

THE MARKETING OF EDUCATION:
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COLLEGE STUDENT
EXPERIENCES AND THE DESIRE TO BECOME A
DONOR

By

DAVID H. BENNETT

Bachelor of Science in Advertising/Public Relations
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1975

Master in Business Administration
Oklahoma City University
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
1994

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
In partial fulfillment of
The requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
December, 2016

THE MARKETING OF EDUCATION:
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COLLEGE
STUDENT EXPERIENCES AND THE DESIRE TO
BECOME A DONOR

Dissertation Approved:

Dr. Bert Jacobson
Dissertation Advisor and Committee Chair

Dr. Ed Harris

Dr. Julie Angle

Dr. Tom Brown

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The successful completion of this dissertation is the result of a small army of professors, mentors, family, and friends providing sustained support as it was long in the making. Packaged around three military deployments (one to Bosnia and two to Afghanistan), all involved were most gracious in their understanding and flexibility. Oklahoma State University was equally impressive in its willingness to allow for military obligations, extending my time allowed for course work, research, and writing. While professional and institutional standards were never compromised, the administration was strong in its support of my doctoral efforts. At one point I was informed I had outlasted every original professor in the particular area of study in which I began, which is not referenced with pride but rather as acknowledgement of and with the greatest measure of appreciation to all those involved.

Clearly, my wife, Susan, has the heart of a saint in her unwavering support and encouragement of this work. She allowed me this opportunity and should share equally in the rewards of its completion. While I know it couldn't be the case for her, the strains and stresses of an extended doctoral program were made to look as if it was nothing and with a grace few could appreciate. It was the same loving attitude she maintained while I was deployed in a combat zone for a total of over two years.

Also, my primary mentor, Dr. B. Curtis Hamm, never gave up on me. Dr. Hamm has given so many students the gift of education through his blessed ability to read the hearts of people and steer them to degrees in programs of their interests so they could enjoy richly rewarding lives. He started me in my Master of Business Administration program at Oklahoma City University and guided me to this last year of my doctoral program. Unfortunately, his death this past year from an aging body leaves all of us with a great emptiness, but his support of students in thousands, through his over 50 years of student mentorship and scholarship funding leaves a legacy for generations to come.

A special acknowledgement to my final committee is also important. Because of retirements, Dr. Bert Jacobson, Regents Professor and Seretean Professor in Wellness in the College of Education at Oklahoma State, became my third Chair and was most gracious with his time and direction. He and Dr. Ed Harris, Williams Chair of Educational Leadership and Higher Education Leadership Professor in the College of Education at Oklahoma State, both continued their support for extended periods of time and I am truly indebted. Dr. Julie Angle, Director of the Secondary Science Education program and Assistant Professor in the College of Education at Oklahoma State, learned of my program more recently but willingly took me on with a professional sense of interest and provided a fresh perspective of the research. Finally, Dr. Tom Brown, Noble Foundation Chair in Marketing Strategy and Professor of Marketing in the Spears School of Business at Oklahoma State, has been an admired professor and respected friend for many years and specifically requested to support my work to its completion as a tribute of respect to our mutual friend and mentor Dr. Hamm. Thanks to all of you.

Name: DAVID BENNETT

Date of Degree: MAY, 2016

Title of Study: THE MARKETING OF EDUCATION: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COLLEGE STUDENT EXPERIENCES AND THE DESIRE TO BECOME A DONOR

Major Field: DOCTORATE OF EDUCATION

Abstract: As colleges and universities around the country are being squeezed by new federal regulations, state mandates, and local codes – most of which require financial investments, some major – institutional leaders are struggling to find streams of revenue that address such requirements without further burdening students through increased tuitions, fees, and other assessment charges. Added to the other common and reasonable increases to the costs of education, it is easy to understand the financial dilemma facing most institutions. Creative strategies developed to improve funding potential have often become controversial with various stakeholder groups and proven too costly in other than monetary measurements. However, there has been one area in which institutions have found financial success and increased positive support across all stakeholder categories: the development of alumni donor giving.

This study explores how colleges and universities might market themselves to their alumni bases and where they might find current successes that can be accelerated tomorrow by increasing student campus involvement today. Focused on current students, this study assesses student perceptions of their transitioning suburban university in the southwest major metropolitan city. It considers how students are engaging during their student years and what interactions might be valuable today for the university's development of these soon-to-be alumni tomorrow.

The anonymous student survey found relationships developed between the students and their university do have some impact on the students' perceptions of becoming donors sometime after graduation. The donation parameters included financial contributions, contributions of time, and contributions of professional expertise. They were cross-measured against the values of maintaining relationships with fellow students, faculty and staff, the institution, and their individual departments. And students were assessed by their involvement or participation in campus activities, groups, and programs. Because of the low participation rate of the survey, this study doesn't provide statistical significance for traditional research validity, but it does provide a valuable baseline for similar research and a springboard for future study of this important educational concern.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter.....	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Theoretical Perspective	2
Background	4
Statement of the Problem	5
Hypotheses	6
Significance of Study	8
Assumptions	8
Limitations	9
Delimitations	10
Definition of Terms	10
Summary	11
Organization of the Study.....	11
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	12
Historical Perspective.....	13
America’s Educational Development.....	14
Diversity Among American Institutions	15
Funding Research of Various Institutional Categories.....	16
III. METHODOLOGY	20
Descriptive Analysis of Subject University	21
Context of Survey.....	22
Survey Design	24
Survey Conclusion	25
IV. FINDINGS.....	26
Analytic Strategy.....	27
Results	27
Donation of Time	27
Donation of Financial Assets	30
Donation of Business Expertise	33

Chapter	Page
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	38
Hypotheses and Conclusions	39
Recommendations	42
Short Term	43
Long Term	46
Looking to the Future	47
REFERENCES	49
APPENDICES	54
Appendix A – Dissertation E-Mail Survey Introduction (Spring Semester)	54
Appendix B – Dissertation E-Mail Survey Introduction (Fall Semester).....	55
Appendix C – Student Survey as Presented Through Qualtrics	56
Appendix D – Support Request E-Mail to College Dean and Department Chair	62
Appendix E (1) – Survey Test Results	63
Appendix E (2) – Test Survey A Raw Data	64
Appendix E (3) – Test Survey B Raw Data	68

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
Table 1: Sample 3 × 3 Matrix	27
Table 2: The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with Fellow Students and Intended Donation of Time	28
Table 3: The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with the Faculty/Staff and Intended Donation of Time	28
Table 4: The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with the Institution and Intended Donation of Time	29
Table 5: The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with the Department and Intended Donation of Time	29
Table 6: Bonferroni Correction for Donating Time Multiple Comparisons	30
Table 7: The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with Fellow Students and Intended Donation of Money	31
Table 8: The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with Faculty/Staff and Intended Donation of Money	31
Table 9: The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with the Institution and Intended Donation of Money	32
Table 10: The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with the Department and Intended Donation of Money	32
Table 11: Bonferroni Correction for Donating Financially Multiple Comparisons.....	33
Table 12: The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with Fellow Students and Intended Donation of Business Expertise	34
Table 13: The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with Faculty/Staff and Intended Donation of Business Expertise	34
Table 14: The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with the Institution and Intended Donation of Business Expertise	35
Table 15: The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with the Department and Intended Donation of Business Expertise	35
Table 16: Bonferroni Correction for Donating Business Expertise Multiple Comparisons	35

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There are a finite number of funding sources for institutions of higher education in the United States. Among them are government funding, tuitions and fees, endowments, corporate partnerships, research licensing agreements, and other donors. As each of these sources has been negatively impacted by the economy over this past decade, an increasingly attractive source of new or increased funding opportunities has been recognized in alumni (and/or friends). Universities large and small have recognized the need to formalize their professional fundraising programs and either have or are in the process of developing donor programs, most positioned in the Foundation arms of the institutions. In those Foundations (or other named financial development offices or departments), marketing professionals are working with alumni to financially support the institutions from which some of the alumnis' success can be attributed.

Dan J. Nicoson, Missouri Western State University vice president for university advancement, has researched the process of grooming alumni into becoming donors and acknowledges the often-cited saying “donors don’t give to causes; they give to people with causes” rings true (Nicoson, 2010, p. 73). He goes on, emphasizing, “the donor is influenced largely by the personality, professionalism, and character of the asker” and says the qualifying factors for developing prospects is the principle of “linkage, ability,

and interest” (p. 74). Nicoson says that for professional development officers to be successful, they need to find people who have some previous or natural relationship with the institution (linkage), access to available funds (ability), and a genuine interest in giving to the university (which might be veiled or complicated, requiring development, or might be as simple as being asked). But while his formula is simple, it is not necessarily easy. The process can take months and even years.

Giving an example, in reflection on the development of a donor who, on paper, was a billionaire, professional fundraiser Lisa Dietlin says her cultivation strategy time is around 22 months to develop, keep involved, and interested her donors before securing, in her example, an eight-figure financial commitment (Dietlin, 2011). Nicoson (2010, p. 76) says his grooming process – typically from the first contact, through the development of a respected relationship, to the conclusion of a donor commitment – “is commonly said to be 18 to 30 months to complete, sometimes longer.”

According to Dietlin (2011, p. 104), the cultivation strategy has to be unique. “It is important...to find ways to keep him constantly and consistently engaged and interested,” says Dietlin. “There is nothing we could buy or give him that he couldn’t purchase himself.”

Melissa Buller, Associate Director of The Fund Raising School at the Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, confirms the formula Nicoson references as being the basis for teaching materials at their school, developed in part by Nicoson, where he was a faculty member for over a decade (M. Buller, personal communication March 14, 2015 and D. Nicoson, personal communication, January 29, 2015). Buller added that in the current curriculum (updated just four years ago) the phrased theory of “linkage, ability, interest” is cited extensively throughout their materials as it is critical in the fundamentals of fundraising.

Kirk A. Jewell, president and chief executive officer of the Oklahoma State University Foundation at Stillwater, Oklahoma, said there is such strong anecdotal evidence of the tie between a student's active campus involvement and later-in-life financial support of university programs, his institution is introducing a program called "Tradition Keepers." It is designed to encourage current students to involve themselves in a series of events during their traditional four-year college experience with the specific intent of linking them more closely to the university. Jewell said the program includes a campus-wide photographic scavenger hunt to find historic "monuments," student involvement in campus activities and community service; the student reward for completing the approximate 75 requirements being a medallion to be worn during graduation ceremonies. The Foundation's reward would be a graduate who, through involvement in the required "Tradition Keepers" obligations, would have a stronger and more meaningful bond with the institution and would be a prime candidate for future financial support of university needs (K. Jewell, personal communication, February 9, 2014).

Theoretical Perspective

The Social Exchange Theory was introduced in 1959 as the result of extensive research conducted by Stanford Professors John W. Thibaut and Harold H. Kelley involving their work in social behavior and their analysis of dyadic interdependence (Thibaut & Kelley, 1986). "It posits that how people think about a relationship is based upon an analysis of what is put into a relationship – the cost – and what they get out of a relationship – the benefit" (O'Neil & Schenke, 2007, p. 62). O'Neil and Schenke further submit the basic premise of the Social Exchange Theory is that individuals seek to maximize their benefits and minimize their costs.

John K. Chadwick-Jones (1976) characterizes the Social Exchange Theory as assuming that relationships are a give-and-take among partners. In agreement with O'Neil and Schenke (2007), he notes it can be thought of in economic terms with its cost-benefit determination as to the continuation of the relationship. Related to education and potential donors, other research expands the Social Exchange Theory's cost-benefit consideration to include past benefit of alumni with the present (Weerts & Ronca, 2007).

The theory has been expanded to triadic interdependence, small groups, and larger relationships with noted increases in complexities caused by the multiple relationships (Somers, 1960). Research concluded that participants will voluntarily continue their association only if the experienced outcomes (or those anticipated by inference) are adequate in meeting certain criteria, which equates as components of the "comparison level" or "comparison level for alternatives" (Somers, 1960).

In studying the relationships students establish with their institutions during the college experience, the Social Exchange Theory can provide excellent insight as to student involvement and the possible link to later-life interest in becoming a donor. As Thibaut & Kelley note (1959, p. 65), "In the formative stage, as later, the fate of the relationship presumably depends upon the outcomes experienced by the prospective members as they interact."

A study specifically applying the tenets of the Social Exchange Theory puts a microscope on the importance of the relationship potential donors developed through campus activities while they were in college. Such a study can enlighten those involved in donor development programs to the importance of college-day relationships and memories, providing building blocks to emotional and social development of donors. The study could also serve as a

catalyst for identifying specific experiences that were meaningful to students while they were in college, allowing educational institutions to review programs, policies, courses, and events with an eye toward improving such institutional activities to more involve current students interactively both now and in the future.

The theory informs this research study as to the expectations that potential donors relate to their college experiences. How those expectations can rekindle the past social importance to them and identify necessary relational exchanges going forward provides a springboard for potential donor development opportunities in the future.

Background

Educational institutions across the United States have experienced declining revenue streams over the last half decade from state and federal governments as a result of the extended recession and are struggling to maintain existing academic programs (Fisher, 2009; Kelderman, 2009). In January 2009, Arizona's three state universities experienced a budget deficit of \$1.6 billion (Fischer, 2009). In that same year, Colorado Governor Bill Ritter told public colleges in his state to expect a 10% budget cut in the state's 2010 fiscal year after state revenues fell hundreds of millions of dollars below state-expected projections (Kelderman, 2009). Maryland Governor Martin J. O'Malley cut \$37 million from higher-education spending after revenue projections fell \$700 million short of earlier estimates (Kelderman, 2009).

In addition to funding from government entities, other sources of traditional revenue have either seen reductions in availability or have not kept pace with cost increases (Skorton, 2009). At Cornell University (a private, Ivy League university), the president addressed the belt-tightening measures his institution would have to implement in an early 2009 open letter

to the Cornell community. Among the budgetary issues the university was experiencing was a 27% loss in its endowments over a six-month period (Skorton, 2009).

Then there are the politicians who are highly concerned with tuition increases in economic downturns. Elected officials in multiple states have frozen tuition increases as a way of easing the burden on students, hoping to keep them in college. Lawmakers in Maryland in 2010 continued their tuition freeze for a fourth consecutive year. In arguing against tuition increases, state legislative leaders often use California's experience from the 1990s as evidence of the negative impact on unreasoned tuition increases. It was during that time, with California struggling in the midst of a sluggish economy, that universities were allowed to individually determine tuitions. Most universities instituted significant tuition increases and statewide student enrollment dropped by more than 200,000 students (Breneman, 2002).

Statement of the Problem

This study is designed to provide insight for those involved in the development of donor programs at institutions of higher learning as to the importance of student interaction with institutional programs. Its focus is on the relationships established by current students with the institution through involvement in organizations, clubs, and campus-related activities. The outcome of this study attempts to identify doors of opportunity for university foundation representatives in establishing or rekindling relationships with existing alumni. It hopes to reveal positive current-day social exchanges based on important institutional relationships established by the alumni during their college years.

The purpose of this study is to determine whether a relationship exists between a current student's college experiences and the desire to become a donor to the institution. Its design is

to assess whether students involved in campus activities while in college will favorably weigh the cost of financial or volunteer support in the present or future against benefits they may have received in the past or present (Weerts & Ronca, 2007). Benefits could include their focus of study (their major) and quality of education, financial needs, living experience (Greek affiliation versus residence hall versus off-campus versus commuters), classroom size, or whether they were legacies or athletes (Marr, Mullin, & Siegfried, 2003; O'Neil & Schenke, 2007; McAlexander & Koenig, 2012; Monks, 2002).

Hypotheses

The null-hypotheses in this study are as follows.

- 1a) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of time to their institution later in life based on their involvement versus non-involvement in campus life activities.
- 1b) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming financial donors to their institution later in life based on their involvement versus non-involvement in campus life activities.
- 1c) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of business expertise to their institution later in life based on their involvement versus non-involvement in campus life activities.
- 2a) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of time to their institution later in life based on the proximity of where they lived prior to their enrollment.

- 2b) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming financial donors to their institution later in life based on the proximity of where they lived prior to their enrollment.
- 2c) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of business expertise to their institution later in life based on the proximity of where they lived prior to their enrollment.
- 3a) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of time to their institution later in life based on whether they are legacy students.
- 3b) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming financial donors to their institution later in life based on whether they are legacy students.
- 3c) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of business expertise to their institution later in life based on whether they are legacy students.
- 4a) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of time to their institution later in life based on whether they are students on scholarships.
- 4b) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming financial donors to their institution later in life based on whether they are students on scholarships.
- 4c) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of business expertise to their institution later in life based on whether they are students on scholarships.

- 5a) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of time to their institution later in life based on their being undergraduate students versus graduate students.
- 5b) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming financial donors to their institution later in life based on their being undergraduate students versus graduate students.
- 5c) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of business expertise to their institution later in life based on their being undergraduate students versus graduate students.

Significance of the Study

This study is important to the research on educational donors and why they make the decisions they do regarding contributions to education in general and university/college donations more specifically. While the research in the field of educational philanthropy is growing, as more educational institutions formalize their donor development programs, it is still an area of research relatively young in its formal development.

Assumptions

I expect that students with more campus-related associations will have a higher level of support for and allegiance to their institutions. This research will attempt to find that the more involved the student, the more receptive and supportive they will be to the needs of the institution.

While I expect that participants who respond to the survey are sincere in their responses, I cannot assume those who respond positively will actually become donors to the colleges they attended. The same can be said for those who respond negatively at this time, that they will

never become donors. It is also not assured that those who respond will actually become alumni or that their experiences in college continue to be of a similar quality as those they have experienced up to the point of their responses.

Finally, I acknowledge that those surveyed are already members of their institution's alumni association. That membership assumes they already have some current level of positive feelings for their university and that they are actively involved in some college/university programs and campus life experiences beyond the single student alumni association membership.

Limitations

There are some aspects of this research that are beyond the control of the researcher. Among them are the following.

- The contact list is provided by the alumni association.
- It cannot be assured that the students on the list actually use the e-mail account provided for their daily communications.
- It cannot be confirmed that the list is a quality cross-section of the student population.
- There is no assurance those who actually participate are accurately responding to the questions.
- It cannot be confirmed that the list and/or the participants are balanced in terms of gender, majors, classification, residence status, funding resources, ethnic background, or even the kind of campus activities to which the respondents are attracted.

It should be noted, this research is being conducted at a single university. I suggest that the research be repeated at other institutions in the future.

Delimitations

There are some aspects of this research that are controllable. Among them are the following.

- The population to which the survey will be sent is pre-qualified by the alumni association.
- The time in which the survey is conducted.
- The number of questions on the questionnaire.

Definition of Terms

- **Student Alumni Association.** This is the organizational structure from which survey participants are identified and surveyed. Students in the Student Alumni Association have shown themselves to be active to some degree by their action in joining the alumni association while in college.
- **Campus Life Activities.** There is an almost endless array of events happening on campuses in which students are allowed/invited/encouraged to participate. For the purposes of this study they will be identified as “activities,” “clubs,” or “organizations.” These would include (but are not limited to) student government associations, honor societies, choral or musical groups, student clubs, mutual-interest research groups, living groups, intramural athletic programs, hobby groups, ethnic and cultural groups, on-campus and off-campus student competitions, etc.
- **University/College/Institution.** These terms are used interchangeably in this study and reflect the structure of higher education.
- **Donors.** These are people, businesses, organizations and other entities capable and willing to provide funding and/or other valuable assets to universities. What is

donated can be a direct financial transaction, as well as stock, product, time, knowledge, and other assets owned or controlled by an individual or group that provide the university an ability to improve its physical or educational capabilities for its constituents.

Summary

The research literature shows varying levels of ties between students who were involved in campus activities during their college careers. Some appear to be strong, others not as strong. There are also varying degrees of willingness to participate depending on the types of activities in which the students were involved.

Studying the desire to give back to one's alma mater through the lens of the Social Exchange Theory will provide an additional view to the growing research in the area of donor giving to educational institutions. It will shed new light related to the importance of relationships measured in cost versus benefit to the individual.

The research possibilities are strong for further development in this area. Institutional benefits can be significant from continued research in the field of donor development.

Organization of the Study

Beyond the introduction of this study, it will be organized by a literature review; a methods section, in which the design of the study will be explained and developed; a survey outcomes section; and conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study is to determine the importance of a student's relationship and campus life participation in a college experience and the potential of that student becoming a donor to the institution in later years. There are a multitude of formal educational sources and publications from which both background and specific information has been used. There are also dissertations of doctoral candidates who have researched specific aspects of the donor development process that are relevant to this study.

What is apparent from a review of the literature is that research in this area is still in its developmental stages. The concept of educational institutions establishing, developing, and maintaining donor programs in and of itself is not new. What is relatively new is the formalization of it, that degreed programs have been developed and instituted at both undergraduate and graduate levels. In fact, one of the early centers to study the concept of and offer degrees in educational philanthropy is The Indiana University Center of Philanthropy, and it was not founded until 1987 (Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis website, 2012), less than 30 years ago. Today, at the

Lilly Family School of Philanthropy at Indiana University - Purdue University Indianapolis, Bachelor of Arts, Master of Arts, and Ph.D. degrees are offered in Philanthropic Studies. But there is a documented historical role of philanthropy in higher education, and it will be reviewed as well as how educational philanthropy has been professionalized and trends that have developed within the industry.

Historical Perspective

The rise and fall of civilizations throughout the course of history has been reflective, to some degree, of the philanthropic values of those in power. Whether it was kings and queens, the wealthy, or religions and their institutions, philanthropic giving has been used to pay for many exploratory, educational, and public service programs like art, libraries, museums, hospitals, and even public parks (Andrews, 1978; Bremner, 1988). The start of educational fundraising can be found more than 2,000 years ago when Plato directed that, after his death, the income from his fields was to be used to support the Academy (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990).

As the desire for education grew in the early development of societies around the world, colleges and universities were established, funded and administered mainly by religious entities. In the 12th and 13th centuries, the study of theology, law, medicine, and the arts were concentrated in monastic schools (Riché, 1978). But as the European continent developed and those schools could not keep up with the demand for knowledge, institutions were created that were independent of religious control and financial stability. These universities basically acted as private corporations created, funded, and managed by the instructors and their students (Pedersen, 1997). Absent of church funding, these institutions turned to two distinct methods of revenue generation: endowments and fees. Endowments

would include “manors, lands, rectories, house properties, shops, etc.” and fees were primarily “students’ matriculation and graduation fees, fines, acquisition of books, educational material or furniture” (de Ridder-Symoens, 1996, p. 185).

America’s Educational Development

Educational fundraising officially began in the United States in 1641, when representatives of Harvard University traveled to England to raise money to support the institution (Worth, 2002; Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990). Three years later, “the New England Confederation of four colonies recommended each family within the confederation contribute a shilling or a peck of wheat for scholarships to Harvard” (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990, p. 25).

For most early American institutions of higher education, financial stability was only a dream. According to Cohen (2007, p. 43), funding for colonial institutions was “...derived from a combination of donations or subscriptions and legislative appropriation, supplemented by whatever tuition they could collect from the students.” As a result, institutions remained small, “despite continuous efforts by institutional leaders to solicit public support through the conclusion of the eighteenth century” (p., 2011, p. 34). Financing, facilities, and qualified faculty were all challenges institutions faced, and private institutions fared far better than public.

However, the realization of the importance of education was always there and slowly built over time. “Philanthropy has played a significant role in the growth of American higher educational through the years. As far back as the 17th century, Americans have given liberally (relative to their ability) to support colleges and universities” (Thomas & Smart, 2005, p. 3).

Even though religion played a significant role in the development of higher education in America, as the centuries passed governance of the institutions tended toward broader systems and overall church-related control and support was moderated and declined, Cohen and Kisker (2010, p. 5) maintain. They assert that as the bureaucracies grew, so did institutional dependence on public funds “until the late twentieth century, when forces of privatization took hold and colleges and universities were forced to broaden their search for support.”

Diversity Among American Institutions

As American institutions were established and developed, they became identified and, to some degree, defined by their funding sources. Most of the early colleges and universities in the United States were private schools, funded from tuition fees and private donations. After 1900, as communities and states recognized the importance for their populations to be educated and “legislatures in the Midwest and West started to embrace and financially support through taxation the idea of a great university as a symbol of state pride” (Thelin, 2003, p. 11). These institutions tended to be larger in size with a larger variety of educational study opportunities.

Within the two broad categories of private and public institutions of higher education, there are subdivisions further defining the institutions into groups of similar structure, mission, or philosophy. The Carnegie Foundation provides a basic classification system designed to “allow researchers to organize institutions by degree level and specialization” (Griffin & Hurtado, 2011, p. 26). Its six major types are: associate’s institutions, doctorate-granting universities, master’s colleges and universities, baccalaureate colleges, special focus institutions, and tribal colleges.

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education identify three public institution tiers: Research Universities, Regional Universities, and Community Colleges (Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, 2014 Annual Report, p. 9). They can further be divided into four-year universities, two-year colleges (also known as Community or Junior Colleges), Liberal Arts colleges, Land Grant universities, comprehensive research universities, urban institutions, regional colleges, and professional colleges (p. 16-17). There are also religious colleges and universities and even proprietary institutions.

Funding Research of Various Institutional Categories

Even though formal research in educational philanthropic activities concerning higher education is relatively young, researchers have worked diligently to study and learn about the need for donor funding and the intricacies of the process. Much focus has been given to the development of alumni giving and the potential they represent for the financial strength of their alma maters. This research has been conducted and can be found in all categories of higher education, from comprehensive institutions to historically black colleges, from private to community colleges. The following provides insight as to the diversity of the research.

A study of alumni giving at a prestigious southern public university involving alumni with solely baccalaureate degrees between 1940 and 2002 identified positive relationships in giving an “overall time of involvement in co/extra-curricular activities” and “attending a meeting of a club or organization” (Steepers, 2009, p. 71), but no significant effect on alumni giving based on undergraduate “leadership roles within those” student activities (p. 146). However, alumni giving at a highly selective private liberal arts college was found to be more generous (when originating from states where charitable tax deductions are allowed) in years when greater athletic prestige was achieved but less when academic prestige rose

(Holmes, 2009). Research also concluded that recent alumni donors were more influenced by institutional prestige and females were more generous in their giving, as were close alumni living in wealthier neighborhoods within 250 miles of the campus. Alumni with close alumni relatives tended to give more, as did alumni who participated in campus activities during their college years (Holmes, 2009).

A Fredrick Wampler study of two Ivy League colleges revealed that influencing current students to remain connected with an institution requires an understanding of the alumni culture; developing a young alumni support mechanism; and using traditions, rituals, and multigenerational connections to strengthen their identity and commitment (Wampler, 2013). He concluded that young alumni programs with robust, comprehensive volunteer structures can solidify the relationship between the institution and the young alumni for a lifetime.

Research focused on undergraduate Greek membership and alumni giving at a private, liberal arts university in a southern state concluded that Greek membership had a positive impact on alumni giving compared to non-Greek alumni (O'Neill, 2005). In another study that same year at a public institution in a neighboring southern state, results indicated the characteristics of 1) years since graduation, and 2) three types of activities – social, campus leadership, and academic – provided measurable statistics in distinguishing donors from nondonors (Thomas, 2005). A study at a traditional Black liberal arts college in the Midwest suggests that there is a relationship between perceived level of satisfaction as an undergraduate and the propensity to give donations. The same study found that there was a statistically significant relationship between sustaining donors and their undergraduate history of student involvement on campus as well as the number of years away from campus (Ward, 2004). A more recent study of the alumni at a regional state university in the south

found that while there was not significant differences between donors and nondonors based on gender, major (focus of study), or location of current residence, there were significant differences concerning involvement with the institution when identifying time since graduation (or leaving), college involvement, and their attitudes toward the institution now (Lackie, 2010).

Not all studies concluded significance of a relationship between donors and their involvement on campus. One researcher examining alumni giving at a regional university in the Midwest found that alumni donors had not been as involved in extracurricular activities as nondonors (Miller & Casebeer, 1990). In this study, the two most significant factors to alumni giving related to academic achievement and satisfaction with the value recognized from their education.

Historically, community colleges have depended on state and local governments as major funding sources. But with reductions in public financial support, community colleges have begun searching for alternative sources. Some have worked to increase their fundraising activities by creating development offices (Ryan, 2003). In 2000-2001, the largest proportional funding sources for community colleges were: state governments (44.6%), local governments (19.5%), tuition and fees (19.5%), and the federal government (5.4%). State lotteries in 38 states represent a relatively new source of funds for community colleges, often in the form of student scholarships (Tollefson, 2009). Research regarding community college fundraising has also been conducted regarding Internet and website efforts. Results suggest that websites can be viable vehicles for fundraising, but with caveats attached. These would include website designs that 1) ensure security, 2) give donors the ability to designate how and where donated funds are to be used, and 3) provide for interactive feedback to comfort

donors, allowing for the development of an ongoing relationship for future donor participation (McAllister, 2013).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study was designed to identify the possible relationship between a college student's experiences while in college and the desire to become a donor at some point after graduation. There were five measurements involved in the research: 1) student involvement in campus activities; 2) their living proximity to the college prior to enrollment; 3) their family's history/relationship with the college, meaning was there a legacy to the college prior to student enrollment; 4) whether the student was on scholarship (educational, athletic, or otherwise) during college; and 5) whether the student was classified as an undergraduate or graduate student. Each of the five measurements was further divided into three separate elements of student's willingness to donate his or her 1) time, 2) money, or 3) expertise.

A survey was created to isolate each of the five measurement categories through questions establishing the student's attractions to a university; their involvement in student organizations, clubs, and/or student activities; and their interests in maintaining relationships – specifically with fellow students, faculty/staff, and the institution – after graduation. The options of relationships with the institution included their donor consideration at some point in the future through the three variables of time, money, or

expertise. The survey was finalized with appropriate demographic questions (see Appendix C).

Descriptive Analysis of the Subject University

The survey was conducted at a university in a southwestern U.S. state, selected because of its unique, current institutional transition away from what many graduates called a “commuter college” (because of its proximity to a major metropolitan city and common degrees offered). Its transitioning toward an identity of a destination institution, based on its development of more industry-specific degrees available, the growth of post-graduate programs, campus life expansion, and purposeful integration into the rapidly expanding metropolitan city. As an example, much of its music degree classes were moved off-campus to a thriving metropolitan downtown entertainment and tourist district. A second example would be the partnership between its forensic program and the state’s bureau of investigation, in which the university built a new forensic-specific facility across the street from the state’s new investigative forensic lab.

Its administration has made a concentrated effort for over a decade to identify and/or create niche academic programs and degrees for specific student interests and invested significantly in student organizations and programs to provide on-campus relevance for the increasing on-campus residential population, up over 30% since the year 2001 (University of Central Oklahoma website, Institutional Research 2001-2002 and 2014-2015 Factbooks).

The university’s 2014 student population was 16,480, with 12,777 full-time equivalent students and 4,063 part-time students (University of Central Oklahoma website, Institutional Research, Fall 2014 Demographics Book). Its student average age has maintained at 25 for the last five years but is trending toward a younger age; its 25 and under student population

representing 72.8% of the population (five year trend up .9%), and its 26-plus student population representing the other 27.3 (five-year trend down .9%). Its gender make-up is 59% women and 41% men, with women trending up 1.1% over the last five years.

The institution's website further presents the demographic makeup of the students, suggesting more of a working, middle-class background with a large portion of them directly funding a portion, if not all, of their education. Over 50% of the students also work part or full time while working toward their degrees, and its undergraduates represent just under 90% of the population. Additionally, the Greek population is less than 10% of the total student body.

Context of Survey

The survey was distributed through the university's Information Technology (IT) department via student university e-mail accounts to a university pre-established group of students who were current members of the university's Student Alumni Association. The participant number exceeded 800 students and provided a broad cross-section of students by college and classification. The anonymity of each student was ensured through the use of the electronically administered and the independent survey instrument Qualtrics, through its contract with the College of Education at Oklahoma State University. The e-mail sent to all selected students included an explanation of the survey, the necessary disclaimers, and a link to the Qualtrics program (see Appendices A, B, and C).

There was an unanticipated distribution issue that impacted the quality of the student participation expectation that merits explanation as it did affect the research results. The date selected for distribution was to be approximately two weeks after the return of the students from the university's spring break so as not to interfere with either the break itself or exams

leading up to the final weeks of the semester. An unfortunate change in the university's directorship of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) administrative oversight office during the spring semester resulted in a change in university protocol by the interim director. Among the changes was the addition of two administrative layers of oversight, requiring both college dean and department chair approval of any research associated with professors under their administrative control (see Appendix D). The added layers of approval and apparent internal issues resulted in the loss of a required institutional professor partner and a setback for the research.

The resulting delay in securing a credentialed professor willing to provide a partnership role moved the distribution of the survey to the week of the semester known as Pre-Finals or "Dead Week." It is so titled as semester course work is to be completed, allow students to focus their studies toward final exams. It is officially acknowledged and defined as: "no new assignment or exam worth more than 5% of the final grade may be given. Also, student or campus organizations are not to hold meetings or sponsor activities requiring student participation during this week" (Oklahoma State University website, New Graduate Student Handbook, 2011, p. 21.) The term also accurately defined the success of the survey as sent through the IT department to the pre-established group of students identified for the survey. Phrased another way, the response was minimal.

The survey approval process was revamped to meet IRB requirements at both institutions and presented to the pre-established group of students who were members of the institution's Student Alumni Association for the fall semester. Again, it was a third party Qualtrics survey, and it was sent out the second week of the fall semester (see Appendix B).

After a two-week period, a reminder e-mail was sent to the same students encouraging their participation with the Qualtrics link. After an ensuing two weeks of opportunity, the final result was that 44 students responded to the survey.

Survey Design

The survey design involved participating students assessing their individual sense of the importance of various components of a campus and campus life. They also assessed their personal involvement in various organizations, clubs, and/or student activities and their personal sense of the importance of maintaining relationships with fellow students, faculty/staff, their specific colleges, and their specific departments after graduation. Finally, they assessed their sense of the importance of offering or providing support to their university by way of time, financial, or expertise donations. These survey elements were packaged as follows.

- three Likert Scale-type questions regarding student opinions of the importance of various campus and campus life components;
- two “yes-no” questions of participation in various student organizations, clubs, and/or student activities;
- two Likert Scale-type questions regarding student sense of the importance of maintaining relationships and supporting their institution after graduation;
- eight demographic questions.

At the end of the survey, there were two questions regarding information the university’s alumni association requested that were not relevant to this research study but of interest to the university.

Survey Conclusion

The survey response was of such modest results that it remained opened for over a month, but no additional students chose to participate. IRB restrictions allowed no additional interaction with the student group, and thus the raw results were tabulated, analyzed and packaged for presentation. The expected statistical method used would have been a Chi-Square analysis. Because of the limited participation, Fisher's Exact Test was performed instead.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

One way to analyze Likert-type responses is with a Chi-Square analysis. Using this statistical strategy, the frequencies of responses were tabulated, and then the proportions of responses to questions of interest were compared based on some prespecified category. An example would be the proportion of males who provide a certain answer to a question as compared to the proportion of females who provide that same answer. However, one of the general rules for conducting a Chi-Square analysis is that there be a minimum of five respondents per response option, and this did not always happen with this data. Additionally, Chi-Square analyses are better suited for large sample sizes. As a result, an alternative analysis was needed. The qualifying alternative selected for this analysis is called Fisher's Exact Test. Fisher's Exact Test also tests for differences in proportions of response rate, but with fewer requirements than the Chi-Square. One of the most noticeable differences between a Chi-Square analysis and a Fisher's Exact Test is that there is no test statistic to report when conducting Fisher's Exact Test, but only a *p*-value.

Results

Due to low response rates, data from the original 1-7 Likert-type scales was trichotomized – that is, the data was divided into three categories – based on response. Scores of 1-3 were relabeled Low, scores of 4 were labeled Medium, and scores of 5-7 were labeled High. This method grouped interpretative like-minded numbers together for more measurable results. It allowed data to be analyzed in the form of a 3×3 matrix, as shown in Table 1, for both variable measurements by rows and columns.

Table 1
Sample 3×3 Matrix

	Low	Medium	High
Low	a	d	g
Medium	b	e	h
High	c	f	i

As stated in the Analytic Strategy section, a Fisher’s Exact Test was used to test each null hypothesis that the proportions of the response rates to the questions were equal across categories. The variables tested were those questions asking about maintaining relationships after college and the willingness to donate in some capacity after graduation. Due to some confusion about the distinction between “the College” and “the Institution,” the question asking about maintaining relationships with the College after graduation was excluded from further analysis. What follows are charts presenting the 3×3 matrix of each of the variables tested in the questions.

Donation of Time

Cross-tabulations of responses of the four questions asking about maintaining relationships after graduation – with fellow students, with faculty and staff, with the institution, with the department -- as compared to willingness to donate time are presented on

the following pages, in numeric form. They are represented in Tables 2 through 5. Each table should be read left to right for the row percentages (the specific percentages to the right of the n value) and top to bottom for the columns (with the specific percentages next to the n value).

Table 2

The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with Fellow Students and Intended Donation of Time

		Intended Donation of Time			
		Low	Medium	High	Total
Desire to Maintain Relationships with Fellow Students	Low (row) (column)	($n = 9$) 75% 40.9%	($n = 0$) 0% 0%	($n = 3$) 25% 21.3%	($n = 14$) 100%
	Medium (row) (column)	($n = 4$) 50% 18.2%	($n = 3$) 37.5% 50%	($n = 1$) 12.5% 7.7%	($n = 8$) 100%
	High (row) (column)	($n = 9$) 42.9% 40.9%	($n = 3$) 14.2% 50%	($n = 9$) 42.9% 69.2%	($n = 21$) 100%
	Total	($n = 22$) 100%	($n = 6$) 100%	($n = 13$) 100%	

Table 3

The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with the Faculty/Staff and Intended Donation of Time

		Intended Donation of Time			
		Low	Medium	High	Total
Desire to Maintain Relationships with Faculty/Staff	Low (row) (column)	($n = 8$) 88.9% 36.4%	($n = 0$) 0% 0%	($n = 1$) 11.1% 7.7%	($n = 9$) 100%
	Medium (row) (column)	($n = 5$) 50% 22.7%	($n = 4$) 40% 50%	($n = 1$) 10% 7.7%	($n = 10$) 100%
	High (row) (column)	($n = 9$) 40.9% 40.9%	($n = 2$) 9.1% 33.3%	($n = 11$) 50% 84.6%	($n = 22$) 100%
	Total	($n = 22$) 100%	($n = 6$) 100%	($n = 13$) 100%	

Table 4

The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with the Institution and Intended Donation of Time

		Intended Donation of Time			
		Low	Medium	High	Total
Desire to Maintain Relationships with Institution	Low (row)	(n = 13) 92.9%	(n = 1) 7.1%	(n = 0) 0%	(n = 14) 100%
	(column)	59.1%	16.7%	0%	
	Medium (row)	(n = 5) 50%	(n = 3) 30%	(n = 2) 20%	(n = 10) 100%
	(column)	22.7%	50%	15.4%	
	High (row)	(n = 4) 23.5%	(n = 2) 11.8%	(n = 11) 64.7%	(n = 17) 100%
	(column)	18.2%	33.3%	84.6%	
	Total	(n = 22) 100%	(n = 6) 100%	(n = 13) 100%	

Table 5

The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with the Department and Intended Donation of Time

		Intended Donation of Time			
		Low	Medium	High	Total
Desire to Maintain Relationships with the Department	Low (row)	(n = 7) 87.5%	(n = 0) 0%	(n = 1) 12.5%	(n = 8) 100%
	(column)	31.8%	0%	7.7%	
	Medium (row)	(n = 5) 62.5%	(n = 2) 25%	(n = 1) 12.5%	(n = 8) 100%
	(column)	22.7%	33.3%	7.7%	
	High (row)	(n = 10) 40%	(n = 4) 16%	(n = 11) 44%	(n = 25) 100%
	(column)	45.5%	66.7%	84.6%	
	Total	(n = 22) 100%	(n = 6) 100%	(n = 13) 100%	

Using the Fisher's Exact Test, an assessment can be made as to whether the difference in proportions of response was statistically significant. Because multiple comparisons were made, a Bonferroni correction was applied to reduce the risk of a family-wise Type 1 error. With this correction, the *p*-value was divided by the number of possible comparisons, making it more difficult to obtain statistically significant results. Results are presented in the Table 6 below.

Table 6
Bonferroni Correction for Donating Time Multiple Comparisons

	Adjusted <i>p</i> -value
Maintain relationships with students	.420
Maintain relationships with faculty/staff	.048
Maintain relationships with the institution	<.001
Maintain relationships with the department	.512

There was a statistically significant difference in the responses of participants when asked about the importance of maintaining relationships with faculty/staff and their willingness to donate time to the institution after graduation ($p = .048$). The most noticeable difference was in the proportion of people who indicated that maintaining relationships with faculty and staff was of low importance; eight of those respondents indicated that donating time to the institution after graduation was of low importance, as compared to only one respondent who indicated that donating time was of high importance.

There was also a statistically significant difference in the responses of participants when asked about the importance of maintaining relationships with the institution and their willingness to donate time to the institution after graduation ($p < .001$). The most noticeable difference was in the proportion of people who indicated that maintaining relationships with the institution was of low importance; seven of those respondents indicated that donating time to the institution after graduation was of low importance, as compared to only one respondent who indicated that donating time was of high importance.

Donation of Financial Assets

Cross-tabulations of responses of the four questions asking about maintaining relationships after graduation – with fellow students, with faculty and staff, with the institution, with the department -- as compared to willingness to donate financially are

presented on the following pages, both in numeric and graphical form. They are represented in Tables 7 through 10. Each table should be read left to right for the row percentages (the specific percentages to the right of the n value) and top to bottom for the columns (with the specific percentages next to the n value).

Table 7
The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with Fellow Students and Intended Donation of Money

		Intended Donation of Money			
		Low	Medium	High	Total
Desire to Maintain Relationships with Fellow Students	Low (row) (column)	($n = 11$) 75% 40.9%	($n = 0$) 0% 0%	($n = 1$) 25% 23.1%	($n = 12$) 100%
	Medium (row) (column)	($n = 3$) 50% 18.2%	($n = 4$) 37.5% 50%	($n = 1$) 12.5% 7.7%	($n = 8$) 100%
	High (row) (column)	($n = 9$) 40% 40.9%	($n = 3$) 16% 50%	($n = 9$) 44% 69.2%	($n = 21$) 100%
	Total	($n = 23$) 100%	($n = 7$) 100%	($n = 11$) 100%	

Table 8
The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with Faculty/Staff and Intended Donation of Money

		Intended Donation of Money			
		Low	Medium	High	Total
Desire to Maintain Relationships with Faculty/Staff	Low (row) (column)	($n = 8$) 88.9% 34.8%	($n = 0$) 0% 0%	($n = 1$) 11.1% 9.1%	($n = 9$) 100%
	Medium (row) (column)	($n = 3$) 50% 21.7%	($n = 4$) 40% 57.1%	($n = 1$) 10% 9.1%	($n = 8$) 100%
	High (row) (column)	($n = 9$) 45.5% 43.5%	($n = 3$) 13.6% 42.9%	($n = 9$) 40.1% 81.8%	($n = 21$) 100%
	Total	($n = 22$) 100%	($n = 6$) 100%	($n = 13$) 100%	

Table 9

The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with the Institution and Intended Donation of Money

		Intended Donation of Money			
		Low	Medium	High	Total
Desire to Maintain Relationships with the Institution	Low (row)	(n = 11) 78.6%	(n = 2) 14.3%	(n = 1) 7.1%	(n = 14) 100%
	(column)	47.8%	28.6%	9.1%	
	Medium (row)	(n = 6) 60%	(n = 3) 30%	(n = 1) 10%	(n = 10) 100%
	(column)	26.1%	42.9%	9.1%	
	High (row)	(n = 6) 35.3%	(n = 2) 11.8%	(n = 9) 52.9%	(n = 17) 100%
	(column)	26.1%	28.6%	81.8%	
	Total	(n = 23) 100%	(n = 7) 100%	(n = 11) 100%	

Table 10

The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with the Department and Intended Donation of Money

		Intended Donation of Money			
		Low	Medium	High	Total
Desire to Maintain Relationships with the Department	Low (row)	(n = 7) 87.5%	(n = 0) 0%	(n = 1) 12.5%	(n = 8) 100%
	(column)	30.4%	0%	9.1%	
	Medium (row)	(n = 4) 50%	(n = 3) 37.5%	(n = 1) 12.5%	(n = 8) 100%
	(column)	17.4%	42.9%	9.1%	
	High (row)	(n = 12) 48%	(n = 4) 16%	(n = 9) 36%	(n = 25) 100%
	(column)	52.2%	57.1%	81.8%	
	Total	(n = 23) 100%	(n = 7) 100%	(n = 11) 100%	

Using the Fisher's Exact Test, an assessment can be made as to whether the difference in proportions of response was statistically significant. Because multiple comparisons were made, a Bonferroni correction was applied to reduce the risk of a family-wise Type 1 error. Results are presented in the Table 11 below.

Table 11

Bonferroni Correction for Donating Financially Multiple Comparisons

	Adjusted <i>p</i>-value
Maintain relationships with students	0.024
Maintain relationships with faculty/staff	0.184
Maintain relationships with the institution	0.096
Maintain relationships with the department	0.708

There was a statistically significant difference ($p = .024$) in the responses of participants when asked about the importance of maintaining relationships with students and their willingness to donate financially to the institution after graduation. The most noticeable difference was in the proportion of people who indicated that maintaining relationships with fellow students was of low importance; 11 of those respondents indicated that donating financially to the institution after graduation was of low importance, as compared to only one respondent who indicated that donating financially was of high importance.

There was a marginally significant difference ($p = .096$) in the responses of participants when asked about the importance of maintaining relationships with the institution and their willingness to donate financially to the institution after graduation. The most noticeable difference was in the proportion of people who indicated that maintaining relationships with the institution was of low importance; 11 of those respondents indicated that donating financially to the institution after graduation was of low importance, as compared to only one respondent who indicated that donating financially was of high importance.

Donation of Business Expertise

Cross-tabulations of responses of the four questions asking about maintaining relationships after graduation – with fellow students, with faculty and staff, with the institution, with the department –as compared to willingness to donate business expertise are

presented on the following pages, both in numeric and graphical form. They are represented in Tables 12 through 15. Each table should be read left to right for the row percentages (the specific percentages to the right of the *n* value) and top to bottom for the columns (with the specific percentages next to the *n* value).

Table 12

The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with Fellow Students and Intended Donation of Business Expertise

		Intended Donation of Business Expertise			
		Low	Medium	High	Total
Desire to Maintain Relationships with Fellow Students	Low (row)	(<i>n</i> = 10) 83.3%	(<i>n</i> = 0) 0%	(<i>n</i> = 2) 16.7%	(<i>n</i> = 12) 100%
	(column)	52.6%	0%	13.3%	
	Medium (row)	(<i>n</i> = 4) 50%	(<i>n</i> = 3) 37.5%	(<i>n</i> = 1) 12.5%	(<i>n</i> = 8) 100%
	(column)	21.1%	42.9%	6.7%	
	High (row)	(<i>n</i> = 5) 23.8%	(<i>n</i> = 4) 19%	(<i>n</i> = 12) 57.1%	(<i>n</i> = 21) 100%
	(column)	26.3%	57.1%	80%	
	Total	(<i>n</i> = 19) 100%	(<i>n</i> = 7) 100%	(<i>n</i> = 15) 100%	

Table 13

The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with Faculty/Staff and Intended Donation of Business Expertise

		Intended Donation of Business Expertise			
		Low	Medium	High	Total
Desire to Maintain Relationships with Faculty/Staff	Low (row)	(<i>n</i> = 7) 77.8%	(<i>n</i> = 1) 11.1%	(<i>n</i> = 1) 11.1%	(<i>n</i> = 9) 100%
	(column)	36.8%	14.3%	6.7%	
	Medium (row)	(<i>n</i> = 3) 30%	(<i>n</i> = 4) 40%	(<i>n</i> = 3) 30%	(<i>n</i> = 10) 100%
	(column)	15.8%	57.1%	20%	
	High (row)	(<i>n</i> = 9) 40.9%	(<i>n</i> = 2) 9.1%	(<i>n</i> = 11) 50%	(<i>n</i> = 22) 100%
	(column)	47.4%	28.6%	73.3%	
	Total	(<i>n</i> = 19) 100%	(<i>n</i> = 7) 100%	(<i>n</i> = 15) 100%	

Table 14

The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with the Institution and Intended Donation of Business Expertise

		Intended Donation of Business Expertise			
		Low	Medium	High	Total
Desire to Maintain Relationships with the Institution	Low (row)	(n = 12) 85.7%	(n = 2) 14.3%	(n = 0) 0%	(n = 14) 100%
	(column)	63.2%	28.6%	0%	
	Medium (row)	(n = 3) 30%	(n = 4) 40%	(n = 3) 30%	(n = 10) 100%
	(column)	15.8%	57.1%	20%	
	High (row)	(n = 4) 23.5%	(n = 1) 5.9%	(n = 12) 70.6%	(n = 17) 100%
	(column)	21.1%	14.3%	80%	
	Total	(n = 19) 100%	(n = 7) 100%	(n = 15) 100%	

Table 15

The Influence of Desire to Maintain Relationships with the Department and Intended Donation of Business Expertise

		Intended Donation of Business Expertise			
		Low	Medium	High	Total
Desire to Maintain Relationships with the Department	Low (row)	(n = 6) 75%	(n = 0) 0%	(n = 2) 25%	(n = 8) 100%
	(column)	31.6%	0%	13.3%	
	Medium (row)	(n = 5) 62.5%	(n = 2) 25%	(n = 1) 12.5%	(n = 8) 100%
	(column)	26.3%	28.6%	6.7%	
	High (row)	(n = 8) 32%	(n = 5) 20%	(n = 12) 48%	(n = 25) 100%
	(column)	42.1%	71.4%	80%	
	Total	(n = 19) 100%	(n = 7) 100%	(n = 15) 100%	

Using the Fisher's Exact Test, an assessment can be made as to whether the difference in proportions of response was statistically significant. Because multiple comparisons were made, a Bonferroni correction was applied to reduce the risk of a family-wise Type 1 error. Results are presented in the Table 16 below.

Table 16

Bonferroni Correction for Donating Business Expertise Multiple Comparisons

	Adjusted <i>p</i> -value
Maintain relationships with students	.016
Maintain relationships with faculty/staff	.244
Maintain relationships with the institution	<.001
Maintain relationships with the department	.448

There was a statistically significant difference ($p = .016$) in the responses of participants when asked about the importance of maintaining relationships with students and their willingness to donate business expertise to the institution after graduation. The most noticeable difference was in the proportion of people who indicated that maintaining relationships with fellow students was of low importance; 10 of those respondents indicated that donating business expertise to the institution after graduation was of low importance, as compared to two respondents who indicated that donating business expertise was of high importance. A trend is also noticeable among people who indicated that maintaining relationships with fellow students was of high importance; five such students indicated that donating business expertise was of low importance, as compared to 12 students who indicated that donating business expertise was of high importance.

There was also a statistically significant difference ($p < .001$) in the responses of participants when asked about the importance of maintaining relationships with the institution and their willingness to donate business expertise to the institution after graduation. The most noticeable difference was in the proportion of people who indicated that maintaining relationships with the institution was of low importance; 12 of those respondents indicated that donating business expertise to the institution after graduation was of low importance, with none of respondents who indicated that donating business expertise was of high importance. Additionally, a difference exists in students who indicated that maintaining relationships with the institution was of high importance; there were no students who indicated that maintaining a relationship with the institution was of low importance and donating business expertise was of high importance, as compared to 12 students who

indicated that both maintaining a relationship with the institution and donating business expertise were both of high importance.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this research, while limited by the number of respondents and other unanticipated roadblocks, provide foundational data worthy of analysis as a springboard for further query. However, with only 44 respondents of the over 800 survey e-mail requests, it doesn't provide a broad enough base to meet the statistical significance needed to provide traditional research validity.

As mentioned previously, the survey was also conducted at a university in flux with its research development and in significant transformation to a regional "destination university." Over the last decade, the university has made tremendous strides in its move to provide students with quality campus-life opportunities. But as with all great advancements in institutional development, there are always some lead/lag components, and research – both at the institutional and student participation levels – appears to be one component still at a fledgling stage. While systems on innovation, application, and accountability are in place and the commitment unquestioned at the senior administrative level, some obligated mid-level administrative stakeholders appear hesitant in embracing this institutional growth with their support.

Hypotheses and Conclusions

The conclusions of this study are not of a level for validation because of the sparse responses to the survey. Nonetheless, these are the null hypotheses researched and the resulting findings.

- *Student Involvement Versus Noninvolvement in Campus Life Activities*

1a) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of time to their institution later in life based on their involvement versus noninvolvement in campus life activities.

1b) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming financial donors to their institution later in life based on their involvement versus noninvolvement in campus life activities.

1c) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of business expertise to their institution later in life based on their involvement versus noninvolvement in campus life activities.

The elements analyzed for Hypotheses 1a, 1b, and 1c were found in survey questions 4, 5 and 7. Hypotheses results of 1a were represented statistically in Tables 2, 4, and 5; 1b in Tables 7, 9, and 10; and 1c in Tables 12, 14, and 15. Unfortunately, there were not enough respondents answering these campus life activities questions (i.e., only one or two people responding yes to certain questions). So the research failed to reject these null hypotheses.

- *Proximity of Where Students Lived Prior to Enrollment*

2a) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of time to their institution later in life based on the proximity of where they lived prior to their enrollment.

2b) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming financial donors to their institution later in life based on the proximity of where they lived prior to their enrollment.

2c) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of business expertise to their institution later in life based on the proximity of where they lived prior to their enrollment.

The elements analyzed for Hypotheses 2a, 2b, and 2c were found in survey questions 2, 7, and 12. Hypotheses results of 2a were represented statistically in Table 4, 2b in Table 9, and 2c in Table 14. The conclusions were that there were no statistically significant differences observed for willingness to donate time, finance, and business expertise, so the research failed to reject these null hypotheses.

- *Student Family Heritage with Institution*

3a) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of time to their institution later in life based on whether they are a legacy student.

3b) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming financial donors to their institution later in life based on whether they are a legacy student.

3c) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of business expertise to their institution later in life based on whether they are a legacy student.

The elements analyzed for Hypotheses 3a, 3b, and 3c were found in survey questions 1 and 7. Hypotheses results of 3a were represented statistically in Table 4, 3b in Table 9, and

3c in Table 14. The conclusions were that there were no statistically significant correlations found in willingness to donate time, finances, or business expertise, so the research failed to reject these null hypotheses.

- *Scholarship Versus Nonscholarship Students*

4a) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of time to their institution later in life based on whether they are students on scholarship.

4b) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming financial donors to their institution later in life based on whether they are students on scholarship.

4c) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of business expertise to their institution later in life based on whether they are students on scholarship.

The elements analyzed for Hypotheses 4a, 4b, and 4c were found in questions 7 and 15. Hypotheses results of 4a were represented statistically in Tables 4 and 5, 4b in Tables 9 and 10, and 4c in Tables 14 and 15. The conclusions were that there were no statistically significant differences in the willingness of students to become a) donors of time, b) financial donors, or c) donors of business expertise to their institution based on whether they were students on scholarships, so the research failed to reject these null hypotheses.

- *Undergraduate Versus Graduate Students*

5a) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of time to their institution later in life based on their being undergraduate students versus graduate students.

5b) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming financial donors to their institution later in life based on their being undergraduate students versus graduate students.

5c) There will be no difference in the willingness of students to consider becoming donors of business expertise to their institution later in life based on their being undergraduate students versus graduate students.

The elements for Hypotheses 5a, 5b, and 5c were found in survey questions 7 and 11. Hypotheses results of 5a were represented statistically in Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7; 5b in Tables 7, 8, 9, and 10; and 5c in Tables 12, 13, 14, and 15. The conclusions were that there were no statistically significant differences in the willingness of students to become donors to their institution based on their being undergraduate students versus graduate students, so the research failed to reject these null hypotheses.

Recommendations

The value of this research can provide substantial growth related to universities developing both new donor programs and those wanting to enhance existing programs. A number of identifiable recommendations should be considered as a result of the research. Each could create additional value in the marketing of education with a specific focus on the relationship between college student experiences and the desire to become a donor. Each recommendation could provide a better understanding of variables and their possible significance, enriching the university foundation's knowledge and potentially improve their donor relationships and levels of measurable support to their alma maters.

This study should be duplicated at other institutions to further address the hypotheses considered. Sheer numbers would serve to bolster conclusions identified and/or provide

counter analysis, either of which would assist in institutional consideration in development programs. It would also be most interesting to compare this study at this institution, with its previously described student demographic makeup, against a private institution with a majority of students on some level of scholarship funding and a minority of them working at least part time to help fund their education.

Comprehensive institutions with active research components involving student interaction and providing a robust environment in which students understand the value of research and freely participate in on-campus studies and surveys would enhance the potential for in-depth, qualified results. Institutions with streamlined Internal Review Board prerequisites and minimized bureaucratic layers of approval will help expedite the process of getting the survey to the students and build a broader cross-section for interaction and results.

Consideration of other social media vehicles for soliciting student participation should be considered for the continued study of this research and looking forward to other research requiring interaction with college-aged students. Students are already involved with social media as a component of the educational experience. Research shows over 90% of faculty use social media as a tool for professional and class involvement (Moran, Seaman, & Tinti-Kane, 2011). While university-provided student e-mail accounts is an established and historically proven vehicle for communication, the speed at which today's college students are finding, using, embracing, and/or abandoning the various and evolving social media platforms as communication tools complicates research interactions.

From the data collected and analyzed, the following are some short-term opportunities for foundations to initiate immediately as well as some long-term considerations that could

increase donor possibilities looking toward future years. The following recommendations are separated into short-term and long-term interests.

Short Term

Foundations at universities should immediately identify current campus leaders and those involved in activities and begin the grooming process for continued involvement with the university after graduation. Many institutions use the term “stewardship” in their alumni relations or development offices and take simple steps like sending birthday cards, graduation congratulation cards, and other nominal actions to plant seeds of support and appreciation (Kemp-DeLisser, 2015). This could be a small but meaningful gesture for the current students that might warm them to the idea of maintaining a relationship with the institution. Short notes written on the cards by foundation employees should include references to one or more of the students’ campus activities. Follow-on communications should build on knowledge gained through foundation research to identify not only all the activities of these students, but which are considered more important by the students themselves. If the institution requests and retains graduating seniors resumes, identified extra-curricular activities would show their involvement and an understanding of the culture they enjoyed in college as researched by Steepers (2009) and also Holmes (2009).

Simultaneously, the foundation should build a database on alumni based on their campus activities during their college days and integrate it with a social medium platform. Currently Facebook would be an excellent platform for extended relationships as it is a vehicle students in a study at a major Midwest comprehensive university found to be a readily used social network site for student interaction in building and maintaining social capital (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007, p. 1162). “Our participants overwhelmingly used Facebook to

keep in touch with old friends and to maintain or intensify relationships characterized by some form of offline connection such as dormitory proximity or a shared class.” A further study found Facebook users positively associated with civic participation, including “volunteering to help the needy, fundraising for nongovernmental organizations, participating in community services, or being an active member of an environmental organization” (Valenzuela, Park, & Kee, 2009, p. 879).

With a functioning database and a student-turned-alumni audience, periodic notes to them should include references to their “college days” activities with maybe an update on what one or more of those activities (clubs, events, programs) are doing today. Not every communication would need to have a request for a contribution, but quarterly notes would lay the groundwork for an annual request. Over a year or more, continued development of the individual alums with database notes could build a basis for focused development.

There could also be a combination of the above two programs with requested support and participation of current students in reaching out to alumni who were involved in the current students’ campus activities with invitations to attend current on-campus events of the organizations and flattering acknowledgement at those organizational events. This would help in the immediate building of data on current campus leaders and provide an emotional tie between two generations of university students who had similar experiences. Pumerantz (2004) entitled this concept “alumni-in-training.” This outreach could be extended to reach one of the surveyed considerations of alumni being asked to be speakers at club meetings and/or program days. This contribution by alumni is in essence a soft commitment of support to the institution and would begin a new weave within the fabric of lifetime support by the alumni, in similar respect to the research findings of Wampler (2013).

Long Term

Foundation managers should reach alumni who were leaders on campus and in organizations during their college years. Perhaps a taskforce within the foundation should build a database and cross reference it with other foundation data to ensure graduates of the institution who were active on campus are part of the formal foundation work. Where it can be determined, this data should identify the alumni who were most active as students and foundation representatives assigned to track all institutional communications to ensure they are 1) kept current as to university activities and 2) not overly burdened with uncoordinated contact with the institution.

The foundation should also consider annual events that would be of interest to these alumni and work to confirm their participation. This could be alumni association events honoring such alumni or on-campus activities these alumni would enjoy (such as national speaker events, unique music programs, student-driven entertainment shows, special interests programs focused on categorically definable elements easily identified with a specific alumni subset – i.e., energy, gender, or ethnic celebration, agricultural, military association, international focus, athletic, economic, entertainment industry, etc.). These events don't need to be large, campus-wide activities. In fact, research suggest some demographic groups actually become more involved and better bond in smaller settings (Redmore & Tynon, 2010). The more opportunities to have alumni back on campus, the better the possibility of tying or reigniting a potential monetary tie between the institution and the alumni.

The foundation, perhaps through the president's office, should conduct a curriculum review of all programs, including fundraising elements, in their course offerings. Certainly there would be courses in business marketing, business communications, and/or brand

communications, educational funding, perhaps architecture or art, sports management, public administration, political science and/or campaign analysis, entrepreneurial development, and many other possibilities that would have component elements focused on funding sources. The foundation should offer its expertise in developing course materials, seminars, or other speaker opportunities to interact with professors and students alike in discussing the professional development of fundraising and finance, be it corporate or public, and its impact on business, social issues/political development, educational growth, and other areas of research. Areas of mutual consideration could stimulate future development in the areas of research of value to the specific educational programs and professors while stimulating ideas and positive attitudes toward future alumni funding sources for the institution that could, in turn, further support the development of the educational programs involved in the initial research. Identifying these types of courses could lead to advanced studies, courses, or even entire programs creating a platform for donor development 10, 20, and even 30 years down the road. A long-term strategy beginning with incoming freshmen could be evolutionary in funding development for a generation from now.

Looking to the Future

Research in this area of donor programs is still relatively young, formalized less than a century ago, and the formalized focus on alumni even younger. But there is a wealth of potential, not only with established alumni possessing significant business ties and much discretionary income, but with young graduates who have enjoyed their college experience and appreciate the institutional support provided throughout their educational years. As this study addressed, there are even avenues that can be developed to channel future donors during their collegiate days.

Conscientious institution foundation professionals, in concert with senior administrators and willing faculty, can grow the social support of current students to become valuable donors in the short term (time and business expertise) and beyond (donor participants) with comprehensive development programs that are educational, valuable, and meaningful.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, J.D. (1978). Philanthropy within the American Bar Association: The next hundred years. *American Bar Association Journal*, 64(10), 1356- 1358.
- Bremner, R.H. (1988). *American philanthropy* (2nd. Ed). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1960)
- Breneman, D.W. (2002). For colleges, this is not just another recession. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 14, 2002.
- Brittingham, B.E., & Pezzullo, T.R. (1990). *The campus green: Fund raising in higher education*. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports). Washington, DC: The George Washington University
- Chadwick-Jones, J.K. (1976). *Social exchange theory: Its structure and influence in social psychology*. London: Academic Press.
- Cohen, A.M. (2007). *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cohen, A.M., & Kisker, C.B. (2010). *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of contemporary system* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

- deRidder-Symoens, H. (1996). *A history of the university in Europe: Vol 2. Universities in early modern Europe (1500-1800)*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dietlin, L.M. (2011). *Transformational philanthropy: Entrepreneurs and nonprofits*. Burlington MA: Jones & Bartlett Publishers.
- Ellison, N.B., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2007). The benefits of Facebook “friends:” Social capital and college students’ use of online social network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(4), 1143-1168.
- Fischer, H. (2009). University presidents decry funding cuts. *East Valley/Scottsdale Tribune*, retrieved from <http://www.eastvalleytribune.com/story/13404>.
- Griffin, K.A., & Hurtado, S. (2011). Institutional variety in American higher education. In *Student services: A handbook for the profession*, 24-42.
- Holmes, J. (2009). Prestige, charitable deductions and other determinants of alumni giving: Evidence from a highly selective liberal arts college. *Economics of Educational Review*, 28, 18-28.
- Kelderman, E. (2009). More cuts for colleges are likely even after states pass budgets. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 29.
- Kemp-DeLisser, Khristian (2015). Stewardship of Underrepresented Communities. *The Vermont Connection*, 27(1), 4. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.uvm.edu/tvc/vol27/iss1/4>
- Lackie, M.B. (2010). Alumni giving at Arkansas Tech University: College experiences and motivations to give as predictors of giving behavior. (University of Arkansas). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*.
- Marr, K.A., Mullin, C.H., & Siegfried, J.J. (2003). Undergraduate financial aid and subsequent alumni giving behavior. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 45 (3), 123-143.
- McAlexander, J.H., & Koenig, H.F. (2012). Building communities of philanthropy higher education: Contextual influences. *International Journal of Non-Profit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 17, 122-131.
- McAllister, S.M. (2013). Toward a dialogic theory of fundraising. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 37(4), 262-277.
- Miller, M.T., & Casebeer, A.L. (1990). Donor characteristics of college of education alumni: Examining undergraduate involvement.

- Monks, J. (2002). Patterns of giving to one's alma mater among young graduates from selective institutions. *Economics of Education*, 22, 121-130.
- Moran, M., Seaman, J., & Tinti-Kane, H. (2011). Teaching, learning, and sharing: How today's higher education faculty use social media. *Babson Survey Research Group*.
- Nicoson, D.J. (2010). Prospect development systems: Empowering artful fundraising. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 149, 73-79.
- Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, Annual Report, 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.okhighered.org/studies-reports/annual-report/annual-report2014.pdf>
- Oklahoma State University website, New Graduate Student Handbook, 2011, p. 21. Retrieved from <https://gradcollege.okstate.edu>
- O'Neil, J., & Schenke, M. (2007). An examination of factors impacting athlete alumni donations to their alma mater: A case study of a U.S. university. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 12(February), 59-74. DOI: 10.1002/nvsm.274
- O'Neil, P.P. (2005). The undergraduate Greek membership on alumni giving at the College of William and Mary. (The College of William and Mary). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*.
- Page, M.B. (2011). Creating a culture of giving: An exploration of the role of young alumni in institutional philanthropic efforts. (The University of Texas). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*.
- Pederson, O. (1997). *The first universities: Stadium generale and the origins of university education in Europe*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pumerantz, R.K. (2004). *Alumni-in-training: Institutional factors associated with greater alumni giving at public comprehensive colleges and universities* (Doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate University).
- Redmore, L.E., & Tynon, J.F. (2010). WOWnet: A communication and networking model for women. *Journal of Extension*, 46(5).
- Riché, P. (1978). *Education and culture in barbarian west*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Ryan, E.F. (2003). Sources and information: Development and fundraising within community colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 124, 95-104.
- Skorton, D.J. (2009). Erasing the deficit and enhancing Cornell's excellence through thoughtful and imaginative change. *Letter from the office of the President, Cornell*

University, retrieved at:<http://www.cornell.edu/president/statements/2009/20090125-fy2009-budget.cfm>

- Somers, M.L. (1960). The social psychology of groups. John W. Thibaut and Harold H. Kelley, *Chicago Journals Social Service Review*, 34 (4), 455-457.
- Steepers, D.W. (2009). The effects of selected undergraduate student involvement and alumni characteristics on alumni gift-giving behavior at the University of Virginia. (University of Virginia). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*.
- Thelin, J.R. (2003). Historical overview of American higher education. *Student services: A handbook for the profession*, 4, 3-22.
- Thibaut, J.W., & Kelley, H.H., (1986). *The social psychology of groups*. New York: Wiley.
- Thomas, J.A. (2005). The relationship between personal and social growth and involvement in college and subsequent alumni giving. (University of Memphis). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*.
- Thomas, J., & Smart, J. (2005). The relationship between personal and social growth and involvement in college and subsequent alumni giving. *Online Submission (ERIC Document Reproduction Service. No. ED 491032)*.
- Tollefson, T. (2009). Community college governance, funding, and accountability: A century of issues and trends. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 33(3-4), 386-402.
- University of Central Oklahoma website, Academic Affairs Institutional Research, Fall 2014 Demographics Book, Fall 2014, 5-28. Retrieved from <http://www.uco.edu/>
- University of Central Oklahoma website, Academic Affairs Institutional Research, Factbook, 2001-2002, Student Housing, p. 53. Retrieved from <http://www.uco.edu/>
- University of Central Oklahoma website, Academic Affairs Institutional Research Factbook 2014-2015, Student Housing, p. 65. Retrieved from <http://www.uco.edu/>
- University of Indiana Center on Philanthropy website. Retrieved from <http://www.philanthropy.iupui.edu/>
- Valenzuela, S., Park, N., & Kee, K.F. (2009). Is there social capital in a social network site? Facebook use and college students' life satisfaction, trust, and participation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 14(4), 875-901.
- Wampler, F.H. (2013). Bridges to a lifelong connection: A study of Ivy Plus young alumni programs designed to transition recent graduates into engaged alumni (University of Pennsylvania). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*.

Ward, H. (2004). The impact of collegiate involvement on African-American, Alumni giving. (Bowling Green State University). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*.

Weerts, D.J., & Ronca, J.M. (2007). Profiles of supportive alumni: Donors, volunteers, and those who “do it all.” *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 7(1), 20-34.

Worth, M.J. (2002). The historical overview. In M.J. Worth (Ed.), *New strategies for educational fundraising*. Westport, CT: Paeger.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Dissertation E-Mail Survey Introduction (Spring Semester)

E-MAIL INTRODUCTION

The University of Central Oklahoma, in cooperation with doctoral candidate David Bennett's dissertation research, is conducting a survey regarding members of University of Central Oklahoma Student Alumni Association and their relationships with the university, on-campus activities, and events. It would be greatly appreciated if you would take the approximate four to seven minutes to complete the linked survey in support of this valuable data collection. This study has both UCO and OSU IRB approval and authorization from the UCO Alumni Association.

By continuing to the survey beyond this page, you are confirming your willingness to participate without undue influence, your being at least 18 years old, and your understanding all information provided by you is done so anonymously with the expectation that anonymity will be maintained. To that end, all data collected in this research is through an independent, third-party web service research organization that will only provide raw data in co-mingled groupings per question so that no one individual's responses can be tied together. Only the group averages will be shared with the UCO Alumni Association.

Thank you for your participation. This information will help the UCO Alumni Association be more supportive to your needs and interests.

Appendix B: Dissertation E-Mail Survey Introduction (Fall Semester)

E-Mail Introduction

The University of Central Oklahoma and the University of Central Oklahoma Student Alumni Association are excited to have you on campus as we begin the fall semester. To maximize your overall college experience, this e-mail survey is being offered as a collaborative effort with doctoral candidate David Bennett and his dissertation research regarding UCO students and their relationships with the university's on-campus activities and events. Your participation will enhance both your experience and the experiences of all UCO students over the next few years.

The survey only takes four to seven minutes to complete and provides valuable data. Because it is collected through an independent, third-party web service research organization, the university and primary researcher will only be provided raw data in co-mingled groupings per question so individual participant anonymity is totally maintained and no one individual's responses can be tied together.

This study has both UCO and OSU IRB approval and authorization from the UCO Alumni Association. By continuing to the survey beyond this page, you are confirming your willingness to participate without undue influence, your being at least 18 years old, and your understanding all information provided by you is done so anonymously with the expectation that anonymity will be maintained.

Thank you in advance for participating and helping us provide the highest quality of experience for all our UCO students. Have a wonderful fall semester, and Go Broncos!!

Appendix C: Student Survey as Presented Through Qualtrics

					2
0	C7YqUliMQlhM6lc				
					2
0	C7YqUliMQlhM6lc				



COLLEGE OF
Education

David Bennett

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY &
UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL OKLAHOMA**

Title: The relationship between college student experiences and the desire to become a donor

Investigators: David Bennett, EdD candidate, Dr. Bert Jacobson, EdD, Dr. Cia Verschelden, EdD

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to determine if there is a relationship between a student’s college experiences and that student’s desire to become a donor to the institution. You must be 18 years or older to participate. **What to Expect:** This research study is administered online. Participation in this research will involve completion of a questionnaire. You may skip any questions that you do not wish to answer. You will be expected to complete the questionnaire once. It should take you about four to seven minutes to complete.

Risks: There are no risks associated with this project that are expected to be greater than those ordinarily encountered in daily life.

Benefits: There are no direct benefits to you. However, you may gain an appreciation and understanding of how research is conducted.

Compensation: No direct compensation is involved.

Your Rights and Confidentiality: Your participation in this research is voluntary. There is no penalty for refusal to participate, and you are free to withdraw your consent and participation in this project at any time.

Confidentiality: The records of this study will be kept private. Any written results will discuss group findings and will not include information that will identify you. Research records will be stored on a password protected computer in a locked office, and only researchers and individuals responsible for research oversight will have access to the records. Data will be destroyed three years after the study has been completed.

Contacts: You may contact any of the researchers at the following addresses and phone numbers, should you desire to discuss your participation in the study and/or request information about the results of the study: David Bennett, EdD Candidate, STCL, College of Education, 237 Willard Hall, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK 74048, 405-744-9214. Dr. Bert Jacobson, Health and Human Performance, College of Education, 180 Colvin Recreational Center, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK 74078. Dr. Cia Verschelden, University of Central Oklahoma, 100 N. University, Edmond, OK 73034. If you have questions about your rights as a research volunteer, you may contact Dr. Shelia Kennison, OSU IRB Chair, 219 Cordell North, Stillwater, OK 74078, 405-744-3377, irb@okstate.edu or Dr. Jill Devenport, UCO IRB chair, 216 Lillard Administration Building, University of Central Oklahoma, Edmond, OK 73034, 974- 5497, irb@uco.edu.

If you choose to participate: Please, click NEXT if you choose to participate. By clicking NEXT, you are indicating that you freely and voluntarily and agree to participate in this study and you also acknowledge that you are at least 18 years of age.

It is recommended that you print a copy of this consent page for your records before you begin the study by clicking below.

NEXT

No, I don't meet the above qualifications

Q1

On a scale of 1 (no importance) to 7 (most important) please rate the following regarding their influence on your attraction to your university. (Please answer each factor. If it is not applicable, choose the number 1.)

	No Importance						Most Important
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Area of study (your major)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Attractiveness of campus	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Availability of public transportation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Class size	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Community support	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Evening course offerings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Family's relationship with institution	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q2

(continued) On a scale of 1 (no importance) to 7 (most important) please rate the following regarding their influence on your attraction to your university. (Please answer each factor. If it is not applicable, choose the number 1.)

	No Importance						Most Important
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Greek life	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Influence of close friend attending	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Job opportunities while in college	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Library (institution's research capabilities)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Location related to your family home	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
On-campus housing opportunities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
On-line course offerings	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q3

(continued) On a scale of 1 (no importance) to 7 (most important) please rate the following regarding their influence on your attraction to your university. (Please answer each factor. If it is not applicable, choose the number 1.)

	No Importance						Most Important
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Safety	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Strength of intramural program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Strength of student government	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Varsity athletic program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Institution's reputation

Q4

Are you currently involved with and/or a member of any of the following organizations/clubs/student activities:

	Yes	No
Arts-oriented program (such as entertainment, graphic, music)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Education-related club/organization (such as math, psychology)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fraternity/Sorority	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Honors program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Housing governance (Greek, Off-campus, On-campus)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Intramural team/program	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q5

(continued) Are you currently involved with and/or a member of any of the following organizations/clubs/student activities:

	Yes	No
Leadership program (such as a dean's or president's council)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Minority program (such as ethnic, international, sexual-orientation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Service-Learning program (such as public or non-profit projects)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Special interest-related (such as chess, hobby, military, running)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student government (such as college or university)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q6

On a scale of 1 (no importance) to 7 (most important) please rate the following:

	No Importance						Most Important
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Maintaining contact with fellow students after graduation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Maintaining contact with faculty/staff after graduation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Maintaining a relationship with the institution after graduation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Maintaining a relationship with your college after graduation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Maintaining a relationship with your department after graduation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q7

On a scale of one (no importance) to seven (most important) please rate the following:

	No Importance						Most Important
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
After graduation, offering/providing support to your university in the form of a donation of your time	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
After graduation, offering/providing support to your university in the form of a financial donation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
After graduation, offering/providing support to your university in the form of offering your business expertise	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q8

Please provide your year of birth:

Q9

Please indicate your gender:

- Male
- Female

Q10

Which of the following best describes you?

Single	Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q11

In number of college credit hours completed, what most closely identifies your college classification?

Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate student	Other
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q12

Prior to enrolling at this institution, what was the approximate distance from your home to campus?

Less than 50 miles	50 to 250 miles	More than 250 miles
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q13

If you are a U.S. resident, select of which state? (If you are not from one of the 50 states, select choice #51)

Click here to edit choices

Q14

If you are not from the United States, indicate from which country you have come to study. (If you identified a state in the above question, skip this question)

Q15

Please identify by approximate percentage how your education (tuition /room & board) is being funded. Multiple answers are possible but should total 100 percent.

Employer

Endowment fund

Military benefits

Parent(s)

Scholarship(s)

Student

Other (please specify)

Total

Q16

Are you a current member of the UCO Student Alumni Association?

Yes	No
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q17

Upon graduation, do you expect to continue or establish your membership in the alumni association?

- Yes, as a special "young alumni" annual member (at \$15.00 per year for the first 3 years)
- Yes, as a life member (at \$750.00 single payment)
- Yes, as a life member (in four installments of \$190.00 per quarter year)
- No

Appendix D: Support Request E-Mail to College Dean and Department Chair

Dr. Steward and Dr. Miller:

I am conducting research regarding the relationship between students' involvement in campus life activities and their propensity to become donors sometime after graduation. Dr. Christy Vincent has been most gracious in agreeing to provide me access to students who are current members of UCO's Student Alumni Association in that the university requires a UCO representative to be a part of research conducted at UCO.

In working through the Institutional Review Board at UCO, Dr. Jill Devenport has introduced me to the new application. A part of the application requires Christy's signature as the Co-Primary Investigator. Additionally, because of her position as a Mass Communication professor, I will also need the department chair's signature and the college dean's signature. I am attaching the entire IRB application for your review and am asking that you assist me – through your signatures – to proceed with the research. Dr. Devenport has indicated that if I can have the entire packet to her on Wednesday, April 2, she can complete her portion of the IRB process late this week or early next week. Because of the need to complete a student survey sent via campus e-mail to the target students prior to their focusing on finals, it is important it be sent within the next week. UCO's Information Technology has indicated that is possible if they receive the IRB approval early next week.

Long story short, I will be on campus Wednesday morning and am hoping that I can meet with each of you briefly to answer any questions and secure your individual signatures. To assist with your understanding, I am attaching the 21 pages of the IRB application packet. Truly, the only pages of interest to you would be the bottom of page 1 and onto the top of page 3 (where the description of the purpose/hypothesis of the project is) and page 10 (where the description of the benefits the study is).

I genuinely appreciate your consideration and support of this research project.

Thank you.

-- David

Appendix E (1): Survey Test Results

From: "Jacobson, Bert H. Jacobson" <bert.jacobson@okstate.edu>

To: "davidbennett@earthlink.net"

Subject: RE: Excel spread sheets

Date: Nov 8, 2013 10:43 AM

David: I have analyzed your data and the result is $r = .86$. (strong reliability)

Bert H. Jacobson, Ed.D., FACSM
Professor – Health and Human Performance
Seretean Endowed Professor
Oklahoma State University
180 CRC
405 744 2025
Bert.jacobson@okstate.edu

Appendix E (2): Test Survey A Raw Data

AGE	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29+
	0	2	2	1	1	0	2	1	0	1	0	0
GENDER	male	female										
	10	0										
CLASSIFICATION	freshman	sophomor	junior	senior	gradute st							
	0	4	3	3	0							
FUNDING SOURCES	up to 25%	25-50%	51-75%	76-100%								
student	1	0	3	0								
parent (s)	2	1	0	3								
trust fund	1	0	0	0								
scholarship (s)	2	1	0	2								
employer	1	0	1	0								
military benefits	1	0	0	2								
other	2	0	1	0								
	PARTICAL	NO INTER	2	3	4	5	6	VERY	BLANK			
area of study		0	0	0	1	3	3	2	1			
attractive campus		0	0	1	2	1	6	0	0			
class size		0	0	1	2	1	1	5	0			
community support		0	0	0	3	5	1	1	0			
cost vs competitors		1	0	1	2	1	1	4	0			

DISTANCE TO
CAMP

3

less than 50 miles	1	0	0	0	3	2	3	1
50-250 miles	1	0	0	2	1	0	2	4
250 plus	2	0	1	1	1	0	2	1
evening courses	1	0	0	2	1	2	3	1
affordability of coll	0	1	0	3	1	2	3	0
are you legacy	6	1	0	0	0	3	0	0
Greek life	1	0	1	0	2	1	5	0
on-campus jobs	1	1	2	1	0	0	5	0
off-campus jobs	0	0	0	1	4	3	2	0
Library capabilities	0	0	0	3	3	3	1	0
on-campus living	2	0	0	5	0	3	1	0
on-line courses	1	1	0	1	2	2	3	0
public transportation	3	1	0	4	0	1	1	0
safety	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	0
fam/friend influence	2	0	0	1	3	3	1	0
sports participation	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	0
student gov partic	1	0	0	4	1	3	1	0
varsity athletic prgm	1	0	1	3	1	1	2	0
univ reputation	0	0	1	1	2	2	4	0

CURRENT INVOLVEMENT

YES

NO

arts-oriented program	0	10
education-related club/org	4	6
fraternity/sorority	10	0
honors program	3	7

housing governance	2	8
intramural team/program	4	6
minority program	1	9
service-learning program	3	7
special interest-related	5	5
student government	2	8

MAINTAIN

CONTAC	NONE	NO INTER	2	3	4	5	6	VERY
fellow students	0	1	0	0	2	2	2	3
faculty/staff	0	2	1	0	1	3	1	2
institution	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	4
college	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	4
department	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4

AFTER GRAD

SUPPO	NONE	1	2	3	4	5	6	VERY
time donation	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	2
financial donation	0	0	2	0	2	3	1	2
business expertise	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	2

ETHNICITY	Africa-Am	Arab	Asian	Caucasian	Hispanic	Hawaii/PI	Native Am	Other
	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0

ARE YOU:	Single	Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed
	10	0	0	0	0

HOME TO CAMPUS	<50 4	50-250 mi 5	>250 1	
RESIDENCY	OKLA 10	USA 10		
Alumni Assoc status	YES 0	NO 10		
After Grad AA	Special 4	Life one 2	Life 4 pay 2	NO 2

less than 50 miles	2	0	1	0	0	3	3	1
50-250 miles	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3
250 plus	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	4
evening courses	0	0	2	2	3	2	1	0
affordability of coll	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	0
legacy influence	4	1	1	3	0	6	0	0
Greek life	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	0
on-campus jobs	1	0	1	3	0	2	2	1
off-campus jobs	1	1	0	0	2	3	2	2
Library capabilities	1	0	0	2	1	4	2	0
on-campus living	3	0	2	1	2	1	1	0
on-line courses	0	0	3	1	1	4	1	0
public transportation	2	3	1	3	0	1	0	0
safety	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	0
fam/friend influence	1	0	0	1	4	2	2	0
sports participation	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	0
student gov partic	0	0	2	3	2	3	0	0
varsity athletic prgm	1	1	2	2	0	3	1	0
univ reputation	1	0	0	2	2	2	3	0

CURRENT INVOLVEMENT	YES	NO	BLANK
arts-oriented program	2	7	1
education-related club/org	4	5	1
fraternity/sorority	10	0	
honors program	2	7	1
housing governance	3	6	1
intramural team/program	5	4	1
minority program	0	9	1

service-learning program	5	4	1
special interest-related student	6	3	1
government	0	9	1

MAINTAIN CONTACT	NO INTER	2	3	4	5	6	VERY
fellow students	0	0	0	3	1	2	4
faculty/staff	0	0	1	4	1	3	1
institution	0	1	0	3	2	2	2
college	0	1	0	2	2	2	3
department	0	1	1	1	1	3	3

AFTER GRAD SUPPO	NONE	NO INTER	2	3	4	5	6	VERY
time donation	0	0	0	2	5	2	1	
financial donation	1	0	0	2	4	1	2	
business expertise	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	

ETHNICITY	Africa-Am	Arab	Asian	Caucasian	Hispanic	Hawaii/PI	Native Am	Other
	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0

ARE YOU:	Single	Married	Separated	Divorced	Widowed
	10	0	0	0	0

HOME TO CAMPUS	<50	50-250 mi	>250
	4	5	1

RESIDENCY	z	USA			
	10	10			
Alumni Assoc status	YES	NO			
	0	10			
After Grad AA	Special	Life one	Life 4 pay	NO	BLANK
	5	1	1	2	1

The results were presented statistically in Tables 2, 3 and 4 respectively.

VITA

David H. Bennett

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE MARKETING OF EDUCATION: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COLLEGE STUDENT EXPERIENCES AND THE DESIRE TO BECOME A DONOR

Major Field: Applied Educational Studies

Biographical:

Education:

Completed the requirements for the Doctor of Education in Applied Educational Studies at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma to graduate in December, 2016.

Completed the requirements for the Master of Science in Business Administration and graduated from Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma in December, 1994.

Completed the requirements for the Bachelor of Science in Advertising/Public Relations and graduated from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in December, 1975.

Experience:

2012 to present: Adjunct Business Professor, Oklahoma City Community College

2001 to 2011: Instructor of Advertising, University of Central Oklahoma

1999 to 2000: Instructor of Marketing, University of Central Oklahoma

1995 to 1998: Visiting Assistant Professor, Oklahoma State University

1999 to 2002: Adjunct Business Professor, Oklahoma City Community College

1994 to 1999: Adjunct Business Professor, University of Central Oklahoma

1994 to 1999: Adjunct Business & Advertising Professor, Oklahoma City University

Civic Engagement:

1998 to present: Mayor and Council member, The City of The Village, Oklahoma