1985

Iowa State University alumni contributions: an analysis of alumni giving patterns by selected class years, 1974 and 1979

Larry H. Dietz
Iowa State University

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

University Microfilms International
300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Dietz, Larry H.

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY ALUMNI CONTRIBUTIONS: AN ANALYSIS OF ALUMNI GIVING PATTERNS BY SELECTED CLASS YEARS - 1974 AND 1979

Iowa State University PH.D. 1985

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark __✓__.

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy __✓__
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages __✓__
8. Print exceeds margin requirements __✓__
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received _____
16. Other _____

_____

_____

University
Microfilms
International

Iowa State University alumni contributions: An analysis of alumni giving patterns by selected class years - 1974 and 1979

by

Larry H. Dietz

A Dissertation Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department: Professional Studies in Education
Major: Education (Higher Education)

Approved:

Signature was redacted for privacy.

In Charge of Major Work

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Department

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Graduate College

Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

General Overview

Assurance of adequate financial resources for higher education has been a concern to leaders in higher education throughout its history in the United States. Standard definitions of adequate funding have been avoided because of the diversity in the missions of institutions of higher education. Nevertheless, educational institutions not unlike private businesses must be able over time to balance revenues with expenditures and remain financially solvent to survive. This continual battle for financial survival has resulted in educators seeking new and better ways to ensure financial security. One of the ways institutions have sought to alleviate this concern has been through fund-raising efforts. Despite the growth in fund-raising, the increased level of sophistication among professionals in the fund-raising profession, and the dollar volume produced by fund-raising activities, adequate funding for higher education continues to require considerable attention from chief executive officers of institutions of higher education.

Several factors have been identified as contributing to adequate funding and institutional stability. They are: (1) the ability to maintain or increase enrollments as a means of providing revenue through student fees; (2) the ability to continue involvement with federal and state governments providing direct revenues through contracts and grants and indirect revenues in the form of student financial aid; and (3) the ability to attract financial contributions from the private sector. As enrollments decline and the shortfall of student financial aid continues,

more and more emphasis has been placed upon institutional advancement, development, and fund-raising programs designed to attract contributions from private foundations, the corporate sector, and from individual friends and alumni of institutions of higher education.

Curti and Nash (1965) noted the importance of private sector support in their expose entitled Philanthropy and the Shaping of Higher Education. They pointed out that appeals to private individuals for funds were present in the early attempts to found colleges. While several methods of fund-raising were employed during the early days of fund-raising, the most popular method was the direct mail solicitation letter sent to potential donors. Wright (1954) in his research on philanthropic giving discussed one of the first mail solicitation letters. In a letter written in approximately 1633, John Eliot, a missionary to the Indians, solicited funds for a school from a wealthy Englishman, Sir Simonds D'Ewes. Wright regarded Eliot's letter as a masterpiece of philanthropic appeal. Eliot reminded D'Ewes of their meeting and appealed to him on a personal note. Following are excerpts from Eliot's letter written in the Old English style:

> if we nourish not Larning both church and common wealth will sinke. . . . God hath bestowed upon you a bounty full blessing; now if you should please, to imploy but one mite of that greate welth which God hath given, to erect a school of larning, a college among us; you should due a more glorious work, acceptable to God and man; and the commemeration of the first founder of the means of Larning, would be a perpetuating of your name and honour among us (p. 274).

Indeed many of the solicitation letters sent out by colleges and universities today employ similar strategies. That is, the potential donor is reminded of the relationship between the donor and the institution and

appeals are made which will allow the donor to contribute while respecting the individual's desire to remain anonymous or to recognize the contribution in some way.

While active solicitation was evident in the early history of higher education in the United States, the beginning of fund-raising actually began after the founding of Harvard College in 1636 (Sailor 1932). Efforts to secure funds for higher education in the United States have continued persistently to the present time. Sailor found that the annual reports of presidents of institutions were used for the purpose of raising money. Prior to 1890, practically all fund-raising activities were undertaken by college presidents directly. Sailor also discovered that with the establishment of the Yale Alumni Fund in 1890 came a new idea related to fund-raising. The Fund recognized a widespread sentiment among Yale graduates who favored a systematic way to increase the resources of the University. The initiation of the Yale Alumni Fund provided a means by which graduates could channel their funds to serve the institution.

Sailor also noted that fifteen years after the Yale Alumni Fund was founded, other institutions followed their lead - most notably Princeton, Amherst, Dartmouth, and Cornell. The next most significant event in fund-raising took place during 1904-05 at Harvard University when President Eliot outlined in his annual report the need for a $2.5 million endowment fund. To meet this challenge, a committee of alumni was formed and a campaign was initiated to raise capital funds for the university. It was regarded as the most successful fund-raising attempt prior to that time. Other colleges followed suit as Princeton's Committee of Fifty was tailored after the Harvard campaign to raise money for endowment and current

expenses. The first time a major public institution established a capital campaign was during 1914-15 when the University of Michigan sought $1 million for a new student union building.

Organized alumni support gained momentum after 1918 (Curti & Nash, 1965) as practically all colleges and universities faced tremendous financial obstacles following World War I. As a result, the period from 1919 forward became known as the era of the intensive campaign for permanent endowment. Sailor (1932) described the era after 1919 as being ideal for campaign drives based upon the following reasons:

1. The need for funds was imperative.
2. The country was in a period of unprecedented prosperity.
3. The American people were still in the habit and spirit of giving to worthwhile causes.
4. A highly developed technique had been utilized for nationwide intensive campaigns as a result of the war service drive.

Despite the fact that campaigns for permanent endowments began to intensify in the decade of 1920, Reichley in Rowland (1977) pointed out that as late as 1936, fewer than half of the institutions surveyed by the American College Public Relations Association (ACPRA) reported that they had an alumni fund. By 1952, there were thirteen institutional representatives listed on the ACPRA roster with the title of director of development indicating an emergence of the position and an implied ascendancy of the profession. The concepts of the contemporary organization of college and university relations were formed at the Greenbrier Conference financed by the Ford Foundation. The meeting included representatives of ACPRA and the American Alumni Council. Those attending felt that since fund-raising, alumni relations, and public

relations were all parts of the institution's program to gain understanding and support, they should be related in a unified organizational framework. They also suggested the unit report directly to the president through a coordinating officer. Most institutions adopted this organizational pattern which has served as the basis for the modern era of development and fund-raising for higher education.

Even though fund-raising began as a slow, individualized movement primarily on the part of the presidents of institutions in early 1600, it has evolved into intensive campaigns designed to raise funds for a variety of institutional causes. The work of fund raisers has been important in the assurance of the financial futures of institutions of higher education. Equally important to the efforts of fund-raisers has been their desire to find new and more effective ways of raising funds. The direct mail solicitation has continued to be a popular method employed in philanthropic appeals as well as the personal visit to a prospective donor by an institutional official. Other current methods of fund-raising include the use of telethons, challenge campaigns, and appeals surrounding a particular theme or need. However, one of the more recent ideas utilized by fund-raisers to become more effective in their efforts has been to employ research methods in identifying and analyzing characteristics of donors and potential donors. The patterns of giving and the characteristics of donors and potential donors must be identified, analyzed, and understood to insure the most cost effective fund-raising program. Once the donor profile has been developed, then solicitations can be targeted allowing for a potentially more successful campaign guaranteeing more contributors at less administrative cost. Several research methods differing in levels of

statistical sophistication have been used to analyze giving patterns. The application of research methods to fund-raising has been a fairly recent phenomenon and institutional interest in prospect research has increased despite an earlier awareness of the impact research could have upon fund-raising.

The need for more research in the fund-raising field was identified as early as 1961 by Hanson. He indicated:

> While notable exceptions exist, it may be observed that methods of research have not as yet been used extensively in fund-raising. Accordingly, the criteria presented are derived largely from recognized successful practice. It is hoped that with the passage of time and following examples already set, the lights of research will be cast on fund-raising with an emphasis which will be comparable to that used for many years in other phases of administration . . . (p. 1). From professional experience over the past forty years much has been learned about the theory and practice of fund-raising. The methods of research and scholarship have rarely been used. The method of trial and error has been the teacher (p. 27).

Eighteen years later, Leslie in Heemann (1979) indicated most colleges conduct very little market research and rely a great deal on intuition and only rudimentary prospect research to base most of their solicitation. He confirmed the suspicions many fund-raisers had regarding their only mode of operation.

Fisher (1980) supported the idea that there needed to be more research regarding fund-raising. He pointed out two major factors in all successful support-building attempts. First, he noted that "the influence hierarchy affecting the institution should be identified as completely as possible, making sure to draw up an 'Order of Battle' on all persons who do or can influence the condition of the institution" (p. 88). He encouraged fund-raisers to know as much about the prospective donor as possible so

effective cultivation could occur. Second, Fisher called for "setting about the business of systematic and assiduous cultivation of these individuals and, where appropriate, the organizations they represent" (p. 89).

In order to provide for the "systematic and assiduous cultivation of individuals" as described, empirical research techniques and statistical methods can be used in determining those individuals most likely to contribute. If relationships between giving and donor characteristics can be determined, the potential donors may be able to be identified. If so, development staff would be able to focus more of their time and energy on cultivating these target populations. This targeting may become the most cost effective way for development offices to administer their overall program.

Purpose of the Study

The financial futures of many institutions of higher education will depend upon their ability to attract funds from the private sector - particularly alumni and friends of the institution. To the extent that alumni and development offices are successful in attracting these funds will depend to a large degree upon their ability to determine which potential donors will be most likely to contribute under what conditions. Knowing this information will allow development offices to target their efforts toward more cost effective solicitations potentially attracting more dollars at a lower administrative cost. The key to providing this information is prospect research, which emphasizes analyzing characteristics about donors and non-donors.

This study was designed (1) to identify donors and non-donors from two selected graduation classes - the class of 1974 and the class of 1979; (2) to analyze the characteristics of the donors and non-donors from these two classes; (3) to develop a profile of donors of the two classes; (4) to apply a statistical procedure to determine if the donors and non-donors were significantly different; and, (5) to summarize the results of the findings and make recommendations for future studies.

The intent of the study was to provide information to the Development Office at Iowa State University for utilization in their fund-raising efforts. Although the study pertained only to graduates of Iowa State University, it was also the investigator's aspiration that the research model would be helpful in stimulating others to conduct similar research and perhaps serve as a useful research model.

Hypotheses

Specifically, this study will target the following hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference in giving to the athletic program, the academic program or total giving by sex combined with marital status.
2. There is no significant difference in giving to the athletic program, the academic program, or total giving by the characteristic of sex.
3. There is no significant difference in giving to the athletic program, the academic program, or total giving by the characteristic of marital status.
4. There is no significant difference in giving to the athletic program, the academic program, or total giving by the characteristic of first degree achieved.
5. There is no significant difference in giving to the athletic program, the academic program, or total giving by the characteristic of college in which the first degree was granted.

6. There is no significant difference in giving to the athletic program, the academic program, or total giving by the characteristic of being a scholarship or loan recipient.

7. There is no significant difference in giving to the athletic program, the academic program, or total giving by the characteristic of affiliation with an organization while in college.

8. There is no significant difference in giving to the athletic program, the academic program, or total giving by the characteristic of wealth rating.

9. There is no significant difference in giving to the athletic program, the academic program, or total giving by the characteristic of occupation upon graduation.

10. There is no significant difference in giving to the athletic program, the academic program, or total giving by the characteristic of anticipated salary range upon graduation.

11. There is no significant difference in giving to the athletic program, the academic program, or total giving by the characteristic of affiliation with a student honorary organization while in college.

12. There is no significant difference in giving to the athletic program, the academic program, or total giving by the characteristic of place of residence while in college.

Limitations of the Study

This study dealt primarily with undergraduate students who had responded to a survey instrument which had been distributed prior to graduation. Other data on file in the Development Office on the respondents were taken from communication that office had with the respondents. Therefore, in some cases, the information base was larger than the data gathered from the respondent through the graduation questionnaire, though the occurrence of this was infrequent. The respondents were then categorized as either donors or non-donors depending upon whether they had ever made a contribution to the University. Based

upon this information, the limitations of this study were determined as follows:

1. Only class years 1974 and 1979 were examined.
2. Only respondents to the graduation questionnaire or to other Development Office correspondence were analyzed.
3. Only undergraduate students were studied eliminating graduate and professional students from the pool of respondents.
4. Only donors and non-donors were studied without reference made to the amount given.
5. Only twelve variables of the donors and non-donors were studied.
6. Only the above described population of Iowa State University were studied.
7. Only three levels of contributions were analyzed - giving to athletics, the academic program, and total giving.

While there may be other limitations to this study, the above reflect some of the more obvious limitations.

Definition of Terms

The literature regarding the role of private sector support in the financing of higher education produced a variety of terms to describe the various types of support and the ways in which institutions attempt to garner that support. The terms institutional advancement, development, and fund-raising were used interchangeably which preempted the subtle, but important differences between those terms. In order to provide clarity of definition, several author's works were reviewed to determine if unanimity existed. While no commonality existed between definitions offered by the various writers, the following definitions represented the closest to unanimity and were used for the purpose of this study.

1. Institutional Advancement: All those programs and activities under-taken by a college or university to develop understanding and support from all its publics for its goals (Rowland, 1977).

2. Development: Those promotional activities which are necessary for the continued growth of the institution (Bohlen in Knowles, 1970).

The following terms and their definitions were provided by Tenbrunsel (1982) and add to the glossary of terms used in the fund-raising field.

3. Fund-raising: The process of obtaining funds for non-profit organizations from individuals, corporations, foundations, and government. Fund-raising includes grantsmanship as well.

4. Grantsmanship: The skill of raising money for nonprofit organizations by identifying and cultivating funding agencies and writing proposals.

5. Bequest: A gift effective upon a person's demise.

6. Donor: One who gives cash or goods or services to a non-profit organization.

7. Philanthropy: The giving of gifts to non-profit organizations.

8. Foundation: A legal organization which exists to receive money and make grants.

9. Prospect list: A list containing names and addresses of potential donors based upon demographic or special interests. It is used for the initial mailing in a direct mail campaign.

10. Old Boys Network: Both in grantsmanship and fund-raising what still counts most is who knows whom. The old boys network tends to exclude newcomers to the grantsmanship process (p. 8-90).

In addition to the above terms, Bohlen in Knowles (1970) further delineated specialized programs within the field of fund-raising. These programs were alumni annual giving, capital appeals, deferred giving, corporate support, and foundation development. Each of these programs were targeted to a specific population of potential donors and served to allow for donor participation in unique though not necessarily mutually exclusive

ways. To gain insight into these programs, the following definitions should be examined.

11. Alumni annual giving: A continuous program designed for total involvement and participation by all alumni and friends. Some major institutions depend for any capital effort upon as much as 85% on support from their alumni.

12. Capital appeals: A program that includes both immediate and long range objectives of the institution and the requirements for endowed chairs and professorships, financial aid, award funds, scholarships, laboratories, classrooms, faculty offices, named buildings, etc.

13. Deferred giving: A new program in the fund-raising field associated with estate planning, bequests, and life income plans and annuities. It is one of the best long range investments an institution can make but does not provide for today's operating expenses or capital funds.

14. Foundation development: A program that necessitates close contact with private foundations which receive funding requests and grant funds.

15. Corporate Support: A program similar to the foundation development program but the source of funding is from private, profit-making organizations (p. 108-110).

The previous descriptions of programs and terms were provided to promote a better understanding of the terminology used when discussing this study and the role of private support in the financing of higher education.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to gain more insight into the fields of institutional advancement, development, and fund-raising for higher education, and more specifically into the area of prospect research, a review of the literature was conducted.

The literature review came from a variety of sources including a number of unpublished dissertations. Several sources reviewed were somewhat dated (1961 to 1981) indicating a need for additional and more current research in the field. Some of the more numerous and important contributions were made between 1970 and 1975. There was great reliance upon dissertations and other related resources due to the absence of a scholarly research journal in the field of fund-raising.

This literature review provides information relating five areas included in the study: (1) a discussion of the evolution of the terms used in fund-raising and comments about the importance of philanthropy to higher education; (2) a definition of the annual campaign, its history and relative importance to the entire fund-raising effort; (3) the future of the annual campaign; (4) the importance of the use of prospecting and research tools in fund-raising activities; and (5) a review of the findings of other investigators and writers on the topic of analyzing donor characteristics.

Evolution of Terms and the Importance of Philanthropy to Higher Education

Early in this century, Pierce (1932) recognized the need for building on-going programs for the sole purpose of raising funds for specific causes. He stated:

> Most agencies meet their financial difficulties as emergencies. What is needed in most instances is a continuous and cumulative program for the purpose of building sufficient capital to meet expanding needs and to safeguard programs at times of special peril (p. 218).

It was in search of a way of building on-going financial support that institutions sought descriptive terms to identify new and diversified functions within their organizational framework. By building this framework, these institutions took on the task of building the very programs to which Pierce referred. As a result, new terminology was promulgated and words such as institutional advancement, development, and fund-raising came into existence in the vocabulary of higher education.

Development was a relatively new term as suggested by Bohlen in Knowles (1970) and has been used interchangeably with fund-raising. Bohlen made a distinction between development and fund-raising defining development as an all inclusive term used to describe, "those promotional activities which are necessary for the continued growth of the institution" (p. 102) and fund-raising as a collection of "specialized programs-alumni annual giving, capital development, deferred giving, corporate support, and foundation assistance" (p. 102).

An even broader definition was given to institutional advancement when Rowland (1977) described it as essentially any activity or program which an institution undertakes to further support and understanding of its goals among it publics. The function of institutional advancement in American

institutions of higher education was viewed by Rabbino in Fisher (1980) as one which "enables each individual college or university to do well in a competitive environment and to assist the whole sector of higher education to compete effectively for available resources" (p. 32). Sweet in Fisher (1980) saw the primary function of an institutional advancement office as being able to "help the president secure resources enabling the college to fulfill its educational mission (p. 40). In addition, Sweet postulated:

> an effective program for institutional advancement and support is based upon several presuppositions: that the college knows its business, its customers, and their wants and needs before it designs specific activities for institutional advancement. The college must understand that the mission of institutional advancement and support is acquiring resources needed to achieve central educational purposes (p. 43).

It appears that all three terms - development, fund-raising, and institutional advancement - had similar but distinct meanings and fell into the general rubric which described the act or the art of securing resources for a particular cause. Adams (1924) summed up the relationship between education and funding most succinctly when he wrote, "the whole problem of education is one of its cost in money" (p. 302).

Even though he recognized the cost problem, Andrews (1950) wrote that "education has long been a favored form of philanthropy" (p. 188). In addition, Andrews quoting Andrew Carnegie also noted that contributions toward education were important in that "it places within reach ladders upon which the aspiring can rise" (p. 188). Andrews stated, "Where giving to relieve physical want has sometimes had the disastrous effect of destroying initiative, educational aid has usually spurred the individual to greater activity and higher achievement" (p. 188).

Jenkins in Andrews (1953) speaking on philanthropy once called it "our finest enterprise . . . supported by gifts and free to choose its own directions without severe governmental control" (p. 123). It has been a primary goal of many educational fund-raisers to make sure that philanthropic efforts be directed toward higher education. This statement was supported by Pollard (1958) when he remarked, "like mercy, philanthropy blesses both the giver and the receiver" (pg. xvi). He warns that "American philanthropy for higher education in the foreseeable future is likely to fall chiefly where there has been the most careful seeding" (pg. xvi). He continues with some sage advice for fund-raisers:

> One comprehensive and cardinal principle lies at the root of the most notable fund-raising achievements: no appeal for support can be made effectively without a good case, first rate leadership, and co-workers thoroughly committed to the cause and willing to go to the right sources and ask for money (p. 31)

In the book entitled, Patterns of Giving to Higher Education, Levi & Steinbach (1975) issued one of the most important statements about the significance of individual gifts to higher education. An excerpt from this book follows:

> individual donor gifts may well mean the difference between high quality education, research, and services or mediocrity (in some cases even survival). Higher education in this nation owes its beginnings to the generosity of private benefactors. Even though the succeeding decades have seen increasing governmental support and funding, the contributions of private donors remain essential to the financial health of all colleges and universities, both public and private. . . . Given the significance of private gift support, it is incumbent on all those concerned with the financing of higher education - in government, in the higher education enterprise, and elsewhere - to understand the amount, characteristics, and patterns of private philanthropy (p. 1).

Francis in Fisher (1980) defines the linkage between philanthropy and institutional management by saying:

> Successful philanthropy is a by-product of good management. It is literally the result of an effective and well-coordinated team approach. To get the job done, to reach our goals, to achieve our objectives, we must depend upon two critically important management factors: systems and people. Who are these people; how do they behave within and outside of what kinds of systems; and what is the impact of the systems and the people when they come up against the issues and forces around us, behind us, and even ahead of us (p. 65-66).

A distinction between fund-raisers and grantspersons was made by Tenbrunsel (1982) and he captured the essence of the art in his Fund-Raising Resource Manual. He wrote:

> The first and last word in fund raising and grantsmanship is captured in the saying, 'people give to people.' Both grantsmanship and fund-raising are essentially an interpersonal persuasion process with a lot of hard work researching the funding source. . . . Grantspersons write proposals and make contacts in Washington; fund-raisers cultivate wealthy individuals and design large funding campaigns (p. 1).

Tenbrunsel (1982) summed up the importance of philanthropy and its evolution by stating that "giving has always been a natural tendency among human beings" (p. 55). It seems apparent that the wise administrator connected with institutional advancement, the development officer, or the fund-raiser must understand this statement well and where and when possible cultivate this natural tendency to the point where it results in a contribution. With this in mind, it is important now to turn to examining the annual campaign by defining it and tracing the history and importance of the annual campaign and the individual gift.

Defining the Annual Campaign, Its History, and Relative Importance to the Entire Fund-Raising Effort

While the majority of the history of the annual campaign has already been discussed in an earlier section of this paper, much of the literature described the annual campaign as one in which alumni were solicited in a

variety of ways for a variety of purposes. Some campaigns solicit both alumni and friends of the institution. This study, however, dealt specifically with alumni contributions.

Bohlen in Knowles (1970) offered the following definition of an annual alumni campaign: "a continuous program designed for total involvement and participation by all alumni" (p. 108). He noted that some major institutions depended for any capital effort upon as much as 85% on support from their alumni and friends. He has also referred to the annual campaign as one component of several activities which relate directly to a comprehensive fund-raising program.

While Bohlen's definition was accepted for the purpose of this study, it was noteworthy to examine other similar definitions and descriptions. Williams (1981) defined annual giving as a "broad, recurring, organized effort to seek funds for a non-profit organization's most pressing needs - usually to support its current operating expenses" (p. 5). She described the importance of the annual giving program as follows:

> Annual giving is the cornerstone upon which all other fund-raising programs are built, the place where all good development programs begin and the dynamic stimulus that reinforces the development program each year. Annual giving is the bread and butter of a development program - not only because it produces a steady flow of cash, but also because it lays the foundations and cultivates the donors for much larger gifts in the future (p. 4).

Williams also pointed out the following important implications of an annual giving program in addition to producing money. It can:

1. create a greater awareness of the organization and its objectives.
2. build a constituency of people who are interested in helping to meet an organization's needs and to further its objectives.
3. create a partnership between donors and the organization that reaches far beyond mere fund-raising.

4. promote acceptance of fund-raising as a way to meet the organization's objectives; it breaks the ice for future fund-raising.

5. create a training ground for both giver and getters. Later, this training can help produce major support through other fund-raising programs.

6. create and evaluate a base of annual donors upon which the organization can build future major fund-raising campaigns (p. 6).

The most effective alumni programs described by Foreman in Fisher (1980) were "those that start with the premise that alumni need to have activities that serve their own needs and interests" (p. 51). Serving individual needs was viewed as important and oftentimes resulted in an individual donation. The importance of individual donations was pointed out by Smith in Heemann (1979) when he observed, "individual donors have consistently been the largest single source of voluntary support, accounting for between 44-49% of the total" (p. 10).

In a 1978 publication by Foreman, comments were made regarding the relationship between the alumni association and alumni. He indicated:

> the first objective of any alumni association is to serve its alma mater . . . . (and) . . . . to provide programs that . . . . serve the individual with the obvious long-range result that a well-served alumnus is going to serve the university (p. 17).

Foreman further emphasized this relationship by saying, "people are basically well-motivated toward their institution, but it takes a lot of skill to go out and find the best way to get them to contribute" (p. 18).

One of the most prolific authors to write about the importance of the annual fund was Pollard (1958). He viewed the annual fund as comprising the very heart of a good development program if it was based on "recurrent giving by the alumni and other friends of the college" (p. 91). Pollard also outlined the four chief values of the alumni fund:

1. The fund ordinarily brings in unrestricted money, of which no institution of higher education ever receives enough.

2. The funds generated through the alumni fund can generally be considered and used as a "budgeted asset" and applied to the current operating expenses. To this extent it is, as many institutions call it, "living endowment."

3. The fund is not only a dependable back-log for current operations, but a feeder line. Once an alumnus or other friend forms the habit of annual giving to a college or university, it has a prospect for a capital gift now and then during his lifetime, or for a bequest.

4. A regularly contributing alumnus is a positive advocate of an institution's program, needs, and opportunities - a kind of ambassador (p. 93).

In writing on the topic of financing higher education, Russell (1944) pointed out that one of the strengths of the alumni campaign is its focus of directing more attention toward raising funds for current, undesignated purposes. He saw the campaign as capitalizing on alumni loyalties encouraging them to contribute as a way of paying for the benefits given to them when they were students. The epitome of success for an annual alumni campaign according to Russell was when, "the institution succeeded in cultivating a feeling among their alumni that one's personal success is measured by the amount of one's annual contribution" (p. 305).

In summary, the annual alumni campaign targets alumni as well as friends. The annual alumni campaign has a long history in the financing of higher education and is the major component of all fund-raising activities undertaken by institutions of higher education.

The Future of the Annual Campaign

One conclusion from reviewing the literature was that just as fund-raising will play a more significant role in the future of the

financing of higher education, the annual campaign for donations from alumni and friends will continue to play a major role in the overall development or fund-raising program.

In 1958, Pollard hypothesized that most alumni funds and annual campaigns appeared to lack the basic essentials of effective fund-raising. He listed six basic ingredients for successful fund-raising. They were:

1. An informed and interested constituency, stimulated by facts clearly and regularly set before it.
2. A well-grounded case for support.
3. An influential leadership group, able to organize and lead a movement, lending public prestige to the college and its cause.
4. A committed team of co-workers who are willing and able to go to the right sources and ask for money.
5. A financial program adequate for the service which the college gives to those segments of society from which it must seek support.
6. A competently staffed alumni and development office which is necessary to carry on fund-raising continuously as a regular administrative function of the college (p. 95).

These six ingredients of effective fund-raising form a standard by which fund-raising campaigns can be measured and allow for fund-raising analysis and predictions to occur. Perhaps, one of the most practical lists of predictions related to the future of fund-raising were categorized by what Ketchum (1980) called "sure things," "in the bag," "toss-ups," and "long-shots."

<u>"Sure things"</u>:

1. New volunteer leadership - result is that we must identify, inspire, train, and sell new leadership on the necessity of private support for higher education.
2. New donors in the '80s.

3. New causes, programs, and projects will receive changing emphasis - as students change, a different mix among buildings, programs, and endowments will change.

4. New legislation - state, national, and municipal - will offset fund-raising; we need to be aware of non-profit organization coalitions.

"In the bag":

5. People will react first emotionally, then rationally - the heart gives and the brain justifies.

6. People will give to people - donors will continue to expect boards and campaign leaders to lead the way by giving significant financial support to the causes they head.

7. People will reject demands for immediate responses to complex ideas - potential donors require time for mental digestion.

8. Institutional leaders will play prominent roles in raising capital funds - chancellors/presidents will have to personalize the institution to prospective donors.

"Toss-ups":

9. Technological changes will have a significant effect on fund-raising - computers will have an impact on prospecting and make impulse gifts possible.

10. There will be new demands on development staffs - planned giving and phonathons were trends of the past decade, new demands are not known yet.

11. People will scrutinize more closely our cases for support - more accountability for gifts.

12. Fund-seeking institutions will have to face continuing inflation.

13. The government policy of redistributing wealth will continue - pressure groups will demand and receive more.

14. The various types of fund-raising will be more closely integrated - capital, annual, and deferred giving programs will be more closely orchestrated. The argument as to whether to have a capital campaign or a long-range development program will die. None of the major forms of fund-raising will be dropped.

15. A major problem will be to determine the optimum depth of penetration of the constituency in a capital campaign - top donors vs. major donors vs. minor donors.

"Long Shots":

16. Prospect and donor records will be far more sophisticated and comprehensive - better records of alumni occupations, personal interests, and relationships with the institution will be maintained to help with prospecting.

17. Improved methods to maintain contact with scattered but vital alums will be used - closed circut television, video cassettes, and more frequent visits to campus will be used.

18. Deferred giving will play a greater role in all phases of fund-raising.

19. Donors will demand that institutions make greater year-round use of their facilities.

20. There will be an increase in corporate support of higher education - stronger institutions will be supported and weaker ones won't be due to the "band wagon" effect.

21. Philanthropic foundations will provide a smaller portion of the funds going to capital projects - they will move toward pilot projects and social and environmental causes.

22. Development offices will get smaller but officers paid more.

23. The quality and quantity of intercollegiate athletics will go down with negative consequences for fund-raising - this will be due to the continued growth of professionalism in sports.

24. There may be a division of responsibility where one leader manages the institution and another handles its outside relationships, including fund-raising - this will be similar to the relationship of corporate chairmen and presidents (p. 40-42).

In reviewing both Pollard's accusation about elements lacking in most campaigns and Ketchum's predictions for the future of fund-raising, it appeared that the implications for the future of the annual campaign were many and varied. Several common themes were identified from the literature, however. First, the annual campaign will have to be presented in a manner which introduces facts about the institution's mission and financial needs in a convincing manner. Second, fund-raisers in charge of the annual campaign will have to be increasingly aware of constituent needs

and offer programs to meet those needs. Third, technology will have to be introduced into fund-raising and relied upon more heavily to gather, store, and retrieve information about donors and potential donors and to develop models which will allow institutions to more accurately analyze and predict potential contributors. To the extent that institutions and fund-raisers are able to meet these goals, the annual campaign will either flourish or falter.

In recognition of the importance of the use of technology to the fund-raiser currently and in the future, the use of data analysis, prediction, prospecting, and research tools in fund-raising activities will now be discussed.

The Importance of the Use of Analysis, Prediction, Prospecting, and Research Tools in Fund-Raising Activities

Research methods in the field of fund-raising for the purpose of data analysis, prospecting, and the eventual prediction of donors is a relatively new phenomenon. The literature is replete with discussions about the importance of introducing more research methods into the area of fund-raising. The initial goal of this effort was to gain the ability to determine which individuals were most likely to contribute. The second goal was to identify the programs to which they preferred to target their gift. The third goal was left to the Development Office staff at Iowa State University but would be to determine which way might be the best way to approach the individual about the prospective gift. Many authors have written on this topic including Fisher (1980), Hanson (1961), and Leslie in Heemann (1979) who have been discussed earlier.

In addition to the authors noted above Pfizenmaier (1981) indicated that between 5% and 10% of donors provide between 90% and 95% of the gifts with four major factors influencing the large gift: (1) the giving capacity of the donor - income and assets; (2) the interest of the donor in a specific project; (3) the closeness of the donor to a particular project; (4) the persuasiveness of the fund-raiser (p. 14).

The first step she identified in prospecting was financial research followed closely by research which showed the prospect's family ties, interests, and significant relationships with other individuals who were connected with the institution. She also quoted Radock from the University of Michigan:

> Modern fund-raising is 90% research and 10% solicitation. Careful research done by a true professional is the best way to ensure that the right solicitor asks the right prospects for the right amount for the right project at the right time (p. 18).

A tact taken by Andrews (1950) may reflect a difference in approach between 1950 and 1981. He suggested that undue emphasis was placed on the higher-income groups and that more interest should be shown toward the smaller donor because, "the small giver is more liberal, within his means, than many of the large givers, and there are very many more of them" (p. 58). In essence, Andrews downplayed much of the current emphasis on researching the major donor but was supportive of research on all potential donors.

Cheshire quoted in Fisher (1980) wrote more generally about strategies for advancement, but noted that there were several steps which could be followed to develop a relationship between a prospect and the institution. First, the prospect needs to be identified and contacted so that an

interest is kindled. Second, the person needs to become actively engaged in some way to believe that the contribution being made is helping to shape the future of the institution. The research conducted to help identify the prospect and to include the prospect in an appropriate project or activity may play a major role in whether the person will become a donor.

Likewise, Pickett quoted in Pray (1981) reported that successful colleges use prospect research to produce more complete information on potential donors and warns that before any request for funds is made prospects should be carefully identified and researched. He indicated that an institution that does not have a professional staff assigned to prospect research will miss some critical financial resources.

Prospect research for non-alumni donors as well as alumni donors was also important as indicated by Young quoted in Pray (1981). He noted that nearly two-thirds of the total dollar amount needed will likely come from friends, not necessarily alumni, of the institution, and nearly 90% of that two-thirds will come from a select few. Proper identification and researching of these prospects was viewed as of paramount importance and seen as a prerequisite to cultivation and solicitation.

Frey (1977) in an article which dealt specifically with applying scientific research methods to alumni fund-raising stated,

> Gathering information from and about alumni needs to be done more systematically . . . we need to pay more serious attention to scientific methods such as sampling, question writing, and questionnaire and research design. . . . Profitable fund-raising is often the result of having accurate information on the market (p. 19).

In addition to the prospect research it is equally important to rate prospects once they have been identified. Bell quoted in Cooley (1962)

wrote about the rating of prospects, particularly those prospects who appeared to have the potential for making a large gift. He noted,

> You should have a high-low chart with a definite price tag placed on each individual. . . . This screening or rating session should be a yearly affair and a school should never wait until it has a capital gifts campaign before bringing its records up-to-date. . . . The trustee development committee should make a special point of sitting down at least once a year to go over the prospects and rate them. Time spent in evaluating these top financial prospects is certainly time well spent (p. 130).

While Bell's suggestions center around the major donor prospect, Williams (1981) advocated the importance of using prospect research for annual giving by identifying ways to isolate specific parts of the overall public. If no prospect list exists, Williams advocates two ways to create one: (1) identify people who have already contributed to specific causes or have similar characteristics of known donors; or (2) identify your cause and let those interested appeal to you. Once prospect lists are made, Williams emphasizes the importance of drawing a profile of the prospective donor using characteristics such as age, income, size of family, type of home, etc. Williams then suggests gathering a group of volunteers who know your organization and the prospects for the purpose of rating the top 20% who tend to donate 80% of the funds sought. This top 20% will probably be called upon personally in hopes that the 80% goal will be achieved pointing out, once again, the importance of prospect research.

Although it is vitally important for any campaign to employ the tools of research in identifying and cultivating prospects, equally important is the need to understand the potential impact which accurate research can have on fund-raising activities. To explore this potential further, the next section of this paper will review the findings which other researchers

and writers have conducted on the topic of analyzing data about contributors and non-contributors and predicting individual donations.

A Review of Findings Related to Analyzing Individual Donations

The reasons one individual decides to become a donor while another decides not to contribute to a particular cause, project, or institution vary and are most often unclear. Some may give to a particular cause in order to exert control while others may give to gain the feeling of immortality. Some individuals may contribute if a colleagues gives or due to peer pressure. Conversely, some may choose not to give becasue they don't know to whom or where to send their money while others may think that they would be able to give such a small amount as to be insignificant. Others may view money as providing security or power and do not want to give either away.

The discovery of donors motives are important to fund-raisers as they seek contributions. While some writers have regarded the field of fund-raising as more of an art rather than a science, it is evident from reviewing the literature that more frequently institutions of higher education are turning this art into more of a science. While one general trend in fund-raising is to employ more prospect research, the number of research studies on the topic of predicting individual donations or even analyzing giving patterns is not extensive and most of the literature is not current. The findings of ten researchers were examined and discussed based upon the chronological order of their respective publications; related research was shared; and, finally general trends about donors were identified.

O'Connor (1961) - Factors characteristic of alumni who provide financial support and alumni who provide no financial support

This author completed a descriptive study of behavioral, motivational and attitudinal factors which influenced the ability or desire of alumni at Alford University to become donors. He tested the following four hypotheses:

1. Alumni who provide greater support have a greater understanding of the university's operation.
2. Those who provide continuous support verbalize a greater obligation to society.
3. Those who provide continuous support develop a greater positive feeling toward their university.
4. Both giving and non-giving alumni will tend to support to a greater extent when fund appeals are direct and personal.

Based upon his survey, hypothesis one was affirmed. That is, donors tend to read special alumni letters, attend alumni meetings, hold alumni offices, return to campus often, and feel well-informed about the university's needs. Donors also expressed an obligation to society, to their college, and their class showing that hypothesis two was confirmed. Hypothesis three was not borne out by the survey. The particular occupation of the alumni and the decade of graduation did not seem to influence whether the person became a donor. Finally, the non-donors indicated that they would more likely become donors if they were personally contacted or had some type of direct contact by the institution which confirmed hypothesis four.

O'Connor identified four factors influencing alumni giving: communication, humanitarianism, positive feeling for the institution, and personal attention. He also targeted four reasons influencing the decision

of the alumni not to give: (1) earnings were insufficient; (2) felt poorly about their status; (3) had inadequate budgeting or multiple financial obligations; and (4) had graduated too recently to be secure enough financially to make a commitment.

Spaeth and Greeley (1970) - Financial contributions to the alma mater

This study was conducted for the purpose of identifying correlations between alumni giving and various other donor characteristics. Both public and private institutions were examined and the authors found that there were three important variables related to alumni giving - the characteristics of the particular institution, the loyalty to the particular institution, and the donor's family background.

The highest correlation between variables existed between giving one year and planning to give the next year. The second highest correlation was drawn between alumni giving and the type of control of the particular institution. Graduates of private institutions were more likely to contribute to their alma mater than graduates of public institutions. The number of colleges attended also affected the likelihood of a contribution. Alumni who attended only one college were more likely to contribute than a person who attended several institutions. This was due to the amount of conflicting loyalties that come into play for those attending multiple institutions. Finally, the parent's socio-economic status was important in an alumni's decision to contribute. In some instances, if the parents were donors, contributing was also expected from the offspring. Parents of alumni and alumni who attended private institutions were more likely to contribute than parents of alumni and alumni of public institutions. Those

who had private institution affiliation tended to be more affluent than their counterparts at public institutions and had a higher socio-economic status.

Perhaps, the most notable finding of Spaeth and Greeley, however, is that income was only slightly related to giving and, except for emotional attachment, it did not appear based on the data that any factor significantly increased the potential for giving.

Morris (1970) - Donors who gave $10,000 or more

The Morris study is quoted often by other researchers. It compared the characteristics of 280 donors who gave or pledged $10,000 or more to the University of Michigan's $55 Million Program of 1964-67 with 280 persons who had been identified as having the potential to give $10,000 or more but chose to contribute less than the $10,000 amount.

One goal of the research project was to examine the two groups to see if differences existed between the actual donor list and the prospect or candidate list. If differences were identified, then it was assumed that fund-raisers could concentrate on those whose characteristics were more closely aligned with the actual donors. To determine if the differences existed between the two groups, 64 variables were examined and the person's giving records were also analyzed over a 20 year period from 1948 to 1967. The data were compiled solely from existing records in the University's Development Office - no surveys or questionnaires were used.

There were no significant differences between the birthplace and student residence of either the donor or candidate. The donors also tended to have graduated from the University and held at least one degree and

sometimes two or three. The candidates tended not to have graduated. There were no significant differences between the grade point averages of the donors and the candidates. The donors were more likely to have been involved in campus activities and held far more student offices but there were more candidates than donors who had been involved in athletics. The donors were more involved in the Greek system than the candidates but the candidates outnumbered the donors in membership in professional fraternities. More of the donors had a spouse who was also an alumnae. Likewise, the alumni who had no children or as many as two children were most likely to be donors but having three or more children placed them in the candidate category. There were few differences between donors and candidates in reference to occupation. More donors were architects, stock brokers, and communication executives while more candidates were bankers and merchants. Alumni who were active in alumni affairs were most likely to be donors. There were more donors than candidates who listed their religion as Jewish but more candidates than donors in the Presbyterian and Catholic religious categories. All of the candidates and donors were men and the donors who had served in the military outnumbered the candidates. The donors were also more likely to designate their gifts than the candidates; donors tended to give more money and give it more regularly than the candidates. Two clear patterns emerged: (1) the larger the gift, the more likely it was to be designated; (2) donors paid little attention to the goals of the campaign even though they were well defined.

Finally, several conclusions were drawn from the research. In Morris' own words,

> Involvement of alumni with alma mater is highly important in future giving. Campus activities, including social and honorary

> fraternity and sorority memberships, also leads to giving. The pattern of attending the University is critical - that is, the more degrees and the longer the attendance, the better. The location of the first degree is particularly important. Family relationships after graduation (wives, children) are positively related while pre-college (parents and siblings) are not (p. 6).

MacIsaac (1973) - Attitudes of donors of selected institutions of higher education

The attitudes of donors at three institutions of higher education - Iowa State University, Drake University, and Cornell University - were examined in this study. MacIsaac tested three hypotheses: There were significant differences between the donors of the three institutions related to (1) type of college or university; (2) donor classification; and (3) era of graduation. A survey was mailed to 841 alumni and correlations were used to describe the results of the findings.

MacIsaac concluded that donors viewed clear, internally consistent goals which were relevant to today's society, and inherent in the philosophy and objectives of the particular college or university as important motives in their decision to contribute. Donors also thought that academic excellence would result in more financial support; that gifts should be designated for specific projects; and that the federal government should provide needed funding for student financial aid. Cash contributions were the favored form of giving and donors felt that consistent communication with alumni about its goals and objectives was important.

This study was one of the first attitudinal studies completed in the area of fund-raising. The author thought more research was needed

particularly in evaluating the attitudes of donors through the use of valid, reliable instruments.

Carruthers (1973) - A study of certain characteristics of alumni who provide financial support and alumni who provide no financial support for their alma mater

A sample of 225 alumni of Oklahoma State University was selected to determine if there were any differences in characteristics between donors and non-donors. The contingency coefficient measured the degree of association between the variables. The sample consisted of 100 donors and 125 non-donors. A secondary goal of the research was to develop a profile of donors. Five major categories of characteristics were identified: (1) academic experiences; (2) student experiences; (3) alumni support; (4) personal data; (5) alumni attitudes.

The author developed 27 summary statements about her findings. The most important findings were:

1. There were significant differences between supporting and non-supporting alumni in the areas of distance lived from campus, number of children, academic college attended, and age of children.
2. The respondents differed significantly in their attitudes about experiences they had had at Oklahoma State, their participation in alumni clubs and the reasons for contributing.
3. Alumni who were satisfied with their campus experiences tended to remain positive about the campus.
4. Alumni who participated in alumni activities tended to give more than those who were not active.

Finally, a profile of the financial supporters was offered. Donors tended to be graduates of the College of Agriculture, Business Administration, or Engineering; participants in alumni clubs; parents of

older (not defined) children; residents of communities within 51 to 100 or over 500 miles from the campus; promoters of the institution; and, visitors to campus.

Blumenfeld and Sartain (1974) - Predicting alumni financial donations

One of the earliest attempts to employ the use of prediction was made by these investigators. The purpose of the study was to develop and cross-validate a procedure based on demographics which would show differences between donors and non-donors. To that end, 109 donors and 109 non-donors were selected from alumni lists at Georgia State University. From these samples, an item analysis of 59 donors and 59 non-donors was conducted based upon demographic information. A biserial correlation of .37 indicating significance at the .01 level was established. Several independent variables enumerated below were analyzed:

1. Sex
2. Whether or not the spouse attended the university
3. Age at graduation or date of last attendance
4. School attended within the university
5. Degree from the university
6. Type of degree obtained (certificate or associate degree, bachelor's degree, master's degree, and/or doctoral degree)
7. Whether or not financial assistance was received
8. Participation in athletics
9. Organization membership (religious, social, honorary, and/or professional)
10. Degree from another institution (bachelor's degree, master's degree, and/or doctoral degree)
11. Major

12. Undergraduate grade point average

13. Graduate grade point average

14. Hours transferred from another institution to the university

The data indicated that seven of the variables differentiated between donors and non-donors. A profile was developed. Donors tended to be male, business school students, graduates of Georgia State, recipients of master's degrees from Georgia State, economics majors, holders of low or high (not moderate) undergraduate grade point averages, and achievers of moderate to high graduate grade point averages.

The author suggested that fund-raisers divide the particular market being cultivated by types of appeals and amount of attention planned to be given to donors during fund-raising activities. They concluded "prediction of who will and who will not contribute financially is a feasible and institutionally meaningful objective for alumni relations management . . . to pursue" (p. 523).

Although the sample used in this study was relatively small, the research was well conducted. The article describing the findings was precise, well-written, and could serve as a model for other researchers interested in prediction.

Gardner (1975) - Attitudes of Harding College alumni with an emphasis on the donor

A sample of 339 was drawn from graduates of the classes of 1951, 1961, and 1970 of Harding College. Donors and non-donors were examined for the purpose of establishing more effective fund-raising techniques. Several hypotheses were targeted including:

1. Emotional attachment affects donor, non-donor relationship

2. Religious affiliation affects donor, non-donor relationship
3. Church attendance affect donor, non-donor relationship
4. Political philosophy affect donor, non-donor relationship
5. Length of time at Harding College affects donor, non-donor relationship
6. Income affects donor, non-donor relationship
7. Extra curricular involvement affects donor, non-donor relationship
8. Alumni affiliation of spouse affects donor, non-donor relationship

Limitations of the study included the fact that the sample was not random; the study was limited to three classes of graduates; and descriptive statistics were used to draw conclusions. Gardner found little difference between the income levels of donors and non-donors. A higher percentage of donor's spouses had also attended Harding compared to non-donors. Donors were most likely to give again while non-donors were more skeptical about a future gift. Donors tended to have a more positive feeling about the college and would feel more comfortable recruiting for the college than non-donors. As in other studies, Gardner also found that donors tended to have participated in student activities while in attendance. Donors also were more satisfied with the academic program and a high percentage of them attended for four years. Political conservatism and church attendance were also a characteristic of the donors. Having had a close relationship with faculty members was not, however, directly related to being a donor.

McKee (1975) - Factors affecting alumni participation and support

Alumni from Indiana State University were the focus of this study, targeting the characteristics and opinions of a sample of 332. The sample

was divided into groups of active participants and non-participants as well as contributors and non-contributors. McKee used a questionnaire to collect demographic as well as attitudinal characteristics of the various subgroups. He was able to draw some conclusions about both the sub-groups and issued four statements about the demographic characteristics, specifically. First, the area of current residence was found to affect both participation in alumni activities and financial support; second, the type of degree earned affected both participation and support; third, a person's current occupation affected participation; and, fourth, the decade of graduation affected support.

Three statements about attitudinal characteristics of the subgroups were made. First, both participants in alumni activities and financial contributors had more positive opinions about the University, the alumni program and financial support than non-participants and non-contributors. Second, alumni had more positive opinions about the University than about the alumni program and financial support. Third, alumni were more inclined to have positive opinions about the University, the alumni program and financial support which allowed for a passive response rather than active involvement.

McKee suggested six directions for the future of the development program at Indiana State. They included:

1. An evaluation of the current programs for communication, alumni activities, and financial support.
2. A continuation of a dynamic and comprehensive program of university alumni relations.
3. A continuation of the efforts to involve an increased number of alumni in alumni programs.

4. A cultivation of individuals in categories which appear to most favorably affect participation and support, i.e., those who have earned a baccalaureate degree, have education-related occupations, and who are new alumni.

5. A program to provide additional attention to those categories of alumni who are below average in participation and financial support, i.e., retired alumni, those residing in adjacent counties, etc.

6. A program designed to develop positive impressions of the University, the alumni program, and financial support among alumni.

Although the study was somewhat limited in scope, it did take into account attitudinal characteristics which few other studies had done heretofore.

Blakely (1975) - Bases for prediction of alumni involvement

Variables relating to male participation in alumni activities at Purdue University were the subject of this study. Blakely hypothesized that if alumni involvement could be predicted then possibly it could be assumed that these individuals would also be the persons most likely to contribute financially to the institution. To this end, 52 variables were identified and the results were analyzed. Blakely concluded that motivation for alumni involvement was shaped during the undergraduate years. Likewise, positive or negative feelings about the institution were also established during this time period. These data showed that the strengths and direction of this bonding process were determined by two factors - size of the student enrollment and the alumni's relationship with the environment.

Size of enrollment was further measured by the feeling of school spirit. Data indicated that undergraduates perceived school spirit to be

higher than graduate students. Also, the larger the school in which the student enrolled within the University, the less effective in delivering a quality education it was perceived to be.

Environmental effects of the institution were measured by feelings of attachment to the institution. In-state students had a stronger feeling of attachment to the institution than did out-of-state students. The extent to which friendships were formed was also an indicator of attachment as was the life style pursued during college. That is, the person who had a great deal of contact with faculty, was involved in student organizations, held honorary memberships, and maintained high grades felt more of an attachment to Purdue. The data also showed that those students who held positions of authority or perceived authority were viewed by others as continuing that responsibility as an alumni. Simply stated, undergraduate leaders had self-imposed and peer expectations to be leaders once they reached alumni status.

Blakely was able to draw some conclusions about variables which affected alumni visits too. He found that the distance from campus, memberships in the alumni association, patterns of informal contact with other alumni, and general levels of participation in other voluntary organizations determined whether or not alumni would return for a visit to the campus.

From a fund-raising standpoint, Blakely was able to determine that the variables having the greatest impact upon financial contributions were age, level of income, patterns of informal contact with alumni, alumni visits, and membership in the alumni association.

Finally, Blakely concluded that the nature of the undergraduate experience was crucial in generating a motivational base for future alumni involvement which in turn determined whether or not the individual became a financial contributor to the institution. The largest portion of this study appeared to be related more to predicting involvement in alumni activities rather than financial contributions, though it is difficult to separate the two.

Kelley (1979) - Predicting alumni giving - alumni donors and non-donors

The purpose of this study was to identify the variables that discriminated between alumni donors and non-donors and to predict which alumni had the highest probability of giving to the College of Journalism at the University of Maryland. Kelley sampled 1,713 alumni of the college who either had a record of giving or non-giving. She used a multiple discriminant analysis as the statistical approach to the problem. Based upon the research, she made several generalizations about the population. They were:

1. Donors had paid their alumni dues for a longer period of time.
2. Donors had more friends who gave to their alma mater and were more likely to have had children.
3. Donors were more likely to have contributed to non-profit organizations than non-donors.
4. If alumni donate in tax deductible contributions, there is a higher probability that the person will become a donor.
5. Donors had a sense of prestige having graduated from the University and were older than non-donors.
6. Donors who viewed themselves as successful thought they had an obligation to contribute as a way of paying back the institution for the part their education played in their success.

7. Reading the alumni magazine was not a strong discriminator between donors and non-donors.

8. Having a faculty acquaintance as a student was not rated as an important factor in giving.

9. If both husband and wife were alumni, it was more likely that both would become donors.

10. Alumni who had children approaching college age were likely to become donors.

11. The factors of age, sex, race, and grade point average were weak discriminators in determining donors.

Further, Kelley introduced the concept of diffusion of innovations, marketing segmentation, knowledge-attitude behavior dissonance, and Grunig's multi-system theory of communication behavior to her research. She attempted to show the potential of integrating the various theories with fund-raising. Kelley was also critical of the Morris study and the MacIsaac study. She indicated that the Morris study was superficial and did not lend itself to helping make predictions. She felt that Morris' most discriminating variable which was involvement with alumni activities, could be the result of being a donor rather than being a characteristic. She was critical of MacIssac because he failed to utilize a control group of non-donors to see if the attitudes were unique to donors.

In addition to the above findings, Kelley cited two general trends in the Grunig model regarding alumni prospects. First, males tend to be more likely to give than females. Second, alumni who had higher incomes were more likely to become donors.

Other related research

Andrews (1953) - Attitudes toward giving Andrews was able to characterize donor attitudes based upon interviews with 91 persons. He

found that 98% of those who had incomes over $50,000 contributed to a charity and that the large gifts did not necessarily come from the wealthy. In fact, the largest portion of total giving came from families of modest (not defined) income. The interviews reflected that volunteer work was a stimulus to giving and those who contributed to colleges and universities were most likely to be those who had graduated or at least attended the particular institution. There was no evidence to show that age was a factor in giving but those interviewed indicated that gratitude was a chief motivator to give.

In addition, the interviews produced several fund-raising tips. They were:

1. In order to get money, you have to ask for it.
2. Habit and imitation of others form a basis for giving.
3. Self-protection is a strong motive.
4. Appealing to a person's sense of obligation to society and using the person-to-person approach is most effective.
5. If the donor has immediate contact with the problem, a contribution is more likely.

Hunter (1968) - Characteristics of donors who contribute over $1 million This research project involved interviewing 30 people who had made at least a single philanthropic contribution of $1 million or more. He found several motivations for giving and ranked them in order of importance: (1) merits of the project; (2) self-generated conviction; (3) objectives and plans of the organization; (4) efficiency of the organization; and (5) competence of the organization's leadership. In twenty-three of the cases, the contributor was a alumnus or member of the organization and in twenty of the cases the contributor was a trustee of

the receiving institution. Contrary to what might be a likely assumption, tax considerations were not ranked as a very important consideration in deciding to contribute.

Hunter developed a profile of the large donor defined as one who contributed $1 million or more, based upon his interviews. The average age of those interviewed was 66 with the oldest 89 and the youngest 39; 18 had completed college and eight had complete some graduate work; all were male; there was little correlation between having children and giving, but 26 were married; 16 considered themselves employed, six were retired and six were self-employed; occupations seemed to be mixed varying from the automobile industry to newspaper publishing to finance and many others were listed with no pattern emerging; 17 were Republicans with only two regarding themselves as Democrats; there was no distinct religious preference; and six reported an annual income of over $1 million, ten were in the $100,000 to $500,000 range, and two reported a salary of less than $50,000. Hunter learned that education received the greatest percentage of the total current annual giving of these majors donors.

Relationships between private donations and sports programs

Whether having a successful athletic program defined by a winning tradition results in a more favorable development program has been debated widely. The findings are mixed on this subject but it is interesting to note research that has been conducted on the topic.

Segdimas and Carter (1979) conducted a study to see if alumni giving varied according to the student's success or failure on the playing field. The evidence was mixed and no definitive conclusions were drawn. Below is

a summary of their findings which lists studies supporting the theory that a winning sports tradition favorably affects the development program and studies not supporting the theory.

Evidence to support the theory:

1. Klein (1967) reported that after Texas Western won the NCAA basketball championship in 1966, the support from the community came easier.

2. Ambur (1971) found that alumni giving at Ohio State University fell by almost $500,000 when their football record fell from 7-2 in 1965 to 4-5 in 1966.

3. Ambur (1971) found that after the University of Georgia's football record fell from 6-4 in 1960 to 3-7 in 1961, alumni support dropped. Conversely, he found that alumni contributions almost doubled after the University of Missouri improved its football record in 1960. He also reported alumni contributions increased each year at Amherst except for two years when they did not win the Little Three Football Championship.

4. Sports Illustrated (1973) reported that alumni contributions increased at Virginia Tech after their basketball team won the National Invitational Tournament.

Evidence not supporting the theory:

1. Sixteen schools which attempted to build a strong athletic program in order to increase donations were studied by Marts (1934). He found that their endowments increased by 105% but when compared to 16 other institutions who did not attempt to build a strong athletic program found that their endowments increased by 125%. He also reported that those institutions who chose to build a strong athletic program also incurred tremendous debts in the process.

2. In a study of an institution which had given up its varsity sports, Springs (1974) found that the decision had little or no effect upon alumni giving and in some cases it had a positive effect.

3. Budig (1976) found in his research that the significance of relationships between athletic success and alumni giving was so random that any relationship at all was due probably to sheer chance (p. 284-289).

A more detailed study of the relationship between a successful athletic program and alumni giving was conducted in 1975-76 by the Council for Financial Aid to Education (CFAE). One-hundred and thirty eight colleges and universities that maintained Division I athletic programs were studied to determine if there was a relationship between athletic success and alumni giving. The data were obtained over a fourteen year period and three variables were examined. These three variables were (1) increase or decrease in total volume of alumni giving; (2) average dollar value of gifts that a school received in a given year; and (3) the number of school alumni that contributed in any year. Three other variables were compared to the above-mentioned variables. These were: (1) the percentage of football games won; (2) the football team's participation in a bowl game; and (3) the percentage of basketball games won. Both correlation and regression analyses were used to determine the relationship between each school's alumni-giving and their athletic success. Data analysis revealed that not one of the six correlation coefficients were significant at the .05 level. The study concluded that the lack of relationship between success in intercollegiate athletics and increased alumni giving mattered a great deal less than the fact that so many people believe that the relationship does exist. It seems the myth that the relationship existed was more widely accepted than the fact that the relationship was at best a random association.

In a similar study, Brooker and Klastorin (1981) examined the relationship between athletic success and alumni contributions for 58 major universities. The study tried to show how emotional attachment is positively related to contributions. They used two dependent variables:

size of average gift contributed and per capita gift to the annual fund. In addition, they studied six independent variables: percentage of football and basketball games won; winning percentage indicated by one or two years; participation in a major or minor bowl game; ranking in final UPI Top 20 national poll; ranking among top 20 teams; and, Gross National Product to adjust for general economic conditions. They used a multiple step regression to examine possible relationships between the variables and found that there were some differences but those were mostly dependent upon some institutional factors. For example, the private school analysis found more of a relationship indicating that at least one dependent variable was associated with one or more indicators of athletic success. The analysis of state universities showed inconsistent results. The results did indicate that private schools had a high proportion of alumni who were donors of large gifts. The authors cautioned against placing too much reliance on consciously increasing the athletic program for the purpose of boosting private contributions.

As indicated by the small amount of published research in the area, there appears to be a need for more research on the relationship between athletic programs and alumni giving. Regardless, the trend for the financially troubled institutions is toward curtailing sports programs rather than increasing them. This may be an unconscious recognition of the mixed findings regarding the relationship between sports programs and alumni donations.

It is appropriate to now focus attention on the problem this paper has identified and to describe the research methods used in testing the various hypotheses.

Summary of Literature Review

Educators have recognized the importance of philanthropy in defining the financial stability of institutions of higher education. Whether philanthropic appeals have been made in the name of institutional advancement, institutional development, or simply fund-raising campaigns is insignificant compared to the importance of the actual appeal, the preparation for the appeal, and in the end, the net result of the appeal - donations.

Private funding has been sought by higher education in a variety of ways but perhaps the most important is through the annual campaign for funds from alumni and friends. Most higher educational institutions have solicited alumni and friends regularly since the founding of Harvard College in 1636. But the solicitations of today are becoming more sophisticated as research methods are introduced. Characteristics of alumni and friends are studied closely in an attempt to focus the efforts of fund-raisers upon those who have been identified as the most likely to contribute. The research conducted thus far has been limited and the findings have been mixed.

Nevertheless, several general observations were made which may have an important bearing on this study. First, most (90% to 95%) gifts are contributed by a small (5% to 10%) number of donors (Pfizenmaier, 1981). Second, donors are more likely to have been actively engaged in some activity which elicits a good feeling about the institution as indicated by Fisher quoting Cheshire (1980). Third, Pray quoting Pickett (1981) noted that institutions successful in soliciting funds from alumni and friends utilize prospect research. Fourth, most of the research conducted is

institution specific and the results cannot necessarily be generalized to the larger universe due the uniqueness of the sample studied.

In designing a research proposal which deals with analyzing the characteristics of donors, their respective giving patterns, and attempting to develop a prediction model for alumni giving, it becomes apparent that there is no easy solution or approach. The literature reflects a variety of approaches which could be integrated in developing an appropriate research method for a particular institution. The challenge is to find the best approach for the particular institution.

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides a history of the development of this research project, describes the survey sample procedures, gives a rationale for the manner in which the data were treated, and describes the statistical procedures used in analyzing the data.

History of Alumni Research Activities at Iowa State University

In 1978, the Iowa State University Alumni Association Board of Directors conducted a survey of ISU graduates. A four page survey was developed by the ISU Alumni Association Board of Directors containing 53 questions designed to ask demographic as well as attitudinal questions of the graduates. Demographic information was solicited about the respondent's age, academic background, and anticipated salary. Attitudinal questions centered around the respondent's attitude about particular issues including the degree of identity with Iowa State and determining whether the academic program prepared the respondent for a particular occupation. The survey instrument may be found in Appendix A. There were 48,724 responses to the survey. This was the first major research project conducted by the Alumni Association and one of the largest surveys ever conducted by any college or university.

In 1980, Dr. Roy Hickman of the Statistical Laboratory at Iowa State University was commissioned to analyze the data. He selected 1,218 respondents from the 1978 survey for the purpose of analyzing their financial contributions. The financial variables considered were total prior year contributions and total life contributions. Other demographic

variables analyzed included sex and marital status, location of residence, salary, degrees held, college in which the highest degree was earned from ISU, and honors earned at Iowa State. A variety of attitudinal variables were also analyzed. Dr. Hickman's data analysis and written report are presented in Appendix B.

The Hickman project provided the impetus for further research regarding alumni and potential donors. As a result, a prospect researcher was employed by the Development Office to gather data which would help to identify and cultivate potential donors. This person began to compile information obtained from a variety of sources about potential donors to supplement the data gained from the survey. From conversations with the Alumni and Development Office's staff and from reading about prospect research, the decision was made to conduct research which would potentially enable the Development Office staff to predict alumni giving. The initial goal of this research project was to develop a prediction model for alumni giving utilizing the data from the 1978 research project, the prospect file which had been generated by the Development Office based upon the 1978 data, and the experience of the Development Office field staff in working with donors and prospective donors.

A pool of 6,535 potential donors regarded by the Development Office as possessing characteristics similar to other individuals who had already made a contribution to the university was made available. The characteristics of each individual on the file were reflected in data gathered in 1978. The initial goal was to focus on the demographic and attitudinal factors identified in the 1978 project. The first step in the research was to calculate frequencies of the variables and to correlate the

variables analyzed. The second step of this research was to conduct a regression analysis of the variables which would provide a prediction model resulting in an individual being identified as likely to contribute to the institution.

Unfortunately, the data were not available in sufficient quantities in the various cells to allow for correlations to be computed. In turn, this made the development of a prediction model not feasible since prediction is based upon the strength of the correlations among variables.

Survey and Sample Procedures

Since the prediction model was not a satisfactory alternative, the investigator in consultation with experts in educational research explored the possibility of analyzing giving patterns of individuals in selected graduating classes. The class years 1974 and 1979 were selected since they represented a span of 10 and 5 years respectively beyond receiving the baccalaureate degree. The data available were taken from a survey instrument utilized by the Alumni and Development Office for many years (see Appendix C). The survey is given to seniors at the time of graduation and while completing the survey is optional, most graduating seniors actually return the survey, according to Development Office staff. The data from this survey instrument was coded by the ISU Development Agencies. Upon the investigator's request, the Development Office then merged the list of respondents with the actual donor files for the same years cited above. The computer tapes for the two files for the class year 1974 and 1979 were modified to remove the names on the files in order to protect the confidentiality of the individuals.

Data Treatment

At the point that the computer tapes from each class year were made available, the data on each file were examined and a number of variables were recoded from alphabetical codes to numeric codes to allow for ease in analysis. A list of frequencies was calculated for each variable. There were 3,378 and 3,672 individual records on the 1974 and 1979 tapes respectively. Following preliminary analysis from all graduate and professional students, it was decided to eliminate them from the study due to insufficient numbers. Widows and widowers were eliminated from the sex/marital status variable due to the small numbers reported in each cell. Separated men and women as well as an "unknown" category were eliminated from the study due to insufficient data available in each cell. Marital status was reflected in the single and married categories only and all male and female divorcees as well as widows and widowers were classified as single. Several variables were modified by the investigator for the purpose of analysis. Occupational codes were reduced from 112 specific occupations to eight categories: mathematical sciences, physical sciences, engineering, life sciences, miscellaneous, business, social sciences, and home economics (specific codes are available in Appendix D). Student honorary organizations were recoded from 77 specific entries into five categories: academic honoraries, active honoraries, professional honoraries, departmental societies and organizations, and honor societies with an emphasis on scholarship and research (specific codes are available in Appendix E). Student residences were recoded from 81 specific places of residence into only three categories: Greek, on-campus, and off-campus

(specific codes are available in Appendix F). In addition, the anticipated salary ranges were condensed from nine categories into four categories.

A decision was made to use the entire population of the two class years. The following twelve variables were selected for data analysis from the survey.

1. Sex and marital status.
2. Sex
3. Marital status
4. First degree achieved
5. College in which first degree was achieved
6. Scholarship or loan recipient
7. Affiliation with an organization while in college
8. Wealth rating defined by the Development Office
9. Anticipated occupation upon graduation
10. Anticipated salary range upon graduation
11. Affiliation with a student honorary organization while in college
12. Place of residence while in college

In addition, individuals were classified according to whether they were non-donors or donors (defined by giving $1.00 or more to a particular cause). The gifts were examined by three categories: (1) a gift to the athletic program; (2) a gift to the academic program; and (3) a total gift which would include a gift to athletics, the academic program, or both.

Statistical Procedure Utilized

The statistical procedure utilized to examine the data was the chi-square. Chi-square analysis is a particularly useful non-parametric statistical test used when the data are in the form of categorical variables. It is the appropriate test to be used to determine whether two frequency distributions differ significantly from each other. Finally, educational researchers tend to use the chi-square test most frequently in causal-comparative studies (Borg & Gall, 1979). Thus, it was decided to utilize the chi-square test of significance in this study. The level of

significance was chosen to be .05. Where relationships are found to be highly significant (.01), the strength of the relationship was noted. The tables utilizing the chi-square should be interpreted with a degree of caution, however, due to the small number of donors in some of the categories. The reader should also be advised that due to missing information, the number of total donors varies among the tables.

CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This research project was conducted to determine giving patterns among the undergraduate classes of 1974 and 1979. The findings reported in this chapter and the discussion of these findings represent the results from the application of statistical procedures and interpretation of the data. The data are presented by variable with primarily donor characteristics being discussed. The interaction of the variables are discussed and the data are interpreted as the data within each year and between graduation years are compared. All three subgroups of giving - to the athletic program, to the academic program, and total giving - are discussed under each variable and the tables follow in the same order the hypotheses were presented in Chapter 1 and listed again in Chapter 3. All tables are found in the Appendix and are listed in numerical order. Although the data regarding the non-donor is listed in each table, the characteristics of the donor are emphasized. Raw data are represented by the first figure in each cell. In ranking the variables, the row percentage was used (the second figure in each cell in the tables) in order to determine the relative strength of the subcategory. Finally, due to the small number of donors in some of the cells caution should be used in interpreting the data.

Section 1: Profile of Donor Characteristics by Sex and Marital Status

Giving to athletics

Tables 1 and 2 represent the donor profile characteristic of those giving to the athletic program. From the class of 1974, only 2.8% of the 3,303 respondents were listed as donors. The data revealed that men were

more likely to have given to the athletic program. Married men were over 7 times more likely to have given to the athletic program than married women. Of all of the men, 3.6% of the single men and 4.5% of the married men were donors whereas only .7% of the single and .6% of the married women gave to the athletic program. None of the 63 divorced women contributed. These differences were significant at the .001 level and were due largely to the higher rate of contribution of the married men and the lower rate of contributions of married women. For the class of 1979, data were available for 3,500 respondents; however, only 1.4% were listed as donors. Again, married men and single men gave more frequently than women. Married men were more likely to have contributed to the athletic program than married women while single men were more likely to have given compared to single women. None of the divorced men or women contributed to athletics. These differences were also significant at the .001 level attributed primarily to the higher rate of contribution by the married men (2.2%) and the lower rate of contribution of married women (.1%). Several trends may be noted including: the 1974 respondents were more likely to have given to athletics than the 1979 respondents; married and single men gave more than any other category; while divorced women gave the least to the athletic program.

Giving to the academic program

Contributors to the academic program differed considerably from those who gave to the athletic program as indicated by Tables 3 and 4. In 1974, 16.2% of the respondents gave to the academic program while 4.0% made a contribution to the academic program from the class of 1979. In 1974,

divorced women were most likely to have given to the academic program followed by married women and married men. In 1979, divorced men were most likely to have given followed by divorced women and then married men. Least likely to have given were single women (1974) and married women (1979). The data for the class of 1974 showed a fairly even distribution between the donors in the various sex and marital status categories; thus, there were no statistically significant differences. The differences in the various categories of data for the class of 1979 were statistically significant at the .001 level due to the relatively high level of giving of divorced men (13.6%) and the lower rate of giving of married women (2.0%). The trends noted in these data include: divorced men in 1974 gave at about the same level as divorced men in 1979 while the other sex/marital status variables indicated that in all other categories the class of 1974 was more likely to have contributed as their 1979 counterparts; divorced men (13.6%) and women (8.0%) gave the most frequently from the class of 1979; divorced women (14.0%) and married women (16.7%) gave more frequently than any other category for the class of 1974; the least likely to have contributed from the class of 1974 were single women (14.1%) and from the class of 1979 were married women (2.0%).

Total giving

Total giving which combined athletic giving with giving to the academic program is reflected in Tables 5 and 6. Of the 3,303 respondents in 1974, 17.7% had made a contribution compared to 4.4% of the 3,500 respondents from the class of 1979. By combining the two types of contributions, the married male (19.2%) was the most likely to have

contributed in 1974 compared to the divorced male (13.6%) in 1979. Divorced women (19.0%) were the next most likely to have given in 1974 followed by single men (17.4%). The least likely to have given in 1974 was the single female (14.0%) and the married female (2.0%) was the least likely to have given in 1979. The differences in the contribution levels for the class of 1979 produced statistically significant results ($p \leq .001$) mainly because of the high contribution level of divorced men (13.6%) and the lower contributions of married women (2.0%). The general trends identified in these data include the following: divorced men and women were more likely to have given from the class of 1979; divorced men gave at about the same rate when comparing class years while the members of the other categories from the class of 1974 were more likely to have made contributions than the respective members in the class of 1979; and married respondents tended to give more frequently than the single respondents in both classes.

Section 2: Profile of Donor Characteristics by Sex

Giving to athletics

Tables 7 and 8 represent the donor profile for the above characteristic based upon contributions to the athletic program. In examining the characteristic of sex, men in the class of 1974 were more likely to have given as women while men in the class of 1979 were more likely to have given than women. Similarly, the male donors from 1974 were more likely to have given than their 1979 male counterparts. Giving for the women in the class of 1974 versus the class of 1979 was only slightly more frequent. The data from both the classes of 1974 and 1979 showed

statistically significant differences ($p \leq .001$) attributed to the higher level of contributions by men in both classes compared to a lower contribution level for the women. One major trend was identified; men were more likely to have contributed to the athletic program than women.

Giving to the academic program

Contributions to the academic program are shown in Tables 9 and 10. While men from the class of 1979 were more likely to have given than women, the pattern was reversed for the class of 1974. Women from the class of 1974 were slightly more likely to have given to the academic program than men. Men from the class of 1974 were more likely to have given than men from the class of 1979. Women from the class of 1974 were more likely to have given than women from the class of 1979. Women from the class of 1979 were more likely to have given to the academic program than to athletics. Men from the 1979 class were more likely to have given to the academic program than athletics. From the class of 1974, men were more likely to have given to the academic program than to athletics but women were more likely to have given to the academic program than to athletics. The 1979 data were statistically significant ($p \leq .001$) due to the higher contribution level of the men (5.0%) and the lower contribution level of the women (2.4%). Two general trends were identified; for the class of 1979, men were more likely to have contributed to the academic program; and for the class of 1974, contributions for both men and women were almost evenly distributed.

Total giving

Due to the dominance of men over women in giving to athletics and the small difference between men and women giving to the academic program, the men were more likely to have given than women in total giving for both class years. The data are shown in Tables 11 and 12. The men and women from the class of 1974 were more likely to have given as their 1979 counterparts. The data for the class of 1979 were statistically significant ($p \leq .001$) due mainly to the higher level of contributions among men (5.6%) and the lower level of contributions among women (2.4%). Two trends were noted in these data: first, contribution levels among men and women from the class of 1974 were fairly evenly distributed; and second, men from the class of 1979 were more likely to have given than women.

Section 3: Profile of Donor Characteristics by Marital Status

Giving to athletics

Contributions to athletics as determined by the marital status of the donors from each class are presented in Tables 13 and 14. Of the total number of contributors representing 2.8% of the population, married persons gave at slightly higher levels in the class of 1974 than did single persons. Data from the class of 1979 indicated the opposite finding. Single persons gave in slightly higher numbers than married persons. The data were too evenly distributed to be considered statistically significant. The only trend identified was that the donors from the class of 1974 gave at a higher rate than the donors from the class of 1979.

Giving to the academic program

Those individuals who chose to contribute to the academic program from the class of 1979 reversed the trend reflected in the data from the previous table. Married persons from the class of 1979 and the class of 1974 tended to have given with a higher frequency than single persons. Single persons from both classes gave less than married persons. Respondents from the class of 1974 were more likely to have given than respondents from the class of 1979. Two factors were noted from this data: first, in both classes, men were more likely to have given than women; second, the data were too evenly distributed to be statistically significant. Tables 15 and 16 reflect this data.

Total giving

In examining total giving patterns, the trend was the same for total giving as for giving to the academic program. Married persons in the class of 1979 tended to have given in slightly larger numbers than single persons. The percentage of married donors from the class of 1974 exceeded that of single donors. There were also more married and single donors from the class of 1974 than married and single donors from the class of 1979. The results from this analysis are presented in Tables 17 and 18. Once again, the data were too evenly distributed to reflect statistical significance. The only conclusion which could be drawn was that more males gave than females and that more donors from the class of 1974 gave than from the class of 1979.

Section 4: Profile of Donor Characteristics by First Degree Achieved

Giving to athletics

Tables 19 and 20 represent the donor profile for the above characteristics. In the class of 1974, of the 3,303 respondents, 2.6% gave to athletics compared to 1.4% of the 3,527 respondents in 1979. In both classes, those persons who graduated with a Bachelors of Science (B. S.) degree gave in larger numbers than those who graduated with a Bachelor of Arts (B. A.) degree. In comparing the two years, the class of 1974 donors with a B. S. degree gave in slightly larger numbers than the 1979 donors with a B. S. degree. The class of 1974 donors with a B. A. degree likewise gave in slightly larger numbers than 1979 donors with a B. A. degree. However, the number of donors in the B. A. category from each class year were too small (6 in the class of 1974 and 2 in the class of 1979) to warrant any meaningful conclusions.

Giving to the academic program

The data shown in Tables 21 and 22 were fairly evenly distributed. The analysis of data indicated that those individuals from the class of 1974 who either never received a degree or received a certificate from the institution were more likely to have given than individuals who received either a B. S. or B. A. degree. Those who attended but never received a degree were the most likely to have contributed to the academic program but the number of contributors in this category were too small to warrant the drawing of any conclusions from these data. For the class of 1979, the person most likely to give to the academic program was the B. S. degree holder followed by the person with a B. A. degree. None of the individuals

who attended but never graduated or persons who received a certificate only were listed as donors from the class of 1979. The B. S. degree holder and the B. A. degree holder from 1974 were more likely to have contributed to the academic program than the same degree holders from 1979.

Total giving

The total giving figures listed by the first degree received are listed in Tables 23 and 24. The data for total giving were similar to the data for giving to the academic program. For the class of 1974, those who had either attended but did not graduate or those who received a certificate were more likely to have given than the baccalaureate degree recipients. For the class of 1979, the B. S. degree recipients were more likely to have given than those individuals who received a B. A. degree; those who attended but never graduated or those who received a certificate were not listed at all as donors. There were more B. S. degree donors from both classes than B. A. donors. An unexplained feature of the data remained, however, that the person who attended but did not graduate and the person who received a certificate but not a baccalaureate degree was the most likely to have given in the class of 1974 and the least likely to have given in the class of 1979. This may be attributable to the small number of donors resulting in unpredictable conclusions. Only 2.6% of the class of 1979 were listed as donors in total giving compared to 17.1% of the class of 1974.

Section 5: Profile of Donor Characteristics by College in Which the First Degree Was Granted

Giving to athletics

Tables 25 and 26 reflect the data for the college in which the degree was granted. From the class of 1979, out of a population of 3,217, 1.5% were listed as donors compared to 2.6% of the population of 3,314 from the class of 1974. In both the class of 1974 and 1979, the person most likely to have given to the athletic program was the graduate in Agricultural Engineering though there was only one donor from the class of 1974 and four from the class of 1979 followed by graduates of the College of Agriculture. It must be noted that Iowa State University does classify Agricultural Engineering graduates separately as does the Development Office but typically does not regard Agricultural Engineering as a separate college. For the purpose of this research project and because the data were coded in this manner, Agricultural Engineering was classified separately. Both Agricultural Engineering and Agriculture graduates from the class of 1974 were more likely to have given than the next most frequent categories of donors, graduates from the Colleges of Sciences and Humanities and Engineering. The least likely to have given from the class of 1974 were the College of Education graduates. The graduate least likely to have given from the class of 1979 was from the College of Home Economics. The data from both classes were statistically significant ($p \leq .001$) reflecting a higher contribution level from graduates in Agricultural Engineering (5.0% for 1974 and 11.1% for 1979) and a lower contribution level from the College of Education for the class of 1974 (.6%) and the College of Home Economics for the class of 1979 (.6%).

Giving to the academic program

In analyzing the data by college in terms of gifts to the academic program, the data followed some of the same trends reflected in the tables listing contributions to athletics. There were several differences, however. The data are presented in Tables 27 and 28. For the class of 1974, the Agricultural Engineering graduates lead all of the other categories of colleges in terms of contributions. For the class of 1979, the Agricultural Engineering graduates were the least likely to have contributed. The most likely to have contributed were the graduates from the College of Sciences and Humanities though there were only 78 donors from all of the colleges. The second most likely contributor from both classes were the graduates from the College of Engineering followed by graduates from the College of Agriculture. The 1974 graduates of the College of Engineering were more likely to have contributed than the Engineering graduates from the class of 1979. The 1974 graduates of the College of Agriculture were more likely to have contributed than their 1979 counterparts. The graduates from the College of Education and the Home Economics graduates ranked fourth and fifth respectively from the class of 1979. For the class of 1974, the same colleges ranked sixth and fourth respectively. The most striking feature of this data set remained the Agricultural Engineering graduates who were not listed as contributors in the class of 1979 but were regarded as the most likely contributors from the class of 1974. The differences among the data for the class of 1974 were statistically significant ($p \leq .002$) as were the differences in the data for the class of 1979 ($p \leq .019$). This was the result primarily from the higher contribution levels among the Agricultural Engineering graduates

(35.0%) and the lower giving rate among Education graduates (10.6%). Likewise, the statistical significance of the 1979 data was due mainly to the higher contribution rate of the graduates of the College of Science and Humanities (3.3%), the College of Engineering (3.1%), and no contributors listed at all in the Agricultural Engineering category.

Total giving

In examining the data for total giving of the donors by college, 17.0% of the 3,314 population of the class of 1974 had contributed compared to 2.8% of the 3,217 from the class of 1979. Specific data about this category of donors are found in Tables 29 and 30. The donors listed under total giving represent somewhat different colleges than donors to the athletic program but are similar to the donors in the academic program category. The one exception to this statement was the Agricultural Engineering graduate who was the most likely to have given from the class of 1974 compared to graduates from the College of Engineering who ranked as the next most likely to have given. The least likely to have contributed continued to be graduates from the College of Education. From the class of 1979, the graduates of the College of Sciences and Humanities were the most likely to have given followed by the graduates of the College of Engineering. The Agricultural Engineering graduates were ranked as third most likely to have given but represented only one donor. The graduates of the College of Agriculture were fifth most likely to have given. These rankings were markedly different than the rankings for the same class year using athletic contributions as the indicator of giving. Graduates from the College of Home Economics were least likely to have given from the

class from 1979 ranking in the same place as their counterparts of the class of 1979 who gave to athletics. All colleges showed higher percentages of donors to the academic program from the class of 1974 compared to the class of 1979. The data for the class of 1974 were statistically significant ($p \leq .001$).

Section 6: Profile of Donor Characteristics by Having Received a Scholarship or Loan

Giving to athletics

In this category of donors, there were 2,434 respondents from the class of 1974 and 3.3% gave to the athletic program. From the class of 1979, there were 1,632 respondents and 1.8% gave to the athletic program. These data are presented in Tables 31 and 32. In both class years, the category of respondents most likely to have given had received benefits from the G. I. Bill. The second ranked category of respondents either had not received any type of assistance or received a scholarship. For the class year 1979, there was, however, only one recipient of the benefits of the G. I. Bill who had given to athletics and only five from the class of 1974. The members of the category least likely to have contributed to athletics from both class years were the respondents who had received both a scholarship and a loan. The next least likely to have contributed were the respondents who had received a loan only. From the class of 1974, the recipients of the benefits of the G. I. Bill were more likely to have contributed than the category of respondents who had received a loan only and were also more likely to have contributed than the respondents who had received both a scholarship and a loan. Similar results occurred in the data from the class of 1979 though the relationship was more dramatic. The

members of the category of respondents who had received the benefits of the G. I. Bill were more likely to have contributed to athletics than the members of the category of respondents who had received both a scholarship and a loan and also more likely to have contributed than the members of the category of respondents who had received a loan while in college. Those who had received only a scholarship were more likely to have contributed than those who had received only loans. The data from both class years produced statistically significant results ($p \leq .035$ for 1974 and $p \leq .011$ for 1979). The strength of the statistical significance of the data was based upon the higher contribution levels of the recipients of the G. I. Bill (7.5% for 1974 and 16.7% for 1979) and the lower rate of contribution among the graduates who had received both scholarships and loans (1.2% for both classes). Caution should be taken in inferring this finding to the larger population, however, due to the relatively small number of donors from each class year - only 29 donors from the class of 1979 and 81 from the class of 1974.

Giving to the academic program

As was the case generally with other data in this project, the number of donors who contributed to the academic program compared to athletics were higher. The data for this characteristic are presented in Tables 33 and 34. Of the class of 1974, 19.4% of the population of 2,434 had contributed to the academic program while 4.8% of the population of 1,632 from the class of 1979 had contributed. Once again, the members in the category representing recipients of the G. I. Bill were most likely to have contributed from the class of 1974 followed by those who had not received

assistance from any of the programs listed and those who had received only a scholarship. Those least likely to have contributed from the class of 1974 had received a loan only and those who had received both a scholarship and a loan. For the class of 1979, those who had received both a scholarship and a loan were most likely to have given which reversed the trend indicated for athletic giving. Those next most likely to have given had not received assistance from any of the programs listed which was the same finding for the class of 1974. Those least likely to have contributed were the respondents who had received a scholarship. For the class of 1979, there were no donors listed in the G. I. Bill category at all. The range between the category of persons most likely to have given and the category of persons least likely to have given within the same class year was more dramatic for the class of 1974 than the class of 1979. The data for the class of 1974 were statistically significant ($p \leq .002$). The significant differences in the data were mainly due to the lower contribution level of the categories of recipients who received only a loan while in school (14.4%) or both a scholarship and a loan (15.8%) compared to the higher rate of contribution for those who had received the G. I. Bill while in school (25.4%) and those who had received no scholarship or loan (22%).

Total giving

Tables 35 and 36 allow for an examination of total giving levels for this variable. Of the class of 1974, 21.2% actually contributed to either the athletic program, the academic program, or both programs while the same figure for the class of 1979 was 5.4%. The preponderance of recipients of

the G. I. Bill in the class of 1974 in both athletic and academic program giving resulted in that same category being the most likely to have given in total giving. One comparison made between years indicated that the persons least likely to have contributed from either class were the those who had received only a loan. The second most likely to have contributed from both years were those who had not received assistance from any of the programs listed. The members of the category of respondents who had not received any benefits from the class of 1974 were more likely to have given than the members in the same category from the class of 1979; those who had received a scholarship only from the class of 1974 were more likely to have contributed than the 1979 counterpart; respondents who had received a scholarship and a loan were more likely to have contributed than the 1979 counterpart; and, respondents who had received a loan only from the class of 1974 were more likely to have made a contribution than the counterpart from the class of 1974. For the class of 1974, the differences in the contribution levels for the categories were statistically significant ($p \leq .001$).

Section 7: Profile of Donor Characteristics by Affiliation with a Student Organization While Enrolled

Giving to athletics

There were 1,855 respondents from the class of 1974 with 2.9% of that population shown as donors. The 1979 data indicated 1,902 in the population with 1.4% listed as donors. The specific characteristics of those contributing to athletics are listed in Tables 37 and 38. The category which appeared as the one in which the highest percentage of donors appeared for both the class of 1974 and the class of 1979 was

participation in athletics. For the class of 1974, this category contained only slightly more donors than the next category, affiliation with the Navy ROTC. Both categories combined accounted for six donors however of a total of only 54. For the class of 1979, however, the members in the category, participation in athletics, were more likely to indicate donor characteristics than the second most likely category of donors, occasional contribution to a publication. Again, the total of both categories represented only five donors of a total of 26 donors. The category, normal activity in a professional organization, ranked as the third and fourth category as being more likely to contribute for class years 1979 and 1974 respectively. The category, normal activity in a campus organization, ranked fourth for the class of 1979 but was ranked as the next to least likely to contribute category for the class of 1974. The only category ranked by both classes as representative for those least likely to contribute was participation in the performing arts. Those who participated in athletics in 1979 were more likely to have contributed than those who participated in athletics from the class of 1974 though both represented the category identified with having the greatest number of contributors. Due to the relatively small number of donors in each class year (26 for the class of 1979 and 54 for the class of 1974), caution should be used in extrapolating the information to the larger population.

Giving to the academic program

The data from Tables 39 and 40 show the members who had been normally active in a professional organization for the class of 1979 gave most frequently compared to those who had been an occasional contributor to a

publication as the top ranked category for the class of 1974. The second most frequent category of donors for the two class years were reversed from the above order. Involvement in student government was third in the top five types of involvement for the class of 1974 while "other" ranked third for the class of 1979. Participation in AFROTC and other participation ranked fourth and fifth for the class of 1974 while participation in athletics and normal activity in a campus organization ranked fourth and fifth respectively for the class of 1979. The donor from the class of 1974 who had experienced normal activity in a professional organization was more likely to have given than the class of 1979 counterpart. The occasional contributor to a publication from the class of 1974, however, was more likely to have contributed than the person from the same category from the class of 1979. The total number in this category for both years was only ten however so caution should be used in drawing any conclusions from this data set.

Total giving

Tables 41 and 42 show 21.5% of the 1,855 respondents from the class of 1974 gave to the athletic program, to the academic program, or both. This compared to 5.2% of the 1,902 respondents from the class of 1979. In analyzing the top five categories for the class of 1974 and 1979 which identified donors, the respective ranking was: normal activity in a professional organization, occasional contribution to a publication, participation in student government, normal activity in a campus organization, and "other" for the class of 1974 followed by normal activity in a professional organization, participation in athletics, occasional

contribution to a publication, "other", and normal activity in a campus organization for the class of 1979. Participation in student government which ranked as third highest for the class of 1974 did not have any donors in this category at all for the class of 1979. Athletic participation which was ranked as the second category for donors most likely to have contributed from the class of 1979 was not ranked in the top five by the class of 1974. There were no contributors listed in the Marine ROTC category or the religion category for the class of 1979. Similarly, there were no contributors listed in the categories of student government, AFROTC, Army, Marine, or Navy ROTC, or religion for the class of 1979. The class of 1974 data were statistically significant ($p \leq .048$) due to the relatively high percentage of contributors who had seen normal activity in a professional organization (25.7 %) and the relatively low contribution levels of the other variables being considered. Caution should be taken in interpretation; however, due to the small number of donors in these categories. The total number of contributors from the class of 1979 was only 98 with all but ten of those individuals having either had normal activity in a professional organization or in a campus organization.

Section 8: Profile of Donor Characteristics by Wealth Rating

Giving to athletics

The wealth rating allowed the respondent to indicate which of five categories most closely described his or her respective income level. Each respondent indicated an income level in the respondent's state of residence in five 20% intervals. Tables 43 and 44 present this variable across the five categories of giving to athletics. Of 3,148 respondents to this

survey item, only 2.9% were donors in the 1974 class compared to 1.8% of the 3,324 respondents from the class of 1979. The data across both class years reflected a fairly even distribution of contribution rates among all of the categories. The data, however, for the class of 1974 showed those who ranked themselves in the lowest 20% of income level in their state of residence were most likely as a group to have contributed with those ranking themselves in the highest 20% second. The respondents from the class of 1979 who ranked in the highest 20% income level in their state of residence and the lowest 20% income level in their state of residence represented categories of people most likely to have been donors. There were no statistically significant differences among the five categories of wealth ratings.

Giving to the academic program

In examining giving to the academic program, the percentages of donors of the total population for both years was higher than the donor percentages for giving to athletics, which was similar to the findings in other analyses. Of the 1974 population of 3,148, 16.4% were donors compared to 4.0% of the 1979 population of 3,324. The data for 1974 donors showed that those who ranked themselves in the highest 20% income level in their state of residence, as a group, were more likely to have contributed than any other group. Those who ranked themselves in the lowest 20% income level were the least likely to have contributed to the academic program. While these data indicated a logical trend, the data were fairly evenly distributed. The data for 1979 did not show any particular trends. Those most likely to have contributed ranked themselves in the middle category of

income earners in their state of residence. The category of respondents least likely to have contributed ranked themselves in the lowest group of income earners in their state of residence. Tables 45 and 46 depict the distribution of this variable.

Total giving

Tables 47 and 48 show the distribution of data for the wealth rating variable in terms of total giving. The donor percentages for the class of 1974 and the class of 1979 were 18.0% and 4.4% respectively. Neither set of data was statistically significant as the data for both class years were fairly evenly distributed. In the class of 1974, the category with the respondents most likely to have contributed ranked themselves in the top 20% of the income earners in their state of residence. The category reflecting respondents least likely to have given ranked themselves in the lowest income category in their state of residence. Individuals in the category, next to lowest income category, were the second most likely to have given in total giving. For the class of 1979, respondents who ranked themselves in the middle category of income earners were the most likely to have given in total giving. The category of individuals least likely to have contributed was the category, lowest 20% of income earners, followed by the category, second 20% of income earners. The total giving category of the wealth rating followed the athletic and academic program categories in that there was little difference in the percentage of people from the category most likely to have given to the category least likely to have given.

Section 9: Profile of Donor Characteristics by Affiliation with a Student Honorary Organization

Giving to athletics

This variable was selected as a way to examine whether the various honor societies to which a student could be appointed had any impact upon giving. The first tables in this section, Tables 49 and 50, show the impact of giving to athletics by the various categories of honoraries. The five categories of honoraries included academic honoraries, active honoraries, professional honoraries, departmental societies and organizations, and honor societies with an emphasis on scholarship and research. Of the 847 respondents from the class of 1974, 2.6% were donors compared to 1.7% of the total population of 871 from the class of 1979. Both data sets from the class of 1974 and 1979 had fairly even distributions. The most important point about this analysis was that there were only 22 donors from the class of 1974 and 15 donors from the class of 1979 which resulted in inconclusive evidence to suggest any trends or significance.

Giving to the academic program

The differences in the data from the class of 1974 and 1979 produced statistically significant results for both years ($p \leq .001$ for 1974 and p .014 for 1979). The significance of the data for 1974 was primarily attributable to the higher contribution level of those who had been involved with an active honorary and the lower contribution levels of those who had been affiliated with a professional organization. The same was true for the 1979 data except the category of honor society with an emphasis on scholarship and research was added to the active honorary to

represent the higher level of contributors. Those involved with an academic honorary were the lowest level of contributors. The difference between those two groups resulted primarily in the statistical significance of the data. For the class year 1974, 23.4% of the total of 847 respondents were donors. The category representing those most likely to have given had been affiliated with an active honorary while in college. This was followed by the category of those who had been involved with a departmental honorary while in college. The category representing those least likely to have given from the class of 1974 was the category representing those who had been affiliated with a professional honorary. Those in the category of active honorary respondents were more likely to have given than those in the category of professional honorary respondents. For the class of 1979, the respondents most likely to have given had been involved with an honor society emphasizing scholarship or research or an active honorary while in college. Those least likely to have given had been affiliated with an academic honorary. In comparing the data between class years, the active honorary respondents were the most likely to have given from the class of 1974. The active honorary respondents tied with the persons who had been involved with an honor society emphasizing scholarship or research those most likely to have given from the class of 1979. The persons who had been affiliated with an academic honorary were the least likely to have given from the class of 1979 and next to least likely to have given from the class of 1974. The active honorary respondents from the class of 1974 were more likely to have contributed than the active honorary respondents from the class of 1979. Also, the respondents least likely to have given from the class of 1979 were the

academic honorary respondents. The 1974 academic honorary respondents were more likely to have given than the class of 1979 counterpart even though this category of respondents ranked as the next least likely to have given from the class of 1974. Tables 51 and 52 show the various relationships between the categories of this variable.

Total giving

The total giving by the student honorary variable is reflected in Tables 53 and 54. The data closely paralleled the data for giving to the academic program. The only difference in the ranking of the various categories by class year was in the class year 1979. The category of respondents most likely to have contributed in total giving was the category representing those who had been involved in an honorary which emphasized scholarship and research followed by the category of persons who had been involved in an active honorary. These two categories were in the top position in giving to the academic program. Other categories for both class years were ranked exactly the same as they were for giving to the academic program. Similar to the data examined in giving to the academic program, the total giving data showed that the category of persons most likely to have given from the class of 1974 was the active honorary respondent. Individuals least likely to have given were the professional honorary respondents. The respondents most likely to have given from the class of 1979 had been involved in an honorary which emphasized scholarship or research. The respondents least likely to have given were the academic honorary respondents. The active honorary respondent from the class of 1974 was more likely to have given than the 1979 counterpart. For class

year 1974, 24.8% of the population were donors in the total giving variable compared to 6.0% of the population for the class year 1979. The data for the class of 1974 were statistically significant ($p \leq .001$) mainly due to the wide distribution between the category of respondents who had an affiliation with an active honorary, which represented the group most likely to have contributed (35.7%), and the category of respondents who where least likely to have contributed, those who had an affiliation with a professional honorary (14.1%). The distribution of the data for the class of 1979 was not as wide as the distribution for the class of 1974. The data were statistically significant ($p \leq .022$) however. The difference between the category representing those most likely to have contributed, those who had an affiliation with an honor society which emphasized scholarship and research, and the category representing those who were least likely to have contributed, the category representing those individuals who had an affiliation with an academic honorary, contributed to the statistical significance of this data.

Section 10: Profile of Donor Characteristics by Occupation

Giving to athletics

The data in Tables 55 and 56 reflect contributions to athletics by the various occupations listed. The results of the 1974 data were statistically significant ($p \leq .001$) due to the wide distribution among the occupational categories especially between the highest level of contributors, those respondents in life science occupations (8.0%) and the category of respondents least likely to have contributed, those categorized in miscellaneous occupations (2.0%). Of the 1,227 respondents from the

class of 1974, 4.6% were donors compared to 1.9% of the 698 respondents from the class of 1979. The only category of occupations which showed some degree of consistency from 1974 to 1979 was business which ranked as the category of respondents next to most likely to have given to the athletic program. For the class of 1974, the respondents who were most likely to have given to athletics were the persons who had listed life sciences as their occupation. Those listing social sciences as their occupation ranked as the most likely to have contributed for the class of 1979. Those least likely to have given to athletics were the respondents who listed their occupation as either in the fields of home economics or physical sciences for 1974 and as either engineering, home economics, physical sciences, life sciences, or mathematical sciences for the class of 1979. Those listing business as their occupation from the class of 1974 were more likely to have given than their 1979 counterparts.

Giving to the academic program

Contributions to the academic program by occupational categories are presented in Tables 57 and 58. The data for the class year 1974 were statistically significant ($p \leq .003$). Primarily, this was due to those involved in the life science occupations giving at a relatively high level (33.0%) and those involved in the miscellaneous occupations giving at a relatively low level (12.7%). Of the population of 1,227 respondents, 20.5%, were donors from the class of 1974 compared to 5.6% of the 698 respondents from the class of 1979. Life science continued to rank as the category of occupations denoting the individuals most likely to have contributed to the academic program for both classes and replaced the

social sciences occupation as the category of respondents most likely to have contributed to athletics. Business remained as the second-ranked category of occupations reflecting contributions for the class of 1974 while engineering was the second-ranked category of occupations denoting contributors for the class of 1979. The percentage of life science contributors who gave in the class of 1979 (39.2%) was higher than for the class of 1974 (33.0%) even though life sciences represented the category of occupations most likely to have produced donors for both years. A finding in the class of 1974 was that the top four categories of occupations which were most likely to have reflected actual donations were in the same order for both giving to athletics and giving to the academic program. The order of those categories of occupations were as follows listing those categories which represented persons most likely to have contributed first: life sciences, business, mathematical sciences, and engineering. Persons listing business as their occupation in the class of 1974 were more likely to have been a donor than the 1979 counterpart whose occupation was also business. The class of 1979 respondent with a life science occupation was more likely to have contributed than the engineer who was listed as the next most likely to have contributed. This represented a considerable gap between the first and second categories for 1979 which was not apparent in any of the other categories examined except for the total giving category shown in the next table.

Total giving

Tables 59 and 60 show the various relationships between categories of occupations in terms of total giving. The data set from the class of 1974

produced statistically significant results ($p \leq .001$). Again, this was due to the wide distribution of data for the category of respondents most likely to have contributed, the life science occupation, (37.5%) compared to the category of respondents least likely to have contributed, those respondents in the miscellaneous fields (13.2%). The order of categories from most likely to have given to least likely to have given were the same for total giving as they were for giving to the academic program and to athletics except for the fifth ranked occupation, social science. Life science continued to be the occupation with the most respondents having contributed. For the class of 1979, some changes in ranking were noticed. The life science occupation continued to be the category which produced the greatest number of donors; however, the engineering category ranked second for the class of 1979 rather than the business category. The life science respondent from the class of 1979 was more likely to have given than the second most likely category, engineering. The occupations least likely to have produced donors from the class of 1979 were home economics, mathematical sciences, and physical sciences compared to miscellaneous, home economics, and physical sciences from the class of 1974. Of the total population of 1,227 from the class of 1974, 23.3% were donors in total giving while 6.0% of the population of 698 were donors in total giving from the class of 1979.

Section 11: Profile of Donor Characteristics by Anticipated Salary Range

Giving to athletics

The salary range categories represent the salary the respondents thought they would earn in their first job. The relationships between

anticipated salary range and contributing to athletics are presented in Tables 61 and 62 for the class years 1974 and 1979. The 1974 data was statistically significant ($p \leq .001$). For the class year 1974, the salary range representing the respondents most likely to have given to athletics was the range from $25,000 to $50,000 followed by the $50,000 an above salary range. The respondents least likely to have given were those with an anticipated salary of less than $15,000. For the class of 1979, the respondents most likely to have given to athletics were those with an anticipated salary of between $15,000 or less per year followed by the respondents with an anticipated salary between $15,000 and $25,000 per year. Neither the $25,000 to $50,000 nor the $50,000 or above data cells contained any donors. The $25,000 to $50,000 and $50,000 and above salary ranges which appeared as first and second in the class of 1974 did not appear at all in the top two contribution levels for the respondents from the class of 1979. Donors from the class of 1974 represented 3.7% of the total 1,471 in the population; whereas, donors from the class of 1979 represented only 2.1% of the total 575 respondents.

Giving to the academic program

In examining the salary range variable by giving to the academic program in Tables 63 and 64, the data were found to be statistically significant ($p \leq .001$) for the 1974 class. This was due primarily to the wide distribution of donors between those most likely to have given, those in the $50,000 and above salary range category, and those least likely to have contributed, respondents in the $15,000 and less salary range category. The data for the class of 1974 closely resembled the data for

giving to athletics for the same year except the categories representing the first and second categories which most likely contained donors were reversed. For the class of 1979 the category representing those most likely to have given was the category of individuals who anticipated a salary between $25,000 and $50,000 followed by the $15,000 to $25,000 salary range category. The third category of respondents most likely to have contributed was the category with an anticipated salary of $15,000 or less. Ironically, the $50,000 and above anticipated income earner was the least likely to have contributed. Of the 1,471 from the class of 1974, 21.6% were donors compared to 7.1% of the 575 from the class of 1979.

Total giving

The data for total giving for the anticipated salary range variable were statistically significant ($p \leq .001$) for the class of 1974. This was the result of a sizable difference between the members of the anticipated salary range category most likely to have given, the $50,000 and above category (36.8%) and the members of the anticipated salary range category least likely to have given, the $15,000 or less category (8.1%). The relationships between the various categories of variables are presented in Tables 65 and 66. The order of the categories of ranges for total giving for the class of 1974 followed the same order as the categories most likely to have given to the academic program. The top two categories of ranges were the $50,000 and above and $25,000 to $50,000 ranges ranking first and second respectively. The top two categories of ranges for the class of 1979 for total giving were the $25,000 to $50,000 range (first) and the $15,000 to $25,000 range (second). The donors in terms of total giving

represented 23.7% of the 1,471 population for the class of 1974 and 8.2% of the 575 population for the class of 1979.

Section 12: Profile of Donor Characteristics by Place of Residence While Enrolled

Giving to athletics

Three categories of places of residence were used to describe this variable: off-campus, on-campus, and Greek housing. The data for the class of 1979 were statistically significant ($p \leq .004$). This was attributed to the differences between the donors who had lived in Greek housing being the most likely to have contributed (3.0%) and those who were least likely to have contributed, the on-campus dwellers (1.1%) or off-campus dwellers (1.2%). The data for giving to athletics are shown in Tables 67 and 68. The respondent who lived in Greek housing while attending Iowa State was most likely to have become a donor for both class years compared to the other two categories. The Greek resident was more likely to have been a donor than the category of respondents least likely to have given from the class of 1974 which represented those respondents who had resided in off-campus housing. For the class of 1979 the Greek resident was more likely to have contributed to athletics compared to the on-campus resident, who was least likely to have contributed to athletics. Of the total population of 3,051 respondents, 3.0% were donors from the class of 1974 compared to 1.5% of the total population of 3,057 from the class of 1979.

Giving to the academic program

For the class of 1974, the order of the categories most likely to have given to least likely to have given were the same as giving to athletics. The category representing those who had resided in Greek housing was first, the on-campus resident was second and off-campus resident was third. For the class of 1979, however, the category of respondents most likely to have given was the off-campus resident followed by the Greek resident and the on-campus resident. For the class of 1979, the category representing off-campus residents was more likely to have given to the academic program than to have given to athletics. The on-campus resident was more likely to have given to the academic program than to athletics. The Greek resident from the class of 1979 was slightly more likely to have given to the academic program than athletics. For the class of 1974, the Greek resident was more likely to have given to the academic program than the athletic program; the on-campus resident was more likely to have given to the academic program than athletics; and, the off-campus resident was more likely to have given to the academic program than to athletics. The Greek resident from the class of 1974 was more likely to have given to the academic program compared to 1979 Greek resident while the on-campus resident from 1974 was more likely to have given than the 1979 on-campus resident. The figures for the off-campus resident for 1974 showed this person to be more likely to have contributed to the academic program than the 1979 off-campus resident. Of the 3,051 population from the class of 1974, 16.8% were donors compared to 4.1% of the class of 1979. Tables 69 and 70 present the data described above.

Total giving

The total giving by place of residence while attending Iowa State is reflected in Tables 71 and 72. For the class of 1974, those most likely to have given were the residents who had lived in Greek housing followed by the on-campus resident and then the off-campus resident. For the 1979 class, those most likely to have given in total giving had lived off-campus followed by the Greek resident and then the on-campus resident. The Greek resident from the class of 1974 was more likely to have given than the same 1979 category. The on-campus resident from the class of 1974 was more likely to have given than the respondent who had lived on-campus from the class of 1979. The off-campus resident from the class of 1974 was more likely to have contributed in total giving compared to the 1979 off-campus resident. Of the total 3,051 respondents for the class of 1974, 18.5% were donors. This compared to 4.5% of the population of 3,057 from the class of 1979.

CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The information presented in this chapter summarizes the findings of the study, relates the summary to the literature review, and recommends future studies on the topic. The results of the study are mixed; and, as a result, the investigator chose to describe the findings rather than make inferences to the entire population.

Summary

As mentioned earlier in this paper, there were obvious limitations to the study. Only two class years were studied which may not be representative of the entire population of donors and non-donors. Undergraduates were studied which may not be representative of the entire student population studied in the two classes. Students enrolled in the College of Veterinary Medicine and graduate students were eliminated from the study due to insignificant numbers in these categories. This decision may have biased the results of the study. Only former students who had completed the questionnaire given to them at the time of their graduation were studied which may not be representative of the entire population. Only Iowa State University students were included in the study which may not be representative of donors and non-donors from other institutions. Finally, caution should be used in interpreting the chi-square of some of the tables due to the small number of donors.

Nevertheless, the statistical treatment of the data yielded statistically significant results in some cases and provided only informative data in other instances. One overall observation based upon

the data was that more alumni contributed from the class of 1974 than the class of 1979. This was probably due to the graduates from the class of 1974 having been out of school longer and probably earning more money than their 1979 colleagues. In addition, the alumni of the class of 1974 would have had more opportunity to contribute due to more contacts with the Alumni Association. Also, because of higher salaries, the 1974 graduates may have had more discretionary income. The contribution levels varied from characteristic to characteristic but with all variables considered, an average of 13.6% of the population from the class of 1974 contributed to the University compared to 3.61% from the class of 1979.

A second overall observation was more alumni gave to the academic program than to the athletic program. The total giving category was determined simply by adding the other categories together. Nevertheless, giving to the academic program seemed to be more popular among donors than giving to athletics.

There may be several reasons for this trend. The donors to the athletic program may have viewed their donation as enhancing the visibility of the institution and regarded their contribution as increasing the likelihood of obtaining better services at athletic events. The donors to the academic programs may have viewed their contributions as supporting the University's teaching, research, and service missions which has a broader appeal than the appeal of athletics.

Although the contribution levels were different from variable to variable, the average percentage of donors in each category of giving was: 3.05% of the population from the class of 1974 gave to the athletic program compared to 1.58% from the class of 1979; 18.14% of the population from the

class of 1974 gave to the academic program from the class of 1974 compared to 4.40% of the population from the class of 1979; and 19.8% of the population from the class of 1974 gave in total giving compared to 4.86% of the population from the class of 1979.

A third overall impression was that of the 12 characteristics analyzed by the three different giving types for the two classes studied - 72 comparisons in all between the characteristics, the years, and the giving types - 29 of the 72 differences in donor characteristics and non-donor characteristics produced statistically significant results or over 40% of the characteristics analyzed were statistically significant. Summary statements for the twelve characteristics follow. They are:

1. Sex and marital status were related to giving to athletics for both class years. Married and single men gave at significantly higher levels than any other combinations of sex and marital status. Sex and marital status were related to giving to the academic program for the class of 1979, with divorced men and women giving at significantly higher levels than any other category. Likewise, sex and marital status were also related to total giving for the class of 1979 with divorced men and women giving at higher levels than the other categories. This variable was not treated in any of the other literature so the findings are not supported or refuted by other studies.

2. Sex was related to giving to athletics for both class years. Men gave at higher levels than women. Sex was also related to giving to the academic program and in total giving with men giving at higher levels than women. Several of the studies reviewed earlier dealt with the variable, sex. Morris (1970), Blumenfeld and Sartain (1974), Kelley (1979), and Hunter (1968) examined this variable and found that donor status was related to sex. Kelley found that sex was a weak discriminator between donors but recognized that males were more likely to give than females. Hunter discovered in his study that all of the contributors he studied who had given more than $1 million were male.

3. Marital status was not related to giving to the athletic program, the academic program, or to total giving for either class year. Hunter (1968) was the only researcher who dealt directly with marital status and he found that most of the large donors he studied were married. Other researchers studied characteristics which dealt indirectly with marital status but instead described

their findings in terms of number of dependents, number of dependents who were college age, etc.

4. The characteristic, first degree achieved, was not related to giving for either class year upon any of the levels of contribution. While few of the earlier studies reviewed dealt directly with this variable as the investigator defined it, several studies indicated that donors were more likely to have graduated from the particular institution studied than non-donors. Morris' (1970) research indicated that donors tended to have at least one degree from the institution to which they were contributing; Carruthers (1973) identified graduates as more likely to contribute; Blumenfeld and Sartain (1974), as well as Andrews (1953) found similar results and Gardner (1975) found that those students who had attended at least four years were more likely to be a donor than the student who had attended less than that time or who had not graduated.

5. The college in which the first degree was achieved was related to contributions to athletics for both class years. Students who had been enrolled in agricultural engineering or agriculture gave at significantly higher levels than graduates from other colleges. Similarly, the college variable was related to contributions to the academic program for both class years. The data showed that the agricultural engineers and engineers gave at higher levels than the other categories for the class of 1974 while the graduates from the College of Sciences and Humanities and the College of Engineering gave at higher levels for the class of 1979. The total giving data also was related to the college for the class of 1974. Again, the agricultural engineers, and the graduates from the Colleges of Engineering and Agriculture gave at higher levels than the graduates from the other colleges.

   According to the research of Carruthers(1973), Blumenfeld and Sartain (1974), and McKee (1975), the particular college in which the student graduated was an important factor in giving. Carruthers (1973) found that graduates in the fields of agriculture, business administration, and engineering were the most likely to contribute; Blumenfeld and Sartain (1974) discovered that business school graduates and economics majors were the most likely to become donors; and McKee (1975) found that the type of degree earned affected participation in alumni activities and support of the institution.

6. Whether the student had received a scholarship and/or a loan was related to contributions to athletics for both class years. The recipient of the G. I. Bill was far more likely to be a contributor than other categories of recipients. There were also significant differences for the class of 1974 when analyzing contributions to the academic program. The G. I. Bill recipient, the person who had not received any benefits, and the scholarship

recipient more frequently contributed than the other categories of recipients. The class of 1974 data for total giving also showed that recipients of the G. I. Bill, those who had not received any benefits, and the scholarship recipient gave more frequently than the others. The only researcher who indirectly studied the characteristic of whether donors were more likely to have received some form of financial aid was Morris (1970). His findings indicated that donors were more likely to have served in the military and probably were recipients of the G. I. Bill.

7. The only relationship between giving and student organization affiliation was for the class of 1974 in total giving. Those students who had characterized their involvement as "normal activity in a professional organization", "occasional contribution to a publication", "involved with student government", or "normal activity in a campus organization" gave at higher levels than others who had been involved in a variety of other campus organizations.

   Morris (1970), Gardner (1975), and Blakely (1975) studied the importance of having been involved in a student organization related to becoming a contributor to a particular institution. Morris found that donors were more likely to have been involved in campus activities and to have held more offices than non-donors. Gardner discovered that donors tended to be involved more in student activities than non-donors. Blakely found that those students who had been involved in student organizations were more likely to give than those students who had not been as active in student organizations.

8. Wealth rating was not related to contributions to any level of giving for either class year. Kelley was the only researcher who indirectly dealt with the wealth rating of the individual as this study defined it. She indicated that donors were more likely to view themselves as successful than non-donors.

9. Affiliation with a student honorary organization for both class years was related to giving to the academic program and total giving. For the class of 1974, the person who had been involved in an active honorary was most likely to contribute to the academic program. For the class of 1979, the person who had been involved in an active honorary or one which emphasized scholarship and research was the most likely to give to the academic program. These categories were also the same for total giving for both class years except for the class of 1979 in which the most likely to contribute was the person who had been involved with an honor society which emphasized scholarship and research followed by the person who had been involved with an active honorary organization.

   Morris' (1970) and Blakely's (1975) research supported these findings. They found that affiliation with a student honorary

was very important in identifying donors. Morris was more specific about which honorary was important and further indicated that the individual who was a member of a social and honorary fraternity or sorority was more likely to give than the individual who did not have this affiliation.

10. Occupation was related to giving to the athletic program, the academic program, and total giving for the class of 1974. The respondents listing their anticipated occupations as being in the life sciences, business, mathematical sciences, or engineering fields gave at higher levels than the other occupational categories. The relationship between occupation and being a donor was described in the Morris (1970), McKee (1975), and Hunter (1968) studies. Hunter found that the occupations of the large donors he studied were mixed; McKee found that individuals who had educationally related occupations were more likely to contribute than those in other occupations; and, Morris' research showed that there was little difference in occupation among the donors and the non-donors.

11. The anticipated salary range data were related to identifying contributors to the athletic, academic program and total giving for the class of 1974. The person who listed a salary range of $50,000 or more was most likely to contribute in terms of total giving to the academic program. The $25,000 to $50,000 range produced the people most likely to have contributed in the athletic giving category. Several researchers dealt with the question of salary range related to actual contributions. Andrews (1953) indicated that large gifts do not necessarily come from the wealthy; Hunter (1968) suggested similar findings but by most standards all of his subjects would be regarded as wealthy. Gardner (1975) found little difference between income levels of donors and non-donors. Blakely (1975) suggested that there was a relationship between giving and contribution levels and Kelley's (1979) research definitely demonstrated that the higher the income level the more likely the person was to give.

12. Place of residence while in college was not related to contribution types for either class year except for contributions to athletics for the class of 1979. For that category, place of residence was statistically significant. The student who had lived in Greek housing was more likely to contribute to athletics than the person who had lived either off-campus or on-campus. The only researcher who dealt with place of residence while in college was Morris (1970). He found that there was no difference in contribution levels based upon place of residence while in attendance.

Recommendations

Development offices gather information on alumni for a variety of purposes. In some instances the purpose is to add information to their data base for future use in recognizing alumni accomplishments and providing services back to alumni. At other times, the purpose is to conduct research on contributing and non-contributing alumni to determine motives and characteristics of those who decide to become donors to the institution. The recommendations pertain to the latter purpose.

First, more statistical research needs to be conducted on this topic. One way to begin additional research would be to apply the research model used in this project to other class years. This would be helpful in determining whether the conclusions reached in this study apply to more than the class years of 1974 and 1979 and could be used in making some inferences to the larger population of alumni. A follow-up survey tailored after the one administered at graduation would also allow for the comparison of data gathered on individuals five and ten years later. The same statistical treatment could be applied and the results compared to determine if the findings from this study were similar.

Second, from a statistical perspective, the marital status, wealth rating, and type of first degree variables added very little insight into what constituted a donor. These variables could potentially be removed from the next research model. Further, the place of residence while in college was statistically significant in only one of the six analyses. Similarly, the variable, anticipated salary range, was statistically significant in only two analyses. Consideration should be given to eliminating these variables from future studies. The variable, anticipated

occupation, was statistically significant in three of six analyses. The sex and marital status, sex, college, honor society, and scholarship variables were statistically significant in at least four of the six analyses studied for the two years. The variable with the most statistically significant analyses was the one representing the college in which the first degree was achieved. Five of the six analyses were statistically significant indicating this variable was particularly important in showing characteristics of donors. Using the above rationale, the next research project could consider only six variables. If so, the investigator suggests that the organizational affiliation variable be added to the hypotheses. Although this variable was not a strong indicator in this research project, other research indicates that it can be.

Third, it is important to know which donors tend to give to athletics versus the academic program. The unique donor characteristics need to be taken into account in solicitation. It may be possible to solicit these individuals in a different manner and result in a more effective campaign.

Fourth, the survey instrument needs to be reviewed to ensure that the information gathered is readily adaptable for research purposes. The data gathered from the instrument should also be coded numerically for ease in data treatment. Finally, it would be helpful to conduct the same survey one year after the respondent graduated as well as at the time of graduation. Some of the questions on the survey ask the respondent to answer questions which may not be known at the time of completion of the form. For example, the respondent may not yet be employed or have any idea as to the amount of salary possible. If another survey was conducted one year after graduation, then some of the information gathered at the time of

graduation could be compared to the information gathered one year later. This would also add to the data base for each respondent and could provide the completeness of data necessary to begin to conduct regression analyses for the purpose of predicting contributions.

Finally, efforts need to be made to promote on-going, thorough, research which utilizes statistical treatment. This research could ultimately allow the Development Office to predict alumni contributions so solicitation efforts could be more focused resulting in more efficient, cost-effective fund-raising campaigns. With the inclusion of more statistically based prospect research in the Development Office management plan, more funds potentially could be raised with less administrative overhead. Hopefully, with the addition of the results of this research project and the incorporation of the above suggestions, this goal will be achieved.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, H. (1924). The education of Henry Adams. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Andrews, F. E. (1950). Philanthropic giving. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Andrews, F. E. (1953). Attitudes toward giving. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Blakely, B. E. (1975). Bases for prediction of alumni involvement: A case study of Purdue University. Unpublished masters thesis, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Blumenfeld, W. S. & Sartain, P. L. (1974). Predicting alumni financial donation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 522-523.

Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (1979). Educational research. New York: Longman, Inc.

Brooker, G. & Klastorin, T. D. (1981). To the victor belong the spoils? College athletics and alumni giving. Social Science Quarterly, 62, 747-750.

Carruthers, F. A. S. (1973). A study of certain characteristics of alumni who provide financial support and alumni who provide no financial support for their alma mater. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

Cooley, C. A. (1962). Fund-raising for the private school. Boston: Independent School Consultants.

Curti, M. & Nash, R. (1965). Philanthropy in the shaping of American higher education. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Fisher, J. L. (Ed.). (1980). New dirctions for institutional advancement activities. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc.

Foreman, R. G. (1978). Alumni doesn't just spell money. CASE Currents, 4, 16-18.

Frey, J. H. (1977). Make your survey scientific. CASE Currents, 3, 18-19.

Gardner, P. M. (1975). A study of attitudes of Harding College alumni with an emphasis on the donor. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.

Hanson, A. (1961). Guides to successful fund-raising. Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, New York.

Heemann, W. (Ed.). (1979). New directions for institutional advancement: Analyzing the cost effectiveness of fund-raising. San Francisco, Jossey Bass.

Hickman, R. (Ed.). (1980). Iowa State University alumni survey analysis of financial contributions for a sample of respondents. Iowa State University Survey Section Statistical Laboratory, Ames, Iowa.

Hunter, T. W. (1968). The million dollar gift. College and University Journal, 7, 35-45.

I. S. U. Development Agencies. (1984). Iowa State University on-line alumni information system coding and procedure guide. Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

Kelley, K. (1979). Predicting alumni giving: An analysis of alumni donors and non-donors at its college of journalism at the University of Maryland. Unpublished masters thesis, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland.

Ketchum, D. S. (1980). Fund-raising: What's in the cards. CASE Currents, 6, 40-42.

Knowles, A. S. (1970). Handbook of college and university administration. New York: McGraw Hill.

Levi, J. H. & Steinbach, S. E. (1975). Patterns of giving to higher education III: An analysis of voluntary support of American colleges and universities, 1973-74. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education.

MacIssac, C. R. (1973). Attitudes of donors of selected institutions of higher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.

McKee, D. F. (1975). An analysis of factors which affect alumni participation and support. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana.

Morris, D. A. (1970). An analysis of donors of $10,000 or more to the $55 million program at the University of Michigan. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Morris, D. A. (1975). Report of the author's dissertation. Office of the Vice President for Development, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Geneva, New York.

O'Connor, W. J. (1961). A study of certain factors characteristic of alumni who provide financial support and alumni who provide no financial support for their college. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Buffalo, Buffalo, New York.

Pfizenmaier, E. (1981). Finding the fabulous few: Why your program needs sophisticated research. CASE Currents, 8, 14-18.

Pierce, L. L. (1932). How to raise money. New York: Harper and Row.

Pollard, J. A. (1958). Fund-raising for higher education. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Pray, F. C. (Ed.). (1981). Handbook for educational fund-raising. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Rowland, A. W. (1977). Handbook of institutional advancement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Russell, J. D. (1944). The finance of higher education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Bookstore.

Sailor, R. W. (Ed.). (1932). The fund committee of the American alumni council: An alumni fund survey. Ithaca, New York: American Alumni Council.

Segdimas, L. & Carter, R. (1979). Win one for the giver? Alumni giving and big time college sports. Social Science Quarterly, 60, 284-289.

Spaeth, J. L. and Greeley, A. M. (1970). Recent alumni and higher education. New York: McGraw Hill.

Tenbrunsel, T. W. (1982). The fund-raising resource manual. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Williams, M. J. (1981). The fund-raising institute (FRI) annual giving book. Ambler, Pennsylvania: Fund-Raising Institute.

Wright, F. M. (1954). A college first proposed, 1633: Unpublished letters of apostle Eliot and William Hammond to Sir Simonds D'Ewes. Harvard Library Bulletin, 8, 274.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The successful completion of this dissertation is to a large extent due to the many individuals who offered their expertise, financial support, time, guidance, understanding, and encouragement. I am appreciative of the time expended on my behalf by committee members Dr. J. Stanley Ahmann, Dr. Wilbur Layton, and Dr. Trevor Howe. Committee member, Dr. Rex Thomas, gave valuable advice on data treatment and interpretation and was most helpful. Dr. Larry H. Ebbers, my major professor and chair of the committee, deserves a great deal of credit for the completion of this dissertation and my entire graduate program. His guidance, good judgment, sense of humor, gentle nudging, and respect for the "teachable moment" have inspired me. I am deeply indebted to him as a respected colleague, mentor, and friend.

This paper would not have been possible without the cooperation and financial support from Don Gustafson and Jim Hopson of the I.S.U. Development Agencies, and funding from the Graduate College. A special thank you is extended to Marilyn Lee for her help in providing valuable information and reality checks regarding the data format and interpretation.

Also, Sharon Drake and Art Jefferson provided extensive research and technical expertise. Linda Brown and Becki Adair helped type the manuscript and Roberta Johnson helped prepare the manuscript for printing, formatted the tables, and put the finishing touches on the document. The encouragement of the office staff and other colleagues provided much needed support and great motivation. Thanks to all of you.

Professional guidance and personal support were given to me by Dr. James Moore, Dr. Margaret Healy, and Dr. Virginia Slimmer. Dee Rice Brown and Bill Zeller became my writing companions and mutual reinforcers. Many other friends, colleagues, and relatives showed an interest in my work, gave me encouragement, and respected my need to achieve this goal. I am indeed grateful.

Finally, I am expecially grateful to my relatives and family who have been my supporters and have always believed in me. It is through the example of my parents, H. O. and Helen, and brother Clifford, who taught me at an early age the value of making a contribution and striving to achieve a goal, that I have been able to complete this dissertation and my degree program. I dedicate this paper to them and others who have supported me in my efforts and will try to return my good fortune by providing similar help to others.

HUMAN SUBJECTS STATEMENT

The Iowa State University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research reviewed this project and concluded that the rights and welfare of the human subjects were adequately protected, the risks were outweighed by the potential benefits and expected value of the knowledge sought, that confidentiality of data was assured and that informed consent was obtained by appropriate procedures.

APPENDIX A. SURVEY INSTRUMENT

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY ALUMNI QUESTIONNAIRE

(Please Print or Type)

All data existing in or originating from the Iowa State University Alumni Association shall be considered confidential and shall be used only for official University and Alumni Association related activities. Under no circumstances should such data be used for commercial or political purposes.

. . . .Iowa State University Alumni Association
Board of Directors

1. Where did you last live while attending ISU? (Name specific house, fraternity, Pammel Court, off-campus, etc.)

_____

2. Were you a scholarship or loan recipient while attending ISU? (Check as many as apply)
   1 _____ Scholarship
   2 _____ Loan
   3 _____ Both
   4 _____ G.I. Bill
   5 _____ None

3. What is your birthdate? _____
   Where is your place of birth? _____

_____

4. What is your marital status?
   1 _____ Single Male
   2 _____ Married Male
   3 _____ Single Female
   4 _____ Married Female
   5 _____ Divorced Male
   6 _____ Divorced Female
   7 _____ Widower
   8 _____ Widow
   9 _____ Separated Male
   0 _____ Separated Female

5. What are your spouse's first and middle names?

   K _____

6. What is your spouse's last name (if different from yours)?

_____

7. What is your home telephone number? (Include area code)

   K _____

8. Print any correction in name and address if different from the label used on this form. (Include zip code)

_____

_____

9. Would you prefer to receive your University mail at your home or business address?

   1 _____ Home
   2 _____ Business

10. What are your children's names and when are their birthdates? (List youngest to oldest)

	First	Last (if married)	Birthdate (month & year e.g. 09-78)
K			
K			
K			

_____

_____

11. Did you receive any honors while attending ISU? (List honor or organization)

_____

_____

_____

12. Do you currently hold a valid teacher's certificate?
    1 _____ Yes
    2 _____ No

13. What is your business telephone number? (Include area code)

    K _____

14. What is your business address?
    Street City

    K _____
    State Zip code

    _____

15. What is the name of your current employer?

    K _____

    _____

16. If no employer, are you:
    1 _____ Retired
    2 _____ Self Employed
    3 _____ Unemployed
    4 _____ A Homemaker

17. What is your occupational title?

    K _____

    _____

18. What kind of work do you do; that is, what are your main duties on the job?

    K _____

    _____

    _____

19. What type of business or industry is this; that is, what product is made or what service is provided?

    K _____

    _____

20. How would you rate the effectiveness of your ISU education in preparing you for this occupation?

    1 _____ Excellent
    2 _____ Good
    3 _____ Adequate
    4 _____ Poor

21. What was your total income from all sources last year, (including your spouse's income if you were married)?
    1 _____ Less than $5,000
    2 _____ $5,000-$7,500
    3 _____ $7,500-$10,000
    4 _____ $10,000-$12,500
    5 _____ $12,500-$15,000
    6 _____ $15,000-$25,000
    7 _____ $25,000-$50,000
    8 _____ $50,000-$100,000
    9 _____ More than $100,000

22. Would you say that your degree of identity with Iowa State is. . .
    1 _____ Strong
    2 _____ Moderate
    3 _____ Weak
    4 _____ Non-existent

23. What degrees have you received from institutions **other** than ISU? (List type of degree, e.g. BS, MS, etc., year received, major and institution)

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

24. Do you feel more strongly identified with some other institutions of higher learning than ISU?
    1 _____ Yes If yes, which one and why?
    2 _____ No

    _____

    _____

    _____

25. Through what means would you like to maintain an affiliation with Iowa State? (Check as many as may be appropriate)
    1 _____ Attendance at seminars, workshops and short courses for alumni
    2 _____ Attendance at cultural events at Iowa State Center or elsewhere on campus
    3 _____ Participation in foreign tours sponsored by the ISU Alumni Association
    4 _____ Communication with appropriate offices on campus concerning professional placement opportunities
    5 _____ Judging Veishea parade floats
    6 _____ Judging Homecoming decorations
    7 _____ Involvement with high school students interested in ISU
    8 _____ Assisting Iowa State coaches in recruiting top men and women student athletes
    9 _____ Representing ISU at inaugurals of college presidents
    A _____ Representing ISU at college days at your local high school
    B _____ Representing ISU at memorial services of prominent alumni

C _____ Serving as a class agent for the ISU Achievement Fund
D _____ Participation in local alumni club activities
E _____ Participation in the Parent's Association
F _____ Acceptance of responsibilities with your University class

Acceptance of officer or committee membership responsibilities with:

G _____ ISU Achievement Fund Board of Trustees
H _____ Alumni Association Board of Directors
I _____ ISU Foundation Board of Governors
J _____ Local Alumni club
K _____ Athletic Council
L _____ Cyclone Club
M _____ Memorial Union Board of Directors
N _____ Parents' Association Board of Directors
O _____ Attendance at ISU athletic events
P _____ Telephoning other alumni in your community to ask for contributions to ISU's annual giving program
R _____ Hosting an alumni related activity in your home
S _____ Assisting in verifying addresses and telephone numbers of alumni in your area.
T _____ Assisting Iowa State by contacting legislators in your area regarding University needs
U _____ Participation in the "extern program" by affording an ISU student the opportunity to work with you in your profession for one week and hosting him/her in your home
V _____ Participation in the "Alumni Family Vacation Camp" by spending a 4-day vacation on or near campus with other alumni

26. Have you attended an alumni club meeting in your area within the past two years?
1 _____ Yes
2 _____ No

27. Would you attend alumni club meetings if they were available in your area?
1 _____ Yes
2 _____ No

28. Do you feel that you have benefited from your college education enough to have justified your investment in time and money?
1 _____ Yes, definitely
2 _____ Yes, probably
3 _____ Not sure
4 _____ No, probably not
5 _____ No, definitely not

29. If you had it to do over again, would you. . .
1 _____ Attend Iowa State
2 _____ Attend some other college or university
3 _____ Not attend college
4 _____ Not sure

30. What do you feel is the most important purpose of a college education? (Check only one)
1 _____ To promote individual, personal development
2 _____ To prepare one for an occupation or career
3 _____ To make a better citizen
4 _____ To develop problem solving capabilities
5 _____ To provide exposure to a variety of ideas and opinions
6 _____ Other (Specify) _____

_____

_____

31. Did any of the following attend Iowa State? (Check as many as apply)
1 _____ Either of your parents
2 _____ Any of your grandparents
3 _____ Brothers or sisters
4 _____ Your spouse
5 _____ Any other relative of yours (other than children)

32. Check if you have any children who have attended or are now attending a college or university? (Check as many as apply)
1 _____ Iowa State University
2 _____ State University of Iowa
3 _____ Private college or university in Iowa
4 _____ Out-of-state public college or university
5 _____ Out-of-state private college or university
6 _____ University of Northern Iowa
7 _____ Two-year college in Iowa

33. Would you encourage a child of yours (or some other young person) to attend Iowa State?
1 _____ Yes
2 _____ No
3 _____ Not sure

34. How do you feel the general public rates Iowa State academically?
1 _____ Outstanding
2 _____ Excellent
3 _____ Above average
4 _____ Average
5 _____ Below average
6 _____ Poor

35. Aside from business and family, what are the areas of your greatest interest or involvement at the present time? (Check as many as apply)
    1 _____ Art/Literature
    2 _____ Politics
    3 _____ Sports
    4 _____ Education
    5 _____ Service Clubs
    6 _____ Church
    7 _____ Music
    8 _____ Social Clubs
    9 _____ Other _____

36. Have you visited the Iowa State University campus since you were a regularly enrolled student?
    1 _____ Yes, within the last two years
    2 _____ Yes, longer than two years ago
    3 _____ No

37. Do you visit the Iowa State University campus fairly regularly? (If yes, check as many as are appropriate)
    1 _____ To attend extension classes
    2 _____ To attend cultural events
    3 _____ To attend alumni reunions
    4 _____ To attend athletic events
    5 _____ To attend Homecoming
    6 _____ Other (Specify) _____

_____

38. Which of the following subjects, when featured in the news stories about Iowa State in **The Iowa Stater** are most likely to attract your attention? (Check as many as apply)
    1 _____ Athletic Events
    2 _____ Cultural Events
    3 _____ Research Projects
    4 _____ Academic Programs
    5 _____ Financial Matters
    6 _____ Student Activities
    7 _____ Alumni Activities
    8 _____ Faculty Appointments
    9 _____ Higher Education in General
    0 _____ Other (Specify) _____

_____

39. Which of the following programs do you feel the Iowa State Alumni Association should be sponsoring? (Check as many as apply)
    1 _____ Reunions
    2 _____ Alumni Clubs
    3 _____ Group Insurance
    4 _____ Honors and Awards
    5 _____ Travel/Charters
    6 _____ Cultural Activities
    7 _____ Continuing Education
    8 _____ Athletic Assistance
    9 _____ Retirement Community
    0 _____ Recreational Activities
    A _____ Legislative Relations
    B _____ Merchandizing ISU Related Items (i.e. blankets, pennants, etc.)
    _____ Other (Specify) K _____

_____

40. If you were asked to give some time to assist Iowa State in some way, do you think you would be likely to do so?
    1 _____ Yes, definitely
    2 _____ Yes, probably
    3 _____ No, probably not
    4 _____ No, definitely not
    5 _____ Not sure

41. Do you feel it is important for alumni of a public university such as Iowa State to support their alma mater financially?
    1 _____ Yes
    2 _____ No

42. Have you contributed to any educational institutions other than Iowa State?
    1 _____ Yes
    2 _____ No

43. Comments?

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B. HICKMAN STUDY

Iowa State University
Alumni Survey

Preliminary Tabulations

Survey Section
Statistical Laboratory
August 1980

Note: The attached tables contain preliminary results and are not for distribution or publication.

Table 1. Alumni category of respondents.

Category	Number	Percent
Graduated from ISU	40,692	83.5
Attended ISU, did not graduate	765	1.6
Alumni born in a foreign country	375	0.8
Alumni married to an alumni	6,892	14.1
Total	48,724	100.0

Table 2. Sex and marital status of respondents.

Status	Number	Percent
Single male	3,936	8.1
Married male	26,797	55.0
Single female	2,799	5.7
Married female	12,121	24.9
Divorced male	815	1.7
Divorced female	653	1.3
Widower	412	0.8
Widow	912	1.9
Other codes (0,9)	279	0.6
Total	48,724	100.0

Table 3. Age of respondents.

Age category	Number	Percent
Less than 25	3,706	10.0
25 thru 34	13,769	37.0
35 thru 44	7,179	19.3
45 thru 54	5,253	14.1
55 thru 64	3,852	10.4
65 thru 74	2,187	5.9
75 and older	1,234	3.3
Total*	37,180	100.0

*11,423 respondents (23.4 percent) did not indicate date of birth; 121 respondents (0.2 percent) had errors in date of birth.

Table 4. Family income of respondents.

Income range	Number	Percent
Below $5,000	1,516	3.4
$5,000 to $7,500	1,248	2.8
$7,500 to $10,000	1,968	4.4
$10,000 to $12,500	2,556	5.7
$12,500 to $15,000	3,382	7.6
$15,000 to $25,000	12,504	28.1
$25,000 to $50,000	17,191	38.8
$50,000 to $100,000	3,495	7.9
Over $100,000	594	1.3
Total*	44,454	100.0

*4,270 respondents (8.8 percent) did not indicate income.

Table 5. "How would you rate the effectiveness of your ISU education in preparing you for this occupation?"

Response	Number	Percent
Excellent	17,123	39.5
Good	19,137	44.2
Adequate	5,704	13.2
Poor	1,360	3.1
Total*	43,324	100.0

*5,400 alumni (11.1) percent did not respond.

Table 6. "Would you say that your degree of identity with Iowa State is ..."

Response	Number	Percent
Strong	16,311	34.1
Moderate	21,190	44.3
Weak	8,577	17.9
Non-existent	1,792	3.7
Total*	47,870	100.0

*854 alumni (1.8 percent) did not respond.

Table 7. "Do you feel more strongly identified with some other institutions of higher learning than ISU?"

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	6,456	13.5
No	41,396	86.5
Total*	47,852	100.0

*872 alumni (1.8 percent) did not respond.

Table 8. "Through what means would you like to maintain an affiliation with Iowa State?"

Response	Number	Percent
Attendance at seminars and short course for alumni	12,796	26.3
Attendance at cultural events at ISU	16,165	33.2
Participation in foreign tours sponsored by ISU Alumni Association	7,172	14.7
Communication with appropriate offices on campus concerning professional placement	7,654	15.7
Judging Veishea parade floats	1,305	2.7
Judging Homecoming decorations	896	1.8
Involvement with high school students	6,163	12.7
Assisting ISU coaches in recruiting	2,704	5.6
Representing ISU at inaugurals	1,447	3.0
Representing ISU at college days at high school	4,147	8.5
Representing ISU at memorial services	713	1.5
Serving as a class agent for ISU Achievement Fund	466	1.0
Participation in local alumni club	8,761	18.0
Participation in the Parent's Association	379	0.8
Acceptance of responsibilities with your University class	1,291	2.7
Serving on ISU Achievement Fund Board	1,106	2.3
Serving on Alumni Association Board	1,288	2.6
Serving on ISU Foundation Board	1,005	2.1
Serving on local Alumni club	3,557	7.3
Serving on the Athletic club	1,187	2.4
Serving on theCyclone club	1,646	3.4
Serving on the Memorial Union Board	625	1.3
Serving on Parents' Association Board	137	0.3
Attendance at ISU athletic events	15,358	31.5
Telephoning other alumni for contributions	690	1.4
Hosting an alumni activity in your home	2,221	4.6
Assisting in verifying addresses of alumni	4,566	9.4
Assisting by contacting legislators regarding needs	1,802	3.7
Participation in the "extern program"	4,074	8.4
Participation in the "Alumni Family Vacation Camp"	1,291	2.7
Did not indicate any means	15,647	32.1

Table 9. "Have you attended an alumni club meeting in your area within the past two years?"

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	4,355	9.1
No	43,523	90.9
Total*	47,878	100.0

*846 alumni (1.7 percent) did not respond.

Table. 10. "Would you attend alumni club meetings if they were available in your area?"

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	19,689	50.7
No	19,129	49.3
Total*	38,818	100.0

*9,906 alumni (20.3 percent) did not respond.

Table 11. "Do you feel that you have benefited from your college education enough to have justified your investment in time and money?"

Response	Number	Percent
Yes, definitely	35,857	74.9
Yes, probably	8,472	17.7
Not sure	2,596	5.4
No, probably not	725	1.5
No, definitely not	226	0.5
Total*	47,876	100.0

*848 alumni (1.7 percent) did not respond.

Table 12. "If you had it to do over again, would you ..."

Response	Number	Percent
Attend Iowa State	39,508	82.5
Attend some other college or university	2,690	5.6
Not attend college	278	0.6
Not sure	5,398	11.3
Total*	47,874	100.0

*850 alumni (1.7 percent) did not respond.

Table 13. "What do you feel is the most important purpose of a college education?"

Response	Number	Percent
To promote individual, personal development	19,705	42.8
To prepare one for an occupation or career	16,491	35.8
To make a better citizen	609	1.3
To develop problem solving capabilities	4,355	9.4
To provide exposure to a variety of ideas and opinions	3,661	7.9
Other	1,276	2.8
Total*	46,097	100.0

*2,627 alumni (5.4 percent) did not respond.

Table 14. "Did any of the following attend Iowa State?"

Relative	Number	Percent
Either parent	6,493	13.3
Any grandparent	1,198	2.5
Brothers or sisters	16,389	33.6
Spouse	15,282	31.4
Other relatives (other than children)	14,936	30.7
At least one relative other than children	31,783	65.2
No relatives other than children	16,941	34.8

Table 15. Alumni who have children who have attended or are now attending a college or university.

Institution	Number	Percent
ISU	5,293	10.9
State University of Iowa	1,790	3.7
Private college or university in Iowa	1,660	3.4
Out-of-state public college or university	8,809	18.1
Out-of-state private college or university	4,169	8.6
University of Northern Iowa	633	1.3
Two-year college in Iowa	606	1.2
At least one of the above checked	15,066	30.9
None of the above checked	33,658	69.1

Table 16. "Would you encourage a child of yours (or some other young person) to attend Iowa State?"

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	39,452	82.4
No	1,268	2.7
Not sure	7,149	14.9
Total*	47,869	100.0

*855 alumni (1.8 percent) did not respond.

Table 17. "How do you feel the general public rates Iowa State academically?"

Response	Number	Percent
Outstanding	12,002	25.8
Excellent	24,425	52.6
Above average	8,765	18.8
Average	1,232	2.6
Below average	42	0.1
Poor	17	0.1
Total*	46,483	100.0

*2,241 alumni (4.6 percent) did not respond.

Table 18. "Aside from business and family, what are the areas of your greatest interest or involvement at the present time?"

Area	Number	Percent
Art/Literature	10,062	20.7
Politics	6,487	13.3
Sports	21,149	43.4
Education	11,913	24.5
Service Clubs	7,500	15.4
Church	19,347	39.7
Music	7,332	15.1
Social Clubs	5,780	11.9
Other	7,175	14.7
At least one area checked	44,218	90.8
No area checked	4,506	9.2

Table 19. "Do you visit the Iowa State University campus fairly regularly?"

Response	Number	Percent
To attend extension classes	3,266	6.7
To attend cultural events	6,864	14.1
To attend alumni reunions	2,385	4.9
To attend athletic events	11,099	22.8
To attend Homecoming	5,208	10.7
Other	8,634	17.7
At least one response checked	20,962	43.0
No response checked	27,762	57.0

Table 20. "Have you visited the Iowa State University campus since you were a regularly enrolled student?"

Response	Number	Percent
Yes, within the last two years	26,223	55.7
Yes, longer than two years ago	15,963	33.9
No	5,157	11.0
Other codes (4,5,7,9)	49	0.1
Total checking at least one response*	47,087	100.0

*1,637 alumni (3.5 percent) did not respond; percents do not add to 100 since multiple responses were made.

Table 21. "Which of the following subjects, when featured in the news stories about Iowa State in The Iowa Stater are most likely to attract your attention?"

Subject	Number	Percent
Athletic Events	24,595	50.5
Cultural Events	23,320	47.9
Research Projects	26,161	53.7
Academic Programs	19,595	40.2
Financial Matters	6,845	14.1
Student Activities	14,915	30.6
Alumni Activities	18,393	37.8
Faculty Appointments	9,526	19.6
Higher Education in General	12,208	25.1
Other	1,837	3.8
At least one subject checked	44,827	92.0
No subjects checked	3,897	8.0

Table 22. "Which of the following programs do you feel the Iowa State Alumni Association should be sponsoring?"

Program	Number	Percent*
Reunions	17,693	47.4
Alumni Clubs	18,861	50.5
Group Insurance	3,267	8.8
Honors and Awards	12,947	34.7
Travel/Charters	14,402	38.6
Cultural Activities	15,923	42.6
Continuing Education	23,337	62.5
Athletic Assistance	9,741	26.1
Retirement Community	5,719	15.3
Recreational Activities	5,978	16.0
Legislative Relations	13,258	35.5
Merchandizing ISU Related Items	6,397	17.1
Other	418	1.1
Total checking at least one response	37,355	100.0

*Percents do not add to 100 since multiple responses were made.

Table 23. "If you were asked to give some time to assist Iowa State in some way, do you think you would be likely to do so?"

Response	Number	Percent
Yes, definitely	2,539	5.3
Yes, probably	17,002	35.5
No, probably not	13,031	27.2
No, definitely not	2,296	4.8
Not sure	13,002	27.2
Total*	47,870	100.0

*854 alumni (1.8 percent) did not respond.

Table 24. "Do you feel it is important for alumni of a public university such as Iowa State to support their alma mater financially?"

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	30,272	72.5
No	11,492	27.5
Total*	41,764	100.0

*6,960 alumni (14.3 percent) did not respond.

Table 25. "Have you contributed to any educational institutions other than Iowa State?"

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	14,070	30.4
No	32,166	69.6
Total*	46,236	100.0

*2,488 alumni (5.1 percent) did not respond.

October 2, 1980

Iowa State University Alumni Survey
Analysis of Financial Contributions for a Sample of Respondents

I. Introduction

From the 48,724 alumni who completed the questionnaire in 1978, a sample of 1218 (2.5% of the respondents) was selected for study of patterns of financial contributions. For these sample respondents, in addition to data on financial contributions, data were obtained on such variables as sex and marital status, location of residence, salary range, degrees held, college in which the highest degree was obtained from ISU, honors earned at ISU, and several attitudinal variables. The variables of financial contributions that were considered are Total Prior Year Contributions, Total Current Year Contributions, and Total Life Contributions.

II. Analysis

The percentages of sample respondents, who made financial contributions, and the average contributions are given in Table 1. These data indicate that a slightly greater percentage of alumni gave in the prior year than the current year and that the average contribution was about three times as large.

The analysis of giving by sex-marital status is summarized in Table 2. The chi-square statistic involved is for the testing for the homogeneity of the proportions giving in the different classifications. Below the value of the chi-square statistic is the probability of obtaining a larger value, under the assumption that the several proportions are the same. The probability is given correct to three-decimal places.

The results presented in Table 2 indicate that there are significant differences among the proportions of respondents giving in the several sex-marital status classifications. For example, for the prior-year giving the chi-square value of 18.40 is such that there is only a probability of about 0.010 of getting a larger value when the true proportions giving in the 8 classifications are assumed to be the same. For a test of size, $\alpha = 0.05$, (level of significance), the hypothesis of equal proportions of contributions for the different classifications would be rejected. The results for sex indicate that there are no significant differences between the proportions of contributors for males and females. However, there are significant differences among the proportions of contributors for the different classifications of marital status.

Analyses of giving according to location of respondents yielded somewhat surprising results (see Table 3). There are no significant differences among the proportions giving to ISU for individuals in the different location categories considered. Hence, distance of alumni from ISU does not appear to have a significant influence on the incidence of making financial contributions to Iowa State.

Table 4 presents a summary of the results obtained for analyses involving the pattern of degrees obtained by alumni. The sample respondents are classified into five mutually exclusive groups defined by degrees obtained from ISU and other institutions. There are significant differences among the proportions of respondents giving in the different degree categories for all three contribution variables. Those who attended but did not graduate from ISU had proportions giving which are greater than the average proportions giving for prior-year, current-year and life-time giving. For the greatest

proportion of alumni, who hold only one degree which is from ISU, the proportions giving to ISU are approximately the same as the average proportions for the respondents for the three financial contribution variables. For alumni, who obtained bachelor degrees from other institutions, the proportions giving to ISU are smaller than for any other degree categories. There appear to be no signficant differences between the proportions of alumni giving to ISU who obtain all degrees from ISU and those who obtain graduate degrees from other institutions.

Classification of sample respondents according to the number of honors received at ISU indicates that about 28% received at least one honor (see Table 5). Testing for the homogeneity of the proportions of givers who had zero, one, two, or three honors indicates that such proportions are not the same. It is noted that the proportions of sample respondents making positive financial contributions to ISU are smallest for those who obtained no honors. A supplementary analysis involving only those individuals receiving at least one honor indicates that there are no significant differences among the proportions giving for the one, two, and three honor groups.

Results obtained in comparing proportions giving to ISU for respondents who are classified according to the college in which their highest ISU degree was obtained are summarized in Table 6. There are significant differences among the proportions giving from these different classifications. For the sample respondents involved, Education graduates had the lowest proportion giving, while Veterinary Medicine graduates had the highest proportion giving. For life-time giving, the colleges listed in ascending order of magnitude of the sample proportion of graduates giving to ISU are: Education (34.3%), Science & Humanities (43.3%), Agriculture (51.7%), Home Economics (51.8%), Engineering (53.7%), and Veterinary Medicine (71.4%).

The proportion giving for the non-graduate and interdisciplinary graduates (68.1%) was slightly smaller than for Veterinary Medicine graduates.

Comparisons among respondents of different salary ranges are indicated in Table 7. The proportions of respondents giving to ISU generally increases with increasing salary range, although the differences are only significant at the 5% level for prior-year and life-time giving. Inclusion or deletion of sample respondents failing to indicate their salary range does not change the basic conclusions of the analyses.

The analysis of the responses obtained from the question, "Were you a scholarship or loan recipient while attending ISU?", are summarized in Table 8. There appear to be no significant differences among the proportions giving from the several classifications indicated in the questionnaire. (It would appear that the question involved is such that respondents would not necessarily conclude that loans or scholarships from ISU were the only ones intended.)

The responses obtained from respondents rating the effectiveness of their ISU education are such that they are directly related to the proportions giving to ISU (see Table 9). That is, those with higher ratings of the effectiveness of their education have higher proportions giving than those with lower ratings. The sample proportions giving for the several rating classifications are significantly different for prior-year and life-time giving, but not for current-year giving.

The relative frequencies of the different ratings of respondents of their "degree of identity" with ISU are given in Table 10. For the respondents in the different identity classifications the percentages that made financial contributions to ISU are also given. There are significant

differences among the proportions giving for the several identity ratings. The proportions giving are greatest for those who rate their identity with ISU as "strong," but it is surprising that the proportions giving to ISU are so large for those who rate their identity with ISU as "non-existent."

For respondents who consider that they are more strongly identified with other institutions of higher learning than ISU, the proportions that gave are less than for those who judge otherwise (see Table 11). If the individuals, who did not respond to the question involved, are excluded from analyses, then the corresponding chi-square statistics have values with associated probabilities that are about one-half those reported in Table 11. In such circumstances the hypotheses of homogeneous proportions giving are rejected at the 10% level of significance for all three variables.

For respondents who believe that it is important for alumni to support their alma mater financially, the proportions giving are much larger than those for respondents who judge otherwise (see Table 12). The non-response rate for the question involved was quite high (14.5%) and the proportions of these individuals who gave financially to ISU are between those who respond "yes" and those who respond "no." The proportions giving for individuals having different beliefs about the importance of financially supporting one's alma mater are significantly different, whether or not the non-response category is included in the analyses.

The responses obtained for the question dealing with an alumnus' willingness to assist ISU if asked to do so are summarized in Table 13. The proportions of respondents who gave financially to ISU declines systematically as the degree of willingness to assist decreases. These sample proportions are significantly different, whether or not the non-response category is included in the anlyses.

The analysis of patterns of giving among the different responses for willingness to encourage attendance at ISU are indicated in Table 14. The proportions of respondents who gave financially to ISU, among those indicating "yes" are largest and those for individuals indicating "no" are smallest. At the 5% level of significance, the assumption of homogeneity of the several proportions giving to ISU is not rejected for any of the three variables considered. However, if the non-response category is omitted from the analyses, the assumption of homogeneity of the proportions giving to ISU is rejected for a test of size, $\alpha = 0.05$.

Table 1: Percentages of sample alumni making contributions and average contributions

	Financial contributions		
	Prior year	Current year	Life time
Percentages contributing	21.8%	19.9%	50.4%
Average contributions (Positive values only)	$216.87	$70.58	$802.69

Table 2: Financial contributions according to sex-marital status

Sex-marital status	Percent of sample	Percentages of respondents giving		
		Prior year	Current year	Life time
Single male	8.5	19.4	18.4	39.8
Married male	54.8	21.3	20.1	52.6
Single female	5.1	24.2	24.2	51.6
Married Female	24.8	20.2	16.2	46.0
Divorced male*	2.1	23.1	19.2	42.3
Divorced female*	1.4	17.7	5.9	58.8
Widower	1.3	62.5	62.5	87.5
Widow	2.1	32.0	36.0	64.0
Chi-square statistic (Probability)		18.40 (0.010)	27.84 (0.000)	20.11 (0.005)
Sex				
Male	66.67	21.9	20.7	51.4
Female	33.33	21.4	18.2	48.5
Chi-square statistic (Probability)		0.04 (0.844)	1.03 (0.310)	0.87 (0.351)
Marital status				
Single	13.6	21.2	20.6	44.2
Married	79.6	20.9	18.9	50.6
Divorced*	3.5	20.9	14.0	48.8
Widowed	3.4	43.9	46.3	73.2
Chi-square statistic (Probability)		12.23 (0.007)	19.64 (0.000)	11.06 (0.011)

*The "divorced" categories include individuals who are separated from their spouses.

Table 3: Financial contributions according to location of residence of respondents.

Locations	Percent of sample	Percentages of respondents giving: Prior year	Current year	Life time
State of Iowa	38.6	23.4	20.0	49.8
Neighboring states*	25.5	21.0	21.9	47.7
Other U.S. states	34.4	21.2	18.1	53.5
Foreign countries	1.6	5.3	21.1	42.1
Chi-square statistic (Probability)		4.21 (0.240)	1.68 (0.641)	3.28 (0.350)

*This group consists of states which are either contiguous with Iowa or belong to the Big 8 athletic conference.

Table 4: Financial contributions according to degrees obtained from Iowa State University

Degrees	Percent of sample	Percentages of respondents giving: Prior year	Current year	Life time
Attended but did not graduate	1.8	27.3	31.8	68.2
Bachelor degree the only degree and from ISU	70.0	22.3	19.2	49.3
Only graduate degrees from ISU	10.8	3.8	9.1	31.1
Bachelor and all graduate degrees from ISU	8.5	33.7	24.0	65.4
Bachelor degree from ISU but graduate degrees from elsewhere	8.9	26.9	31.5	64.8
Chi-square statistic (Probability)		35.87 (0.000)	22.09 (0.000)	41.27 (0.000)

Table 5: Financial contributions according to the number of honors obtained from Iowa State University

Honors	Percent of sample	Percentages of respondents giving		
		Prior year	Current year	Life time
No honors	72.2	18.6	17.5	46.4
One honor	15.8	28.6	22.9	59.4
Two honors	6.7	28.4	27.2	67.9
Three honors	5.3	35.4	33.8	56.9
Chi-square statistic (Probability)		19.57 (0.000)	14.90 (0.002)	22.95 (0.000)

Table 6: Financial contributions according to the College in which the highest degree was obtained from Iowa State University

Colleges	Percent of sample	Percentages of respondents giving		
		Prior year	Current year	Life time
Agriculture	21.6	22.8	20.2	51.7
Education	5.7	7.1	11.4	34.3
Engineering	19.1	23.6	23.6	53.6
Home Economics	22.5	22.6	18.6	51.8
Science & Humanities	23.7	18.3	16.6	43.3
Veterinary Medicine	3.4	35.7	31.0	71.4
Other*	3.9	31.9	29.8	68.1
Chi-square statistic (Probability)		19.86 (0.004)	13.46 (0.048)	28.21 (0.000)

*This group consists of those not graduating from ISU and those in the interdisciplinary programs, including agricultural engineering.

Table 7: Financial contributions according to salary range

Salary	Percent of sample	Percentages of respondents giving: Prior year	Current year	Life time
Below $5,000	3.9	14.9	14.9	29.8
$5,000 - $7,500	2.3	7.1	14.3	39.3
$7,500 - $10,000	3.8	15.2	17.4	43.5
$10,000 - $12,500	5.4	19.7	18.2	45.9
$12,500 - $15,000	8.1	23.2	26.3	44.4
$15,000 - $25,000	26.0	21.8	15.8	45.7
$25,000 - $50,000	34.3	23.4	21.3	58.6
$50,000 - $100,000	5.8	28.2	31.0	66.2
More than $100,000	1.3	50.0	25.0	56.3
Non-response	9.0	16.4	18.2	45.5
Chi-square statistic (Probability)		18.05 (0.035)	13.96 (0.124)	35.17 (0.000)

Table 8: Financial contributions according to scholarship or loan status of respondents

Scholarship or loan status	Percent of sample	Percentages of respondents giving: Prior year	Current year	Life time
Scholarship	17.7	25.6	22.8	49.8
Loan	10.8	22.0	17.4	46.2
Both	5.3	21.5	16.9	41.5
G.I. Bill	9.0	20.0	22.7	56.4
None	53.2	21.5	19.6	52.2
Non-response	3.9	12.5	14.6	39.6
Chi-square statistic (Probability)		4.50 (0.479)	3.44 (0.633)	7.62 (0.179)

Table 9: Financial contributions according to rating of the "effectiveness of Iowa State University education"

Effectiveness	Percent of sample	Percentages of respondents giving: Prior year	Current year	Life time
Excellent	34.7	24.6	21.7	54.8
Good	38.9	23.2	20.9	50.2
Adequate	10.8	10.6	16.7	44.7
Poor	2.8	14.7	11.8	29.4
Non-response	12.7	20.6	16.1	48.4
Chi-square statistic (Probability)		13.32 (0.010)	4.86 (0.302)	11.31 (0.025)

Table 10: Financial contributions according to ratings of degree of identity with Iowa State University

Identity with Iowa State University	Percent of sample	Percentages of respondents giving: Prior year	Current year	Life time
Strong	34.3	29.4	27.3	58.4
Moderate	41.4	19.4	17.5	49.8
Weak	18.4	12.9	12.1	38.4
Non-existent	3.9	25.0	18.8	45.8
Non-response	2.0	12.5	16.7	45.8
Chi-square statistic (Probability)		27.74 (0.000)	25.01 (0.000)	24.22 (0.000)

Table 11: Financial contributions according to responses to "Do you feel more strongly identified with some other institutions of higher learning than Iowa State University?"

More strongly identified with other institutions	Percent of sample	Percentages of respondents giving		
		Prior year	Current year	Life time
Yes	14.0	14.1	15.3	44.1
No	84.0	23.3	20.7	51.6
Non-response	2.1	12.0	16.0	44.0
Chi-square statistic (Probability)		8.59 (0.014)	2.94 (0.230)	3.70 (0.158)

Table 12: Financial contributions according to responses to "Do you feel it is important for alumni of a public university such as Iowa State University to support their alma mater financially?"

Important to support alma mater	Percent of sample	Percentages of respondents giving		
		Prior year	Current year	Life time
Yes	61.7	29.2	25.8	60.1
No	23.8	4.1	6.6	29.7
Non-response	14.5	19.2	16.4	43.5
Chi-square statistic (Probability)		77.74 (0.000)	50.43 (0.000)	81.29 (0.000)

Table 13: Financial contributions according to responses to "If you were asked to give some time to assist Iowa State in some way, do you think you would be likely to do so?"

Willing to assist ISU	Percent of sample	Percentages of respondents giving: Prior year	Current year	Life time
Yes, definitely	5.4	42.4	37.9	74.2
Yes, probably	34.2	25.9	21.8	58.0
Not sure	24.8	19.2	20.5	49.0
No, probably not	28.7	17.8	16.6	40.4
No, definitely	4.8	10.2	3.4	39.0
Non-response	2.1	12.0	16.0	44.0
Chi-square statistic (Probability)		31.24 (0.000)	27.14 (0.000)	42.41 (0.000)

Table 14: Financial contributions according to responses to "Would you encourage a child of yours (or some other young person) to attend Iowa State University?"

Encourage attendance at ISU	Percent of sample	Percentages of respondents giving: Prior year	Current year	Life time
Yes	81.4	22.9	20.6	52.1
Not sure	14.0	18.8	17.7	44.1
No	2.7	9.1	12.1	36.4
Non-response	2.0	12.5	16.7	45.8
Chi-square statistic (Probability)		5.95 (0.114)	2.25 (0.523)	6.59 (0.086)

APPENDIX C. GRADUATE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
CENTRAL UNIVERSITY RECORDS

Social Security No._____

Name (In Full):

_____

Dear Iowa Stater:

I know this is a busy time for you, but, among the important tasks before you within the next few days, I hope you will include completion of this questionnaire.

The data you provide will help make possible institutional studies and services of value to alumni and students. Please return your completed questionnaire with your ok slip.

Thank you for your cooperation and best wishes in your future pursuits.

Sincerely,

W. Robert Parks
President

Disregard the areas in green. They are for the purpose of coding the data given by you.

Preferred name listing(for mailings)
Last First Middle

Preferred title
_ Miss _ Ms _ Mrs _ Mr _ Dr other: 06

Sex
_ Female _ Male

Marital status
_ Single _ Married _ other: 07 08

Anticipated home telephone number (include area code) 09

Until further notice, send university and alumni mail to:
street city state zip

10 11

11 12

Preferred mailing address
_ Home _ Business 12 13 14 15 16

Anticipated home street number | City | State | Zip Code

List below certificates and / or degrees received

Name of degree	Month / year / Quarter	Major	Institution (ISU and others)						
Certificate, BA, BS, etc.				37	38	39	40	41	42
Master's degree				43	44	45	46	47	48
Doctor's degree				49	50	51	52	53	54
Other degree				55	56	57	58	59	60

Residences while attending ISU (fraternity, sorority, dormitory, married housing) Name specific house or fraternity. 61

Were you a scholarship or loan recipient while attending ISU 62
_ Scholarship _ Loan _ Both

Is your spouse:
_ an ISU graduate _ an ISU student

If spouse is graduate:
year quarter degree major

Spouse's full name (include maiden name) | Spouse's social security no. (if alumnus) 63

Your maiden name (if female) 64

Your birth date | Spouses birth date (if alumnus) | Your name at graduation (if female) 66

Please check if you were a member of any of the following types of organizations while at ISU 67

_ Professional
_ Campus Organization
_ Student Government
_ Athletics
_ Publications
_ ROTC (specify branch)
_ Performing Arts
_ Other:
_ Religion

67

over

APPENDIX D. OCCUPATION CODE LISTING

Section 9 OCCUPATIONAL CODES

Mathematical Sciences

M11 Mathematics
M13 Operations Research, Applied Math
M15 Statistics
M31 Electronic Data Processing (computer programming, systems analysis)
M40 Computer Science

Physical Sciences

P11 Astronomy
P21 Chemistry
P31 Earth/Nautical Sciences
P35 Metallurgy
P45 Physics

Engineering

E05 Aeronautical Engineering
E06 Commercial Pilot
E10 Agricultural Engineering
E15 Architectural Engineering
E20 Astronautical/Aerospace Engineering
E25 Biomedical Engineering
E30 Ceramic Engineering
E35 Chemical Engineering
E36 Chemical Technology
E40 Civil Engineering
E41 Construction; contracting, building
E45 Electrical Engineering Power
E50 Electronics Engineering (Communications, etc.)
E55 Engineering Mechanics
E60 Engineering Science
E65 Industrial Design
E70 Industrial Engineering
E75 Manufacturing/Production Engineering
E80 Mechanical Engineering
E81 Mechanical Technology
E85 Mining/Petroleum Engineering
E90 Nuclear Engineering
E95 Plant/Sanitation Engineering

Life Sciences

L10 Agricultural Research
L11 Agronomy
L12 Forestry/Range Science
L15 Biochemistry
L21 Biology
L22 Biophysics
L25 Botany
L31 Entomology
L35 Horticulture
L41 Medical Sciences/Services
L45 Pharmacology
L51 Zoology
L55 Veterinary Medicine
L66 Turf Management

Miscellaneous

U00 Unemployed
U01 Military Service
U02 Graduate Student
U03 Law
U04 Dentistry
U05 Medicine
U06 MBA

Occupational Codes (Cont.)

Business

B11 Advertising/Sales Promotion
B15 Business (General) Administration
B21 Economics
B23 Farming
B24 Dairy
B25 Finance/Accounting
B31 Foreign Trade
B35 Graphic or Commercial Arts
B41 Market Research
B45 Methods and Procedures
B51 Personnel/Industrial Relations
B55 Product Planning
B61 Public Administration
B65 Public Relations/Communications
B71 Purchasing/Contract Administration
B75 Sales/Marketing
B76 Real Estate Sales; brokerage
B81 Technical Writing/Editing
B85 Transportation/Traffic
B86 Peace Corps, Job Corps, Vista, etc.
B87 Secretarial

Social Sciences - Liberal Arts - Languages

S11 Architecture
S12 Landscape Architecture
S16 Religion
S21 Humanities
S25 Fine Arts
S31 History
S35 Law
S41 Library Science
S45 Political Science
S51 Psychology/Human Factors
S52 Psychometrics
S55 Sociology
S56 Rural Sociology
S57 Sociometrics
S60 Educ. Admin. (Supt.-Principal)
S61 Elementary Educ. Teacher (K-6)
S62 Secondary Educ. Teacher (7-12)
S63 College & University Teaching
S64 Education Counselor
S65 Research at College or University
S66 Special Educ. Teacher-Learning Disabilities
S67 College or University Administration
S91 Other Liberal Arts
S93 Other Social Sciences
S94 Urban Planning
S95 Extension; University
S26 Languages

Home Economics

H11 Child Care - Nursery School
H15 Commercial - Institutional Food Service
H21 Decorator
H25 Dietetics; general
H31 Dietetics; hospital
H45 Home Service
H51 School Lunch Supervisor
H55 Social Welfare
H61 Test Kitchen - Food Research
H65 Therapeutics; Retarded Children

APPENDIX E. HONOR SOCIETY SURVEY CODE LISTING

Section 8 STUDENT HONORS

[illegible]demic

[illegible] Honors Program
[illegible] With Distinction
[illegible] Honors with Distinction

[illegible]e Honoraries

[illegible] Beacons
[illegible] Cardinal Key
[illegible] Gamma Gamma (Greek Residence System)
[illegible] Knights of St. Patrick (Engr.)
[illegible] Mortar Board
[illegible] Order of the Chessmen (Residence Hall System)
[illegible] Phi Upsilon Omicron (H. Ec.)
[illegible] Tomahawk (Residence Hall System)
[illegible] Women's "I"
[illegible] Order of the Rose (Residence Hall System)
[illegible] Cyclone Aids

[illegible]fessional

[illegible] Alpha Kappa Psi (Ind. Adm.)
[illegible] American Military Engineers
[illegible] Chi Epsilon (Civil E.)
[illegible] Delta Phi Delta - deleted
[illegible] Delta Sigma Rho
[illegible] Eta Kappa Nu (E.E.)
[illegible] Gamma Epsilon Sigma
[illegible] The Helm
[illegible] Iota Sigma Pi (Chem.)
[illegible] Keramos (Ceramic E.)
[illegible] Lampos (Sciences & Humanities)
[illegible] Order of the Sextant (Naval ROTC)
[illegible] Phi Delta Kappa (Educ.)
[illegible] Phi Lambda Upsilon (Chem.-Bio Chem.-Chem. E.)
[illegible] Pi Tau Sigma (Mech. E.)
[illegible] Psi Chi (Psychology)
[illegible] Scabbard and Blade
[illegible] Sigma Gamma Tau (Aero. E.)
[illegible] Society of Advanced Artillery Cadets

C26 Omego Psi Phi (All U.)
C27 Tau Beta Pi (All Engr.)

Department Societies and Organizations

DØ1 Alpha Chi Sigma
DØ2 Arnold Air Society
DØ3 Delta Phi Delta
DØ4 Epsilon Pi Tau (Ind. Edu.)
DØ5 Pershing Rifles
DØ6 Phi Mu Alpha
DØ7 Phi Sigma Iota (French-Spanish)
DØ8 Pi Mu Epsilon (Math)
DØ9 Pi Tau Pi Sigma - deleted
D1Ø Sigma Alpha Iota (Music)
D11 Sigma Delta Chi (Journalism)
D12 Theta Sigma Phi
D13 Xi Sigma Pi (Forestry)
D14 Kappa Phi (Methodist Women's Group)
D15 Alpha Epsilon (Ag. Engr.)
D16 Delta Phi Alpha (German)
D17 Kappa Delta Pi (Educ.)
D18 Pi Kappa Lambda (Music)
D19 Theta Alpha Phi (Theatre)
D2Ø Alpha Mu Gamma (Foreign Language)
D21 Kappa Lambda (Elem. Educ.)
D22 Sigma Gamma Epsilon (Earth Science)

Honor Societies with Emphasis on Scholarship or Research

EØ1 Alpha Kappa Delta (Sociology)
EØ2 Alpha Lambda Delta (All-University Freshmen)
EØ3 Alpha Zeta (Agri. & Vet. Med.)
EØ4 Gamma Sigma Delta (Agri & Vet. Med.)
EØ5 Omicron Nu (Home Econ.)
EØ6 Phi Alpha Theta (History)
EØ7 Phi Eta Sigma (All-University Freshman)
EØ8 Phi Kappa Phi (All-Univ.)
EØ9 Tau Beta Pi (Eng.)

(continued on next page)

C20 Tau Lambda Rho
C21 Tau Sigma Delta (Arch.-L.A.-Comm. Planning-A.A.)
C22 Epsilon Omicron Rho
C23 Sigma Lambda Chi (Cons. Engr.)
C24 Pi Sigma Alpha (Pol. Sci.)
C25 Alpha Pi Mu (Ind. Eng.)

E10 Sigma Xi (Natural Sciences)
E11 Phi Zeta
E12 Omicron Delta Epsilon
E13 Omega Chi Epsilon (Chem. E.)
E14 Mu Sigma Rho (Statistics)
E15 Phi Beta Kappa (All-University)

APPENDIX F. RESIDENCE CODE LISTING

Section 7 RESIDENCE HALLS

Fraternities:

A01 Acacia
A02 Adelante
A03 Alpha Chi Rho
A04 Alpha Gamma Rho
A05 Alpha Kappa Lambda
A06 Alpha Sigma Phi
A07 Alpha Tau Omega
A08 Beta Sigma Psi
A09 Beta Theta Pi
A10 Chi Phi
A11 Delta Chi
A12 Delta Sigma Phi
A13 Delta Tau Delta
A14 Delta Upsilon
A15 Farm House
A16 Kappa Sigma
A17 Lambda Chi Alpha
A18 Omega Tau Sigma
A19 Phi Delta Theta
A20 Phi Gamma Delta
A21 Phi Kappa Psi
A22 Phi Kappa Tau
A23 Phi Kappa Theta
A24 Pi Kappa Alpha
A25 Pi Kappa Phi
A26 Sigma Alpha Epsilon
A27 Sigma Chi
A28 Sigma Nu
A29 Sigma Phi Epsilon
A30 Sigma Pi
A31 Tau Kappa Epsilon
A32 Theta Chi
A33 Theta Xi
A34 Triangle
A35 Theta Delta Chi
A36 Sigma Tau Gamma
A37 Omega Psi Phi

Sororities:

B01 Alpha Chi Omega
B02 Alpha Delta Pe
B03 Alpha Gamma Delta
B04 Alpha Omicron Pi
B05 Chi Omega
B06 Delta Delta Delta
B07 Delta Zeta
B08 Gamma Phi Beta
B09 Kappa Alpha Theta
B10 Kappa Delta
B11 Kappa Kappa Gamma
B12 Pi Beta Phi
B13 Sigma Kappa
B14 Zeta Tau Alpha
B15 Alpha Xi Delta
B16 Alpha Phi

Key to Greek Letters:

A Alpha	H Eta	Λ Lambda	π Pi	φ Phi
B Beta	Θ Theta	M Mu	P Rho	X Chi
Γ Gamma	Δ Delta	N Nu	Σ Sigma	Ψ Psi
E Epsilon	I Iota	Ξ Xi	T Tau	Ω Omega
Z Zeta	K Kappa	O Omicron	Y Upsilon	

148

Residence Halls:

C05 Alumni Hall

D01 Barton Hall
(formerly South Hall)
Anders House
Tappan House

D02 Birch Hall
Dana House
Lange House
Lindstrom House
Stevenson House

D03 Elm Hall
McGlade House
Merchant House
Miller House
Turner House

D04 Freeman Hall
(formerly East Hall)
Busse House
Vollmer House

C03-Friley Hall
Anthony House
Bennett House
Chamberlain House
Converse House
Dodds House
Godfrey House
Henderson House
Hutton House
Kimball House
Knapp House
Lincoln House
Lorch House
Meeker House
Murphy House
Niles House
Noble House
O'Bryan House
Palmer House
Pearson House
Pennell House
Russell House
Spinney House
Stange House
Stanton House

C04-Helser Hall
Brown House
Carpenter House
Davidson House
Elwood House
Firkins
Foster House
Fulmer House
Haber House
Halsted House
Jones House
Livingston House
Louden House
MacDonald House
Merrill House
Mortensen House
Norman House
Richey House
Stalker House
Stewart House
Woodrow House

149

Residence Halls:

012 Home Management Houses
(Fisher-Nickell House)

031 Knapp Hall

Doolittle House	Otopalik House
Fuller House	Rawson House
MacRae House	Schmidt House
Maney House	Vance House
Murray House	Wilkinson House

034 Larch Hall

Caine House	Greene House
Cessna House	Hanson House
Cunningham House	Kehlenbeck House
Emerson House	Wolf House

035 Linden Hall

Brandt House	Rowe House
Devitt House	Sadler House
Hoxie House	Sullivan House
Lawther House	

036 Lyon Hall (formerly West Hall)

Barker House	Harwood House

041 Maple Hall

Cranor House	Knowles House
Forbes House	Shilling House
Friant House	Walls House
Hayden House	Young House

047 Oak Hall

Durian House	King House
Fosmark House	Sims House

048 Roberts Hall

Fairchild House	Harriman House
Franklin House	

C02 Storms Hall

Baker House	Nielsen House
Boyd House	Raymond House
Campbell House	Sage House
Coover House	Starbuck House
Griffith House	
Lovelace House	

C06 Wallace Hall

Rambo House	Lancelot House
Errington House	Lantz House
Gilman House	McCowen House
Hartman House	Nuckolls House
Kilbourne House	Petersen House

D09 Welch Hall

Ayres House	Beyer House
Bergman House	Cassell House

D10 Westgate Hall

Fleming House	Nelson House
Lowe House	Tilden House

D13 Willow Hall

Anderson House	Cook House
Arnquist House	Lancaster House
Bates House	Lommen House
Bishop House	Tompkins House

C07 Wilson Hall

Gwynne House	Matterson House
Hewitt House	Owens House
Johnson House	Rothacker House
Lamson House	Webber House
Mashek House	Werkman House

150

Married and Off-Campus:

E01 Pammel Court

E02 Hawthorn

E03 University Village

E04 Off-Campus

E05 Independent Student Association

E06 Schilletter Village

Graduate Student Residence:

F01 Buchanan Hall

151

Table 1. Giving to the Athletic Program by Sex Combined with Marital Status, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Single Males	702	26	728
	96.4	3.6	22.0
Married Males	1241	59	1300
	95.5	4.5	39.4
Single Females	295	2	297
	99.3	.7	9.0
Married Females	855	5	860
	99.4	.6	26.0
Divorced Males	54	1	55
	98.2	1.8	1.7
Divorced Females	63		63
	100.0		1.9
COLUMN TOTAL	3210	93	3303
	97.2	2.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 38.32 WITH 5 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 2. Giving to the Athletic Program by Sex Combined with Marital Status, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Single Males	1184	26	1210
	97.9	2.1	34.6
Married Males	858	19	877
	97.8	2.2	25.1
Single Females	578	4	582
	99.3	.7	16.6
Married Females	783	1	784
	99.9	.1	22.4
Divorced Males	22		22
	100.0		.6
Divorced Females	25		25
	100.0		.7
COLUMN TOTAL	3450	50	3500
	98.6	1.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 20.22 WITH 5 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 3. Giving to the Academic Program by Sex Combined with Marital Status, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Single Males	615 84.5	113 15.5	728 22.0
Married Males	1084 83.4	216 16.6	1300 39.4
Single Females	255 85.9	42 14.1	297 9.0
Married Females	716 83.3	144 16.7	860 26.0
Divorced Males	47 85.5	8 14.5	55 1.7
Divorced Females	51 81.0	12 19.0	63 1.9
COLUMN TOTAL	2768 83.8	535 16.2	3303 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 2.01 WITH 5 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.847

Table 4. Giving to the Academic Program by Sex Combined with Marital Status, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Single Males	1168 96.5	42 3.5	1210 34.6
Married Males	816 93.0	61 7.0	877 25.1
Single Females	566 97.3	16 2.7	582 16.6
Married Females	768 98.0	16 2.0	784 22.4
Divorced Males	19 86.4	3 13.6	22 .6
Divorced Females	23 92.0	2 8.0	25 .7
COLUMN TOTAL	3360 96.0	140 4.0	3500 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 37.40 WITH 5 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 5. Total Giving by Sex Combined with Marital Status, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Single Males	601	127	728
	82.6	17.4	22.0
Married Males	1051	249	1300
	80.8	19.2	39.4
Single Females	253	44	297
	85.2	14.8	9.0
Married Females	715	145	860
	83.1	16.9	26.0
Divorced Males	46	9	55
	83.6	16.4	1.7
Divorced Females	51	12	63
	81.0	19.0	1.9
COLUMN TOTAL	2717	586	3303
	82.3	17.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 4.17 WITH 5 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.526

Table 6. Total Giving by Sex Combined with Marital Status, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Single Males	1159	51	1210
	95.8	4.2	34.6
Married Males	812	65	877
	92.6	7.4	25.1
Single Females	566	16	582
	97.3	2.7	16.6
Married Females	768	16	784
	98.0	2.0	22.4
Divorced Males	19	3	22
	86.4	13.6	.6
Divorced Females	23	2	25
	92.0	8.0	.7
COLUMN TOTAL	3347	153	3500
	95.6	4.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 38.62 WITH 5 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 7. Giving to the Athletic Program by Sex, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Males	1999	86	2085
	95.9	4.1	63.0
Females	1217	7	1224
	99.4	.6	37.0
COLUMN TOTAL	3216	93	3309
	97.2	2.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 34.35 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 8. Giving to the Athletic Program by Sex, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Males	2066	45	2111
	97.9	2.1	60.3
Females	1387	5	1392
	99.6	.4	39.7
COLUMN TOTAL	3453	50	3503
	98.6	1.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 17.49 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 9. Giving to the Academic Program by Sex, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Males	1748	337	2085
	83.8	16.2	63.0
Females	1025	199	1224
	83.7	16.3	37.0
COLUMN TOTAL	2773	536	3309
	83.8	16.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 0.001 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.982

Table 10. Giving to the Academic Program by Sex, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Males	2005	106	2111
	95.0	5.0	60.3
Females	1358	34	1392
	97.6	2.4	39.7
COLUMN TOTAL	3363	140	3503
	96.0	4.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 13.87 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 11. Total Giving by Sex, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Males	1700	385	2085
	81.5	18.5	63.0
Females	1022	202	1224
	83.5	16.5	37.0
COLUMN TOTAL	2722	587	3309
	82.3	17.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 1.90 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.168

Table 12. Total Giving by Sex, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Males	1992	119	2111
	94.4	5.6	60.3
Females	1358	34	1392
	97.6	2.4	39.7
COLUMN TOTAL	3350	153	3503
	95.6	4.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 19.74 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 13. Giving to the Athletic Program by Marital Status, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Single	1120	29	1149
	97.5	2.5	34.7
Married	2096	64	2160
	97.0	3.0	65.3
COLUMN TOTAL	3216	93	3309
	97.2	2.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 0.38 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.537

Table 14. Giving to the Athletic Program by Marital Status, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Single	1812	30	1842
	98.4	1.6	52.6
Married	1641	20	1661
	98.8	1.2	47.4
COLUMN TOTAL	3453	50	3503
	98.6	1.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 0.84 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.360

Table 15. Giving to the Academic Program by Marital Status, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Single	973	176	1149
	84.7	15.3	34.7
Married	1800	360	2160
	83.3	16.7	65.3
COLUMN TOTAL	2773	536	3309
	83.8	16.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 0.91 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.341

Table 16. Giving to the Academic Program by Marital Status, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Single	1779	63	1842
	96.6	3.4	52.6
Married	1584	77	1661
	95.4	4.6	47.4
COLUMN TOTAL	3363	140	3503
	96.0	4.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 3.05 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.081

Table 17. Total Giving by Marital Status, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Single	956	193	1149
	83.2	16.8	34.7
Married	1766	394	2160
	81.8	18.2	65.3
COLUMN TOTAL	2722	587	3309
	82.3	17.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 0.97 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.324

Table 18. Total Giving by Marital Status, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Single	1770	72	1842
	96.1	3.9	52.6
Married	1580	81	1661
	95.1	4.9	47.4
COLUMN TOTAL	3350	153	3503
	95.6	4.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 1.73 WITH 1 DEGREE OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.188

Table 19. Giving to the Athletic Program by First Degree Achieved, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Bachelor of Arts	424	6	430
	98.6	1.4	13.0
Bachelor of Science	2758	81	2839
	97.1	2.9	86.0
Certificate	22		22
	100.0		.7
Attended - did not graduate	12		12
	100.0		.4
COLUMN TOTAL	3216	87	3303
	97.4	2.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 4.02 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.259

Table 20. Giving to the Athletic Program by First Degree Achieved, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Bachelor of Arts	502	2	504
	99.6	.4	14.3
Bachelor of Science	2929	48	2977
	98.4	1.6	84.4
Certificate	36		36
	100.0		1.0
Attended - did not graduate	10		10
	100.0		.3
COLUMN TOTAL	3477	50	3527
	98.6	1.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 5.23 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.156

Table 21. Giving to the Academic Program by First Degree Achieved, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Bachelor of Arts	372	58	430
	86.5	13.5	13.0
Bachelor of Science	2386	453	2839
	84.0	16.0	86.0
Certificate	18	4	22
	81.8	18.2	.7
Attended - did not graduate	9	3	12
	75.0	25.0	.4
COLUMN TOTAL	2785	518	3303
	84.3	15.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 2.62 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.454

Table 22. Giving to the Academic Program by First Degree Achieved, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Bachelor of Arts	494	10	504
	98.0	2.0	14.3
Bachelor of Science	2907	70	2977
	97.6	2.4	84.4
Certificate	36		36
	100.0		1.0
Attended - did not graduate	10		10
	100.0		.3
COLUMN TOTAL	3447	80	3527
	97.7	2.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 1.34 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.719

Table 23. Total Giving by First Degree Achieved, Class of 1974

	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Bachelor of Arts	369 85.8	61 14.2	430 13.0
Bachelor of Science	2341 82.5	498 17.5	2839 86.0
Certificate	18 81.8	4 18.2	22 .7
Attended - did not graduate	9 75.0	3 25.0	12 .4
COLUMN TOTAL	2737 82.9	566 17.1	3303 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 3.50 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.320

Table 24. Total Giving by First Degree Achieved, Class of 1979

	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Bachelor of Arts	493 97.8	11 2.2	504 14.3
Bachelor of Science	2895 97.2	82 2.8	2977 84.4
Certificate	36 100.0		36 1.0
Attended - did not graduate	10 100.0		10 .3
COLUMN TOTAL	3434 97.4	93 2.6	3527 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 1.81 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.613

Table 25. Giving to the Athletic Program by the College in which the First Degree was Granted, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Agriculture	586	28	614
	95.4	4.6	18.5
Ag Engineering	19	1	20
	95.0	5.0	.6
Education	339	2	341
	99.4	.6	10.3
Engineering	494	15	509
	97.1	2.9	15.4
Home Economics	553	4	557
	99.3	.7	16.8
Science & Humanities	1236	37	1273
	97.1	2.9	38.4
COLUMN TOTAL	3227	87	3314
	97.4	2.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 23.50 WITH 5 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 26. Giving to the Athletic Program by the College in which the First Degree was Granted, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Agriculture	698	18	716
	97.5	2.5	22.3
Ag Engineering	32	4	36
	88.9	11.1	1.1
Education	275	6	281
	97.9	2.1	8.7
Engineering	581	4	585
	99.3	.7	18.2
Home Economics	356	2	358
	99.4	.6	11.1
Science & Humanities	1228	13	1241
	99.0	1.0	38.6
COLUMN TOTAL	3170	47	3217
	98.5	1.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 35.64 WITH 5 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 27. Giving to the Academic Program by the College in which the First Degree was Granted, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Agriculture	509	105	614
	82.9	17.1	18.5
Ag Engineering	13	7	20
	65.0	35.0	.6
Education	305	36	341
	89.4	10.6	10.3
Engineering	416	93	509
	81.7	18.3	15.4
Home Economics	463	94	557
	83.1	16.9	16.8
Science & Humanities	1091	182	1273
	85.7	14.3	38.4
COLUMN TOTAL	2797	517	3314
	84.4	15.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 18.44 WITH 5 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.002

Table 28. Giving to the Academic Program by the College in which the First Degree was Granted, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Agriculture	703	13	716
	98.2	1.8	22.3
Ag Engineering	36		36
	100.0		1.1
Education	277	4	281
	98.6	1.4	8.7
Engineering	567	18	585
	96.9	3.1	18.2
Home Economics	356	2	358
	99.4	.6	11.1
Science & Humanities	1200	41	1241
	96.7	3.3	38.6
COLUMN TOTAL	3139	78	3217
	97.6	2.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 13.58 WITH 5 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.019

Table 29. Total Giving by the College in which the First Degree was Granted, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Agriculture	493	121	614
	80.3	19.7	18.5
Ag Engineering	12	8	20
	60.0	40.0	.6
Education	305	36	341
	89.4	10.6	10.3
Engineering	407	102	509
	80.0	20.0	15.4
Home Economics	461	96	557
	82.8	17.2	16.8
Science & Humanities	1071	202	1273
	84.1	15.9	38.4
COLUMN TOTAL	2749	565	3314
	83.0	17.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 25.17 WITH 5 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 30. Total Giving by the College in which the First Degree was Granted, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Agriculture	699	17	716
	97.6	2.4	22.3
Ag Engineering	35	1	36
	97.2	2.8	1.1
Education	274	7	281
	97.5	2.5	8.7
Engineering	566	19	585
	96.8	3.2	18.2
Home Economics	356	2	358
	99.4	.6	11.1
Science & Humanities	1197	44	1241
	96.5	3.5	38.6
COLUMN TOTAL	3127	90	3217
	97.2	2.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.18 WITH 5 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.071

Table 31. Giving to the Athletic Program by the Characteristic of Being a Scholarship or Loan Recipient, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Scholarship & Loan	419	5	424
	98.8	1.2	17.4
G.I. Bill	62	5	67
	92.5	7.5	2.8
Loan	421	15	436
	96.6	3.4	17.9
None	779	30	809
	96.3	3.7	33.2
Scholarship	672	26	698
	96.3	3.7	28.7
COLUMN TOTAL	2353	81	2434
	96.7	3.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.37 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.035

Table 32. Giving to the Athletic Program by the Characteristic of Being a Scholarship or Loan Recipient, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Scholarship & Loan	483	6	489
	98.8	1.2	30.0
G.I. Bill	5	1	6
	83.3	16.7	.4
Loan	632	8	640
	98.8	1.3	39.2
None	96	2	98
	98.0	2.0	6.0
Scholarship	387	12	399
	97.0	3.0	24.4
COLUMN TOTAL	1603	29	1632
	98.2	1.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 12.99 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.011

Table 33. Giving to the Academic Program by the Characteristic of Being a Scholarship or Loan Recipient, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Scholarship & Loan	357	67	424
	84.2	15.8	17.4
G.I. Bill	50	17	67
	74.6	25.4	2.8
Loan	373	63	436
	85.6	14.4	17.9
None	631	178	809
	78.0	22.0	33.2
Scholarship	550	148	698
	78.8	21.2	28.7
COLUMN TOTAL	1961	473	2434
	80.6	19.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.81 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.002

Table 34. Giving to the Academic Program by the Characteristic of Being a Scholarship or Loan Recipient, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Scholarship & Loan	457	32	489
	93.5	6.5	30.0
G.I. Bill	6		6
	100.0		.4
Loan	613	27	640
	95.8	4.2	39.2
None	93	5	98
	94.9	5.1	6.0
Scholarship	384	15	399
	96.2	3.8	24.4
COLUMN TOTAL	1553	79	1632
	95.2	4.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 4.95 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.293

Table 35. Total Giving by the Characteristic of Being a Scholarship or Loan Recipient, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Scholarship & Loan	355	69	424
	83.7	16.3	17.4
G.I. Bill	48	19	67
	71.6	28.4	2.8
Loan	366	70	436
	83.9	16.1	17.9
None	615	194	809
	76.0	24.0	33.2
Scholarship	535	163	698
	76.6	23.4	28.7
COLUMN TOTAL	1919	515	2434
	78.8	21.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 20.83 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 36. Total Giving by the Characteristic of Being a Scholarship or Loan Recipient, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Scholarship & Loan	454	35	489
	92.8	7.2	30.0
G.I. Bill	6		6
	100.0		.4
Loan	612	28	640
	95.6	4.4	39.2
None	93	5	98
	94.9	5.1	6.0
Scholarship	379	20	399
	95.0	5.0	24.4
COLUMN TOTAL	1544	88	1632
	94.6	5.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 4.76 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.313

Table 37. Giving to the Athletic Program by the Characteristic of Affiliation with an Organization, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Normal Activity - Professional Organization -	681 96.9	22 3.1	703 37.9
Normal Activity - Campus Organization -	647 97.1	19 2.9	666 35.9
Appointed Position - Student Government -	97 97.0	3 3.0	100 5.4
Participated in Athletics -	93 94.9	5 5.1	98 5.3
Once Contributed to a Publication -	36 100.0		36 1.97
AFROTC Commission -	22 100.0		22 1.2

Table 38. Giving to the Athletic Program by the Characteristic of Affiliation with an Organization, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Normal Activity - Professional Organization -	792 98.5	12 1.5	804 42.3
Normal Activity - Campus Organization -	699 98.9	8 1.1	707 37.2
Appointed Position - Student Government -	54 100.0		54 2.8
Participated in Athletics -	32 88.9	4 11.1	36 1.9
Once Contributed to a Publication -	25 96.2	1 3.8	26 1.4
AFROTC Commission -	11 100.0		11 .6

Table 37. Giving to the Athletic Program by the Characteristic of Affiliation with an Organization, Class of 1974, Continued

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Army ROTC	13		13
Commission	100.0		.7
Marine ROTC	1		1
Commission	100.0		.1
Navy ROTC	20	1	21
Commission	95.2	4.8	1.1
Performing	90		90
Arts -	100.0		4.9
Participated			
Other	101	4	105
Participation	96.2	3.8	5.7
Religion			
COLUMN TOTAL	1801	54	1855
	97.1	2.9	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 7.21 WITH 10 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.706

Table 38. Giving to the Athletic Program by the Characteristic of Affiliation with an Organization, Class of 1979, Continued

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Army ROTC	7		7
Commission	100.0		.4
Marine ROTC			
Commission			
Navy ROTC	10		10
Commission	100.0		.5
Performing	49		49
Arts -	100.0		2.6
Participated			
Other	147	1	148
Participation	99.3	.7	7.8
Religion	49		49
	100.0		2.6
COLUMN TOTAL	1876	26	1902
	98.6	1.4	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 29.95 WITH 11 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.002

Table 39. Giving to the Academic Program by the Characteristic of Affiliation with an Organization, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Normal Activity - Professional Organization	536 76.2	167 23.8	703 37.9
Normal Activity - Campus Organization	548 82.3	118 17.7	666 35.9
Appointed Position - Student Government	81 81.0	19 19.0	100 5.4
Participated in Athletics	86 87.8	12 12.2	98 5.3
Once Contributed to a Publication	27 75.0	9 25.0	36 1.9
AFROTC Commission	18 81.8	4 18.2	22 1.2

Table 40. Giving to the Academic Program by the Characteristic of Affiliation with an Organization, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Normal Activity - Professional Organization	735 91.4	69 8.6	804 42.3
Normal Activity - Campus Organization	691 97.7	16 2.3	707 37.2
Appointed Position - Student Government	54 100.0		54 2.8
Participated in Athletics	35 97.2	1 2.8	36 1.9
Once Contributed to a Publication	25 96.2	1 3.8	26 1.4
AFROTC Commission	11 100.0		11 .6

Table 39. Giving to the Academic Program by the Characteristic of Affiliation with an Organization, Class of 1974, Continued

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Army ROTC Commission	12 92.3	1 7.7	13 .7
Marine ROTC Commission	1 100.0		1 .1
Navy ROTC Commission	18 85.7	3 14.3	21 1.1
Performing Arts - Participated	77 85.6	13 14.4	90 4.9
Other Participation	86 81.9	19 18.1	105 5.7
Religion			
COLUMN TOTAL	1490 80.3	365 19.7	1855 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 16.68 WITH 10 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.082

Table 40. Giving to the Academic Program by the Characteristic of Affiliation with an Organization, Class of 1979, Continued

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Army ROTC Commission	7 100.0		7 .4
Marine ROTC Commission			
Navy ROTC Commission	10 100.0		10 .5
Performing Arts - Participated	48 98.0	1 2.0	49 2.6
Other Participation	143 96.6	5 3.4	148 7.8
Religion	49 100.0		49 2.6
COLUMN TOTAL	1809 95.1	93 4.9	1902 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 42.83 WITH 11 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 41. Total Giving by the Characteristic of Affiliation with an Organization, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Normal Activity - Professional Organization	522 74.3	181 25.7	703 37.9
Normal Activity - Campus Organization	534 80.2	132 19.8	666 35.9
Appointed Position - Student Government	78 78.0	22 22.0	100 5.4
Participated in Athletics	85 86.7	13 13.3	98 5.3
Once Contributed to a Publication	27 75.0	9 25.0	36 1.9
AFROTC Commission	18 81.8	4 18.2	22 1.2

Table 42. Total Giving by the Characteristic of Affiliation with an Organization, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Normal Activity - Professional Organization	734 91.3	70 8.7	804 42.3
Normal Activity - Campus Organization	689 97.5	18 2.5	707 37.2
Appointed Position - Student Government	54 100.0		54 2.8
Participated in Athletics	33 91.7	3 8.3	36 1.9
Once Contributed to a Publication	25 96.2	1 3.8	26 1.4
AFROTC Commission	11 100.0		11 .6

Table 41. Total Giving by the Characteristic of Affiliation with an Organization, 1974, Continued

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Army ROTC Commission	12 92.3	1 7.7	13 .7
Marine ROTC Commission	1 100.0		1 .1
Navy ROTC Commission	18 85.7	3 14.3	21 1.1
Performing Arts - Participated	77 85.6	13 14.4	90 4.9
Other Participation	85 81.0	20 19.0	105 5.7
Religion			
COLUMN TOTAL	1457 78.5	398 21.5	1855 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 18.43 WITH 10 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.048

Table 42. Total Giving by the Characteristic of Affiliation with an Class of Organization, Class of 1979, Continued

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Army ROTC Commission	7 100.0		7 .4
Marine ROTC Commission			
Navy ROTC Commission	10 100.0		10 .5
Performing Arts - Participated	48 98.0	1 2.0	49 2.6
Other Participation	143 96.6	5 3.4	148 7.8
Religion	49 100.0		49 2.6
COLUMN TOTAL	1804 94.8	98 5.2	1902 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 40.54 WITH 11 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 43. Giving to the Athletic Program by the Characteristic of Wealth Rating, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	1009 96.6	36 3.4	1045 33.2
2nd Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	778 97.6	19 2.4	797 25.3
3rd Highest 20% Income State of Residence	597 97.9	13 2.4	610 19.4
4th Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	451 97.0	14 3.0	465 14.8
Lowest 20% Income in State of Residence	222 96.1	9 3.9	231 7.3
COLUMN TOTAL	3057 97.1	91 2.9	3148 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 3.98 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM,
SIGNIFICANCE = 0.408

Table 44. Giving to the Athletic Program by the Characteristic of Wealth Rating, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	970 97.9	21 2.1	991 29.8
2nd Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	842 98.9	9 1.1	851 25.6
3rd Highest Income in State of Residence	639 98.5	10 1.5	649 19.5
4th Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	541 99.1	5 .9	546 16.4
Lowest 20% Income in State of Residence	281 97.9	6 2.1	287 8.6
COLUMN TOTAL	3273 98.5	51 1.5	3324 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 5.49 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.240

Table 45. Giving to the Academic Program by the Characteristic of Wealth Rating, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	855 81.8	190 18.2	1045 33.2
2nd Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	674 84.6	123 15.4	797 25.3
3rd Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	514 84.3	96 15.7	610 19.4
4th Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	391 84.1	74 15.9	465 14.8
Lowest 20% Income in State of Residence	198 85.7	33 14.3	231 7.3
COLUMN TOTAL	2632 83.6	516 16.4	3148 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 3.99 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM,
SIGNIFICANCE = 0.407

Table 46. Giving to the Academic Program by the Characteristic of Wealth Rating, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	953 96.2	38 3.8	991 29.8
2nd Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	821 96.5	30 3.5	851 25.6
3rd Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	616 94.9	33 5.1	649 19.5
4th Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	521 95.4	25 4.6	546 16.4
Lowest 20% Income in State of Residence	279 97.2	8 2.8	287 8.6
COLUMN TOTAL	3190 96.0	134 4.0	3324 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 4.09 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM,
SIGNIFICANCE = 0.393

Table 47. Total Giving by the Characteristic of Wealth Rating, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	836 80.0	209 20.0	1045 33.2
2nd Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	662 83.1	135 16.9	797 25.3
3rd Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	507 83.1	103 16.9	610 19.4
4th Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	383 82.4	82 17.6	465 14.8
Lowest 20% Income in State of Residence	194 84.0	37 16.0	231 7.3
COLUMN TOTAL	2582 82.0	566 18.0	3148 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 4.61 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.329

Table 48. Total Giving by the Characteristic of Wealth Rating, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	944 95.3	47 4.7	991 29.8
2nd Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	821 96.5	30 3.5	851 25.6
3rd Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	615 94.8	34 5.2	649 19.5
4th Highest 20% Income in State of Residence	520 95.2	26 4.8	546 16.4
Lowest 20% Income in State of Residence	277 96.5	10 3.5	287 8.6
COLUMN TOTAL	3177 95.6	147 4.4	3324 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 3.63 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.458

Table 49. Giving to the Athletic Program by Affiliation with a Student Honorary Organization, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Academic Honorary	193 99.0	2 1.0	195 23.0
Active Honorary	126 97.7	3 2.3	129 15.2
Professional	96 97.0	3 3.0	99 11.7
Departmental Society or Organization	92 97.9	2 2.1	94 11.1
Honor Society with Emphasis in Scholastics or Research	318 96.4	12 3.6	330 39.0
COLUMN TOTAL	825 97.4	22 2.6	847 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 3.51 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.477

Table 50. Giving to the Athletic Program by Affiliation with a Student Honorary Organization, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Academic Honorary	230 99.1	2 .9	232 26.6
Active Honorary	70 97.2	2 2.8	72 8.3
Professional	101 98.1	2 1.9	103 11.8
Departmental Society or Organization	101 99.0	1 1.0	102 11.7
Honor Society with Emphasis in Scholastics or Research	354 97.8	8 2.2	362 41.6
COLUMN TOTAL	856 98.3	15 1.7	871 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 2.36 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.670

Table 51. Giving to the Academic Program by Affiliation with a Student Honorary Organization, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Academic Honorary	159 / 81.5	36 / 18.5	195 / 23.0
Active Honorary	84 / 65.1	45 / 34.9	129 / 15.2
Professional	87 / 87.9	12 / 12.1	99 / 11.7
Departmental Society or Organization	69 / 73.4	25 / 26.6	94 / 11.1
Honor Society with Emphasis in Scholastics or Research	250 / 75.8	80 / 24.2	330 / 39.0
COLUMN TOTAL	649 / 76.6	198 / 23.4	847 / 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 19.85 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 52. Giving to the Academic Program by Affiliation with a Student Honorary Organization, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Academic Honorary	227 / 97.8	5 / 2.2	232 / 26.6
Active Honorary	66 / 91.7	6 / 8.3	72 / 8.3
Professional	98 / 95.1	5 / 4.9	103 / 11.8
Departmental Society or Organization	99 / 97.1	3 / 2.9	102 / 11.7
Honor Society with Emphasis in Scholastics or Research	332 / 91.7	30 / 8.3	362 / 41.6
COLUMN TOTAL	822 / 94.4	49 / 5.6	871 / 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 12.59 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.014

Table 53. Total Giving by Affiliation with a Student Honorary Organization, Class of 1974

	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Academic Honorary	157 80.5	38 19.5	195 23.0
Active Honorary	83 64.3	46 35.7	129 15.2
Professional	85 85.9	14 14.1	99 11.7
Departmental Society or Organization	67 71.3	27 28.7	94 11.1
Honor Society with Emphasis in Scholastics or Research	245 74.2	85 25.8	330 39.0
COLUMN TOTAL	637 75.2	210 24.8	847 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 18.08 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 54. Total Giving by Affiliation with a Student Honorary Organization, Class of 1979

	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Academic Honorary	226 97.4	6 2.6	232 26.6
Active Honorary	66 91.7	6 8.3	72 8.3
Professional	97 94.2	6 5.8	103 11.8
Departmental Society or Organization	99 97.1	3 2.9	102 11.7
Honor Society with Emphasis in Scholastics or Research	331 91.4	31 8.6	362 41.6
COLUMN TOTAL	819 94.0	52 6.0	871 100.0

CHI SQUARE = 11.46 WITH 4 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.022

Table 55. Giving to the Athletic Program by Occupation, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Business	394	33	427
	92.3	7.7	34.8
Engineering	193	6	199
	97.0	3.0	16.2
Home Economics	31		31
	100.0		2.5
Life Sciences	103	9	112
	92.0	8.0	9.1
Math Sciences	43	3	46
	93.5	6.5	3.7
Physical Sciences	11		11
	100.0		.9
Social Sciences	194	2	196
	99.0	1.0	16.0
Miscellaneous	201	4	205
	98.0	2.0	16.7
COLUMN TOTAL	1170	57	1227
	95.4	4.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 24.85 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 56. Giving to the Athletic Program by Occupation, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Business	292	8	300
	97.3	2.7	43.0
Engineering	101		101
	100.0		14.5
Home Economics	19		19
	100.0		2.7
Life Sciences	51		51
	100.0		7.3
Math Sciences	32		32
	100.0		4.6
Physical Sciences	9		9
	100.0		1.3
Social Sciences	103	4	107
	96.3	3.7	15.3
Miscellaneous	78	1	79
	98.7	1.3	11.3
COLUMN TOTAL	685	13	698
	98.1	1.9	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 7.30 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.399

Table 57. Giving to the Academic Program by Occupation, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Business	329	98	427
	77.0	23.0	34.8
Engineering	161	38	199
	80.9	19.1	16.2
Home Economics	26	5	31
	83.9	16.1	2.5
Life Sciences	75	37	112
	67.0	33.0	9.1
Math Sciences	36	10	46
	78.3	21.7	3.7
Physical Sciences	9	2	11
	81.8	18.2	.9
Social Sciences	160	36	196
	81.6	18.4	16.0
Miscellaneous	179	26	205
	87.3	12.7	16.7
COLUMN TOTAL	975	252	1227
	79.5	20.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 21.26 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.003

Table 58. Giving to the Academic Program by Occupation, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Business	291	9	300
	97.0	3.0	43.0
Engineering	97	4	101
	96.0	4.0	14.5
Home Economics	19		19
	100.0		2.7
Life Sciences	31	20	51
	60.8	39.2	7.3
Math Sciences	32		32
	100.0		4.6
Physical Sciences	9		9
	100.0		1.3
Social Sciences	104	3	107
	97.2	2.8	15.3
Miscellaneous	76	3	79
	96.2	3.8	11.3
COLUMN TOTAL	659	39	698
	94.4	5.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 119.25 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 59. Total Giving by the Characteristic of Occupation, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Business	309	118	427
	72.4	27.6	34.8
Engineering	156	43	199
	78.4	21.6	16.2
Home Economics	26	5	31
	83.9	16.1	2.5
Life Sciences	70	42	112
	62.5	37.5	9.1
Math Sciences	34	12	46
	73.9	26.1	3.7
Physical Sciences	9	2	11
	81.8	18.2	.9
Social Sciences	159	37	196
	81.1	18.9	16.0
Miscellaneous	178	27	205
	86.8	13.2	16.7
COLUMN TOTAL	941	286	1227
	76.7	23.3	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 32.60 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 60. Total Giving by the Characteristic of Occupation, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Business	289	11	300
	96.3	3.7	43.0
Engineering	97	4	101
	96.0	4.0	14.5
Home Economics	19		19
	100.0		2.7
Life Sciences	31	20	51
	60.8	39.2	7.3
Math Sciences	32		32
	100.0		4.6
Physical Sciences	9		9
	100.0		1.3
Social Sciences	103	4	107
	96.3	3.7	15.3
Miscellaneous	76	3	79
	96.2	3.8	11.3
COLUMN TOTAL	656	42	698
	94.0	6.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 108.59 WITH 7 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 61. Giving to the Athletic Program by Anticipated Salary Range, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
$15,000	645	12	657
	98.2	1.8	44.7
15,000-25,000	528	22	550
	96.0	4.0	37.4
25,000-50,000	226	19	245
	92.2	7.8	16.7
$50,000	18	1	19
	94.7	5.3	1.3
COLUMN TOTAL	1417	54	1471
	96.3	3.7	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 18.18 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 62. Giving to the Athletic Program by Anticipated Salary Range, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
$15,000	301	9	310
	97.1	2.9	53.9
15,000-25,000	252	3	255
	98.8	1.2	44.3
25,000-50,000	9		9
	100.0		1.6
$50,000	1		1
	100.0		.2
COLUMN TOTAL	563	12	575
	97.9	2.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 2.26 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.521

Table 63. Giving to the Academic Program by Anticipated Salary Range, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
$15,000	544	113	657
	82.8	17.2	44.7
15,000-25,000	422	128	550
	76.7	23.3	37.4
25,000-50,000	174	71	245
	71.0	29.0	16.7
$50,000	13	6	19
	68.4	31.6	1.3
COLUMN TOTAL	1153	318	1471
	78.4	21.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 17.4 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 64. Giving to the Academic Program by Anticipated Salary Range, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
$15,000	303	7	310
	97.7	2.3	53.9
15,000-25,000	224	31	255
	87.8	12.2	44.3
25,000-50,000	6	3	9
	66.7	33.3	1.6
$50,000	1		1
	100.0		.2
COLUMN TOTAL	534	41	575
	92.9	7.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 30.25 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.521

Table 65. Total Giving by Anticipated Salary Range, Class of 1974

	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
$15,000	538	119	657
	81.9	18.1	44.7
15,000-25,000	407	143	550
	74.0	26.0	37.4
25,000-50,000	166	79	245
	67.8	32.2	16.7
$50,000	12	7	19
	63.2	36.8	1.3
COLUMN TOTAL	1153	318	1471
	78.4	21.6	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 17.4 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 66. Total Giving by Anticipated Salary Range, Class of 1979

	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
$15,000	300	10	310
	96.8	3.2	53.9
15,000-25,000	221	34	255
	86.7	13.3	44.3
25,000-50,000	6	3	9
	66.7	33.3	1.6
$50,000	1		1
	100.0		.2
COLUMN TOTAL	528	47	575
	91.8	8.2	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 26.83 WITH 3 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.001

Table 67. Giving to the Athletic Program by Place of Residence while in College, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Greek	668	30	698
	95.7	4.3	22.9
On-Campus	1595	46	1641
	97.2	2.8	53.8
Off-Campus	696	16	712
	97.8	2.2	23.3
COLUMN TOTAL	2959	92	3051
	97.0	3.0	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 5.62 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.060

Table 68. Giving to the Athletic Program by Place of Residence while in College, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Greek	623	19	642
	97.0	3.0	21.0
On-Campus	1654	19	1673
	98.9	1.1	54.7
Off-Campus	733	9	742
	98.8	1.2	24.3
COLUMN TOTAL	3010	47	3057
	98.5	1.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 10.88 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.004

Table 69. Giving to the Academic Program by Place of Residence while in College, Class of 1974

	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Greek	565	133	698
	80.9	19.1	22.9
On-Campus	1371	270	1641
	83.5	16.5	53.8
Off-Campus	602	110	712
	84.6	15.4	23.3
COLUMN TOTAL	2538	513	3051
	83.2	16.8	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 3.61 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.165

Table 70. Giving to the Academic Program by Place of Residence while in College, Class of 1979

	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Greek	616	26	642
	96.0	4.0	21.0
On-Campus	1613	60	1673
	96.4	3.6	54.7
Off-Campus	703	39	742
	94.7	5.3	24.3
COLUMN TOTAL	2932	125	3057
	95.9	4.1	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 3.66 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.161

Table 71. Total Giving by Place of Residence while in College, Class of 1974

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Greek	549	149	698
	78.7	21.3	22.9
On-Campus	1344	297	1641
	81.9	18.1	53.8
Off-Campus	594	118	712
	83.4	16.6	23.3
COLUMN TOTAL	2487	564	3051
	81.5	18.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 5.68 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.058

Table 72. Total Giving by Place of Residence while in College, Class of 1979

COUNT / ROW PCT / COL PCT / TOT PCT	Non-Donor	Donor	ROW TOTAL
Greek	611	31	642
	95.2	4.8	21.0
On-Campus	1609	64	1673
	96.2	3.8	54.7
Off-Campus	700	42	742
	94.3	5.7	24.3
COLUMN TOTAL	2920	137	3057
	95.5	4.5	100.0

CHI SQUARE = 4.27 WITH 2 DEGREES OF FREEDOM, SIGNIFICANCE = 0.118