

Collection C45 President John W. Ryan papers at the IU Archives:

Memo from D. C. Danielson to Professor Patrick M. Brantlinger, 1 May 1980, American Federation of Teachers, 1979-1980.

Resolution of the IU Northwest Faculty Organization, 8 May 1972, American Federation of Teachers Local 1955 (IUN) 1971-1972.

Memo from Professor Don Gray to Members of the Bloomington Chapter of the AAUP, and Other Members of the Bloomington Faculty and Administration, 30 March 1974, Collective Bargaining 1975-1976.

"Ballot on Collective Bargaining." Collective Bargaining 1979-1980.

"Second Guessing the Faculty's Position on Collective Bargaining," AFT-IUB Speaks Out Newsletter, November 18, 1980. Collective Bargaining 1980-1981.

Memo from D. C. Danielson to Professor Patrick Brantlinger, 1 May 1980, American Federation of Teachers, 1979-1980.

Memo from President John Ryan to The Faculty, 10 February 1981, Collective Bargaining 1980-1981.

Memo from Professor William E. Becker to Mr. Richard Stoner, 23 October 1981, Collective Bargaining, 1981-1982.

Kelly A. Kish is a doctoral candidate in Higher Education at Indiana University Bloomington. She received her B.A. in government and politics from the University of Maryland and her M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs Administration from Indiana University Bloomington. Kish has served as Chief of Staff to the Bloomington Faculty Council and currently serves as Research Specialist in the Office of the President. Correspondence regarding this article may be sent to the authors at kekish@indiana.edu.

Lauren E. Morrill-Ragusea graduated with a Master's in Higher Education and Student Affairs from Indiana University Bloomington in 2008. She received her B.A. in History from Indiana University Bloomington in 2005. While at IUB she served graduate supervisor for Residential Programs and Services in Wright Quadrangle and a practicum intern for the Bloomington Faculty Council.

Robin L. Murphey graduated from Indiana University Bloomington in 2008 with a M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs. She earned her B.S. in Computer Science and Mathematics from Georgetown College in 2000. While at IUB, Robin served as a Graduate Research Assistant for the Faculty Council Office and Graduate Leadership Development Coordinator in the Student Activities Office.

Predicting Collegiate Philanthropy: Student Engagement as a Correlate of Young Alumni Giving

John V. Moore III

Alumni giving is an important source of revenue for colleges and universities. This exploratory study is an attempt to find predictors of future alumni giving across multiple institutions using the National Survey of Student Engagement's benchmarks of educational effectiveness. Few effects were found, leading the researcher to speculate that the decision for alumni to donate to their schools may be a decision based more on institutional post-graduation efforts than college experiences.

Introduction

Financial gifts from alumni are an important source of income for American colleges and universities. Nationally, it has become one of the largest sources of revenue for institutions of higher education (Council for Aid to Education, 2003). Beyond the monetary benefits, alumni giving rates are used as a measure of institutional quality by external constituencies. In the highly influential US News and World Report's national rankings of colleges and universities, for example, alumni giving accounts for 5% of a school's overall score (US News and World Report, 2004). Grant-giving agencies and major corporate donors may also use alumni giving in their awards criteria (Winston, 2000).

Given the importance of alumni giving, it is no surprise that institutions invest time and resources in the cultivation of alumni donors. College Web sites indicate that this is done through the work of alumni offices, the hiring of fundraisers dedicated to fund solicitation from graduates, and annual fund drives. Another part of this effort includes statistically modeling student behaviors such as fraternity or sorority membership (O'Neill, 2005) and extracurricular involvement (Taylor & Martin, 1995) or demographic characteristics such as age (Olsen, Smith, & Wunnave, 1989), race (Clotfelter, 2001), and level of financial aid (Marr, Mullin, & Siegfried, 2005). Managers of giving campaigns are interested in factors that are shown to be predictors of alumni giving. This kind of marketing research assists institutions in deciding where it is best to commit resources in the solicitation of funds from alumni (Mosser, 1993; Pearson, 1999).

Because of the personal nature of the data and the way in which the results will be used, many of the studies of alumni giving have been local, in-house examinations of the phenomenon. Few have attempted to look nationally at characteristics associated with alumni giving at colleges (Sears, 1990/1922; Spaeth and Greenley, 1970). It is only recently that there have been attempts to examine a broader context have been published (Clotfelter,

1999; Cunningham and Cochi-Ficano, 2002). This exploratory study seeks to add to the body of literature on alumni giving by examining the relationship between alumni giving and student experiences in college (as quantified by National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) scores) at a number of schools from across the country.

Specifically, the study examines whether there is a relationship between institutional averages on NSSE benchmarks of good educational practice and later giving patterns for graduates. This question will be addressed by correlating measures of student cohorts' experiences while in college with their future alumni giving rates.

History of Alumni Giving

The Beginning of Alumni Giving

In the last 50 years, alumni have been a major source of funding for their alma maters. They have consistently provided one quarter of all voluntary funding for American institutions of higher education (Council for Aid to Education, 2003; Council for Financial Aid to Education, 1987; Smith, 1978). Alumni have always played an important role in supporting their colleges in this country. Like American universities themselves, soliciting donations from alumni fits within an English tradition. Markoff (1978) traced its history back more than 500 years at Oxford University. Early in the history of the United States, four alumni donated a parcel of land to Harvard in 1648 (Markoff). Harvard was also the recipient of the largest alumni gift of the seventeenth century; William Stroughton gave £1,000 to his school in 1699 (Markoff) which is approximately \$207,733 in 2007 dollars.

Although these early alumni gifts were significant to the universities that received them, it took more than 150 years for schools to begin organizing their alumni giving programs in a meaningful way. Curti and Nash (1965) cite University of Michigan president James Angell, who, in his 1871 inaugural address, claimed for the university a "hope that the men she [University of Michigan] had been sending forth into the honorable callings and professions might testify to their indebtedness by increasing her power and usefulness" (p. 187). This was to be accomplished by those men giving back to the university. And the fact that Michigan was a public school did not mean that graduates could not assist their alma mater. It should not, he continued, "be thought that the aid furnished by the State leaves no room for munificence" (Curti & Nash, p. 187). Yale University, too, had an important and early foray into the world of organized alumni giving. In 1890, Yale developed the first annual alumni giving program in the United States. The Yale System, as it came to be known, allowed the school to grow its endowment through small donations rather than solely depending on major

contributions. The school had been in financial trouble for years and administrators hoped this program might assist a bit in bringing in some additional funds. It more than met their expectations, raising \$11,000 (\$250,824) in its first year and about \$10,000 each subsequent year for the next ten (Geiger, 1985). By 1905, Yale's alumni giving turned around what had been years of fiscal woes. Indeed, it was viewed by the university leadership as providing the institution with a competitive edge over its peers (Geiger, 1985). In the same year, Harvard University orchestrated a fund drive targeting alumni; the class of 1880, in honor of its 25th year reunion, raised the substantial sum of \$100,000 (\$2.3 million). That sum, subsequently, became a tradition for each graduating class to give for its quarter-century anniversary. Alumni giving improved the fortunes of these two institutions rapidly in the next two decades. Both added approximately \$10 million (\$243 million) to their endowments in the decade that followed 1905, and, in the 1920s, the schools received a combined \$174 million (\$2 billion) in voluntary support (Geiger).

Although these campaigns were successful, the system was not adopted in the greater higher education community (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976). By 1910, only four additional annual alumni funds were in existence, all were at private schools. The University of Illinois was the first public institution to create such a fund in 1915, and by 1922, its program was one of only seven like it that existed at public universities in the United States (Curti & Nash, 1965). Although the number of formal donation programs may have been small, the impact of alumni giving should not be underestimated. Geiger (1985) contends that it was voluntary giving during this time period that allowed top colleges to differentiate themselves from less competitive schools and was one of the major factors in determining the unique character of the top research universities in the country.

Formalization of Alumni Giving

Although there was a group of schools that were successfully raising operational funds from graduates, there was little systematization of the alumni giving process prior to World War II. Conley (1999) points to a 1957 joint meeting of the American Alumni Council (AAC) and the American College Public Relations Association as the turning point in history of alumni giving. A summary of that meeting, *The Greenbriar Report*, noted the need for organized, regular giving as a goal for institutional advancement. Prior to that meeting, the AAC had published *A Primer of Alumni Work* by R. W. Sailor in 1944. Sailor was a faculty member from Cornell University and had worked with the AAC for over 20 years doing research into best practices in dealing with alumni (Morrill, 1945). With sections titled Goodwill Building, The Alumni Office, Fund Raising, The Magazine, and Alumni Organization, the text covers all aspects of a development office from staff-

ing and equipment needs to the importance of getting alumni involved in organized groups. Many of the recommendations made by Sailor are still used by alumni offices today.

The 1940s were an exciting time for colleges. Unprecedented expansion occurred between 1942 and 1944, doubling the college alumni population in the United States (Sailor, 1944). In an attempt to harness the financial potential of this new group, the AAC recommended that planning for a yearly alumni fund that would stabilize the giving year to year and get alumni into a habit of giving to their alma maters regularly. Few schools were using such organized planning for their giving; an AAC survey of colleges found that between 1919 and 1944 only 32 of the 300 schools surveyed had annual alumni giving drives. The AAC study also looked at the average annual giving for institutions among alumni contacted. The average giving over the time period remained steady (through a post-war boom, a national depression, and a world war) at about \$12.28 (\$146) per alumni contacted. Growth would come not from more generous alumni, Sailor advocated, but from volume and consistency: "A fund hopes primarily to increase its list of subscribers, knowing that if it can add a thousand subscribers to the list it will add a presumptive \$12,280 (\$145,750) to the total annual income" (Sailor, 1944, p. 120).

The goal was not to get big gifts, but rather to "come as nearly as possible to one hundred percent in the number of contributions" (Sailor, 1944, p. 120). He predicted that although new subscribers may start off giving for as little as "five dollars a year...once they are in and sold on the idea, it is not a difficult task to get them to increase the amounts of their subscriptions" (p. 120-121). Sailor also recommended that institutions split up their alumni into logical groups that can compete against each other in categories such as number of subscribers, percentage of subscribers, and giving total. Efforts in standardization such as this, and those that continued through the 1950s, contributed to the institutionalization of alumni drives by the time of Curti and Nash's 1965 review of philanthropy in higher education. Today, alumni development Web sites show signs that Sailor's ideas about most aspects of the creation and administration of alumni relations are still very much in use on college campuses today.

Alumni Giving Today

Charles Eliot, president of Harvard from 1869-1909, noted a relationship between the influx of money from alumni and the quest for additional finances from other sources:

It is, of course, largely by the extent of the support accorded to a college by its own graduates that the world judges the right of that college to seek co-operation of others in planning for the future. An institution that cannot

rally to its financial assistance the men who have taken its degrees and whose diploma is their passport into the world is in a poor position to ask any assistance from others. It is not merely what alumni give; it is the fact that they do give that is of supreme importance (Markoff, 1978, p. 80).

Eliot's words proved prescient. Schools today take this same message directly to students. Kalamazoo College, for example, informs its alumni on its Web site:

The percentage of alumni participation is as important as the total dollars raised. It is a way for Kalamazoo College to say to the world 'our alumni believe in what we do here,' a fact that helps the College raise funds from outside sources (Kalamazoo College, 2008).

In the rankings game that has become so influential in American higher education, percentage of alumni giving is used as one measure of an institution's strength and success. The rationale behind the use of alumni giving is that former students will contribute to their institutions if they were happy with the experiences they had while enrolled. Giving, then, is a proxy for student satisfaction (US News & World Report, 2004). This point is also driven home by the schools' messages to their alumni. Princeton's Annual Giving (AG) campaign Web site notes that perhaps more significant than the dollars given are the messages sent through alumni donations: "As important as the funds are, AG's equally significant purpose is its spirit. Through gifts to AG, Princetonians demonstrate their regard for the University, their affinity with their classmates, and their desire to help current students" (Princeton University, 2008). Others make the direct connection to rankings:

Alumni giving is a key factor in determining national rankings; therefore your gift helps increase the value of every Madison diploma. This in turn, makes our graduates more competitive in the job market. ... The number of alumni who make a gift every year is a key factor in determining national rankings of colleges and universities, such as U.S. News & World Report's annual top-20 list (James Madison University, 2008).

In addition to the status that a high percentage of alumni giving can add to an institution, revenue from alumni giving can represent an important source of discretionary funds for an institution (Leslie and Ramey, 1988). This has become particularly important in a time of decreasing public funding for higher education (Leslie and Ramey). In 1990, the Council for Financial Aid to Education calculated that donations from alumni to colleges and universities totaled about \$1.2 billion (\$1.9 billion in 2005 dollars) (Council for Financial Aid to Education, 1991). By 2005, that number had grown to \$7.1 billion (Council for Aid to Education, 2006). The efforts by institutions of higher education to maximize their share of that multi-billion dollar

sum have been labeled by at least one researcher as part of the arms race in education (Winston, 2000).

Predicting Alumni Giving

An important part of the arsenal in this arms race is the ability for institutions to maximize their returns on investments geared toward generating alumni gifts. This drives schools to better understand the giving patterns of their graduates. Indeed, the vast majority of the scholarship in this area appears to come from this motivation. Many of the studies of alumni giving have been done by single institutions attempting to understand more efficient ways of targeting former students (Conley, 1999). Generally, these studies look at various characteristics of the alumni population, although school characteristics may also be considered in the rare cases of cross-institutional studies.

Of the variables commonly studied, only a few have consistently predicted alumni giving effectively across multiple studies. In his review of 33 studies of alumni giving, Conley (1999) found that among the 24 variables, only 6 were significant factors in differentiating donors from non-donors. These factors included: involvement in alumni activities, reading alumni publications, decade of graduation, previous giving history, additional education (degrees), and perception of financial need of the institution. The remaining 18 variables have been used in either one study only, or have had mixed, inconclusive, or non-significant results. Among institutional variables, only two were consistent predictors of higher rates of alumni giving: larger endowments (Dunn, Terkla, & Secakusuma, 1988; Loessin & Duronio, 1990) and a more active or experienced development office (Boyle, 1990; Pickett, 1981). Boyle also found that institutional quality was a significant factor in alumni giving. Through interviews with students, alumni, faculty, and administrators, he gathered information on student integration into the campus, student faculty interaction, involvement in extracurricular activities, and a well-articulated set of college values. These factors are quite similar to those measured by NSSE in its College Student Report.

Other student experience factors that have been found to be predictive of alumnigiving include level of involvement on campus as a student (Miller & Casebeer, 1990), level of alumni involvement with the institution (Bruggink & Siddiqui, 1995), emotional attachment to the alma mater (Birmingham & Pezzullo, 1989), academic success while at the school (Gaier, 2005), and overall satisfaction with the undergraduate experience (Miller & Casebeer, 1990). These studies, with the exception of Gaier's, were at single institutions. They also looked at individuals' reflections back on their college experience, rather than longitudinally asking current students about their institutional perceptions and later examining their giving rates as alumni.

Methods

Study Sample

Institutions who participated in the four NSSE annual survey administrations between 2000 and 2003 were included in this study. The Web sites of the 725 schools in this group were searched for information on alumni giving rates by class year. There were 23 schools that published alumni giving rates by graduation year. Several of these institutions had partaken in the NSSE project for multiple years. (Of the 23 schools, six had two years of data, five had three years, and two had four years. The remaining 10 had one year of data.) There were 45 appropriate cases with alumni giving percentages that were able to be matched to NSSE data.

Variables

The independent variables for this study come from the NSSE benchmarks of educational practice, which summarize student responses to clusters of questions on the NSSE survey. They are summarized below:

- Academic Challenge: the extent to which a student feels they are being challenged by in and out of class coursework;
- Active and Collaborative Learning: the amount of participation a student reports working with other students in and out of the class room to complete their academic work;
- Student-Faculty Interaction: the amount and quality of contact with faculty on academic and career issues;
- Enriching Educational Experiences: the level of involvement in beneficial educational and co-curricular activities such as an internship, community service or a learning community; and
- Supportive Campus Environment: the student's rating of their school's climate in terms of its support for them and the quality of their relationships with peers, faculty and staff. (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2003a)

To look at the relationship between alumni giving and students' experience in college, NSSE benchmarks were correlated with alumni giving rates (percentage of students contributing to the alumni fund) by class year for institutions. Information was gathered about alumni giving rates from schools' Web sites.

The 2004 giving rates for individual classes were matched with scores on the NSSE Benchmarks for seniors in the equivalent year. That is, the percent of students in the class of 2000 (at a given institution) who gave money to their institution in 2004 was paired with the mean scores on the NSSE benchmarks from students who were seniors (at the same institution) in 2000.

The National Survey of Student Engagement

NSSE was designed by a team of higher education researchers under the auspices of the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research. The survey consists of approximately 98 items (including demographic questions) that assess students' educational experiences, interactions with university officers and peers, and perceptions of campus culture. The items were developed based on research into good practices in higher education. The benchmarks are five groups of NSSE questions that are used to assist institutions in understanding areas in which they can improve practice on their campus (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2003b).

NSSE's benchmarks have been used in a number of studies and have been found to be significantly associated with student success and persistence (Kuh, Cruce, Shoup, Kinzie, & Gonyea, 2007; Kuh, Kinzie, Cruce, Shoup, & Gonyea, 2006). These benchmarks also align well with the previous work on predictors of alumni giving mentioned above. They capture student experiences that have previously been associated with graduates' voluntary giving such as interaction with faculty and staff, participation in campus activities, and satisfaction with academics.

Analysis

Because of the relatively small sample size in this study ($n=45$), the most appropriate way to explore the relationship between alumni giving percentage and NSSE benchmarks is through correlation. Correlations measure the existence of a relationship between two variables, the extent to which changes in one is associated with changes in the other. It is important to note, however, that it does not directly speak to a reason for this relationship, nor does it necessarily indicate any causation (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 2002).

The use of multiple cohorts from the same institution may have the impact of reducing variance by making the sample more homogenous. This concern must be balanced with the additional accuracy that comes from the inclusion of additional cases, however (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003). An analysis of the data with and without the multiple years included indicated only small changes in both the means and standard deviations for each of the variables. This suggests that the structural features of the data remain intact and that the variability is not being suppressed in a way to significantly alter the strength of any of the correlations. A *t*-test conducted on the two data sets further suggests that they come from the same population ($t(68) = .615$, $p < .05$, two-tailed). A final check was made to ensure that there was no correlation between the number of cohorts a school had in the study and the other variables. There was no significant relationship on any of the variables,

indicating that the schools with more cohorts are not biasing the data in a particular direction.

Before conducting the analysis, several assumptions of correlation analyses were examined. The first was to plot each benchmark against alumni giving percentage to ensure that the relationship between the variables was not clearly curvilinear. The second was to check the normality of the distribution of each variable. The relationships among dependant and independent variables appeared sufficiently linear, and the skewness and kurtosis for each was within an acceptable range, indicating that the normality assumption was not violated. With the assumptions checked, each benchmark was then correlated with the alumni giving percentage.

Results

The percentages of alumni giving for the 45 cases ranged from 2%-36% with a mean 15.3% and a standard deviation of 8.8%. Table 1 contains the means, and standard deviations for the variables included in the study.

Means and Standard Deviations of Variables

Variable Name	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Percent of Cohort Giving	15.13	8.83
Level of Academic Challenge	60.84	4.36
Active and Collaborative Learning	52.26	3.77
Student Faculty Interaction	51.73	5.00
Enriching Educational Experiences	56.02	6.69
Supportive Campus Environment	62.18	4.66

The correlation analysis did not show any strong or significant relationships between alumni giving and three of the benchmarks: Level of Academic Challenge, Active and Collaborative Learning, and Student-Faculty Interaction. There was a moderate, positive, and significant relationship between Supportive Campus Environment and alumni giving ($R^2 = .351$, $p < .05$). Institutions with students who found the environment more supportive had higher percentages of alumni giving. There was also a small, significant, negative correlation between Enriching Educational Experiences and giving ($R^2 = -.253$, $p < .10$). Institutions with students who participated more in activities such as study abroad or community service had lower percentages of participation in giving by alumni. Additionally, there were significant correlations among some the benchmarks as well, indicating that there are relationships between these variables and perhaps some overlap in what they measure. A complete list of the correlation results can be found in Table 2.

Intercorrelations Between NSSE Benchmark Scores and Alumni Giving Percentage

	% Giving	LAC	ACL	SFI	EEE	SCE
Percent of Cohort Giving (% Giving)	---	.093	-.082	.001	-.253*	.351**
Level of Academic Challenge (LAC)	---	---	.249*	.707***	.686***	.238
Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL)	---	---	---	.357*	.193	.219
Student Faculty Interaction (SFI)	---	---	---	---	.645***	.313**
Enriching Educational Experiences (EEE)	---	---	---	---	---	.115
Supportive Campus Environment (SCE)	---	---	---	---	---	---

*p < .10 level, **p < .05, ***p < .01

Conclusions

Discussion

This study looked at the relationship between student experiences in college as measured by NSSE's College Student Report and those students' giving rates as young alumni. Only one of these correlations, Supportive Campus Environment, was found to be significant and positive. Another benchmark, Enriching Educational Experiences, was negatively correlated with alumni giving. The remaining indicators did not have a significant relationship with the percent of alumni who donated to their alma mater.

Institutions that do a better job making students feel supported on campus have higher percentages of students who give back as alumni. Perhaps this commitment to student satisfaction is something that is continued after graduation through frequent contact with alumni and invitations to continue to participate in campus life. Alternately, students who leave institutions where they have felt supported are likely to, as graduates, retain their positive feelings and be more likely to give back financially. Institutions looking to improve their alumni giving rates would do well to examine ways in which they can be more supportive to their future alumni while they are on campus as students by cultivating respectful relationships between students and their faculty and administrators and by carefully assessing their needs and supporting them appropriately. This relationship also supports prior research by Miller & Casebeer (1990), who found a correlation between student experiences and later giving.

The second significant correlation is less straightforward. Institutions with a greater number of seniors more engaged in enriching educational experiences such as community service, learning communities, or internships have a lower percentage of graduates who donate as alumni. Perhaps a clue here lies in one of the limitations of the study—that its focus is younger alumni. Studies have demonstrated that students who are more involved in community service are more likely to pursue careers in service oriented professions (Astin, Sax, & Avalos, 1999) and those that require further education (Astin & Sax, 1998). Both of these factors might limit the discretionary

income that younger graduates have to donate back to their schools. This idea is lent additional support from previous studies which found that individual income is a strong predictor of giving both in and outside of academe (Lakford and Wyckoff, 1991; Okunade, Wunnava, & Walsh, 1994).

The non-significant results challenge some previous studies, particularly those that suggest that involvement on campus or with faculty has a positive relationship with future giving as alumni (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1989; Miller & Casebeer, 1990). As previously mentioned, however, these studies generally have two differences with this one: they do not time-lag their data (they measure giving and experiences simultaneously), and they take place within the context of a single institution. Despite the fact that this study provides little evidence for a relationship between a student's college experience and their willingness to donate to the institution later in life, it does not mean that these relationships do not exist at any given school.

Limitations and Future Research

The limited scope of the sample is a fault of the study. By no means are the schools in the sample representative of the current landscape of higher education today. The majority of the schools (81%) were classified as Baccalaureate Liberal Arts (Bac-LA) schools (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2000). Bac-LA schools are generally smaller schools through which students travel in more traditional patterns. It is easy to extrapolate why these schools were more likely to track alumni giving by class. Their smaller size makes it more likely that individual students will have stronger class year identifications than those at larger institutions, where associations are more likely to be associated with a school, department, or other affinity group within the university.

Baccalaureate schools are also better performers overall on the benchmarks that NSSE measures (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2003b). The selection criteria for this study (i.e. schools that contained information about alumni giving by class year) directly influenced the types of institutions included in the study in a way that potentially restricted the range of the sample on the benchmark scores. Range restriction of this type can easily mask correlations in a sample (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 2002). However, this limitation of range also made the schools in the sample more similar and may have prevented large differences in size of alumni affairs departments or other factors that might have explained differences.

A second limitation of the study is that the relationship between these two aggregate variables may be of limited usefulness. This study examines the relationship between a mean score of a sample of students on benchmarks and an average of giving. Perhaps a model with student level, rather than institutional level data would be more revealing. Such a model would

examine a more direct link between a student's experience and their giving as an alumnus and would provide more variability in the model.

Institutions have more variability within their students' NSSE benchmark score than they have among each others' (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2002). This greater range of scores and more direct relationship between an individual's experiences and their gift-making decisions would likely provide new, useful information that is being concealed by the aggregate nature of the current study. Therefore, a better way to examine the issue might be to measure students' individual scores on the benchmarks, then track whether they, as alumni, contributed to their former institution. Performing this type of analysis, however, would necessitate significant cooperation from participating schools and may be difficult to achieve.

A final limitation is the small nature of the sample size. Although 45 cases is adequate for correlation, with a larger sample a study could be conducted that permitted a more complex more utilizing multiple regression. This would allow for statistical control for some potentially extraneous variables such as competitiveness (Boyle, 1990), size of alumni programs (Boyle; Pickett, 1981), or endowment (Dunn, Terkla, & Secakusuma, 1988; Loessin & Duronio, 1990). With the correlation used in this study, there was no way to test for the impact of these variables. A more complex model could aid in teasing these issues apart.

Implications for Practice and Research

In a study on schools that outperform their predicted NSSE scores, Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates (2005) discuss specific programs that contribute to improving scores on specific benchmarks. Schools looking to create a more supportive campus environment would glean much from these findings. Specifically, the researchers examined transition programs, advising networks, peer support programs, multiple safety nets, residential environments, and support programs for special populations. Across all of these programs, three notable themes emerge: 1) close relationships between students and those that are intended to support them throughout their time at the university; 2) an integrated approach to student success that welcomes overlap among services and multiple points of access for students; and 3) a clear vision across faculty, staff, and students of what it takes to be a successful student at that institution. Institutions that replicate these types of systems would likely create a more supportive campus environments, causing more students to contribute back to their institution as alumni.

Having researched both charitable giving, generally, and alumni giving, specifically, Clotfelter (1999) views the latter as different from more traditional types of voluntary support. Some consistent predictors, however, have been found in both academic and non-academic sectors. The most

prominent among these are the relationship between income and giving. Wealthier individuals are more likely to regularly donate to charities as well as their alma maters (Lakford and Wyckoff, 1991; Okunade, Wunnava, and Walsh, 1994). Schools interested in understanding their own alumni giving patterns would do well to control for these variables when examining their former students. Nonetheless, even this may not lead to conclusive information about what motivates alumni to give.

Some scholars have noted that findings on the reasons for philanthropy, even those that specifically examine philanthropy in education, are difficult to apply to alumni giving (Mosser, 1993). Graduates often have very personal and somewhat irrational attachments to their alma mater that make finding appropriate variables. These attachments are quite difficult, if not impossible, to quantify and would likely vary immensely among institutions and individuals. Although it is easy to be critical of studies that only examine predictors of giving at single institutions, perhaps these are the most useful to the institutions, given the complexity of that decision and the difficulty in finding valid and reliable variables to serve as predictors. Indeed, some have suggested the project might be best abandoned altogether. Seligman (1998) claims that philanthropy is, at its core, an irrational decision and is therefore not predisposed to empirical study. However, this should not mean that we abandon all hope of understanding the phenomenon of giving, only that it is may be more complicated than we initially believed.

Alumni centers and researchers looking to better understand giving at their schools could take Seligman's advice and study the issue qualitatively. Asking alumni who do and do not donate what their motivation was for their giving decisions might begin to capture the supposed irrationality of student attachments and donation patterns. This could allow for some measure of theory building upon which future quantitative studies could build their analytic models.

Given the ambiguity in the research, institutions best techniques for improving their alumni giving rate may be to work harder at reaching students in new and creative ways. Unsurprisingly, researchers found a relationship between development center activity and alumni donation rates (Baade and Sundburg, 1996; Grunig, 1995; Pickett, 1981). This idea was confirmed by conducting a bit of post-script research. The researcher examined several institutions not included in the original sample, but whose characteristics paralleled those of the original study. Specifically schools that had increased their young alumni (less than 10 years out of the institution) giving rates significantly during a short period of time were sought out. All of the schools with such increases reported new, targeted campaigns that were often developed in coordination with the alumni at which they were aimed.

An excellent example of this is the campaign by Macalester College: Dead Rich Guys are No Way to Fund a College. It was directed to address the low giving rate for young alumni. After the campaign, the rate of giving for this group went from 1-3% per class to 6-10% per class, a strong improvement (Macalester College, 2003). The school took steps to ensure that the alumni understood the importance of giving and limited their asking to just ten dollars, a sum that was intended to be within the reach of most young alumni.

Given the importance that external constituencies place on the percent of alumni donating rather than the total amount of those donations, this campaign makes much sense. Ten dollars is a reasonable amount for even the least solvent of graduates. Receiving ten dollars from half your young alumni is potentially more valuable in the long run than one large donation of a similar dollar amount. It also establishes a pattern of giving to the institution, an important part of long-term donor cultivation (Lakford and Wyckoff, 1991).

If, as hypothesized above, a lack of disposable income in younger graduates at schools with higher Enriching Educational Experiences scores is a barrier to their giving, then this changing a fundraising focus from dollar amounts to simply giving something could prove quite fruitful. Outside agencies look less at total dollars collected from alumni, and more at giving percentages (US News and World Report, 2004; Winston, 2000). This means that even these small donations could have a large impact on the institution if collected in large numbers.

Conclusions

Alumni support of institutions of higher education has been an important part of college and university success almost since they were first established in the United States. Given the funding situations at many institutions today, and the sheer volume of alumni dollars that are donated each year, it would appear that its importance has not diminished with time. In 1952, John Pollard referred to the process of university fundraising as "operation endless" (p. 300), and those words are still true today. Research into the motivations and patterns of giving by alumni can make a valuable contribution to the lives of those who are charged with soliciting money from alumni in support of their alma maters. It can help them design programs and strategies that are more efficient and effective and can contribute to the financial (and academic) success of their institutions.

References

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (2002). *Introduction to research in education*. 6th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Astin, A. W., & Sax, L. J. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development*, 39, 251-263.
- Astin, A. W., Sax, L. J., & Avalos, J. (1999). Long term effects of volunteerism during the undergraduate years. *Review of Higher Education*, 22, 187-202.
- Baade, R. A., & Sundburg, J. O. (1996). What determines alumni generosity? *Economics of Education Review*, 15(1), 75-81.
- Brubacher, J. S., & Rudy, W. (1976). *Higher education transition*. New York: Harper.
- Boyle, J. J. (1990). *College quality and alumni giving*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1990.
- Brittingham, B., & Pezzullo, T. (1989). Fund raising in higher education: What we know, what we need to know. ERIC Document ED 313 988.
- Bruggink, T. H., & Siddiqui, K. (1995). An econometric model of alumni giving: A case study for a liberal arts college. *American Economist*, 39(2), 53-60.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2000). List of Institutions by Carnegie Classification, Control, and State. Retrieved April 24, 2004, from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/Classification/CIHE2000/PartIfiles/partI.htm>
- Clotfelter, C. (1999). Alumni giving to private colleges and universities. Unpublished Manuscript. Retrieved February 10, 2007, from http://www.ilr.cornell.edu/cheri/conf/cheri-conf1999/cheri-conf1999_01.pdf
- Clotfelter, C. (2001). Who are the alumni donors? Giving by two generations of alumni from selective colleges. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 12(2), 119-138.
- Conley, A. T. (1999). Student organization membership and alumni giving at a public, research I university. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1999.
- Council for Aid to Education. (2003). *2002 voluntary support of education*. New York: Author.
- Council for Aid to Education. (2006). *2005 voluntary support of education*. New York: Author.
- Council for Financial Aid to Education. (1987). *Voluntary support of education, 1985-1986*. New York: Author.
- Council for Financial Aid to Education. (1991). *Voluntary support of education, 1990*. New York: Author.
- Curti, M., & Nash, R. (1965). *Philanthropy in the shaping of American higher education*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Cunningham, B. M., & Cochi-Ficano, C. K. (2002). The determinants of donative revenue flows from alumni of higher education: An empirical inquiry. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 37(3), 540-569.
- Dunn, J. A., Jr., Terkla, D. G., & Secakusma, P. (1988). Fundraising in US colleges and universities: The fifty best performances 1979-80 through 1985-86. Paper presented at 23rd annual meeting of the Society for College and University Planning, Toronto, August 1988.
- Gaier, S. (2005). Alumni satisfaction with their undergraduate academic experience and the impact on alumni giving and participation. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 5(4), 279-288.
- Geiger, R. (1985). After the emergence: Voluntary support and the building of American research universities. *History of Education Quarterly*, 25(3), 369-381.
- Grunig, S. D. (1995). The impact of development office structure on fund-raising efficiency for research and doctoral institutions. *Journal of Higher Education*, 66(6), 686-699.
- Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2003). *Applied statistics for the behavioral sci-*

- ences. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- James Madison University. (2008). The Madison fund: Why give? Retrieved February 13, 2008 from http://www.jmu.edu/development/madison_fund/why_give.shtml
- Kalamazoo College. (2004). Giving to the Kalamazoo College fund. Retrieved April 22, 2004 from <http://www.kzoo.edu/afgiving/>
- Kuh, G. D., Cruce, T., Shoup, R., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R. M. (2007). Unmasking the Effects of Student Engagement on College Grades and Persistence. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Cruce, T., Shoup, R., & Gonyea, R. M. (2006). Connecting the dots: Multi-faceted analyses of the relationships between student engagement results from the NSSE, and the institutional practices and conditions that foster student success: Final report prepared for Lumina Foundation for Education. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, Center for Postsecondary Research.
- Kuh, G. D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E. J. & Associates. (2005). Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lakford, R.H., & Wyckoff, J.H. (1991). Modeling charitable giving using a Box-Cox standard Tobit model. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 73(3), 460-470.
- Leslie, L. L., & Ramey, G. (1988). Donor behavior and voluntary support for higher education institutions. *Journal of Higher Education*, 29(2), 115-132.
- Loessin, B. A., & Duronio, M. A. (1990). Fund raising outcomes and institutional characteristics in ten types of higher education institutions. *The Review of Higher Education*, 13(4), 539-556.
- Macalester College. (2003). 2002-2003 Fiscal Year: A Year of Incredible Generosity. Retrieved April 2, 2004 from http://www.macalester.edu/development/annual_fund/previous_results.html
- Markoff, R. M. (1978). An analysis of the relationship of alumni giving and level of participation in voluntary organizations: A case study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Toledo, 1978.
- Marr, K. A., Mullin, C. H., & Seigfried, J. J. (2005). Undergraduate financial aid and subsequent alumni giving behavior. *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 45(1), 123-143.
- Miller, M. T., & Casebeer, A. L. (1990). Donor characteristics of college of education alumni: Examining undergraduate involvement. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 323 836.
- Morrill, J. L. (1945). Up to date. *Journal of Higher Education*, 16(7), 395.
- Mosser, J. W. (1993). Predicting alumni/ae gift giving behavior: A structural equation model approach. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1993.
- National Survey of Student Engagement. (2002). 2002 Institutional Report. Retrieved April 22, 2004 from <http://www.indiana.edu/~nsse/html/details2.shtml>
- National Survey of Student Engagement. (2003a). Construction of the 2000-2003 NSSE benchmarks. Retrieved April 15, 2004 from http://www.iub.edu/~nsse/2003_annual_report/html/benchmarks_construction.htm
- National Survey of Student Engagement. (2003b). 2003 Annual Report. Retrieved April 2, 2004 from http://www.iub.edu/%7Ensse/2003_annual_report/
- Okunade, A. A., Wunnava, P.V., and Walsh, R. (1994). Charitable giving of alumni: Micro-evidence from a large public university. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 53(1), 73-84.
- Olsen, K., Smith, A. L., & Wunnava, P. V. (1989). An empirical study of the life-cycle hypothesis with respect to alumni donations. *The American Economist*, 33, 60-63.
- O'Neill, P. P. (2005). The impact of undergraduate Greek membership on alumni giving at the College of William and Mary. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The College of William and Mary, 2005.
- Pearson, J. (1999). Comprehensive research on alumni relationships: Four years of market research at Stanford University. *New Directions in Institutional Research*, 1999(101), 5-21.
- Pollard, J. A. (1952). Raising funds: Operation endless. *Association of American Colleges Bulletin*, 38(2), 300-309.
- Pickett, W. L. (1981). Prerequisites for successful fund raising. In F. C. Pray (Ed.), *Handbook for Educational Fund Raising* (pp. 11-14). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Princeton University (2008). Princeton's margin of excellence. Retrieved January 3, 2008 from <http://giving.princeton.edu/ag/>
- Sailor, R. W. (1944). A primer of alumni work: Handbook series #7. E. W. Durham. (Series Ed.). New Brunswick, NJ: American Alumni Council.
- Sears, J. B. (1990/1922). *Philanthropy in the history of American higher education*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Seligman, D. (1998). Is philanthropy irrational? *Forbes*, 161(11), 94.
- Smith, H. W. (1978). Student and their institutions: A changing relationship. M. V. Massengale & J. W. Peltason, (Eds.). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Spaeth, J. L., & Greenly, A. M. (1970). Recent alumni and higher education: A survey of college graduates (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Taylor, A. L., & Martin, J. C. (1995). Characteristics of alumni donor and nondonors are a Research I, public university. *Research in Higher Education*, 36(3), 283-302.
- US News & World Report. (2004). Undergraduate ranking criteria and weights. Retrieved April 22, 2004 from http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/college/rankings/about/weight_brief.php
- Winston, G. C. (2000). The positional arms race in higher education. Discussion Paper 53. Williamstown, MA: Williams Project on the Economics of Higher Education.

John V. Moore III is a doctoral student in Higher Education and Inquiry Methodology. He earned an BA in psychology and English from Drew University, an MEd in college student affairs from the University of South Florida, and a graduate certificate in institutional research from IU. He works as a research associate for the Center for Postsecondary Research.