An Analysis of the Characteristics of Alumni Donors and Non-Donors at Butler University

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the College of Human Resources and Education

of

West Virginia University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

The Degree of Doctor of Education

by

Freddie Duke Haddad, Jr.

Morgantown

West Virginia

1986

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation is dedicated to my father, the late Freddie Duke Haddad, Sr., and my mother, Betty Jane Haddad, of Charleston, West Virginia. I also acknowledge my wife, Cindy, and my children, Chip and Shannon Lynn, for their support during this endeavor.

The following project would never have been completed without the guidance, involvement and participation of my doctoral committee. I want to especially thank Dr. Stephen Cupps, Dr. Richard Hartnett, Dr. Paul Leary, Dr. Richard Meckley, Chairman, and Dr. Jack Yeager, for believing in me.

In addition, a special note of thanks goes to Sherri Gordon. Without her assistance the following document would not have been possible. And, to the many unsung heroes who assisted me with this project, my heartfelt thanks.

Freddie Duke Haddad, Jr.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

Table | Page

Table | Page

CHAPTER I

This study was an analysis of the characteristics of alumni donors and non-donors at Butler University, a mid-sized midwestern university located in Indianapolis, Indiana.

Introduction

Institutions of higher education in the United States have provided educational opportunities for students, service to their communities and research for the improvement of mankind for over three hundred years. Throughout the history of higher education, colleges and universities have depended upon financial support from a variety of sources to maintain a level of service for their constituencies. This financial assistance has taken many forms. In the early years of higher education, beginning with Harvard College in 1636, financial contributions primarily consisted of private donations from individuals (Cutlip, 1965). As time passed and the demands on higher education increased, additional funding sources were needed. Federal and state government subsidies began to provide additional program revenue assistance. Public institutions became dependent on those subsidies, which today account for approximately 45 cents of every budget dollar, to provide the financial foundation for higher education (Magarrell, 1981).

Currently, drastic changes in higher education funding are taking place. The American Council on Education (1985) reported that federal funds distributed to states are being substantially reduced. Palmer (1986) noted that under the deficit-reduction law, popularly known as the Gramm-Rudmann-Hollings Act, automatic federal spendings cuts of 8.4% for education would be imposed in October of 1986, not withstanding the latest decision of the Supreme Court.

Economic conditions have forced states to redistribute existing revenues. State treasuries are being drained by inflation and increasing costs. Roger Ricklefs (1981) attributes tighter government aid and stationary enrollment patterns to many colleges and universities that are now dropping departments, programs and personnel. The Carnegie Commission on Policy Studies (1980) noted that plant maintenance and library acquisitions face decay because of a critical shortage of funds. This problem is affecting both public and private institutions of higher learning.

More than ever before, institutions must rely on private financial contributions to offset federal and state reductions in operating revenues (Froomkin, 1983). This urgent message was heard as early as 1970 as colleges and universities faced revenue shortfalls and increased operating expenses. These problems were caused primarily by the growth of expenditures, increasing costs of education per student and inflation (Cheit, 1971). A survey compiled by the National Observer (1970) showed that college and university administrators must plan programs to obtain additional funds from private sources, especially from their alumni. This sentiment was repeated in the Council of Financial Aid to Educations Annual Report (CFAE, 1980).

R. Reichley (1977) noted that millions of alumni contribute money to their colleges, universities and independent schools. But, the report of the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs (1975) concluded that for higher education a greater number of alumni must give significant amounts of money for higher education. The majority of alumni across the country are presently non-donors and thus, greater emphasis must be placed upon alumni fund raising in the future to assure greater private financial support. For success to occur,

greater institutional involvement and participation by alumni is necessary (Mood, 1973).

Fund raising programs at institutions of higher education look to alumni as a major source of private revenue. Alumni at most colleges are solicited on a yearly basis through a vehicle known as the annual fund program. The reasons for this activity are very clear. Giving USA's 1983 report showed that of all total private contributions in 1982, 80.6% represented donations made by individuals. A Council for the Advancement and Support of Education's 1979 Survey Report of over 800 institutions pointed out that the estimated 1978 private contributions to higher education totaled over $3 billion. According to a recent CFAE report, private contributions to higher education grew to $5.60 billion in 1984. Of this amount, alumni played a leading role by contributing an estimated $1,305 million.

For fund raising to be successful in higher education in the future, institutions must develop strategies to assure success in this important area. This fact is important; according to a 1981 study of the National Association of College and University Business Officers, fewer than 50 of America's 3,100 colleges and universities have endowments of $100 million or more, and fewer than 200 have an endowment larger than $10 million. Nine out of ten institutions in the United States, therefore, are precariously financed, and many live at the brink of jeopardy and instant retrenchment (Keller, 1984).

This study will allow individuals given the responsibility for fund raising to focus their efforts in order to raise the additional revenue expected by colleges each year. If research is developed in this important area, ways may be uncovered to generate increased alumni financial contributions in terms of both donors and dollars.

Significance of the Study

According to the literature reviewed, there have been no previous studies on alumni giving characteristics at small to medium-sized, private, independent universities with a primarily undergraduate program base. There has also been limited research on giving at private, independent institutions in general. Because of the fact that alumni from private institutions have always played a major role in institutional fund raising, the major significance of the study is in providing important clues to successful alumni fund raising at Butler University.

As a result of this study, it is hoped that Butler University administrators will be better able to predict those individuals likely to make financial contributions based on the analysis of characteristics generated through a statistical test in order to increase private financial support for the University. Also it is hoped that the study results will enhance the predictive efforts for potential alumni donors to Butler, and that 1,500 additional private, independent institutions can possibly utilize the study results for their fund raising efforts.

Research Hypotheses

1. The following demographic characteristics of Butler University alumni are not significant with respect to those who donate to the University and those who do not donate to the University.

Sex
Age
Marital Status
Parenthood
Number of Children
Children's Age Range
Distance Lived From Butler
Employment Status
Major College of Study
Type of Degree Earned
Graduation Period
Fraternity or Sorority Affiliation
Commuter or Residential Student
Receipt of Institutional Scholarship or Grant
University Job Placement
Involvement in Student Activities
Involvement in Alumni Activities
Whether Spouse Attended College
Whether Spouse Contributed to Butler

2. The above noted demographic characteristics of Butler University alumni are not significant with respect to those who donate to the University at the following giving levels:

Level I: $1.00 - $99.99
Level II: $100.00 - $499.99
Level III: $500.00 - $999.99
Level IV: $1,000 and over.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to the alumni of a single, medium-sized, independent, private, urban university. Thus the study results may be generalized to include only the results applicable to specific alumni characteristics at the time of the survey.

The alumni characteristics represent those, that on the basis of research, appear to have a significant relationship to the hypotheses. The characteristics involved in this study only comprise selected variables. It does not attempt to evaluate every possible characteristic. Also, this was a study dealing with demographic characteristics with respect to groups of individuals. In addition, the data included information obtained through a questionnaire and is accurate to the extent that the questionnaire and subsequent responses are valid and reliable.

Definition of Terms

1. Alumni: For purposes of this study, alumni are defined as those students who received a degree from Butler University. The term will encompass all degree recipients at the associate, bachelor and graduate degree level without regard to transfer credit or minimum number of years on campus.
2. Characteristics: Characteristics will refer to differences in alumni according to these factors: sex, distance lived from campus, age, type of degree earned, period of graduation, college of major study, commuter or residential student, involvement in student activities, involvement in alumni activities, marital status, whether spouse attended college, whether spouse contributed to his/her alma mater, receipt of institutional scholarship or grant, obtainment of a job through the Universities Career Planning & Placement Center, membership in a fraternity or sorority, whether alumnus has children, number of children, age range of children and status of employment.
3. Contributing Alumni: Contributing alumni will be those who have made a financial contribution to Butler University during the 1983-84 fiscal year.

Because alumni contributors vary in the size of gifts, further division of contributors into the following levels was made:

Level I: Those individuals who have contributed $1.00 to $99.99 during the 1983-84 fiscal year.

Level II: Those individuals who have contributed from $100.00 to $499.99 during the 1983-84 fiscal year.

Level III: Those individuals who have contributed from $500.00 to $999.99 during the 1983-84 fiscal year.

Level IV: Those individuals who have contributed $1,000.00 or over during the 1983-84 fiscal year.

Organization of the Study

The study is divided into the following chapters:

Chapter I includes the introduction and background, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, research hypotheses, limitations of the study, definition of terms and organization of the study.

Chapter II contains a review of literature related to a brief historical review of philanthropy, a brief history of alumni philanthropy, a review of research on alumni giving and a brief history of the Butler University fund raising efforts.

Chapter III contains an introduction, the development of a questionnaire, a description of population, statistical analysis and data reporting process.

Chapter IV includes an analysis and interpretation of the data obtained in the study.

Chapter V contains the purpose of study, results of chi-square tests, independent variable review, conclusions and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

Review of Related Literature and Studies

Introduction

The phenomenon of giving financial contributions to colleges and universities has taken place since the founding of Harvard University in 1636. Over the years the complexity and organization of fund raising efforts have broadened in scope and development. In this century, millions of dollars have been given by alumni to their alma maters. In contrast to the dollar amounts contributed by alumni, a paucity of research studies exist that relate to the characteristics of donors. In this chapter, a brief history of philanthropy, a brief history of alumni philanthropy, a review of research on alumni giving, and a brief history of Butler University fund raising efforts will be reviewed in order to provide a framework for this study.

A Brief History of Philanthropy

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (1981) defines the term philanthropy as a thing that benefits humanity such as a philanthropic agency, enterprise and gift. The act of giving financial resources to individuals, causes, or specific entities is rooted in religion, nationality, history and economics. F. Emerson Andrews (1950) further defines "giving" as donating an object or rendering a type of service without expectation of any personal return. This activity originated primarily in the Orient, Greece, Rome, Egypt and other middle eastern countries.

Pre-1800's

During the Middle Ages, the European church was a primary source for financial gifts. As the power of the Church diminished at the close of the Middle Ages, the concept of giving was firmly established in England (Ashcrott, 1902). Socially prominent professional groups such as clergymen, merchants and magistrates began to support colleges in the new United States. They continued their original English practice of contributing to higher educational institutions (Rudolph, 1962).

Appeals to private individuals for funds were present in the earliest attempts to found colleges in the New World, and most donations in the colonial period were obtained through active solicitation (Curti, 1965). This activity involved personal solicitations of large gifts and emotional platform appeals (Demerath, Stephens & Taylor, 1967). The Harvard College of 1638 commanded a major share of philanthropic attention, in response to the efforts of Thomas Hollis and John Harvard.

Cotton Mather observed that Americans expressed a spirit of philanthropy as early as the seventeenth century (Bremner, 1960). Educational leaders attempting to take advantage of this initiative raised money for their institutions in addition to fulfilling their teaching and administrative duties (Burns, 1962). Throughout the Colonial period, Benjamin Franklin assumed a leadership role in working for several philanthropic causes, including college fund raising. He believed in a collective, voluntary effort to meet the educational needs of the community. He was the leading force in obtaining funds for a library, fire department, and a hospital and university (Bremner, 1975).

In the Colonial period, philanthropy enabled minority groups to attend college for the first time. The College of Rhode Island received a gift from a Jewish merchant and voted that individuals of the Jewish faith could be admitted without religious restrictions (Ford Foundation, 1962). The importance of philanthropy during this period was stressed by college presidents who played a leading role in soliciting alumni donations.

During the administration of President Mather at Harvard College, the first large donation from an alumnus was made. In 1699, William Stoughton funded a dormitory named after him. During this era, college presidents also used alumni to raise funds. Since many were pastors of churches, they were frequently asked to support their alma mater (Stover, 1930). The idea for philanthropic support was in evidence especially among church related colleges during the Colonial period.

1800-1900

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, Charles Thwing, college president and historian of higher education, estimated that the total productive funds in higher education totaled less than half a million dollars (Thwing, 1906). Many struggling educational institutions operated in this century by the resourceful fund raising efforts of a president, who by now was fully recognized as the chief fund raiser for the college (Rudolph, 1956). In addition to presidents, the faculty of many colleges began to make substantial contributions to their particular schools (Fosdick, 1962). Between the Revolutionary and Civil Wars, the record indicates that six large gifts, ranging from $20,000 to $175,000, were given to higher educational institutions (Harmon, 1931).

In the middle nineteenth century, the trend toward educational philanthropy evolved as higher education turned academically to the economic problems of an expanding United States. This trend was reinforced by the emergence of a new elite in American society. Richard Shryock (1948) adds that approximately after the first generation after Independence, entrepreneurs, financiers and industrialists encroached on the domain of social and economic preeminence formerly dominated by classically trained gentlemen. Willis Rudy and John Brubacher (1958) note that a large number of personal fortunes were given to educational institutions in the balance of the century. Whole universities were philanthropically tendered as gifts. Some examples include Cornell, Stanford, Johns Hopkins, Duke, Chicago, Vanderbilt, Rochester and the Carnegie Institute of Technology (Demerath, Stephens & Taylor, 1967).

The phenomenon of higher education assisting society changed the attitudes of the major benefactors of practical higher education during the late 1800's. These individuals contributed heavily to the institutions emphasizing applied science, commerce and business administration (Johnson, 1931). A new spirit of progressiveness that reshaped the United States was evident at the beginning of the twentieth century. This phenomenon affected resource allocation toward areas that sought to improve the overall condition of man.

1900-Present

At the turn of the twentieth century, the foundation was established as a major institution of philanthropic attention and giving. Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller and Edsel Ford were leaders in the philanthropic field. Foundations assisted many colleges tremendously and proved an invaluable asset

general price index, and state governments are reducing their educational budgets. The present and future need of increased private funding support is readily apparent (Duffey, 1976).

The role of philanthropy for higher education in the United States in 1986 is just as vital as that role in 1636. It is truly an important part of American higher education and society, past and present.

Brief History of Alumni Philanthropy

The term alumni as defined by Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (1981) is an individual who has graduated from a college or university. As a result of this collegiate experience, Chambers (1963) notes that most college graduates have a strong sentimental attachment to their alma mater. During their college years they have made lifelong friendships and enjoyed many happy events. They remember their experience with nostalgic affection and want to see their alma mater exist forever. This is one of the major reasons for private fund raising activities directed at this group.

1636-1860

During the period of 1636 until the late 1800's, alumni contributed land, buildings, books, scholarships and professorships to colleges. The bulk of alumni financial support consisted of small donations. The majority of alumni were pastors, and the church influence was prominent. The college president was the chief and in many cases, the only fund raiser for higher education (Stover, 1930). Presidents learned very early that one could not ignore alumni support. They attempted to use every resource available to unite the college with its

alumni because of fund raising implications (McVey & Hughes, 1952). However, the fund raising efforts in the Colonial period were only sporadically successful (Pierson, 1952).

1860-1900

Rudolph (1962) observed that colleges began to generate monies from their alumni constituencies in a concentrated effort shortly after the Civil War. During the late 1860's, alumni initiated important roles in college and university governance. Alumni were beginning to assume positions of eminence and wealth. This fact enabled them to join wealthy outsiders and faculty in support of American higher education (Morison, 1936). Many alumni also joined college governing boards for the first time (Ranck, 1901).

A new philosophy toward alumni giving was depicted by William Graham Sumner. He stated in 1870 that if every graduate would give their college ten dollars, an unquestionable financial plan would be created. We would be paying a debt which we all owe (Chambers, 1963).

As the importance of alumni grew in the late 1800's, these individuals were the first group to be mobilized in a college money raising effort (Seymour, 1925). This change brought about a restructuring of rationale for alumni giving. Trevor Arnett (1940) noted that alumni giving would attach the alumni to the university more than any other factors since many alumni feel more deeply attached to an institution when they bestow something besides criticism.

As interest in alumni giving grew, colleges began soliciting their graduates for funds. Alumni were found as a fruitful source of contributions, especially for current needs (Andrews, 1950). A major campaign was initiated by the

oldest alumni fund at Yale, in 1890 (Brakeley, 1934). This effort realized $11,000 for the college (Blackwell, 1966). Shortly thereafter, a $30,000 alumni building campaign was underway at Smith College (Seelye, 1923).

1900-1960

Before the First World War, alumni contributions in general were limited. During this time alumni fund raising campaigns met with various degrees of success. The Colleges of New Jersey and Dartmouth realized alumni giving achievements. Rutgers and Yale had difficulties as recorded in a 1956 Dartmouth College booklet. The first example of mobilizing alumni in a highly organized campaign was in 1914-15 when the University of Michigan student union effort took place. Several general alumni associations were soon organized by college presidents (Stover, 1930). As the War ended, alumni financial contributions increased since the reasons for giving were more clearly recognized. This is particularly true of community chest giving and in a developing alumni funds across the country (Jones, 1942).

During the 1920's, three private institutions provided examples of how alumni generously supported their alma mater. These institutions were Antioch, Oberlin and Centre College of Kentucky (Garside, 1948) & (Curti, 1957). The public institutions of the University of Michigan, University of Virginia, West Virginia University and Ohio State University received substantial gifts from individual alumni. These outstanding alumni were William Wilson Cook, Philip Francis DuPont, Dr. Israel C. White and Ralph Merson, respectively (Shaw, 1934), (Stewart, 1955) & (Price, 1963).

The number of new alumni funds expanded by 64 in the 1930's, 10

in the 1940's and 11 in the 1950's. Yet according to an Alumni Council survey in 1955, less than one third of American colleges and universities made approaches to cultivate alumni dollars (Stewart, 1955). However the record of contributions is impressive. In 1936, 86 alumni funds reported over $2,800,000 in annual gifts. By 1951, this amount grew to over $19,000,000 as reported by the American Alumni Council (1962).

1960-Present

From the 1960's to the 1980's, many organized alumni giving programs were created. By 1961, the Council for Financial Aid to Education Biennial Surveys of Philanthropy showed alumni to be a source of support second only to foundations (1963). Merle Curti (1965) observed that financial contributions from alumni needed to be increased as early as the mid-1960's, because of the increasing costs associated with higher education.

Henry T. Heald, President of the Ford Foundation, stated that the ultimate continuing strength of a university rests with its alumni (Rowland, 1978). Alumni build institutions of higher learning by contributing financial support (Turner, 1947). Graduates of institutions constitute a potential but little used resource for higher education. Alumni must stay involved in their college families by using them in ways beneficial to the institution (Mood, 1973). The Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs (1975) concluded that Americans must give significant amounts of time and money for higher education. This message became more pronounced as early as 1970 when signs of financial stress effected higher education.

This situation was created primarily by the growth of expenditures,

increased student educational costs and inflation (Cheit, 1971). A National Observer Survey (1970) indicated that university administrators must create strategies to raise additional private revenue from alumni. This sentiment was repeated in the Council of Financial Aid to Education's Annual Report (1980).

The giving of financial resources by individuals to institutions of higher education has been significant. A report by Giving USA (1980) indicated that individuals contribute 84.4% of all private donations made to education. A survey was administered to over 800 institutions by the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (1979). The results estimated that 1978 private contributions to higher education totaled over $3 billion. Alumni played a leading role by giving an estimated $714 million. This figure grew to $1,240 million, according to the Council for Financial Aid to Education in 1983 (Magarrell, 1983).

The need for increased private donations from alumni has been greatly and firmly emphasized since the federal government is reducing financial assistance to higher education (Mayhew, 1980), (Ricklets, 1981) & (Carnegie Commission on Policy Studies, 1980). Proposed federal budget cuts will reduce allocations between $5 and $7 billion to non-profit organizations at all levels and for all types of programs (Magarrell, 1981). Eugene Wilson (1981) observed that private giving will have to increase 44% in 1984 over 1983 levels to adequately replace federal budget reductions.

As reported in the final report of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1981), the financial resources of many institutions will be strained in the next 20 years. As such, colleges will have to devise imaginative ways of approaching alumni and other donors. This is a result of

reduced income from tuition, greater fixed student costs, higher faculty salaries and higher inflation rates.

Despite future pressures for increased alumni contributions to the nation's colleges, almost half of all the giving in this century has taken place in a recent four year span (Whitley, 1980). This means that we are just on the threshold of growth. Specifically, since 1910 one half of all the money that has been given in this century took place between 1976 and 1979.

Efforts have made to increase giving by alumni. In 1979, during the first half of the Congressional session over 40 bills were introduced in the House and 12 in the Senate with effects on philanthropy (Whitley, 1980). A new tax law, IRC 170 (1), has revised the prospects for increased individual donations in the United States. Conrad Teitell (1981) reported that the current rules continue for those who itemize their deductions. For those who take the standard deduction, the law now allows deductions for their charitable gifts. This ranged from 25% of the first $100 contributed in 1982 to 100% of all contributions in 1986.

At this time, changing economic conditions and governmental budget reductions threaten the financial stability of higher education. To offset this situation, many development officers are planning new strategies aimed at obtaining increased alumni contributions. This effort may become more difficult due to the population shift that is reducing the traditional 18 to 22 year-old student grouping. With this reduction, the number of adult students has increased, and future students will be older when they graduate (Mood, 1973), (Harrington, 1977) & (Dunn, 1979).

The Higher Education Deskbook (1980) reported that as a percentage of the total population attending college from 1978 to 2000, the 18 to 21 year-old student population will remain stable. At the same time, the 25 to 29 year-old student population, 30 to 34 year-old student population and 35 and over population will increase 14%, 11% and 3% respectively. This change could affect future alumni prospectives and attitudes toward giving to their alma mater.

In summary, college and university development officers rely on strong, positive attitudes to generate their alumni fund raising programs (Marcus, 1980). These individuals will constantly have to re-examine their programs as alumni populations change. Graduates of public institutions have been relatively exempt from aggressive solicitations until recent times. This has changed and most public and all private colleges and universities will have to be successful in acquiring funding support from their alumni group (Duffey, 1976). Institutions must be successful in taking advantage of this very important constituency. Their ultimate survival may depend on it.

Review of Research on Alumni Giving

Karl Beeler (1982) noted in his research that:

> It is noteworthy that comparatively few researchers have been able to carry out a comprehensive investigation of the characteristics and attitudes of college graduates as they relate to financial support of their undergraduate institutions. (p. 24).

The majority of previous research that has dealt with the study of alumni donor and non-donor characteristics has been in the form of doctoral dissertations. Broms and Davis in their University of Colorado study (1966)

attempted to observe variations in alumni donor and non-donor characteristics. Twenty-three characteristics were measured through the implementation of a questionnaire mailed to the alumni sample selected. Their results ascertained that alumni donors had higher incomes, older age levels, and actively participated in undergraduate activities and alumni activities.

In an additional study, Caruthers (1973) felt that by reviewing the characteristics of alumni financial supporters, the Oklahoma State University Alumni Association could enhance their fund raising efforts. She sampled 225 alumni and analyzed 27 variables. Her study revealed that eight variables were typically associated with donors. The degree earned was a significant predictor of giving by alumni. Other factors that distinguished alumni donors from non-donors were alumni activity participation and college attended. Also, alumni who lived 51 to 100 miles from campus and those living more than 500 miles from campus were the best supporters.

The factors of current residence, occupation, financial contribution, date of degree, residence, type of degree and alumni activity participation were analyzed (McKee, 1974). He sampled 332 former students at Indiana State University. His results showed that individuals who graduated from the period of 1942-51 proved to be the best financial contributors. He also found that occupational category was not statistically important with reference to giving and those individuals who acted in a volunteer capacity gave money. In addition, graduates who received a baccalaureate and graduate degree more readily gave than those who obtained only a baccalaureate degree.

Alumni donors and non-donors were the subject of a 1975 study (Blakely,

1975). This research project attempted to evaluate null hypotheses of these groups. Differences between these groups related to the factors of age, campus visits, number of children, income, class identification, alumni and student activity involvement and undergraduate status. Decade of graduation, area of residence and years attended were shown not to be items of difference with respect to alumni donors and non-donors.

Paul Gardner (1975) examined both graduate donors and non-donors from the classes of 1951, 1961 and 1971 at Harding College in Arkansas. He sampled 600 alumni of this private institution. His assessment showed that extracurricular involvement related directly to later financial contributions. Alumni who attended only Harding College throughout their college years were more likely to contribute than individuals who transferred to Harding College. A positive relationship also existed between the factors of income and activity involvement while a student.

The purpose of John McNulty's (1977) research was to ascertain if characteristic differences existed between alumni donors and non-donors at Loyola University of Chicago. The review also attempted to show if membership in college student personnel service sponsored activities affected either group with regard to their later financial support. Using a chi-square test based on a combined sample of 479 donors and 224 non-donors, the results indicated that members of alumni organizations assist the University financially. An additional conclusion drawn from this study is that the role of the placement facility is a major determinant of alumni giving. It was also found that students who participated in college activities viewed educational philanthropy in a positive way.

Richard Markoff (1978) attempted to analyze alumni contributors to the annual fund of the University of Toledo Alumni Foundation, Inc. A total of 640 alumni, half of whom were contributors, were the targets of this research study. The primary thrust of this research was to see if differences existed between former students who made financial contributions and alumni who did not based on their participation in voluntary organizations. A secondary purpose of the study consisted of an analysis between alumni contributions of time versus money. A major conclusion obtained was that donors actively participated in more voluntary organizations than non-donors. Factors reviewed in this study included type of voluntary organization activity, rates of voluntary organization memberships, attendance and financial contributions and amount of participation in voluntary organizations.

Graduates from the University of Georgia became the subject of a study (Miracle, 1978). Miracle wanted to find out if characteristic differences existed between alumni donors and non-donors. The research revealed that significant differences existed between the groups in university awareness, whether individuals secured a degree and in charitable involvement.

The concepts of self-esteem and altruism as it relates to alumni were the focus of a dissertation (Anderson, 1981). In addition, relationships were explored between alumni donor characteristics. An assumption was made that contributor self-esteem and altruism are directly linked to alumni giving behavior. Eight characteristics were perceived to have an indirect or direct relationship to either altruism or self-esteem with respect to philanthropy. A sample of 400 randomly selected alumni who contributed to the Western Michigan University

Over the years, the annual alumni giving campaign (now known as the Annual Fund) has grown in scope and in its importance to the University. Contributions to the Fund have been used for items such as scholarships, salaries, library equipment and current operating expenses.

In 1963, a President's Club for donors of $100 or more was initiated. This Club has remained intact and has been supplemented by the President's Council ($500) and the President's Cabinet ($1,000), forming the Butler Presidential Societies. Donors to the Annual Fund, of whom 75% are Butler alumni, have grown from 1,255 in 1958-59 fiscal year to over 7,500 in the 1984-85 fiscal year. The fund has grown from $17,000 to $1 million in the same time frame.

Butler's Annual Fund ranks in the top 17% among 153 medium-sized independent schools in its peer group who report alumni annual giving results to the Council of Financial Aid to Education. Participation of Butler alumni in the Annual Fund is nearly 24%, approximately the average participation for all independent colleges and universities.

Generally the amount of alumni contributions to the Annual Fund has grown throughout the history of the fund. However for the past several years, the alumni participation rate has remained constant at 24%. In addition, the goal for this fund has been steadily increased and achieved throughout the past 26 years. The stability of this fund raising program provides an excellent model for study because opportunities for increased financial contributions and donor participation are definitely apparent, based on the fact that approximately 76% of the over 27,000 Butler University alumni do not contribute financially to the University. It is hoped that the results of this study will provide the information

needed to design programs that will increase alumni giving in terms of both increased donor participation and greater financial support.

Summary of Literature

From the founding of Harvard University in 1636 to 1986, the complexity and organization of fund raising efforts have broadened in scope and development. Fund raising as it is known today evolved from the concept of philanthropy that is truly American in scope. The major influences on individual giving to causes such as higher education reflect prior roots in religion, economics, human welfare, business and government. Philanthropy serves higher education by providing a basic support for private institutions such as Butler University.

An important component of philanthropy is giving by individuals. In higher education, graduates of institutions have been asked to support their alma mater from the colonial period to the present time. Giving from alumni to higher education grew to $1,240 million in 1983. A new tax law, IRC 170(1) has revised the prospects for increased giving by alumni. Yet to be determined is the affect of an older graduate pool and how to effectively generate private support dollars from approximately 75% of all college graduates who are non-contributors to their respective alma maters.

In attempting to acquire additional financial participation by alumni, research has been initiated to study alumni donors and non-donor characteristics in order to identify those alumni who are more likely to make a financial contribution to colleges and universities. A variety of studies attempted to

obtain responses based on selected variables. Two demographic characteristics have been determined statistically reliable throughout a substantial number of research studies. One characteristic is involvement in undergraduate activities while a student (Broms and Davis, 1966), (Blakely, 1975), (Gardner, 1975) and (Keller, 1982). An additional characteristic is current involvement in alumni activities (Broms and Davis, 1966), (Carthers, 1973), (Blakely, 1975), (Gardner, 1975), (McNulty, 1976) and (Keller, 1982).

Butler University provides an excellent model for this study. This is because the annual fund goal has steadily increased throughout the twenty-six year history of the fund but the participation rate by alumni has remained constant for several years. It is hoped that the study results will assist Butler fund raisers in determining those non-donor alumni to be specifically targeted for solicitation efforts.

In summary, although the concept of philanthropy in our society has been in place for many years, fund raising programs directed towards specific alumni populations are of recent origin. Research in this area of study basically consists of doctoral dissertations, focusing on demographic characteristics of alumni donors and non-donors. It is hoped that the study will add to the developing area of research that relates to fund raising in higher education.

CHAPTER III

Procedures

Introduction

The primary purpose of the study was an attempt to obtain predictive data on variables to be used by fund raisers at Butler University, specifically, and similar institutions, generally, as attempts are made to focus alumni fund raising programs. To accomplish this purpose, relationships were investigated between selected characteristics of Butler University alumni donors and non-donors to the Butler University Annual Fund between June 1, 1983, and May 31, 1984. Additional characteristics among alumni donors in various contribution level categories were also analyzed.

Specifically, the study attempted to examine a category of hypotheses that certain demographic characteristics of Butler University alumni are not significant with respect to those who donate to the University and those who do not donate to the University. A category of null hypotheses—that there are no significant demographic differences among alumni in various contribution level categories—was also tested. The procedures used in evaluating the hypotheses are described in this chapter. They include:

1. Development of Questionnaire
2. Description of Population
3. Statistical analysis
4. Summary

Development of Questionnaire

According to Nachmias (1981), a mail questionnaire was considered the most appropriate and feasible method of collecting the necessary data on alumni donors and non-donors. A research review, including an examination of existing literature, was conducted to determine appropriate questions for this study. The questionnaire was also professionally reviewed prior to actual submission to the alumni population in the study. This was accomplished by submitting the questionnaire to several faculty members at Butler University who have their doctorates in the fields of psychology, sociology and education. These individuals teach and do extensive research and were chosen because of their expertise in questionnaire development. The questionnaire was also submitted to several alumni marketing executives and the president of the Butler University Alumni Association for input regarding the various questionnaire components.

The demographic data evaluated among alumni donors and non-donors included sex, distance lived from Butler, age, type of degree earned at Butler University, graduation period, major college of study, commuter or residential student status while at Butler, involvement in alumni and student activities, marital status, whether spouse attended college, whether spouse has contributed to Butler University, receipt of institutional scholarship or grant, obtainment of a job through Butler's Career Planning and Placement Center, fraternity or sorority affiliation, whether alumnus is a parent, number of children, children's age range and employment status.

Among alumni donors in various donor level categories, the following variables were also reviewed and analyzed. These variables were sex, distance

lived from Butler, type of degree earned, major college of study, employment status, involvement in student and alumni ac..., ...rital status, whether spouse attended college, whether spouse attended Butler University, whether spouse contributed to Butler University, commuter or residential student status while at Butler, receipt of institutional scholarship or grant, fraternity or sorority affiliation, obtained a job through Butler's Career Planning and Placement Center, whether alumnus is a parent, number of children, children's age range, and employment status. The questionnaire was constructed to enhance participation in the study.

After the questionnaire was approved for use, a mailing was sent to alumni in the sample population. A cover letter explaining the study was included in the initial mailing. A follow-up letter and questionnaire were sent to those individuals not responding to the first mailing. In addition non-participants were telephoned and asked to respond to this survey.

Description of Population

The sample populations for this study were determined through a stratified random sample process (Mendenhall, Ott and Larson, 1974). The general population was comprised of graduates from Butler University in Indianapolis, Indiana. These individuals graduated from the five major colleges of the University: College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Business Administration, Pharmacy, Education and the Jordan College of Fine Arts. Of the total alumni population solicited in the 1983-84 Annual Fund Program, 6,178 were alumni donors and 19,232 were alumni non-donors for a grand total of 25,410 living alumni. Both alumni donor and alumni non-donor populations were evaluated in this study.

The sample size was derived using a formula created by Mendenhall (1974). This disproportional stratified random sample formula reflected an analysis of two groups, alumni non-donors and donors.

$$\text{Needed sample size } (n) = \frac{4\,pq}{B^2}$$

Where B is the bound on the error of estimation
(.05 margin for error)

$$n = \frac{4 \times .5 \times .5}{.05 \times .05} = \frac{1}{.0025} = 400$$

The n of 400 reflects a sampling ratio of 6% for donors and 2% of non-donors. A table of random numbers was used to select 400 alumni for each sample (Best, 1977).

Statistical Analysis

The study was based on the possibility that significant relationships may exist between selected demographic variables of alumni donors and non-donors and within alumni donors with respect to donor levels. A statistical technique which examines relationships between variables was used. The dependent variables for the study were alumni donor status, donor or non-donor as well as various ranges of donor involvement in the University's annual campaign. Donors were graduates of Butler who made any financial contribution to the annual campaign during the 1983-84 fiscal year. Non-donors were those graduates who made no contribution to the campaign. In addition, donors were evaluated according to various donor level categories based on the amount given during the 1983-84 campaign.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Crosstabs Program was employed to compute the chi-square statistic for analysis of data acquired (National Institute of Education, et al., 1975). The chi-square statistic was used to determine if differences in giving existed between donors and non-donors on the following variables:

Sex

Distance Lived From Butler

Age

Type of Degree Earned at Butler University

Graduation Period

Major College of Study

Commuter or Residential Student While at Butler

Involvement in Alumni and Student Activities

Marital Status

Whether Spouse Attended College

Whether Spouse has Contributed to Butler University

Receipt of Institutional Scholarship or Grant

Obtained a Job Through Butler's Career Planning and Placement Center

Fraternity or Sorority Affiliation

Whether Alumnus is a Parent

Number of Children

Children's Age Range

Employment Status

The chi-square statistic was also used to determine if differences exist among alumni in various contribution level categories according to the above stated variables. Yate's correction for continuity was applied to the chi-square statistic, because of several small cell frequencies in this study. Ferguson (1976) noted that Yate's application would enhance the statistical application to the data obtained. The chi-square was applied and the statistical significance level was .05.

Reporting of Data

Tables were used in this study and data reported on a narrative basis. The chi-square statistic was used and the results of this analysis were presented in the form of tables. Tables of percentages were compiled to show both frequency and percentages of the variables being investigated for possible relationships.

CHAPTER IV

Analysis of Data

Introduction

The primary purpose of the study was an attempt to obtain predictive data on variables to be used by fund raisers at Butler University, specifically, and similiar institutions, generally, as attempts are made to focus alumni fund raising programs. To accomplish this purpose, relationships were investigated between selected characteristics of Butler University alumni donors and non-donors to the Butler University Annual Fund between June 1, 1983, and May 31, 1984. Characteristics among alumni donors in various contribution level categories were also analyzed.

According to Nachmias (1981), a mail questionnaire used in this study was considered the most appropriate and feasible method of collecting data on alumni donors and non-donors. The size of the sample for this study was derived using a formula created by Mendenhall (1974). Based on this formula, the sample size of 400 was considered appropriate for the population studied. Since Elliott (1990) noted that researchers should not assume more than a 50% response rate, 800 questionnaires were mailed in the study. The sample population was selected through a stratified random sample process directed at both alumni donor and non-donor groupings (Mendenhall, Ott and Larson, 1974). Of a total of 800 questionnaires, 400 were directed to alumni donors and 400 to alumni non-donors. From the alumni donor grouping, 288 were returned for a response rate of 72%. Of the alumni non-donor grouping, 205 were returned for a response rate of 51%. By combining the returns, a response rate of 62% was generated.

The sample population was homogeneous with all respondents being Butler University alumni. The sample population was divided into donor and non-donor groupings. The characteristics of the sample generated by the questionnaire results are reflected in Table 1.

Table 1

Characteristics of the Sample

Variables	Donors No.	Donors %	Non-Donors No.	Non-Donors %
Sex				
Male	151	53.4	94	46.8
Female	132	46.6	107	53.2
Missing: 9 total	283		201	
Age Group				
21 to 29	18	6.3	32	15.9
30 to 39	24	8.5	42	20.9
40 to 49	49	17.3	33	16.4
50 to 51	64	22.5	47	23.4
60 or over	129	45.5	47	23.4
Missing: 8 total	284		201	
Marital Status				
Single	31	10.8	24	11.8
Married	218	75.5	154	75.9
Divorced	15	5.2	13	6.4
Widowed	24	8.3	12	5.9
Missing: 2 total	288		203	
Distance from Butler				
25 miles or less	160	56.7	83	41.7
26 to 50 miles	25	8.9	19	9.5
51 to 100 miles	11	3.9	12	6.0
101 to 200 miles	23	8.2	18	9.0
over 200 miles	63	22.3	67	33.7
Missing: 12 total	282		199	
Employed				
Yes	257	92.1	179	90.9
No	22	7.9	18	9.1
Missing: 17 total	279		197	
Retired				
Yes	87	31.1	47	23.5
No	193	63.9	153	76.5
Missing: 13 total	280		200	

Variables	Donors No.	Donors %	Non-Donors No.	Non-Donors %
Occupation				
Clerical	6	2.3	4	2.2
Homemaker	43	16.7	27	15.1
Managerial	40	15.6	23	12.8
Professional	133	51.8	98	54.7
Sales	11	4.3	10	5.6
Other	24	9.3	17	9.4
Missing: 13 N/A: 44	total 257		179	
Major College				
Business Administration	69	24.3	35	17.2
Pharmacy	32	11.3	24	11.8
Liberal Arts and Sciences	101	35.6	55	27.0
Education	71	25.0	75	36.9
Jordan College of Fine Arts	8	2.8	13	6.4
Religion	2	0.7	2	0.9
None	1	0.4	1	0.4
Missing: 6	total 284		203	
Type of Degree				
None	8	2.9	1	0.5
Associate	2	0.7	1	0.5
Baccalaureate	192	69.1	128	64.7
Graduate	37	13.3	44	22.2
Baccalaureate and Graduate	39	14.0	24	12.1
Missing: 17	total 278		198	
Graduation Period				
Prior to 1930	35	12.2	5	2.4
1930-1939	49	17.0	14	6.8
1940-1949	36	12.5	20	9.8
1950-1959	68	23.6	39	19.0
1960-1969	51	17.7	36	17.6
1970-1979	35	12.2	57	27.8
1980-1984	13	4.5	34	16.6
Missing: 1	total 287		205	
Fraternity or Sorority Affiliation				
Yes	173	61.6	75	37.9
No	108	38.4	123	62.1
Missing: 14	total 281		198	
Commuter Student				
Yes	177	63.9	135	68.2
No	100	36.1	63	31.8
Missing: 18	total 277		198	
On-Campus Student				
Yes	107	39.2	62	31.2
No	166	60.8	137	68.8
Missing: 21	total 273		199	

Variables			Donors No.	Donors %	Non-Donors No.	Non-Donors %
Receipt of Scholarship or Grant						
Yes			88	31.5	69	34.7
No			191	68.5	130	65.3
Missing: 15		total	279		199	
Obtained Job through Butler Placement Center						
Yes			22	7.9	22	11.1
No			255	92.1	177	88.9
Missing: 17		total	277		199	
Contribution Category						
Donors	288	58.4				
Non-Donors	205	41.6				
	total 493					
Contribution Level						
$0	205	41.6				
$1-$99	115	23.3				
$100-$499	114	23.1				
$500-$999	41	8.3				
$1000 or over	18	3.6				

To further investigate family characteristics of alumni, variables related to the family were studied. Emphasis was placed on married alumni contribution levels and their spouses that attended college. With respect to alumni donors to Butler University, 84% of their spouses went to college, and 57% of their spouses contributed to their college or university. It is interesting to note that 43% of alumni donor's spouses went to Butler, while 76% of alumni non-donor spouses did not attend Butler. Family characteristics of alumni are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Family Characteristics of Alumni

Variables	Donors No.	Donors %	Non-Donors No.	Non-Donors %
Sex				
Male	139	55.2	94	46.8
Female	113	44.8	107	53.2
Missing: 11 N/A: 29 total	252		201	
Children				
Yes	218	76.8	151	75.1
No	66	23.2	50	24.9
Missing: 8 total	284		201	
Number of Children				
0	66	23.2	50	24.9
1	47	16.5	22	10.9
2	95	33.5	59	29.4
3	35	12.3	52	25.9
4 or more	41	14.6	18	8.9
Missing: 8 total	284		201	
Age Range of Children (in years)				
5 and below	11	5.0	20	13.2
6 to 18	32	14.7	18	11.9
Over 18	150	68.8	82	54.3
Mixed Ages	25	11.5	31	20.5
Missing: 10 N/A: 114 total	218		151	
Spouse's Education				
College	204	84.0	133	77.3
No College	39	16.0	39	22.7
Missing: 3 N/A: 75 total	243		172	
Spouse's University				
Butler	88	43.1	41	23.8
Not Butler	116	56.9	131	76.2
Missing: 3 N/A 114 total	204		172	
Spouse Contributed				
Yes	84	57.1	38	31.4
No	63	42.9	83	68.6
Missing: 139 N/A: 86 total	147		121	
Spouse's Contribution Level				
$0	63	42.9	83	68.6
$1-$99	42	28.6	18	14.9
$100-$499	33	22.4	12	9.9
$500-$999	2	1.4	2	1.6
$1000 or over	7	4.8	6	4.9
Missing: 139 N/A: 86 total	147		121	

Donor respondents to the questionnaire were also asked to indicate their preference to a factor or factors that affected their decision to donate to the University. As indicated in Table 3, 64% of the donors surveyed felt the major factor in giving to Butler was feelings of loyalty to the school, and 59% felt that by donating they were doing something worthwhile for Butler. A total of 75 respondents or 26%, contributed to the University primarily for tax considerations. Only 5.6% decided to make a gift to become a member of special University gift clubs.

Table 3

Factors Affecting the Decision to Donate to the University

Factor	Donors who Agreed* No.	%
Close association with a faculty or staff member	34	11.8
Feelings of loyalty to the school	185	64.2
Interest in a particular academic or athletic program	35	12.2
Interest in a student financial aid program	35	12.2
Tax considerations	75	26.0
Financial considerations	17	5.9
Become members of specific gift clubs	16	5.6
Promote the concept of higher education in society	100	34.7
Feel that I am doing something worthwhile for Butler	171	59.4
Other	17	5.9

* Based on a total of 288 donors: percentages total more than 100% because respondents chose more than one item.

Research Hypotheses Tested and Results

There were two major categories of null hypotheses in the study. Nineteen sub-hypotheses were tested in the study for each category. The results and interpretations of the data analysis for the variables evaluated with the hypotheses follow. The chi-square statistic with the .05 level of significance was employed for all analyses.

The first major category of null hypotheses stated that the following demographic characteristics of Butler University alumni are not significant with respect to those who donate to the university and those who do not based on sex, age, marital status, parenthood, number of children, children's age range, distance lived from Butler, employment status, major college of study, type of degree earned, graduation period, fraternity or sorority affiliation, commuter or residential student status, receipt of institution scholarship or grant, university job placement, involvement in student activities, involvement in alumni activities, whether spouse attended college and whether spouse contributed to Butler.

The second major category of null hypotheses stated that the above demographic characteristics of Butler University alumni are not significant with respect to those who donate at the giving levels of $1.00 to $99.99, $100.00 to $499.99, $500.00 to $999.99, and over $1,000.

Relationship of Sex to Contribution Category

The relationship of the variable sex to donor/non-donor status was tested. The resulting chi-square was nonsignificant (chi-square = 1.79, df = 1, p = 0.1813) indicating that sex and donor/non-donor status were independent. The distribution of sex was as follows for donors and non-donors: 53.4% of the donors were male; 46.6% of the donors were female; 46.8% of the non-donors were male; and 53.2% of the non-donors were female. Therefore the null hypothesis for this variable was retained. Table 4 shows these results.

Table 4

Crosstabulation of Sex by Contribution Category

Sex	Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
Male	151	53.4	94	46.8	245	50.6
Female	132	46.6	107	53.2	239	49.4
Total	283	100	201	100	484	100

Chi square = 1.79 (n.s., p = 0.1813), missing = 9, df = 1 (with Yates correction)

Relationship of Sex to Contribution Level

The relationship between sex and contribution level was analyzed. A chi-square was computed. It was statistically significant (chi-square = 22.95, df = 4, p = 0.0001). The distribution of sex varied according to specific contribution levels. Of the respondents who were male, 38.4% did not contribute; 28.9% contributed in the $100 to $499 level, 11.8% contributed in the $500 to $999 level. Of the respondents who were female, 44.8% did not contribute, and 29.7% contributed in the $1 to $99 level. The distribution of sex in the over $1,000 contribution category appeared very similar. The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. The results indicated that males contributed in greater dollar amounts than females. Table 5 reports these results.

Table 5

Crosstabulation of Sex by Contribution Level

	Sex					
	Male		Female		Total	
Contribution Level	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
$0	94	38.4	107	44.8	201	41.5
$1-$99	42	17.1	71	29.7	113	23.3
$100-$499	71	28.9	42	17.6	113	23.3
$500-$999	29	11.8	12	5.0	41	8.5
Over $1000	9	3.7	7	2.9	16	3.3
Total	245	100	239	100	484	100

Chi-square = 22.95 (sig., p = 0.0001), missing = 9, df = 4

Relationship of Age to Contribution Category

The relationship of the variable, age, to donor/non-donor status was tested. In the donor category, 6.3% who contributed were 21 to 29 years of age; 8.5% of those individuals were 30 to 39 years of age; 17.3% were 40 to 49 years old; 22.5% were 50 to 59 years old; and, 45.4% were 60 or over. In the non-donor category, the percentages were equally distributed among age groups with a variation of 15.9% of alumni non-donors in the 21 to 29 age grouping and 23.4% non-donor alumni in the over 60 and over category. This analysis yielded a significant chi-square (chi-square = 39.72, df = 4, p = 0.0000). This indicated that a significant relationship existed between this variable and the donor/non-donor status. The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. Alumni donors to Butler University are older than alumni non-donors. Table 6 reports these results.

Table 6

Crosstabulation of Age with Contribution Category

	Contribution Category					
	Donors		Non-donors		Total	
Age	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
21-29	18	6.3	32	15.9	50	10.3
30-39	24	8.5	42	20.9	66	13.6
40-49	49	17.3	33	16.4	82	16.9
50-59	64	22.5	47	23.4	111	22.9
60 or over	129	45.4	47	23.4	176	36.3
Total	284	100	201	100	485	100

Chi-square = 39.72 (sig., p = 0.0000), missing = 8, df = 4

Relationship of Age to Contribution Level

The relationship between age and contribution level was tested. Of the alumni who were 21-29 years old, 64.0% did not contribute and 28.0% contributed at the $1 to $99 contribution level. Alumni who were 40-49 years old showed 40.2% non-donors and 19.5% at the $100 to $499 contribution level. Alumni who were 60 or over indicated a non-donor rate of 26.7%, 37.5% at the $100 to $499 contribution level and 5.7% at the $1,000 or over contribution level. This analysis yielded a significant chi-square (chi-square = 74.26, df = 16, p = 0.0000). This indicated that a significant relationship existed between this variable and the donor/non-donor status. The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. Older alumni, particularly those over 60, generally distributed greater amounts than any other age grouping. Table 7 shows these results.

Table 7

Crosstabulation of Age with Contribution Level

Contribution Level	Age 21-29 No.	%	30-39 No.	%	40-49 No.	%	50-59 No.	%	60 or over No.	%	Total No.	%
$0	32	64.0	42	63.6	33	40.2	47	42.3	47	26.7	201	41.4
$1-$99	14	28.0	17	25.8	19	23.2	21	18.9	42	23.9	113	23.3
$100-$499	3	6.0	4	6.0	16	19.5	24	21.6	66	37.5	113	23.3
$500-$999	0	0.0	3	4.5	11	13.4	16	14.4	11	6.2	41	8.5
$1000 or over	1	2.0	0	0.0	3	3.7	3	2.7	10	5.7	17	3.5
Total	50	100	66	100	82	100	111	100	176	100	485	100

Chi-square = 74.26 (sig., p = 0.0000), missing = 8, df = 16

Relationship of Marital Status to Contribution Category

In analyzing the relationship between marital status and donor/non-donor status, the chi-square statistic was used. Of the total sample, the greatest number of respondents were married, 75.8%. Single alumni represented 11.2% of the total sample. In the donor category, 75.7% were married and 10.8% were single. In the non-donor category, 75.9% were married and 11.8% were single. This analysis yielded a non-significant chi-square (chi-square = 1.37, df = 3, p = 0.7124), indicating that this variable and donor/non-donor status were independent. The null hypothesis for this variable was retained. Table 8 indicates these results.

Table 8

Crosstabulation of Marital Status with Contribution Category

Marital Status	Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
Single	31	10.8	24	11.8	55	11.2
Married	218	75.7	154	75.9	372	75.8
Divorced	15	5.2	13	6.4	28	5.7
Widowed	24	8.3	12	5.9	36	7.3
Total	288	100	203	100	491	100

Chi-square = 1.37 (n.s., p = 0.7124), missing = 2, df = 3

Relationship of Marital Status to Contribution Level

The relationship between marital status and contribution level was tested. Of the total sample, 23.4% of the respondents contributed at the $1 to $99 contribution level, and 23.2% of the total respondents contributed at the $100 to $499 contribution level. Of the alumni who were married, 21.8% contributed at the $1 to $99 level, and 22.6% made contributions at the $100 to $499 contribution level. At the over $1,000 contribution level, 4.3% of the alumni donors were married. This analysis yielded a non-significant chi-square (chi-square = 12.48, df = 12, p = 0.4078). The null hypothesis for this variable was retained. Table 9 reports these results.

Table 9

Crosstabulation of Marital Status with Contribution Level

Contribution Level	Marital Status: Single No.	Single %	Married No.	Married %	Divorced No.	Divorced %	Widowed No.	Widowed %	Total No.	Total %
$0	24	43.6	154	41.4	13	46.4	12	33.3	203	41.3
$1-$99	16	29.1	81	21.8	7	25.0	11	30.6	115	23.4
$100-$499	14	25.5	84	22.6	6	21.4	10	27.8	114	23.2
$500-$999	1	1.8	37	9.9	2	7.1	1	2.8	41	8.4
Over $1000	0	0.0	16	4.3	0	0.0	2	5.6	18	3.7
Total	55	100	372	100	28	100	36	100	491	100

Chi-square = 12.48 (n.s., p = 0.4078), missing = 2, df = 12

Relationship of Parenthood to Contribution Category

The relationship between whether the alumnus has children and donor/non-donor status was tested. The distribution of having children was similar for donors and non-donors. In the donor category, 77.1% of the respondents had children, and 22.9% did not have children. In the non-donor category, 75.6% of the respondents had children, and 24.4% did not have children. The resulting chi-square was nonsignificant (chi-square = 0.07, df = 1, p = 0.7853), indicating that having children and donor/non-donor status were independent. The null hypothesis for this variable was retained. Table 10 shows these results.

Table 10

Crosstabulation of Parenthood with Contribution Category

Parenthood	Contribution Category: Donors No.	%	Non-donors No.	%	Total No.	%
Children	222	77.1	155	75.6	369	76.1
No children	66	22.9	50	24.4	116	23.9
Total	283	100	205	100	485	100

Chi-square = 0.07 (n.s., p = 0.7853, with Yates correction), missing = 0, df = 1

Relationship of Parenthood to Contribution Level

The relationship between children and contribution level was tested. Of alumni with children, 41.1% did not contribute; 23.3% contributed at the $1 to $99 level; 22.5% contributed at the $100 to $499 level, and 4.2% contributed over $1,000. For alumni with no children, 43.1% did not contribute; 23.3% contributed at the $1 to $99 level, and 1.7% contributed at the $1,000 level. The resultant chi-square was nonsignificant (chi-square = 2.23, df = 4, p = 0.6943). The null hypothesis was retained. Table 11 reports these results.

Table 11

Crosstabulation of Parenthood with Contribution Level

Contribution Level	Parenthood: Children No.	Children %	No children No.	No children %	Total No.	Total %
$0	155	41.1	50	43.1	205	41.6
$1-$99	88	23.3	27	23.3	115	23.3
$100-$499	85	22.5	29	25.0	114	23.1
$500-$999	33	8.8	8	6.9	41	8.3
Over $1000	16	4.2	2	1.7	18	3.7
Total	377	100	116	100	493	100

Chi-square = 2.23 (n.s., p = 0.6943), missing = 0, df = 4

Relationship of Number of Children to Contribution Category

The relationship between number of children and donor/non-donor status was tested. Of respondents with no children, 22.9% were donors. The highest percentage of donor respondents was alumni with two children, 33.0%. In the non-donor category, alumni with two children represented 28.8%, while alumni having three children was 25.4%. Of the total sample, 31.2% of the alumni respondents had two children. This analysis yielded a significant chi-square (chi-square = 17.42, df = 4, p = 0.0016), indicating that a significant relationship existed between this variable and donor/non-donor status. The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. The majority of donor respondents had several children. Table 12 reports these results.

Table 12

Crosstabulation of Number of Children with Contribution Category

Number of Children	Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
Zero	66	22.9	50	24.4	116	23.5
One	47	16.3	22	10.7	69	14.0
Two	95	33.0	59	28.8	154	31.2
Three	35	12.2	52	25.4	87	17.6
Four or more	45	15.6	22	10.7	67	13.6
Total	288	100	205	100	493	100

Chi-square = 17.42 (sig., p = 0.0016), missing = 0, df = 4

Relationship of Number of Children to Contribution Level

The relationship between number of children and contribution level was tested. Of alumni with no children, 41.6% were in the zero contribution level; 23.3% were in the $1 to $99 contribution level; 23.1% were in the $100 to $499 contribution level; 8.3% were in the $500 to $999 contribution level, and 3.7% were in the over $1,000 contribution level. Alumni with no children received their highest percentage at the $0 level and declined for increased contribution levels. Alumni with three children had their highest percentage in the $0 level compared to other groupings. This analysis yielded a significant chi-square (chi-square = 41.71, df = 16, p = 0.0004), indicating that a significant relationship existed between these variables. The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. Alumni who have children contributed in greater amounts than alumni who do not have children. Table 13 reports these results.

Table 13

Crosstabulation of Number of Children with Contribution Level

Contribution Level	Number of Children: Zero		One		Two		Three		Four or more		Total	
	N	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
$0	50	43.1	22	31.9	59	38.3	52	59.8	22	32.8	205	41.6
$1-$99	27	23.3	25	36.2	32	20.8	16	18.4	15	22.4	115	23.3
$100-$499	29	25.0	13	18.8	42	27.3	11	12.6	19	28.4	114	23.1
$500-$999	8	6.9	4	5.8	17	11.0	8	9.2	4	6.0	41	8.3
Over $1000	2	1.7	5	7.2	4	2.6	0	0.0	7	10.3	18	3.7
Total	116	100	69	100	154	100	87	100	67	100	493	100

Chi-square = 41.71 (sig., p = 0.0004), missing = 0, df = 16

Relationship of Children's Age Range to Contribution Category

In analyzing the relationship between children's age range and contribution category, the chi-square statistic was used. In the donor category, 5.0% had children in the age range of 5 and below; 14.7% had children in the age range of 6 to 18 and 68.8% in the age range of over 18. In the non-donor category, 13.2% had children in the age range of 5 and below; 11.9% in the age range of 6 to 18 and 54.3% in the over 18 age range. The resultant chi-square was significant (chi-square = 15.45, df = 3, p = 0.0015), indicating that a relationship exists between age range of children and donor/non-donor status. The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. The majority of donors had children in the age range of over 18. Table 14 reports these results.

Table 14

Crosstabulation of Children's Age Range with Contribution Category

Children's Age Range	Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
5 and below	11	5.0	20	13.2	31	8.4
6 to 18	32	14.7	18	11.9	50	13.6
Over 18	150	68.8	82	54.3	232	62.9
Mixed ages	25	11.5	31	20.5	56	15.2
Total	218	100	151	100	369	100

Chi-square = 15.45 (sig., p = 0.0015), missing = 6, df = 3
Excluded due to nonapplicability = 118

Relationship of Children's Age Range to Contribution Level

The relationship between children's age range and contribution level was tested. For alumni with children in the age range of 5 and below, 64.5% did not contribute; 22.6% contributed in the $1 to $99 level, and 3.2% contributed in the over $1,000 level. For alumni with children in the age range of 6 to 18, 36.0% were non-donors, and 30.0% contributed at the $1 to $99 level. For the age range of over 18, 35.3% were non-donors; 29.7% contributed at the $100 to $499 contribution level, and 4.7% contributed over $1,000 to Butler. The resultant chi-square was significant (chi-square = 28.59, df = 12, p = 0.0045). The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. Alumni with children in the over 18 age range contributed both in greater numbers and in dollar amounts. Table 15 reports these results.

Table 15

Crosstabulation of Children's Age Ranges with Contribution Level

	Children's Age Ranges									
	5 and below		6 to 18		over 18		mixed ages		total	
Contribution Level	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
$0	20	64.5	18	36.0	82	35.3	31	55.4	151	40.9
$1-99	7	22.6	15	30.0	50	21.6	14	25.0	86	23.3
$100-499	1	3.2	9	18.0	69	29.7	5	8.9	84	22.8
$500-999	2	6.5	7	14.0	20	8.6	4	7.1	33	8.9
Over $1000	1	3.2	1	2.0	11	4.7	2	3.6	15	4.1
Total	31	100	50	100	232	100	56	100	369	100

Chi-square = 28.59 (sig., p = 0.0045), missing = 6, df = 12
Excluded due to nonapplicability = 118

Relationship of Distance from Butler to Contribution Category

The relationship between distance lived from campus and contribution category was tested. Of the donors, 56.7% lived 25 miles or less from campus, and 22.3% lived over 200 miles from campus. Of the non-donors, 41.7% lived 25 miles or less from campus, and 33.7% lived over 200 miles from campus. The chi-square obtained was significant (chi-square = 12.03, df = 4, p = 0.0171), indicating that a relationship existed between distance lived from campus and donor/non-donor status. The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. Donors to the University tended to either live close to campus or over 200 miles from the University. Table 16 reports these results.

Table 16

Crosstabulation of Distance from Butler with Contribution Category

Distance	Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
25 miles or less	160	56.7	83	41.7	243	50.5
26 to 50 miles	25	8.9	19	9.5	44	9.1
51 to 100 miles	11	3.9	12	6.0	23	4.8
101 to 200 miles	23	8.2	18	9.0	41	8.5
Over 200 miles	63	22.3	67	33.7	130	27.0
Total	282	100	199	100	481	100

Chi-square = 12.03 (sig., p = 0.0171), missing = 12, df = 4

Relationship of Distance Lived from Butler to Contribution Level

The relationship between distance lived from Butler and contribution level was tested. Of the respondents who lived 25 miles or less from the Butler University campus, 27.6% contributed at the $1 to $99 contribution level. For alumni living over 200 miles from Butler, 20.8% contributed at the $1 to $99 contribution level, and 17.7% contributed at the $100 to $499 contribution level. For alumni contributions of over $1,000, alumni who lived 25 miles or less represented 4.9%. The chi-square obtained was nonsignificant (chi-square = 21.30, df = 16, p = 0.1673), indicating that no differences existed between contribution level categories and distance lived from campus. The null hypothesis for this variable was retained. Table 17 shows these results.

Table 17

Crosstabulation of Distance from Butler with Contribution Level

Contribution Level	Distance: 25 miles or less No.	%	26-50 miles No.	%	51-100 miles No.	%	101-200 miles No.	%	over 200 miles No.	%	Total No.	%
$0	83	34.2	19	43.2	12	52.2	18	43.9	67	51.5	199	41.4
$1-$99	61	25.1	12	27.3	6	26.1	6	14.6	27	20.8	112	23.3
$100-$499	67	27.6	7	15.9	4	17.4	12	29.3	23	17.7	113	23.5
$500-$999	20	8.2	5	11.4	1	4.3	5	12.2	10	7.7	41	8.5
Over $1000	12	4.9	1	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	2.3	16	3.3
Total	243	100	44	100	23	100	41	100	130	100	481	100

Chi-square = 21.30 (n.s., p = 0.1673), missing = 12, df = 16

Relationship of Employment Status to Contribution Category

The relationship between status of employment and contribution category was tested. For alumni donors, 92.1% were employed and 7.9% were unemployed. For alumni non-donors, 90.9% were employed and 9.1% were unemployed. The data obtained yielded a nonsignificant chi-square (chi-square = 0.10, df = 1, p = 0.7512), indicating that donor/non-donor status and status of employment were independent. The null hypothesis for this variable was retained. Table 18 indicates these results.

Table 18

Crosstabulation of Employment Status with Contribution Category

Employment Status	Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
Employed	257	92.1	179	90.9	436	91.6
Unemployed	22	7.9	18	9.1	40	8.4
Total	279	100	197	100	476	100

Chi-square = 0.10 (n.s., p = 0.7512 with Yate's correction), missing = 17, df = 1

Relationship of Employment Status to Contribution Level

The relationship between status of employment and contribution level was tested. Of those alumni who were employed, 41.0% did not contribute; 22.7% contributed at the $1 to $99 level; 23.9% contributed at the $100 to $499 level, and 3.7% contributed at the over $1,000 level. Of these alumni who were unemployed, 45.0% did not contribute; 27.5% contributed at the $1 to $99 level, and 2.5% contributed over $1,000. The chi-square obtained was nonsignificant, indicating no relationship existed between employment status and contribution level (chi-square = 1.48, df = 13, p = 0.8310). The null hypothesis for this variable was retained. Table 19 reports these results.

Table 19

Crosstabulation of Employment Status with Contribution Level

Contribution Level	Employment Status: Employed No.	Employed %	Unemployed No.	Unemployed %	Total No.	Total %
$0	179	41.0	18	45.0	197	41.4
$1-$99	99	22.7	11	27.5	110	23.1
$100-$499	104	23.9	8	20.0	112	23.5
$500-$999	38	8.7	2	5.0	40	8.4
Over $1000	16	3.7	1	2.5	17	3.6
Total	436	100	40	100	476	100

Chi-square = 1.48 (n.s., p = 0.8310), missing = 17, df = 4

Relationship of Retirement Status to Contribution Category

A test was performed to evaluate if a relationship existed between status of retirement and donor/non-donor status. Of the donor respondents, 31.1% were retired, and 23.5% of non-donor respondents were retired. The chi-square obtained was nonsignificant (chi-square = 2.96, df = 1, p = 0.0855). The null hypothesis for this variable was retained. Table 20 shows these results.

Table 20

Crosstabulation of Retirement Status with Contribution Category

Retirement Status	Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
Retired	87	31.1	47	23.5	134	27.9
Not Retired	193	68.9	153	76.5	346	72.1
Total	280	100	200	100	480	100

Chi-square = 2.96 (n.s., p = 0.0855 with Yates correction), missing = 13, df = 1

Relationship of Retirement Status to Contribution Level

The relationship between status of retirement and contribution level was tested. In the $1 to $99 contribution level for alumni, 35.1% were retired. Also, 22.4% contributed at the $1 to $99 level, and 34.3% contributed at the $100 to $499 contribution level. For non-retired alumni, 44.2% did not make a contribution; 24.0% contributed at the $1 to $99 level, and 3.4% contributed over $1,000. This analysis yielded a significant chi-square (chi-square = 13.39, df = 4, p = 0.0095). The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. Alumni who were not retired contributed at higher contribution levels than retired alumni. Table 21 reports these results.

Table 21

Crosstabulation of Retirement Status with Contribution Level

Contribution Level	Retirement Status: Retired No.	Retired %	Not Retired No.	Not Retired %	Total No.	Total %
$0	47	35.1	153	44.2	200	41.7
$1-$99	30	22.4	83	24.0	113	23.5
$100-$499	46	34.3	66	19.1	112	23.3
$500-$999	8	5.9	32	9.2	40	8.3
Over $1000	3	2.2	12	3.4	15	3.1
Total	134	100	346	100	480	100

Chi-square = 13.39 (sig., p = 0.0095), missing = 13, df = 4

Relationship of Occupation to Contribution Category

The relationship between occupation and donor/non-donor status was tested. The greatest number of respondents, 53.0%, were in the professional category. The smallest number of respondents were in the clerical category, 2.3% of the total sample. In the donor category, professional respondents totaled 51.8%; homemakers 16.7% and managerial positions, 15.6%. In the non-donor category, 54.7% were in professional positions; 15.1% in homemaker positions, and 12.8% managerial positions. In all of the categories of occupation, the distribution was similar for donors and non-donors. This analysis yielded a nonsignificant chi-square (chi-square = 1.28, $df = 5$, $p = 0.9373$), indicating that no relationship existed between occupation and donor/non-donor status. The null hypothesis for this variable was retained. Table 22 reports these results.

Table 22

Crosstabulation of Occupation with Contribution Category

Occupation	Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
Clerical	6	2.3	4	2.2	10	2.3
Homemaker	43	16.7	27	15.1	70	16.1
Managerial	40	15.6	23	12.8	63	14.4
Professional	133	51.8	98	54.7	231	53.0
Sales	11	4.3	10	5.6	21	4.8
Other	24	9.3	17	9.5	41	9.4
Total	257	100	179	100	436	100

Chi-square = 1.28 (n.s., $p = 0.9373$), missing = 13, $df = 5$
Excluded due to non-applicability = 44

Relationship of Occupation to Contribution Level

The relationship between occupation and contribution level was analyzed. A chi-square was computed. It was not statistically significant (chi-square = 29.40, df = 20, p = 0.0802). Regarding clerical respondents, 40.0% contributed at the $1 to $99 level. For homemakers, 7.1% contributed at the over $1,000 level. Managers reflected a 27.0% response at the $100 to $499 level. Professional alumni indicated a 6.9% at the $500 to $999 level. For alumni who work in sales, 47.6% did not make a contribution to Butler. The null hypothesis for this variable was retained. Table 23 reflects these results.

Table 23

Crosstabulation of Occupation with Contribution Level

Contrib. Level	Occupation: clerical No.	%	homemaker No.	%	mgr. No.	%	professional No.	%	sales No.	%	other No.	%	total No.	%
$0	4	40.0	27	38.6	23	36.5	98	42.4	10	47.6	17	41.5	179	41.1
$1-$99	4	40.0	13	18.6	10	15.9	67	29.0	2	9.5	3	7.3	99	22.7
$100-$499	2	20.0	19	27.1	17	27.0	45	19.5	6	28.6	15	36.6	104	23.9
$500-$999	0	0.0	6	8.6	9	14.3	16	6.9	2	9.5	5	12.2	38	8.7
Over $1000	0	0.0	5	7.1	4	6.3	5	2.2	1	4.8	1	2.4	16	3.7
Total	10	100	70	100	63	100	231	100	21	100	41	100	436	100

Chi square = 29.40 (n.s., p = 0.0802), missing = 13, df = 20
Excluded due to nonapplicability = 44

Relationship of Major College to Contribution Category

The relationship between college of major study and donor/non-donor status was tested. With respect to donors, the three colleges with the greatest number of alumni respondents were Education, Liberal Arts and Sciences and Business Administration with percentages of 25.0%, 35.6% and 24.3%, respectively. For alumni non-donors, the Colleges of Education, Liberal Arts and Sciences plus Business Administration reflected percentages of 36.9%, 26.8% and 17.2%, respectively. This analysis yielded a significant chi-square (chi-square = 14.77, df = 6, p = 0.0221), indicating that a relationship existed between major college of study and contribution category. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences denoted the greatest number of donors, followed by the Colleges of Education and Business Administration. The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. Table 24 reports these results.

Table 24

Crosstabulation of Major College with Contribution Category

Major	Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
None	1	0.3	1	0.5	2	0.4
Religion	2	0.7	2	1.0	4	0.8
Fine Arts	8	2.8	13	6.4	21	4.3
Education	71	25.0	75	36.9	146	30.0
Liberal Arts and Sciences	101	35.6	55	26.8	156	31.9
Pharmacy	32	11.3	22	10.8	54	11.1
Business Administration	69	24.3	35	17.2	104	21.4
Total	284	100	203	100	489	100

Chi-square = 14.77 (sig., p = 0.0221), missing = 4, df = 6

Relationship of Major College to Contribution Level

The relationship between college of major study and contribution level was tested. For the respondents indicating that the College of Religion was their major college of study, 50.0% of the respondents contributed at the $1 to $99 level. For the College of Fine Arts, 23.8% of the respondents contributed at the $1 to $99 level. The $100 to $499 level reflected the highest percentages of contributions by the Colleges of Business, Liberal Arts and Sciences, and Pharmacy, 33.7%, 29.5% and 24.1%, respectively. In the over $1,000 level, 5.1% of the respondents in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences contributed at this level. The resultant chi-square was significant (chi-square = 39.86, df = 24, p = 0.0221). This indicated that a significant relationship existed between college of major study and contribution level. The Colleges of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Business and Pharmacy reflect a higher percentage of donors who contributed in higher dollar amounts than other colleges. The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. Table 25 shows these results.

Table 25
Crosstabulation of Major College with Contribution Level

Contribution Level	Major: None No.	%	Religion No.	%	Fine Arts No.	%	Education No.	%	Liberal A&S No.	%	Pharmacy No.	%	Bus. Admin. No.	%	Total No.	%
$0	1	50.0	2	50.0	13	61.9	75	51.4	55	35.3	22	40.7	35	33.7	203	41.7
$1-$99	1	50.0	2	50.0	5	23.8	42	28.8	34	21.8	11	20.4	20	19.2	115	23.6
$100-$499	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	20	13.7	46	29.5	13	24.1	31	29.8	110	22.6
$500-$999	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	9.5	6	4.1	13	8.3	6	11.1	14	13.5	41	8.4
Over $1000	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	4.8	3	2.1	8	5.1	2	3.7	4	3.8	18	3.7
Total	2	100	4	100	21	100	146	100	156	100	54	100	104	100	487	100

Chi-square = 39.86 (sig., p = 0.0221), missing = 6, df = 24

Relationship of Type of Degree to Contribution Category

The relationship between type of degree earned and contribution category was analyzed. In the donor category, 69.1% of the respondents earned a baccalaureate degree; 13.3% of the respondents earned a graduate degree, and 14.0% of the respondents earned both a baccalaureate and graduate degree. In the non-donor category, 64.6% of the respondents earned a baccalaureate degree; 22.2% of the respondents earned a graduate degree, and 12.1% of the respondents earned both a baccalaureate and graduate degree. This analysis yielded a significant chi-square (chi-square = 9.58, df = 4, p = 0.0481), indicating that a relationship existed between contribution category and degree earned. The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. A greater number of donors received a baccalaureate degree as opposed to other degree combinations. Table 26 indicates these results.

Table 26

Crosstabulation of Type of Degree with Contribution Category

Degree	Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
None	8	2.9	1	0.5	9	1.9
Associate	2	0.7	1	0.5	3	0.6
Baccalaureate	192	69.1	128	64.6	320	67.2
Graduate	37	13.3	44	22.2	81	17.0
Baccalaureate & Graduate	39	14.0	24	12.1	63	13.2
Total	278	100	198	100	476	100

Chi-square = 9.58 (sig., p = 0.0481), missing = 17, df = 4

Relationship of Type of Degree to Contribution Level

The relationship between type of degree earned and contribution level was analyzed. A chi-square was computed. It was shown to be statistically signficant (chi-square = 38.08, df = 16, p = 0.0015) that indicates for this variable the null hypothesis was rejected. The highest percentage of respondents for individuals not having earned a degree was 44.4% in the $100 to $499 contribution level category. This contribution level category also reflected the highest percentage respondent rate for donor baccalaureate recipients, 26.6%. Graduate respondents highest donor percentage of 30.9% was in the $1 to $99 contribution level. This contribution level also indicated the highest percentage respondent rate for donors having both baccalaureate and graduate degrees, 36.5%. Donors with baccalaureate degrees contributed to Butler in greater numbers and in greater dollar amounts. Table 27 reports these results.

Table 27

Crosstabulation of Type of Degree with Contribution Level

Contribution Level	Type of Degree: None No.	%	Assoc. No.	%	Bacc. No.	%	Grad. No.	%	Bacc. & Grad. No.	%	Total No.	%
$0	1	11.1	1	33.3	128	40.0	44	54.3	24	38.1	198	41.6
$1-$99	1	11.1	1	33.3	61	19.1	25	30.9	23	36.5	111	23.3
$100-$499	4	44.4	1	33.3	85	26.6	9	11.1	11	17.5	110	23.1
$500-$999	2	22.2	0	0.0	31	9.7	3	3.7	5	7.9	41	8.6
Over $1000	1	11.1	0	0.0	15	4.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	16	3.4
Total	9	100	3	100	320	100	81	100	63	100	476	100

Chi-square = 38.08 (sig., p = 0.0015), missing = 17, df = 16

Relationship of Graduation Period to Contribution Category

The relationship between period of graduation and contribution category was tested to determine if a relationship existed between these variables. Regarding graduation period, 23.7% of the alumni donor respondents graduated during the 1950-1959 time frame, and 4.5% of the alumni donor respondents graduated during the 1980-1984 time frame. Regarding non-donor respondents, 27.8% graduated during the 1970-1979 time period, and 2.4% graduated prior to 1930. These data yielded a significant chi-square (chi-square = 59.59, df = 6, p = 0.0000), indicating that a significant relationship existed between this variable and donor/non-donor status. For this variable, the null hypothesis was rejected. The majority of alumni donor respondents graduated during the 1950-1959 time period. Table 28 shows these results.

Table 28

Crosstabulation of Graduation Period with Contribution Category

	Contribution Category					
	Donors		Non-donors		Total	
Graduation Period	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Prior to 1930	35	12.2	5	2.4	40	8.1
1930-1939	49	17.1	14	6.8	63	12.8
1930-1949	36	12.5	20	9.8	56	11.4
1950-1959	68	23.7	39	19.0	107	21.7
1960-1969	51	17.8	36	17.6	87	17.7
1970-1979	35	12.2	57	27.8	92	18.7
1980-1984	13	4.5	34	16.6	47	9.6
Total	287	100	205	100	492	100

Chi-square = 59.59 (sig., p = 0.0000), missing = 1, df = 6

Relationship of Graduation Period to Contribution Level

The relationship between graduation period and level of contribution was examined. Regarding the 1950-1959 graduation period, 27.1% contributed at the $100-$499 contribution level: 18.7% contributed at the $1 to $99 contribution level, and 6.5% contributed at the over $1,000 contribution level. For the 1980-1984 graduation period, 72.3% of the alumni respondents did not contribute. For the 1970-1979 time period, 29.3% contributed at the $1 to $99 contribution level, and 62.0% did not make a contribution. The resultant chi-square was significant (chi-square = 122.27, df = 24, p = 0.0000). This indicated that a significant relationship existed between period of graduation and contribution level. The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. Older class years reflected greater numbers of donors and amounts of contribution. Table 29 reports these results.

Table 29
Crosstabulation of Graduation Period with Contribution Level

Contribution Level	Graduation Period: prior to 1930 No.	%	1930-39 No.	%	1940-49 No.	%	1950-59 No.	%	1960-69 No.	%	1970-79 No.	%	1980-84 No.	%	Total No.	%
$0	5	12.5	14	22.2	20	35.7	39	36.4	36	41.4	57	62.0	34	72.3	205	41.7
$1-$99	4	10.0	14	22.2	16	28.6	20	18.7	23	26.4	27	29.3	11	23.4	115	23.4
$100-$499	25	62.5	22	34.9	15	26.8	29	27.1	16	18.4	5	5.4	2	4.3	114	23.2
$500-$999	3	7.5	7	11.1	5	8.9	12	11.2	11	12.6	2	2.2	0	0.0	40	8.1
Over $1000	3	7.5	6	9.5	0	0.0	7	6.5	1	1.1	1	1.1	0	0.0	18	3.7
Total	40	100	63	100	56	100	107	100	87	100	92	100	47	100	492	100

Chi-square = 122.27 (sig., p = 0.0000), missing = 1, df = 24

Relationship of Fraternity or Sorority Affiliation to Contribution Category

The relationship of the variable fraternity or sorority affiliation to donor/non-donor status was tested. The resultant chi-square was significant (chi-square = 25.16, df = 1, p = 0.0000) indicating that a relationship exists between fraternity or sorority affiliation and donor/non-donor status. For donor respondents, 61.6% indicated an affiliation with a fraternity or sorority, and 38.4% were not affiliated with a fraternity or sorority. For non-donors, 62.1% were not affiliated with a fraternity or sorority. The null hypothesis was rejected for this variable. Alumni who had an affiliation with a fraternity or sorority were more likely to be donors than alumni without a greek affiliation. Table 30 indicates these results.

Table 30

Crosstabulation of Fraternity or Sorority Affiliation with Contribution Category

Fraternity or Sorority Affiliation	Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
Affiliate	173	61.6	75	37.9	248	51.8
Non-affiliate	108	38.4	123	62.1	231	48.2
Total	281	100	198	100	479	100

Chi-square = 25.16 (sig., p = 0.0000 with Yates correction), missing = 14, df = 1

Relationship of Fraternity or Sorority Affiliation to Contribution Level

The relationship between fraternity or sorority affiliation and contribution level was tested. The highest percentage for affiliates was at the $100 to $499 contribution level; 31.5% while the zero contribution level indicated 30.2%. At the $1 to $99 contribution level, affiliates represented 22.2%. For non-affiliates, 53.2% did not contribute; 24.2% contributed at the $1 to $99 level, and 1.3% contributed over $1,000 to Butler. A chi-square test was employed. The results showed a significant relationship (chi-square = 38.45, df = 4, p = 0.0000), indicating that the null hypothesis was rejected for this variable. Alumni with greek affiliations contributed at higher contribution levels than alumni non-affiliates. Table 31 reports these results.

Table 31

Crosstabulation of Fraternity or Sorority Affiliation with Contribution Level

	Fraternity or Sorority Affiliation					
	Affiliate		Non-affiliate		Total	
Contribution Level	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
$0	75	30.2	123	53.2	198	41.3
$1-$99	55	22.2	56	24.2	111	23.2
$100-$499	78	31.5	34	14.7	112	23.4
$500-$999	26	10.5	15	6.5	41	8.6
Over $1000	14	5.6	3	1.3	17	3.5
Total	248	100	231	100	479	100

Chi-square = 38.45 (sig., p = 0.0000), missing = 14, df = 4

Relationship of On Campus Students to Contribution Category

The relationship between residential students and donor/non-donor status was tested to determine if the variables of residential student status and contribution category were independent. Of the donors, 39.2% lived on campus while a student, and 60.8% of the donor respondents did not live on campus. For non-donors, 31.2% lived on campus while a student, and 68.8% of the non-donor respondents did not live on campus. The resultant chi-square was nonsignificant (chi-square = 2.90, df = 1, p = 0.0888). The null hypothesis for this variable was retained. Table 32 reflects these results.

Table 32

Crosstabulation of On-Campus Students with Contribution Category

	Contribution Category					
	Donors		Non donors		Total	
On campus	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	107	39.2	62	31.2	169	35.8
No	166	60.8	137	68.8	303	64.2
Total	273	100	199	100	472	100

Chi-square = 2.90 (n.s., p = 0.0888 with Yates correction), missing = 21, df = 1

Relationship of On Campus Students to Contribution Level

The relationship between residential (on campus) students and contribution level was tested. Of the alumni who lived on campus, 36.7% did not contribute; 24.9% contributed at the $100 to $499 contribution level, and 23.7% contributed at the $1 to $99 contribution level. For alumni who did not live on campus while a student, 45.2% did not contribute; 23.4% contributed at the $1 to $99 contribution level, and 3.3% contributed over $1,000. The chi-square test proved nonsignificant (chi-square = 5.97, df = 4, p = 0.2011), indicating an independent relationship existed between these variables. The null hypothesis for this variable was retained. Table 33 reports these results.

Table 33

Crosstabulation of On Campus Students with Contribution Level

Contribution Level	On campus students: Yes No.	Yes %	No No.	No %	Total No.	Total %
$0	62	36.7	137	45.2	199	42.2
$1-$99	40	23.7	71	23.4	111	23.5
$100-$499	42	24.9	65	21.5	107	22.7
$500-$999	20	11.8	20	6.6	40	8.5
Over $1000	5	3.0	10	3.3	15	3.2
Total	169	36.9	301	100	472	100

Chi-square = 5.97 (n.s., p = 0.2011), missing = 21, df = 4

Relationship of Commuter Student to Contribution Category

The relationship between commuter student and donor/non-donor status was tested to determine if contribution category and being a commuter student while in college were independent. Of the donor respondents, 63.9% were commuting students, and 36.1% were non-commuting students. Of the non-donor respondents. 68.2% were commuters, and 31.8% were non-commuting students. The resultant chi-square was nonsignificant (chi-square = 0.75, df = 1, p = 0.3836). The null hypothesis for this variable was retained. Table 34 reflects these results.

Table 34

Crosstabulation of Commuter Student with Contribution Category

Commuter Student	Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
Commuter	177	63.9	135	68.2	312	65.7
Non-Commuter	100	36.1	63	31.8	183	34.3
Total	277	100	198	100	475	100

Chi-square = 0.75 (n.s., p = 0.3836 with Yates correction), missing = 18, df = 1

Relationship of Commuter Student to Contribution Level

The relationship between commuter student (off campus) and contribution level was tested. For alumni who were commuter students while at Butler, 43.3% did not contribute; 23.4% contributed at the $100 to $499 contribution level, and 3.8% contributed over $1,000. For non-commuter students, 38.7% did not contribute, and 23.3% contributed at both the $1 to $99 and $100 to $499 contribution levels. The chi-square results (chi-square = 3.40, df = 4, p = 0.4938) indicated that no relationship existed between the variables tested. The null hypothesis was retained. Table 35 reports these results.

Table 35

Crosstabulation of Commuter Students with Contribution Level

Contribution Level	Commuter Students: Commuter No.	%	Non-Commuter No.	%	Total No.	%
$0	135	43.3	63	38.7	198	41.7
$1-$99	73	23.4	38	23.3	111	23.4
$100-$499	70	22.4	38	23.3	108	22.7
$500-$999	22	7.1	19	11.7	41	8.6
Over $1000	12	3.8	5	3.1	17	3.6
Total	312	100	163	100	475	100

Chi-square = 3.40 (n.s., p = 0.4938), missing = 18, df = 4

Relationship of Financial Aid Recipients to Contribution Category

The relationship between financial aid recipients and contribution category was tested. The recipient respondents comprised 31.5% of the donor category, and non-recipients totaled 68.5% of the donor category. In the non-donor category, 34.7% of the non-donors received financial assistance while at Butler, and 65.3% of the non-donors did not receive financial assistance while at Butler. The chi-square test indicated that a relationship between variables did not exist (chi-square = .38, df = 1, p = 0.5353). The null hypothesis was retained. Table 36 shows these results.

Table 36

Crosstabulation of Financial Aid Recipients with Contribution Category

	Contribution Category					
	Donors		Non-donors		Total	
Financial Aid Recipient	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Recipient	88	31.5	69	34.7	157	32.8
Non-recipient	191	68.5	130	65.3	321	67.2
Total	279	100	199	100	478	100

Chi-square = 0.38 (n.s., p = 0.5353 with Yates correction), missing = 15, df = 1

Relationship of Financial Aid Recipient to Contribution Level

The relationship between contribution level and receipt of financial aid while a student at Butler was tested. A chi-square test was performed. The results (chi-square = 4.06, df = 4, p = 0.3984) reflect that a relationship did not exist between the variables tested. The null hypothesis was retained. For alumni who received financial aid while a student, 43.9% did not contribute; 21.7% contributed at the $100 to $499 contribution level, and 3.2% contributed over $1,000. For non-recipients, 40.5% did not make a contribution to Butler, and 3.4% contributed over $1,000. Table 37 reflects these results.

Table 37

Crosstabulation of Financial Aid Recipients with Contribution Level

	Financial Aid Recipients					
	Recipient		Non-recipient		Total	
Contribution Level	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
$0	69	43.9	130	40.5	199	41.6
$1-$99	31	19.7	80	24.9	111	23.2
$100-$499	34	21.7	77	24.0	111	23.2
$500-$999	18	11.5	23	7.2	41	8.6
Over $1000	5	3.2	11	3.4	16	3.3
Total	157	100	321	100	478	100

Chi-square = 4.06 (n.s., p = 0.3984), missing = 15, df = 4

Relationship of Job Placement to Contribution Category

The relationship between job placement and contribution category was analyzed. In donor category, 7.9% of the respondents were individuals who received a job through the efforts of the University Career Planning and Placement Center. A percentage of 92.1% was reflected by donors who did not receive job placement assistance through the University Career Planning and Placement Center. In the non-donor category, 11.1% of the respondents received job placement through Butler, and 88.9% of the respondents did not receive job placement through Butler's Career Planning and Placement Center. A chi-square test was performed and the results (chi-square = 0.99, df = 1, p = 0.3192) reflect that a relationship does not exist between variables. Therefore, the null hypothesis for this variable was retained. Table 38 shows these results.

Table 38

Crosstabulation of Job Placement with Contribution Category

Job Placement	Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
Through Butler	22	7.9	22	11.1	44	9.2
Not through Butler	255	92.1	177	88.9	432	90.8
Total	277	100	199	100	476	100

Chi-square = 0.99 (n.s., p = 0.3192 with Yates correction), missing = 17, df = 1

Relationship of Job Placement to Contribution Level

The relationship between whether an individual received job placement through the University Career Planning and Placement Center and contribution level was tested. Of the respondents who received job placement through Butler, 25.0% of the respondents contributed at the $1 to $99 contribution level; 11.4% of the respondents contributed at the $500 to $999 contribution level, and 2.3% contributed at the over $1,000 contribution level. Of the respondents who did not receive job placement through Butler, 23.1 % contributed at the $1 to $99 contribution level; 8.3% contributed at the $500 to $999 contribution level, and 3.7% of the respondents contributed at the over $1,000 level. The null hypothesis for this variable was retained. This result was based on a chi-square test (chi-square = 4.23, df = 4, p = 0.3754), indicating no relationship existed between the variables analyzed. Table 39 shows these results.

Table 39

Crosstabulation of Job Placement with Contribution Level

Contribution Level	Job Placement: Through Butler No.	%	Not through Butler No.	%	Total No.	%
$0	22	50.0	177	41.0	199	41.8
$1-$99	11	25.0	100	23.1	111	23.3
$100-$499	5	11.4	103	23.8	108	22.7
$500-$999	5	11.4	36	8.3	41	8.6
Over $1000	1	2.3	16	3.7	17	3.6
Total	44	100	432	100	476	100

Chi-square = 4.23 (n.s., p = 0.3754), missing = 17, df = 4

Relationship of Number of Student Activities to Contribution Category

The relationship between involvement in student activities and donor/non-donor status was tested. Of the alumni donor respondents, 43.1% participated in two to four activities while a student. Donor respondents participating in five or more activities represented 18.4% of the donor sample surveyed. Of the non-donor respondents, 36.6% participated in no student activities, and 29.8% participated in two to four student activities. The resultant chi-square was significant (chi-square = 16.33, df = 3, p = 0.0010). This indicated that a significant relationship existed between this variable and donor/non-donor status. The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. The majority of donor respondents participated in two to four activities while a student at Butler. Table 40 indicates these results.

Table 40

Crosstabulation of Number of Student Activities with Contribution Category

Number of Student Activities	Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
Zero	62	21.5	75	36.6	137	27.8
One	49	17.0	38	18.5	87	17.6
Two to four	124	43.1	61	29.8	185	37.5
Five or more	53	18.4	31	15.1	84	17.0
Total	288	100	205	100	493	100

Chi-square = 16.33 (sig., p = 0.0010), missing = 0, df = 3

Relationship of Number of Student Activities to Contribution Level

The relationship between involvement in student activities and contribution level was tested. In the zero contribution level, 54.7% of the respondents participated in zero activities. For alumni who participated in two to four student activities, 32.4% contributed at the $100 to $499 contribution level, and 4.9% contributed over $1,000. Alumni who participated in five or more activities reflected 25.0% in the $1 to $99 contribution level and 21.4% in the $100 to $499 contribution level. Alumni who did not participate in any student activity did not make any contribution over $1,000. This analysis yielded a significant chi-square (chi-square = 38.56, df = 12, p = 0.0001). The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. Table 41 reports these results.

Table 41

Crosstabulation of Number of Student Activities with Contribution Level

Contribution Level	Number of Student Activities: zero		one		two-four		five or more		total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
$0	75	54.7	38	43.7	61	33.0	31	36.9	205	41.6
$1-$99	38	27.7	21	24.1	35	18.9	21	25.0	115	23.3
$100-$499	20	14.6	16	18.4	60	32.4	18	21.4	114	23.1
$500-$999	4	2.9	8	9.2	20	10.8	9	10.7	41	8.3
Over $1000	0	0.0	4	4.6	9	4.9	5	5.9	18	3.7
Total	137	100	87	100	185	100	84	100	493	100

Chi-square = 38.56 (sig., p = 0.0001), missing = 0, df = 12

Relationship of Number of Alumni Activities to Contribution Category

The relationship between involvement in alumni activities and contribution category was analyzed. The respondents who participated in zero activities comprised 37.2% of the donor and 64.4% of the non-donor categories. The respondents who participated in one to three activities represented 46.9% of the donor and 34.1% of the non-donor respondents. The respondents who participated in four or more activities represented 16.0% and 1.5% of the donor and non-donor categories. A significant chi-square was obtained (chi-square = 48.36, df = 2, p = 0.0000), reflecting a significant relationship existed between donor/non-donor status and this variable. This variable was rejected in relationship to the null hypothesis tested. The results indicated that the majority of donors participated in one to three activities while the majority of non-donors did not participate in any activity. Table 42 shows these results.

Table 42

Crosstabulation of Number of Alumni Activities with Contribution Category

Number of Activities	Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
0	107	37.2	132	64.4	239	48.5
1 to 3	135	46.9	70	34.1	205	41.6
4 or more	46	16.0	3	1.4	49	9.9
Total	288	100	205	100	493	100

Chi-square = 48.36 (sig., p = 0.0000), missing = 0, df = 2

Relationship of Number of Alumni Activities to Contribution Level

The relationship between contribution level and involvement in alumni activities was tested. Of alumni who participated in zero activities, 55.2% did not make a contribution, and 25.9% contributed at the $1 to $99 contribution level. Alumni who participated in one to three activities indicated 29.8% at the $100 to $499 contribution level and 23.9% at the $1 to $99 contribution level. For four or more activities at the $1,000 contribution level, 10.2% of alumni donors responded. A chi-square test was performed. The results (chi-square = 101.04, df = 8, p = 0.0000) indicated that a significant relationship existed between number of alumni activities and contribution level. The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. The results indicated that alumni who participated in at least one activity contributed in greater amounts than alumni who did not participate. Table 43 shows these results.

Table 43

Crosstabulation of Number of Alumni Activities with Contribution Level

Contribution Level	Number of Activities: None No.	%	1 - 3 No.	%	4 or more No.	%	Total No.	%
$0	132	55.2	70	34.1	3	6.1	205	41.6
$1-$99	62	25.9	49	23.9	4	8.2	115	23.3
$100-$499	31	13.0	61	29.8	22	44.9	114	23.1
$500-$999	9	3.8	17	8.3	15	30.6	41	8.3
Over $1000	5	2.1	8	3.9	5	10.2	18	3.7
Total	239	100	205	100	49	100	493	100

Chi-square = 101.04 (sig., p = 0.0000), missing = 0, df = 8

Relationship of Spouse's Education to Contribution Category

The chi-square statistic was used to test the relationship between whether spouse attended college and donor/non-donor status. Of the respondents in the non-donor category, 77.3% had spouses who attended college, and 22.7% had spouses who did not attend college. In the donor category, 84.0% had spouses who attended college, and 16.0% had spouses who did not attend college. A nonsignificant chi-square was obtained (chi-square = 2.48, df = 1, p = 0.1154), indicating that this variable was independent with donor/non-donor status. The null hypothesis for this variable was retained. Table 44 reports these results.

Table 44

Crosstabulation of Spouse's Education with Contribution Category

Spouse's Education	Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
College	204	84.0	133	77.3	337	81.2
No college	39	16.0	39	22.7	78	18.8
Total	243	100	172	100	415	100

Chi-square = 2.48 (n.s., p = 0.1154 with Yates correction), missing = 3, df = 1
Excluded due to nonapplicability = 75

Relationship of Spouse's Education to Contribution Level

The relationship between contribution level and whether spouse attended college was tested. For spouses who attended college, 39.5% did not contribute; 24.0% contributed at the $100 to $499 contribution level, and 5.0% contributed over $1,000. For alumni spouses who did not attend college, 50.0% did not contribute; 24.4% contributed at the $1 to $99 contribution level, and 1.3% contributed over $1,000. This analysis yielded a nonsignificant chi-square (chi-square = 5.79, df = 4, p = 0.2156). Thus no relationship existed for these variables and the null hypothesis was retained. Table 45 shows these results.

Table 45

Crosstabulation of Spouse's Education with Contribution Level

Contribution Level	Spouses Education: College No.	College %	No College No.	No College %	Total No.	Total %
$0	133	39.5	39	50.0	172	41.4
$1-$99	73	21.7	19	24.4	92	22.2
$100-$499	81	24.0	14	17.9	95	22.9
$500-$999	33	9.8	5	6.4	38	9.2
Over $1000	17	5.0	1	1.3	18	4.3
Total	337	100	78	100	415	100

Chi-square = 5.79 (n.s., p = 0.2156), missing = 3, df = 4
Excluded due to nonapplicability = 75

Relationship of Spouse's College to Contribution Category

The relationship between donor/non-donor status and whether spouse attended Butler University was tested. Of the spouses who attended Butler University, 36.2% were spouses of donors. For spouses who did not attend Butler University, 63.8% were spouses of donors. Of the respondent spouses who did not attend Butler University, 76.2% were married to non-donor alumni. This analysis yielded a significant chi-square (chi-square = 6.64, df = 1, p = 0.0100) indicating that a relationship existed between this variable and donor/non-donor status. The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. The majority of respondent spouses who attended Butler University were spouses of donors that graduated from Butler. Table 46 reflects these results.

Table 46

Crosstabulation of Spouse's College with Contribution Category

Spouse's College	Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
Butler	88	36.2	41	23.8	129	31.1
Not Butler	155	63.8	131	76.2	286	68.9
Total	243	100	172	100	415	100

Chi-square = 6.64 (sig., p = 0.0100 with Yates correction), missing = 3, df = 1
Excluded due to nonapplicability = 75

Relationship of Spouse's College to Contribution Level

The relationship between whether spouse attended Butler University and contribution level was tested. In the zero contribution level, 31.8% of the spouses who attended Butler University were married to alumni who did not made a contribution. In the $100 to $499 contribution level, 31.8% of the spouses who attended Butler University were married to alumni that contributed at that level. Of the spouses who did not attend Butler University, 24.5% of the spouses were married to alumni that contributed at the level of $1 to $99, and 45.8% of the spouses were married to non-donor alumni. This analysis yielded a significant chi-square (chi-square = 19.28, df = 4, p = 0.0007). The null hypothesis was rejected. Table 47 reports these results.

Table 47

Crosstabulation of Spouse's College with Contribution Level

Contribution Level	Spouse's College: Butler No.	Butler %	Not Butler No.	Not Butler %	Total No.	Total %
$0	41	31.8	131	45.8	172	41.4
$1-$99	22	17.1	70	24.5	92	22.2
$100-$499	41	31.8	54	18.9	95	22.9
$500-$999	19	14.7	19	6.6	38	9.2
Over $1000	6	4.7	12	4.2	18	4.3
Total	129	100	286	100	415	100

Chi-square = 19.28 (sig., p = 0.0007), missing = 3, df = 4
Excluded due to nonapplicability = 75

Relationship of Spouse's Contribution Category to Alumni Contribution Category

The relationship between contribution category of married alumni and spouses was tested. Of the alumni donors, 89.4% had spouses who were donors, and 30.6% had spouses who were non-donors. Of the alumni non-donors, 49.1% had spouses who were donors, and 50.9% had spouses who were non-donors. This analysis reflected a chi-square that was significant (chi-square = 14.90, df = 1, p = 0.0001). Thus a significant relationship existed between donor/non-donor status and this variable. The majority of alumni donors had spouses who were also donors. The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. Table 48 shows these results.

Table 48

Crosstabulation of Spouse's Contribution Category with Alumni Contribution Category

Spouse's Contribution Category	Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
Donor	143	69.4	80	49.1	223	60.4
Non-donor	63	30.6	83	50.9	146	39.6
Total	206	100	163	100	369	100

Chi-square = 14.90 (sig., p = 0.0001 with Yates correction) missing = 38, df = 1
Excluded due to nonapplicability = 86

Relationship of Spouse's Contribution Category to Alumni Contribution Level

A chi-square statistic was employed to test the relationship between alumni contribution level and contribution category of spouses. Of the spouse donors 42.9% were married to non-donor alumni, 28.6% were married to alumni in the $1 to $99 contribution level, and 4.8% were married to alumni in the over $1,000 contribution level. Of the spouse non-donors, 68.6% were married to alumni non-donors; 14.9% were married to alumni at the $1 to $99 contribution level, and 5.0% were married to alumni at the over $1,000 level. A chi-square test was performed that showed a relationship existed between the variables tested (chi-square = 19.88, df = 4, p = 0.0005). The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. The majority of spouse non-donors were married to alumni non-donors. Table 49 reports these results.

Table 49

Crosstabulation of Spouse's Contribution Category with Alumni Contribution Level

Alumni Contribution Level	Spouse's Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
$0	63	42.9	83	68.6	146	54.5
$1-$99	42	28.6	18	14.9	60	22.4
$100-$499	33	22.4	12	9.9	45	16.8
$500-$999	2	1.4	2	1.7	4	1.5
Over $1000	7	4.8	6	5.0	13	4.9
Total	147	100	121	100	268	100

Chi-square = 19.88 (sig., p = 0.0005), missing = 139, df = 4
Excluded due to nonapplicability = 86

Relationship of Spouse's Contribution Level to Alumni Contribution Category

The relationship between spouses contribution level and alumni contribution category was tested. For alumni who made a contribution to Butler, 35.9% of their spouses did not make a contribution; 28.7% of their spouses contributed at the $1 to $99 level, and 4.0% of their spouses contributed at the over $1,000 level. For alumni non-donors, 56.8% of their spouses did not contribute, and 2.7% of their spouses contributed at the over $1,000 level. A chi-square test was performed that resulted in a significant chi-square (chi-square = 18.20, df = 4, p = 0.0011). The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. Alumni donors had spouses who made larger contributions than alumni non-donor spouses. Table 50 reflects these results.

Table 50

Crosstabulation of Spouse's Contribution Level with Alumni Contribution Category

Spouse's Contribution Level	Contribution Category: Donors No.	Donors %	Non-donors No.	Non-donors %	Total No.	Total %
$0	80	35.9	83	56.8	163	44.2
$1-$99	64	28.7	28	19.2	92	24.9
$100-$499	56	25.1	20	13.7	76	20.6
$500-$999	14	6.3	11	7.5	25	6.8
Over $1000	9	4.0	4	2.7	13	3.5
Total	223	100	146	100	369	100

Chi-square = 18.20 (sig., p = 0.0011), missing = 35, df = 4
Excluded due to nonapplicability = 86

Relationship of Spouse's Contribution Level to Alumni Contribution Level

The relationship between spouse's contribution level with alumni contribution level was tested. Of alumni donors who contributed in the $1 to $99 level, 13.3% of their spouses made the same size of contribution. For alumni respondents contributing at the over $1,000 level, 30.8% of their spouses made the same size of contribution. A chi-square test was performed (chi-square = 64.65, df = 16, p = 0.0000) that indicated a significant relationship existed between the variables tested. The null hypothesis for this variable was rejected. In many instances, the spouse contribution level paralleled the alumni contribution level. Table 51 reports these results.

Table 51

Crosstabulation of Spouse's Contribution with Alumni Contribution Level

Alumni Contribution Level	Spouse's Contribution Level: $0 No.	%	$1-$99 No.	%	$100-$499 No.	%	$500-$999 No.	%	over $1000 No.	%	Total No.	%
$0	83	56.8	18	30.0	12	26.7	2	50.0	6	46.2	121	45.1
$1-$99	28	19.2	26	43.3	7	15.6	0	0.0	1	7.7	62	23.1
$100-$499	20	13.7	11	18.3	18	40.0	1	25.0	2	15.4	52	19.4
$500-$999	11	7.5	3	5.0	6	13.3	1	25.0	0	0.0	21	7.8
Over $1000	4	2.7	2	3.3	2	4.4	0	0.0	4	30.8	12	4.5
Total	148	100	60	100	45	100	4	100	13	100	268	100

Chi-square = 64.65 (sig., p = 0.0000), missing = 139, df = 16
Excluded due to nonapplicability = 86

Table 52

Characteristics in Which Statistically Significant Differences Were Found Between Donors and Non-Donors to the Butler University Annual Fund While Testing The First Category of Null Hypotheses

Characteristic	Sig.	Non-Sig.	Major Findings Donors
Sex		X	
Age	X		Older
Marital Status		X	
Parenthood		X	
Number of Children	X		Two children
Children's Age Range	X		Children over 18
Distance Lived from Butler	X		25 miles or less
Employment Status		X	
Major College of Study	X		LAS
Type of Degree Earned	X		Baccalaureate
Graduation Period	X		Majority (1950-1959)
Fraternity or Sorority Affiliation	X		Majority (affiliates)
Commuter or Residential Student		X	
Receipt of Institutional Scholarship or Grant		X	
University Job Placement		X	
Involvement in Student Activities	X		Majority (2-4 activities)
Involvement in Alumni Activities	X		Majority (1-3 activities)
Whether Spouse Attended College		X	
Whether Spouse Contributed to Butler	X		Majority (if alumni donor)

Table 53

Characteristics in Which Statistically Significant Differences Were Found Between Donors at Various Contribution Levels to the Butler University Annual Fund While Testing the Second Category of Null Hypotheses

Characteristic	Sig.	Non-sig.	Major Findings - Donors (Greater $ Amounts)
Sex	X		Males
Age	X		Older
Marital Status		X	
Parenthood		X	
Number of Children	X		Two children
Children's Age Range	X		Over 18 range
Distance lived from Butler		X	
Employment Status		X	
Major College of Study	X		LAS
Type of Degree Earned	X		Baccalaureate
Graduation Period	X		1950-1959
Fraternity or Sorority Affiliation	X		Affiliates
Commuter or Residential Student		X	
Receipt of Insitutional Scholarship or Grant		X	
University Job Placement		X	
Involvement in Student Activities	X		2-4 activities
Involvement in Alumni Activities	X		1-3 activities
Whether Spouse Attended College		X	
Whether Spouse Contributed to Butler	X		Greater alumni $

Table 54
Alumni Participation in Alumni Activities

Participation in Alumni Activities	Donors and Non-Donors Who Agreed*			
	Donors	%	Non Donors	%
Alumni Butler Club Activities	58	20.1	1	.1
Homecoming	108	37.5	42	20.5
College or Department Activities	27	9.4	5	2.4
Athletic Events	74	25.7	33	16.0
Continuing Education Courses	32	11.1	22	10.7
Travel Programs	15	5.2	1	.1
Fund Raising Activities	63	21.9	8	3.9
Career Day Programs	23	8.0	0	0
Special Alumni Events	38	13.2	5	2.4
Other	14	4.9	15	7.3
None	108	37.5	129	62.9

Table 55
Participation in Student Activities
When Alumni Were Students

Participation in Student Activities	Donors and Non-Donors Who Agreed*			
	Donors	%	Non Donors	%
Student Government	44	15.3	13	6.3
Residence Hall Association	18	6.3	9	4.3
Varsity Athletics or Intramural Athletics	71	24.7	42	20.5
Theatre	7	2.4	5	2.4
Dance	13	4.5	6	2.9
Musical Performing Groups	18	6.3	21	10.2
Greek Social Organization	155	53.8	67	32.7
Student Publications	37	12.8	15	7.3
College Nights	18	6.3	11	5.4
Spring Sing	72	25.0	32	15.6
Geneva Stunts	107	37.2	39	19.0
Honorary Organizations	105	36.5	54	26.3
Others	21	7.3	7	3.4
None	64	22.2	86	41.9

* Based on a total of 288 donors and 205 non-donors: percentages total more than 100% because respondents chose more than one item.

Summary

The data analyzed in this chapter were obtained through a statistical treatment of the questionnaire sent to alumni donors and non-donors at Butler University. The purpose of the instrument was to determine if relationships existed between the characteristics of alumni donors and non-donors and among donors at various contribution levels. The Annual Fund time frame utilized in this study was June 1, 1983, to May 31, 1984.

Two categories of null hypotheses were developed to assess the differential impact on giving based on demographic variables. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Crosstabs Program was employed to compute the chi-square statistic for analysis of data acquired.

Table 52 reports categories in which statistically significant differences between alumni donors and non-donors were found while testing the first category of hypotheses. Table 53 reports characteristics in which alumni donors significantly differed at various donor contribution levels while testing the second category of hypotheses. Tables 54 and 55 indicate the total responses by alumni according to participation in both alumni activities and activity participation while a student.

There were two categories of null hypotheses tested in this study. As a result of statistical analysis the data suggested that 11 demographic characteristics were shown to evoke significant differences between both alumni donors and non-donors. Eleven demographic characteristics were shown to evoke significant differences among alumni donors in various contribution levels. These characteristics were age, number of children, children's age range, distance lived from Butler, major college of study, type of degree earned, graduation

period, fraternity or sorority affiliation, involvement in student activities, involvement in alumni activities and whether spouse contributed to Butler University. In addition, significant characteristics obtained with respect to contribution level were the same as between alumni donors and non-donors but also included the characteristics of sex and type of degree earned.

In contrast, the demographic characteristics that were shown not to evoke significant differences between alumni donors and non-donors and among alumni donors in various contribution levels were marital status, parenthood, distance lived from Butler, employment status, commuter or residential student, receipt of institutional scholarship or grant, university job placement, and whether spouse attended college.

The purpose of this chapter was to present the results of the statistical test described in Chapter III. The central research questions were answered using chi-square procedures. The following chapter summarizes, analyzes and interprets the research findings presented in this chapter.

CHAPTER V

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Chapter Five is a summary analysis of the data obtained in Chapter Four and provides conclusions from study results and recommends action for future steps to be taken in this developing area of research. The first section is a review of the purpose of the study including central research questions and a discussion of the variables utilized in the study. The second section is an examination of each variable in terms of its relationships with other variables, a comparison of the literature to the results of the study, and conclusions and recommendations for possible future research activity.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of the study was an attempt to obtain predictive data on variables to be used by fund raisers at Butler University, specifically, and similar institutions, generally, as attempts are made to focus alumni fund raising programs. To accomplish this purpose relationships were investigated between selected characteristics of Butler University alumni donors and non-donors to the Butler University Annual Fund. Additional characteristics among alumni donors in various contribution level categories were also analyzed.

The demographic characteristics tested were sex, distance lived from Butler University, age, type of degree earned, graduation period, major college of study, commuter or residential student status, involvement in student activities, involvement in alumni activities, marital status, whether spouse attended college, whether spouse contributed to Butler University, receipt of institutional

scholarship or grant, obtainment of a job through the University's Career Planning and Placement Center, fraternity or sorority affiliation, whether alumnus is a parent, number of children, age range of children and employment status.

Results of Chi-Square Tests

Nonsignificant Variables

Chi-square analyses were applied to demographic variables on an individual basis to ascertain if differences existed between donors and non-donors. For donor non-donor comparisons, the results indicated that no significant differences existed based on the demographic characteristics of sex, commuter student status, residential student status, marital status, whether spouse attended college, receipt of institutional scholarship or grant, placement through the University's Career Planning and Placement Center, whether alumnus has children, status of employment, retirement status and occupation.

For the high donor and low donor comparisons, no significant differences existed among alumni based on the demographic characteristics of distance lived from campus, commuter student status, residential student status, marital status, whether spouse attended college, receipt of institutional scholarship or grant, placement through the University's Career Planning and Placement Center, whether alumnus has children, status of employment and occupation.

Independent Variables

Significant Variables

Each variable in this section is discussed with respect to the significant differences obtained as a result of chi-square analysis. The results obtained in this study are compared to other research findings generated in earlier studies where available. The following demographic characteristics reflect the primary focus areas for future alumni fund raising strategies and emphases.

Sex

The relationship between sex and contribution level was analyzed, and a statistically significant result was obtained. The analysis showed that males contributed larger amounts of money than females. This outcome corresponded to Anderson's (1981) conclusion. The majority of male donors contributed at the $100 to $499 contribution level while the majority of females contributed at the $1 to $99 contribution level.

Age

The demographic characteristic of age was deemed significant, with respect to not only contribution category but also contribution level. These findings corresponded with the studies of Broms and Davis (1966), McKee (1974) and Blakely (1975). The majority of donor respondents were age 60 or older, and this age group also made more $1,000 and over contributions than any other age group.

Number of Children

The relationship between number of children and donor/non-donor status and contribution level was tested. In both cases, a significant result was obtained. The results showed that the majority of alumni donors had two children, and alumni with two children contributed more than any other alumni with children combination at the $100 to $999 level.

Children's Age Range

This demographic characteristic, children's age range, was tested with both contribution category and contribution level, and in both cases the test outcome proved significant. The majority of alumni donors had children over 18 years of age. Alumni donors who had children in this age range made greater contributions than any other age range at the $1 to over $1,000 level.

Major College of Study

A demographic characteristic that was proven significant by the chi-square analysis was college of major study when tested with contribution category and contribution level. This finding related positively to Caruther's (1973) and Keller's (1982) results. Graduates from the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Business Administration and Education donated in greater numbers. Graduates from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences contributed in greater numbers at the $1,000 and over level.

Type of Degree Earned

The demographic characteristic of type of degree earned was proven significant with respect to contribution category and contribution level. The majority of alumni donors had a baccalaureate degree. Alumni with this degree contributed in greater numbers from $1 to the over $1,000 level.

Graduation Period

With respect to period of graduation, the results showed that the majority of alumni donors graduated during the 1950-1959 period. Also, graduates during this decade contributed more frequently at the $100 to over $1,000 level.

Distance Lived From Butler

The results indicated that the majority of donors lived either 25 miles or less or over 200 miles from campus. This finding related positively to Caruther's (1973) and Boeler's (1982) results.

Fraternity or Sorority Affiliation

The relationships between fraternity or sorority affiliation and contribution category and contribution level were tested. A significant statistical result showed that alumni with greek affiliations contributed in greater numbers than non-affiliates. Affiliates with fraternities and sororities contributed more frequently at the $100 to over $1,000 contribution level.

Involvement in Student Activities

The demographic characteristic of involvement in student activities was shown to be significant when tested with both contribution category and level. This finding agreed with Broms and Davis (1966), Blakely (1975), Gardner (1975), and Keller (1982). The majority of alumni donors participated in two to four activities while a student at Butler. Donors that participated in two to four activities also contributed more frequently at the $100 to over $1,000 level.

Involvement in Alumni Activities

An analysis of involvement in alumni activities showed that a significant difference existed between alumni who contribute and those who do not contribute. Also a significant result was obtained for contribution level. Broms and Davis (1966), Caruthers (1973), Blakely (1975), Gardner (1975), McNulty (1976) and Keller (1982) obtained the same result in their related studies regarding alumni donors. The majority of alumni donors participated in one to three activities. Alumni that participated in one to three activities also contributed more frequently at the $100 to over $1,000 level.

Whether Spouse Contributed to Butler

A test was performed to see if a relationship existed between the demographic characteristic of whether spouse contributed to Butler and contribution category and level. A chi-square test was performed that showed

a relationship between the variables tested. The results suggest that alumni donors have spouses who also contribute in greater amounts to Butler if they are graduates of Butler.

Conclusion

This study is entitled an Analysis of the Characteristics of Alumni Donors and Non-Donors at Butler University. Based on the premise that colleges and universities need increased financial support from alumni, demographic characteristics of Butler graduates were tested to ascertain if significant differences existed between alumni donors and non-donors. With the acquisition of additional information, it is suggested that greater fund raising success could occur by targeting future solicitation appeals towards those alumni who possess favorable demographic characteristics for giving.

There were two major categories of null hypotheses tested in the study. The categories of null hypotheses tested stated that no significant differences exist between alumni who donate, those who do not donate and those who donate at various contribution levels to Butler University based on selected characteristics. Using the chi-square statistic, the independent variables proven significant were sex, age, number of children, children's age range, major college of study, type of degree earned, graduation period, distance lived from Butler, fraternity or sorority affiliation, involvement in student activities, involvement in alumni activities and whether spouse contributed to Butler.

The results of this study provide information that could be used by fund raisers across the country as they focus their alumni fund raising activities.

For the information generated by this study to be utilized in an effective manner, Butler University must develop innovative student and alumni programs that involve greater numbers of participants.

Recommended Program Initiatives

1. Development of Alumni Programs - Programs directed toward alumni must be created that will allow Butler graduates the opportunity to participate in Butler activities. Programs should take various forms and utilize the resources of the University. Also, current programs must be marketed more effectively and targeted to specific alumni segments, including recent Butler graduates.

2. Establishment of Indianapolis and National Alumni Club Network - By establishing an alumni club in Indianapolis, Indiana, and nationally where there are large concentrations of alumni, graduates living both near and far away from campus will be able to participate in programs sponsored by the alumni association. These programs must be determined by volunteer leadership in each specific location. Programs must be varied in scope and be social, educational, informational and stimulating.

3. Program Emphasis Towards Older Graduates - Attention must be immediately given to Butler alumni who graduated during the 1950–1959 graduation period or older in age. Suggested programs include weekend colleges, workshops, continuing education programs, tours of campus and monthly luncheons with guest speakers, preferably retired faculty. A committee of older alumni should be formed to plan strategies for implementation.

4. Cultivation of Professional Groups - Attention must be given to Butler graduates who are doctors, dentists, lawyers and pharmacists. Programs under consideration should include continuing education seminars, workshops and other activities geared toward these professional market segments.

5. Fraternity and Sorority Record System - Efforts must be made to immediately identify Butler alumni who have fraternity or sorority linkages and input this data into Butler's record system. After this project is completed, a committee of alumni with fraternity and sorority affiliations should be formed to determine future programming directed toward these groups.

6. Development of Student Programs - Student programs must be initiated to provide the opportunity for involvement in various activities sponsored by the alumni association. By participating in alumni sponsored programs, it is hoped that students will support Butler following graduation. Programs for joint participation should involve residential, commuter, full and part time students. Programs must be designed to enhance awareness and promote broad-based support.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the findings of this investigation, recommendations for further research are as follows:

1. A replication of the study should be held at similar institutions, adding variables that show promise of being related to alumni philanthropy.

2. A replication of the study should be initiated at similar institutions using donors who contribute at the same level of giving over a period of years.

3. Research should be conducted at Butler University using alumni donors and non-donors willing to grant in-depth interviews concerning their decision to donate or not to donate.

4. An exact replication of this study should be initiated at Butler in five years for comparative analysis purposes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Alumni Council. Annual Giving and Alumni Support, 1960-61. Washington, 1962.

Anderson, Gerald Leonard. Self-esteem and altruism perceived as motivational factors for alumni giving, and their relationships to various donor characteristics (Ed. D. Dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1981).

Andrews, F. Emerson. Corporation Giving. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1952.

Andrews, F. Emerson. Philanthropic Giving. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1950.

Arnett, Trevor. Recent trends in higher education in the United States. General Education Board Occasional Paper, No. 13. New York: 1940, 27-28.

Ashcrott's. The English Poor Law System. London: Knight and Company, 1902.

Beeler, Karl Joseph. A study of predictors of alumni philanthropy in private universities (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1982).

Bell, Daniel. The corporation and society in the 1970's. Public Interest. Summer, 1971, 5-32.

Best, John W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.

Blackwell, Thomas E. College and University Administration. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1968.

Blakely, B. E. Alumni administration at state colleges and universities: An analysis of current perspectives and practices in alumni administration: The results of a national survey. U. S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 175308, 1979.

Blakely, B. E. Historical and Contemporaneous Predictors of Alumni Involvement. (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 35, 7400A. (University Microfilms No. 75-10, 847).

Brakeley, George A. Higher education endowments: Their past and future from the point of view of fund raising methods. Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 1934, 20, 62-78.

Bremner, Robert. American Philanthropy. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1960.

Bremner, Robert. Private Philanthropy and Public Needs: A Historical Perspective. A Report to the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs, 1975.

Broms, Peter A. and Davis, Kenneth L. "A Study of the Characteristics of Consistent Alumni Givers and Non-givers," Masters thesis, University of Colorado, 1966.

Brubacher, John S. & Rudy, Willis. Higher Education in Transition. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958.

Burns, Gerald P. Administrators in Higher Education. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Canby. Alma Mater, the Gothic Age of the American College. New York: Harper, 1936.

Carnegie Council's Final Report. Chronicle of Higher Education. January 28, 1980, 9.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education: A Summary of Reports and Recommendations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Carp, A. & Roelfs, P. Adult learning interests and experiences. In K. P. Cross, J. R. Valley and Associates, Planning Non-Traditional Programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Caruthers, Flora Ann Spencer. A study of certain characteristics of alumni who provide financial support and alumni who provide no financial support for their alma mater. (Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1973).

(CFAE) Council for Financial Aid to Education Annual Report, 1979-80. New York, 1980, 4.

Chambers, M. M. Financing Higher Education. Washington: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963.

Cheit, Earl F. & Lobman, Theodore. Private Philanthropy and Higher Education: History, Current Impact and Public Policy Considerations. A Report to the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs, New York, 1975.

Cheit, Earl F. The New Depression in Higher Education-A Study of Financial Conditions at 41 Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Chewning, Paul B. What's on their minds: studies on what alumni donors think. Case Currents, 1985, 11, 7.

Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs. Guide to Sponsored Research of the Committee on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs. CPPPN, 1975, 51.

Committee on the Role of Education in American History. Fund for the Advancement of Education. New York, 1965.

Council for Financial Aid to Education. Guide Lines to Voluntary Support of American Higher Education, Supplemental Report, No. 2. New York, 1963, 23.

Council for the Advancement of Education, Survey Report. CFAE Division of Research, May, 1979, 3.

Cross, K. P. The Adult Learner. Paper prepared for the American Association for Higher Education. Washington, D. C., 1978.

Cross, K. P. & Zusman, A. The Needs of Non-Traditional Learners and the Responses of Non-Traditional Programs. University of California Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, Berkeley, 1977.

Cunningham, Merrimon. Private Money and Public Service: The Role of Foundations in American Society. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Curti, Merle E. Papers from Dr. Algo D. Henderson. December 24, 1957.

Curti, Merle E. Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Higher Education. New Brunswick: Rutgers University, 1965.

Cutlip, Scott. Fund Raising in the United States. Rahway: Quinn & Boden, 1965.

Demerath, Nicholas, Stephens, Richard & Taylor, R. Power, Presidents and Professors. New York: Basic Books, 1967.

Dennis, Lloyd B. Corporate giving goals must be redefined by new choices. Fund Raising Management, 1979, 1, 26.

Devine, Thomas F. Corporate Support for Education: Its Bases and Principles. The Catholic University of America Educational Research Monographs. Washington, 1956, 19, 2.

Dodds, Harold W. The Academic President-Educator or Caretaker? New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Duffey, Joseph. A background paper on education. Academe, 3, 76.

Dunn, Samuel. Residential liberal arts colleges: surviving the future. Education Digest. 1979, 45, 42.

Editorial Projects in Education, Inc. The Higher Education Deskbook 1980-1981. Washington, 1980.

Eells, Richard. Corporation Giving in a Free Society. New York: Harper & Row, 1956.

Final report of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, Three Thousand Futures. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Ford Foundation in the 1960's. Statement of the Board of Trustees on Policies, Programs and Operations. New York, 1962, 16.

Fosdick, Raymond. Adventure in Giving: The Story of the General Education Board. New York: Harper, 1962.

Froomkin, Joseph. The crisis in higher education, Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science. New York, 1983, 35,2.

Gardner, Paul Mills. A Study of the Attitudes of Harding College Alumni with an Emphasis on Donor and Non-Donor Characteristics. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio University, 1975. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 36, 1295A. (University microfilms No. 75-19, 285)

Garside, Bettis A. & Charles Martin Hall. Dictionary of American Biography. No. 8, New York, 1948.

Giving in America. Report of the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs.

Giving USA. Annual Report of the American Association of Fund Raising Council, Inc., New York, 1980.

Goulden, Joseph. The Money Givers. New York: Random House, 1971.

Harmon, Darrel G. Some trends in financing higher education. Social Science, 1931, 6, 97-109.

Harrington, Fred H. The Future of Adult Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Heald, Morrell. The Social Responsibilities of Business, Company and Community, 1900-1960. Cleveland: Case Western University, 1970.

Higher Education and National Affairs, American Council on Education, Volume 34, Number 2, Washington, D.C. February 11, 1985.

Jedamus, P., Peterson, M. W. & Associates. Improving Academic Management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Johnson, Emory. The Wharton School: Its First Fifty Years, 1881-1931. Philadelphia: Wharton, 1931.

Jones, John P. American Philanthropy for Higher Education. New York: Inter-River, 1962.

Jones, John P. College Endowment Campaigns. Report of the Tenth Annual Conference of the Association of Alumni Secretaries. Ithaca, 1923, 98-103.

Jones, John P. The Yearbook of Philanthropy. New York: Inter-River, 1942.

Keller, George. Academic Strategy. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984.

Keller, Mary Jeanetta Cor. An analysis of alumni donor and non-donor characteristics at the University of Montevallo (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1982).

Kelly, Kathleen. Predicting alumni giving: An analysis of alumni donors and non-donors of the school of journalism at the University of Maryland (Master's Thesis, University of Maryland, 1979).

Keppel, Fredrick P. Education for adults and other essays. First published 1926. Reprinted from a copy in the collections of the New York Public Library. Astor, Lenox and Tilder Foundations. Yale Review, April 26, 1968.

Koppel, Frederick P. The Foundation: Its Place in American Life. New York: MacMillian, 1930.

Knowles, Malcolm. The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species. New York: Gulf, 1978.

Kuhn, Harry. Personal Deductions in the Federal Income Tax. Princeton: Princeton, 1960.

Laukhuff, Paul. Do alumni care if their colleges fail? College and University Journal, May, 1972, 40-42.

Lawrence, William. Memories of a Happy Life. New York: Harper, 1926.

MacDonald, Dwight. The Ford Foundation: The Man and the Millions. New York: Reynal, 1956.

Magarrell, Jack. Serious financial problems facing states portend a lean year for public campuses. Chronicle of Higher Education. 2, 17, 81, 1.

Magarrell, Jack. Study shows gifts to nonprofits must rise 144 pct. in 5 years to offset cuts, inflation. Chronicle of Higher Education, 14, 5, 81, 1.

Magarrell, Jack. The 1980's: higher educations "not me" decade. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1, 7, 80, 6.

Markoff, Richard Michael. An analysis of the relationship of alumni giving and level of participation in voluntary organizations: A case study (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toledo, 1978).

Marcus, Steven. Giving triad boosted with market segmentation. Fund Raising Management, 4, 80, 40.

Mason, Edward. The Corporation in Modern Society. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1959.

Mayhew, Lewis. Surviving the eighties. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

McKee, Dale F. An analysis of factors which affect alumni participation and support (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1975).

McNulty, John William. Alumni and giving: A study of student personnel sources and alumni philanthropy (Doctoral dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1977).

McVey, Frank L. & Hughes, Raymond. Problems of College and University Administration. Ames: Iowa State College Press, 1952.

Mendenhall, William, Ott, Layman, and Larson, Richard. Statistics: A Tool for the Social Sciences. Belmont, CA: Duxbury Press, 1974.

Millett, John D. Financing Higher Education in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.

Miracle, W. D. Differences between givers and non-givers to the University of Georgia annual fund (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 38, 4489A. (University Microfilms No. 77-30, 493.)

Mood, Alexander. The Future of Higher Education. Berkeley: Carnegie Foundation, 1973.

Morison, Samuel E. Three Centuries of Harvard, 1636-1936. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1936.

Nachmias, David and Chava. Research Methods in the Social Sciences. New York: St. Martins Press, 1981.

Neilsen, Waldemar. The Big Foundations. New York: Columbia University, 1972.

Palmer, Stacy G. Federal spending deficits. The Chronicle of Higher Education, February 24, 26, 31, 1986.

Perkins, James A. The University as an Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Pierson, George W. Yale College: An Educational History, 1371-1921. New Haven: Yale University, 1952.

Price, Paul. Geological and Economic Survey. Paper presented to Merle Curti, July 17, 1963.

Private Colleges Cry "Help!," Time, January 15, 1979.

Ranck, Samuel. Education, 22, 1901, 107-109.

Reichley, R. The alumni movement: An overview. In A. W. Rowland (Ed.), Handbook of Institutional Advancement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

Ricklets, Roger. Some colleges drop whole departments to meet fiscal crunch. Wall Street Journal, September 11, 1981, 1.

Rowland, A. Westley. Handbook of Institutional Advancement. San Francisco: Jossesy-Bass, 1978.

Rudolph, Fredrick. The American College and University: A History. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

Rudolph, Fredrick. Mark Hopkins and the Log: Williams College 1836-1872. New Haven: Vintage, 1956.

Savage, Howard. Fruit of an Impulse-Forty Five Years of the Carnegie Foundation, 1905-1950. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1953.

Seeley, John, Junker, Buford & Jones, Wallace. Community Chest: A Case Study in Philanthropy. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1957.

Seelye, L. Clark. The Early History of Smith College, 1871-1910. Cambridge: Haughton-Mifflin, 1923.

Seymour, Harold. Strong and weak points at John Hopkins. Proceeds in the Semi-Annual Conference of the Staff, June 29-30, 1925 in John Price Jones Papers, BP-2.

Shaplen, Robert. Toward the Well-Being of Mankind: Fifty Years of the Rockefeller Foundation. New York: Doubleday, 1964.

Shaw, Wilfred. Support of the University of Michigan from sources other than public funds or student fees, 1817-1934. University of Michigan Official Publication, 1934, 25, 1-52.

Shryock, Richard. American indifference to basic science during the nineteenth century. Archives Internationales d'Histoire des Sciences, II. October, 1948, 50-65.

Simpkins, Thelma. College at middle age. College Student Journal, 1979, 45, 42.

Stewart, Ernest. Alumni support and annual giving. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1955, 31, 129.

Stover, Webster S. Alumni Stimulation by the American College President. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1930.

Sumner, William G. The ways and means for our colleges. Nation. September 8, 1970, 153-154.

Survey on private giving. National Observer, August 17, 1970, 1.

Teitell, Conrad. Tax act continues tax incentives for donors. Fund Raising Management, October, 1981, 22.

Three Thousand Futures. Final report of the Carnegie Council on policy studies in higher education San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 1981.

Thwing, Charles W. A History of Higher Education in America. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1906.

Turner, F. H. An Adventure in Alumni Relations. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1947.

U. S. Congress, Senate: Committee on Finance, Hearings Revenue Act of 1935, 74th Congress, First session, 1935. Washington: US Congress, 1935, 111-118.

Veysey, Laurence R. The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Weaver, Warren. U. S. Philanthropic Foundations. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield: G. & C. Merriam Company, 1981.

Welch, Patrice A. Increasing Annual Giving. New Directions for Institutional Advancement, No. 7 (1980).

Whitley, Frank. Future of development rests with fund raisers. Fund Raising Management, 12, 1980, 40.

Wilson, Eugene. Fifty million opportunities for broadening the base. Fund Raising Management, October, 1981, 41.

World Book Dictionary. Philadelphia: Doubleday and Co., 1973.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

BUTLER UNIVERSITY ALUMNI SURVEY

Directions: The following survey questions deal with educational experiences and personal characteristics. Please circle the letter next to your answer unless otherwise instructed. Your responses will be treated anonymously. They will be reported on a group basis only. Please complete the form within the next seven days and return in the envelope provided.

1. Please circle the letter(s) by the activities you have participated in as an alumnus.

   A. Alumni Butler Club Activities
   B. Homecoming
   C. College or Department Activities
   D. Athletic Events
   E. Continuing Education Courses
   F. Travel Programs
   G. Fund Raising Activities
   H. Career Day Programs
   I. Special Alumni Events
   J. Other _____
   K. None

2. What degree did you earn at Butler?

   A. Associate Degree B. Baccalaureate Degree C. Graduate Degree
   D. Combination of both Baccalaureate and Graduate Degrees

3. What was your major college of study?

   A. Education
   B. Pharmacy
   C. Jordan College of Fine Arts
   D. Business Administration
   E. Liberal Arts & Sciences

4. What are the most important factors that affect your decision to donate to Butler?

   A. Close association with a faculty or staff member
   B. Feelings of loyalty to the school
   C. Interest in a particular academic or athletic program
   D. Interest in a student financial aid program
   E. Tax considerations
   G. Become members of specific gift clubs
   H. Interested in promoting the concept of higher education in society
   I. Feel that I am doing something worthwhile for Butler
   J. Other _____

5. What is your marital status?

   A. Single B. Married C. Divorced D. Widowed

6. If you are married or widowed, did your spouse

   A. Attend Butler B. Attend another college C. Did not go to college

7. If your spouse made a separate contribution to his/her school between June 1, 1983, and May 31, 1984, indicate his/her level of giving.

   A. $1 to $99.99 B. $100 to $499.99 C. $500 to $999.99
   D. Over $1,000 E. Did not contribute

8. What distance do you live from the Butler University campus?

   A. 25 miles or less B. 26 to 50 miles C. 51 to 100 miles
   D. 101 to 200 miles E. Over 200 miles

9. Please circle the letter(s) by the activities you participated in while a student at Butler University.

   A. Student Government B. Residence Hall Assoc.
   C. Varsity Athletics or Intramural Athletics D. Theatre
   E. Dance F. Musical Performing Groups
   G. Greek Social Organization H. Student Publications
   I. College Nights J. Spring Sing
   K. Geneva Stunts L. Honorary Organizations
   M. Others _____

10. Did you belong to a fraternity or sorority while a student at Butler?

    A. Yes B. No

11. Were you a commuter student while at Butler?

    A. Yes B. No

12. Did you live on campus while attending Butler?

    A. Yes B. No

13. Did you receive a scholarship or grant to attend Butler?

    A. Yes B. No

14. Did you obtain a job through the efforts of Butler University's Career Planning and Placement Center?

    A. Yes B. No

15. Please list the ages of your children. _____

16. What is your occupation?

A. Clerical B. Homemaker C. Managerial
D. Professional E. Sales F. Other_____
G. Not currently employed

17. Are you retired at the present time?

A. Yes B. No

18. What is your sex?

A. Male B. Female

19. How old are you?

A. 21 to 29 B. 30 to 39 C. 40 to 49
D. 50 to 59 E. 60 or over

Please return this questionnaire in the stamped pre-addressed envelope. Thank you for participating in this important project.

APPENDIX B

INITIAL COVER LETTER OF EXPLANATION

April 15, 1985

Dear Friend:

Future projections for many colleges and universities include declining enrollments, reductions in governmental appropriations, uncertainties in economic conditions and increased competition for private support dollars. Thus, for colleges and universities to succeed, every effort must be made to strengthen current university relations and development programs.

At the present time, I am engaged in research for a doctoral dissertation undertaken as partial fulfillment for the degree of Doctor of Education at West Virginia University. Through this study I hope to obtain data that can be used to enhance Butler's future planning activity in the areas of university relations and development.

Completion of the enclosed questionnaire, which takes approximately five minutes, will be an invaluable contribution to the success of the study. Participation is voluntary and collected information will be processed with a maximum concern for confidentiality. In no instance will you be referred to by name. The number in the upper right corner of the questionnaire is for follow-up purposes only. Responses to each question is left entirely to your discretion.

Upon conclusion of the response period, the master project list containing names and identifying numbers will be destroyed. Your participation is encouraged and deeply appreciated.

Sincerely,

Duke Haddad
Director of Annual Programs

DH:gh
enc

P.S. Please return your questionnaire by April 23, 1985

APPENDIX C

FOLLOW-UP LETTER OF EXPLANATION

May 2, 1985

Dear Friend:

About three weeks ago, I wrote to you concerning some of your own characteristics and educational experiences in order to learn about Butler University graduates as a group. As of today, we have not received your completed questionnaire.

We have undertaken this study because we believe that information concerning Butler graduates is important to strengthen current University relations and development programs.

I am writing to you again because of the significance each questionnaire has to the usefulness of this study. Your name was drawn through a scientific sampling process. This means that only 800 graduates out of our 27,000 alumni are being asked to complete this questionnaire.

In order for this study to be useful for analysis, it is essential that each person in the sample return their questionnaire.

In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated. Please return your questionnaire to me by May 14, 1985. Thank you very much for your interest in this important matter.

Sincerely,

Duke Haddad
Director of Annual Programs

DH/yje

Enc.

APPENDIX D

ABSTRACT

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF ALUMNI DONORS AND NON-DONORS AT BUTLER UNIVERSITY

FREDDIE DUKE HADDAD, JR.

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of the study was to generate predictive data to be used by fund raisers at Butler University, specifically, and similar institutions, generally, as attempts are made to focus alumni fund raising programs. To accomplish this, relationships were investigated between selected characteristics of Butler University alumni annual fund donors and non-donors.

The study attempted to examine a category of hypotheses that certain demographic characteristics of Butler University alumni are not significant with respect to those who donate and those who do not donate to the University. A category of null hypotheses—that there are no significant demographic differences among alumni in various contribution level categories—was also tested. The characteristics examined were: sex, age, marital status, parenthood, number of children, children's age range, distance lived from Butler, employment status, major college of study, type of degree earned, graduation period, fraternity or sorority affiliation, commuter or residential student, receipt of institutional scholarship or grant, university job placement, involvement in student activities, involvement in alumni activities, whether spouse attended college and whether spouse contributed to Butler.

A mail questionnaire was utilized to survey a stratified random sample of Butler University alumni. The mail questionnaire was sent to 400 alumni donors and 400 alumni non-donors. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Crosstabs Program was utilized to compute the chi-square statistic for analysis of data acquired at the .05 level of significance.

As a result of statistical analysis the data suggested that the characteristics of age, number of children, children's age range, distance lived from Butler, major college of study, type of degree earned, graduation period, fraternity or sorority affiliation, involvement in student activities, involvement in alumni activities and whether spouse contributed to Butler University were shown to evoke significant differences between both alumni donors and non-donors. In addition, significant characteristics obtained with respect to contribution level were the same as between alumni donors and non-donors but also included the characteristics of sex and type of degree earned.

Recommended program initiatives were reported.

APPENDIX E

VITA

VITA

Freddie Duke Haddad, Jr., is a native of Charleston, West Virginia. He was educated in the Kanawha County, West Virginia School System. He graduated cum laude with a B.S. degree in Business Administration from West Virginia University. He received an MPA degree in Public Administration from the West Virginia College of Graduate Studies. He did post-graduate work in business administration and higher education administration at the University of Louisville.

His career in higher education administration includes positions in development and alumni/parent relations with the University of Louisville, Kentucky; Florida International University in Miami, Florida; University of Charleston in Charleston, West Virginia; and Butler University in Indianapolis, Indiana.

He has been recognized for his work by the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE), the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), plus other organizations. He was recently nominated for the Outstanding Young Men of America Award. He has written six articles for national publication in the areas of alumni relations and fund raising.

Dr. Haddad is married to the former Cynthia Ann LaMaster of Charleston, West Virginia. They have two children, Freddie III "Chip" and Shannon Lynn. They reside in Indianapolis, Indiana.

APPROVAL OF EXAMINING COMMITTEE

D. Stephen Cupps, Ph.D.

Richard Hartnett, Ed.D.

Paul A. Leary, Ed.D.

Jack Yeager, Ed.D.

Richard Meckley, Ph.D., Chair

7/18/86

Date