions. The responses for those contributors above $1,000 and for those who contributed between $10 to $1,000 are indicated in Table 22.
Table 22

Questions asked: (1) Have you ever made a financial contribution (other than alumni dues) to UNLV? (2) About how much have you financially contributed to UNLV, thus far?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributors</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Over $1,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 and above</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 - $49,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 - $19,999</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 - $9,999</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 - $4,999</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$10 - $1,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500 - $1,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 - $499</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10 - $99</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the contributors of over $1,000, only 16.7% contributed at least $20,000, and 63.5% contributed less than $10,000. Of the contributors between $10 and $1,000, 83.3% contributed between $10 - $500.

The final question on the survey allowed the respondents to make comments. The statement read: Please make any comments you think may help encourage voluntary...
financial support to UNLV. The responses varied. Samples of a few suggestions are as follows: Conduct face to face solicitation. Mail alumni journals on time. List even small donors on regular reports to the public. Discontinue paying coaches from donated funds. Support the Greek organizations that tend to give to their alma mater. Allow giving to specific projects rather than to the general fund. Do things that can involve people who no longer live in Las Vegas. Work more closely with the business community. Make a broader appeal rather than asking the same people for money. Provide accurate accounting of funds. Stress the quality of faculty and libraries. Develop a strong academic reputation. Skip the trinkets. Market how the funds make a difference. Provide increased donor interaction with the campus and program. Recognize donors in publications. Emphasize value of sports in general rather than just basketball and football. Emphasize that UNLV is an integral part of the community both academically and athletically. Keep inviting past president's associate contributors, as well as potential donors, to foundation functions. Treat alumni nicer. Provide valet parking for donors. Organize cultural events, which would be available to donors only. Maintain a balanced commitment between athletics and academics. Expand on phone calls from students to solicit funds. Target prior scholarship recipients to give back. Discontinue "hounding" with repetitive contacts. Allow small $5 - $25 donations. Continue growth of curriculum for graduate students. Stress that UNLV is a young institution with little alumni/donor support as compared to older more established institutions. Create more school spirit while a student.
Correlation Statistics

The relationships among various variables to the level of gift-giving were calculated utilizing artificial neural network technology. The supervised learning algorithm, specifically, the backpropagation method in the NeuroShell® 2, (correlation statistical analysis technique) was used to analyze the data and identify correlations among variables to various levels of gift-giving. Multiple regression was used to compare the neural network $R^2$ results. The neural network was designed to answer the following research questions: 1. What set of motives and characteristics predict alumni participation at various levels of giving? 2. What set of motives and characteristics predict repeat participation? 3. What factors characterize the alumni non-donor?

The coded Excel data were divided into two groups: the test data and the training data. Ten percent of the data was used as test data: systematically selected using every $10^{th}$ pattern (subject) selected. Three layers were used in the backpropagation consisting of the input, hidden, and output layers. The input layer consisted of neurons equal to the number of independent variables. The hidden layer consisted of neurons equal to four times the number independent variables. The missing values (Excel cells that were blank because the respondent did not respond to that particular question) were set to average values. The learning rate was set at .01 with a momentum of .01, which controlled the weight adjustments. As the data passed through the hidden layer, the weight was adjusted by 10% to create a new weight.

The neural network analysis was utilized to examine the variables being studied with the level of gift-giving. Initial processes produced an $R^2$ that was unacceptable. Subsequently, data were processed utilizing only the variables that produced higher
correlation coefficients, to determine which set of variables would produce an $R^2$ that would predict variables to the level of gift-giving.

Results of the Processes

The entire study group was processed with all motive and characteristic variables as the independent variables, and the amount of giving as the dependent variable. This process produced an $R^2 = .19$. A subsequent backpropagation was run using only the highest value factors (income level, marital status, industry, giving to another higher educational institution, and attending sporting events) with the resulting $R^2 = .01$.

Then only the motives (desire for prestige, desire for tax deduction, desire for recognition, elevate the image and reputation of the Las Vegas area, attend sporting events, attend cultural events, and improve the quality of cultural activities in the community) were processed with the entire study group resulting with an $R^2 = .00$. (note graph 1). Multiple regression was utilized to determine if it would yield a more robust predictive model than the network’s $R^2 = .00$. The results of the regression model were the same as the backpropagation.
Graph 1. Relative contribution factor of motives for entire study group. The numbers on the graph represent the variables as follows:

1 2.68 Elevate image and reputation of Las Vegas area.
2 3.10 Improve cultural activities in community.
3 2.96 Recognition.
4 2.48 Attend sporting events.
5 3.02 Attend cultural events.
6 2.38 Prestige.
7 2.51 Tax deduction.

Then multiple regression was conducted using motives only for the alumni givers ($10 and above) of the sample group. Again, the result was $R^2 = .001$. Multiple regression was conducted using motives only for the alumni non-contributors against income (due to the dependent variable of giving amount all equal to $0), resulting with $R^2 = .11$. Consequently, all processes produced an extremely low $R^2$ indicating that motives cannot predict gift-giving.

Only the characteristics (income level, age, religious preference, academic college from which one has received their degree, number of years following graduation before
giving for the first time, occupation/industry, involvement in university-organized activities, marital status, and educational level attained) were processed with the entire study group with the neural network resulting with an $R^2 = .18$. The four highest variables (income level, religious preference, academic college from which one has received their degree, and number of years following graduation before giving for the first time) were subsequently processed. Again the $R^2 = .18$.

The contributors of over $1,000 were processed with the neural network, with all variables as the independent variables and the level of giving as the dependent variable. The process produced an $R^2$ of .11. This group was processed several times, utilizing various combinations of variables as the independent variable with the level of giving as the dependent variable. The highest $R^2$ that was achieved was .30, which was obtain by utilizing all variables, and excluding the number of years following graduation before giving for the first time, and repeat giving.

Then, the data were reviewed. For those cells that contained blanks, either averages were inserted or the subject was removed. Subjects that left the degree question blank or income blank were removed; “no” was inserted for blanks on contributing to another university; and averages were inserted for all other cells that were blank. A bivariate correlation coefficient was processed demonstrating the variables’ relationship. The two highest correlations, with the amount of giving, were income level with $r = .38$ and occupation with $r = .18$. Stepwise multiple regression was utilized, each time adding the next highest variable to the process. There were small, inconsequential increases but, again, with the highest achievable $R^2 = .15$. These data were processed utilizing the neural network with the resulting $R^2 = .22$. 
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In conducting the bivariate correlation coefficients, the highest correlations were desire for prestige and desire for recognition, \(r = .65\); attend cultural events and attend sporting events sponsored by the foundation or alumni association, \(r = .63\); elevate the image and reputation of the Las Vegas area, and improve the cultural activities in the community, \(r = .61\); and desire for prestige and attending sporting events, \(r = .51\).

The contributors of over $1,000 were processed in the neural network, with all variables as the independent variables and repeat participation as the dependent variable. This process produced an \(R^2 = .41\). The five highest variables were the number of years following graduation before giving for the first time, desire for a tax deduction, academic college from which one has received their degree, giving to another higher educational institution, and marital status. Graph 2 illustrates the relative contribution factor suggesting similar importance with each variable.
Graph 2. Relative contribution factor of variables with repeat giving, for over $1,000 contributors. The numbers on the graph represent the variables as follows:

1. 10.44 Educational level.
2. 13.44 Academic college from which one received their degree.
3. 10.73 Involvement in university-organized activities.
4. 13.76 Number of years following graduation before giving for first time.
5. 12.39 Amount contributed.
6. 12.86 Giving to another institution.
7. 10.93 Elevate image and reputation of Las Vegas area.
8. 11.23 Improve cultural activities in community.
9. 11.85 Recognition.
10. 11.67 Attend sporting events sponsored by foundation or alumni association.
11. 11.54 Attend cultural events sponsored by foundation or alumni association.
12. 11.79 Prestige.
13. 13.67 Tax deduction.
14. 11.14 Income level.
15. 11.10 Age.
16. 12.69 Marital status.
17. 11.28 Religious preference.
18. 11.90 Occupation.
19. 11.28 Industry.

The contributors of over $1,000 were processed again, excluding the variables with the smallest contribution factors (educational level attained, involvement in university-organized activities, elevate the image and reputation of the Las Vegas area,
age, income level, improve cultural activities in the community, religious preference, industry). The process produced an $R^2 = .43$. The data were reprocessed again, excluding additional variables that had a small contributing factor (attend cultural events sponsored by foundation or alumni association, attend sporting events sponsored by foundation or alumni association, desire for prestige, desire for recognition, and amount of giving). This process produced an $R^2 = .66$. Subsequent processes occurred utilizing only the two highest factors (number of years following graduation before giving for the first time, and desire for tax deduction), resulting with an $R^2 = .25$. The next process added two additional factors (academic college from which one received their degree and giving to another institution), producing an $R^2 = .32$. The final process added marital status, resulting with an $R^2 = .41$. Then motives only were used as the independent variables, which resulted with an $R^2 = .00$. Following this procedure, the characteristics only were used, which resulted with an $R^2 = .33$.

Consequently, the highest $R^2$ achievable for repeat participation for contributors over $\$1,000$ was $.66$, with the three highest predictor variables (note graph 3) being the academic college from which one received their degree, number of years following graduation before giving for the first time, and desire for a tax deduction.
Graph 3. Relative contribution factor of variables with repeat giving, for over $1000 contributors. The numbers on the graph represent the variables as follows:

1. 14.93 Academic college from which one received their degree.
2. 14.77 Number of years following graduation before giving for the first time.
3. 9.54 Amount contributed.
4. 8.20 Giving to another institution.
5. 14.63 Tax deduction.
6. 7.58 Marital status.

Contributors of $10 to $1,000 were processed to determine predictor variables to repeat participation. The first process included all variables as the independent variables and repeat participation as the dependent variable. The process produced an $R^2 = .43$ (note graph 4) with the three highest variables being, the amount of giving, age, and occupation.
Graph 4. Relative contribution factor of variables with repeat participation for $10 - $1,000 contributors. The numbers on the graph represent the variables as follows:

1. 3.85 Educational level.
2. 2.71 Academic college from which one received their degree.
3. 3.17 Involvement in university-organized activities.
4. 2.26 Repeat giving.
5. 5.27 Amount contributed.
6. 3.32 Giving to another institution.
7. 2.09 Elevate image and reputation of Las Vegas area.
8. 2.13 Improve cultural activities in community.
9. 2.97 Recognition.
10. 2.72 Attend sporting events sponsored by foundation or alumni association.
11. 3.28 Attend cultural events sponsored by foundation or alumni association.
12. 3.02 Prestige.
13. 2.17 Tax deduction.
14. 2.35 Income level.
15. 4.58 Age.
16. 2.80 Marital status.
17. 2.89 Religious preference.
18. 4.52 Occupation.
19. 2.46 Industry.

The next process included only the strongest eight variables (amount of giving, age, occupation, educational level, giving to another institution, attend cultural events sponsored by the foundation or alumni association, involvement in university-organized
activities, and desire for prestige). That process resulted with an $R^2 = .40$. Then only the strongest six variables were included (amount of giving, age, occupation, educational level, giving to another institution, attend cultural events sponsored by the foundation or alumni association) which produced an $R^2 = .38$. The last process only included the three strongest variables (amount of giving, age, occupation) which resulted with an $R^2 = .36$. Consequently, the highest $R^2$ achievable was .43, indicating that all variables combined provide the highest prediction for repeat participation. Although, the overall predictive value at $R^2 = .43$ is relatively low.

**Summary**

The descriptive statistics indicate small differences between the three groups (over $1,000 contributors, $10 to $1,000 contributors, and the non-contributors). The respondents had similar responses for the seven motives studied, indicating that there were few differences between the contributors and non-contributors regarding their reasons for making a contribution. The respondents were somewhat different in terms of their characteristics. However, these differences were minimal.

The analysis of the data utilizing the neural network reflected the similarities of the three groups with the various variables being studied. Subsequent multiple regressions supported that analysis.

The study demonstrated that there were small differences between the three study groups. There is little evidence to support the ability to predict gift-giving at various levels of giving, using the motives and characteristics taken from a review of the literature on gift-giving.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR FURTHER STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of this exploratory study was to build a predictive model that looks at the motives and characteristics of gift-giving by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas alumni. This study determined the relationship among these variables to the level of gift-giving. There were limited data on the motives and characteristics of donors who give to universities. Data that would provide information on the motives and characteristics of these individuals would help identify the population most likely to contribute and target fundraising activities toward those individuals.

Summary of Findings

The study findings are described within the contexts of the three research questions that guided this study.

1. What set of motives and characteristics predict alumni participation at various levels of giving?

2. What set of motives and characteristics predict repeat participation?

3. What factors characterize the alumni non-donor?
Research Question 1

The first research question was, What set of motives and characteristics predict alumni participation at various levels of giving? The results of this study indicated that there were low predictive values for any of the groupings of motives and characteristics to predict alumni gift-giving. There is little to no relationship among the variables to the level of gift-giving. The results supported the literature review, which suggested that the prior limited research on predicting donor participation at various gift levels was difficult. Although the results of this study supported the literature review, the study did reveal some information that may be helpful to the UNLV Foundation.

The donors indicated that the reasons they give were similar to the non-donors. Respondents from the three groups more frequently indicated that the desire for prestige and the desire for recognition were not reasons for contributing. However, the donors who contributed over $1,000, responded slightly more frequently, that these would be reasons for their contributions. All groups indicated that receiving a tax deduction would be more of a reason for contributing, with the donors of over $1,000, again, slightly more frequently, indicating that this would be a reason for donating. In terms of attending sporting events or cultural events sponsored by the foundation or alumni association, the donors more frequently indicated that attending cultural events was more of a reason for contributing. The motive that received the highest positive response from donors (indicating that this was a reason for their contribution) was because UNLV helps improve the quality of cultural activities in the community. And the second most positively responded motive was because UNLV enhances the image and reputation of the Las Vegas area.
In terms of characteristics, the study supported the literature review that suggested the larger giver has a higher income, is in an occupation that usually accompanies a higher salary, and is older. Although the differences among the three groups were minimal, there were a few nuances that may be helpful to the UNLV foundation.

The study indicated that the level of education for the contributors was only slightly higher than the non-donors. The donors in the $1,000 and above category more frequently indicated that they did not have a religious preference, in comparison to the $10 - $1,000 contributors who indicated a preference toward the Protestant religion. The literature review suggested that Protestants tend to donate in comparison to other groups; this study suggested that the “None – no preference” respondents had a slightly higher percent for the over $1,000 contributors in comparison to the $10 to $1,000 contributors. The over $1,000 contributors more frequently contributed to another institution in comparison to the other two groups, and were more involved with university-organized activities while a student or alum. Business college alumni more frequently contributed and did so at the larger giving group of over $1,000, with the education college alumni second and liberal arts alumni third. The over $1,000 contributors more frequently were in the executive/administrative/managerial occupations, and were in the financial/insurance/real estate/law industries.

Research Question 2

The second research question was, What set of motives and characteristics predict repeat participation? The neural network results indicated a moderate $R^2 = .66$ for contributors of over $1,000$. This indicated that the six predictor variables account for a total net variance of 66%. The six variables, in order of importance, were the academic
college from which one has received their degree, the number of years before giving, a tax deduction, the amount given, giving to another institution, and marital status. The results for contributors of $10 to $1,000 were $R^2 = .43$. This predictive value was relatively low.

Consequently, the set of motives and characteristics that predict repeat participation by alumni who contribute over $1,000 included the academic college from which they received their degree, the number of years following graduation before they began making a contribution, the desire for a tax deduction, the amount they contributed, giving to another college or university, and their marital status. And the value of this prediction is moderate. However, these data could offer the UNLV foundation some information upon which to build fundraising efforts.

Research Question 3

The third research question was, What factors characterize the alumni non-donor? The neural network was not specifically utilized for the third research question: no dependent variable, i.e., level of gift-giving, was available. The results of the neural network for the other two study groups, along with the descriptive statistics, did reveal information about the non-donor that may be of interest to the UNLV Foundation.

In terms of motives, the alumni non-donor responded in a similar manner as the donors. The non-donors more frequently indicated that prestige, recognition, and attending sporting events, would not be reasons for contributing to the university. The non-donors indicated that receiving a tax deduction, and attending functions sponsored by the foundation or alumni association related to cultural events would be more of a reason for making a contribution. And the non-donors indicated that the reasons they would
make a contribution would be because UNLV helps improve the quality of cultural
activities in the community, and because UNLV enhances the image and reputation of the
Las Vegas community.

In terms of characteristics, the non-donor was slightly different than the donors in
that they were younger, with a lower income, were Protestant, or did not have a religious
preference, were less involved with university activities as a student or alum, were in the
colleges of hotel or health science, were in an administrative support occupation, and
were in the hotel/gaming or marketing/public relations industry.

Delimitations and Limitations of the Study

This study was delimited to a sample of the total population of over 35,000
alumni at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. The sample consisted of a sub-sample
(5%) of alumni who contributed $10 to $1,000 at least one time, (2) a sub-sample (1%) of
alumni who were non-contributors, and (3) all alumni (100%) who contributed over
$1,000 at least one time. The total study group was 602 alumni.

A limitation of the study was the small sample size. A larger sample size, or
utilizing all existing data on gift-giving, alumni and non-alumni, may have provided
better correlations.

Another limitation of the study was that the respondents might respond to the
survey questions in a manner they thought would place them in a favorable light
(Hillman, 1980). Therefore, the respondents' responses to the motive questions may be
suspect. Questions such as prestige and recognition may have been rated lower by the
respondents because they perceived answering them positively would put them in a less
favorable light.
Conclusions

Overall, the study demonstrated that there were small differences between the three study groups (over $1,000 contributors, $10 - $1,000 contributors, and the non-contributors). There is little evidence to support the ability to predict gift-giving at various levels of giving, using the motives and characteristics that were under review in this study. There is moderate predictive ability in terms of repeat giving for contributors of over $1,000, with the following predictive variables: the academic college from which one received their degree, the number of years following graduation before giving for the first time, the desire for a tax deduction, the amount contributed, giving to another higher educational institution, and marital status. Also, the study offered a few nuances that may be helpful to the UNLV Foundation.

The results of this study supported the literature review. Although the differences were small, the data indicated that alumni donors tend to be involved with university activities, those who were married give more than single people, those with higher levels of education give more than others, alumni with higher incomes give more as do repeat givers, and people give more as they age. Religious preference was the one variable that the study data did not completely support the literature review. The literature review indicated that Protestants give more than Catholics. The study indicated that more Catholics gave over $1,000 than did Protestants, and the ‘None-no preference’ group gave more frequently than Catholics. However, the study group was small and these three religious preference groups had minimal differences.

The study indicated that the use of artificial neural network technology is a viable tool in higher education administration to determine trend analysis. The technology is
inexpensive, requires a small learning curve, and is a powerful tool that could assist higher education administrative units that rely on trend analysis for decision-making.

Implications for Higher Education Administrators

One of the revealing study findings was that all groups of alumni respondents (over $1,000 contributors, $10 - $1,000 contributors, and the non-contributor) had similar motives for giving. The motive that received the highest positive response from all respondents was, because UNLV helps improve the quality of cultural activities in the community. And the second most positively responded motive was, because UNLV enhances the image and reputation of the Las Vegas area. Utilizing the data from this study, as it relates to motives, may help in developing fundraising strategies.

Targeting the non-donors with incentives that meet their desires (as they reported) may assist the university in increasing the number of alumni contributors. Because the non-donor is younger, with a smaller income, advertising that small donations are as important as large donations may also help increase the number of alumni contributors as well as help establish a pattern of giving among younger donors that may increase as their income level increases.

The various nuances of the study in terms of characteristics may help target fundraising efforts to those alumni who may be more inclined to contribute.

Recommendations for Further Study

The University of Nevada, Las Vegas is a young university, established in 1957, with a relatively young alumni base. Further study to compare gift-giving among young institutions with more established institutions of higher education may provide valuable
information for all institutions. Additional research to compare types of institutions, such as private vs. public, may be useful to add to the body of limited knowledge about gift-giving.

Comparing gift-giving among young urban state institutions may offer valuable information that provides insight about the impact of location. Would a similar institution as the University of Nevada, Las Vegas have a different gift-giving pattern if it was located in a city dissimilar to Las Vegas.

Another recommendation for further study would be to study the non-alumni donor population at UNLV. Currently, the majority (76%) of gifts to the UNLV Foundation come from non-alumni (UNLV Foundation, 1998).

Studying the non-donor could be conducted using artificial neural networks with the Kohonen (in NeuroShell® 2) algorithm; it does not require a dependent variable, and self-organizes to identify groupings and trends.

Utilizing the neural network to analyze large amounts of data may provide a better predictive model (using all existing UNLV Foundation data on gift-giving, alumni and non-alumni).

Also, conducting a qualitative study comparing a group of givers with non-givers with similar characteristics may provide valuable information to the limited body of knowledge on gift-giving. A qualitative study may provide insight into various issues, such as the increased likelihood of contributing if one's parents contributed (living in a philanthropic environment) or if one feels pressure from their peers and colleagues to contribute to their alma mater. In-depth case studies might reveal more critical characteristics than are currently discussed in the research literature on gift-giving.
APPENDIX I

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE
AND CORRESPONDENCE
SURVEY ABOUT ALUMNI

We ask that you share general information to help us learn about the characteristics of donors (or potential donors) and their reasons for financially supporting UNLV. This will help us better understand gift-giving.

The survey should take you about 8 minutes to complete. All responses are confidential and anonymous.

We sincerely thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

The first set of questions will help us better understand how alumni contribute (or might contribute) to UNLV:

1. Which is the highest level of education that you completed at any institution? (Circle the number of your answer)

1 BACHELOR’S DEGREE
2 SOME COURSEWORK BEYOND A BACHELOR’S DEGREE
3 MASTER’S DEGREE
4 SOME COURSEWORK BEYOND A MASTER’S DEGREE
5 PROFESSIONAL DEGREE (M.D., D.D.S., J.D., ETC.)
6 DOCTORATE DEGREE
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2. In what year did you receive your first degree from UNLV and from which academic college? (Enter year and name of academic college)

19_____

COLLEGE OF ____________________________
(BUSINESS, HOTEL, EDUCATION, LIBERAL ARTS, ETC.)

3. As a student, or alum, were you involved in any university-organized activities (examples: student clubs, teams, organizations, or alumni participant in organized events, volunteer/advisor)? (Circle the number of your answer)

1  NOT INVOLVED
2  INVOLVED AS A STUDENT ONLY
3  INVOLVED AS AN ALUM ONLY
2  INVOLVED AS A STUDENT & ALUM

4. Have you ever made a financial contribution (other than alumni dues) to UNLV? (Circle the number of your answer)

1  NO  IF NO, SKIP QUESTIONS 5,6,7 AND GO TO QUESTION 8.
2  YES

5. About what year did you make your first financial contribution to UNLV? (Enter year)

19______ WAS THE APPROXIMATE YEAR

6. How many times have you made a financial contribution to UNLV? (Circle the number of your answer)

1  ONCE
2  TWICE
3  MORE THAN TWICE
7. About how much have you financially contributed to UNLV, thus far? (Enter dollar amount)

$________.00 TOTAL

8. Have you ever made a financial contribution, as a donor or alumni, to another college or university? (Circle the number)

1 NO
2 YES

This second set of questions is for both contributors and non-contributors and will ask you about reasons for giving (or possibly giving) to UNLV. The questions were developed from research that listed some of the reasons people donate to universities. These questions will help us better understand why people contribute or might contribute.

(Please answer each question. Circle the appropriate abbreviation that best answers the questions.)

STRONGLY AGREE = SA
AGREE = A
NO OPINION = NO
DISAGREE = D
STRONGLY DISAGREE = SD

I contribute (would contribute) because:

UNLV enhances the image and reputation of the Las Vegas area........SA A NO D SD

UNLV helps improve the quality of cultural activities in the community........................SA A NO D SD
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I contribute (would contribute) because:

I receive recognition for contributing to UNLV..........................SA A NO D SD

I can attend activities sponsored by the foundation or alumni association related to *sporting events* (tailgate parties, receptions, etc.)...............SA A NO D SD

I can attend functions sponsored by the foundation or alumni association related to *cultural events* (dinners, receptions, lectures, etc.)..............SA A NO D SD

It is prestigious to be known as having contributed to UNLV......SA A NO D SD

I receive a tax deduction for contributing to UNLV..............SA A NO D SD

The last set of questions will help us better understand the differences among people who give (or might give) to universities for different reasons.

16. Which of the following categories best describes your 1997 total household income from all sources before taxes, including taxable and non-taxable income? (Circle the number of your answer)

1 LESS THAN $ 20,000
2 $ 20,000 TO $ 39,999
3 $ 40,000 TO $ 59,999
4 $ 60,000 TO $ 79,999
5 $ 80,000 TO $ 99,999
6 $100,000 TO $199,999
7 $200,000 TO $299,999
8 $300,000 OR MORE
17. Which of the following categories includes your age on the day you completed this survey? (Circle number)

1 UNDER 25
2 25 TO 29
3 30 TO 34
4 35 TO 39
5 40 TO 44
6 45 TO 49
7 50 TO 54
8 55 TO 59
9 60 TO 69
10 70 OR ABOVE

18. Your present marital status: (Circle number)

1 NEVER MARRIED
2 MARRIED
3 SEPARATED
4 DIVORCED
5 WIDOWED

19. What is your religious preference? (Circle number)

1 PROTESTANT
2 CATHOLIC
3 MORMON
4 MUSLIM
5 JEWISH
6 NONE (NO PREFERENCE)
7 OTHER...(specify)__________________
20. Please describe your general occupation. (If retired, describe your occupation before retirement.)

TITLE: _________________________________________

KIND OF WORK YOU DO: ________________________

KIND OF COMPANY/BUSINESS: _________________

Please make any comments you think may help encourage voluntary financial support to UNLV: (use the back of this page for additional space)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

We most sincerely thank you for completing this survey to help us better understand the characteristics of donors and their reasons for financially supporting UNLV.

Please return this survey in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope to:

Judy Belanger, Research Coordinator
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway, Box 458000
Las Vegas, Nevada 89154-8000

___ Check here if you request a summary of the results.
This is a survey for information only, not a solicitation.

As an alum, you are being asked to share information that will help us better understand gift-giving. We need your assistance as we look for ways to support the university's continued progress by encouraging voluntary financial contributions.

This survey is being conducted by the College of Education, Department of Educational Leadership. The results of this research will be reported on a group basis only and a summary of the results will be available to you upon your request.

Your name was randomly selected from 35,000 UNLV alumni. You are one of a small group of alumni whose responses will benefit UNLV students and help shape the university's future.

You may be assured of complete confidentiality. The survey has an identification number for mailing purposes only, which will allow us to remove your name from the mailing list when you return the questionnaire.

Thank you for your thoughtful responses to this brief survey. Please use the postage-paid return envelope and mail as soon as possible to Judy Belanger, Research Coordinator, University of Nevada Las Vegas, 4505 Maryland Parkway Box 458000, Las Vegas, Nevada, 89154-8000. We are available to answer any of your questions or concerns (702-895-0704).

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Judy Belanger
Research Coordinator
Last week a questionnaire requesting information that will help us better understand gift-giving at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas was mailed to you.

If you have already completed and returned the questionnaire please accept our sincere thanks. If not, please do so as soon as possible. Because it has been sent to a limited number of UNLV alumni it is extremely important that your survey also be included in the study.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire or it was misplaced, please call me at (702-895-0704), and I will send another one to you today.

Sincerely,

Judy Belanger
Research Coordinator
March 8, 1999

About three weeks ago we wrote to you requesting information that will help us better understand gift-giving. As of this day, we have not yet received your completed questionnaire.

Our research unit has undertaken this study because we are looking for ways to support the university’s continued progress by encouraging voluntary financial contributions.

We are writing to you again because each questionnaire is essential to this study. Your name was drawn through a sampling process in which every UNLV alumni had an equal chance of being selected. This means that only about one out of every 50 alumni are being asked to complete this survey. In order for the results of this study to be representative of the UNLV alumni it is important that each person in the sample return their questionnaire.

In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, we have enclosed a replacement for you. We are available to answer any of your questions or concerns and can be reached at 702-895-0704.

Your help and cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Judy Belanger
Research Coordinator
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