RECENT GRADUATE DONOR MOTIVATIONS

Allison Jill Bass

A thesis submitted to the faculty at 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
2014

Approved by:

Barbara Osborne

Erianne Weight

Nicholas Fulton

Nels Popp

ABSTRACT

Allison Bass: Recent Graduate Donor Motivations
(Under the direction of Barbara Osborne)

The purpose of this study was to examine what motivates recent graduates to give to athletic department fundraising campaigns. Recent graduates involved alumni who had graduated from the institution within the past five years, and were contacted via email to participate in an online survey. Data was obtained involving demographic information, giving levels, family history of athletic giving, and motivations for giving to an athletic fundraising campaign.

Motives to be tested were determined through prior research of motives for charitable and athletic contributions. Using independent t-tests, significant motivations were found for recent graduates to give to athletics. There were no differences in motivations or giving levels between males and females. Motivations were statistically significant between recent graduates with a family history of giving and those without a family history of giving, but giving levels were not significantly different between the two groups.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

In the current climate of college athletics, it is ever so important to develop strong donor ties to supporting collegiate athletics. Escalating expenses found in scholarships, facility planning and renovations have all caused strain on financial budgets of athletic departments. Additionally, "due to declining federal and state funding, the bulk of universities and their athletic programs have become dependent on private support from their alumni and other boosters (Ko, Rhee, Walker & Lee, 2013, p.2). With increasing support needed from outside private sources, it is imperative that athletic development offices work to build relationships to loyal donors, and especially those with strong university ties such as recent graduates.

"Understanding the motives underpinning donor willingness to give is important to conceptualize and operationalize what drives these individuals to support their favorite university" (Ko et al., 2005, p.16). If an athletic development officer realizes what individual recent graduates deem important in their relationship to their alma mater, the better means of cultivation may be executed. Importantly, "If charities are to succeed …they need to find ways of improving satisfaction and deepening the bonds that exist between them and their supporters" (Sargeant, 2001, p.188). Personalizing communication based on individual donor's motivations can maximize donor cultivation of recent graduates.

Alumni of a university already have a personal connection to the university, with memories of their experiences at the institution fresh in their minds. By determining current recent graduate donors' motivations, a link could be found to their view of their relationship with

the university. "Alumni who identify with their alma mater are expected to maintain relationship with the institution, participate in acts such as charitable giving that support the alma mater, and, therefore, reinforce and strengthen their identity with the university" (Stinson & Howard, 2007, p.237). If a person were positively connected to their university, especially athletics, the more likely the alumnus would be a potential donor to the athletic department. "Exposure to and involvement with intercollegiate athletics programs might also be part of alumni's university experience and contribute to the university-related identification" (Stinson & Howard, 2007, p.241). Recognizing that many recent graduates have a strong university-related identity as they begin to develop their careers, they can become an influential donor base.

Most importantly, as revealed in most marketing theory, "it costs up to five times as much to recruit a new customer as to do business with an existing one" (Sargeant, 2001, p.178). So, by developing positive donor relations with recent graduates can lead to loyal relationship fundraising. Yet, many athletic fundraising offices fail to maximize their relationships of recent graduate potential donors. Few departments have strong communication plans and well developed programs to attract recent graduates to participate in athletic giving. Simply, discovering the motives behind current recent graduate donors may exposure ways to best communicate and cultivate a larger base of recent graduates for athletic giving.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine motives for giving to an athletic development office's annual fund by recent graduates at Division I NCAA institutions.

Research Questions

Based on a review of literature concerning the topic, the following research questions were formed:

RQ1: What are the primary motives for alumni who have graduated within five years to contribute to athletic fundraising organizations?

RQ 2: Are there significant differences in the motives for donating among recent graduates between males and females?

RQ 3: Are there significant differences in the motives for donating among recent graduates based on family history of athletic giving?

RQ 4: Are there significant differences in giving levels between males and females?

RQ 5: Are there significant differences in the giving levels of recent graduates based on family history of athletic giving?

Assumptions

1. The research methods used in this study were valid and reliable.

2. The subjects responded in an honest manner and recorded accurately.

3. The sample determined in this study is large enough to generalize findings recent graduate annual fund donors of Division I institutions.

Delimitations:

1. Only studying recent graduates does not lend this study to generalize findings to larger group of annual fund donors.

2. Only studying recent graduates does not lend this study to generalize findings to larger group of annual fund donors who are not alumni.

3. Only studying Division I programs limits the findings to Division I schools, where findings at Division II and Division II may be different.

Limitations:

1. Not all Division I institutions were surveyed.

2. The study was limited to those subjects who voluntarily participated in answering the survey.

3. Respondents may not have been truthful in answering questions.

4. The respondent may not have identified all motives important to them.

5. Respondents may not have been representative of all recent graduates.

6. Differing Division I institutions may have different structures and benefits associated with a recent graduate program within their annual fund that could influence motivations.

7. Only those with a valid email address were included in the sample.

Definition of Terms:

1. Annual Fund: donations contributed on an annual basis

2. Athletic Development: The practice of fundraising for non-profit athletic departments' support of student-athlete scholarships, and capital projects.

3. Division I: The highest level of collegiate athletic competition designated by the NCAA.

4. Donor: a person who contributes to an athletic charitable organization

5. Recent Graduate: An alumnus of a specified institution of higher learning that has graduated within five calendar years from the current date.

6. Young Alumni: a recent graduate of a specified institution within five years of their graduation date in this calendar year.

7. Olympic Sports: A sport sponsored by the varsity athletic department that is not Men's Basketball, Women's Basketball or Football

Significance of Study

This study is significant because it highlights the reasoning behind recent graduate donor motivations. It is important to those in the field to build strong relationships with recent graduates in order to develop a long lasting relationship of lifetime giving from the recent graduate as they progress through their individual careers. Additionally, it is valuable for athletic development offices to have a strong annual fund campaign. The annual fund is usually used to support student-athlete scholarships. Building loyalty with recent graduates can help athletic development officers define communication campaigns and build program benefits that would attract recent graduates.

By determining what motivates current recent graduates to donate, practitioners may be able to use the knowledge to manipulate marketing materials to attract a larger base of recent graduates and seek participation in their annual fund. This study should aid in maximizing contributions to athletic charitable organizations from recent graduates. This study can help athletic charitable organizations better understand their recent graduate donor base.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

Athletic Service and Loyalty

In a study focused on determining the service aspect of athletics and its relations with donor perceptions, Shapiro argues that the level of quality service is of utmost importance with customer satisfaction, especially with the non-profit sector (2010). As institutions of higher education become more dependent on voluntary support from outside contributors, service perceptions can be valuable to building a strong athletic fundraising base.

Service quality was analyzed within college athletics, and measured to understand its impact on donor satisfaction. Additionally, service quality was examined to discover how, if at all, service quality influenced donor behaviors. A survey was distributed to current athletic department donors at a variety of schools. The survey had components such as: demographics, responsiveness, feedback, and effectiveness (Shapiro, 2010, p.156). Responsiveness refers to personal attention paid to donors. Effectiveness refers to donor "confidence that the organization cares about its stakeholders" (Shapiro, 2010, p.156). Lastly, feedback refers to the ability of the department to communicate, especially with donors (Shapiro, 2010, p.156).

Shapiro found that "service quality explained a significant portion of variability in donor satisfaction (Shapiro, 2010, p.161). Though it was found not to have a significant relationship between service quality and donor behavior. Shapiro reasons that athletic success, and tangible benefits such as tickets, may have a stronger effect on donor behavior than service quality (Shapiro, 2010, p.161). The researcher supports broadening donor education so that donors "understand the importance of their contribution, regardless of the amount of the contribution"

(Shapiro, 2010, p.163). The selection criteria were then distributed to athletic support groups for validation of donor motivations.

Donor Motivation Theories

In order to create a foundation to explain motives for young alumni donors, several theories were examined pertaining to general giving motivations. A study conducted by Thomas Mann (2007) outlined various theories to provide a theoretical framework for practitioners as to why donors choose to give to collegiate fundraising campaigns. Mann sought to research "which theoretical perspectives most accurately reflect our donor's motives for giving" (2007, p. 35). Multiple theories were described in this study.

The first theory utilized by Mann is charitable giving theory. Charitable giving theory is comprised of three components: altruism, reciprocity, and direct benefits (Mann, 2007). This theory claims that the "first motivation for giving states that individual have altruistic preferences to their alma mater" (Mann, 2007, p. 38). As far as reciprocity in this theory, "the belief that the motivation for an individual to make a gift is based on the potential return of some benefit" (2007, p. 38). The third facet of the charitable giving theory, direct benefits, is explained in terms of donor motivations as "the advantages to growing or improving the brand value and reputation of their college and any resulting benefits that my come to them as a result" (Mann, 2007, p.38). The charitable giving theory suggests those who give to colleges due so out of a personal feeling of obligation and pride for the continued success of their college.

The second theory addressed in Mann's study is the theory of organizational identification. Mann states that in this theory, constituents "who feel a strong connection to the organization will celebrate the successes that the organization achieves but also will be

concerned when a weakness of failure is exposed" (2007, p. 39). According to this theory, a donor feels accomplished if a collegiate development office reaches its fundraising goals. The donor feels compelled by the success of the organization it contributes to.

Additionally, the social identification theory is a motive outlined by Mann's study. According to the study, this theory "suggests individuals have a tendency to order themselves into a variety of social groups which includes organizational membership, gender, and age" (Mann, 2007, p.40). Donors utilize social interaction when they define themselves in relation to certain groups. By self-assigning group membership, the donor may feel that the qualities of the organization are reflected in themselves. This might break down into a donor having interest in a certain campaign, such as the College of Arts and Sciences, a construction project, or a specific sport. Typically, social identification happens if the donor graduated from that specific college or played that sport.

Economic theory is another facet explored in Mann's study to discover why someone contributes to higher education. Economic theory claims "the utility that the recipients or beneficiaries of the gift experience is what directly influences the donor to make a gift" (Mann, 2007, p. 41). In this instance, donors would seek achieve a mutual satisfaction of needs. The donor realizes that those receiving the benefits of the gift are in great need, especially if they personally received a similar gift in the past. A donor gives to resolve the need for resources.

Mann's study also includes the services-philanthropic theory. This theory encompasses that each person's "behavioral intent is influenced by three primary constructs (1) service value, (2) service quality, and (3) satisfaction" (Mann, 2007, p. 42). When alumni feel they receive quality service from the organization, the more likely the person is willing to contribute to fund raising campaigns. The benefits may range from philanthropic to tangible, but the donor

calculates the receivables to the size of their gift. If the donor believes the organization is of high quality, the more satisfied the donor becomes with their contribution.

Finally, the last theory in Mann's study is the relationship-marketing theory. This framework states that donors see their giving in terms of quality of benefits. Donors are on a continuum, ranging from no emotional connection to the university to a strong connection. Relationships may either be transactional, or highly relational, depending on the donor's connection to the organization (Mann, 2007, p. 37). In turn, the better communication the fundraising department has with its donors, the stronger the connection to the fundraising organization.

Overall, Mann's study outlines a way for fundraising offices to provide a theoretical basis for why their donors give. Since many fundraising organizations do not have a theoretical base for their campaigns, Mann suggests ways to pinpoint why constituents donate to certain causes. All of the theories listed in Mann's study can be utilized to develop a strategic solicitation plan for fundraising offices.

Measuring Donor Motivations in Athletic Fundraising

There have been multiple studies in which a device to test motivations for athletic fundraising have been developed. In a study performed by Staurowsky, Parkhouse, and Sachs (1996), a list of selection criteria representing various aspects of donor behaviors were selected to be tested. Curiosity, or an interest displayed by the donors in an event, was chosen as a motivation theory (Staurowsky et.al, 1996). Additionally, a philanthropic motive in which an individual wishes to "benefit others to gain a feeling of personal worth" was included in the motivation list (Staurowsky et al., 1996, p.267). Also, power was listed as selection criteria for

motives in which a person is motivated by the desire to exert influence over others. Social

motivations were also included in the selection criteria in the study. Social motivations are

defined as "deriving from opportunities for social interaction and approval" (Staurowsky et al.,

1996, p.267). Finally, success was included as a motivation factor that dealt with a person's

connection to extrinsic rewards, or prestige or status. " (Staurowsky et al., 1996, p.267).

The study found that these six factors created a comprehensive tool in which to measure

athletic fundraising donor motivations. The significant social reasons for donor motivations were

"the personal enjoyment people derive from watching games, the interest donors have in visiting

college campuses, renewing friendships, the desires of donors to meet coaches and players, and

the opportunity for donors to obtain tickets" (Staurowsky et al., 1996, p.270).

The success factor yielded two distinct categories of motivations. Success 1 entailed

loyalty to the school and a vested interest in continuing the prestige of the program and

university (Staurowsky et al., 1996, p.271). Success 1 focuses on future achievements of the

school's athletic programs and prestige. Success 2 motivations aligned with the importance of

athletic success to the state in which they lived and honored past successes of the athletic

department. Success 2 involves more nostalgic tradition and past points of references

(Staurowsky et al., 1996, p.272).

Philanthropic motives were also found to be significant to donor motivations.

Motivations based on the need to "offer assistance to needy student-athletes and to provide

scholarship aid." were found to be significant to the study (Staurowsky et al., 1996, p.273).

Altruism of a donor is a factor in these criteria.

Benefits were also found to be significant to donor motivations. "Accessibility to tickets

for business purposes, specialty items, newsletters, and tax benefits" were all significant

motivations" (Staurowsky et al., 1996, p.273). Curiosity was the only factor not found to be a significant source of donor motivations.

Verner, Hecht, and Fansler (1998) also developed an instrument to assess donor motivations within athletics. The study's purpose was to find a "sound theory of human motivation to athletics donor behavior, and then to validate a practical instrument for donor motivation assessment" (Verner et al., 1998, p.124). Social cognition theory provided the theoretical foundation. The social cognitive theory purports that "people are not driven by inner forces controlled by external stimuli, but are shaped by a model of triadic reciprocally in which behavior, cognition, and other personal factors and the environment interact" (Verner et al., 1998, p.124). This theory is based on the idea that the reason one gives is individualized.

A combination of synthesized literature and interviews with athletic donors generated a list of recurring themes of motivations. The list included social affiliation/acceptance, power, loyalty, philanthropy, material benefit, public recognition, curiosity, change, create, connect, commit, collaborate, celebrate, know and how gift is to be used (Verner et al., 1998, p.128). Social affiliation/acceptance refers to social interactions and bonding with others through athletics. Power is described as having influence, whether it is formal or informal, over other's behavior and interests. Loyalty is described as allegiant to the program. Philanthropy refers to the effort to promote welfare, in this case toward student athletes. Material benefits include a tangible gain, such as tickets or parking. Public recognition is the appreciation expressed by the receiving organization amongst others. Curiosity refers to the inquisitive need for information. Change concerns the ability to alter something that exists, or change the status quo. To establish a relationship refers to the motivation to connect. Commitment concerns the affiliation one has with the organization at hand. Collaboration refers to working in partnerships to achieve a goal

through cooperation. Celebration refers to the entertainment value of motivation. Finally, the concept of knowing how a gift is to be used refers to the idea that the gift will be designated to accomplish a specific goal (Verner et al., 1998).

An expert panel, a field test, a think tank, and a pilot study were utilized to test the validity of the list of motivation themes. Twelve specific factors were found significant to assess donor motivations in athletics. Participating in secondary events, public recognition, giving of time and energy, inside information, priority treatment, philanthropy, collaboration, create, change, curiosity, power, and loyalty were all determined to be useful in assessment. (Verner et al., 1998, p.132) Ultimately, this study provides a reliable instrument for determining motives amongst athletic fund contributors.

In 2013, a paper was released by Ko, Rhae, Walker, and Lee, refining previous research on instrumentation to measure donor motivations. Using existence, relatedness, and growth needs as its basis, this study worked to improve measurement of athletic donor behavior. Growth needs consisted of philanthropy, vicarious achievement, and demonstration of commitment (Ko et al., 2013, p.5). Relatedness needs consisted of affiliation and social interaction (Ko et al., 2013, p.5). Finally, Existence needs focused on public recognition, power, and tangible benefits (Ko et al., 2013, p.5). Overall, this study found that these criteria were viable to measure donor behavior. All of these studies can be synthesized to create a useful tool to measure recent graduate donor motivations.

Previous Studies on Donor Motivations for Athletic Giving

Apart from previous studies concerned with donor motivation for contributing to colleges and universities as a whole, there are a few studies that look into why constituents donate to collegiate athletic fundraising departments. For instance, in a study that examined athletic donors at Division I institutions conducted by Mahoney, Gladden, and Funk (2003), the researchers sought to develop a scale for assessing the motivational factors important to athletic donors. This research also focused on the relative importance of each factor to the athletic donors. The study built on previous research into athletic giving, which focused on benefits, tradition, current success, future success, and community pride (Mahoney, Gladden, & Funk, 2003, p.11). This study also included a nostalgia and psychological commitment factor to their study (Mahoney, Gladden, & Funk, 2003, p.11).

To gauge the importance of factors for athletic donors, the researchers focused on twelve items: "(a) philanthropic, (b) social, (c) escape, (d) priority seating for football, (e) priority seating for basketball, (f) business enhancement, (g) success I- tradition (h) success II- current, (i) success III-future, (j) success IV-community pride, (k) nostalgia, and (l) psychological commitment" (Mahoney, Gladden, & Funk, 2003, p.11). Ultimately, in this study, it was found that success related factors, such as current success, future success, tradition, and community pride, as well as priority seating for football and basketball were most important to donors of Division I athletic fundraising departments (Mahoney, Gladden, & Funk, 2003, p.16). Psychological commitment, as in having an allegiance and loyalty to the university, was also found to be an important factor (Mahoney, Gladden, & Funk, 2003, p.11). Escape, business enhancement, and philanthropic motives were not as significant to donors as success based factors.

Due to priority seating being shown as significantly important to athletic donors over philanthropic ideals, Mahoney, Gladden, and Funk claim that for some donors at the Division I level, "the donation is based more on reciprocity than altruistic feelings and may simply be seen as a requirement for good seats" (Mahoney, Gladden, & Funk, 2003, p.20). According to this study, donor motivation is based on tangible receivables such as better seats for revenue producing sports, rather than philanthropic ideals. The researchers do acknowledge that even though their findings indicate that donors focus on seating for sports like football and men's basketball, development offices may be failing to cultivate potential donors that may have an interest in other sports offered at the specific institution (Mahoney, Gladden, & Funk, 2003, p.20-21). Overall, this study emphasizes that continuing and/or improving the success of the institution they choose to support motivates most athletic donors. Most importantly, contributors to Division I athletics are concerned with improving seat locations for sports like football and men's basketball (Mahoney, Gladden, & Funk, 2003, p.21).

A study that evaluates annual contributions to Division I athletics as well as donor motivations was performed by Wells, Southall, Stotlar, and Mundform in 2005. In this study, the research focused on three main areas involving athletic donor motivations, "(1) investigating donor motivations, (2) studying the "spillover effect", and (3) analyzing factors that affect annual contributions to athletic departments' fund raising programs" (Wells et. al, 2005, p.4-5). The spillover effect refers to studying the impact of athletic success on contributions to the university's athletic department's annual fundraising campaign (Wells et. al, 2005, p.5). Institutional characteristics, demographics, organizational fund-raising characteristics, and institutional athletic success characteristics were used to test annual fund success, and discover

why people make annual contributions to Division I athletic departments (Wells et. al, 2005, p.6).

This study focuses on attributes of a development office that make donors contribute annually. This study found a variety of factors influence a donor's actions when contributing to Division I athletics annual funds. The director of development's fundraising experience (in years), number of years a full-time fund raising position has been designated and the sale of season tickets had the most significant relationship with annual fund raising contributions (Wells et. al, 2005, p.8). This study also acknowledges that differences in the structure and history of success in an athletic department may affect donor motivations (Wells et. al, 2005, p.9). For example, schools with historic success in basketball, the success of annual contributions or the motives of that specific school's donors might not be associated with the football program (Wells et. al, 2005, p.9). Overall, this study finds that the structure of the development office, and being a season ticket holder influence donors to contribute to successful annual fund campaigns in Division I athletics.

Additionally, in a study performed by Gladden, Mahony, and Apostoloupoulou, research was conducted to determine "which motivations are most prevalent among donors" (2005, p.18). This study outlines the challenges to successful athletic fundraising campaigns. Economic downturns of the economy, competition amongst charitable organizations, a lack of donors making a regular habit to educational giving, and the structure of athletic fundraising basis of priority points for seating purposes (Gladden et al., 2005). Donor motives were classified in the following categories: affiliation, altruist, commitment, communitarian, dynast, entertainment, family needs, good cause, help student-athletes, membership benefits, repayer, socialite, support and improve the athletic program, support and promotion of the college/university, ticket-

oriented and miscellaneous (Gladden et al., 2005). Responses from participants in the study's survey were then classified into these categories. Most respondents had multiple reasons as to why they contributed to athletic fundraising efforts.

It was found that the "desire to support and improve the athletic program" was the most reported motivational factor (Gladden et al., 2005, p.25). Success and support based motivations were found to be present in donors giving to athletic campaigns. Additional motivations that were reported with high response rates in the study were a desire to help student-athletes and ticket-oriented benefits. Ultimately, this study found that there are "a significant number of donors who feel a very strong emotional connection and/or commitment to the university, athletics program, or a particular team" (Gladden et al., 2005, p.28). This study focuses on a wide range of movies from respondents that be implemented when researching recent graduate donors.

These studies on motivations of donors to give to athletic fundraising have given insight into what types of motives may be important when researching recent graduate contributors. Focusing on direct benefits, loyalty, social implications, economic decisions and altruism are worth investigating as to why recent graduates participate in athletic fundraising. Using these studies as a basis to develop instrumentation will benefit my research.

Previous Studies on Alumni and Giving Habits

While there are multiple studies on donor motivations for giving to Division I athletics and alumni to higher education, there is a lack of comprehensive knowledge about specifics of young alumni and their motivations to donate to Division I athletic campaigns. There are a few studies that have been conducted that explore alumni donor motivations to higher education, and

ones specifically determined to examine young alumni motivations. One such previous study performed by Monks (2005) looks into alumni giving to higher education. Though not specifically geared toward young alumni, it does provide insight on giving behaviors of alumni of an institution.

In this specific study, Monks found that those who were satisfied with their undergraduate experience tended to give more to their alma mater (Monks, 2005, p.122). Monks explains, "Alumni giving is influenced by dissatisfaction with the emphasis (or lack thereof) on faculty research undergraduate teaching, intercollegiate athletics, extra-curricular activities, a racially diverse student body, need-based financial aid, merit aid, and of course alumni concerns" (2003, p.128). Alumni who felt their experience on campus was valuable to them both personally and professionally were more likely to contribute toward fundraising goals of their alma mater.

Additionally, alumni that received grant based aid, as in they did not need to pay back their financial aid, tended to contribute more towards their alma mater than alumni who received loan based aid (Monks, 2003, p.126). If a student had to repay their financial aid, they felt less compelled to contribute to the philanthropic campaigns on campus. This study suggests that it is valuable to ask respondents whether they received financial aid during their time at the institution.

In a separate study done by Bent in 2012, institutional strategies were examined to best determine how to engage young alumni to contribute to the institution of higher education's fundraising campaigns. Bent identified five main strategies to engage young alumni, "1) foster community; 2) treat young alumni as partners; 3) gain feedback from young alumni and offer programs that meet their needs; 4) draw upon emotional connections; and 5) institute

philanthropy education" (Bent, 2012, p.146-147). By utilizing these techniques, a university's development office can actively communicate with young alumni.

In order to foster community, the institution must create a sense of belonging (Bent, 2012, p.133). Alumni must feel an emotional connection to the cause of the fundraising campaign. To treat young alumni as partners. Bent suggests that young alumni are made to feel influential in the campaign (Bent, 2012, p.133). For instance, young alumni must be encouraged to be a part of the campaign, such as serving as ambassadors for the campaign or having the ability to make suggestions and influence the direction of the campaign (Bent, 2012, p.133-134). Ultimately, young alumni want access to campaign leaders to feel that their influence is being appreciated.

Additionally, Bent's study focuses on gaining feedback from young alumni to improve fundraising efforts. Bent suggests that it is important that development offices listen to the feedback of young alumni to better serve their needs. Challenge gifts and fundraising competitions were found to accomplish this goal (Bent, 2012, p.135). Challenging young alumni to raise a certain amount and publicize competition will have come about from listening to feedback from young alumni donors. Additionally, listening to young alumni needs and incorporating that into the fundraising campaigns can increase young alumni engagement. What is most important to the young alumni demographic? Would it be tangible returns, education, and fulfillment? Both are important questions to ask when developing a young alumni donor campaign. For instance, if your young alumni were interested in learning more about finance management, then sponsoring an informational session would be beneficial for a fundraising campaign.

Bent's study also suggests using an emotional connection to engage young alumni in cultivation and solicitation strategies. Fundraising staff should be encouraged to include nostalgia in messaging strategies when cultivating young alumni (Bent, 2012). Calling on fond memories from young alumni can contribute to successful fundraising campaigns. One specific strategy Bent suggests is peer-to-peer solicitation (Bent, 2012). Donors feel more connected to the university around those who experienced similar things while in attendance. Solicitation by peers can be effective with young alumni (Bent, 2012).

Finally, Bent's study suggests educating young alumni about philanthropic efforts is important to engaging young alumni (Bent, 2012). Educating young alumni about what specific accomplishments are made through fundraising efforts can be a great way to educate the demographic. Explaining why donations are important to the value of their diploma and the future successes of the university can be beneficial to sparking young alumni engagement. Ultimately, Bent's strategies to engage young alumni in higher education fundraising campaigns may be beneficial in laying out strategies to involve young alumni and recent graduate donors in an athletic development office.

Overall, this research will help determine which motives to test for recent graduates participating in athletic fundraising campaigns. Motivations based on altruism, direct benefits, success, organizational identity, and social proofing will all be useful in creating the appropriate instrumentation. This research provides a foundation to evaluate motivations for athletic donors, regardless of age. Additionally, since recent graduates are alumni of a specific university, this research shows that alumni are invested in the success of their university and preserving prestige.

The need for research involving recent graduates is imperative. The specific age level once a person graduates is a unique time for individuals. Their memories of their education are

recent and recent graduates are beginning to develop their careers. It is important for an athletic development office to form a strong relationship with a recent graduate in order to work towards building lifelong loyalty from the recent graduate. It is less costly to maintain a relationship with a current donor than to generate a new relationship. Therefore, reaching recent graduates and developing a mutually beneficially relationship is of importance to athletic department fundraising staffs. If the recent graduate feels admired, respected, and is comfortable with their relationship with the athletic development office, then as they progress through their careers, hopefully the more developed and interconnected the relationship will become. By reaching donors at an early stage in their careers, an athletic department can have a longer time span to develop loyalty to their organization.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Sample and population

The population is all recent graduates who actively contribute to an athletic fundraising campaign at a Division I institution. All recent graduates who are participating in giving to an athletic fundraising endeavor and have an active email address at a selected Division I institution were included in the sample. The school is a large, state public institutions. The school serving as the sample hosts 28 varsity sports, and has a strong tradition in both men's and women's basketball, and women's soccer. Additionally, the school is located in the southeast region of the United States. The numbers of potential subjects was 506, and included active donors who have graduated within the last five years from School A with a valid email address.

Variables

Independent Variable: recent graduates who have contributed to an athletic fundraising campaign.

Dependent Variables: 23 motives for donating outlined in the table below, family history of giving, gender.

Table 1: Motives for Donating to Athletic Department Fundraising Campaigns

Altruism	To provide opportunities for education to student-athletes
	To repay benefits previously received from athletic department
Economic	To fulfill financial needs of athletic department
	To enhance my personal business opportunities
	To contribute to capital campaigns
	To receive a tax deduction
Direct Benefits	To receive priority ticketing for men's basketball
	To receive priority ticketing for football
	To receive priority parking for athletic events
	To build priority points for my account
	To receive access to postseason ticketing for all sports
	To receive access to special events
Organizational Identification	To show loyalty to the university
	To have influence over the athletic department's decision making process
	To receive athletic department newsletters
Reciprocity/Success	To support the current successes of the athletic department within this season
	To support progress towards future success for the athletic department
	To reinforce past successes of the athletic department
	To promote community pride of the athletic department
	To support a particular sport
Social Proofing	To be a part of the Athletic Department
	To join friends in supporting the Athletic Department
	To continue a family tradition of giving

Instrumentation

A Qualtrics survey was created to measure the donor motivations and demographics for each respondent. The instrument was limited to reflect the research questions of this study. Based on previous research, a grouping system was used to align motives to specific theoretical categories of altruism, reciprocity, success, direct benefits, and priority seating based on Mann's theoretical research. This survey is a modification of the ACQUIRE II instrument devised by Staurowksy (1996) and the revised version by Mahony, Gladden, & Funk (2003). A Likert scale was used to measure the strength of the motivation. The Likert scale included four points of importance and ranged from unimportant to major importance. Additionally, open-ended questions were included at the end of each grouping to more deeply capture the respondent's feelings about the question. The survey was reviewed by the Odum Institute. The Odum Institute supports the teaching and research of the social sciences. The institute provides counseling in survey construction, as well as statistical and data anaylsis. The survey was then vetted through a pilot study of athletic development professional from a range of Division I schools.

Procedures for Data Collection

An email was sent to the contact, an athletics fundraising administrator at the institution with information about the study and instructions to distribute the survey to the recent graduates. Instructions asked each participant to answer the questions honestly and appropriately. A reminder letter was sent approximately seven days after the initial recruiting letter was distributed. A second reminder letter was sent the following week. The survey closed approximately three weeks after initial distribution.

Statistical Analysis

Once the survey data was collected, results were analyzed as follows. Descriptive statistics were generated to determine importance of the independent variables to the recent graduates. Means and standard deviations were reported. For research question one, a mean of above three was deemed to be an important motivation to recent graduates.

An independent sample t-test was done for research questions two through five to determine any significant differences in means existed. An alpha level of .05 was used to determine if significant differences between motivations existed for research question two, by gender. An alpha level of .05 was used to determine if significant differences between motivations existed for research question three, by history of family giving to athletic departments. An alpha level of .05 was used to determine if significant differences between giving levels existed for research question four, by gender. An alpha level of .05 was used to determine if significant differences between giving levels existed for research question four, by history of family giving.

For open-ended questions, a coding system was developed for the responses. One researcher originally coded the responses, than the code was reviewed for reliability by a second researcher. The code developed used major themes that appeared within the responses to create the code used to explain results.

CHAPTER 4

Results

Demographic Information and Open-ended Questions

The survey was sent to 507 active recent graduate donors. There were a total of 126

responses for a response rate of 24.9%. For these respondents, 73.45%(n=126) are male, and

26.55% (n=126) are female. Additionally 34.29% (n=126) of respondents had a family history of

athletic giving, while 65.71% (n=126) of respondents did not. Overall, the average annual

contribution of a recent graduate was $364.22.

In the open-ended responses of the instrument, respondents also critiqued the areas for

improvement within an athletic fundraising department. One repeated area of improvement

focused on targeted marketing to recent graduates specifically. Most often citied areas for

improvement were marketing and transparency. For instance, expressing the stories of student-

athletes was expressed as an important place to improve for the marketing of recent graduate

donor programs, as expressed in this comment, "Share more student-athlete stories. I want to see

how this opportunity is changing the lives of these young men and women, especially off of the

playing field." Particularly, segmenting marketing plans towards recent graduates was cited as

an area of potential improvement. One respondent stated, "More opportunities for young alumni

to engage and more activities geared for them.

Additionally, areas of strength of the athletic fundraising department were researched. A

focus on customer service and events were most appreciated by the researched sample. For

instance, "Customer Service is second to none. Anytime there is a question, they are all over it. More than pleased with the friendliness and professionalism of those involved with the [School A] that I have been in contact with" were comments stated in the results of the survey.

Research Question 1: What are the primary motives for alumni who have graduated within five years to contribute to athletic fundraising organizations?

The respondents were asked to rate the importance of twenty-three different motives on their recent contribution to an athletic fundraising campaign. A motive with a mean higher than three was deemed to be important to recent graduates. The most important motive was "to show loyalty to the university", with a mean of 3.66. The table below provides the means of each motive for the overall recent graduate sample. Additional motives that were found to be important to recent graduates were "to build priority points for my account" with a mean of 3.36, and "to support progress towards future success for the athletic department", with a mean of 3.33. The motive "to provide opportunities for education to student-athletes" was also found to be important to recent graduates, with a mean of 3.16. Table 2 provides the means and standard deviations for all twenty-three factors measured.

An open-ended question was included to discover what motivates recent graduates to give to athletic departments can help athletic development officers. For example, many of the open-ended responses to the question, "What is the most important reason for your contribution to the organization?" were altruistically based. Memorable quotes included "I believe in the value that athletics provides the students that participate", and "giving back to [School A] so the students can have the same great atmosphere as I did" convey messages of donating in order to provide opportunities for both education and enjoyment of experiences for future generations. In fact, 58% (n=126) of the responses involved giving back to the university for altruistic reasons.

Table 2

Motivations for Recent Graduates to Contribute to Athletic Department Fundraising Campaigns

Motivation for Recent Donation	M	SD
To show loyalty to the university	3.66*	0.621
To build priority points for my account	3.36*	0.900
To support progress towards future successes for the athletic department	3.33*	0.816
To provide opportunities for education to student-athletes	3.16*	0.779
To reinforce past successes of the athletic department	2.97	1.026
To promote community pride of the athletic department	2.95	0.926
To support the current successes of the athletic department within this season	2.95	0.985
To receive access to postseason ticketing for all sports	2.89	1.087
To receive priority ticketing for football	2.89	1.168
To be a part of the athletic department	2.68	1.108
To fulfill the financial needs of the athletic department	2.63	0.862
To receive access for special events	2.62	1.073
To receive priority ticketing for men's basketball	2.58	1.177
To receive priority parking for athletic events	2.31	1.150
To join friends in supporting the athletic department	2.29	1.074
To receive athletic department newsletters	2.20	0.884
To contribute to capital campaigns	2.05	0.815
To support a particular sport	1.99	1.217
To continue a family tradition of giving to the athletic department	1.77	1.163
To have influence over the athletic department's decision making process	1.76	0.886
To repay benefits previously received from athletic department	1.68	1.022
To receive a tax deduction	1.63	0.779
To enhance my personal business opportunities	1.59	0.857

Note. * = $p < .05$

Research Question 2: Are there significant differences in the motives for donating among recent graduates between males and females?

The results reveal that there is no significant difference in motives for athletic giving between males and females. An independent samples t-test found that no statistical differences exist in the motives to give to athletic fundraising campaigns between genders. Table 3 lists the statistical data concerning the differences between genders and motives to give.

Table 3

Differences in Motivations for Recent Graduates to Contribute to Athletic Department
Fundraising Campaigns by Gender

Motivation for Recent Donation	Males		Females		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*
To show loyalty to the university	3.63	0.639	3.74	0.575	0.413
To support progress towards future successes for the athletic department	3.40	0.795	3.16	0.860	0.170
To build priority points for my account	3.39	0.922	3.28	0.851	0.580
To provide opportunities for education to student-athletes	3.16	0.804	3.16	0.723	0.163
To reinforce past successes of the athletic department	3.00	1.048	2.90	0.978	0.656
To receive priority ticketing for football	2.99	1.142	2.63	1.212	0.136
To support the current successes of the athletic department within this season	2.99	1.006	2.84	0.934	0.474
To promote community pride of the athletic department	2.90	0.958	3.06	0.840	0.412
To receive access to postseason ticketing for all sports	2.85	1.101	2.97	1.062	0.614
To fulfill the financial needs of the athletic department	2.67	0.885	2.53	0.803	0.180
To be a part of the athletic department	2.65	1.131	2.77	1.055	0.598
To receive access for special events	2.57	1.106	2.75	0.984	0.413
To receive priority ticketing for men's basketball	2.53	1.183	2.72	1.170	0.444
To join friends in supporting the athletic department	2.36	1.089	2.09	1.027	0.233
To receive priority parking for athletic events	2.36	1.185	2.19	1.061	0.470
To receive athletic department newsletters	2.12	0.875	2.42	0.886	0.109
To support a particular sport	2.10	1.241	1.70	1.119	0.126
To contribute to capital campaigns	2.10	0.790	1.94	0.878	0.170
To continue a family tradition of giving to the athletic department	1.70	1.145	1.97	1.204	0.266
To have influence over the athletic department's decision making process	1.69	0.882	1.97	0.875	0.132
To enhance my personal business opportunities	1.66	0.887	1.41	0.756	0.151
To repay benefits previously received from athletic department	1.63	1.021	1.81	1.030	0.213
To receive a tax deduction	1.62	0.811	1.66	0.701	0.834

Note. * = *p* < .05

Research Question 3: Are there significant differences in the motives for donating among recent graduates based on family history of athletic giving?

There is a significant difference in motives for athletic giving between those with a family history and those without a family history of athletic giving. Not surprisingly, the motive "to continue a family tradition of giving to the athletic department" was statistically significant, $t(104)=6.541$, $p<.000$. Additionally, the motive "to fulfill the financial means of the athletic department" was statistically significant, $t(104)=3.432$, $p<.001$. Table 4 lists the statistical data concerning the differences between the presence of a family history and motives to give.

Table 4

Differences in Motivations for Recent Graduates to Contribute to Athletic Department Fundraising Campaigns by Family History of Giving

Motivation for Recent Donation	Family History Present		No Family History		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*
To show loyalty to the university	3.77	0.547	3.62	0.644	0.247
To support progress towards future successes for the athletic department	3.53	0.736	3.29	0.788	0.136
To build priority points for my account	3.44	0.843	3.26	0.958	0.324
To provide opportunities for education to student-athletes	3.39	0.645	3.07	0.804	0.430
To reinforce past successes of the athletic department	3.22	0.989	2.86	1.033	0.082
To promote community pride of the athletic department	3.11	0.820	2.86	0.952	0.177
To support the current successes of the athletic department within this season	3.11	1.063	2.91	0.903	0.318
To fulfill the financial needs of the athletic department	3.03	0.774	2.46	0.829	0.001*
To receive access to postseason ticketing for all sports	3.00	1.069	2.78	1.096	0.330
To receive priority ticketing for football	2.97	1.082	2.79	1.226	0.443
To receive priority ticketing for men's basketball	2.78	1.072	2.43	1.211	0.147
To be a part of the athletic department	2.71	1.017	2.67	1.100	0.847
To continue a family tradition of giving to the athletic department	2.64	1.246	1.31	0.826	0.000*
To receive access for special events	2.64	1.018	2.57	1.071	0.756
To receive priority parking for athletic events	2.58	1.180	2.13	1.102	0.052
To join friends in supporting the athletic department	2.33	1.014	2.26	1.112	0.732
To contribute to capital campaigns	2.14	0.899	2.03	0.780	0.514
To receive athletic department newsletters	2.14	0.762	2.23	0.942	0.610
To repay benefits previously received from athletic department	1.89	1.190	1.66	0.961	0.282
To have influence over the athletic department's decision making process	1.89	0.950	1.74	0.869	0.419
To support a particular sport	1.79	1.219	2.00	1.176	0.402
To enhance my personal business opportunities	1.58	0.906	1.64	0.869	0.743
To receive a tax deduction	1.53	0.654	1.75	0.847	0.166

Note. $* = p < .05$

Research Question 4: Are there significant differences in giving levels between males and females?

The results reveal that there is no significant difference in the average giving level for an annual athletic contribution between males and females. Table 5 lists the statistical data concerning the differences between genders and giving levels to give.

Table 5

Differences in Giving Levels by Gender

| Females | | Males | | |
M	SD	M	SD	t
250.00	475.395	350.00	650.617	0.780

Note. * = *p* < .05

Research Question 5: Are there significant differences in the giving levels of recent graduates based on family history of athletic giving?

The results reveal that there is not a significant difference in the average giving level for an annual athletic contribution between those with a family history of athletic giving and those without a family history. Table 6 lists the statistical data concerning the differences between the presences of a family history and giving levels to give.

Table 6

Differences in Giving Levels by Family History

Family History Present		No Family History		
M	SD	M	SD	t
453.47	907.393	269.64	406.066	0.152

Note. * = *p* < .05

CHAPTER 5

Discussion

The results from this study provide relevant information for athletic development offices in relation to recent graduate donors. These findings can assist athletic fundraising offices develop better solicitation methods, communication plans, and overall relationships with recent graduate donors. Additionally, areas for potential future research are discussed in this chapter.

Important findings were found in the open-ended questions involving the areas for improvement and strengths described by respondents. It was found that communication was a frequently mentioned an area of improvement. By gearing messaging and communication specifically to this target market of recent graduates, athletic fundraising departments can engage recent graduates through a strong communication plan. Also, knowing what recent graduates feel are strengths relative to current athletic fundraising departments is important because it encourages athletic fundraising staffs to go the extra mile in appreciating their recent graduate donor base.

Significant Motivations for Recent Graduates to give to athletic fundraising campaigns

According to Mann's theory, there were various types of theories behind motivations to give to philanthropic organizations. The motivations found to be most important to recent graduates were based in the theory of organizational identification, reciprocity, and altruism

(2007). The motivation to show loyalty to the university, build priority points, support progress to future success, and provide opportunities for education for student-athletes were most important to recent graduates. The findings in this study support Mann's previous research into the theory of organizational identification, reciprocity, and altruism as motives for philanthropic giving (2007).

Organizational identity theory was shown through an important motivation to show loyalty to the university. The respondents showing a strong connection to the organization, the university and the athletic department at hand demonstrate this. Also, the organizational identification theory was represented in the results, as recent graduates were motivated to contribute to athletic fundraising campaigns to support progress towards future success. The respondents' motivations for giving showed that they were motivated to give in order to affect the success of the organization's future success (2007). In turn, the contribution celebrates and encourages the future successes for the athletic fundraising organization.

Charitable giving theory defined by Mann was also supported in this study by the findings of reciprocity and altruism being important to recent graduates. The theory of reciprocity, found within charitable giving theory was exemplified in the importance of building priority points to recent graduates. Due to the respondents' motivations being based on receiving priority points for their contributions, the reciprocity was shown. Finally, the significance of altruism to recent graduates was represented in the motivation to provide opportunities to student-athletes by recent graduates. Since recent graduates feel an altruistic connection to their alma mater, recent graduates were found to want to support educational opportunities for student-athletes, and provide an experience at the university for a future student. The feeling of providing education for others shows an altruistic motive for recent graduates. All of these

theories found within the results of this study support Mann's findings about motivations for philanthropic giving (2007).

Additionally, the findings in this study support Mahony, Gladden, and Funk's findings that recent graduate donors value future success and a psychological commitment through loyalty (2005) when determining motivations to give to athletic fundraising departments. Since supporting future success and showing loyalty to the university were deemed important to recent graduates, this supports previous research in Mahony, Gladden, and Funk's study. Mahony, Gladden, and Funk's study determined that loyalty was an important motivation for athletic donors, which was supported by the findings in this study. Also, this study supports the findings that economic reasons, such as personal business enhancement were not significant to recent graduate donors. (Mahony, Gladden, & Funk, 2005).

The findings in this study do counter the findings of the Mahony, Gladden, and Funk as this study suggests recent graduates are at least in part motivated by philanthropic motives to provide educational opportunities (2005). Recent graduates contribute to athletic fundraising campaigns to support educational motives, while the previous study by Mahony, Gladden, and Funk claims that philanthropic motives are not important to donors of athletic development offices (2005).

Differences in Motivations for Recent Graduates to give to athletic fundraising campaigns by gender

This study found that there were no significant differences in the differences between the motivations between male and female donors. There was very little difference in the means of the potential motivations between male and female graduate donors. The social identification

37

theory suggested in Mann's study that donors use social groupings, which involve gender, to reflect the priorities of the organization within themselves (2007). The social identification theory serves as a possible reason why there was no significant difference found between the genders in recent graduate donor motivations. Since both genders had the same profile as far as alumni status and connection to the university, social groupings such as gender do not create significant differences between motivations by gender since both social groups are interested in supporting the athletic fundraising department. No previous studies were found to inquire about the differences between genders involving athletic development donor motivations. This information can be helpful to practitioners to know that when discussing reasons to give to athletic fundraising campaigns, messaging about what the respondent's gift does for the respondent, the athletic department, and the university does not have to be differentiated by gender.

Significant differences Motivations for Recent Graduates to give to athletic fundraising campaigns by history of family giving

Significant differences were found between motivations of recent graduates that had a family history of giving to athletics, and those that did not have a family history. The motivations "to fulfill the financial needs of the athletic department", and "to continue a family tradition of giving to the athletic department" were found to be significantly different. This relates to Mann's theory that donors may be motivated to contribute to organization based on the economic needs of the organization, and what the experience of the beneficiaries of the gift is like (2007). By showing a motivation of fulfilling the financial needs of the athletic department, recent graduates with a history of family giving are additionally be motivated by economic reasons, which is

consistent with Mann's economic theory (2007). This information is helpful to current development officers for prospecting donors. If a prospective donor has a family history of giving, providing explanations for the economic need for a contribution might form a better relationship with this prospective donor and draw on important motivations within the recent graduate donor.

Differences in giving levels for Recent Graduates to give to athletic fundraising campaigns by gender

This study found that there were no statistically significant differences between giving levels for male and female recent graduate donors. There was a $100 difference in the means of giving levels between men and women, which was not found to be statistically significant. Since both genders are supporting the same organization, the social identification theory suggested in Mann's study that donors use social groupings, which involve gender, to reflect the priorities of the organization within themselves (2007).

The social identification theory serves as a possible reason why there was no significant difference found between the genders in recent graduate donor motivations. Since both genders had the same profile as far as alumni status and connection to the university, social groupings such as gender do not create significant differences between giving levels since both social groups are interested in supporting the athletic fundraising department. No previous studies were found to inquire about the differences between genders involving athletic development donors giving levels. This is relevant to athletic development officers as the ask amount for a recent graduate should not be differentiated based on the gender of the donor.

Differences in giving levels for Recent Graduates to give to athletic fundraising campaigns by history of family giving.

This study found that there were no significant differences in the differences between the giving levels of donors with family history of athletic giving. There was a difference of $183.83 in the means between donors with a family history and those who do not have a family history of athletic giving. The social identification theory suggested in Mann's study that donors use social groupings, which involve family, to reflect the priorities of the organization within themselves (2007). Since both types of recent graduates are supporting the same organization, the social identification theory serves as a possible reason why there was no significant difference found between two types of recent graduates with family history of athletic giving in recent graduate giving levels.

The social identification theory serves as a possible reason why there was no significant difference in motivations found between two types of recent graduates with family history of athletic giving in recent graduate giving levels. Since both types of family histories of giving had the same profile as far as alumni status and connection to the university, social groupings such as a family history of giving do not create significant differences between motivations since both social groups are interested in supporting the athletic fundraising department. No previous studies were found to inquire about the differences between family history involving athletic development donors. This information shows that Mann's social identification theory is not relevant to recent graduates (2007). This can be helpful to athletic department fundraisers when developing a prospecting plan or solicitation, that the giving level asked for should not be different based on a family history of giving.

Recommendations

This study found valuable information for athletic fundraising departments to use when building and improving connections to recent graduates. Athletic fundraising departments can utilize the important finding of significant motivations for recent graduates in order to grow relationships and improve communication with these donors. Using messaging that conveys these important motivations may entice recent graduates to either begin to give or give at a higher level. Emphasizing the motives of loyalty to the university, future progress, priority points, and altruistic views of providing educational opportunity in communication with recent graduates will build stronger relationships with this segment of athletic donors.

Loyalty to the university can be expressed to donors by communicating messages of support and a strong relationship to the university that are dependent on the contributions of recent graduates. A contest between alumni classes to raise funds to determine which class is the "most loyal" might help practitioners implement loyalty messaging.

Also, future progress can be shown to recent graduates by development offices by showing how their contributions are providing more scholarships, facility improvements, and opportunities for athletics in order to work toward building future success. For instance, a development officer can share future plans for a facility upgrade to a recent graduate donor, and emphasize the need to support the future of success at the school to the donor.

Priority points should always be fully explained to the recent graduate donor, as well as the benefits they receive depending on the priority points. By directly addressing the affect of priority points on seating, ticketing, parking, and other items, the development office can establish a stronger relationship with recent graduate donors.

Educational opportunities for student-athletes should also be addressed when communicating to recent graduate donors. Messaging to recent graduates that breaks down the cost of books, room and board fees, and tuition and the need for contributions to provide these items can help recent graduates understand what their contribution accomplishes. By appealing to the altruistic motives of recent graduates, development offices can improve relations with recent graduates.

Finally, athletic fundraising offices should be constantly working to better their interactions with current donors, and solicitation of new donors. Since of loyalty to the university, future progress, priority points, and altruistic views of providing educational opportunity were found to be important to recent graduates, these ideas need to be expressed when soliciting and communicating with recent graduate athletic donors. By understanding and incorporating these important motives into fundraising strategies, these offices can be equipped with a better opportunity to cultivate and steward recent graduates who contribute to athletic fundraising campaigns.

Future Research

  This study yields itself to promote further research into the topic of recent graduate athletic donor motivations. For instance, incorporating a larger number of Division I BCS sample schools would be beneficial to research, to see if the results can be applied across campuses, or if different schools yield different results. Additionally, looking into the motivations of active recent graduate donors in Division I FCS, Division II, and Division III would be relevant to determine whether motives differ between recent graduates at different competitive divisions. The instrument used in this study was found to be valid and reliable, and should be used for comparative purposes in future research.

  Furthermore, studying recent graduates who do not actively contribute to athletic campaigns may be a relevant population to research in order to determine if there are reasons why recent graduates specifically aren't contributing to athletic fundraising campaigns. With that knowledge, it might provide insight into recent graduate overall giving habits, and how to tailor messaging to attract new recent graduate donors.

REFERENCES

Baade, Robert A, Sundberg, Jeffery O. (1996). What determines Alumni Generosity? *Economics of Education Review, 15*(1), 75-81.

Bent, L. G. (2012). Young alumni giving: An exploration of institutional strategies. (Order No. 3544242, Johnson & Wales University). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.* 177.

Gladden, James M., Mahony, Daniel F., Apostolopou, Artemisia. (2005). Toward a Better Understanding of College Athletic Donors: What Are the Primary Motives? *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 14*(1), 18-30.

Ko, Young Jae. Rhee, Young Chae, Walker, Mathew, Lee, Jeoung-Hak. (2013). What Motivates Donors to Athletic Programs: A New Model of Donor Behavior. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,* 1-24.

Mahony, D.F., Gladden, J.M., & Funk, D.C. (2003). Examining athletic donors at NCAA Division 1 institutions. *International Sports Journal*, *7*(1), 9-27.

Mann. T. (2007). College Fund Raising Using Theoretical Perspectives to Understand Donor Motives. *International Journal of Educational Advancement, 7*(1), 35-44.

Monks, James. (2003). Patterns of giving to one's alma mater amoung graduates from selective institutions. *Economics of Education Review, 22*(2), 121-130.

Sargeant, Adrian. (2001). Relationship Fundraising How to Keep Donors Loyal. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 12*(2), 177-192.

Sargeant, Adrian, Woodliffe, Lucy. (2005). The Antecedents of Donor Commitment to Voluntary Organizations. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, (16)*1, 61-78.

Shapiro, Stephen. (2010). Does Service Matter? An Examination of Donor Perceptions of
    Service Quality in College Athletics. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 19*(3), 154-156.

Staurowsky, Ellen J., Parkhouse, Bonnie, Sachs, Michael. (1996). Developing an Instrument to
    Measure Athletic Donor Behavior and Motivation. *Journal of Sport Management, 10,*
    262-277.

Stinson, Jeffery L., Howard, Dennis R. (2007). Athletic Success and Private Giving to Athletic
    and Academic Programs at NCAA Institutions. *Journal of Sport Management, 21*(1),
    235-264.

Verner, M. Elizabeth, Hecht, Jeffrey B, Fansler, A. Gigi. (1998). Validating an Instrument to
    Assess the Motivation of Athletic Donors. *Journal of Sport Management, 12*(1), 123-137.

Wells, D.E., Southall, R.M., Stotlar, D. & Mundfrom, 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.