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ABSTRACT

This research explored the connection between the philanthropic profile and alumni charitable giving. More specifically, this research attempted to identify differences regarding alumni perceptions of the philanthropic profile of their alma mater institutions and determine whether those differences were predictive of donor status and/or increased charitable giving behaviors. A non-experimental quantitative survey was administered to 1,992 alumni associated with 32 higher education institutions. The survey instrument used a 5-point Likert scale consisting of 23 questions from the Smits (2012) philanthropic profile instrument, plus 8 personal demographic and 4 institutional special questions. Descriptive analysis was conducted to rank the importance of the 23 philanthropic profile elements. Factor analysis and logistic regression analysis was also conducted to determine if there were specific philanthropic profile factors that were predictive of increased charitable giving behavior.

Findings revealed that a three-factor solution consisting of 9 of 23 items accurately represents the core essence of philanthropic profile and are predictive of donor status but not predictive of increased donation amount or frequency of donations. Findings also revealed that there are some significant differences between how alumni and chief development officers rank the importance of some philanthropic profile items. Recommendations for future research include conducting a longitudinal study, testing of additional items to isolate effective predictors of donation frequency and amount, comparison studies testing the model at specific institutions, and replicating the study in other nonprofit, for profit, and educational environmental settings.
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“When we learn to see the world through cultural lenses, all kinds of things begin to make sense that initially were mysterious, frustrating, or seemingly stupid” (Shein, 2010, p. 13).
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PHILANTHROPIC CULTURE:
A QUANTITATIVE STUDY EXPLORING THE CONNECTION BETWEEN
PHILANTHROPIC PROFILE AND ALUMNI CHARITABLE GIVING

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The word philanthropy comes from the Greek word *philanthropia*, which was originally used to describe “the love of what it is to be human” (Zunz, 2012, p. 17). American history is full of great business leaders who were also very generous with their personal wealth—leaders who loved what it was to be human. Benjamin Franklin led efforts to build the first public library and the first volunteer fire brigade in Philadelphia. Industrialists Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller each gave large portions of their vast personal holdings to charitable causes. Recently, tech moguls Bill and Melinda Gates, investor Warren Buffett, and media pioneer Ted Turner have all followed in the tradition of wealthy Americans donating major portions of their wealth to philanthropic causes including health care, social programs, education, and general welfare efforts (Philanthropy Roundtable, 2014). In 2010, Warren Buffett and Bill and Melinda Gates launched the Giving Pledge, a campaign to encourage the world’s wealthiest people to make a commitment to give most of their wealth to philanthropic causes. According to the Huffington Post (October 19, 2014), 127 of the world’s wealthiest billionaires have now accepted that challenge.

Higher education has also benefited from the generosity of American philanthropists. Harvard University was named after the college’s first benefactor, the young minister John Harvard, who upon his death in 1638 left his library of 400 books and half of his estate (£779) to
the institution (Harvard University, 2014). Since that first gift to Harvard in the 17th century, philanthropy has been a major part of how higher education is financed in America.

In fact, for most American colleges and universities, philanthropy is today an integral part of their annual revenue streams. These institutions employ large teams of development professionals charged with securing gifts and grants from alumni, parents, corporations, foundations, and friends of their schools. Ensuring that these development teams operate effectively and efficiently has become a top priority for university leaders interested in maximizing philanthropic donations while minimizing the cost of securing those gifts and grants. To achieve this important balance, institutional leaders must attempt to elevate the philanthropic profile of their institutions, especially in the eyes of their key donor population: alumni of their institutions. The ultimate intent of this research is to provide the higher-education community with the beginnings of a model of what their organizations look like in terms of their externally observable philanthropic profile; that is, how their organizations should look from the perspective of their alumni donors, and how those images might influence charitable giving behaviors directed toward their institutions.

Overview of Doctoral Thesis: Purpose and Structure

The purpose of this doctoral thesis is to explore the connection between the philanthropic profile and alumni charitable giving of colleges and universities. More specifically, this thesis is designed to uncover differences between donor and non-donor alumni perceptions of the philanthropic profile associated with institutions of higher education and to determine whether those differences are predictive of increased charitable giving behavior. Philanthropic profile represents the organization’s “level of commitment to fundraising and philanthropy” (Hoover, 2007, p. 5). Charitable giving is defined as “something done or given for the benefit of our
fellows or the public” (Zunz, 2012, p. 17). This research aims to add additional clarity to Hoover’s definition of philanthropic profile, suggesting that a more accurate definition is that philanthropic profile is the perceived level of commitment to fundraising and philanthropy.

Chapter I of this doctoral thesis outlines the problem statement and the significance of this research as it relates specifically to higher education. A formal research question and three sub-questions are introduced, as well as descriptions of the key independent variables that will be analyzed to determine which specific factors influence individual (and aggregate) survey responses regarding philanthropic profile and the associated alumni charitable giving directed toward the 32 institutions of higher education in the sample population. Also discussed is the reasoning behind the decision to select and apply an existing survey instrument and its alignment with specific theoretical frameworks. Key terms and definitions are included at the end of this chapter.

Chapter II summarizes the related literature linking the concepts of philanthropic profile and charitable giving. Each subsection gives a historical overview, identifies the predominant scholars, and then expands on the key scholarship reviews the scholarly literature related to the study of culture, organizational culture, organizational identity, organizational image, higher educational culture, philanthropy, philanthropic profile, and charitable giving. It also summarizes the available frameworks that might have been used to study how philanthropic profile is connected to alumni charitable giving behavior within higher education.

Chapter III details the research design structure, target and sample populations, sampling strategy, survey participate recruitment plans, instrumentation, and proposed strategies for data collection, data storage, and data analysis. Procedures used to ensure the validity, reliability, and generalizability of the data collected are discussed, along with institutionally required procedures
to ensure the protection of human rights via the institutional board review (IRB). Chapter IV presents an analysis of the data collected, and Chapter V discusses the study's results, potential implications to theory and practice, and recommendations for future research. The survey instrument is attached as an appendix.

**Problem Statement**

The very survival of many charitable institutions (including institutions of higher education) now depends on monetary donations (Gaskin, 1999; Sargeant, 1999; Sargeant, West, & Ford, 2004). Since the 1990s, higher education has been “in crisis throughout the world caused in part by the increasing scarcity of public revenue—a function, in turn, of competition from other public needs” (World Bank, 1994, p. 1). If costs continue to grow at current rates, higher education will need to spend about $151 billion (in 1995 dollars) to serve students in 2015 (Benjamin, 1998, p. 16). Assuming that federal, state, and local appropriations to higher education follow current downward trends, government funding of higher education will total only $47 billion in 2015. Tuition, grants, and endowment income will account for another $66 billion, leaving a shortfall of approximately $38 billion needed to meet all of the financial demands of higher education in the United States by the year 2015. Increased private philanthropy is part of the solution to this pending financial crisis for higher education in America.

As costs continue to increase and revenues from traditional state and federal sources continue to decrease (World Bank, 1994; Benjamin, 1998), private philanthropy will become even more important to the financial health of higher education. The overall financial success of any institution of higher education is now (at least in part) directly tied to that institution's ability to raise funds, which in turn is (at least in part) directly tied to alumni perceptions of the institution
philanthropic profile) and the associated charitable giving behaviors directed toward that institution.

Ciconte and Jacob (2005) explained that many factors influence charitable giving in the United States, including the public’s trust that the organization has ethical and honest fundraising practices (p. 5). A fully developed culture of philanthropy has many overlapping and interconnected components and layers, and many years may be required to fully establish a positive culture between an organization and its key supporters and/or alumni base (Ciconte & Jacob, 2005). Without a positive culture of philanthropy and the public’s trust, as described by Ciconte and Jacob (2005), even the most professional and experienced fundraising staff, equipped with the most powerful fundraising strategy, will have difficulty meeting either its annual or its long-range fundraising goals and objectives.

These difficulties were reinforced in a recent benchmarking survey conducted by McDonald and Scaife (2010), when 65% of the nonprofit organizations and educational institutions surveyed stated that the development of a healthier culture of philanthropy was vital to their overall financial success. In 2012, the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) surveyed chief development officers associated with colleges and universities in North America (Smits, 2012; Smits and Paradise, 2013). Of the 246 chief development officers who responded to the survey, 98.6% reported that they did not have a clear understanding of the specific factors that contribute to the health of the philanthropic culture on their campuses, let alone a method for predicting how various cultural elements might influence donor perceptions regarding their organization, and how those perceptions might translate into increased charitable giving directed toward their institutions (Smits, 2012; Smits and Paradise, 2013).
Researchers have attempted to resolve a definitive set of personal characteristics associated with the “ideal donor” (Duffy & Kornienko, 2010; Oliveira, Croson, & Eckel, 2011; Sargeant, Ford, & West, 2005; Taylor & Martin, 2005; Thomas, 2005; and Van Slyke, Ashley, & Johnson, 2007). Many empirical studies have been aimed at resolving the specific set of mechanisms that drive charitable giving behavior (Bekker & Wiepking, 2011; Bennett, 2003; Kumru & Vesterlund, 2010; Verhaert & Van den Poel, 2011). Unfortunately, none of these previous studies looked at how alumni (both donors and non-donors) interpret the factors associated with the philanthropic profile of an organization and how those interpretations might translate into specific charitable giving behaviors, especially toward institutions of higher education. Individual decisions on whether to make a specific charitable donation, as well as the amounts and frequency of those donations, could potentially be influenced by these individual interpretations of the organization’s philanthropic profile (Burnett, 2002; Sargeant, Ford, & West, 2001; Sargeant et al., 2005; Shabbir, Dayananda, & Thwaites, 2007) and are therefore worthy of further study.

**Research Questions**

This research examined the relationship between philanthropic profile and alumni charitable giving at institutions of higher education in the United States. The researcher hypothesized that opinions regarding certain elements of an organization’s philanthropic profile would be measurable and different between donor and non-donor survey respondents within the sample population, and that those differences might also be predictive of increased charitable giving behaviors (frequent and amount of donation). Accordingly, the following research questions.
**Research question:** To what extent does an institution’s philanthropic profile influence charitable giving behaviors of college alumni?

Three additional sub-research questions are associated with this research:

**Sub-question #1:** What factors are the most predictive of donor vs. non-donor status at institutions of higher education?

**Sub-question #2:** Are there specific factors associated with philanthropic profile that are predictive of higher donation frequency at institutions of higher education.

**Sub-question #3:** Are there specific factors associated with philanthropic profile that are predictive of higher donation amounts at institutions of higher education?

**Theoretical Framework**

The primary theoretical framework informing this doctoral thesis is *philanthropic profile* (Smits, 2012; Smits and Paradise, 2013). In 2012, the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) tested a list of 28 distinct characteristics believed to influence the health of an institution’s culture of philanthropy, or its philanthropic profile. These characteristics ranged from the quality and reputation of the faculty to fundraising goals that align with the institutional mission. CASE tested these 28 characteristics when it surveyed 246 chief development officers associated with its member institutions (Smits, 2012; Smits and Paradise, 2013). The characteristics assembled in the Smits (2012) survey instrument represent the most recent and complete collection philanthropic profile items within higher education.
The decision to use this particular instrument (Smits, 2012; Smits and Paradise, 2013) to measure alumni perceptions regarding philanthropic profile was informed by the seminal works of Schein (2010), Hatch and Schultz (1997, 2002), and Denison (1990, 2006), which all focused on the theoretical connections between organizational culture and organizational outcomes. These topics are discussed further in Chapter II.

This theoretical construct, illustrated here in Figure 1, was operationalized through an online survey instrument that used 23 questions from the original Smits (2012) survey and was administered to 1,992 alumni graduates associated with 32 higher education institutions in the United States. Composite scores, along with factor scores that measured sub-scales, allowed for in-depth exploration of the nature of the relationships between donor and non-donor responses to each of the 23 philanthropic profile variables tested. The following section expands on the research plan for this doctoral thesis.

Figure 1. Proposed Theoretical Framework
Overview of Research Plan

This research was designed to address a gap in our knowledge of how alumni interpret the importance of an organization’s philanthropic profile and its impact on their associated charitable giving behaviors (donor status, frequent of donation, and amount of donation). A non-experimental quantitative survey methodology was selected and used to test 23 questions from the Smits (2012) philanthropic profile instrument on a census sample of 1,992 alumni from 32 higher education institutions in the United States.

The survey instrument included 23 questions from the Smits’ (2012) philanthropic culture tool, plus 8 personal demographic and 4 institutional specific questions. A 5-point Likert scale was used for this survey. The research ultimately aimed to identify any points of correlation between survey respondent status (donor vs. non-donor) and mean scores on each of the 23 philanthropy profile scale items. Analysis was also conducted to further resolve for any correlations associated with philanthropic profile that might be predictive of increased donation frequency and/or increased donation amount. Two open-ended questions were also included in the survey instrument that asked respondents whether their institution have done anything specific either to warrant a recent donation or to influence a recent decision not to make a donation.

To address the proposed research question and sub-questions, both descriptive and inferential statistics were analyzed. Descriptive statistics are useful when researchers seek to understand overall trends in the data collected (mean, mode, median); measure the spread of scores (variance, standard deviation, and range); or understand how one score relates to all other scores (z score, percentile ranking) (Creswell, 2012). Inferential statistics, on the other hand, allow researchers to make informed inferences about a population based on data collected from a
small sample within that larger population (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012). In this case, data collected from alumni associated with 32 colleges and universities was analyzed to make informed inferences regarding the larger population of all alumni graduates associated with all colleges and universities in the United States.

Descriptive statistical data were first prepared (mean and standard deviation) for all survey items. Using these descriptive data, inferential data analysis began with an exploratory factor analysis. Factor analysis allowed the researcher to identify unique combinations of variables [subsets] from the list of all variables that most accurately represent the sum of the variables analyzed (Muijs, 2011). Factor Analysis was used to determine if the essence of the 23 philanthropic profile elements could be represented by a smaller set of factors.

Logistic regression analysis allows researchers to look at the relationship between one ‘effect’ variable, called the dependent or outcome variable (in this case donor status), and one or more predictors, also called independent variables (in this case the philanthropic profile scale elements) (Muijs, 2011, p. 157). Logistic regression analysis was conducted to address the research questions and to determine whether there were any differences between the donors and non-donors in the data set with regard to their responses to philanthropic profile scale questions.

**Significance of This Research**

The lack of understanding regarding how alumni associated with institutions of higher education interpret and value elements of an institution’s philanthropic profile makes it (1) impossible to quantify the relationship between an institution’s philanthropic profile and charitable giving behaviors, (2) difficult to implement any proactive changes designed to improve the external image of the organization, and (3) challenging to evaluate the effects of those associated changes. Higher education development managers (fundraisers) need a better
understanding of how their alumni are evaluating their organizations and the impact of those evaluations on charitable giving behaviors aimed at their institutions. A better understanding of these factors will allow institutions to make more informed decisions regarding marketing communications and image management decisions aimed in increasing charitable donations. It will also allow institutions to take corrective action regarding development strategy, if required, and to monitor the effectiveness of any changes made in the pursuit of additional and more frequent charitable donations, and ultimately develop a healthier culture of philanthropy for their campus communities.

Having a better understanding of which specific elements of the organization’s philanthropic profile are positively related to increased charitable giving behavior should allow higher education institutions to design interventions that (1) reinforce the charitable giving behavior of existing donors, (2) potentially increase the charitable giving behavior of individuals who are currently not donors, and (3) reinforce and improve the culture of philanthropy at their campuses.

**Significance to Theory.** This research further tested the utility of the Smits (2012) survey instrument for the quantification of an organization’s philanthropic profile and the possible creation of an effective model of philanthropic profile for institutions of higher education. The availability of this model will inform future research related to the connections between philanthropic profile and charitable giving behavior.

**Significance to Practice.** This research has provided the basis for a model of philanthropic profile within higher education. This model of philanthropic profile should prove useful to institutions interested in bridging the gaps in their understanding of what aspects of philanthropic profile are most important to their alumni donors and how their alumni perceive
their organization’s performance against those baseline expectations. Having a clear and concise picture of how alumni (donors and non-donors) are evaluating the philanthropic profile of their organizations and the impact of those decisions on charitable giving behaviors should prove very useful to development officers at institutions of higher education who are interested in attracting additional and larger donations from their existing donor pool. The availability of a baseline model detailing exactly which cultural traits are important (and which are less important) to specific categories of donors while they are making charitable giving decisions will also allow institutions to make better informed decisions regarding strategic marketing, donor stewardship, and future human resource allocation issues.

Study Delimitations

Three study delimitations have been identified: (1) this study examined only the perspective(s) of alumni graduates associated with 32 colleges and universities in the United States; (2) this study assumed that survey respondents would accurately and truthfully respond to each of the 41 questions in the survey instrument and that recall bias would not be a significant factor in those responses; and (3), this study only used one specific survey instrument (Smits, 2012) to resolve for alumni perceptions regarding philanthropic profile.

Study Limitations

Inherent in this study are several unique limitations: (1) the study only solicited responses from external stakeholders who are alumni graduates of colleges and universities in the United States; (2) the data only includes responses from alumni graduates associated with 32 specific colleges and universities; and (3) the study was not experimental. Because the study involved only the participants in the study, in this case, 1,992 alumni associated with 32 colleges and
universities in the United States, the results cannot be generalized to those who did not participate.

**Study Assumptions**

This study had four key assumptions: (1) individual and collective perceptions regarding the importance of specific philanthropic profile elements can be quantified and connected to differences in charitable giving behavior; (2) all Likert-scale data are ordinal, and there is no distinction between scale points; (3) respondents would be more likely to participate in the survey if asked by an official associated with their alma mater institution; and (4) respondents accurately described the quality of their relationship with their alma mater institutions when participating in the voluntary self-administered survey.

**Summary**

This research explored the relationship between philanthropic profile and alumni charitable giving at higher education institutions. A non-experimental quantitative survey methodology was selected and used to test 23 questions from the Smits (2012) philanthropic profile instrument on a census sample of 1,992 alumni from 32 higher education institutions in the United States.

The survey instrument included 23 questions from the Smits’ (2012) philanthropic culture tool, plus 8 personal demographic and 4 institutional specific questions. A 5-point Likert scale was used for this survey. The research resulted in a model of philanthropic profile for institutions of higher education that should provide new insight into how donors and non-donors evaluate specific organizational traits and how those evaluations might influence charitable giving behavior. This should help institutions better tailor their efforts to improve the
philanthropic profile of their institutions and attract additional and more frequent donations to their causes.

Chapter II connects this research with the existing literature regarding the study of philanthropy, philanthropic profile, charitable giving, culture, higher education culture, and cultural effectiveness.

Key Terms / Definitions

Key terms: Charitable giving, culture of philanthropy, development, fundraising, organizational identity, organizational image, philanthropic profile, philanthropy

Charitable giving: Donating money or other resources to charitable organizations (Adloff, 2009).

Culture of philanthropy: An organization’s attitude toward philanthropy and the development process (Cole, 2011).

Development: The total process by which an organization increases public understanding of its mission and acquires financial support for its programs (Ciconte & Jacob, 2005).

Fundraising: The raising of assets and resources from various sources for the support of an organization or a specific project (Ciconte & Jacob, 2005).

Organizational identity: “That which is central, distinctive, and enduring about an organization” (Albert & Whetten, 1985).

Organizational image: “A holistic and vivid impression held by a particular group towards an [organization], partly as a result of information processing (sense-making) carried out by
the group’s members…and partly by the aggregated communications of the

*Philanthropic profile:* The organization’s level of commitment to fundraising and philanthropy
(Hoover, 2007, p. 5).

*Philanthropy:* Greek word meaning “love of mankind.” According to the dictionary of the
Association of Fundraising Professionals (Levy & Cherry, 1996), “philanthropy is (1) the
love of humankind, usually expressed by an effort to enhance the well-being of humanity
through personal acts of practical kindness or by financial support of a cause or causes,
such as a charity … and (2) any effort to relieve human misery or suffering, improve the
quality of life, encourage aid or assistance, or foster the preservation of values through
gifts, service, or other voluntary activity.”
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter II summarizes the literature linking the concepts of philanthropic profile and charitable giving. Sections are included that review the scholarly literature related to the study of culture, organizational culture, organizational identity, organizational image, higher educational culture, philanthropy, philanthropic profile, and charitable giving. Each subsection gives a historical overview, identifies the predominant scholars, and then expands on the key scholarship on each topic. The available frameworks that might be applicable to studying how philanthropic profile is connected to alumni charitable giving behavior within higher education are also reviewed.

Culture

According to British sociologist Chris Jenks (1993), the concept of culture originally referred to the cultivation of crops, but sometime during the nineteenth century, social scientists extended the idea to include the cultivation of human beings. In 1871, British social anthropologist, E. B. Tylor, provided one of the earliest and most influential definitions of culture as “that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society” (Hatch & Cunliffe, 2013, p. 158).

Today, culture is commonly defined as the set of beliefs, understandings, and values that members of an organization share (Davis, 1984; Louis, 1985; and Sathe, 1985). Schein (2010) expressed his definition of the culture of a group as “a pattern of shared basic assumptions learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaption and internal integration, which has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems” (p. 18). Denison
(1990) restated these definitions in layman’s terms, defining culture as “the deep structure of organizations, which is rooted in the values, beliefs, and assumptions held by organizational members” (p. 624). Cole (1996) added that, “culture is a *system of artifacts* that serves to position individuals within their environmental context” (p. 142).

Schein (2010) suggested that “any group’s culture can be studied at one of three levels: (1) artifacts, visible products of a group, architecture, language, art, clothing; (2) espoused beliefs and values, ideals, goals, values, rationalizations; and (3) basic underlying assumptions, unconscious, taken-for-granted beliefs and values” (p. 24). Schein (2010) further suggested that “the essence of a culture lies in the pattern of basic underlying assumptions, and after you understand those, you can easily understand the other more surface levels and deal appropriately with them” (p. 32).

Hatch and Cunliffe (2013) also provided that “one thing is guaranteed: A culture will form in an organization, a department, and a work group. The question is whether the culture that forms is one that helps or hinders the organization’s ability to execute its strategic objectives” (p. 32). They further suggested that by actively managing culture, an organization might be more likely to deliver on its long-term strategic objectives.

**Organizational Culture**

According to Ashkanasy, Wilderom, and Peterson (2011), the term organizational culture is used as an umbrella concept for a way of thinking involving the cultural and symbolic phenomena aspects in organizations. With the publication of his book, *The Changing Culture of a Factory* in 1952, Elliott Jaques became the first organizational theorist to describe organization culture. Jaques suggested that “organizational culture is a way to describe the transformation of a
group of individuals…into a functioning whole that prefers some ways of handling transactions over others” (Ashkanasy et al, 2011, p. 417). Also according to Ashkanasy et al (2011), organizational culture is not, applying this view, primarily inside people’s heads, but somewhere between the heads of a group of people where symbols and meanings are publicly expressed. Since the 1980s, books such at Peters and Waterman’s *In Search of Excellence*, Ouchi’s *Theory Z*, Dean and Kennedy’s *Corporate Culture*, and Schein’s *Organizational Culture and Leadership* have emerged as major works in the study of managerial and organizational performance and culture (Tierney, 1988). Organizational culture has been described by some researchers as being holistic in nature and only socially constructed by the organization’s members (Hofstede et al, 1990; Louis, 1985; Rousseau, 1990; and Smircich, 1983).

Schein (2010) suggested that “organization culture is to a group what personality or character is to an individual” (p. 14). Organizational culture is an important social characteristic that influences organizational, group, and individual behavior (Hartnell, Ou, & Kinicki (2011). “Organizational cultures, like other cultures, develop as groups of people struggle to make sense of and cope with their worlds” (Trice and Beyer, 1993, p. 4). Organizational cultures develop as groups of people struggle to make sense of and cope with their worlds (Trice and Beyer, 1993), and ultimately are the result of people doing things together for a common purpose (Schein, 2010).

Schein (2010) also suggested “that internally focused cultures concentrate on the internal dynamics of the organization, while externally focused cultures put more emphasis on the external development of the organization” (P. 46). Schein (2010) further suggested that “the process of culture formation is, in a sense, identical to the process of group formation in that the very essence of *groupness* or group identity – the shared patterns of thought, belief, feelings, and
values that result from shared experience and common learning – results in the pattern of shared assumptions that I [Shein] am calling the *culture* of that group” (p. 73).

Organizational leaders need a full and complete understanding of their organization’s culture if they are to communicate decisions that will resonate with all constituencies and secure their full support (Tierney, 1988). According to Tierney (1988), “a central goal of understanding organisational culture is to minimize the occurrence and consequences of cultural conflict and help foster the development of shared goals; (p. 5). Conflict between subgroups with an organization can undermine group performance (Schein, 2010) while a distinct organizational culture positively contributes to performance by facilitating goal alignment for the organization (Alvesson, 2013).

Researchers are conflicted about what specific variables contribute to an effective organizational culture and also how specific variables (or sets of variables) might provide an organization with any unique competitive advantage (Barney, 1986). The results of previous research are consistent in showing that some variable(s) associated with organizational culture are predictive of organizational performance (Horstede et al, 1990, Kanter, 1983; Moos, 1979; Peters and Waterman, 1982). Trice and Beyer (1984) argued that much of the previous research on organizational culture has focused only on the impact of single, discrete elements (variables) of organizational culture, while ignoring the possibility that the nature of organizational culture’s construction might actually be affected by the combination of several interrelated variables, which together might be influencing the organization’s overall performance. Other researchers also have suggested that specific cultural factors (variables) might also play a role in determining organizational outcomes (Amsa, 1986; Hofstede, 1986; Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv and Sanders,
quinn and rohrbaugh (1983) provided the competing values framework (cvf), which has proved to be very useful as a framework for measuring organizational effectiveness. weick’s (daft & weick, 1984) work on sense-making theory could also be useful to any research focused on organizational decision-making. bolman and deal (1984) provide a model that has proved useful for evaluating leadership and management effectiveness using a multiframe, multisector analysis technique. denison (denison, 1984, 1990, 2006; denison & mishra, 1995; denison et al., 2012) designed an organizational culture assessment instrument that is widely used today by all types of organizations looking to evaluate organizational performance and effectiveness. denison showed that specific cultural traits might serve as useful predictors of organizational performance and effectiveness.

denison believed that building a positive organizational culture was a difficult task, “especially hard when we keep looking for a fundamental set of underlying assumptions that form the foundation of any organization’s culture” (denison et al., 2012, p. xv).

seminal scholar edgar schein said:

“... from the beginning, denison was concerned with correlating culture dimensions with organizational performance... he [denison] wisely chose to measure only those parts of culture that relate to performance and has shown how the combination of measurement and organizational change... does indeed improve performance” (denison et al., 2012, p. xi).
Denison’s (2006) model of organizational culture and effectiveness is based on four measurable traits of organizational cultures: involvement, consistency, adaptability, and mission. Involvement and consistency address the internal dynamics of the organization while adaptability and mission focus on the external relationships of the organization. In Denison’s survey instrument, each of these four traits is measured by three five-item indexes.

Hatch and Schultz (2002) argued that “culture needs to be seen, not [only] as a variable to be measured, accounted for and controlled, but as a context within which interpretations of organizational identity are formed and intentions to influence organizational image are formulated” (p. 357).

**Organizational Identity.** According to Hatch and Schultz (2002), culture and identity are closely connected, and the early literature on organizational identity often struggled to explain how the two might be conceptualized separately (p. 996). Fiol et al. (1998) took the relationship between culture and identity a step further stating that, “an organization’s identity is the aspect of culturally embedded sense-making that is [organizationally] self-focused” (p. 56). Hatch and Schultz (2010) further suggested that, “Organizational identity is a potentially precarious and unstable notion. The instability of identity arises mainly from its ongoing interrelationships with organizational image” (p. 350).

Much of the existing research on organizational identity builds on the idea that organizational identity is a relationship construct formed in interaction with others (Albert & Whetten, 1985; and Dutton & Dukerich, 1991). The idea of defining an individual’s identity as a relational construct was first proposed by Mead and Mind (1934) as “the process of social experience and activity, that is, develops in the given individual as a result of his relations to the organization that proves as a whole and to other individuals with that process” (p. 135). Mead
and Mind (1934) suggested that identity should be viewed as a social process with two distinguishable parts, one of which they called the ‘I’ and the other, the ‘me’. According to Mead and Mind (1934) the ‘I’ is the response of the individual to the attitudes of others and the ‘me’ is the organized set of attitudes of others that the individual assumes.

According to Hatch and Schultz (2010), organizational identity is that which is central, distinctive, and enduring about an organization. Hatch and Schultz (2002) provided organizational analogs to Mead’s ‘I’ and ‘me’ explaining that “if organizational culture is to organizational identity what the “I” is to individual identity, its follows that, just as individuals form their identities in relation to both internal and external definitions of self, organizations [may also] form theirs in relation to culture and image” (p. 997).

Albert and Whetten (1985) suggested that, “the phenomenon of organizational identity appears whenever members of an organization ask themselves “Who are we?” “What business are we in?” or “What do we want to be?” Dutton, Dukerich, and Harquail (1994) defined organizational identity at the individual level as a cognitive image held by a member of an organization. (p. 43). Albert and Whetten (1985) further suggested that “disassociation of the organizational ‘I’ and ‘me” may have severe implications for the organization…the greater the discrepancy between the ways an organization views itself and the way outsiders view it, the more the health of the organization will be impaired” (p. 1005).

On this basis, Albert and Whetten concluded that “organizational identity is formed by a process of ordered inter-organizational comparisons and reflections upon them over time” (p. 992). Albert and Whetten (1985, p. 273) described the process of identity formation: “…in terms of a series of comparisons: (1) outsiders compare the target individual with themselves; (2) information regarding this evaluation is conveyed through conversations between the parties and
the individual takes this feedback into account by making personal comparisons with outsiders, which then; (3) affects how they define themselves. Dutton & Dukerich (1991) described identity as “a process that related the organization to its environment by allowing it to both adapt to and change that environment” (p. 86). Hatch and Schultz (2002) explained that organizational identity is formed through a process of “ordered inter-organizational comparisons and reflections over time” (p. 83). Hatch and Schultz (1997) further suggested that “organizational identity is grounded in local meaning and organizational symbols and thus [is] embedded in organizational culture,” which they saw as “internal symbolic context for the development and maintenance of organizational identity” (p. 358). According to Hatch and Schultz (2002), organizational identity needs to be theorized in relation to both culture and image if we are to understand how internal and external definitions of organizational identity interact (p. 991). They argued that, “the relationships between culture, image and identity form circular processes involving mutual interdependence” (p. 361). Hatch and Schultz’s (2002) organizational identity dynamics model is shown in Figure 2.
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**Figure 2. Organizational Identity Dynamics Model**
**Organizational Image.** While an organization’s identity describes what its members believe about their organization, an organization’s image is defined by what people outside the organization think of it (Berg, 1985; Fombrun & Shanley, 1990; Weigelt & Camerer, 1988). The image formed by the external audience can be affected by the intentions and influences of a wide range of actors including other groups (Dowling, 1993, p. 103).

Both organizational image and identity are constructs held in organizational members’ minds. They capture two of the key ways that an organization becomes meaningful to individuals and motivates them to action in particular ways and at particular times. Dutton and Dukerich (1991) defined organizational image as “what organizational members believe others see as distinctive about the organization” (p. 550). In a later article Dutton et al. (1991) restricted this definition of organizational image by renaming it ‘construed organization image’. Under either label, the concept comes very close to Mead’s definition of the ‘me’ as ‘an organized set of attitudes of others’ which one himself assumes.

According to Alvesson (1990), “organizational image is a holistic and vivid impression held by an individual or a particular group towards an organization and is a result of sense-making by the group and communication by the organization of a fabricated and projected picture of itself” (p. 376). An organization’s image is directly related to the level of collective self-esteem derivable from organizational membership (Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Pierce, Gardner, Cummings, & Hunham, 1989).

When information from outside the organization conveys an unexpected transient impression (Berg, 1985; Grunig, 1993) or reputation (Fombrun & Shanley, 1990), organization members are prompted to compare their organization identity and organizational image. Who
we believe ourselves to be as an organization is partly based on how others see us (Cooley, 1902; Gergen & Davis, 1985).

Organizational image can often act as a destabilizing force on identity, frequently requiring members to revisit and reconstruct their organizational sense of self (Hatch and Schultz, 2002, p. 356). Also according to Hatch and Schultz (2002), “when organizational identity dynamics are well-balanced between the influences of culture and image, a healthy organizational identity results from processes that integrate the interests and activities of all relevant stakeholder groups” (p. 1005). The notion of balancing organizational identity dynamics may provide useful guidance for organizations attempting to balance their philanthropic profile dynamics as well.

**Higher Education Culture**

The concepts of culture and organizational culture in higher education has been widely studied (Clark, 1972; Dill, 1982; Masland, 1985). However, linkages among different types of culture, cultural strength, and organizational identity have seldom been examined in a higher education context (Smart & St. John, 1996). Colleges and universities are complex social organizations with distinctive cultures and are, to a large extent, people-oriented institutions (Sporn, 1996). Colleges and universities tend to be organizations that are dominated by social interaction and therefore develop a very specific kind of organizational culture (Becher, 1981; Clark, 1983).

Higher education institutions with very similar missions and curricula can perform quite differently because of the unique ways their organizational identities are communicated to internal and external stakeholders and because of the varying perceptions these groups may hold
regarding organizational performance (Tierney, 1988). The external environment and a university’s organizational structure may also contribute to the development of a distinctive academic culture (Sporn, 1996).

Universities are vulnerable to their environment. Changes in political, economic, social, and technological conditions can affect the situation at universities strongly and should be considered during any strategic planning in higher education (Sporn, 1996). David Dill suggested that, “the strength of academic culture is particularly important when academic institutions face declining resources” (Tierney, 1988, p. 17).

The existing research consistently shows that the organizational performance of colleges and universities is directly linked to their cultural types, suggesting that the management of that culture need to be priorities for college and university leaders (Smart & St. John, 1996). Schein (2010) suggested that “culture and leadership…are two sides of the same coin”…and that “the only thing of real importance that leaders do is to create and manage culture” (p. 1). He further suggested that “organizational culture may be created and influenced through such behaviors as what leaders pay attention to …what criteria leaders use to allocate resources, and the qualities of individual who are recruited by and promoted within the organization” (p. 4).

Tierney (1988) also suggested that leaders in higher education could benefit from a better understanding of their institutions as cultural entities. Unfortunately, the general lack of understanding about how the role of organizational culture affects the ability to manage institutional performance inhibits our ability to address the challenges that face higher education (Tierney, 1988).
Philanthropy

The word philanthropy comes from the Greek word philanthropia, which was originally used to describe “the love of what it is to be human” (Zunz, 2012). American history is full of great business leaders who were also very generous with their personal wealth—leaders who loved what it was to be human. Benjamin Franklin led efforts to build the first public library and the first volunteer fire brigade in Philadelphia. He also started the movement to bring higher education to Philadelphia when in 1843 he began efforts to create the Academy of Philadelphia, the first public college in Philadelphia. The Academy of Philadelphia later became the University of Pennsylvania (Philanthropy Roundtable, 2014).

American industrialists Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller each gave major portions of their vast personal wealth to charitable causes during their lives. Recently, tech moguls Bill and Melinda Gates, investor Warren Buffett, and media pioneer Ted Turner have all followed in the tradition of wealthy Americans donating major portions of their wealth to philanthropic causes including health care, social programs, education, and general welfare efforts (Philanthropy Roundtable, 2014).

Higher education has also benefited from the generosity of wealthy American philanthropists. Harvard University was named after its first benefactor, the young minister John Harvard, who upon his death in 1638 left his library of 400 books and half of his estate (779 £) to the institution (Harvard University, 2014). More recently, Stanford University became the first American university to raise more than $1 billion in a single year. Its five-year capital campaign took in a record-setting $6.23 billion, exceeding its original goal of $4.3 billion and far surpassing (by more than $2 billion) any other single higher-education capital campaign in the
history of American higher education (Lewin, 2013). Since that first gift to Harvard in 1638, philanthropy has become an integral part of how higher education is financed in America.

**Philanthropic Profile**

King (2008), in discussing the importance of building a culture of philanthropy, explains that a key strategy is having a senior fundraising executive who provides a clear roadmap for raising funds and a strong philanthropic vision which is clearly aligned with the organization’s priorities and objectives. King (2008) goes on to suggest that the cultivation and preservation of a culture of philanthropy will depend on demonstrating sound measures that ensure accountability. He also explains that employees are a critical component of the culture of an organization, and that without their involvement, a culture of philanthropy would not exist.

Other than the 2012 CASE survey previously discussed (Smits, 2012; Smits and Paradise, 2013), no evidence was found in the literature of any other attempts to develop a consensus definition of the phrase “culture of philanthropy,” assemble a catalog of what specific components a fully developed culture of philanthropy might contain, or determine how specifically, that philanthropic culture should be measured, evaluated, or improved.

**Definition of the Phrase Culture of Philanthropy.** The existing literature provides only limited discussion regarding the notion of having a culture of philanthropy. Smits (2012; Smits and Paradise, 2013) tested one possible definition of the phrase culture of philanthropy: “a culture of philanthropy fosters relationships that share a common understanding, appreciation, and responsibility for the importance of the joy of giving and receiving in enhancing the institution (p. 11).” Of all those surveyed, 81.8% responded that they either agreed or strongly agreed with this proposed definition (Smits, 2012; Smits and Paradise, 2013). No other attempts to test possible definitions of the phrase “culture of philanthropy” could be found in the
literature. However, the literature does include some discussion of who should be involved in maintaining that culture and the effects (both positive and negative) that a fully or poorly developed culture of philanthropy can have on charitable giving and overall fundraising potential (Harbaugh, 1998; Hurvitz, 2010; King, 2008; Schuyt, Smit, & Bekkers, 2004; and Steen, 1992).

**Contributing Factors.** The existing literature does include attempts to describe the key factors that contribute to an organization’s culture of philanthropy. Schuyt et al. (2004) reviewed the previous research on charitable giving and volunteering, using measures of personal motives for prosocial behavior in interpersonal relations. Their research suggested that personal feelings of civic duty and social responsibility are important motives for personal philanthropy. Hurvitz (2010) also showed that higher educational institutions are potentially able to reinforce an environment in which altruistic and pro-social behavior is developed through a dedicated program geared toward increasing student satisfaction with their overall academic experience.

One of the largest collections of educational fundraising data is the *Voluntary Support of Education Survey* published annually by the Council for Aid to Education (CAE). This comprehensive survey provides educational fundraising data segmented by institution type, institution size, donor type, donation amount, and donation category (CAE, 2011). Information is also provided on donor participation rates and fundraising expenditures associated with most higher education institutions in the United States. Unfortunately, CAE makes no attempt to provide any linkages between its data and the development or measurement of philanthropic culture.

**Charitable Giving**

The previous literature shows that charitable giving is motivated not only by the desire to produce positive change within an organization (pro-social behavior) but also by other motives
such as the approval of others or the increased social status obtained from giving (Harbaugh, 1998). Recent studies also provide evidence of a link between an altruistic self-image and philanthropy. Many studies also find that dispositional empathy is positively related to charitable giving (Bekkers, 2006).

In a regional study of philanthropic giving in Boston and other parts of New England, Havens and Schervish (2007) identified educational attainment, especially beyond the bachelor’s degree, as a major contributing factor in increased charitable giving. Havens and Schervish (2007) also linked certain donor occupations to increased levels of charitable giving.

Havens and Schervish (2007) showed that households headed by African Americans gave the largest percentage of their incomes, on average, to charitable causes compared with all other races. Most of these donations being made to religious causes, and they gave a somewhat larger proportion of their incomes to religious institutions than all other races combined.

Robert Wray (1994) was one of the first to link the importance of branding as another factor contributing to charitable giving. McAlexander and Koenig (2012) later showed a direct relationship between a person’s integration within an alumni brand community and his or her philanthropic intent; they adapted methodology developed from prior research on brand community within the automotive industry and extended the notion of the Brand Community Index (BCI) to the higher education brand community model. McAlexander and Koenig (2012) suggested a direct link between increased alumni giving and BCI. They suggested that BCI could effectively measure how strongly alumni felt about the collective connections of community, including their thoughts on institutional identity, the quality of education received, the image of the institution behind the brand, and the relationships of alumni with other alumni or peers.
Thomas (2005), in his doctoral dissertation study, showed that donors could be distinguished from non-donors by the years since graduation and by three types of activities: social, campus leadership, and academic performance. He showed that personal experiences while in college, as well as other influences within the control of the institution, might have a direct, and significantly positive effect, on charitable giving behavior. Key variables identified by Thomas (2005) as important to charitable giving include serving in a leadership position as a student, career choice, satisfaction with the college experience, and the availability of volunteer engagement opportunities. Thomas (2005) believed that educational institutions would benefit from using all reasonable and educationally sound means to provide students with these particular experiences because doing so would increase the likelihood of them becoming fully engaged alumni volunteers and donors in later years.

The research by Thomas (2005) also illustrated the ability of selected variables to be moderately effective in discriminating between donors and non-donors. He found a significant positive relationship with lifetime giving for some variables, but other variables showed weaker links. Additional research is needed to narrow the focus and improve our understanding of the factors related to alumni giving by eliminating the weakest variables and further defining those with the strongest relationship (Thomas, 2005).

Bekkers and Wiepking (2011) conducted a comprehensive literature review of more than 500 peer-reviewed articles related to charitable giving. As a result of that review, they identified eight specific mechanisms that have been linked as key determinants of individual philanthropy. Those mechanisms are: (1) awareness of need, (2) type of solicitation, (3) costs and benefits, (4) altruism, (5) reputation, (6) psychological benefits, (7) values, and (8) efficacy. Other researchers (Cnaan, Jones, Dickin, & Salomon, 2011; Hurvitz, 2010; McAlexander & Koenig, 2012; Moody,
2008; Sargeant et al., 2005; Sawhill, 2001; Taylor & Martin, 2005) also focused on the effect of specific factors that contribute to giving and volunteering.

**Testing of Key Variables.** Taylor and Martin (2005) cited 33 doctoral dissertations related to alumni giving and its contributing factors in their review of previous research on philanthropic decision making. Taylor and Martin’s (2005) research expanded on the previous research regarding these key variables and produced a comprehensive list of 35 demographic variables that all contribute to an individual’s philanthropic decision making.

Members of CASE’s Council on Philanthropy recently condensed those 35 variables to a set of 28 unique cultural traits they thought might influence the culture of philanthropy at their institutions. That list of 28 key variables was then tested by CASE during a survey of chief development officers regarding the state of the culture of philanthropy at higher education institutions in North America (Smits, 2012; Smits and Paradise, 2013). This recent study was successful in ranking the key variables as they relate to their effects on the culture of philanthropy at those institutions that responded to the survey. Respondents were asked to rank each cultural trait using a five-point Likert scale. The top ten cultural traits shown to have a positive effect on philanthropic culture are as follows: leadership of the organization, engaged volunteers and donors, commitment to stewarding gifts, clear and concise mission and vision statements, fundraising goals aligned with mission, alumni satisfaction with college experience, career success of graduates, opportunities for alumni engagement, donors with capacity and interest in major gifts, and the quality and reputation of the faculty.

This survey (Smits, 2012; Smits and Paradise, 2013) also showed that the following 18 cultural traits were rated unimportant (or less important) as ingredients of a healthy culture of philanthropy: membership in a particular athletic conference, successful athletic programs,
facultty/student ratio, ranking in polls, percentage of parent giving, percentage of student giving, quality and reputation of research programs, graduation class leadership and unity, honors and accolades, percentage of staff giving, quality of academic programs, demonstrated need for philanthropic support, public reputation of the institution, tradition of philanthropy, influence from other donors, percentage of alumni giving, scandals and/or negative press, and percentage of faculty giving.

While the literature and the existing data sets regarding contributing factors that might influence educational fundraising are extensive, serious questions remain regarding the reliability of some of the data collected especially as it relates to oversampling of high-income respondents and other related demographic issues including race and socio-economic status. The key variables as originally defined by Taylor and Martin (2005) and recently tested by Smits (2012; Smits and Paradise, 2013) do represent a comprehensive list of factors that should be very useful for any future research related to design, testing, and evaluation of a measurement framework related to philanthropic profile within higher education.

Existing Methodologies. For a private enterprise, measuring success is often as simple as reading a profit and loss statement. For a mission-driven nonprofit, however, measuring success is far more difficult and has long been recognized as a major concern in the nonprofit management literature (Sawhill, 2001).

Any previous efforts to measure and understand American giving and volunteering tend to be expensive and methodologically complex (Cnaan et al., 2011). Numerous methodological issues must be considered when assessing giving and volunteering data. Cnaan et al. (2011) claim that many of the existing methodologies designed to measure levels of giving and volunteering in the United States yield significantly different results. When asked about the
estimated levels of American giving and volunteering, scholars and policy analysts alike cannot provide an agreed-upon, reliable estimate of recent activity (Cnaan et al., 2011).

Many previous research studies have regarded the decision to donate (or not to donate) as the primary output from any model of giving behavior (Sargeant, 1999). Hiles (2010) compiled a list of traditional measures used to quantitatively measure fundraiser performance including dollars raised; number of calls, moves, and contacts; and proposals submitted. More subjective measures of fundraiser performance and judgment include proposals submitted versus proposals closed, how the fundraiser deals with objections, and the quality of call reports. Hiles (2010) suggested that, while the use of these measures is a common practice today, fundraisers are now more interested in alternative measures of performance, including the level of the gift obtained, the likely lifetime-giving value of the donor, and the extent to which the donor may be persuaded to support the organization in ways other than with simple cash donations.

Hall (2001) noted that “surveys are frequently used to collect data about giving and volunteering; however, the quality of the data is seldom known, and the measurement challenges inherent in such surveys are not well recognized” (p. 515). One of the most common problems when collecting survey data on giving and volunteering is the issue of recall versus recognition bias (Hall, 2001). Most people find it hard to accurately recall past behaviors, including how much, and to which causes, they have actually donated money or provided volunteer support. Wilhelm (2007) suggested that household surveys frequently underestimate giving because of this recall-bias, making the collection of accurate and reliable giving and volunteering data very difficult.

Wilhelm (2007) further suggested that the recent availability of so many data sets is a welcome change, but that researchers planning to conduct research on charitable giving must
now carefully choose which data set to use for their projects to ensure the accuracy of their results. He believed that the choice would not matter if each data set produced similar giving statistics, but his preliminary indications suggest that they do not. He investigated the quality and comparability of giving data from six major giving surveys and attempted to trace differences among them to underlying differences in survey methodology. Wilhelm’s (2007) conclusion was that much of the data difference he observed could be traced to the fact that none of the previous researchers had considered the degree to which missing data were accounted for or whether the frequent oversampling of high-income respondents produces different empirical distributions of giving.

Hall (2001) also notes, “a key decision point in the design of measures of giving and volunteering is the choice of the survey method (e.g., telephone, mail, or personal interview)” (p. 516). Hall (2001) explained that ensuring a representative sample is crucial when sampling for surveys of giving and volunteering. The inclusion of very low-income and very high-income people is often a challenge, as is the ability to interview members of some racial and ethnic minority groups.

Summary

The literature includes many attempts to identify specific factors that contribute to the charitable giving behavior of individuals, develop comprehensive lists of factors that might influence charitable giving behavior, and measure the ways that individual factors (unique cultural traits) influence charitable giving behavior in higher education. With the exception of the CASE survey of chief development officers (Smits, 2012; Smits and Paradise, 2013), no evidence was found of any previous attempts to measure how a comprehensive set of factors (in the CASE example, a list of 28 cultural traits) are ranked by stakeholders as being important to
the development of philanthropic profile and the ability to fundraise at institutions of higher education. While unique in its approach to the measurement of the importance of cultural traits to charitable giving behavior, the CASE study provided data only from the perspective of internal stakeholders.

Chapter III details the proposed research design structure, target and sample populations, sampling strategy, survey participate recruitment plans, and strategies for data collection, data storage, and data analysis. Plans to ensure the validity, reliability, and generalizability of the data collected are discussed. Institutionally required procedures to ensure the protection of human rights (IRB) are reviewed, as well as the researcher’s positionality relative to the proposed research. A copy of the proposed survey instrument is attached in Appendix D.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Chapter III details the research questions, proposed research design, sample design, instrumentation, data collection and data analysis procedures, and trustworthiness factors associated with this research. Institutionally required procedures to ensure the protection of human subjects (IRB) and the researcher’s positionality related to the study will also be reviewed.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

This research examined the relationship between philanthropic profile and alumni charitable giving at institutions of higher education in the United States. The researcher posits that opinions regarding specific philanthropic profile elements are measurable and different between donor and non-donor survey respondents within the sample population, and that those differences may be predictive of increased charitable giving behaviors. Accordingly, the following research questions were tested to examine the relationship between these two primary constructs.

Research question: To what extent does an institution’s philanthropic profile influence charitable giving behaviors of college alumni?

Three sub-research questions are associated with this research:

Sub-question #1: What factors are the most predictive of donor vs. non-donor status at institutions of higher education?

Sub-question #2: Are there specific factors associated with philanthropic profile that are predictive of higher donation frequency at institutions of higher education.
Sub-question #3: Are there specific factors associated with philanthropic profile that are predictive of higher donation amounts at institutions of higher education?

Corresponding hypotheses were proposed for these sub-questions, along with their associated null hypotheses:

H1: There are philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of donor vs. non-donor status at institutions of higher education.

H10: There are not philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of donor vs. non-donor status at institutions of higher education.

H2: There are specific philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of higher donation frequency at institutions of higher education.

H20: There are not specific philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of higher donation frequency at institutions of higher education.

H3: There are specific philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of higher donation amount at institutions of higher education.

H30: There are not specific philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of higher donation amount at institutions of higher education.

Research Design

This non-experimental quantitative correlation study was administered to a convenience sample of 1,992 alumni associated with 32 higher education institutions in the United States. The research attempted to address a gap in our knowledge of how alumni interpret the importance of 23 elements associated with an organization’s philanthropic profile and to resolve
any correlation(s) between those interpretations and the associated charitable giving behaviors directed toward those same higher education institutions.

To address the research question and sub-questions, the researcher analyzed both descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics are useful when researchers are looking to understand overall trends in the data collected (mean, mode, median), to measure the spread of scores (variance, standard deviation, and range), or to understand how one score relates to all other scores (z score, percentile ranking) (Creswell, 2012). Inferential statistics, on the other hand, allow researchers to make informed inferences about a population based on data collected from a small sample within that larger population (Fraenkel et al., 2012).

The 41-question quantitative survey instrument included 23 questions from Smits’ (2012) philanthropic culture tool, plus 8 personal demographic and 4 institutional specific questions. A 5-point Likert scale was used for this survey. The survey also included two open-ended questions that asked respondents whether there is anything specific that their institution may have done to warrant a recent donation or to impact a recent decision not to make a donation.

The research was ultimately looking to identify any points of correlation between donor status and composite scores on philanthropy profile elements. An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to determine whether the core essence of those philanthropic profile variables could be described by a smaller number of factors. Three separate logistic regression analysis were then calculated to determine whether there were any differences in the responses to the philanthropic profile scale questions between (1) donors and non-donors, between (2) frequent and less frequent donors, and (3) high-end and low-end donors in the data set.
Sample Design

According to Fraenkel et al. (2012), “the target population is the total population for which a researcher would like to generalize the results of a particular research study” (p. 92). The target population for this study included all the alumni associated with institutions of higher education in the United States. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) at the U.S. Department of Education estimates that over 51,778,506 individuals have earned at least a bachelor’s degree since 1950 (NCES, 2013). For this research, these alumni were also categorized as either donors or non-donors to their respective educational institution; 27,604,753 (53%) of the individuals are female and 24,173,753 (46%) are male (NCES, 2013).

Sampling Strategy. Rather than attempting to survey the entire target population of 51,778,506 alumni associated with all the colleges and universities in the United States, the researcher surveyed an accessible population that included alumni associated with 32 colleges and universities that are members of CASE. These institutions represented a broad cross section of geographically distributed, private and public, and small and large colleges and universities. The selection of a subset of higher education institutions that are also members of CASE was both accessible and convenient.

The researcher had the advantage of an existing relationship with the members of the CASE Council on Philanthropy that was developed because of his participation in the previously referenced study (Smits, 2012; Smits and Paradise, 2013), which polled 246 higher education chief development officers regarding the cultural elements that positively contributed to the development of a culture of philanthropy at their institutions. CASE offered to assist with the recruitment of alumni from its member institutions as participants for this research because they saw the value of building on the knowledge that was obtained during the Smits (2012) study.
Chief development officers at 32 CASE member institutions were asked to email a link to the online survey instrument to 1,000 alumni (both donors and non-donors) associated with their institutions. It was expected that only 100-200 individuals from each institution would agree to participate, which would result in a potential sample population of 3,200 to 6,400 responses.

**Desired Sample Size Calculation.** A desired sample size calculation, conducted using the RaoSoft sample size calculator, suggests that a total sample of only 384 people is required, based on an accessible population of 750,000 individuals, to detect effects with a margin of error of 5%, a confidence level of 95%, and a potential response distribution of 50%. Ultimately 1,992 people participated in the study, resulting in survey results that are both valid and reflective of the accessible population at large.

**Instrumentation**

This online survey used a 5-point Likert scale consisting of 23 questions from Smits’ (2012) philanthropic culture tool, plus 8 personal demographic and 4 institutional specific questions. Two open-ended questions asked respondents whether there was anything specific that their institution may have done to warrant a recent donation or impact a recent decision not to make a donation.

**Philanthropic Profile.** In 2012, CASE developed a list of 28 distinct characteristics thought to influence an institution’s culture of philanthropy (philanthropic profile). Characteristics ranged from the quality and reputation of the faculty to fundraising goals that align with the institutional mission. CASE tested these characteristics when it surveyed 246 chief development officers associated with its member institutions (Smits, 2012). The characteristics assembled in the Smits (2012) survey instrument represent the most recent and
complete collection of factors known to influence philanthropic profile within higher education and are therefore well suited to also serve as predictors of alumni perceptions of an institution’s philanthropic profile. Twenty-three of the relevant factors originally included in the Smits (2012) were included in the survey instrument for this study.

**Demographics.** Demographic information that might influence individual responses regarding philanthropic profile was also collected during this research. The researcher collected demographic characteristics associated with the individual survey participants and their associated institutions of higher education. The survey collected the following basic demographics: sex, age, race and ethnicity, household income, highest level of academic degree awarded, years since graduation, frequency of donation to the institution, and amount of most recent donation to the institution. The following data on the survey participant’s institutions of higher education were also collected: region of the country, classification of institution (level of degrees offered), public or private institution, and enrollment size. While the research does not intent to use this information as part of this research, it does help validate the broad spectrum of alumni and institutions that are represented in the study. The availability of this demographic and institutional information should also allow future researchers to resolve for specific differences in the responses to the survey questions based on responses to these demographic and institutional factors.

**Data Collection**

Data were collected electronically using a Survey Monkey online survey instrument. A copy of the survey instrument is given in Appendix D. Table 1 illustrates all of the steps in the entire data collection and analysis process used for this study. Specific details associated with
each step in the data collection and data analysis processes are described in the following sections

Table 1: Data Collection and Data Analysis Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Pilot Testing</td>
<td>Online survey instrument was <strong>pilot tested</strong> on 25 Individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Instrument Revision</td>
<td>The <strong>survey instrument was revised</strong> based on input and feedback from pilot testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td><strong>Support from 32 CASE member institutions was enlisted.</strong> Institutions were asked to recruit at least 1,000 Alumni as survey participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Individual <strong>respondents completed the 41-question online survey</strong> instrument. The survey remained open for 30 days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Data Storage</td>
<td>Raw data files will be securely maintained within Survey Monkey’s corporate data center throughout the data collection period. Once the data collection phase of this study was closed; data files were downloaded from Survey Monkey to a password-protected Dropbox location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Data Preparation</td>
<td>The <strong>data set was inspected and cleansed</strong> of any Incomplete responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td><strong>Descriptive statistical data were prepared</strong> (mean and Standard deviation) using MPlus for all survey items (demographics, institutional, and philanthropic profile elements). <strong>Factor analysis</strong> was conducted to using MPlus determine if the 23 philanthropic scale elements could be represented was a smaller set of factors. It was determined that the philanthropic scale elements could be reduced three factors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (Cont.): Data Collection and Data Analysis Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Three separate Logistic Regressions</strong>, using the factors developed during Factor Analysis, were conducted to determine if there were (1) differences between donors and non-donors, (2) differences between annual donors and less frequent donors, and (3) differences between high-end and low-end donors in the data set of 1,709 complete responses.</td>
<td><strong>Qualitative Analysis</strong> Responses to the two open-ended questions were reviewed and coded to determine if there was any common themes within the data. Responses were then grouped into five common coding categories and then analyzed to identify (1) differences between donors and non-donors, and then within the donor respondents for (2) differences based on frequent of donation and (3) differences based on the amount of most recent donation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pilot Testing Procedures.** The online survey instrument was tested on a pilot group of 25 individuals. Pilot group participants were purposefully recruited from the researcher’s known colleagues, friends, and associates to quickly test the online survey technology, as well as to verify the amount of time required to complete the survey and to easily gather constructive feedback about all aspects of the survey instrument and the survey completion process. The pilot survey remained open for 10 days. A follow-up email was sent to all 25 pilot study participants reminding them to complete the survey after 7 days. Minor adjustments were made to the survey instrument’s personal demographics questions based on pilot test feedback. Pilot test data was not included in the final data set for analysis.
Recruitment of Institutions. The researcher emailed development leaders at approximately 60 CASE member institutions requesting their assistance with recruiting alumni from their institutions as participants in this survey. A sample of the institutional recruitment email is attached as appendix A. This process took approximately two weeks, with several follow-up emails needing to be sent to those institutions that had not responded to the initial request. Ultimately, 32 institutions responded positively to this request.

Recruitment of Alumni Participants. Here, the researcher received invaluable assistance from the chief development officers at these 32 CASE member institutions with the distribution of recruitment emails to individual alumni asking them to participate in the online survey. Institutions were asked to invite at least 1,000 alumni from their institutions to participate in the study. A sample of the alumni recruitment email that was provided to the institutions is attached as appendix B.

Date Collection Procedures. The online survey instrument (using Survey Monkey) remained open for a 30-day period from May 1st, 2014 through May 30th, 2014. At the midway point (May 15, 2014), a follow-up email was sent of all 32 participating institutions reminding them of their commitment to recruit alumni from their institutions as participants in the study. This email needed to be sent of all 32 institutions since the individual names and institutions of the survey respondents remained completely autonomous throughout the study, meaning that the researcher had no information regarding which institutions had successfully recruited alumni who had subsequently completed the survey. Ultimately, 1,992 individuals participated in the survey with 1,709 providing complete responses to all 23 philanthropic profile questions.

Data Storage. Participation in this study was completely anonymous. Any reports or publications based on this research will use only group data and will not associate any specific
individuals or specific educational institutions as being affiliated with this project. Raw data files were securely maintained within Survey Monkey’s corporate data center throughout the data collection period. Once the data collection phase of the study was closed, data files were downloaded from Survey Monkey to a password-protected Dropbox location. Only the researcher and his associates have had access to the data files located in this Dropbox location. All documents, drawings, and tables created as part of this dissertation study are also stored in this password-protected Dropbox location. The researcher does intend to retain access to these data files after completion of this study because their availability may be useful for future research.

Data Analysis

The survey data was retrieved in an electronic file format from Survey Monkey and loaded into the MPlus software for review, preparation, and data analysis. The following sections detail the specific steps taken during data analysis.

Preliminary Data Handling. Before data analysis, standard research protocol calls for the data set to be cleaned and checked for errors and missing data were employed (Creswell, 2012). Data cleaning was not a major concern for this study because major data errors were not encountered. Survey respondents were offered only one choice for each survey question, and Survey Monkey did not allow survey respondents to make more than one response per question.

For this research, any missing data were handled using maximum likelihood (Muthen & Muthen, 1998-2011). All of the available demographic and institutionally related data is presented in Chapter IV included details of those survey respondents for which data is missing for particular questions. A total of 283 survey respondents (14%) did not provide complete
responses to all 23 philanthropic profile scale questions. All of these respondents were eliminated, leaving a data set of 1,709 complete responses (n=1,709) for further data analysis.

**Data Analysis Procedures.** Both descriptive and inferential data analysis were conducted to address the research questions associated with this study. Descriptive statistical data were first prepared (mean and standard deviation) using MPlus software for all survey items including all demographics, institutional factors, and philanthropic profile factors. Tables are included in Chapters IV and V that summarize and further discuss the descriptive data.

**Factor Analysis.** Using the descriptive data collected previously, inferential data analysis began with an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) of the philanthropic profile responses. According to Muijs (2011), “Factor analysis reduces a set of variables to a smaller number of underlying factors and identifies the structure in the relationships between variables” (p. 199). EFA was conducted to determine how many factors best represented the core of the 23 philanthropic scale elements. Ultimately it was determined that a three-factor solution best fit this data set. Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was then conducted, allowing the researcher to identify the three specific factors, subsets of the philanthropic profile variables, that best represent the core of the responses to the philanthropic profile variables. The results of both the EFA and CFA are included in Chapter IV.

**Logistic Regression.** Logistic regression analysis allows researchers to look at the relationship between one ‘effect’ variable, called the *dependent* or *outcome* variable, and one or more *predictors*, also called *independent* variables (Muijs, 2011, p. 157). Three separate logistic regression analysis were conducted to determine whether there were any differences in the responses to the philanthropic profile scale questions between (1) donors and non_donors, (2) annual donors and less frequent donors, and (3) high-end and low-end donors in the data set.
Instead of testing the entire list of 23 philanthropic profile variables, these logistic regressions were conducting using the three factors solutions produced during CFA. The results of these three logistic regressions and their connection to the study’s research questions are included in Chapter IV.

**Trustworthiness**

The target population for this study includes all alumni associated with all institutions of higher education in United States. Clearly, it is not feasible to survey this entire target population. Instead, data were collected from a smaller group of the alumni associated with 32 higher education institutions in the United States. Ultimately, 1,992 alumni associated with these 32 higher education institutions participated in the study. Data from this sample group was analyzed to determine a level of confidence that the study’s results are valid, reliable, and generalizable to the target population of all alumni associated with institutions of higher education in United States. The results of this analysis are included in Chapter IV.

**Validity.** According to Fraenkel et al. (2012), validity can be defined as the “appropriateness, correctness, meaningfulness, and usefulness of the specific inferences researchers make based on the data they collect” (p. 148). The three important types of validity researchers must be concerned with are content validity, criterion validity, and construct validity (Fraenkel et al., 2012; Muijs, 2011). For this research, validity concerns were addressed by the use of an existing survey instrument, the CASE (Smits, 2012) philanthropic profile instrument, and be collecting data for a diverse sample population of alumni from a broad spectrum of 32 American college and universities.
Reliability. Several factors threaten the reliability of any research study. The two most common threats to reliability are (1) choice of survey design and (2) volunteerism and non-response. Any threats associated with the choice of survey design were minimized by using proven and tested survey instrument, in this case, the existing Smits (2012) instrument. Threats associated with volunteerism and non-response factors will be minimized by assembling a large and diverse sample population that allows the researcher enough data to properly react to any non-response-related issues in the data set that are generalizable to the target population. Also the survey instrument was first pilot tested before it was distributed to the sample population, which further reduced any threat to the reliability of the instrument.

Generalizability. Generalizability refers to how well the results of the survey apply to a larger group (Fraenkel et al., 2012). According to Fraenkel et al. (2011), the target population is the total population to which a researcher would like to generalize the results of a particular research study. A desired sample size calculation conducted using the RaoSoft sample size calculator suggests that a total sample of only 384 people is required to detect effects with a margin of error of 5%, a confidence level of 95%, and a potential response distribution of 50%. Ultimately, 1,992 people completed the survey, resulting is a sample size that was large enough to be generalizable to the target population of all alumni associated with the 32 higher education institutions that elected to participate in the study.

Positionality Statement

The researcher is currently the Chief Development Officer for Special Olympics Northern California & Nevada. Prior to this position, the senior development positions at three different institutions of higher education. These positions provided the researcher with direct access to key decision-makers at other higher education institutions and access to the leadership of the
Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) that proved important to the success of the recruitment and data collection phases of this research.

**Protection of Human Subjects**

Title 45 Code of the Federal Regulations Part 46 requires all research that receives federal support to undergo Institutional Review Board (IRB) review to ensure the protection of human subjects for harm and abuse. This requirement is the direct result of abuses by Nazi physicians during World War II and more recently the Tuskegee syphilis studies conducted on African-American solders between 1932 and 1972. Northeastern University extends the IRB requirement to all research that is conducted on human subjects (Northeastern University, 2014). This study complied with all of the university’s IRB requirements and all required documents were properly submitted to the university’s IRB review committee for their review and approval prior to receiving permission to collect any data from human subjects.

It was also vital to ensure that all respondents to this research fully understood and appreciated that they had certain rights to privacy and anonymity, and those rights would be protected throughout the entire research process. The use of an online survey instrument helped to ensure the privacy and protection of any personal information provided by survey respondents. A formal consent agreement and acknowledgment was also provided on the introductory page of the online survey instrument. This page explained the purpose of the proposed study, reviewed the rights to privacy of each survey respondent, and provided contact information for any individuals who required additional information before agreeing to participate in the survey.
Summary

To determine the relationship between philanthropic profile (Smits, 2012) and alumni charitable giving, a survey was administered to a census sample of 1,992 alumni from 32 higher education institutions. The survey used a 5-point Likert scale consisting of 23 questions from Smits’ (2012) gift-giving tool, plus 8 personal demographic and 4 institutional specific questions. Two open-ended questions asked respondents whether there was anything specific that their institution may have done to warrant a recent donation or impact a recent decision not to make a donation. Data analysis included descriptive analysis of each philanthropic profile question. Factor analysis was conducted to determine of the core essence of philanthropic profile variables tested could be represented by a subset of the 23 items tested. Logistic regression analysis was also conducted to determine the instrument’s ability to predict donor status and associated charitable giving behaviors. All necessary procedures were followed to protect human subjects from harm and abuse.
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

Introduction

Chapter IV presents an analysis of the data collected from the 1,992 alumni who participated in the study. Descriptive results are provided detailing the personal demographics, institutional characteristics, and philanthropic profile responses reported by the respondents. Inferential data analysis is provided to summarize the results and findings associated with the acceptance or rejection of the study’s hypothesis. A summary analysis of the responses to the two open-ended questions is also included.

Participant Demographics

A total of 1,992 individual respondents (n=1,992) participated in the study. A summary of individual respondent demographics is provided in Table 2.

Table 2: Individual Respondent Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,089</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>60+</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≤ 29</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 2 (Cont.): Individual Respondent Demographics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity (n=1,992)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Native American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>1,564</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Since Graduation of highest degree? (N=1,992)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-9 Years</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 Years</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 Years</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 Years</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40+ Years</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest degree completed (n= 1,992)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Degree</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Household Income (n=1,992)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under $49,999</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $99,000</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 - $199,999</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000+</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Characteristics

Data were collected from each respondent regarding specific characteristics of their college or university to ensure the data set represented alumni from a broad spectrum of institutions. A summary of institutional characteristics is provided in Table 3.

Table 3: Institutional Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type (n=1,992)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td></td>
<td>475</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Full-Time Student Enrollment (n=1,992) |          |    |    |
| < 1,000                               |          | 136 | 6.3 |
| 1,000 – 2,499                         |          | 224 | 11.2 |
| 2,500 – 4,999                         |          | 263 | 13.2 |
| 5,000 – 9,999                         |          | 271 | 13.6 |
| 10,000 +                              |          | 849 | 42.6 |
| Missing                               |          | 259 | 13.0 |

| Region of the Country (n=1,992)       |          |    |    |
| Northeast                             |          | 348 | 17.5 |
| Southeast                             |          | 178 | 8.9 |
| Midwest                               |          | 301 | 15.1 |
| Southwest                             |          | 185 | 9.3 |
| West                                  |          | 619 | 31.1 |
| Northwest                             |          | 92  | 4.6 |
| South                                 |          | 69  | 3.5 |
| Missing                               |          | 200 | 10.0 |

| Academic Classification (n=1,992)     |          |    |    |
| Community College                    |          | 172 | 8.6 |
| Undergraduate                         |          | 254 | 12.8 |
| Professional                          |          | 70  | 3.5 |
| Master’s                              |          | 343 | 17.2 |
| Doctoral                              |          | 948 | 47.6 |
| Missing                               |          | 205 | 10.3 |
Charitable Giving Behaviors

Data were also collected from each respondent regarding their charitable giving behaviors, both to their college or university and to other organizations and/or charitable causes. A summary of responses regarding charitable giving behaviors is provided in Table 4.

Table 4: Charitable Giving Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor vs. Non-donor (n=1,992)</td>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-donor</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Donation (n=1,992)</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only When Asked</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whenever I Visit Campus</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Recent Donation (n=1,992)</td>
<td>&lt; $100</td>
<td>1,117</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$100 - $999</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000 - $4,999</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000 - $9,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000 +</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donated to Other Organization or Charitable Cause (n=1,992)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (Cont.): Charitable Giving Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Donation to Other Organization or Charitable Cause (n=1,992)</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only When Asked</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whenever I Visit Them</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Recent Donation to Other Organization or Charitable Cause (n=1,992)</td>
<td>&lt; $100</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$100 - $999</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000 - $4,999</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000 - $9,999</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000 +</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Philanthropic Profile Elements

The survey instrument included 23 questions from Smits’ (2012) philanthropic culture tool. Respondents were asked to rank the importance of each of these 23 cultural elements using a 5-point Likert scale based on their own personal experiences and/or thoughts regarding the state of these elements at their college or university. Table 5 provides a summary of the mean scores, standard deviations, and number of valid responses (n) for each of the 23 philanthropic profile scale elements tested. Even though it did not specifically address the research questions associated with this study, the significance of the rankings of these elements and their relationship to the rankings previously produced by chief development officers during the Smits (2012) study are discussed in detail in Chapter V.
**Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for Philanthropic Scale Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The public reputation of the institution is ...</td>
<td>4.080</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>1,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leadership of the organization is ...</td>
<td>4.166</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>1,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clear and concise mission and vision statements are ...</td>
<td>3.874</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>1,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fundraising goals clearly aligned with the mission are ...</td>
<td>3.782</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>1,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Demonstrated need for philanthropic support is ...</td>
<td>3.747</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>1,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Personal interest in the specific program or project for Which I am being asked to donate is ...</td>
<td>4.151</td>
<td>0.881</td>
<td>1,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My satisfaction with my college experience is ...</td>
<td>4.097</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>1,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The opportunity to engage as a volunteer is ...</td>
<td>3.216</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>1,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Institution’s stewardship of my previous donations is ...</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>1,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Success of the school’s athlete programs is ...</td>
<td>2.608</td>
<td>1.223</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Membership is a particular athlete conference is ...</td>
<td>2.488</td>
<td>1.151</td>
<td>1,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The school’s ranking in national polls is ...</td>
<td>3.462</td>
<td>1.012</td>
<td>1,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The quality and reputation of the faculty is ...</td>
<td>4.221</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>1,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The school’s recent honors and accolades are ...</td>
<td>3.799</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>1,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The school’s recent scandals and/or negative press is ...</td>
<td>3.731</td>
<td>0.904</td>
<td>1,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Career or professional success of other graduates is ...</td>
<td>3.884</td>
<td>0.879</td>
<td>1,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>My relationships with other alumni is ...</td>
<td>2.991</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>1,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>My relationships with faculty/staff is ...</td>
<td>3.219</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>1,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>My alumni class leadership and unity is ...</td>
<td>2.729</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>1,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The school’s impact on my career was ...</td>
<td>3.759</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>1,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The school’s faculty/student ratio is ...</td>
<td>3.790</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>1,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Quality of the school’s academic/research programs is ...</td>
<td>4.417</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>1,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>My school’s demonstrated tradition of philanthropy is ...</td>
<td>3.547</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>1,677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inferential Statistics**

The 23 philanthropic profile scale elements shown in Table 5 were analyzed using both factor analysis and logistic regression using MPlus statistical analysis software. Missing data were handled using maximum likelihood (Muthen & Muthen, 1998-2011). A total of 283 survey respondents (14%) did not provide responses to all 23 philanthropic scale questions. These respondents were eliminated, leaving a data set of 1,709 complete responses (n=1,709) for factor
analysis and logistic regression. Figure 4 shows a scree plot of eigenvalues for those variables identified as having a correlation coefficient greater than 0.500.

![Figure 4. Scree Plot of Eigenvalues](image)

After reviewing this scree plot and the associated eigenvalues, it was determined that a three-factor exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was most appropriate for this data set. A three factor EFA provided a chi-square value of 74.386 (significant fit), a root-mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) value of 0.055 (fair fit), a comparative fit index/Tucker-Lewis index (CFI/TLI) value of 0.989 (good fit), and a standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) value of 0.014 (good fit).

Correlation coefficient values for the philanthropic scale items (see Table 6) ranged from -0.130 to +0.961. Those items that are present in this data set with correlation coefficients above 0.500 are shown in **bold** in Table 6. These are the variables that were subjected to EFA, as they represent the variables with the strongest factor loadings.
Table 6: Correlations Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.334</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>0.638</strong></td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>0.855</strong></td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>0.730</strong></td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>-0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td><strong>0.825</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td><strong>0.961</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td><strong>0.543</strong></td>
<td>0.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td><strong>0.822</strong></td>
<td>-0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td><strong>0.716</strong></td>
<td>0.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td><strong>0.630</strong></td>
<td>-0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exploratory factor analysis. After reviewing the correlation coefficients shown in Table 6, it was determined that a three-factor solution best fit the data. Nine of the original 23 philanthropic profile elements can be attributed to these three factors, and all have correlation coefficients between 0.543 and 0.961, indicating significant factor loading for these variables.

Factor #1, labeled Alignment of Mission & Fundraising, included having clear and concise mission and vision statements, fundraising goals clearly aligned with mission, and demonstrated need for philanthropic support. Factor #2, labeled Quality of the Academic System, included quality and reputation of the faculty, recent honors and accolades, and quality of the academic
and research programs. Factor #3, labeled Relationships, included relationships with other alumni, relationships with faculty/staff, and alumni class leadership and unity.

Table 7 provides the obliquely rotated factor loadings for each item included in the three factor groupings. The data show that each of the three factors loaded as expected and that no significant variable loading was visible between factors.

Table 7: Obliquely Rotated Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mission &amp; Fundraising</th>
<th>Quality of the Academic System</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-0.122</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>0.552</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Factor loadings < 0.50 appear in bold.

Confirmatory factor analysis. The factor structure revealed through EFA was then tested using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), which allowed for testing of specific hypotheses or theories concerning the structure underlying a set of variables—in this case, the 23 philanthropic scale items. Table 8 shows the standardized loadings obtained using CFA for the three-factor solution tested during EFA. For CFA, goodness-of-fit indices are used to determine how closely the estimated correlations of the model were to the observed correlations. This three factor CFA provided a chi-square value of 255.786 (significant fit), a RSMSE value of 0.075 (acceptable fit), a CFI/TLI value of 0.958 (good fit), and a SRMR value of 0.038 (good fit.)
Table 8: Standardized Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mission &amp; Fundraising</th>
<th>Quality of the Academic System</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows the commonalities for each variable included in the three-factor CFA. These values indicate that a great deal of variance was accounted for by the three common factors. The model represents some of the variables better than others, however all are significant.

Table 9: Commonalities Between Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Est./S.E.</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>21.609</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>32.758</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>21.844</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>21.186</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>23.709</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>30.210</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>23.995</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>25.889</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>17.150</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both EFA and CFA showed that a three-factor solution accurately represented the core of the 23 philanthropic profile elements. Three separate logistic regression analyses were then conducted, one to address each of the three research sub-questions and their associated hypothesis and null-hypothesis statements.

**Research Sub-question #1.** Hypotheses H1 and H10 addressed the relationship between the philanthropic profile factors and donor status (donor vs. non-donor). Table 10 shows the results of a logistic regression of donor status using the three factors: Alignment of Mission & Fundraising, Quality of the Academic System, and Relationships.

*Table 10: Logistic Regression Analysis of Profile Factors Predicting Donor Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>Est./S.E.</th>
<th>p-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission &amp; Fundraising</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>6.597</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Academic System</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>2.488</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>0.550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* 0 = Non-donor and 1 = Donor.

This analysis shows that both Alignment of Mission & Fundraising (B= 0.51) and Quality of the Academic Systems (B= 0.23) had a statistically significant influence on the dependent variable (donor status). That is, for each one-unit increase in the mean score for Mission & Fundraising, the odds of being a donor (versus not being a donor) increased by a factor of 1.67. For each one-unit increase in the mean score for Quality of the Academic Systems, the odds of being a donor (versus not being a donor) increase by a factor of 1.261. Relationships (B = 0.038),
however, did not have any statistically significant influence on donor status. These results suggest that the null hypothesis ($H_{10}$) should be rejected for Sub-question #1, because both Mission & Fundraising and Quality of the Academic System appear to have a significant influence on donor vs. non-donor status, suggesting that there are philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of donor vs. non-donor status at institutions of higher education.

**Research Sub-question #2.** Hypotheses $H_2$ and $H_{20}$ addressed the relationship between the philanthropic profile factors and donation frequency. Table 11 shows the results of a logistic regression of donor frequency using the three factors: Mission & Request, Quality of the Academic System, and Relationships as predictors.

*Table 11: Logistic Regression Analysis of Philanthropic Profile (factors) Predicting Donation Frequency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>Est./S.E.</th>
<th>$p$-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission &amp; Fundraising</td>
<td>-0.156</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>-0.854</td>
<td>0.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Academic System</td>
<td>-0.195</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>-0.798</td>
<td>0.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The dependent variable in this analysis is donor frequency coded so that 0 = annually and 1 = less frequent.

This analysis shows that none of the three factors (Mission & Fundraising ($B= -0.156$), Quality of the Academic Systems ($B= -0.195$), and Relationships ($B= 0.110$) had any statistically significant influence on the dependent variable (donation frequency). These results suggest that
hypothesis H2 should be rejected and indicate there are not philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of increased donation frequency at institutions of higher education.

**Research Sub-question #3.** Hypotheses H3 and H3₀ addressed the relationship between the philanthropic profile factors and the amount of recent donations (high-end vs. low-end). Table 12 shows the results of a logistic regression of donation amount using the three factors (Mission & Fundraising, Quality of the Academic System, and Relationships) that were previously developed during factor analysis.

**Table 12: Logistic Regression Analysis of Philanthropic Profile (factors) Predicting Donation Amount**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>Est./S.E.</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission &amp; Fundraising</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>1.758</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the Academic System</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>-0.364</td>
<td>0.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>1.577</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The dependent variable in this analysis is donor frequency coded so that 0 = high-end and 1 = low-end.

This analysis shows that none of the three factors (Mission & Fundraising ($B = 0.461$), Quality of the Academic Systems ($B = -0.114$), and Relationships ($B = 0.217$) had any statistically significant influence on the dependent variable (donation frequency). These results suggest that the hypothesis H3 should be rejected, suggesting there are not philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of increased donation amount at institutions of higher education.
Open-Ended Responses

To gain additional insight into the perspectives of the individual respondents, two open-ended questions were asked. First, respondents were asked to “describe any factors that have influenced your decision to donate or not donate in the past.” Second, respondents were asked to “describe anything that your alma mater might do to enhance/increase the likelihood of your making a donation in the future or increasing the size of a future donation.”

1,421 (71%) of the survey respondents provided responses to each of these two questions. Each of 1,421 individual open-ended responses was initially reviewed and assigned a coding that best summarized the theme of that specific response. Once all 1,421 responses had been initially coded, the researcher reviewed the list of code categories and grouped them into five common coding categories. Those five coding categories include: nature of the request/intended use of funds, personal financial ability, institutional factors/relationships, personal/religious beliefs about giving, and other/none. Responses to both open-ended questions were then grouped into these five common coding categories and then analyzed to identify differences between donors and non-donors, and then within the donor respondents for differences based on frequent of donation and amount of most recent donation.

Tables 13 and 14 provide summaries of donor vs. non-donor responses to the two open-ended questions. For both questions, the responses provided by donors and non-donors appear relatively uniformly distributed with the majority (91.99%) of the responses grouped into the first three categories, nature of the request/intended use of funds, personal financial ability, and institutional factors/relationships. Question 17 did show a slightly higher other/none coding for non-donors. For Question 18, non-donors also showed a higher response rate for both personal
religious beliefs about giving and other/none coding categories. Figures 4 and 5 present this same data graphically.

Table 13: Summary of Responses to Open-ended Question, “Please describe any factors that have influenced your decision to donate or not donate in the past.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Category</th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Non-Donors</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of request/intended use of funds (n=708)</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>50.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal financial ability (n=396)</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>26.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional factors/relationships (n=198)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>13.59</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>14.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/religious beliefs about giving (n=39)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/None (n=58)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Summary of Responses to Open-ended Question, “Please describe anything that your alma mater might do to enhance/increase the likelihood of your making a donation in the future or increasing the size of a future donation.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Category</th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Non-Donors</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of request/intended use of funds (n=393)</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal financial ability (n=108)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional factors/relationships (n=331)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/religious beliefs about giving (n=57)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/None (n=288)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4. Summary of Donor vs. Non-donor Responses to Open-ended Question, “Please describe any factors that have influenced your decision to donate or not donate in the past.”

Figure 5. Summary of Donor vs. Non-donor Responses to Open-ended Question, “Please describe anything that your alma mater might do to enhance/increase the likelihood of your making a donation in the future or increasing the size of a future donation.”
Tables 15 and 16 provide summaries of annual donor vs. less frequent donor responses to the two open-ended questions. For both questions, the responses provided appear relatively uniformly distributed, with the majority (>90%) of the responses grouped into the first three categories: Nature of the Request/Intended Use of Funds, Personal Financial Ability, and Institutional Factors/Relationships. Question 17 did show a significantly higher response rate for Nature of Request and Personal Finances, especially for the less frequent donors. Question 18 also showed a higher response rate for Other/None, especially for the less frequent donors.

Figures 6 and 7 present these same data graphically.

**Table 15: Summary of Annual Donor vs. Less Frequent Donor Responses to Open-ended Question, “Please describe any factors that have influenced your decision to donate or not donate in the past.”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Category</th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Non-Donors</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of request/intended use of funds (n=346)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal financial ability (n=201)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional factors/relationships (n=116)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/religious beliefs about giving (n=21)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/None (n=13)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 16: Summary of Annual Donor vs. Less Frequent Donor Responses to Open-ended Question, “Please describe anything that your alma mater might do to enhance/increase the likelihood of your making a donation in the future or increasing the size of a future donation.”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Category</th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Non-Donors</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of request/intended use of funds (n=393)</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal financial ability (n=108)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional factors/relationships (n=331)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/religious beliefs about giving (n=57)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/None (n=288)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6. Summary of Annual Donor vs. Less Frequent Donor Responses to Open-ended Question, “Please describe any factors that have influenced your decision to donate or not donate in the past.”

Figure 7. Summary of Annual Donor vs. Less Frequent Donor Responses to Open-ended Question, “Please describe anything that your alma mater might do to enhance/increase the likelihood of your making a donation in the future or increasing the size of a future donation.”
Tables 17 and 18 provide summaries of high-end donor vs. low-end donor responses to the two open-ended questions. For both questions, the responses provided appear relatively uniformly distributed, with the majority (>90%) of the responses grouped into the first three categories: Nature of the Request/Intended Use of Funds, Personal Financial Ability, and Institutional Factors/Relationships. Both questions did show a significantly higher response rate across all coding categories for the low-end donors. Figures 8 and 9 present these same data graphically.

*Table 17: Summary of High-end Donor vs. Low-end Donor Responses to Open-ended Question, “Please describe any factors that have influenced your decision to donate or not donate in the past.”*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Category</th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Non-Donors</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of request/intended use of funds (n=344)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal financial ability (n=202)</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional factors/relationships (n=117)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/religious beliefs about giving (n=21)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/None (n=13)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 18: Summary of High-end Donor vs. Low-end Donor Responses to Open-ended Question, “Please describe anything that your alma mater might do to enhance/increase the likelihood of your making a donation in the future or increasing the size of a future donation.”*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Category</th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Non-Donors</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of request/intended use of funds (n=238)</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal financial ability (n=65)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional factors/relationships (n=144)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/religious beliefs about giving (n=2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/None (n=99)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8. Summary of High-end Donor vs. Low-end Donor Responses to Open-ended Question, “Please describe any factors that have influenced your decision to donate or not donate in the past.”

Figure 9. Summary of High-end Donor vs. Low-end Donor Responses to Open-ended Question, “Please describe anything that your alma mater might do to enhance/increase the likelihood of your making a donation in the future or increasing the size of a future donation.”
Summary

A total of 1,992 individuals participated in the study, with 1,693 (85%) of the respondents completed the entire 41-question survey. The respondents were evenly distributed in age and gender. The majority of the respondents (1,564, 78.5%) reported their race/ethnicity as white or Caucasian, leaving the remaining 415 (20.8%) respondents distributed across all other race and ethnic groups. The majority of respondents (1,605, 80.5%) reported having earned at least a Bachelor’s degree. 1,194 (60.6%) reported an annual household income of less that $100,000.

1,345 (67.5%) attended public and 475 (23.8%) attended private institutions of all sizes with the largest representation, 849 (42.6%), having attended schools with enrollments greater that 10,000 students. Respondents attended schools in all regions of the country with the largest group, 619 (31.1%) attending schools in the West. 1,291 (64.8%) reported attending schools that offered graduate degree programs.

830 (41.7%) were donors and 994 (49.9%) non-donors. 276 (13.9%) reported themselves as annual donors, with the majority of respondents, (1,117, 56.1%) reported the amount of their most recent donation as being less than $100. 91.2% (1,595) of the respondents reporting also making donations to at least one other organization or charity cause. 692 (34.7%) reported making those donations annually. 921 (46.2%) reporting that the amount of their most recent donation was also less than $100.

A total of 283 survey respondents (14%) did not provide complete responses to all 23 philanthropic scale questions. These respondents were eliminated from the data set, leaving 1,709 complete responses (n=1,709) for further analysis.
Mean scores for the philanthropic profile items ranged from 4.417 (s.d. = 0.741) to 2.488 (s.d. = 1.151). The items receiving the highest scores included: quality of the academic/research programs, quality and reputation of the faculty, leadership of the organization, personal interest in the specific program or project, and public reputation of the institution. The items receiving the lowest scores included: membership in an particular athletic conference, success of athlete programs, alumni class leadership & unity, relationships with other alumni, and the availability of volunteer opportunities.

It was determined using exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis that a three-factor solution best fit this data. Nine of the original 23 philanthropic profile elements were attributable to these three factors, and all had correlation coefficients between 0.552 and 0.928, indicating significant factor loading for each of these nine variables using a three-factor solution. Factor #1, labeled **Alignment of Mission & Fundraising**, included clear and concise mission and vision statements, fundraising goals clearly aligned with the mission, and demonstrated need for philanthropic support. Factor #2, labeled **Quality of the Academic System**, included quality and reputation of the faculty, recent honors and accolades, and quality of the academic/research programs. Factor #3, labeled **Relationships**, included relationships with other alumni, relationships with faculty/staff, and alumni class leadership and unity.

These same three factor groupings developed using factor analysis were then used during three separate logistic regressions to test the hypotheses and null hypotheses associated with each of this study’s three sub-research questions. Hypotheses H1 and H10 addressed the relationship between the philanthropic profile factors and donor status (donor vs. non-donor). This analysis shows that factors Alignment of Mission & Fundraising ($B = 0.51$) and Quality of the Academic Systems ($B = 0.23$) had a statistically significant influence on the dependent variable (donor
status). That is, for each one-unit increase in the mean score for Fundraising & Request, the odds of being a donor (versus not being a donor) increased by a factor of 1.67. For each one-unit increase in the mean score for Quality of the Academic Systems, the odds of being a donor (versus not being a donor) increased by a factor of 1.261. Relationships ($B = 0.038$), however, did not have any statistically significant influence on donor status. These results suggest that the null hypothesis ($H_{10}$) should be rejected for Sub-question #1, because both Mission & Fundraising and Quality of the Academic System appear to have a significant influence on donor vs. non-donor status, suggesting that there are philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of donor vs. non-donor status at institutions of higher education.

Hypotheses H2 and $H_{20}$ addressed the relationship between the philanthropic profile factors and donation frequency. This analysis shows that none of the three factors (Mission & Fundraising ($B = -0.156$), Quality of the Academic Systems ($B = -0.195$), and Relationships ($B = 0.110$) had any statistically significant influence on the dependent variable (donation frequency). These results suggest that hypothesis H2 should be rejected and indicate that there are not philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of increased donation frequency at institutions of higher education.

Hypotheses H3 and $H_{30}$ addressed the relationship between the philanthropic profile factors and the amount of recent donations (high-end vs. low-end). This analysis shows that none of the three factors (Mission & Fundraising ($B = -0.156$), Quality of the Academic Systems ($B = -0.195$), or Relationships ($B = 0.110$) had any statistically significant influence on the dependent variable (donation frequency). These results suggest that hypothesis H3 should be rejected, suggesting there are not philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of increased donation amount at institutions of higher education.
Respondents were also asked two open-ended questions designed to learn if there were any factors that influenced decisions to donor or not to donate in the past or might enhance/increase the likelihood of a future donation. Each of 1,421 (71%) individual open-ended responses was initially reviewed and assigned a coding that best summarized the theme of that specific response. Once all 1,421 responses had been initially coded, the researcher reviewed the list of code categories and grouped them into five common coding categories. Those five coding categories included: (1) nature of the request/intended use of funds, (2) personal financial ability, (2) institutional factors/relationships, (2) personal/religious beliefs about giving, and (5) other/none. Responses for each of the five coding groups were equally distributed between donors and non-donors for both questions. Responses of Use of Funds and Personal Financial Ability were more heavily weighted for less frequent and low-end donors.

Chapter V further discusses this study’s findings, implications, limitations, recommendations for future research, and conclusions.
CHAPTER V: RESEARCH FINDINGS

Overview

This chapter is divided into five sections, including: discussion of the findings, possible implications for theory, limitations of the study, recommendations for future research, and finally, a summary of the key implications for practice.

The purpose of this research was to explore the connection between philanthropic profile and alumni charitable giving. More specifically, this doctoral thesis is designed to uncover any differences between alumni donor and non-donor perceptions of the philanthropic profile associated with institutions of higher education, and to determine whether those differences are predictive of increased charitable giving behaviors. Accordingly, the following research questions were tested to examine the relationship between these two primary constructs.

**Research question:** To what extent does an institution’s philanthropic profile influence charitable giving behaviors of college alumni?

Additionally, three sub-research questions were associated with this research:

**Sub-question #1:** What factors are the most predictive of donor vs. non-donor status at institutions of higher education?

**Sub-question #2:** Are there specific factors associated with philanthropic profile that are predictive of higher donation frequency at institutions of higher education?

**Sub-question #3:** Are there specific factors associated with philanthropic profile that are predictive of higher donation amounts at institutions of higher education?

Corresponding hypotheses were proposed for these sub-questions, along with their associated null hypotheses:
H1: There are philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of donor vs. non-donor status at institutions of higher education.

H10: There are not philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of donor vs. non-donor status at institutions of higher education.

H2: There are specific philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of higher donation frequency at institutions of higher education.

H20: There are not specific philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of higher donation frequency at institutions of higher education.

H3: There are specific philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of higher donation amount at institutions of higher education.

H30: There are not specific philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of higher donation amount at institutions of higher education.

**Discussion of Findings**

Discussion of findings will include analysis on how the survey respondents ranked the individual philanthropic profile items, the results of the factor analysis that determined there were three common factors that represent the core elements contained in the 23 philanthropic profile elements, the results of hypothesis testing, and finally, discussion of the findings developed from qualitative analysis of the responds to the two open-ended questions included in the survey.

**Philanthropic Profile Element Rankings**

Table 19 provides a summary of the top ten philanthropic profile items as ranked by the alumni survey respondents. The rankings developed by the 246 chief development officers
surveyed during the Smits (2012) study are provided after the item descriptions in parentheses (#). Four of these items (shown in bold) did not make the top ten when ranked by chief development officers during the Smits study. It is also interesting to note the two items that received the highest rankings from alumni (*quality of the academic system & quality and reputation of the faculty*) were only ranked 7th and 9th on the list compiled by the chief development officers. At the same time, two items (*clear and concise mission & vision statements and commitment to stewardship of my previous gifts*) were ranked 2nd and 3rd by the chief development officers moved down to 8th and 9th when ranked by alumni.

*Table 19: Top Ten Philanthropic Profile Elements.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Quality of the academic/research programs (7)</td>
<td>4.417</td>
<td>0.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quality &amp; reputation of the faculty (9)</td>
<td>4.221</td>
<td>0.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Leadership of the organization (1)</td>
<td>4.166</td>
<td>0.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Interest in the program/project (6)</td>
<td>4.151</td>
<td>0.881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Satisfaction with the college experience (14)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.097</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.841</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public reputation of the institution (12)</td>
<td>4.080</td>
<td>0.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Career success of other graduates (11)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.884</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.879</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Clear and concise mission &amp; vision statements (3)</td>
<td>3.874</td>
<td>0.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Commitment to stewardship of my previous gifts (2)</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>0.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>Recent honors &amp; accolades (20)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.799</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.816</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 provides a summary of those philanthropic profile items that received the lowest rankings from the alumni survey respondents. Those items that received the lowest rankings from the 246 chief development officers surveyed during the Smits (2012) study are provided after the item descriptions in parentheses (#). It is interesting to note that three of these low ranking items, *fundraising goals clearly aligned with the mission, demonstrated need for support*
and opportunities to engage as a volunteer (shown in bold), made the top ten rankings developed by the chief development officers during the Smits (2012) study. All three of the philanthropic profile elements related to the importance of relationships including, relationships with faculty/staff, relationships with other alumni, and alumni class leadership & unity, were all ranked near the bottom of both lists. Success of the athlete programs and membership in a particular athlete conference both ranked at the bottom of both lists. The unimportance of alumni class leadership & unity, success of the athlete programs and membership in a particular athlete conference, appear to be the only points of direct agreement between the two rankings.

**Table 20: Lowest Ranking Philanthropic Profile Elements.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The school’s faculty/student ratio (24)</td>
<td>3.790</td>
<td>0.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><strong>Fundraising goals clearly aligned with the mission (2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.782</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.938</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The school’s impact on my career (n/a)</td>
<td>3.759</td>
<td>0.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><strong>Demonstrated need for support (10)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.747</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.881</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Recent scandals and/or negative press (17)</td>
<td>3.731</td>
<td>0.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Demonstrated tradition of philanthropy (13)</td>
<td>3.547</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Rankings in national polls (26)</td>
<td>3.462</td>
<td>1.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>My relationships with faculty/staff (n/a)</td>
<td>3.219</td>
<td>1.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>Opportunities to engage as a volunteer (8)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.216</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.997</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>My relationships with other alumni (15)</td>
<td>2.991</td>
<td>1.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>My alumni class leadership &amp; unity (22)</td>
<td>2.729</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Success of the athlete programs (27)</td>
<td>2.608</td>
<td>1.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Membership in a particular athlete conference (28)</td>
<td>2.488</td>
<td>1.151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor Analysis**

Factor analysis was used to determine if the essence of the 23 philanthropic profile elements could be represented by a smaller set of factors. Both exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis were conducted with 9 of the 23 elements showing significant factor loadings.
using a 3-factor solution with no significant cross loadings observed between the factors. Factor #1, called **Alignment of Mission & Fundraising**, included: (1) having *clear and concise mission and vision statements*, (2) *fundraising goals clearly aligned with the mission*, and (3) *demonstrated need for philanthropic support*. Factor #2, called **Quality of the Academic System**, included: (1) *quality and reputation of the faculty*, (2) *the school’s recent honors and accolades*, and (3) *quality of the school’s academic and research programs*. Factor #3, called **Relationships**, included: (1) *relationships with other alumni*, (2) *relationships with faculty/staff*, and (3) *alumni class leadership and unity*. Those nine elements, grouped into these three factor sets, were then used during hypothesis testing to determine if specific philanthropic profile factors could be used as predictors of charitable giving behavior.

**Hypothesis 1**

Three separate logistic regression analyses were conducted, one to address each of the three sub-research questions and the associated hypotheses statements. Hypotheses H1 and H10 addressed the relationship between the philanthropic profile and donor status (donor vs. non-donor), stating:

H1: There are philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of donor vs. non-donor status at institutions of higher education.

H10: There are not philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of donor vs. non-donor status at institutions of higher education.

Results indicated that both Mission & Fundraising \((B=0.51)\) and Quality of the Academic Systems \((B=0.23)\) had a statistically significant influence on the dependent variable (donor status). That is, for each one-unit increase in the mean score for Mission & Fundraising, the odds of being a donor, versus not being a donor, increased by a factor of 1.67. For each one-
unit increase in the mean score for Quality of the Academic Systems, the odds of being a donor, versus not being a donor, increase by a factor of 1.261. Relationships ($B = 0.038$), however, did not have any statistically significant influence on donor status. These results suggest that the null hypothesis ($H_{10}$) should be rejected for sub-question #1, because both Mission & Request and Quality of the Academic System appear to have a significant influence on donor vs. non-donor status, suggesting there are philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of donor vs. non-donor status at institutions of higher education. In practical terms, this means, using this model, we can distinguish between donor and non-donor perceptions of what the philanthropic profile should look like institutions of higher education.

**Hypothesis 2**

Hypotheses H2 and $H_{20}$ addressed the relationship between the philanthropic profile factors and donor frequency, stating:

$H2$: There are specific philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of higher donation frequency at institutions of higher education.

$H_{20}$: There are not specific philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of higher donation frequency at institutions of higher education.

Results indicated that each of the three factors (Mission & Fundraising ($B = -0.156$), Quality of the Academic Systems ($B = -0.195$), and Relationships ($B = 0.110$)) did not have any statistically significant influence on the dependent variable (donation frequency). These results suggest that hypothesis H2 should be rejected because there are not philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of donation frequency at institutions of higher education. In practical terms, the model does not allow us to predict anything about donation frequency.
Hypothesis 3

Hypotheses H3 and H3₀ addressed the relationship between the philanthropic profile factors and donation amount, stating:

H3: There are specific philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of higher donation amount at institutions of higher education.

H3₀: There are not specific philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of higher donation amount at institutions of higher education.

Results indicate that none of the three factors (Mission and Fundraising ($B = \text{-0.156}$), Quality of the Academic Systems ($B = \text{-0.195}$), and Relationships ($B = \text{0.110}$) have a statistically significant influence on the dependent variable (donation frequency). These results suggest that hypothesis H3 should be rejected because there are not philanthropic profile factors that are predictive of increased donation amount at institutions of higher education. In practical terms, the model does not allow us to predict anything about donation amount.

Summary of Qualitative Findings

To gain additional insight into the perspectives of the alumni respondents, two open-ended questions were asked. First, respondents were asked to “describe any factors that have influenced your decision to donate or not donate in the past.” Second, respondents were asked to “describe anything that your alma mater might do to enhance/increase the likelihood of your making a donation in the future or increasing the size of a future donation.”

1,421 individual open-ended responses, representing 71% of all respondents, were initially reviewed and assigned a coding that best summarized the theme of that specific response. Five major coding categories were developed, including: (1) nature of the
request/intended use of funds, (2) personal financial ability, (3) institutional factors/relationships, (4) personal/religious beliefs about giving, and (5) other/none.

Responses to both open-ended questions were then grouped into these five common coding categories and then analyzed to identify any differences between donors and non-donors, and then within the donor respondents for differences based on frequency of donation and amount of most recent donation. Responses for each of the five coding groups appeared to be equally distributed between donors and non-donors for both questions with two of the coding categories nature of the request/intended use of funds and institutional factors/relationships aligning with two of the common factors developing during processing of the quantitative data, specifically Alignment of Mission & Fundraising, and Relationships. Coding responses of nature of the request/intended use of funds and personal financial ability tended to be more heavily weighted for less frequent and low-end donors, suggesting that these factors may limit charitable giving behaviors in same way.

Implications to Theory

This study further tested the viability of the Smits (2012) philanthropic tool, as originally derived from the works of Bekkers & Wiepking (2011) and Taylor & Martin (2005) by surveying alumni graduates associated with 32 higher education institutions and confirmed its usefulness in determining whether there are specific elements of an organization’s philanthropic profile that might be predictive of donor vs. non-donor status. In fact, the evidence supports the creation of an effective model of philanthropic profile for institutions of higher education. This study did not resolve whether the Smits (2012) instrument is useful for determining if there are specific elements of an organization’s philanthropic program that might be predictive of increased charitable giving behaviors, specifically increases in donation frequency or increases in
the amount of donations. In fact, the evidence suggests the existence of a fourth [unknown] philanthropic profile factor, one not measured by this instrument, somehow impacts donation frequency and amount. It is also possible that donation frequency and amount is not directly influenced by the philanthropic profile of the organization but rather by some other personal or environmental factors not considered or measured by this model.

**Limitations and Assumptions**

There are several limitations and assumptions of this research that are important to discuss. This study assumed that respondents would be more likely to participate in the survey if asked by an official associated with their alma mater, and that respondents would accurately describe the quality of their relationship with their alma mater institutions when participating in a voluntary self-administered online survey. The study assumed that survey respondents would accurately and truthfully respond to each of 41 questions in the survey instrument and that recall bias, related to responses regarding recent charitable giving, would not be a significant factor in those responses. Finally, this was a non-experimental survey that employed a single survey instrument, the Smits (2012) philanthropic profile tool, to examine the perspective(s) of alumni graduates associated with 32 colleges and universities in the United States which limits the study’s ability to project its results only onto the survey population of alumni graduates associated with the 32 specific institutions that are represented in the data.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Based on the results and limitations of the study, the researcher proposes seven opportunities for future research including the following:
1. Future researchers should consider conducting a longitudinal study designed to identity and resolve for changes in the responses regarding the connections between philanthropic profile and charitable giving behavior over a period of time. Perhaps a similar study could be conducted over a ten-year period with results compiled and reported annually. This longitudinal study would allow researchers to resolve for long-term trends and the impact of any economic, social, and environmental changes.

2. The race/ethnic diversity of respondents was limited for this study, with 1,594 of 1,992 (78.5%) reporting their race/ethnicity as white/Caucasian. Future researchers should consider surveying a more ethnically diverse population in hopes of discovering additional insight relevant to non-whites in the sample population. Perhaps a similar study designed to collect data from alumni associated with the 106 Historical Black Colleges in America or from other college and universities with a more ethnically diverse alumni base.

3. Only 95 (4.9%) of the survey’s 1,992 respondents reported making recent donations to their alma maters in amounts greater than $1,000. At the same time, only 207 (10.4%) of respondents reported making recent donations to other organizations or charitable causes in amounts greater than $1,000. Future researchers should consider surveying a larger sample of high-end donors in hopes of discovering additional insight regarding this very important population of donors who offer the greatest opportunity for future impact at their alma mater institutions.

4. Future researchers should consider conducting comparison studies at specific institutions. Suggestions for possible locations include a small liberal arts college, a specific community college, and at a specific engineering college within a larger university. Data
from these case studies could be compared to the data collected during this study to resolve for specific differences between the two sample populations. Knowing exactly how the alumni from a specific school compared to the larger data set would help institutional leaders determine the health of the philanthropic culture at their campuses. The availability of this site-specific data would also allow institutional leaders to more accurately measure the impact of any interventions designed to improve the health of the philanthropic culture at their campuses.

5. The findings also revealed that there are some significant differences between how alumni and chief development officers rank the importance of some philanthropic profile items; this is worthy of further research and discussion.

6. Researchers should also consider testing the model in other environmental settings, including other nonprofit categories such as healthcare, arts and culture, and sports. It would also be interesting to design and test a version of the model that would be relevant for the for-profit sector. Could a similar instrument be designed and tested that would accurately measure the ability for a company’s culture, identity, and image, its consumer profile, and be useful as a predictor of customer purchasing decision-making behavior?

7. Additional studies should also be aimed at resolving for factors that influence donation frequency and donation amount. This could include testing of additional philanthropic profile variables not included in the list of 23 elements tested during this study.

**Implications to Practice**

This study confirmed the utility of the Smits (2012) survey instrument as a useful tool for the measurement and evaluate the philanthropic profile at institutions of higher education in the
United States. The data from this study supports the original premise that there are specific elements of philanthropic profile that are predictive of donor vs. non-donor status. The data does not necessarily support the premise that there are any elements of philanthropic profile that are predictive of increased donation frequency or the amounts of those donations.

This research demonstrated the existence of an effective model of philanthropic profile that should prove useful to future institutions interested in better understanding how donors and non-donors evaluate specific organizational traits and how those evaluations might influence charitable giving behavior directed toward their institutions. The availability of this new philanthropic profile model should help institutions tailor their efforts to improve the philanthropic profile of their institutions and attract additional and more frequent donations to their causes.

This study also established that a set of three common factors might be used to represent the core essence of the 23 philanthropic profile variables tested. Those elements include the following:

1. **Alignment of Mission & Fundraising**
   a. Having clear and concise mission and vision statements;
   b. Fundraising goals clearly aligned with the mission;
   c. Demonstrated need for philanthropic support.

2. **Quality of the Academic System**
   a. Quality and reputation of the faculty;
   b. Recent honors and accolades;
c. Quality of the school’s academic and research programs.

3. **Relationships**

   a. Relationships with other alumni;

   b. Relationships with faculty/staff;

   c. Alumni class leadership and unity.

   It is clear from this study that chief development officers associated with institutions of higher education have opinions regarding the relative importance of specific philanthropic profile items that differs from the views of their key donors. While not an objective of this study, this new information allows the researcher to make the following specific recommendations to institutional leaders regarding which aspects of their organization’s philanthropic culture to focus their attention, marketing dollars, and resources if interested in appealing to donors within their alumni populations:

   1. The quality of the academic and research programs at their institutions;

   2. The quality and reputation of the faculty;

   3. The leadership of the organization;

   4. Student satisfaction with their college experience;

   5. The public reputation of the institution;

   6. Presenting a clear and concise set of mission and vision statements;

   7. The list of recent honors and accolades bestowed on the institution;

   8. Properly steward existing relationships and gifts from donors; and
9. To fully understand and respect each individual donor’s philanthropic interests and priorities when making solicitations asking for support of specific programs or projects.

The data from this study also allows the researcher to make the following specific suggestions regarding areas of their organization’s philanthropic culture where institutional leaders should NOT focus their attention and energy if interested in appealing to donors within their alumni populations:

1. Ramifications of any recent scandals and/or negative press;
2. Rankings in any national polls;
3. Providing opportunities for alumni to engage as volunteers;
4. Assisting alumni with the development of their relationships with other alumni;
5. Efforts to improve alumni class leadership and unity; and
6. Anything related to promoting the success of your institution’s athlete program success or membership in a particular athlete conference.

Having a clear and concise picture of how alumni (donors and non-donors) are evaluating the philanthropic profile of organizations when making charitable giving decisions should prove useful to leaders at institutions of higher education who are interested in attracting new donors, retaining existing donors, and increasing the frequency and amounts of donations from existing donors. Knowing exactly which cultural traits are predictive and positively associated with charitable giving behaviors will also allow institutions to make informed decisions regarding strategic marketing, donor stewardship, and future human resource allocation issues. This study only begins to expose our limited understanding of the complex nature of the connections
between philanthropic profile and alumni charitable giving behaviors. Further research on this topic is warranted and should be welcomed by the development community.
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APPENDIX A:

INSTITUTIONAL RECRUITMENT LETTER

To: Chief Development Officers CASE-member institutions

From: Kevin Reeds (reeds.k@husky.neu.edu)

Subj: Enlisting your support for my dissertation research - Philanthropic Culture Survey

Dear Development Colleagues,

You previously expressed interest in assisting with the recruitment of alumni from your institution as survey participants for my Ed.D dissertation research project. The intent of this email is to formally ask for your agreement to recruit survey participants from your institution’s alumni base.

My dissertation proposal has now completed the IRB process at Northeastern University and I have been approved to collect data in support of this dissertation research project. The formal title of my dissertation is philanthropic culture: A quantitative study exploring the connection between philanthropic profile and alumni charitable giving.

As you remember, in 2012, CASE surveyed Chief Development Officers regarding which elements contributed positively to the culture of philanthropy on their campuses. The intent of my dissertation is to extend that research by surveying higher education alumni (both donors and non-donors) in order to learn how those same elements influence alumni charitable giving behaviors at institutions of higher education.

I would like to ask you to forward a link to the 41 question online survey instrument (using Survey Monkey) to your alumni asking them to participate in this important research. Most institutions have agreed to ask at least 1,000 of their alumni to participate. A sample alumni recruitment letter is attached for your use. I am planning to officially open the survey link on May 1st. The survey link will close 30 days later on May 31st.

Here is a link to the survey instrument:

Click here for survey link

Thank you in advance for your assistance. I look forward to sharing the results of the research project with you and others from the higher education development community. Please feel free to call me directly at 650-223-9462 (reeds.k@husky.neu.edu) if I can address any other questions or concerns you might have regarding this study.

Thanks again,

Kevin Reeds, MS, CFRE
Ed.D Candidate
Northeastern University
650-223-9462
Reeds.k@husky.neu.edu
APPENDIX B:

SURVEY PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT LETTER (SAMPLE)

Dear Alumni,

I am writing today to ask you to participate in a 41 question online survey being conducted by Kevin Reeds, an Ed.D candidate at Northwestern University. This survey is being conducted to support Kevin’s dissertation entitled: Philanthropic culture: A quantitative study exploring the connection between philanthropic profile and alumni charitable giving.

In 2012, the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) surveyed Chief Development Officers from 246 colleges and universities regarding which elements contributed positively to the culture of philanthropy on their campuses. The intent of Kevin’s dissertation is to extend that research by surveying higher education alumni in order to learn how those same elements influence alumni charitable giving behaviors at institutions of higher education.

Your part in the study will be anonymous to the researcher(s). Your part in this study will be handled in a confidential manner. Any reports or publications based on this research will use only group data and will not identify you or any individual as being affiliated with this project.

This survey opens on May 1st and will close 30 days later on May 31st. Here is a link to the survey instrument: Click here for survey link.

Thanks,
APPENDIX C:
UNSIGNED CONSENT DOCUMENT

Northeastern University, Department of: Education

Name of Investigator(s): Dr. Margaret Gorman, Kevin Reeds (student researcher)

Title of Project: Philanthropic culture: A quantitative study exploring the connection between philanthropic profile and alumni charitable giving

Request to Participate in Research
I would like to invite you to participate in a web-based online survey. The survey is part of a research study whose purpose is to investigate the links between the philanthropic culture of an institution and alumni charitable giving behaviors. This 41-question survey should take about 6-8 minutes to complete.

I am asking you to participate in this study because you graduated from an institution of higher education in the United States. If you attended more than one school, please respond based on the school for which you have the highest affinity. You must be at least 18 years old to take this survey.

The decision to participate in this research project is voluntary. You do not have to participate and you can refuse to answer any question. Even if you begin the web-based online survey, you can stop at any time. There are no foreseeable risks or discomforts to you for taking part in this study and you will not be paid for your participation in this study. Your part in this study is anonymous to the researcher(s). Your part in this study will be handled in a confidential manner. Any reports or publications that are based on this research will use only group data and will not identify you or any individual as being affiliated with this project.

If you have any questions regarding electronic privacy, please feel free to contact Mark Nardone, NU’s Director of Information Security via phone at 617-373-7901, or via email at privacy@neu.edu.
If you have any questions about this study, please feel free to contact me directly at 650-223-9462 (or via email at reeds.k husky@neu.edu). You can also contact the Principal Investigator, Dr. Margaret Gorman, at m.kirchoff@neu.edu.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Nan C. Regina, Director, Human Subject Research Protection, 960 Renaissance Park, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115. Tel: 617.373.4588, Email: n.regina@neu.edu. You may call anonymously if you wish.

By clicking on the survey link below you are indicating that you consent to participate in this study. Please print out a copy of this consent form for your records.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Kevin Reeds
Ed.D Candidate
Northeastern University
6502239462
reeds.k husky@neu.edu
APPENDIX D:
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Thank you in advance for your willingness to complete this survey. The purpose of this study is to learn about relationship between philanthropic profile and alumni charitable giving associated with higher education institutions. If you have attended more than one institution, please consider the institution with which you have the highest level of affinity when answering the survey.

Please answer questions 1-18 based on your personal information and/or the specifics of your college or university...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. What is your gender?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. What is your age?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 60+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 50-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 29 or lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. How long has it been since you graduated?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ 0-9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 10-19 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 20-29 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 30-39 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ 40+ years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Would you describe yourself as:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ American Indian / Native American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Hispanic / Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ White / Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. What is your level of academic degree achievement (highest degree awarded)?
   - No degree
   - Associate’s
   - Bachelor’s
   - Master’s
   - Doctorate

6. What is your annual household income?
   - Under $49,999
   - $50,000 - $99,999
   - $100,000 - $149,999
   - $150,000 - $199,999
   - Over $200,000

7. In your institution public or private?
   - Public
   - Private

8. Please select your institution’s academic classification (level of degrees offered)
   - Community college
   - Undergraduate/Bachelor’s
   - Specialty/Professional
   - Master’s
   - Doctoral

9. What is the full-time (FTE) student enrollment at your institution?
   - Less than 1,000
   - 1,001 to 2,499
   - 2,500 to 4,999
   - 5,000 to 9,999
   - More than 10,000

10. In what region of the country is your college or university located?
    - Northeast
    - Southeast
    - Mid-West
    - Southwest
    - West
    - Northwest
    - South
11. Have you ever made a charitable donation to your college or university?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

12. How often do you make donations to your institution?
   - [ ] Annually
   - [ ] Only when asked
   - [ ] Occasionally
   - [ ] Whenever I visit campus
   - [ ] Never

13. What was the amount of your most recent donation?
   - [ ] Less than $100
   - [ ] $101 to $999
   - [ ] $1,000 to $4,999
   - [ ] $5,000 to $9,999
   - [ ] $10,000 or Greater

14. Do you make donations to any other organizations or charitable causes?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

15. How often do you make donations to that other organization or charitable cause?
   - [ ] Annually
   - [ ] Only when asked
   - [ ] Occasionally
   - [ ] Whenever I visit campus
   - [ ] Never

16. What was the amount of your most recent donation to that other organization or charitable cause?
   - [ ] Less than $100
   - [ ] $101 to $999
   - [ ] $1,000 to $4,999
   - [ ] $5,000 to $9,999
   - [ ] $10,000 or Greater

17. Please describe any factors that have influenced your decision to donate or not donate in the past.

18. Please describe anything that your alma mater might do to enhance/increase the like
likelihood of your making a donation in the future or increasing the size of a future donation.

Based on your experience at your college or university, answer the following questions by telling us how important each of the following factors are to you…

19. The public reputation of the institution is
   - [ ] Extremely Unimportant
   - [ ] Unimportant
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Important
   - [ ] Extremely Important

20. Leadership of the organization is
   - [ ] Extremely Unimportant
   - [ ] Unimportant
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Important
   - [ ] Extremely Important

21. Clear and concise mission and vision statements are
   - [ ] Extremely Unimportant
   - [ ] Unimportant
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Important
   - [ ] Extremely Important

22. Fundraising goals clearly aligned with the mission are
   - [ ] Extremely Unimportant
   - [ ] Unimportant
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Important
   - [ ] Extremely Important

23. Demonstrated need for philanthropic support is
   - [ ] Extremely Unimportant
   - [ ] Unimportant
   - [ ] Neutral
   - [ ] Important
   - [ ] Extremely Important

24. For me, a personal interest in the specific program or project for which I am being asked to donate is
25. My satisfaction with my college experience is
   - Extremely Unimportant
   - Unimportant
   - Neutral
   - Important
   - Extremely Important

26. For me, the opportunity to engage as a volunteer is
   - Extremely Unimportant
   - Unimportant
   - Neutral
   - Important
   - Extremely Important

27. For me, the institution’s stewardship of my previous donations is
   - Extremely Unimportant
   - Unimportant
   - Neutral
   - Important
   - Extremely Important

28. Success of the school’s athletic programs is
   - Extremely Unimportant
   - Unimportant
   - Neutral
   - Important
   - Extremely Important

29. The school’s membership is a particular athletic conference is
   - Extremely Unimportant
   - Unimportant
   - Neutral
   - Important
   - Extremely Important

30. The school’s ranking in national polls is
   - Extremely Unimportant
   - Unimportant
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**31. The quality and reputation of the faculty is**
- ☐ Extremely Unimportant
- ☐ Unimportant
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Important
- ☐ Extremely Important

**32. The school’s recent honors and accolades are**
- ☐ Extremely Unimportant
- ☐ Unimportant
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Important
- ☐ Extremely Important

**33. The school’s scandals and/or negative press is**
- ☐ Extremely Unimportant
- ☐ Unimportant
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Important
- ☐ Extremely Important

**34. Career or professional success of other graduates is**
- ☐ Extremely Unimportant
- ☐ Unimportant
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Important
- ☐ Extremely Important

**35. My relationships with other alumni is**
- ☐ Extremely Unimportant
- ☐ Unimportant
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Important
- ☐ Extremely Important

**36. My relationships with the faculty and/or staff is**
- ☐ Extremely Unimportant
- ☐ Unimportant
- ☐ Neutral
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 37. My alumni class leadership and unity is
- Extremely Unimportant
- Unimportant
- Neutral
- Important
- Extremely Important

### 38. The school’s impact on my career was
- Extremely Unimportant
- Unimportant
- Neutral
- Important
- Extremely Important

### 39. For me, the school’s faculty/student ratio is
- Extremely Unimportant
- Unimportant
- Neutral
- Important
- Extremely Important

### 40. For me, the quality of the school’s academic and research programs is
- Extremely Unimportant
- Unimportant
- Neutral
- Important
- Extremely Important

### 41. For me, my school’s demonstrated tradition of philanthropy is
- Extremely Unimportant
- Unimportant
- Neutral
- Important
- Extremely Important