An Examination of the Motives for Athletic Donor Lapse at a Large NCAA Division I Institution

Robert Matthew Ira Hayden

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Exercise & Sport Science in Sport Administration

Chapel Hill 2010

Approved by:

Dr. Richard Southall, Advisor

Committee Member: Dr. Edgar W. Shields, Jr.

Committee Member: Ms. Amy Piland

© 2010

Robert Matthew Ira Hayden

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Robert M.I. Hayden: An examination of the motivation for athletic donor lapse at a large NCAA Division I institution (Under the direction of Dr. Richard Southall)

This study examined the reasons cited by inactive athletic donors at a major NCAA Division I institution for their decision to lapse. A survey was emailed to all inactive donors with a valid email address on file with the athletic fundraising organization at the institution in question. The survey collected demographic information, followed by levels of agreement with the effect that a number of different service and external factors had on their decision to lapse as donors.

Descriptive statistics were run on the data, and then a series of chi-square tests were run to determine the relationships that existed between different demographic criteria (including male/female, distance of residence from the university, alumni status, and years of membership) and the reasons cited for lapse. The most frequently-cited factors for lapse were identified and discussed, and the significant relationships between demographic groups and the factors for donor lapse were analyzed and discussed.

Love the connection with my university. – Anonymous Survey Respondent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLESix		
Chapter		
1. INTRODUCTION	······	1
Statement of	f Purpose	2
Research Qu	uestions	3
Definition o	f Terms	3
Assumption	s	4
Limitations		4
Delimitation	ns	5
Significance	e of Study	5
2. REVIEW OF LITE	RATURE	6
Nonprofit D	onor Lapse	8
Commercial	Sector Customer Loss	16
Athletic Dor	nor Motivation	19
3. METHODOLOGY		22
Subjects		22
Instrumentat	tion	22
Procedures f	for Data Collection	23
Statistical A	nalysis	24

4.	RESULTS	25
	Demographic Data2	25
	Research Question 1	5
	Research Question 2	9
	Research Question 3	5
5.	DISCUSSION	8
	Demographic Data	8
	Reasons for Lapse	11
	Service Quality and External Issues / Chi-Squares	1 5
	Gender4	15
	Age Group	1 6
	Alumni Statistics4	16
	Distance of Residence	17
	Years of Membership	18
	Likelihood of Renewal	1 9
	Conclusions5	50
	Recommendations for Future Research	51
6.	APPENDICES	
	A. Tables	
	3. Service-Related Issues5	3
	4. Reasons for Deactivation5	6
	5. Overall Satisfaction	58
	6. Likelihood of Reactivation5	8

7.	Gender versus "I could no longer afford my donation."59
8.	Gender versus "Relocation made my membership less useful."
9.	Age Group versus "Relocation made my membership less useful."
10.	Alumni Status versus "The quality of customer support was unsatisfactory."
11.	Alumni Status versus "Improper appreciation shown for gifts."
12.	Alumni status versus "I received too few electronic communications."
13.	Alumni status versus "My membership did not allow me proper access to football tickets."
14.	Alumni status versus "My membership did not allow me proper access to football parking."
15.	Alumni status versus "My membership did not allow me proper access to basketball tickets."
16.	Alumni status versus "A relocation made my membership less useful."
17.	Alumni status versus "Other causes 'deserved' my donation more."
18.	Alumni status versus "Other causes 'needed' my donation more."
19.	Alumni status versus "My donation did not make enough of a difference."
20.	Distance of residence vs. "My membership didn't allow me proper access to football parking."
21.	Distance of residence vs. "There were not enough membership events held in my area."
22.	Years of membership versus "Relocation made my membership less useful."

		23. Years of membership versus "Other causes 'deserved' my donation more"	
		24. Overall satisfaction versus Alumni Status	70
		25. Chi-Square Results: Likelihood of Reactivation and	
		Demographic Criteria	70
		26. Age group versus Likelihood of renewal	71
7	REFERENCES		68

LIST OF TABLES

Т	`al	1e
	. uı	,,,

1.	Reasons for Lapse	9
2.	External Factors	28

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Collegiate athletics have become a large part of American culture. In the eyes of many U.S. citizens, Saturdays in the fall mean college football, Tuesdays in the winter equal college basketball, and Sundays in the spring are for college lacrosse and baseball. This has been the case since the mid-19th century when "sport came to dominate the extracurriculum while challenging the curriculum for importance on the college campus" (Smith, 1988).

While sport has always been a fixture on college campuses, the size and scope of athletic contests have grown considerably. According to a report by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), over 48 million people attended football games at 628 member schools during the 2008 season. Four schools had an average attendance of over 100,000 fans at each of their home games, and the 12-school Southeastern Conference (SEC) had an average attendance of over 76,000 (Johnson, 2009). In line with these attendance totals are revenue and expenditure figures. According to a report issued by the NCAA in March, 2008, median revenues among Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) schools increased 16% from 2004 to 2006. Median total expenses increased 23% during that same period. Revenues and expenses are both increasing, but expenses are increasing at a faster rate (Fulks, 2008).

These trends point to ever-increasing pressure on athletic department revenuegenerators, including athletic development organizations. Fundraising now comprises a major piece of athletic department income. While donations accounted for only 5% of total athletic department revenue in the 1960s, they are now responsible for 18% of total revenue generated by NCAA Division I-A athletic departments (Gladden, Mahony, & Apostolopoulou, 2005). In order to maintain this revenue stream, athletic development groups must protect their most valuable asset: the donor. Studies in the commercial sector have shown that businesses spend five times more money for new customers than they do to maintain current customers (Raphael 1991). This idea, applied by Sargeant (2001a) to general non-profit donor lapse, indicates that it typically costs approximately two-to-three times as much to recruit a donor as the organization will receive from their first donation. Additionally, Sargeant (p. 60) identified that a five percent improvement in donor attrition rates improves profits from 25 to 85 percent. When a donor continues giving they will potentially upgrade their gifts, give in new ways, make recommendations to others about making donations, or perhaps investigate making a planned gift (Sargeant, 2008). A significant amount of potential income is being left on the table, which demands the question: once a donor has "bought in" and begun supporting an athletic department, why do they choose to stop giving? The aim of this study was to find the answer by isolating the reasons for donor lapse at a major Division I athletic department.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the motives for donor lapse at a large National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division-I institution in the Eastern United States.

Research Questions

The developed research questions were:

1. What reasons do donors cite for their decision to deactivate their memberships?

2. Is there a relationship between the reasons given for lapse and membership in the

following donor subsets: males and females; university alumni and non-alumni; those

living at different distances from the school; those giving at different membership

levels and membership for different lengths of time?

3. Is there a relationship between the overall level of satisfaction and any of the

demographic groups listed? Between likelihood of reactivation and those

demographic groups?

Definition of Terms

Annual Fund: Donations made each year, traditionally used for the payment of scholarship

costs.

Athletic Development: Fundraising conducted specifically for the support of athletics.

Commercial Sector: The segment of businesses operating on a for-profit basis.

Contribution: Money donated to a cause; in this case, money donated to a fundraising effort.

Donor: Anyone contributing to a development effort.

Inactive Donor: A donor who has not given to an athletic development annual fund in over

twelve (12) months.

Lapse: The act of ceasing donation to the development fund.

Pledge: The commitment toward a future contribution of something with monetary value to a

fundraising effort.

3

Assumptions

- 1) The measures employed in conducting this research were both accurate and reliable.
- Data collected through survey responses was recorded in a timely and accurate fashion.
- 3) The responses received from study subjects were given honestly.
- 4) The sample size of gathered results was large enough to generalize the motives for lapse among the rest of the population of inactive donors at the university examined, including those who choose not to respond and those without a valid email address.

Limitations

- 1) All surveys were sent via email, due to the substantial difference in cost between email and traditional mail surveys (Kaplowitz, Hadlock, & Levine, 2004), and the limited size and scope of the study.
- 2) The study was limited to those who have a valid email address, and have not changed their email address since they lapsed as donors.
- The subjects of the study had to voluntarily choose to respond to the survey questionnaire.
- 4) Respondents might not have been honest in their responses concerning their reasons for lapse as donors (Nathan and Hallam, 2009).
- 5) Due to the nature of the study, the subject pool might not have been a truly accurate representation of the population. Those who chose to respond to the survey may have chosen to do so due to a more volatile experience as a donor, causing their responses to be skewed from the population norm. Combined with a lower-end return rate, this creates potential for non-response bias (Hager, Wilson, Pollak, & Rooney, 2003).

Delimitations

The study sampled only donors who had given for at least one year to the selected athletic department's annual fund, and then ceased giving to the fund, causing their account status to be set by the giving organization as "inactive." Each donor contacted must have also had a valid email address associated with their account.

Significance of Study

This study is significant to several different groups of constituents. As the size and scope of athletic department operations continue to grow, the need to maintain existing revenue streams increases with it. Annual donations to athletic department development funds therefore must be protected. The best way to do that is by keeping current donors rather than solely focusing on recruiting new donors. This is true for two reasons: the commercial sector has shown that it is many times more expensive to recruit a new customer than it is to work with a current customer (Reichheld & Sasser, 1990), and it has been shown that the longer a donor contributes to a charitable cause, the more exponentially valuable that donor becomes (Sargeant, 2008). Understanding why current athletic donors stop giving could allow industry professionals to address the issues cited and tailor their message to those issues, which may open a huge source of revenue for future donations. The study has specific importance to the athletic fundraising organization in question, as it allows organization staff to look at their inactive donor constituency and acquire insight into their reasons for lapse, highlighting different factors (both internal to the organization and outside of the organization's direct control) that might be adversely affecting their donor base.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

There is a dearth of academic information available on athletic-donor lapse.

Practitioners have taken only minor interest in non-profit donor lapse and donor motivation continues to dominate academic research (Sargeant, 2008). Fortunately, numerous articles published on the subject contain much useful data (Staurowsky, Parkhouse, & Sachs, 1996; Verner, Hecht, & Fansler, 1998; Mahony, Gladden, & Funk, 2003; Wells, Southall, Stotlar, & Mundform, 2005; Tsiotsou, 2007; Gray, 2009). In order to understand athletic-development donor de-motivation, understanding the reasons why those donors chose to start giving is important.

The causes and effects of commercial sector customer loss also require investigation. Customer acquisition, retention, and post-sale customer service are all areas that have been highly researched (Reichheld, & Sasser, 1990; Raphel, 1991; Jones and Sasser, 1995; Mittal and Lassar, 1998), and many of the habits and decisions of the customers of for-profit organizations can be translated to the non-profit constituency. These ideas magnify the importance of donor retention to the non-profit organization.

Although there are few studies that have been conducted on the motives for donors to stop giving (Sargeant, 2001a; Bekkers & Wiepking, 2007), there is a somewhat significant

amount of research that has been conducted on non-athletic, non-profit donor lapse (Sargeant, 2001b; MacMillan, Money, Money, & Downing, 2005; Sargeant, 2008; Nathan, & Hallam, 2009). The reasons why donors stop giving to churches, hospitals, and academic institutions have all been researched, and are very useful to this study.

The over-riding theme of most of the pertinent literature to this topic relates either directly or indirectly to the ideals espoused by the relationship marketing literature. Since the early 1980's, relationship development between service organizations and their partners has been a focus of marketing literature (Berry, 1983). Gronroos' (1994) is the best (Harker, 1999): "Marketing is to establish, maintain, and enhance relationships with customers and other partners, at a profit, so that the objectives of both parties are met. This is achieved through a mutual exchange and fulfillment of promises" (p. 9). Relationship marketing includes customer retention, customer "lock-in," and database marketing (Barnes, 1994), but it also represents many different types of relationships at multiple value chain levels (Morgan, & Hunt, 1994). Sheth and Parvatiyar (1995) argue that it points to a "significant shift in the axioms of marketing: competition and conflict to mutual cooperation, and choice independence to mutual interdependence." It is a shift from traditional Exchange Theory, which focuses on the direct value received by those involved in a transaction. In this new paradigm, each party must value the resources being provided by the reciprocating partner in order for the exchange to occur (McCarville & Copeland, 1994). Individuals will consider the costs and benefits of the exchange, and then engage in the transaction only if they feel that it will maximize their profits (Barnes & McCarville, 2005). While these ideas do account for transactions happening in a vacuum, the relationship being formed between non-profit and donor must be more involved than that. Sargeant (2001a) explains that "relationship

fundraising," as a variant of relationship marketing, is characterized by willingness on the fundraiser's part to invest in the donor in order to realize a future income stream. Sargeant (2001c) built on the idea by incorporating some concepts of Exchange Theory with relationship marketing strategy in discussing donor Lifetime Value; he recommends the most basic needs of all donors should be met, and then further personalization should be made dependent on the future potential giving level of different donors. He recommends doing this by creating "quality of service" strata within the donor base, and meeting the relationship needs of each group individually (p. 28). It is clearly important that an organization understands its donor base; a good step toward this knowledge is to understand why members might choose to deactivate their membership.

Non-Profit Donor Lapse

Noting a lack of empirical research into defection habits of non-profit donors, Sargeant (2001a) focused on the relationship-marketing variant he calls "relationship fundraising." He compared a company's cost of customer loss to the benefits of retained customers, and argued there is a tendency among "non-profits" to become transaction-oriented rather than relationship-oriented (Sargeant). His research examined individual reasons for commercial consumer dissatisfaction and lapse, including attraction by competition, poor quality of service, poor relationship quality, and loss to market. The study consisted of two stages: a) a series of ten focus group sessions, designed to identify key reasons for donor attrition, and b) a postal survey in collaboration with several major non-profit organizations, which represented a variety of causes. The study's goal was twofold: a) to ascertain reasons for donor lapse, and b) to compare active donors' views with those who

had ceased giving to the organization within the proceeding eighteen-month period (Sargeant).

The survey itself contained three parts. The first part gave donors an opportunity to choose from a list of reasons for their lapse. The most common reason cited was financial instability, followed by the feeling that other causes were more deserving of their support, with death or relocation to a different part of the country as the third reason. Also included were a lack of acknowledgement of support, inappropriate communications, and interestingly enough, "I do not recall supporting X organization" (Sargeant, 2001a).

Table 1

Reasons for Lapse

Reason	Percentage
I can no longer afford to offer my support.	54.0
I feel that other causes are more deserving.	36.2
Death/Relocation.	16.0
X did not acknowledge my support.	13.2
I do not recall supporting X.	9.2
X did not inform me how my money had been used.	8.1
X no longer needs my support.	5.6
The quality of support provided by X was poor.	5.1
X asked for inappropriate sums.	4.3
I found X's communications inappropriate.	3.8
X did not take account of my wishes.	2.6
Staff at X were unhelpful.	2.1

Issues with quality of service were found to be prevalent (Sargeant, 2001a). In order to address this, the next section asked donors to rate their feelings about the level of service received on a Likert scale, based on the SERVQUAL measurement instrument (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988). Ratings were given by both active and lapsed donors on such issues as "I felt confident that X was using my money appropriately," and "I felt safe in my transactions with X." As could be assumed, lapsed donors had significantly poorer perceptions of the participating non-profit on nearly all of the factors measured (Sargeant, 2001a). Subjects then rated their overall level of satisfaction with the non-profit; further study into this data set revealed that those who were "very satisfied" were 2.1 times more likely to stay active and make a further donation than those who were simply "satisfied" (Sargeant).

Aspects of highest importance to the donor regarding the donor-non profit relationship were examined next, asking for a Likert scale rating of different aspects of the relationship. These included "asking for appropriate sums" and "thanking me for my gift." This was followed by a rating of the actual performance of the non-profit on each of the aspects listed, and a gap analysis comparing the two sections. The largest gaps between expectation and performance were found on the dimensions of "leaving it to me how much to donate" and "not asking me for support too often" (p. 69).

The final section asked for the active and lapsed donors to rate their reasons for initial support. The results showed that donors were motivated most often at first by a feeling that the organization had a good reputation (Sargeant, 2001a). This could be reflected on the athletic side by a winning program or a development group with long-standing ties to the

university and community. Lapsed donors were much more likely to cite being pressured in the initial approach (Sargeant).

Demographic information was recorded in the last section of the survey. The implications of the study point to a need to improve service quality, and to strengthen the bonds between non-profit and donor. This was supported by a full ten percent of respondent donors having no recollection of ever having made a donation (Sargeant, 2001a). Improvement in these areas would increase the value of the exchange to the donor, and would likely increase the value to the non-profit through a strengthened, and therefore more lengthy (and lucrative), relationship. This study will be very useful to the current study, as the survey that will be conducted will be partly-based on the Sargeant (2001a) survey.

Sargeant (2001b) examined donor loyalty from the perspective of relationship marketing in the for-profit sector. He cited returns in Britain of 70-90 pence per pound spent on donor recruitment versus five pounds of return for every one pound spent on donor development (Sargeant). He isolated the reasons for donor defection down to five: donors can no longer afford to give; they choose to give to a different organization; they look for a higher quality of service elsewhere; death or a family move; an attitude change toward the giving organization; giving to another organization is easier; or that they elect to give more to fewer organizations (Sargeant). He breaks defection down into two categories: natural defection (leaving because customer demand has waned in the face of a finite product life); and unnatural defection, or leaving because of a deficiency in customer treatment (Sargeant). He argued for the idea of "relationship fundraising;" the idea that fundraising organizations must be willing to invest in the relationship with their donors, highlighting the need to offer them a greater number of communication options. The act of making the choice alone will

increase the amount of interaction between the non-profit and the donor. In a similar fashion to the previous study, building the relationship and providing the donor with an increased number of options will improve the perceived value of the relationship to the donor, and hopefully increase the value to the non-profit as well (Sargeant).

Sargeant (2001b) conducted eight focus groups to find potential causes of donor attrition, and then mailed surveys to 1,000 donors at each of ten UK charities, including both lapsed and active donors. He found that "feelings of confidence that funds are being used appropriately and feeling that the gift was having the required impact" (p. 184) were both very important facets of service quality. Additionally, he found that those who were very satisfied were 1.8 times more likely to make a further donation than respondents who claimed to simply be satisfied (Sargeant). Performance expectation means were compared to performance satisfaction means as well; the categories "leaving it to me how much to donate" and "not asking for support too often" were both identified as areas that performance satisfaction did not meet performance expectation (p. 185).

Sargeant and Woodliffe (2005) described the importance of commitment: "in the non-profit context, if donors can be facilitated to develop commitment to the organizations they support, a number of benefits in respect of their attitudes and future behavior should accrue as a consequence" (p. 62). Trust is also described as an antecedent to commitment, an idea Garbarino and Johnson (1999) regard as important to the implementation of relationship marketing ideals. Sargeant and Woodliffe (2005) subdivided the idea of commitment into active and passive groups. According to the analysis, active donors genuinely believe in the cause and their affiliation with it, and usually only express this feeling toward a small number of causes. Cognitive engagement is identified as a conduit to active commitment:

"Donors who felt that they had learned about the cause, shared its beliefs, experienced control or choice over communications, engaged with the organization in multiple ways, and developed a personal link ... to the beneficiary group were significantly more likely to express active commitment" (p. 74).

Conversely, passive commitment is similar to the previously-described concept of inertia (continued donation because the donor has not had a chance to cancel). In addition, passive donors believe their donation is "the right thing to do," without a specific connection to the organization (Sargeant & Woodliffe).

As a further catalyst for transition from passive to active commitment, a strong connection was found between the number of different ways that a donor had chosen to interact with the organization, and the level of commitment expressed (Sargeant & Woodliffe, 2005). The more ways that the fundraising entity was able to get the donor involved (volunteer opportunities, campaigning, and other forms of activism are cited), the stronger the connection became (Sargeant & Woodliffe). Regardless of the way they are achieved, commitment and trust are essential to the relationship-building process, as they "lead directly to cooperative behaviors that are conducive to relationship marketing success" (Morgan & Hunt, 1994).

Sargeant (2008) took a more broad view, conducting a review of literature to examine switching and lapsing factors among non-profit donors. He also explores the triggers that cause the customer to re-examine their relationship with the organization, identifying situational (birth of a child, death of a loved one, change in financial situation) factors that the organization cannot control; influential triggers involving a donor being won over by

another organization (one organization providing better benefits than the other is offered as an explanation); and reactive triggers, which are caused by an interaction between the organization and the customer (Sargeant). Value determinants are the areas of a product or service that are the most important to the customer, which include personal (tangible and intangible benefits) and delivered, which in this case are the benefit to the group that the non-profit is supporting (i.e., student athletes) (Sargeant).

Nathan and Hallam (2009) examined the importance of donor retention to maintaining healthy support margins. They contended recruitment promises not followed up on and an overall lack of engagement of the donor were the most significant retention issues. Active engagement through proper communication was seen as key to developing the relationship. However, perhaps due to a lack of attention to the issue of deficiencies in donor engagement, there was little attention paid to the 'on-boarding' process that should follow initial donor recruitment (Sargeant).

Nathan and Hallam (2009) identified lapsing as a behavioral response. There were not many donors with an inherent predisposition for lapsing, but something about the charity, the cause, or the individual's situation was what caused the lapse. In many cases, a poor financial situation was just a tipping point, causing the donor to stop giving to their least favored charities first (Nathan and Hallam). When asked for the reason they have ceased giving, the donor would usually cite the change in their own personal circumstances before discussing an issue with the organization itself. It was easier for the donor to blame their own situation than to put blame on a charitable organization, even if disappointment in service (and therefore a lack of perceived exchange value) was a major reason for lapse (Nathan and

Hallam). On the surface, the exchange and relationship were not valuable enough to the donor to continue the relationship in light of financial difficulties.

Nathan and Hallam (2009) continued to argue: of the donors that remained, many continued giving because of inertia. Payments continued despite a lack of direct engagement with the charity, and when the donor did decide to cut off payments, they felt that they had not lost anything (Nathan & Hallam). This idea was reflected in the concept that the more thought that someone put into the decision to give, the more likely that person was to stick with the charity. The ensuing decision to lapse therefore reflected a lack of re-affirmation in the donor's decision to give. Many times, when the donor stopped giving to that charity, they would move on to another. This reinforced the idea that one charity's lapser was another charity's donor (Nathan & Hallam).

When a donor did choose to discontinue giving to a charity, Nathan and Hallam (2009) cited several specific failures made by organizations that lead to the decision.

Changes within the charity (including rapid growth, sitting on financial reserves or "inappropriate" spending) reduced the positive sense of self that the donor received from giving to the charity. When a donor felt they were not properly thanked for a gift, were asked for money too often, received unwanted communications, or they did not receive recognition for long-term giving, they reported a sense of ingratitude on the part of the charity (or being taken advantage of by the charity). Broken promises or failure to meet expectations were cited among younger donors; the expectations created by young, engaging recruiters were not met by follow-up communications. Not paying attention to donor's giving preferences (or the donor's feeling of a sense of ineptitude on the part of the charity), asking for money at the

wrong time or in inappropriate amounts, and not knowing when to stop were all cited as specific reasons for lapse as well (Nathan and Hallam).

Nathan and Hallam (2009) cited several ways charitable organizations could stem attrition, that each pointed to the need for increased exchange value in the eyes of the donor. Making donors feel pointed about their gift with materials that pull, not push by stimulating the donors' need to help and be engaged and to feel less helpless by showing the donor what their donations are helping the charity achieve; and to grow through information and involvement (giving the donor a way to display their affiliation is cited as well) (Nathan and Hallam).

Commercial Sector Customer Loss

Ongoing relationships are extremely important in the for-profit sector as well. Barnes (1994) describes how relationship marketing has found a foothold in the commercial sector: "it has become patently obvious that strategic competitive advantage can no longer be delivered on the basis of core characteristics ... corporate profitability has been shown to be linked closely with satisfying existing customers." Jones and Sasser (1995) discussed the difference in customer retention between a neutral or satisfied customer, and a very satisfied customer. As with Sargeant (2001a; 2001b), the authors identify that complete customer satisfaction is the goal for the generation of superior long-term financial performance, because completely satisfied customers are much more loyal than those customers who are simply satisfied. Completely satisfied customers see a higher perceived value in the exchange, and are more likely to provide repeat business (Jones & Sasser, 1995).

Jones and Sasser (1995) identify the difference between true long-term loyalty, and false loyalty. Factors generating false loyalty make the customer seem genuinely loyal even

though they are not and include strong loyalty-promotion plans such as frequent flier miles. As soon as a customer exhausts their frequent flier miles, they are apt to switch to a competitor (p. 90). This could hold true in the athletic development area. If the only benefit that a donor sees from their relationship with the foundation is football tickets and the team begins performing poorly, the donor may decide to defect; as the value that the donor perceives from the relationship has gone away (the marginal utility of the football tickets has gone down). The company or non-profit must work hard to provide their best customers with outstanding value in order to make them truly loyal.

Jones and Sasser (1995) based their study on a statistic from Xerox that their totally satisfied customers were six times more likely to repurchase Xerox products over the next 18 months than their satisfied customers. The authors (Jones and Sasser) looked at over 30 companies from 5 different markets. They found that in highly competitive markets, there was a tremendous difference between the loyalty of satisfied and completely satisfied customers. Customers *want* to be completely satisfied, and if they are not, they can be lured away easily. Therefore, it is essential to understand which of your customers are truly loyal based on delivery of superior value, and which are artificial. In order to satisfy customers completely, a company has to excel at listening to customers and interpreting what they're saying. If false loyalty exists, the company needs to identify it and provide its customers with better value in other areas, transitioning them to true loyalty (Jones and Sasser).

Mittal and Lassar (1998) looked at the connection between customer satisfaction and loyalty. At the heart of their argument is the idea that doing business with repeat customers keeps costs down and increases profitability. The returning customer is familiar with the business and its products, decreasing service costs while revenues increase. The authors

warn, however, that even satisfied customers can leave in favor of another company's offer (Mittal and Lassar) This is true of athletic donors as well; the discretionary dollar spent on donations to an athletic department can be donated in different directions due to requests from other non-profit organizations, or perhaps donated to another university development fund. It is the responsibility of the firm or non-profit to properly serve their constituency, meeting the goals of the customer while also meeting their own needs (Mittal and Lassar).

They discuss the difference between satisfaction and quality; satisfaction measures the customer's experience, while quality measures the firm's resources and skills. Measuring satisfaction tells us if the customer is happy or not, and measuring quality tells us what areas of the firm's service need improvement.

The results of the study (Mittal and Lassar, 1998) indicate that there is a connection between loyalty and satisfaction; there is a minimum "threshold level" of satisfaction that must be maintained. Therefore, customer satisfaction must be achieved, and then loyalty beyond satisfaction can be reached. The authors previously broke down the service sector into two groups; low contact and high contact. Low contact services do not involve a significant amount of direct customer service. Auto mechanics were studied for this group. High contact services involve more direct customer interaction; health care services represented the high contact group. The results of the study showed that, for high contact services (such as athletic development, where a relationship usually needs to be formed between a development officer and the donor), once the threshold level of functional quality and the resultant satisfaction are in place, an enhanced level of technical quality will win over customer loyalty (Mittal and Lassar). The opposite is true for low contact services. For a high-contact service with high satisfaction scores across the board, the authors recommend

investment in technical quality (the dominant loyalty driver) such as equipment, technology, and professional expertise is recommended. The customer is already happy with the functionality of the exchange, so increasing technical quality might convert those satisfied customers into loyal, returning customers (Mittal and Lassar).

Reichheld and Sasser (2001) studied the effect of customer retention on commercial profit margins, stating that companies can boost profits by almost 100% by retaining 5% more of their customers. They cite one auto service company that sees expected profits from a fourth-year customer that over three times more valuable than those that a customer generates in their first year; one industrial distributor sees increasing profits into the nineteenth year of the customer/company relationship (Reichheld and Sasser).

Reichheld and Sasser (2001) discuss several retention strategies, including feedback solicitations from defecting customers, which can help companies move toward continuous improvement. Defecting customers can provide a view of the business that is unavailable to those on the inside, and receive what the authors call an "early warning signal." The company can use the provided information to improve the exchange between the firm and its customers by asking specific, relevant questions about why the consumer has defected (Reichheld and Sasser). This is precisely what the current study is intended to do.

One of the main tenets of relationship marketing involves the creation of added value, by creating stronger ties between the customer and the organization (Gronroos, 1994).

Ravald and Gronroos state: "the company has to get close to the customer to be able to

Athletic Donor Motivation

understand his needs, preferences and all activities which constitute his value chain." It is clearly important for the athletic giving organization (and for the purposes of this study) to know why its donors have chosen to make their initial pledge. Tsiotsou (2007) segmented athletic donors based on their motives; created profiles based on different donor characteristics, and developed a measurement instrument on donor motivation.

The author argues that categorizing donors into homogeneous groups and targeting the most profitable segments can be an effective strategic marketing weapon for non-profits, saving costs and providing information for effective fundraising (Tsiotsou, 2007). She also divided her subjects into high and low motivation groups, finding satisfactory results on four factors: belongingness, trusting, social and practical motivation and prestige. Belongingness (or loyalty to, and association with, the university) explained most of the variance in her results (33 percent). This was followed by trusting (donor's trust on the leadership and vision of the university) and social-practical motivation (tangible rewards, including tickets and parking) at 9.7% each, and prestige (of the university) at 3.6% (Tsiotsou). Tsiotsou concluded, because there is an obvious connection between donation and association with the university, fundraisers should focus their efforts on strengthening those ties and giving the donor more perceived value in the exchange.

Mahony, et al.. (2003) developed a study based on prior research in which they created a new scale for assessing the motivational factors important to athletic donors, and looked at institutional differences in donor motivation. They found that priority seating for football and men's basketball were the most important motives, indicating that the donation may be based more on reciprocity than altruism. They also found that, depending on which of the two was the "major" sport at the school, the most donations were made for seating at those games (whether the school was a "football" or "basketball" school) (Mahony, et al..).

Many times, a higher level of marginal utility is placed either football or men's basketball, so

the fundraising organization should recognize which sport is their donors' giving preferences and adjust accordingly.

They also found that improving the quality of revenue sports was much more important to donors than improving the quality of non-revenue sports. The authors indicated that this may be due to athletic departments' failure to solicit donations for non-revenue sport programs (Mahony, et al..). They concluded by noting that each institution has a unique donor base, and that it's important for each institution to understand its donor base before developing a marketing plan (Mahony, et al..).

Gladden, et al.. (2005) published a study on donor motivation that was focused on the reasons why people donate, which motivations are most prevalent, and how motivations differed across the schools studied. They were the first to utilize an open-ended question to solicit feedback from donor groups about why they donate, receiving feedback on the donor's terms. Their findings indicated that, while each institution may be unique (Gladden, et al..), the primary motives for giving were as follows: supporting and improving the athletic program, receiving tickets, helping student-athletes, deriving entertainment and enjoyment, supporting and promoting the university, receiving membership benefits, repaying past benefits received, helping and enhancing the community, and psychological commitment (Gladden, et al..).

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Subjects

The population considered for this study included all of the inactive donors from a large NCAA Division I athletic department. The sample consisted of inactive athletic donors to that university's athletic fundraising organization with a valid email address still associated with their account. To further define the sample, it consisted of donors who have made a gift to the annual giving fund of the athletic department, activating their account for at least one year in the past, who then did not give a subsequent gift, causing their account to be set as "inactive."

Instrumentation

In order to understand the underlying reasons behind donor lapse, a survey drawing from the questionnaire used by Sargeant's (2001a) study on donor defection was developed. It was unique to this study, but reflected reasons cited for lapse, and the reflection from the study on performance of participating groups. The included questions were modified to reflect the athletic fundraising orientation of the study, citing the motives identified by Gladden, et al.. (2005) and Tsiotsou (2007) as most important to athletic donors.

The survey included five sections. The first section collected demographic data on the lapsed donor, including: gender; age group; distance of residence from the institution; alumni status; total years of donation to the school's annual fund; time period of membership; and

average annual donation. Section two contained a list of reasons for inactivation; those surveyed were asked to select all of the factors from the list that played a role in their decision to inactivate their account. The third section contained a series of Likert scale questions asking the subject to rate their level of agreement on the effect that several service-related issues had on their decision to deactivate, from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The third section asked them to identify their level of agreement on the effect that factors that were external to the fundraising organization had on their decision to deactivate their account. The final section asked two additional Likert Scale questions regarding their level of overall satisfaction with their membership experience, and the likelihood that they would reactivate their membership in the future. The third question in the last section was openended, and asked for feedback regarding what the fundraising organization could do to encourage the donor to reactivate in the future. The last question was also open-ended, asking for any additional feedback on the donor's experience with the fundraising organization.

Procedures for Data Collection

A list of all inactive members was compiled from the database of donors at the institution in question. The list was pared down to those with a valid email address who have made a contribution to the institution's annual fund. The donors who met both qualifications were emailed the link to the survey website. The link to the survey, (which was hosted online at www.surveymonkey.com) was distributed via email to all inactive donors with a valid email address in the fundraising organization database. Due to the traditionally positive effect of follow-up solicitations (Sheehan, & McMillan, 1999), a follow-up email was sent after ten days, thanking those who completed the survey and encouraging those who had not yet taken the survey to do so. The link was closed after 12 days, after the goal of a 15% response rate

was reached through conferment with Dr. Adrian Sargeant (Personal Communication, March 20, 2010). The responses were then collected and analyzed.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics were calculated for each response given for section three (reasons for deactivation), section four (service quality issues), and section five (outside factors). Frequencies of each response were tabulated for each question, and percentages of response for each answer were calculated (i.e. 30 percent of those surveyed answered "Disagree" for "My donation was no longer affordable"). These answers provided raw scores regarding overall reasons for lapse, and answers given among demographic groups. Response means for each factor were calculated, where appropriate. Inferences were then drawn, and are discussed in chapter five.

A series of chi-squared relationship tests were then performed on each individual factor in the survey, for each of the criteria proposed in research question two. The tests revealed any relationships between those criteria and the factors named in each question. Additional chi-square tests were performed to see if there was a relationship between the overall level of satisfaction and likelihood of reactivation, and any specific responses given. Conclusions are presented in chapter five.

CHAPTER 4

Results

The inactive donor survey was sent to 3,910 email addresses from the athletic fundraising database at the institution in question. It was successfully delivered to 2,388 addresses. The survey link was only distributed to those with an email address associated with their account. Of the 2,388 inactive donors that received the email, 16.9% fully completed the survey (N=403). There were an additional 38 partially completed surveys. *Demographic Data*

The survey asked several demographic questions first. These included: gender, age group, alumni status, distance of residence from campus, time period of membership, and average annual donation. Males made up 70% of the pool of respondents, while women accounted for 30.0% percent. The largest age group represented in the study was 26-35 year olds (23.3%), followed closely by 46-55 year olds (22.7%) and 36-45 year olds (21.7%). Alumni composed 72.4% of the responses; non-alumni were 27.6% of the pool. The largest portion of those surveyed lived 100+ miles from campus (47.8% of the sample), followed by less than 25 miles (24.7% of the sample. The most respondents were members for 2-3 years (34.4%), and were members from 2001 to 2005 (56.7%). Finally, the greatest portion of those surveyed donated an average of \$100 - \$500 (75.6%).

Research Question 1

What reasons do donors cite for their decision to deactivate their memberships?

Following the demographic section, donors were asked to select each factor from a list that played a role in their decision to deactivate. "I could no longer afford my donation" was the most-cited reason for deactivation (selected 159 times, selected by 42.4% of respondents), followed by "Other charitable causes 'needed' my donation more (94 selected, 25.1% of respondents), "My membership didn't help me access basketball tickets" (92 selected, 24.5% of respondents) and "A family change necessitated my deactivation" (73 selected, 19.5% of the applicants). Results are illustrated in Appendix A.

Sections three and four illuminate the responses given in section two, allowing for identification of the issues that might have had the strongest effect on donor lapse. Section three asked the respondents to rate their level of agreement with a series of fourteen negatively-worded statements about service factors related to their decision to deactivate their account. Respondents were asked to rate each issue on a five-point scale, from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree."

Service-related issues from section three are represented in Appendix A, Table 3, from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Frequencies are given with percentages of response in parentheses. Averages are displayed for each factor.

The results for all but one question point to results of "Disagree" or "Neither Agree nor Disagree." The factor "Access to basketball tickets through my membership" had the largest number of those surveyed indicate that they agreed with the statement (126, 31.4%), with the highest average response (3.15). Over ten percent of respondents (41, 10.2%) indicated that they "strongly agree" with the statement. However, of 5,596 total responses for the twelve service-related items, only 758 of the responses (13.5%) fell into the "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" category. Conversely, over half (2899 responses, 51.8%) fell into the

"Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" category. Of 438 total survey responses registered, only 74 (16.8%) registered a "Strongly Agree" for any of the service-oriented items (indicating that an area of service affected their decision to deactivate), and of those 74, only 28 (6.3%) registered a "Strongly Agree" for more than one of those items.

The fourth section asked respondents to rate their level of agreement with a series of negative statements about factors outside of the control of the fundraising organization, which were related to their decision to deactivate. Statements about personal financial changes, new family developments, and dissatisfaction with the cause itself were listed in this section. As with section three, the choices were listed on a scale from "Strongly Disagree" (1) to "Strongly Agree" (5) with each of the negative statements. Response frequencies, percentages of total response for each of the seven items, and average response for each item are illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2

External Factors

External Factor External Factor	Strongly	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly	Mean
	Disagree	(2)	(3)	(4)	Agree	(Std.
	(1)				(5)	Dev.)
My donation was no	9.1%	19.5%	24.3%	32.4%	14.7%	3.24
longer affordable.	(36)	(77)	(96)	(128)	(58)	(1.190)
A family change necessitated my	21.1%	26.5%	23.4%	20.1%	8.9%	2.69
deactivation.	(83)	(104)	(92)	(79)	(35)	(1.255)
A relocation made my	28.4%	28.6%	22.9%	13.3%	6.8%	2.41
membership less useful.	(113)	(114)	(91)	(53)	(27)	(1.220)
Other charitable causes *deserved* my donation more.	11.6% (46)	24.2% (96)	32.0% (127)	24.2% (96)	8.1% (32)	2.93 (1.126)
Other charitable causes *needed* my donation more.	10.8% (43)	20.3% (81)	28.8% (115)	31.5% (126)	8.8% (35)	3.07 (1.138)
My donation didn't make	10.8%	21.3%	31.6%	31.8%	4.5%	2.98
enough of a difference.	(43)	(85)	(126)	(127)	(18)	(1.070)
My membership didn't enhance my connection with the university.	13.4% (54)	25.9% (104)	22.6% (91)	30.6% (123)	7.5% (30)	2.93 (1.183)

The responses for section four were higher overall (indicating a stronger level of agreement with the statements posed, therefore indicating that the factors listed had a greater effect on the decision to deactivate). As shown in Table 3, two of the seven items averaged over 3.0, with another three items within one tenth of one point from reaching that mark. The item "My donation was no longer affordable," scored the highest of any item in either section, with an average score of 3.24, and the high frequency of 128 respondents indicating that they "agreed" with the statement.

The final section consisted of two Likert Scale questions, and two open-ended questions. The first Likert Scale question asked donors to rate their overall satisfaction with their experience, from 1 (Very Satisfied) to 5 (Very Unsatisfied). The second question asked them to rate the likelihood that they would reactivate their membership from Very Likely (1) to Very Unlikely (2).

Donor satisfaction trended toward being more satisfied than unsatisfied. Nearly half of respondents indicated that they were "satisfied" (45.4%). The response to the reactivation item was largely neutral, but appeared to be leaning toward reactivation (39.1% not sure of re-activation, 38.1% answered "Likely" or "Very Likely").

Research Question 2

• Is there a relationship between the reasons given for lapse and membership in the following donor subsets: males and females; university alumni and non-alumni; those living at different distances from the school; those giving at different membership levels and membership for different lengths of time?

In order to answer this question, the information from sections three and four of the survey (which asked respondents to rate the level to which a series of factors, related to

service and external factors of their membership experience) were utilized. Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with a series of negatively-worded questions, from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). A series of chi-square tests were run on the results, cross-tabulating the responses for each criteria (there were 19 in all), with six of the demographic criteria posed: gender, age group, alumni status, distance of residence, years of membership, and average annual donation.

The first demographic criterion tested was gender. Of the 436 total responses to the male-female demographic question, between 392 and 402 responses were usable for this criterion. Two of 21 total factors returned statistically significant results against this group. The factor "My donation was no longer affordable" did differ by gender, $(X^24) = 24.25$, p = .005. Additionally, the factor "Relocation made my membership less useful" also differed by gender, $(X^24) = 9.975$, p = .044.

Relationships were found between gender and two factors. The first, "I could no longer afford my donation" found male respondents to be essentially split between "Disagree," "Neither Agree nor Disagree," and "Agree," with 75.2% of respondents selecting one of the three choices. Female respondents, however, were more likely to "agree" with the statement (47.5%). Results are illustrated in Appendix A, Table 7.

Additionally, the factor "Relocation made my membership less useful" also differed by gender. While a higher percentage of females selected "Strongly Disagree" than males (31.9% of females against 27.0% of males), 26.1% of females (to 17.6% of males) chose either "Agree" or "Strongly Agree." Results are shown in Appendix A, Table 8.

The second demographic criterion was the respondents' age group. There were six age groups to select, including 18-25 years old, 26-35 years old, 36-45 years old, 46-55 years

old, 56-65 years old and 65+ years old. In total, there were 437 responses to the demographic criterion item, with between 393 and 403 usable chi-square responses. None of the criteria in the study had significant results at the .05 level, but the criteria "Relocation made membership less useful" produced a nearly-significant result: $(X^220) = 30.895$, p = .057, indicating that there may be a relationship between age group and relocation as a factor for donor deactivation.

Alumni status contained two options: alumnus or non-alumnus of the university in question. There were 435 total responses to the alumni status item, and between 392 and 401 usable responses for the chi-square tests that were computed. A number of relationships were found for this demographic criterion. Alumni status and ten factors were found to have relationships, the results of which are illustrated in Appendix A, Table 10 through Appendix A, Table 19.

Although a very small percentage of alumni (9.1%) and non-alumni (6.9%) "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with the statement "the quality of customer support was unsatisfactory," a higher percentage of non-alumni selected "disagree" or "strongly disagree" (62.9%) than did alumni (54%), and approximately twice as many (percentage-wise, 36.2% versus 18.2%) selected "strongly disagree."

Statistically significant findings were also found between alumni status and "Improper appreciation shown for gifts." As with the customer service metric, non-alumni were shown to be somewhat more satisfied with the level of appreciation shown by the fundraising organization for their gifts; 68.1% of non-alumni either strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement, while 54.2% of alumni disagreed. Along the same lines, 15.5% of alumni agreed with the statement, whereas 9.5% of non-alumni agreed with the statement.

While less pronounced than the previous findings (very few respondents cited this issue as having an effect on their decision to deactivate), it appears that non-alumni were more satisfied with their experience in this regard as well. Nearly double the percentage of non-alumni (24.3%) selected "strongly disagree" than did alumni (12.8%). None of the non-alumni surveyed selected "strongly agree."

The relationship between alumni status and "My membership did not allow me proper access to football tickets" was also statistically significant. Of those alumni surveyed 48.3% "disagreed" or "strongly disagreed" with the statement, while 63% of non-alumni selected those options. Nearly double the proportion of alumni (31.9%) was neutral as non-alumni (17.2%).

Access to football parking through their membership had a statistically significant relationship with alumni status. The largest difference was in the category for "strongly agree;" more than double the percentage of non-alumni strongly disagreed with the statement (19.8%) than did alumni (9.3%).

Alumni status and the factor "My membership did not allow me proper access to basketball tickets" had a statistically significant relationship as well. Overall, the responses were similar for both, but non-alumni had a more significant number of respondents percentage-wise select "strongly disagree," while alumni had a more significant proportion of respondents select "neither agree nor disagree."

Alumni status and the factor "A relocation made my membership less useful produced somewhat unique results. As with the prior factors, a larger percentage of non-alumni "strongly disagreed" with the statement (39.7%) than did alumni (23.9%). In

addition, over three-times the percentage of alumni selected "agree" than did non-alumni (16.8% and 5.2%, respectively).

Alumni status and the factor "other causes deserved my donation more" had a significant relationship. These results are similar to the results from Appendix A, Table 17, in that a much higher proportion of non-alumni selected "strongly disagree," while a significantly higher portion of alumni selected "agree."

Alumni status and the factor "other causes 'needed' my donation more" also had a statistically significant relationship. Non-alumni selected "Strongly Disagree" at over twice the rate of alumni respondents (17.2% versus 8.2%), and university alumni selected "Agree" at over twice the rate of non-alumni, 55.5% to 20.7%.

The relationship between alumni status and the factor "My donation did not make enough of a difference" is nearly identical to the relationship illustrated in Appendix A, Table 19. Non-alumni answered "Strongly Disagree" at over twice the rate of alumni (17.2% to 8.2%), and alumni answered "Agree" at a much higher rate than did non-alumni (35.6% and 22.4%, respectively.

The next demographic criterion examined was distance of residence from the university in question. There were four options for respondents to select: less than 25 miles, 26-50 miles, 51-100 miles, and 100+ miles. There were 437 responses to the demographic question, and between 394 and 403 usable responses for the factors listed in sections three and four. Perhaps predictably, "Unsatisfactory access to football parking" (X^2 12) = 25.5, p = .013, and "Not enough special events in my area" (X^2 12) = 37.27, p = .005, were both found to have statistically significant relationships with distance of residence from campus.

Distance of residence was found to have a statistically significant relationship with the factor "My membership didn't allow me proper access to football parking." Several numbers come up, highlighting this relationship. The greatest frequency of those living within 25 miles of campus said that they neither agreed nor disagreed (44.0%), and along those lines, similar proportions chose "Disagree" (23.0%) and "Agree" (19.0%). The largest anomaly was among those who lived 26-50 miles from campus, as 42.2% selected "Agree," over 20% more than any other group. Those living between 51 and 100 miles from campus were split between "Disagree" and "Neither Agree nor Disagree" (30.8% apiece). Appendix A, Table 20 illustrates these findings.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, a relationship was also found between Distance of residence and "Not enough events held in my area." The greatest percentage of those who "disagreed" was found within 25 miles of campus; the greatest percentage of those who selected "Agree" and "Strongly Agree" were lived 100+ miles from campus. Appendix A, Table 21 illustrates these findings.

Total years of membership had six possible responses: 1 year, 2-3 years, 4-6 years, 7-10 years, 11-20 years, and 21+ years. There were 430 total responses to the demographic item, and between 388 and 398 usable responses for chi-square purposes. There were two criteria found to have a relationship with years of membership; "Relocation made my membership less useful" $(X^220) = 35.45$, p = .018 and "Other causes deserved my donation more" $(X^220) = 32.40$, p = .04.

While the breakdown of years of membership into six groups likely divided the respondent pool too extensively, two significant relationships were still identified. The first relationship was with the factor "Relocation made my membership less useful." Donors

display early on that relocation is not a factor (61.6% of 1 year donors and 61.0% of 2-3 year donors selected either "Strongly Disagree" or "Disagree), at 4-6 years, relocation becomes a relative factor (20.1% "agree"), and as the relationship goes on it becomes less of a factor.

Appendix A, Table 22 displays these results.

The second factor that displayed a statistically significant relationship with Years of membership was "Other causes 'deserved' my donation more." To the naked eye, however, the responses seem to be somewhat nebulous. Donors who have been members for 1 year "strongly disagreed" with the statement (18.3%), "agreed" (25.0%), and "neither agreed nor disagreed" (30.0%). This trend toward the middle continues through the rest of the table (31.9% of the sample "neither agrees nor disagrees"). Results are shown in Appendix A, Table 23.

The final criterion examined was average annual donation. There were six options available for respondents to select: \$100-\$500 (\$100 is the minimum donation to become an active member); \$501-\$1,000; \$1,001-\$2,500; \$2,501-\$5,000; \$5,001-\$15,246 (\$15,246 is the current cost of the highest annual fund level); and greater than \$15,246. There were 427 total responses to this criterion, and between 387 and 397 usable chi-square responses.

Although several factors were found to have significant relationships with average annual donation, due to the lack of an acceptable spread of responses (86.5% of respondents answered either "\$100-\$500" or "\$501-\$1,000"), each was invalidated.

Research Question 3

 Is there a relationship between the overall level of satisfaction and any of the demographic groups listed? Between likelihood of reactivation and those demographic groups? Research question three is an extension of research question two, looking at each of the demographic groups in the study and identifying any relationships between them and overall satisfaction with their donor experience, and the likelihood that they might renew their membership in the future.

There were 401 total responses to the Overall Satisfaction item. Of those responses, between 395 and 401 of the responses were used for the chi-square test. A relationship was found between overall satisfaction and the alumni status demographic criterion (X^24) = 11.20, p = .024.

Overall satisfaction and alumni status had a statistically significant relationship that mirrors the relationships between alumni status and the other factors in the study. Non-alumni cited themselves as being "very satisfied" more often than alumni (23.3% versus 12.4%), and alumni declared themselves proportionally "neither satisfied nor dissatisfied" more often than non-alumni (33.6% to 20.7%). Results are shown in Appendix A, Table 24.

There were 402 total responses to the "Likelihood of Reactivation" item, and of those, between 396 and 402 of the responses were used for the chi-square tests relating the item to the demographic criteria listed. The test found a relationship between likelihood of reactivationl and age group (X^220) = 75.572, p = .005. The results of the tests are shown in Appendix A, Table 25.

A statistically significant relationship was found between Age Group and Likelihood of renewal. The proportion of those most likely to renew is highest among 18-25 years old (48.0%); the highest proportion of donors who aren't sure is between 36 and 55 years old (36-45 years old, 44.3%; 46-55 years old, 45.1%); and the highest proportion of those who

will most likely not renew is found among 56-65 year olds (11.9%) and those 65 and older (25.7%). These results are displayed in Appendix A, Table 26.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion

There are a number of implications for the results of this study. Understanding the reasons why donors choose to stop giving to athletic departments has important financial ramifications to the fundraising organization (Sargeant, 2001a; Reichheld & Sasser, 2001). Since it has been shown that the donor base at each university has a unique set of motives (Hall & Mahony, 1997; Mahony, et al., 2003; Gray, 2009), it is important for each athletic fundraising organization to study its own donor base, learning where any potential issues may have formed. The survey instrument used for this study offers a good starting point for individual athletic fundraising organizations to do just that. This chapter will discuss conclusions from the data presented in Chapter 4, present recommendations and offer ideas for future research.

Demographic Data

As reported in Chapter 4, the age range cited most often by respondents was 26-35, selected 102 times (23.30%), followed closely by 46-55 years old (22.70%) and 36-45 years old (21.70%). Overall, 68% of respondents were between 26 and 55 years old. When applied to a one through six scale (18-25 = 1, 26-35 = 2, 36-45 = 3, etc.), the mean age was a 3.46, or right between 36-45 and 46-55 (standard deviation = 1.41). While slightly ambiguous, this mean is right below the average found by Sargeant (2001a) of 55 years old for lapsed donors, as well as the average found by Mahony, et al. (2003) of 56.5 years old for active donors.

Both the range and lower mean are directly in line with Nathan and Hallam's (2009) finding that, "very generally speaking, the younger the donor, the more fickle their attitude to charity relationships," and that "younger people were more at ease with going online to cancel a direct debit" (p. 11). Additionally, Sargeant and Jay (2003) found that lapsed donors are seven years younger than active donors on average.

As discussed in Chapter 4, 72.4% of those surveyed were alumni of the university. While there is no comparable data for alumni status of lapsed athletic donors, Mahony, et al. (2003) found 57.4%, 63.4%, and 88.5% alumni rates among active athletic donors at three Division IA institutions. Stinson and Howard (2004) studied donor behavior at the University of Oregon from 1994 to 2002; of 19,063 donors to both the department of athletics and the university, 74.7% (14,223) were alumni of the university. However, when "donors giving total gift to academics" (pg. 134) are removed, the percentage of alumni donors (giving to athletics or both athletics and academics – they were not separated in the current study) falls to 59.2%. Without the percentage breakdown of active alumni and non-alumni for the university studied it is difficult to draw any definitive conclusions from this study for these numbers. But a topic for future research could ask whether there is a connection between alumni status and loyalty to the athletic donor organization – are alumni donors lost at a higher rate than non-alumni, or vice versa?

The criteria for the "Distance of Residence from Campus" options were set based on major cities from the university, and the donor breakdown around those cities. However, nearly 50% of respondents live 100+ miles from the university (47.8%), which may indicate that the fundraising organization should turn some of their focus toward benefits that can be enjoyed without needing to be near campus. This could include basic deliverables, such as

decals, calendars, lapel pins, or publications. It could also include events, such as organized game watching parties. A survey respondent also recommends appealing to the donor's philanthropic side:

"Consider a new marketing approach for ... people unable to make it to many games – for those people, market membership in the 'club' as less of a way to get benefits/perks and instead market it as an organization in need of support for the necessary and good work it does." (Anonymous Survey Response, March 15, 2010)

Nathan and Hallam (2009) state that "you should not even begin to think of donors as on-board until they have given at least three cash gifts." The results of this study are in line with this finding, as 49.7% of respondents had been members of the fundraising organization for either "1" or "2-3" years. The fundraising organization might consider a transitioning process to push those donors through this time period, involving separate (or additional) communications or benefits to get their donors through the "on-boarding" process. This might be connected to the responses for average donation, as the majority of respondents (75.6%) averaged \$100 to \$500 for their annual donation. As identified by Sargeant (2001a), donors and customers that continue their relationship with the organization will (generally speaking) upgrade their donations and give in new ways (in addition to decreased educational costs and increases in word-of-mouth advertising from the donor). It behooves the fundraising organization to keep donors in the fold beyond the first few years.

Reasons for Lapse

In section two of the survey, respondents were asked to choose all of the reasons for lapse that applied to their decision to deactivate their account. If a reason was not included in the list, the "other" option could be selected, and the respondent could write in the reason within the provided text box. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the highest frequency of responses was "I could no longer afford my donation," with 41.4% of respondents identifying it as a factor in their decision to lapse. The states of the economy and (specifically) the stock market have been shown to have a significant effect on giving to higher education (Drezner, 2006), and the downturn since 2001 has had a significant effect on giving to all philanthropic organizations (p. 297).

The literature on non-profit philanthropy supports the progression from the most-cited reason to the second-ranked reason, "Other charitable causes *needed* my donation more" (selected by 86 respondents, 25.1% of the overall total). Nathan and Hallam (2009) describe a worsening financial situation as "a tipping point" toward pulling gifts from certain charities. When asked to name the charities from which they would have the most difficulty cutting ties, those with children as beneficiaries, those funding medical research relating to the health of a loved one, or those that they had supported for a long time were all mentioned (p. 5). As one respondent describes: "It is ... hard to justify donating money to Rams Club when other organizations such as March of Dimes and St. Judes need it more" (Anonymous Survey Respondent, March 14, 2010). Another respondent states: "Everything was ok. Both my parents have been diagnosed with cancer. Now spending all my 'charity' contributions toward cancer research" (Anonymous Survey Respondent, March 12, 2010).

The third reason cited is specific to the athletic department studied. Mahony, et al. (2003) found that priority seating for football and men's basketball were very important as a motivating factor for donors, and that it displays one of the main differences between athletic fundraising and fundraising for other non-profits: "people are giving money in order to receive seats, good seats, or better seats" (p. 20). Depending on the institution, priority seating for basketball and/or football are extremely important; in this case, it was a key factor (cited by 86 respondents, 25.1% of the total subject pool). A respondent describes their feelings on this factor:

The loss of conference basketball tickets at my donor level was disappointing and led to my [deactivation]. Additionally, the tickets were so high up; it was not worth attending the games. The quality of the tickets and the available games were the two most important factors. (Anonymous Survey Participant, March 15, 2010)

At times, a donation to an athletic department is based more on reciprocity than altruism (Mahoney, et al., 2003), and in this case, basketball tickets are an extremely important part of the donor experience. In addition to being the third-most selected reason for inactivation, access to basketball tickets and/or parking was mentioned in thirty-eight separate open-ended responses.

The next two most-cited reasons were both external to the fundraising organization, related to changes in the donor's personal situation necessitating the deactivation of their account. "A family change necessitated my deactivation" (68 respondents selected, 19.8%) spoke to family illnesses, new children, or a son or daughter heading to college, creating strain on the personal finances of the donor and necessitating a reduction in charitable giving (or extraneous spending related to athletic tickets). In order to counteract this movement, the

donors in the fold and "active," or offer to contact the donor after a period of time in order to reactivate. "A relocation made my membership less useful" (57 responses, 16.6%) relates to the results of the "Distance of residence from campus" criterion (47.8% of respondents live 100+ miles from campus) and speaks to the previously-mentioned idea that the organization might focus on offering more in the way of deliverable benefits to increase the connection between the organization and donors located outside of the area. When a donor moves to an area outside the range of regular game-attendance, the organization should provide incentives and opportunities to stay involved and connected to the athletic department. One survey respondent remarked in to the "Other" category of reasons for lapse:

I also realized around the time that I stopped [my donations] that I would not be moving back ... for at least 20 years and there is no incentive for me to protect seat rights etc. as I can only make it ... for a handful of games a year and I get great seats from friends in the area ... an incentive that worked to the benefit of someone in my situation might help induce similarly situated people who are on the fence (Anonymous Survey Respondent, March 15, 2010).

The donor's inability to enjoy tickets and parking as a benefit of membership has kept them from renewing their membership; as mentioned, there might be other benefits to offer donors in this situation.

As a previously-quoted survey respondent recommended, the organization might also appeal to the distance donors' philanthropic side. Along those same philanthropic lines, the next three most-cited reasons, "other charitable causes *deserved* my donation more," (54 respondents selected, 15.7%) and "my donation didn't make enough of a difference" (49

selected, 14.3%) were findings that, while certainly not applicable in name alone, could be improved through the theories discussed by the "identifiable victim effect." The theory states that society (as a whole) is willing to spend more to save a single, identifiable, victim than larger groups of "statistical" victims (Jenni & Loewenstein, 1997). Make no mistake, collegiate student-athletes are in no way "victims," but presenting in-depth stories of individual student-athletes might help donors create stronger connections with those who are receiving their donations.

An additional finding from this section worth discussing, "I didn't feel an enhanced connection to the university" (54 respondents selected, 15.7%) could be also addressed through the principals of relationship marketing. Arnett, German, and Hunt (2003) recommend creating a sense of increased identity salience between the donor and the organization in order to create a stronger bond between the two. The authors posit that an individual has several "self-definitions" within their lives which are arranged in a hierarchy, and those that are most prominent will be more likely to affect behavior (p. 89). Presented as important to the success of relationship marketing when "(1) one party to the exchange is an individual and (2) the individual receives significant social benefits from the relationship" (p. 91), the authors cite participation on the part of donors or prospective donors and maintained or increased prestige of the organization, as key drivers toward identity salience and ultimately, a stronger connection between the organization and the donor (p. 101).

Each of the previous findings, as well as the findings to be discussed hereafter, must all be viewed under the lens of the responses provided in the "overall satisfaction" item in the final section of the survey. The highest percentage of those surveyed (45.4%) indicated that they were "satisfied" with their membership experience. This is slightly higher than Sargeant

(2001a) found for satisfied inactive donors (40.6%). The majority of respondents were either "satisfied" or "very satisfied" (60.9%), and less than one-tenth of inactive donors surveyed (9.4%) indicated that they were "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied." Overall, the inactive donor base appears to be satisfied with their experience. Although, as Jones and Sasser (1995) and Sargeant (2001a; 2001b) discovered, some of those donors might have remained active if they had been converted into "very satisfied" members.

Service Quality and External Issues / Chi-Squares

After selecting each of their reasons for lapse, survey respondents were asked to rate a series of 14 negatively-worded factors relating to the level of service exhibited by the fundraising organization, followed by 7 additional negatively-worded factors relating to external (beyond the direct control of the fundraising organization, on a scale from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). A series of chi-square tests were then conducted on the responses, to identify any relationships between those responses and the demographic criteria collected in section one.

Gender

Gender was found to have a statistically significant relationship with two factors: "My donation was no longer affordable" and "Relocation made my membership less useful." Female respondents "agreed" that their donation was no longer affordable at nearly twice the rate of men (47.5% against 25.9%), and men "disagreed" with the statement at over twice the rate of women (23.4% versus 10.0%). These results were mirrored in the crosstab between Gender and "Relocation made my membership less useful." This illustrates a clear difference in viewpoint between male and female inactive donors. Female donors may not see the same value in donating to the organization that is seen by males; increasing perceived value by

organizing additional membership events geared toward females, or marketing specific benefits to females may be beneficial to the organization.

Age Group

The "Age Group" demographic criteria did not have a strictly significant relationship with any of the factors examined. However, there was a *nearly* significant relationship between age group and "Relocation made my membership less useful." Twenty percent of 18-25 year olds and 26-35 year olds surveyed "agreed" with the statement, over double the rate of respondents 46 years old and above. This might point to the transient nature of younger members, in addition to the lack of a strong connection having been formed between the fundraising organization and younger members (as compared to older members – a higher number of 26-35 year olds selected "Strongly Disagree" than selected "Agree"). It appears that a larger sample of donors is needed to make a truly significant finding in this category.

Alumni Status

Statistically significant relationships were found between alumni status and a number of factors. "The quality of customer support was unsatisfactory," "Improper appreciation was shown for my gifts," "I received too few electronic communications," Access to football tickets through my membership was unsatisfactory," "Access to football parking through my membership was unsatisfactory," "Access to basketball tickets through my membership was unsatisfactory," "Relocation made my membership less useful," "Other causes *deserved* my donation more," and "My donation didn't make enough of a difference" all had significant relationships to alumni status at the .05 alpha level.

Interestingly enough, the relationships between alumni status and each of these categories produced very similar results. Table 16 and Table 17 are good examples of this. Table 16, which illustrates the relationship between alumni status and the factor "My membership did not allow me proper access to basketball tickets," shows that, percentagewise, non-alumni "strongly disagree" with that statement at over twice the rate of alumni (17.2% to 7.4%). Alumni were oriented more toward neutrality (33.6% selected "neither agree nor disagree") than non-alumni (25.9%). This trend extends to Table 17. Non-alumni selected "Strongly Disagree" at a higher rate (39.7%) than did alumni (23.9%), and alumni selected "Agree" at a higher rate (16.8%) than non-alumni (5.2%). Of the ten factors that had a significant relationship with the alumni status of respondents, a higher proportion of nonalumni selected "Strongly Disagree" in each of the ten categories. The difference was no less than 7.9 percentage points, and up to 18 percentage points, with an average difference of 11.4% (SD = 3.18), and a higher proportion of alumni selected "Agree" in nine out of ten categories (with a much wider range; as little as 0.8%, and as much as 34.8%). This trend is reflected in the significant relationship between Alumni Status and Overall Satisfaction, as nearly twice the proportion of non-alumni indicated that they were "very satisfied" (23.3%) than did alumni (12.4%). Overall, non-alumni seem to be trending toward being more forgiving and satisfied within this donor base.

Distance of Residence

It may be of no surprise that significant relationships were found between Distance of Residence and "My membership didn't allow me proper access to football parking," as well as "There were not enough membership events held in my area." Donors found within 25 miles of campus were largely indifferent (44.0% selected "Neither Agree nor Disagree"),

while those within 26 to 50 miles "agreed" (42.2%), and those from 51-100 miles (30.8%) and outside 100 miles (45.6%) were largely indifferent. This may indicate that donors are either satisfied with their access to parking, or they are choosing not to come to football games from outside a certain radius of campus. Perhaps predictably as well, donors living 100+ miles away from campus seemed to have the strongest feeling that the lack of events in their area were a factor in their decision to deactivate (33.9% selected either "Agree" or "Strongly Agree").

Years of Membership

While two factors displayed statistically significant relationships with "Years of Membership," it is difficult to draw any inferences from the sample because it was split into so many categories. However, some trends do appear. Relocation appears to start out as less of a factor, as 43.3% of members for one year selected "Strongly Disagree" and 32.6% of members for 2-3 years selected "Disagree." It then seems to become more of a factor at 4-6 years; 20.1% selected "Agree," and 9.1% selected "Strongly Agree," which is the highest percentage group in that category. A high percentage of those having been members for 7-10 years and 11-20 years were indifferent, selecting "Neither Agree nor Disagree" at 38.5% and 28.6%, respectively. The majority of inactive donors who had been members for 11-20 years and 21+ years selected "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree," with 61.9% of each group selecting one of the two. Further research into average age at each of these steps would be a good way of illuminating this data to draw better conclusions (younger members would likely be more transient and less committed, as described by Nathan and Hallam (2009), but there does appear to be a trend between years of membership and the acceptability of movement.

The second factor that had a relationship with "Years of Membership," "Other causes 'deserved' my donation more," found similar, albeit slightly more nebulous trends. Thirty percent (30.0%) of those who had been members for 2-3 years and 32.5% of those who had been members for 4-6 years "disagreed" with the statement, while 44.2% of those who had been members for 7-10 years "agreed" with the statement. As previously described, the sample size may be too small to draw concrete conclusions and no data was collected on age at the time but perhaps there is a connection between years of membership and maturation into and out of interest in funding for athletics.

Likelihood of Renewal

One factor, "Age Group" was found to have a significant relationship with "Likelihood of Renewal," and the relationship may be expected. As previously discussed with the "Age Group" factor, a larger sample size may need to be collected to draw any definitive conclusions, but the beginnings of a trend were shown in Table 27. Nearly half of inactive donors (48.0%) from 18-25 said they were "very likely" to renew. A similar percentage of 36-45 year olds and 46-55 year olds (44.3% and 45.1%) said they "were not sure at this time." However, 40.3% of 56-65 year olds and 54.3% of those 65-plus years old stated they were either "unlikely" or "very unlikely" to renew their memberships. While bequests to charities have been shown to begin around age 49 (Brown, 2003), if the donor has not been brought back into the fold by age 55, it appears that it would be futile to attempt to draw them back after that age. Therefore, it might behoove the fundraising organization to gear its re-activation activities toward those aged 55 and under.

Conclusions

As previously mentioned, all of the results and conclusions must be viewed under the proper scope: the inactive athletic donors at the university studied were generally satisfied (or had no specific problems with) their experience as a donor. This is clearly evidenced by three-quarters of the inactive donors responding that they were either "Satisfied" or "Neither Satisfied nor Unsatisfied" with their membership experience. Forty-two percent of donors indicated that they could no longer afford their donation, which was easily the most-cited reason for deactivation of their membership; a factor that is likely outside of the control of the fundraising organization. Beyond that, there may be an opportunity for growth; while a very satisfied donor may simply choosing to downgrade their membership to a lower giving level, a member who is satisfied and the member deactivating their account altogether, perhaps sacrificing significant future value to the organization (Sargeant, 2001c).

The literature has shown that a stronger connection between a donor and a non-profit, in much the same way as a commercial organization and their customer, the more likely the donor will be to continue that relationship (Jones & Sasser, 1995; Mittal & Lassar, 1998; Reichheld & Sasser, 1990; Sargeant, 2001a; 2001b; 2001c; 2008; Sargeant & Woodliffe, 2005; Nathan & Hallam, 2009). That connection can be strengthened through stories of individuals; in this case, creating a stronger connection between student-athletes and members by telling their stories in an in-depth fashion. A number of respondents to the survey felt as though their membership was not as worthwhile when they moved far from the university itself and lost the ability to attend games; reaching out to those donors with increased deliverables (perhaps a "distance" membership package) might entice them to continue their membership. Many donors deactivated after their third year of membership;

creating an "on-boarding" process through the first three years where donors are taught about the history of the giving organization and the athletic department might be advantageous (perhaps at yearly intervals). Specific deliverables such as lapel pins, decals, or It could be done through email and be relatively inexpensive.

If the donor does choose to deactivate, creating a lower, less expensive, level of membership might be an option in order to keep them active. A more simple option as recommended by Nathan and Hallam (2009) would be to reach out to inactive donors by mail or email after deactivation with a survey instrument similar to the one used for this study, and offer to contact the donor at a later date either by email or phone to discuss their situation further. Donors with a high lifetime value might be worthy of periodic phone calls by a representative of the organization (Sargeant, 2001c).

Recommendations for Future Research

There are several opportunities for future research based on this study. The survey instrument is capable of being modified based on the requirements of individual athletic fundraising organization. While each athletic donor base has been shown to have unique motivating factors (Mahony, et al., 2003; Gray, 2009), there is a significant amount of room to increase the overall body of knowledge on athletic donor lapse.

Additionally, there are a number of ways that the responses from this pool of donors could be illuminated further. The primary opportunity would be to compare the demographic data and overall satisfaction of the inactive donors from the subject pool in this survey to that of the active members of the same organization. The factors in the survey could also be modified slightly to reflect the overall importance of each factor to the membership experience of active donors. Household income and religious affiliation could also be added

as demographic criteria, as Sargeant (2001a) identified that those affiliated with a religion were much more likely to be lapsers.

There were a number of factors that registered statistically significant relationships with alumni status, including an apparent trend between alumni status and satisfaction with different factors and the experience as a whole. A study could be undertaken among active (or both active and lapsed donors) to dig further, and find out if alumni athletic donors have different expectations from non-alumni.

An investigation into the average length of membership and any specific factors might be pertinent as well. A high percentage of respondents to this survey were members for one-to-three years; further investigation could be conducted into the "buying-in" process, to discover if there are any connections between length of membership and commitment. Along those same lines, investigation could be made into the connection between age and commitment to athletic fundraising initiatives, and whether or not there is a difference in commitment between members for different time periods at different age levels.

APPENDIX A:

Table 3

Service-related Issues

Service-relatea Issues	Strongly				Strongly	Mean
Service-related factor	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Agree	(Std.
242 1100 101000 100001	C	(2)	(3)	(4)	_	· ·
	(1)				(5)	Dev.)
The quality of customer	23.6% (95)	33.0%	34.7%	6.9%	1.7% (7)	2.30
support provided by X		(133)	(140)	(28)		(.963)
was unsatisfactory.						
The size of donations	15.9%	33.3%	36.6%	13.2%	1.0%	2.50
requested by X was	(64)	(134)	(147)	(53)	(4)	(.946)
inappropriate.						
X did not show proper	18.2%	39.8%	26.4%	13.7%	2.0%	2.42
appreciation for my	(73)	(160)	(106)	(55)	(8)	(1.001)
gift(s).						
I received *too many*	21.4%	46.4%	29.7%	2.5%	0.0%	2.13
electronic	(86)	(186)	(119)	(10)	(0)	(.771)
communications.						
I received *too few*	16.1%	38.4%	39.4%	4.8%	1.3% (5)	2.37
electronic comms.	(75)	(153)	(157)	(19)		(.852)

Table 3

α	•	D .	1 . 1	7
10	rvico	- K0	nton	Issues

Service-Related Issues						
Service-related factor	Strongly	D:	NI 1	A	Strongly	Mean
	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Agree	(Std.
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Day
	(1)				(5)	Dev.)
I received *too few*	15.7% (62)	39.1%	39.8%	4.3%	1.0%	2.36
traditional mailings.		(154)	(157)	(17)	(4)	(.833)
X did not take proper	19.0%	41.1%	37.1%	2.3%	0.5% (2)	2.24
consideration of my	(76)	(164)	(148)	(9)		(.800)
comm. preferences.						
The quality of my member	19.5% (78)	44.9%	22.8%	12.3%	0.5% (2)	2.29
benefits was		(179)	(91)	(49)		(.936)
unsatisfactory.						
Access to football tickets	15.8% (63)	36.8%	27.8%	16.5%	3.3%	2.54
through my membership		(147)	(111)	(66)	(13)	(1.044)
was unsatisfactory.						
Access to football parking	12.3% (49)	23.6%	39.6%	20.6%	4.0%	2.80
through my membership		(94)	(158)	(82)	(16)	(1.028)
was unsatisfactory.						

Table 3

Service-Related Issues

Strongly				Strongly	Mean
	Disagree	Neutral	Agree		
Disagree	(2)	(2)	(4)	Agree	(Std.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	David
(1)				(5)	Dev.)
	27.6%	48.9%	8.3%		2.56
13.8% (55)	(110)	(195)	(33)	1.5% (6)	(.883)
	28.3%	38.8%	17.0%	4.8%	2.76
11.0% (44)	(113)	(155)	(68)	(19)	(1.015)
	Disagree (1) 13.8% (55)	Disagree Disagree (2) (1) 27.6% 13.8% (55) (110) 28.3%	Disagree Neutral (2) (3) (1) 27.6% 48.9% 13.8% (55) (110) (195) 28.3% 38.8%	Disagree Neutral Agree (2) (3) (4) (1) 27.6% 48.9% 8.3% 13.8% (55) (110) (195) (33) 28.3% 38.8% 17.0%	Disagree Neutral Agree Agree (2) (3) (4) (5) 27.6% 48.9% 8.3% 13.8% (55) (110) (195) (33) 1.5% (6) 28.3% 38.8% 17.0% 4.8%

Reasons for Deactivation

Reason	Frequency	Percentage of
		Responses
I could no longer afford my donation	159	42.4%
Other charitable causes *needed* my donation		
more	94	25.1%
My membership didn't help me access		
basketball tickets	92	24.5%
A family change necessitated my deactivation	73	19.5%
A relocation made my membership less useful	63	16.8%
Other charitable causes *deserved* my donation		
more	56	14.9%
I didn't feel an enhanced connection to the		
university	61	16.3%
My donation didn't make enough of a difference	51	13.6%
My membership didn't help me access football		
tickets	36	9.6%
Lack of appreciation shown for my gifts	33	8.8%
Unsatisfactory member benefits (decals, lapel pins,	,	
calendars)	27	7.2%

Reasons for Deactivation

Reasons for Deactivation	T.	D
Reason	Frequency	Percentage of
		Responses
X's special events weren't held nearby	31	8.3%
Poor customer support	14	3.7%
X's special events weren't satisfactory	13	3.5%
I received too few emails	10	2.7%
I received too few traditional ("snail") mailings	5	1.3%
Inappropriate donation requests	3	0.8%
I received too many traditional ("snail") mailings	2	0.5%
I wasn't able to choose the number of		
emails/mailings	1	0.3%
I received too many emails	1	0.3%
Other	135	
(Child denied admission [9], Direction of	_	
college athletics [6], Disagreement with		
firing of coach [5])		

Overall Satisfaction

	Very Satisfied	Satisfied /	Neutral	Dissatisfied	Very	Mean
	/ Likely to	Likely to		/ Unlikely	Dissatisfied	(SD)
	Re-Activate	Re-		to Re-	/ Unlikely	
		Activate		Activate	to Re-	
					Activate	
Overall		45.4%	29.7%			2.34
Satisfaction	15.5% (62)	(182)	(119)	8.2% (33)	1.2% (5)	(.881)

Table 6

Likelihood of Re-Activation

	Very	Likely	Not Sure	Unlikely	Very	Mean
	Likely				Unlikely	(SD)
Likelihood of	18.9%	19.2%	39.1%	15.7%	7.2%	2.73
Re-Activation	(76)	(77)	(157)	(63)	(29)	(1.151)

Table 7

Gender versus "I could no longer afford my donation."

Gender	Str.	Disagree	Agree nor	Agree	Str. Agree	Total
	Disagree		Disagree			
Male	30	64	71 (25.9%)	71 (25.9%)	38 (13.9%)	274
	(10.9%)	(23.4%)				(69.5%)
Female	6 (5%)	12	25 (20.8%)	57 (47.5%)	20 (16.67%)	120
		(10%)				(30.5%)
Total	36 (9.1%)	76	96 (24.4%)	128	58 (14.7%)	394
		(19.3%)		(32.5%)		
Chi-squar	re Results:	N = 394	df = 4	val = 24.25	P -value = 0.044	

Table 8

Gender versus "Relocation made my membership less useful."

Gender	Str.	Disagree	Agree nor	Agree	Str. Agree	Tot
	Disagree		Disagree			al
Male	75 (27.0%)	86	68 (24.5%)	29 (10.4%)	20 (7.2%)	278
		(31.9%)				
Female	38	27	23 (19.3%)	24 (20.2%)	7 (5.9%)	119
	(31.9%)	(22.7%)				
Total	113	113	91 (22.3%)	53 (13.4%)	27 (6.8%)	397
	(28.5%)	(28.5%)				
Chi-squa	are Results:	N = 397	df = 4	val = 9.795	P-value = 0.044	

Age Group versus "Relocation made my membership less useful"

Age	Str.	Disagree	Agree	Agree	Str. Agree	Total
Group	Disagree		nor			
			Disagree			
18-25 yrs.	6 (24.0%)	7	4	5 (20.0%)	3 (12.0%)	25
		(28.0%)	(16.0%)			
26-35 yrs.	26	17	22	19 (20.0%)	11 (11.6%)	95
	(27.4%)	(18.0%)	(23.2%)			
36-45 yrs.	25	28	15	12 (13.6%)	8 (9.1%)	88
	(28.4%)	(31.2%)	(17.0%)			
46-55 yrs.	27	24	29	9 (9.9%)	2 (2.2%)	91
	(29.7%)	(23.4%)	(31.2%)			
56-65 yrs.	20	23	14	5 (7.9%)	1 (1.6%)	63
	(31.7%)	(36.5%)	(22.2%)			
65+ yrs.	9 (25%)	15	7	3 (8.3%)	2 (5.6%)	36
		(41.2%)	(19.44%)			
Total	113	114	91	53 (13.3%)	27 (6.8%)	398
	(28.4%)	(28.6%)	(22.9%)			
Chi-square I	Results:	N = 398	df = 20	val = 30.895	<i>P-value</i> = 0.057	

Alumni Status versus "The quality of customer support was unsatisfactory"

Alumni	Str.	Disagree	Agree nor	Agree	Str. Agree	Total
Status	Disagree		Disagree			
Alumni	52	102	105	22 (7.7%)	4 (1.4%)	285
	(18.2%)	(35.8%)	(36.8%)			
Non-	42	31	35 (30.2%)	5 (4.3%)	3 (2.6%)	116
Alumni	(36.2%)	(26.7%)				
Total	94	133	140	27 (6.7%)	7 (1.7%)	401
	(23.4%)	(33.2%)	(34.9%)			
Chi-square Results:		N = 401	df = 4	val = 16.523	P-value = 0.002	

Alumni Status versus "Improper appreciation shown for gifts."

Alumni	Str.	Disagree	Agree nor	Agree	Str. Agree	Total
Status	Disagree		Disagree			
		112	81			
Alumni	42 (14.8%)	(39.4%)	(28.5%)	44 (15.5%)	5 (1.8%)	284
Non-		48	24			
Alumni	31 (26.7%)	(41.4%)	(20.7%)	11 (9.5%)	2 (1.7%)	116
		160	105			
Total	73 (18.3%)	(40%)	(26.3%)	55 (13.8%)	7 (1.8%)	400
Chi-square Results:		N = 400	df = 4	val = 10.595	P-value = 0.032	

Table 12

Alumni status versus "I received too few electronic communications"

Alumni sta	itus versus	1 receivea too	jew electron	ic communicati	ons.	
Alumni	Str.	Disagree	Agree nor	Agree	Str. Agree	Total
Status	Disagree		Disagree	-	-	
Alumni	36	110 (39.1%)	115	15 (5.3%)	5 (1.8%)	281
	(12.8%)		(40.9%)			
Non-	28	43 (37.4%)	40	4 (3.5%)	0 (0.0%)	115
		, , ,		, ,	, ,	
Alumni	(24.3)		(34.8%)			
Total	64	153 (38.6%)	155	19 (4.8%)	5 (1.3%)	396
	(16.1%)		(29.0%)			
Chi-squa Results:	re	N = 396	df = 4	val = 10.206	P-value = 0.037	

Table 13

Alumni sta Alumni	Str.	Disagree	Agree nor	Agree	Str. Agree	Total
Status	Disagree		Disagree			
Alumni	36	100	90	48 (17.0%)	8 (2.8%)	282
	(12.8%)	(35.5%)	(31.9%)			
Non-	27	46	20	18 (15.5%)	5 (4.3%)	116
Alumni	(23.3%)	(39.7%)	(17.2%)			
Total	63	146	110	66 (16.6%)	13 (3.3%)	398
	(15.8%)	(36.7%)	(27.6%)			
Chi-square Results:		N = 398	df = 4	val = 13.191	P-value = 0.01	

Table 14

Alumni status versus "My membership did not allow me proper access to football parking." Alumni Disagree Agree nor Agree Str. Agree Status Disagree Disagree 56 (19.9%) 10 (3.6%) Alumni 26 (9.3%) 69 **120** 281 (24.6%) (42.7%) Non-38 23 25 25 (21.6%) 5 (4.3%) 116 Alumni (19.8%) (21.6%) (32.8%)Total 49 94 (8.1%) 158 81 (20.4%) 15 (3.8%) 397 (12.3%)(39.8%) Chi-square Results: N = 397df = 4val = 10.022P-value = .040

Table 15

Alumni status versus "My membership did not allow me proper access to basketball tickets."

Alumni	Str.	Disagree	Agree nor	Agree	Str. Agree	Total
Status	Disagree		Disagree			
Alumni	21 (7.4%)	49	95 (33.6%)	90 (31.8%)	28 (9.9%)	283
		(17.3%)				
Non-	20	18	30 (25.9%)	36 (31.0%)	12 (10.3%)	116
Alumni	(17.2%)	(15.5%)				
Total	41	67	125 (31.3%)	126	40 (10.0%)	399
	(10.3%)	(16.8%)		(31.6%)		
Chi-square Results:		N = 399	df = 4	val = 9.473	P-value = .050	

Table 16

Alumni status versus "A relocation made my membership less useful"

Alumni	Str.	Disagree	Agree nor	Agree	Str. Agree	Total
Status	Disagree		Disagree			
Alumni	67	82	63 (22.5%)	47 (16.8%)	21 (7.5%)	280
	(23.9%)	(29.3%)				
Non-	46	30	28 (24.1%)	6 (5.2%)	6 (5.2%)	116
Alumni	(39.7%)	(25.9%)				
Total	113	112	91 (23.0%)	53 (13.4%)	27 (6.8%)	396
	(28.5%)	(28.2%)				
Chi-squa	re Results:	N = 396	df = 4	val = 16.462	P-value = .002	

Table 17

Alumni status versus "Other causes 'deserved' my donation more."

Atummi Sic	aius versus	Other causes	aeservea m	y aonaiion more	€.	
Alumni	Str.	Disagree	Agree nor	Agree	Str. Agree	Total
Status	Disagree		Disagree			
Alumni	26 (9.3%)	64	88 (31.5%)	78 (28.0%)	23 (8.2%)	279
		(22.9%)				
Non-	20	31	39 (33.6%)	17 (14.7%)	9 (7.8%)	116
Alumni	(17.2%)	(26.7%)				
Total	46	95	127	95 (24.1%)	32 (8.1%)	395
	(11.6%)	(24.0%)	(32.2%)			
Chi-squa	re Results:	N = 395	df = 4	val = 11.066	P-value = .026	

Table 18

Alumni status versus "Other causes 'needed' my donation more."

	atus versus Oti			Agree	~ .	
Alum.	Str. Disagree	Disagree	Agree nor	Str. Agree	Total	
Status			Disagree			
Alum.	23 (8.2%)	52	80 (28.4%)	101	26 (9.2%)	282
	, ,		,		, ,	
		(18.4%)		(55.5%)		
	//		27 (20 21)	- 1 (- 0 - 1)	0 (= 0)	
Non-	20 (17.2%)	28	35 (30.2%)	24 (20.7%)	9 (7.8%)	116
Alum.		(24.1%)				
riidiii.		(2 111 / 0)				
Total	43 (10.8%)	80	115 (28.9%)	125 (31.4%)	35 (8.8%)	398
	- (,		- (/	- (,	(
		(20.1%)				
Chi-squa	are Results:	N = 398	df = 4	val = 13.887	P-value = .008	
1						

Table 19

Alumni status versus "My donation did not make enough of a difference."

Alumni	Str.	Disagree	Agree nor	Agree	Str. Agree	Total
Status	Disagree		Disagree			
Alumni	23 (8.2%)	58	89 (31.7%)	100	11 (3.9%)	281
		(20.6%)		(35.6%)		
Non-	20 (17.2%)	26	37 (31.9%)	26 (22.4%)	7 (6.0%)	116
Alumni		(22.4%)				
Total	43 (10.8%)	84	126 (31.7%)	126 (31.7%)	18 (4.5%)	397
		(21.2%)				
Chi-squa	re Results:	N = 397	df = 4	val = 11.644	P-value = $.02$	

Dist of residence vs "My membership didn't allow me proper access to football parking"

Table 20

Distance	Str.	Disagree	Agree nor	Agree	Str. Agree	Total
of Res.	Disagree		Disagree			
>25 mi.	10	23	44 (44.0%)	19 (19.0%)	4 (4.0%)	100
	(10.0%)	(23.0%)				
26-50	4 (8.9%)	11	8 (17.8%)	19	3 (6.7%)	45
mi.		(24.4%)		(42.2%)		
51-100	11	20	20 (30.8%)	12 (18.5%)	2 (3.1%)	65
mi.	(16.9%)	(30.8%)				
100+	24	40	86 (45.6%)	32 (16.9%)	7 (3.7%)	189
mi.	(12.7%)	(21.1%)				
Total	49	94	158 (39.6%)	82 (20.6%)	82 (20.6%)	399
	(12.3%)	(23.6%)				
Chi-squar	e Results:	N = 399	df = 12	val = 25.50	P-value = .013	

Distance of residence vs. "There were not enough membership events held in my area."

Table 21

Distance of	residence vs	. "There wer	e not enough me	embership eve	nts held in my are	a. ''
Distance	Str.	Disagree	Agree nor	Agree	Str. Agree	Total
of Res.	Disagree		Disagree			
>25 mi.	14	38	40 (40.0%)	6 (6.0%)	1 (1.0%)	100
	(14.0%)	(38.0%)				
26-50 mi.	7	12	20 (44.4%)	5 (11.1%)	1 (2.2%)	45
	(15.6%)	(26.7%)				
51-100	9	17	29 (44.6%)	9 (13.8%)	1 (1.5%)	65
mi.	(13.8%)	(26.1%)				
100+ mi.	14	46	66 (34.9%)	48 (25.4%)	16 (8.5%)	189
	(7.4%)	(24.3%)				
Total	44	113	155 (38.8%)	68 (17.0%)	19 (4.8%)	399
	(11.0%)	(28.3%)				
Chi-square	Results:	N = 399	df = 12	$val = 37.\overline{27}$	P-value = $.005$	

Vears of membership versus "Relocation made my membership less useful"

Table 22

Yrs of	Str.	Disagree	Agree nor	Agree	Str. Agree	Total
Membership	Disagree		Disagree			
1 year	26	11	10 (16.7%)	8 (13.3%)	5 (8.3%)	60
	(43.3%)	(18.3%)				
2-3 yrs	40	46	26 (18.4%)	19 (13.5%)	10 (7.1%)	141
	(28.4%)	(32.6%)				
4-6 yrs	22	17	15 (19.5%)	16 (20.1%)	7 (9.1%)	77
	(28.6%)	(22.1%)				
7-10 yrs	10	14	20 (38.5%)	4 (7.7%)	4 (7.7%)	52
	(19.2%)	(26.9%)				
11-20 yrs	12	14	12 (28.6%)	3 (7.1%)	1 (2.4%)	42
	(28.6%)	(33.3%)				
21+ yrs	2 (9.5%)	11	5 (23.8%)	3 (14.3%)	0 (0.0%)	21
		(52.4%)				
Total	112	113	88 (22.4%)	53 (13.5%)	27 (6.9%)	393
	(28.5%)	(28.8%)				
Chi-square Res	sults:	N = 393	df = 20	val = 35.448	P-value = .018	

Table 23

Years of membership versus "Other causes 'deserved' my donation more."

Years of membe	rsnip versus		uses aeservea	my aonaiion		
Years of	Str.	Disagree	Agree nor	Agree	Str. Agree	Total
Membership	Disagree		Disagree			
1 year	11	9	18 (30.0%)	15 (25.0%)	7 (11.7%)	60
	(18.3%)	(15.0%)				
2-3 yrs	13	40	47 (34.1%)	28 (20.3%)	10 (7.2%)	138
	(9.4%)	(30.0%)				
4-6 yrs	12	25	22 (28.6%)	14 (18.2%)	4 (5.2%)	77
	(15.6%)	(32.5%)				
7-10 yrs	4 (7.7%)	6	15 (28.8%)	23 (44.2%)	4 (7.7%)	52
		(11.5%)				
11-20 yrs	5	11	13 (30.2%)	8 (18.6%)	6 (14.0%)	43
	(11.6%)	(25.6%)				
21+ yrs	1 (4.5%)	4	10 (45.5%)	6 (27.3%)	1 (4.5%)	22
		(18.2%)				
Total	46	95	125	94 (24.0%)	32 (8.2%)	392
	(11.7%)	(24.2%)	(31.9%)			
Chi-square Res	ults:	N = 392	df = 20	val = 32.298	P-value = .040	

Table 24 Overall satisfaction versus Alumni Status

Alumni	Very	Satisfied	Satisfied nor	Dissatisfied	Very	Total
Status	Satisfied		Dissatisfied		Dissatisfied	
Alumnus	35	127	95 (33.6%)	22 (7.8%)	4 (1.4%)	283
	(12.4%)	(44.9%)				
Non-	27	54	24 (20.7%)	10 (8.6%)	1 (0.9%)	116
Alumnus	(23.3%)	(46.6%)				
Total	62	181	119 (29.8%)	32 (8.0%)	5 (1.3%)	399
	(15.5%)	(45.4%)				
Chi-square	Results:	N = 399	df = 4	val = 11.20	P-value = .024	

Table 25 Chi-Square Results: Likelihood of Reactivation and Demographic Criteria

	N	df	Value	Sig. (2-sided)
Gender	401	4	4.469	0.346
Age Group	402	20	75.572	0.005
Alumni Status	400	4	2.454	0.653
Distance of Residence	402	12	6.787	0.871
Years of Membership	397	20	36.47	0.014*
Average Annual Donation	396	20	27.544	0.121

Total responses to Likelihood of Reactivation item: 402 *7 cells (23.3%) have expected count less than 5

Table 26

Age group versus Likelihood of renewal.

Age Group	Very	Likely	Not sure	Unlikely	Very Unlikely	Total
	Likely					
18-25 yrs	12	4	8	1 (4.0%)	0 (0.0%)	25
	(48.0%)	(16.0%)	(32.0%)			
26-35 yrs	27	21	36	9 (9.4%)	3 (3.1%)	96
	(28.1%)	(21.9%)	(37.5%)			
36-45 yrs	21	16	39	10 (11.4%)	2 (2.3%)	88
	(23.9%)	(18.2%)	(44.3%)			
46-55 yrs	10	19	41	14 (15.4%)	7 (7.7%)	91
	(11.0%)	(20.1%)	(45.1%)			
56-65 yrs	4 (6.0%)	12	24	19 (28.4%)	8 (11.9%)	67
		(17.9%)	(35.8%)			
65+ yrs	2 (5.7%)	5	9	10 (28.6%)	9 (25.7%)	35
		(14.3%)	(25.7%)			
Total	76	77	157	63 (15.7%)	29 (7.2%)	402
	(18.9%)	(19.2%)	(39.1%)			
Chi-square R	esults:	N = 402	df = 20	val = 75.57	P-value = .005	

REFERENCES

- Arnett, D.B., & German, S.D. (2003). The Identity Salience Model of Relationship Marketing Success: The Case of Nonprofit Marketing. *The Journal of Marketing*, 67(2), 89-105.
- Barnes, J. (1994). Close to the customer: but is it really a relationship? *Journal of Marketing Management*, 10, 561-570.
- Barnes, M., & McCarville, R. (2005). Patron or Philanthropist: Charitable Giving to a Performance-Based Leisure Provider. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*. 23(2), 110-134.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2007). *Generosity and Philanthropy: A Literature Review*. Accessed via geveninnederland.nl, 2/7/10.
- Berry, Leonard L. (1983). Relationship Marketing, in Berry, L.L., Shostack, G.L., Upah, G.D. (Eds) *Emerging Perspectives on Services Marketing*, pp. 25-28. American Marketing Association, Chicago, IL.
- Brown, D.W. (2003). What research tells us about planned giving. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 9(1), 86-95.
- Drezner, N.D. (2006). Recessions and Tax-Cuts: Economic Cycles' Impact on Educational Giving, Philanthropy, and Higher Education. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 6(4), 289-305.
- Fulks, Daniel L. 2004-2006 NCAA Revenues and Expenses of Division I Intercollegiate Athletic Programs Report. The National Collegiate Athletic Association, Indianapolis, IN. Accessed via neaapublications.com, 11/3/09.
- Garbarino, E., & Johnson, M. S. (1999). The Different Roles of Satisfaction, Trust, and Commitment in Customer Relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 63(2), 70-87.
- Gladden, J.M., Mahony, D.F., & Apostolopoulou, A. (2005). Toward a Better Understanding of College Athletic Donors: What Are the Primary Motives? *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 14, 18-30.
- Gray, P.M. (2009). *An examination of annual athletic fund donor motivations*. Unpublished manuscript, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC.

- Gronroos, C. (1994). From Marketing Mix to Relationship Marketing: Towards a Paradigm Shift in Marketing. *Management Decision*, 32(2), 4-20.
- Hall, J.S. & Mahony, D.F. (1997). Factors affecting methods used by annual giving programs: A qualitative study of NCAA Division I athletic departments. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*,6(3), 21-30.
- Hager, M.A., Wilson, S., Pollak, T.H., & Rooney, P.M. (2003). Response Rates for Mail Surveys of Nonprofit Organizations: A Review and Empirical Test. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 32(2), 252-267.
- Harker, M.J. (1999). Relationship marketing defined? An examination of current relationship marketing definitions. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 17(1), 13-20.
- Homans, G.C. (1961). *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms*. Harcourt, Brace, & World, New York.
- Jenni, K.E., & Loewenstein, G. (1997). Explaining the "Identifiable Victim Effect." Journal of Risk and Uncertainty, 14(3), 235-237.
- Johnson, G.K. Football Attendance Continues to Rise Amid Economic Uncertainty. The NCAA News, February 11, 2009. Accessed 11/3/09.
- Jones, T.O. & Sasser Jr., W.E. (1995). Why Satisfied Customers Defect. *Harvard Business Review*, 73, 88-99.
- Kaplowitz, Hadlock, & Levine (2004). A Comparison of Web and Mail Survey Response Rates. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 68(1), 94-101.
- MacMillan, K., Money, K., Money, A., & Downing, S. (2005). Relationship marketing in the not-for-profit sector: an extension and application of the commitment-trust theory. *Journal of Business Research*, 58, 806-818.
- Mahony, D.F., Gladden, J.M., & Funk, D.C. (2003). Examining athletic donors at NCAA Division I institutions. *International Sports Journal*, 7(1), 9-27.
- McCarville, R.E., & Copeland, R.P. (1994). Understanding Sport Sponsorship Through Exchange Theory. *Journal of Sport Management*, 8, 102-114.
- Mittal, B., & Lassar, W. (1998). Why do customers switch? The dynamics of satisfaction versus loyalty. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 12(3), 177-194.
- Morgan, R.M., & Hunt, S.D. (1994). The Commitment-Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 20-38.
- Nathan, A. & Hallam, L. (2009). *The Fundraiser's Guide to Lapsers*. Bluefrog Ltd, London.

- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., & Berry, L.L. (1988). SERVQUAL: a multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-37.
- Raphael, M. (1991). Stop Mailing to Everyone. Direct Marketing, 53(10), 53-54.
- Ravald, A., & Gronroos, C. (1996). The value concept and relationship marketing. *European Journal of Marketing*, 30(2), 19-30.
- Reichheld, F.F., & Sasser Jr., W.E. (1990). Zero Defections: Quality Comes to Services. *Harvard Business Review*, 68, 105-111.
- Sargeant, A. (2001a). Managing donor defection: Why should donors stop giving? *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, 32, 59-74.
- Sargeant, A. (2001b). Relationship Fundraising: How to Keep Donors Loyal. *Notprofit Management & Leadership*, 12(2), 177-192.
- Sargeant, A. (2001c). Using Donor Lifetime Value to Inform Fundraising Strategy. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 12(1), 25-38.
- Sargeant, A. (2008). *Donor Retention: What Do We Know and What Can We Do About It?* Unpublished manuscript, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.
- Sargeant, A., & Jay, E. (2003). Reasons for lapse: The case of face-to-face donors. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 9(2), 171-182.
- Sargeant, A., & Woodliffe, L. (2005). The Antecedents of Donor Commitment to Voluntary Organizations. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 16(1), 61-78.
- Sheehan, K.B., & McMillan, S.J. (1999). Response Variation in Email Surveys: An Exploration. *Journal of Advertising Research*, 39, 45-54.
- Smith, R.A. (1988). Sports and Freedom: The Rise of Big-Time College Athletics. Oxford University Press, New York, NY, pp. 13.
- Stinson, J.L. & Howard, D.R. (2004). Scoreboards vs. Mortarboards: Major Donor Behavior and Intercollegiate Athletics. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 13(2), 129-140.
- Tsiotsou, R. (2007). An empirically based typology of intercollegiate athletic donors: High and low motivation scenarios. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing*, 15(2), 79-92.

Wells, D.E., Southall, R.M., Stotlar, D., & Mundform, D.J. (2005). Factors Related to Annual Fund-Raising Contributions from Individual Donors to NCAA Division 1-A Institutions. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 6(1), 3-10.