MILLENNIAL ALUMNI GIVING: FACTORS FOR DO-
NATING TO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

by

Yolanda Barbier Gibson
A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Graduate Faculty
of
George Mason University
in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Arts
Community College Education

Committee:

_____   Dissertation Director

_____

_____

_____   Program Director

_____   Dean, College of Humanities and Social
                                    Sciences

Date: _____   Spring Semester 2015
                                    George Mason University
                                    Fairfax, VA

Millennial Alumni Giving: Factors for Donating to Colleges and Universities

A Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Arts at George Mason University

by

Yolanda Barbier Gibson
Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies
George Mason University, 2010

Director: Dr. Jaime Lester, Professor
Department of Higher Education

Spring Semester 2015
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

This work is licensed under a .

DEDICATION

This is dedicated to my two daughters Joelle and Gabrielle. Know that in life you can do anything and that you can do ALL things through Christ.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

MILLENNIAL ALUMNI GIVING: FACTORS FOR DONATING TO COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Yolanda Barbier Gibson, D.A.

George Mason University, 4/29/15

Dissertation Director: Dr. Jaime Lester

Currently, many higher education advancement professionals have direct responsibility for both fund-raising, engaging alumni, and alumni programming. Alumni are the only permanent members of an institution. While presidents, faculty, and staff come and go, alumni are a part of the institution for life (Feud, 2010). Due to the steady increase of millennial alumni graduating from today's colleges and universities, millennial alumni serve as key stakeholders for many American colleges and universities. The millennial generation includes population born between 1980 and 2000 and includes approximately 78 million members (Moore, 2012). The purpose of this study was to examine factors that predict giving among millennial alumni, utilizing results from Marymount University's annual alumni survey. To determine the factors that have a relationship with lifetime giving among millennial alumni, a binary logistic regression was conducted to determine how well the independent factors predicted giving. The sample size consisted of 756 un-

dergraduate millennial alumni. The study found that campus living, enrollment status, final grade point average, institutional aid, and overall experience are predictors of life-time giving. As a result, implications for future research were outlined to include replicating the study with graduate millennial alumni as well as academic majors. Additionally, implication for advancement professionals included creating a culture of philanthropy among current students, providing career services to millennial alumni to keep them connected to the university beyond graduation, and crafting tailored messages specifically for millennial alumni were outlined in this dissertation.

CHAPTER ONE- INTRODUCTION

Today's students and young alumni are members of the largest generation in history and they will soon become the largest segment of prospective donors (Catlett, 2010). By 2030, millennials living in the United States of America will outnumber non-millennials by 22 million (Barton, Fromm, and Egan, 2012). However, millennial alumni are less engaged than other generations and tend to not invest financially in their alma mater (Ncyz-Conner, 2013).The millennial generation often referred to as Generation Y was born between 1980 and 2000; and are known for being goal-oriented and natural collaborators who would rather win together than alone, want shared experiences and venues to speak their minds, and they crave ownership (Ncyz-Conner, 2013).

For higher education advancement professionals, engaging recent graduates is often a difficult task, as many new graduates are just starting out in their careers, struggling with student loan payments, relocating, and figuring out their lives (Laskowski, 2014). Due to the steady increase of millennial alumni graduating from today's colleges and universities, millennial alumni serve as key stakeholders for many institutions. Currently, advancement professionals have direct responsibility for fostering relationships with graduates in order to increase the potential for alumni support through their time, talent, and treasure (Feudo, 2010). Alumni are the only permanent members of an institution. While presidents, faculty, and staff come and go; alumni are a part of the institution for

life (Feudo, 2010). Therefore, without engaging and understanding millennial philanthropy patterns, colleges and universities will continue to face challenges in raising funds to continue to support academic programs and support their missions.

Higher education advancement is a strategic, integrated method of managing relationships to increase understanding and support among an institution's key constituents (Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 2013). American colleges and universities rely on funding from three sources: government, corporations, and private donations. According to the Council for Aid to Education (2009), 27.5% of all private donations to higher education institutions in 2007 came from alumni. Thus, it is vital for colleges and universities to routinely devise strategies to engage and solicit alumni support. Many individuals decide that the primary factor driving their giving is the satisfaction from their personal experience and congruent values with the particular organization (Frumkin, 2010). Thus, the greater the number of young alumni that institutions can connect with soon after graduation, the more likely they will stay engaged or re-engaged later on in life (Catlett, 2010). According to the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (2013), engagement is defined as providing financial support to institutions as well as connecting alumni to institutions beyond graduation. For example, engagement can include providing expert advice and guidance to the university's leadership, offering career advice, mentoring, and internships to current students, supporting student recruitment, and donating regularly through the annual fund (Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 2013).

American higher education is facing severe financial strain. In times like these, it is important to involve millennial alumni in fundraising campaigns to ensure that the mission and financial goals for an institution can be met. The millennial population has high levels of disposable income and has historically been entrusted with credit cards that they utilize to make purchases (Henrie & Taylor, 2009). In addition, new graduates often have more disposable income then they have ever had (Catlett, 2010). The millennial generation is known for certain behaviors and qualities, and alleged to be financially knowledgeable (Henrie & Taylor, 2009). Okunade and Justice (1990) confirmed that alumni giving increases with years since graduation in general. Hence, it is critical that advancement professionals engage millennial alumni immediately after graduation rather than waiting for them to approach their 10th, 20th or 30th reunion (Willemain, Goyal, Van Deven & Thukral, 1994). In order to maintain a lifelong link with young alumni, university advancement professionals must have an understanding of millennial alumni philanthropy patterns, characteristics, and the influences that keep millennial alumni involved and donating to their alma mater.

Statement of the Problem

According to the Council for Aid to Education, in 1990, 18 percent of college and university alumni gave to their alma mater (Allen, 2014). By 2013 that number had been cut in half to less than 9 percent, a record low and a culmination of a trend that has persisted for more than two decades (Allen, 2014). In addition, the average gift declined by 1.4% resulting in a drop in the average gift for capital purposes (Council for Aid to Edu-

cation, 2013). Nationally, alumni donors has been declining since 1992 (Council for Aid to Education, 2013). The decreasing trend among alumni donors can have a major impact on participation rates of giving among colleges and universities. *U.S. News & World Report* considers undergraduate alumni participation rates a barometer of alumni satisfaction and factors them into rankings (Allen, 2014). Rankings create reputation, reputation affects enrollment, and enrollment affects tuition revenue (Allen, 2014). Because many colleges and universities rely heavily on alumni donors to support their mission and to advance their institutions, it is vital to examine the factors that motivate millennial alumni giving behaviors.

Millennial donors do not give out of loyalty to their alma maters as those before them did (Kish, 2013). In the past, when alumni (as students) had an experience that helped them form lifelong relationships and prepared them to live and succeed after graduation for a relatively low cost, alumni felt like they were receiving a good deal. Thus, previous generations such as Baby Boomers and Generation Xers were more willing to give back after they graduated (Allen, 2014). This is a problem because as Baby Boomers and Generation Xers retire or pass away, institutions will not have millennial alumni financial support. Thus, it is important for advancement professionals to cultivate relationships with millennial alumni, understand their giving patterns, and create solicitation strategies that will promote young alumni giving.

The millennial generation includes population born between 1980 and 2000 and includes approximately 78 million members (Moore, 2012). Due to its size and growing

market power, the millennial generation is currently the primary focus of popular media and marketers (Moore, 2012). The preceding age group, Generation X includes population born between 1961and 1980 and is proportionately smaller than the millennial generation and the older Baby Boomer generation. The Baby Boomer generation includes population born between 1943 and 1960 (Moore, 2012). In recent years, Boomers have been challenged with decreasing real estate values and losses in portfolio value forcing a new frugality among this group (Moore, 2012).

Young alumni do not communicate the same way that the rest of alumni population does; snail mail does not work (Catlett, 2010). Millennials use technology on a daily basis for both utilitarian and entertainment purposes (Moore, 2012). They use interactive technologies to connect with retailers or brands and to gather information online (Moore, 2012). Further, they also report active usage of mobile devices to carry out personal and professional business in comparison to other populations (Moore, 2012). They more often use these technologies on the go, instead of using a home computer (Moore, 2012). A survey of young alumni conducted by Southeastern Conference institutions in 2007-2008, found that well over one-third of the respondents visited a social networking site every day and almost 60 percent visited at least "sometimes" or more (Catlett, 2010). Thus, the way that millennials are obtaining information and communicating with others is very different.

Complicating the issue are the differences between alumni donors at private religious institutions versus public institutions. Research from Clotfelter (2003b) indicated that

alumni of private liberal arts colleges are more likely to donate than alumni from other private universities, and alumni of more selective private institutions are more likely to give than alumni from less selective colleges or universities (Newman & Petrosko, 2011). While there is some literature in economics examining giving characteristics and patterns among millennials, there is currently no research literature pertaining to millennial alumni giving patterns and characteristics to private, religious institutions. Specifically, there is limited research on factors that influence or motivate millennial alumni to give to their alma mater. Hence, the researcher examined giving patterns and involvement from millennial alumni whom graduated from Marymount University, a private, liberal arts, Catholic institution founded in 1950, by the Religious Sacred Heart of Mary (RSHM). Marymount University is the only private, Catholic institution located in Virginia that offers bachelors, masters, and doctoral degrees. As of the fall 2014, the total enrollment for both undergraduate and graduate students was 3,441 (Marymount Fact book, 2014). According to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, 94% of incoming first-year students for the fall of 2014 received some sort of financial aid and 30% of the incoming first-year students were first-generation college students. The average financial aid package for undergraduates is $25,682 (Marymount University Factbook, 2014).

Context for study

Marymount University's mission is to create an environment that promotes intellectual curiosity, service to others, global perspective, and a strong Catholic identity. Like many other private religious institutions, Marymount has to continue to rely on alumni to

6

help fill budgeting gaps which affect campus facilities (i.e. renovation of classrooms, chapel, and other buildings), faculty research, and scholarships. Currently, several areas are considered "critical needs" - those that need alumni support. These areas include the renovations at the campus chapel and Ballston Campus, campus ministry funding, faculty development, and scholarships (Marymount University Office of Advancement, 2013). More importantly, tuition only accounts for 82% of the cost of educating a Marymount student, and the remaining 18% is generated through grants and support of alumni (Marymount University Office of Advancement, 2013).

While the need for alumni support is abundant at Marymount University, the office of university advancement recently discovered that participation and giving rates among millennial undergraduate alumni are steadily decreasing while the number of graduates in this population is increasing. As of March 2015, there were a total of 7,043 undergraduate millennial alumni (Marymount University Office of Advancement, 2015). In order to effectively keep undergraduate millennial alumni connected to Marymount University, alumni relations administrators and development officers must have a better understanding of philanthropy patterns, alumni interests, and perceptions toward the university.

According to the office of university advancement, millennial alumni giving trends has been decreasing over the years as well. For instance, in 2005 and 2006, the numbers of millennial alumni donors were 5%, in 2007-2008 it was 3% and 2009-2010 only 2% of millennial alumni made a donation beyond graduation. Thus, this study contributes to in-

stitutional advancement literature by introducing a more comprehensive framework to understand millennial alumni giving patterns particularly at religious institutions. Based in literature and theory the following research questions and supporting hypotheses are posed:

1. Is there a statistically significant relationship between student experiences (i.e. major; student involvement to include student clubs, intercollegiate athletics, spiritual involvement, community service; institutional aid; academic success (final G.P.A.); academic reputation; academic quality; enrollment status; transfer/first college; class location; and campus living) and giving for millennial alumni?

2. Is there a statistically significant relationship between awareness of alumni activities and giving among millennial alumni?

3. Is there a statistically significant relationship between connectedness (i.e. alumni involvement, connection to faculty and the university) and giving amongst millennial alumni?

4. Do student experiences, awareness of alumni activities, alumni involvement, connection to faculty and the university predict millennial alumni giving?

H1: The researcher hypothesizes that if millennial alumni had a positive overall experience at Marymount University then they are more likely to donate.

H2: The researcher hypothesizes if millennial alumni lived on campus at some point during their academic career then they are more likely to donate money to their alma mater.

Thus, a significant difference in the status of donor versus non donor among millennial alumni who lived on campus versus commuted.

H3: The researcher hypothesizes that if millennial alumni received institutional aid, then they are more likely to donate to their alma mater. Thus, there will be a significant difference in the status of donor versus non donor among millennial alumni who received institutional aid versus those who did not.

H4: The researcher hypothesizes that the more connected to the university then the more likely they will be a donor. Thus, there will be a significant difference in the donor versus non-donor status of millennial alumni who are connected to the university.

Significance of the study

This quantitative study is important and needed for several reasons. First, many colleges and universities are faced with pressures to fill budget gaps, build and enhance facilities, improve campus infrastructures, provide scholarships, support research, and fund other campus needs. Second, tuition revenues are becoming more difficult to secure as pricing pressures have pushed all colleges and universities to increase enrollment and/or change the distribution of paying students (Education Advisory Board, 2013). Third, state appropriations for higher education has drastically decreased in recent years (Weerts & Ronca, 2006) with aggregate state contributions falling 30% since the late 1970's. Eroding state and local funding along with substantial declines in endowment funding, has caused higher education institutions to rely more on alumni for funding support (Newman, & Petrosko, 2011). According to the National Postsecondary Student Aid

9

Study (2013), seventy-one percent of all undergraduates received some type of financial aid between July 2011-June 30, 2012. Among the undergraduates who received any aid, the average total amount received was $10,800. Additionally, according to the Chronicle of Higher Education (2013), the average student has more than $27,000 worth of student loan debt. Many colleges and universities both public and private, provide grant aid to undergraduates to help them pay for all or part of the tuition and fees charged by the institution. This practice is often referred to as "tuition discounting" (Horn & Peter, 2012). Some institutions use tuition discounts as a way to increase enrollment among meritorious students (Horn & Peter, 2012). Thus, institutions are relying more and more on alumni donors to fund scholarships and provide institutional aid. But, nationally, only 11.9% of alumni contributed to their alma mater in 2006, which is down from 13.4%, four years earlier (Kaplan, 2007). This means that nearly 90% of all alumni are non-donors (Wastyn, 2009).

Many institutions of higher education are receiving fewer donations from their alumni. Due to the recession that began in 2008, institutions reported an 11% decline in overall alumni participation over the past year (McDearmon & Shirley, 2009). Alumni participation is calculated by dividing the number of donors by the number of records (individuals for whom the institution has a means of contact). For most institutions the number of alumni of record increased yet the number of donors declined. Although, the decline in participation is a positive sign that institutions are keeping better records it also means that the institution is expected to raise more funds (Kaplan, 2012).

A reason for this decline may be attributed to the lack of support from an institution's recent graduates also referred to as young alumni (McDearmon & Shirley, 2009). Although the criteria for who is considered a young alumnus varies between institutions, many categorize them as those who have graduated between 10 and 15 years of the present date and fall between the ages of 25 through 35 years (McDermott, & Shirley, 2009). Those young alumni who do give, make modest donations usually less than $200 in a given year (Monks, 2003). Even if the "gifts of this generation are smaller than others, cultivating young alumni should still be a priority of university administrators" (McDearmon & Shirley, p. 84, 2009). Since it is known that the millennial generation approach college philanthropic giving and engaging with others in many different ways from past generations, it is critical for alumni professionals to identify creative ways to communicate and connect with this population. Advancement professionals are emphasizing annual giving among younger alumni. If an institution can get someone to make a donation early, then there is a much greater chance the donor will continue to donate for life (Feudo, 2010). Thus, it is important for alumni professionals to engage young alumni early and often as well as emphasize the necessity to give back to their alma mater.

Several studies have corroborated that the following factors have an effect on giving and participation rates: age of the alumnus, alumni engagement, student experience, student involvement in extra-curricular activities, communication between the alumnus and the institution, student loans, and misperceptions about giving to higher education (Beeler, 1982; Grill, 1988; Markoff, 1978 as cited in Taylor, & Martin, 1995, McKinney, 1978; Oglesby, 1991 & Shadoian, 1989). Alumni engagement is defined as making a

financial contribution, attending alumni related activities, or serving in an alumni leadership role (Waters, 2008). Involvement in an institution after graduation has been demonstrated in several studies to positively impact the giving rates of alumni (McDearmon & Shirley, 2009). Thus, by understanding how to engage millennial alumni with the university could positively impact giving participation rates.

Recent graduates bring a unique type of knowledge to alumni associations and have much to offer at a young age (Feudo, 2010). The greater the number of young alumni that institutions can connect with soon after graduation, the more likely that they will stay engaged or reengaged later on in life (Catlett, 2010). Young alumni are a diverse group, some want socializing opportunities while others are looking to network in their career field (Feudo, 2010). Whereas other young alumni just want to attend sporting events and have a friendly place to eat and drink before any away football game (Feudo, 2010).

On the other hand, some young alumni want to connect to their alma mater through volunteerism (Feudo, 2010). For example, alumni associations have long been in partnership with admission offices to help recruit students. More and more young alumni state that they would enjoy sharing their ideas and successes with current students by serving as mentors (Feudo, 2010). By offering a broad variety of options, alumni associations can attract a large number of young alumni and attempt to keep them engaged. For example, a young alumnus at California's Sacramento City College stated that "he liked to be involved when he can give back to his alma mater and to meet students and faculty who benefit" (Scully, 2013).

Alumni are valuable volunteers and resources to institutions. Alumni influence is critical to institutions because personal and professional connections held by graduates can open doors to legislative, corporate, foundational, and other major gift prospects (Weerts & Ronca, 2008). Alumni not only open doors, those who volunteer also contribute about 100% more than non-volunteer alumni (Wunnava & Lauze, 2001). Alumni volunteers extend the reach of their alma mater by carrying the institutional message into the field and reinforce their connection to the institution. Their work helps reconnect others at the same time. Alumni volunteers look for purposeful work that makes a difference and for meaningful participation. They want to make a difference and help the institution, but in a role that fulfills their own needs and engages them at their interest level (Feudo, 2010). Volunteers get involved "to meet people, to make connections, to learn a new skill, to be on the inside, and to simply have fun" (Feudo, p. 24, 2010). Some typical ways alumni get involved are in assisting with a phone-a-thon to solicit more donors, serving as class liaisons to encourage more alumni to attend events, and serving as leaders in alumni clubs and networks.

Alternatively, some people have a less charitable view of higher education (Education Advisory Board, 2013). For example, the media focus on student debt and high list prices has led to a shift in public perception of colleges and universities. This perception threatens to erode the privileged position of higher education has secured in the ever-competitive philanthropic space, resulting in an overall erosion of higher education's share of total philanthropic giving (Education Advisory Board, 2013). Additionally, when millennials donate they want to ensure that their gift has a direct impact (Goldseker &

Mood, 2013). Thus, higher education institutions must compete with other non-profit organizations by connecting and engaging with millennial alumni, convincing them that higher education is a worthy philanthropic cause (Kish, B., 2013).

New students and younger alumni require new strategies for engagement. The traditional programs and events will not meet the needs of today's millennial alumni. Currently, the primary method to invite alumni to donate is through mailed solicitation letters and phonathons. Given the low donation rates among all alumni, advancement professionals know that it is critical to understand effective ways to target the millennials. According to the literature, millennials are more ethnically and racially diverse than older adults, and less religious (Pew, 2010). They are on track to become the most educated generation in American history and are therefore more optimistic than their elders about their own economic futures as well as about the overall state of the nation (Pew, 2010). They prefer to be involved and have shared ownership when making donations to an organization (Goldseker & Moody, 2013). In other words, millennials want to have input pertaining to the decision making process as it relates to how their money is being used.

There are several barriers that prevent millennial alumni from donating to their alma mater beyond graduation. In this study, the author addressed these problems by examining the factors that had an impact on giving among millennial alumni. Thus, this study can assist advancement professionals in formulating strategies to cultivate, engage, and connect millennial alumni with their institutions. By collaborating with academic and student affairs as well as other key departments across institutions, strategies can also be

developed to increase awareness of philanthropy among current students. Professional staff members who oversee the communications and marketing for fundraising campaigns and alumni programming can utilize the findings from this study to enhance their messaging to millennials. Through the findings of this study, university administrators can have a more detailed understanding of the factors that impact millennial alumni donors and improve the overall experience for current students. Finally, the findings of this study can help improve participation rates among millennial alumni donors. The following section provides a description of the theoretical framework utilized in this study.

Theoretical Framework

Social exchange theory is a two-sided, mutually contingent rewarding process involving transactions, or simply, exchanges (Emerson, 1976). The theory explains the interdependent relationship that exists between donor and alma mater. Under this theory, alumni donate when they understand that their interests align with the needs and interests of the institution (Drezner, 2009). Kelly (2002) found that based on social-exchange theory, a mixed motive model of giving describes two levels of donor motivation: 1) raising the amount of common good and 2) receiving some private good in return. These mixed motivators are evident in social exchange theory and align with the intrinsic and extrinsic influences of prosocial behavior where donors and volunteers participate for various reasons (Drezner, 2009). So, social exchange theory provides a framework for showing how student experience, alumni benefits, and connection to an alma mater can increase millennial alumni giving.

In addition to social exchange theory, organizational identification (OID), a part of social identity theory, explained the phenomenon of millennial alumni giving patterns and characteristics. OID is the perception of oneness with, or belongingness to, an organization, where individuals define themselves as part of the organization in which they are a member (Mael & Ashforth, 1990). If millennials feel a part of the organization and therefore have some ownership, then they are likely to donate to their alma mater and remain involved beyond graduation. Mael and Ashforth (1992) predicted that alumni identification with their alma mater corresponds to participation in gift campaigns, alumni relations events, and encouraging others to become involved with the institution (Drezner, 2009). Thus, OID provided a framework in identifying the key factors that influence or motivate millennial alumni to stay involved and support their alma mater.

To fully understand the phenomenon of millennial alumni philanthropy patterns, it is imperative to view various factors through the lens of social exchange and social identity (OID) theories. These theories work together because they all focus on developing the relationship between the alumnus and the alma mater with the goal of keeping millennial alumni engaged and involved. Furthermore, the two theories explain the connections between student experience, alumni involvement, and maintaining lifelong relationships between alumni and the institution.

Purpose of the Study

According to (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011), there are eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving: awareness of needs, solicitation, costs and benefits, altruism, reputa-

tion, psychological benefits, values, and efficacy. The overall objective and purpose of this study was to identify the relationship between the factors that impact giving among millennial alumni based on student, academic, and overall experiences at Marymount University, controlling for gender, age, salary. Using a quantitative research method, the researcher aimed to understand the factors that indicate the type of millennial alumni who are likely to be potential donors.

There are a few known factors that predict alumni donating to their alma mater. For instance, attendance at university reunions, which are typically planned and implemented by alumni associations, is positively related to alumni giving (Newman & Petrosko, 2011). Other factors that influence alumni involvement and giving include loyalty and emotional attachment to the alma mater (Beeler 1982), and reading alumni publications (Taylor & Martin 1995 as cited in Newman & Petrosko, 2011). Lindahl & Winship (1994) and Okuande and Berl (1997) found that a significant predictor of alumni giving was past giving, with the best prospects being alumni who made more frequent and recent gifts (Newman & Petrosko, 2011). In any case, alumni involvement begins with a positive student experience (Feudo, 2010). Clotfelter (2003) found that donations made by alumni were highly correlated to their expressed satisfaction with their own college experience (McDearmon & Shirley, 2009). Perception of academic quality and prestige of the alma mater is another factor of alumni giving found by researchers, with greater perceived quality and prestige leading to greater levels of alumni giving (Baade & Sundberg 1996; Belfield & Beney 2000; Clotelter 2003b; Hanson 2000; Leslie & Ramey 1988; Mel & Ashforth 1992 as cited in (Newman & Petrosko, 2011). Other characteris-

tics that predict alumni giving include demographic factors such as age, salary, gender, major, degree, and residence (Newman & Petrosko, 2011).

Summary

Chapter one has introduced role of advancement in higher education and the importance of philanthropy among millennial alumni. Statistics surrounding millennial alumni patterns and giving trends were discussed along with the possible reasons for the lack of giving among millennial alumni. The statement of the problem was explored through the need to identify factors that will predict giving among millennial alumni. The significance of the study was identified with emphasis on ensuring that higher education is sustained financially with the support of millennial alumni donors. Lastly, the purpose of the study was reemphasized to determine how well student, academic, and overall experiences predicts giving among millennial alumni. The findings of this study can provide advancement professionals and university administrators with information that will allow them to have information pertaining giving patterns among millennial alumni.

Chapter two explores various factors that influence alumni giving. More specifically, it provides an overview of the scholarly literature on philanthropy among millennial alumni. The author examined literature related to motivating factors that influence millennial alumni to remain connected with their alma mater. A more detailed description of the theoretical construct is explored, along with the most relevant research conducted on philanthropy among millennial alumni. Chapter three outlines how these constructs were empirically investigated as possible explanations for factors that predict millennial alum-

ni to donate to their alma mater. Chapter four presents the results of the empirical investigations through binary logistic regression. Lastly, chapter five highlights how these results are consistent with the current literatures, along with implication for future research and implications for advancement professionals.

CHAPTER TWO-REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This study addressed the factors that impact giving among millennial alumni. In order to provide a foundation for this study, literature related to philanthropy in higher education, student involvement and experience, communication, relationship between donor and university, and motivating factors for alumni and millennial alumni was reviewed. This chapter provides a brief summary of the theoretical frameworks common in the literature. This chapter is organized into three main categories: context for the study, an overview of philanthropy in higher education, and philanthropy among millennials. The final section provides information pertaining to gaps found in the literature and recommendations for closing the gaps.

Context for the study

Philanthropy and alumni giving are central aspects of American higher education. Philanthropy is important to higher education because many institutions rely on alumni donations for a large portion of the overall budget and to help make the cost of college affordable for current students (Wastyn, 2009). Without the voluntary contributions that alumni donors provide to supplement tuition and other sources of institutional income, universities would not be able to reach their fiscal obligations or curricular goals (Drezner, 2010). Although many higher education institutions rely on financial support from

federal sources and external corporations, they also depend largely on funding donated by alumni. In fact, *World News Report* ranks colleges and universities based on their participation rate among undergraduate alumni donors. Thus, presidents are encouraging alumni professionals to engage alumni and increase their participation whether it is through fundraising or alumni programs.

In an effort to understand the factors that influence millennial alumni giving, it is important to review the role of student involvement. If a graduate who is solicited for a first-time donation has no previous knowledge or involvement with the alumni association, that new alum will have little to no interest in donating (Feudo, 2010). Hence, connecting with students while they are on campus is imperative to the process of engagement. Therefore, the following review of the research explores student involvement, student experience, and communication as it relates to alumni giving.

Student Involvement

Student involvement includes membership and active participation in student clubs, organizations, community services, cultural and spiritual activities, and athletics. Students on campus today are the alumni of tomorrow, so it is vitally important to establish a relationship with them while they are enrolled as students. According to Alexander Astin (1999), student involvement refers to the amount of physical and psychological energy that a student devotes to the academic experience. A highly involved student devotes energy to studying, spending time on campus, participates actively in student organizations, and interacts frequently with faculty members, and students (Astin, 1999).

The first student advancement program was established in 1974 at Iowa State University (Feudo, 2010). A student advancement program serves as liaison between the student body and the office of university advancement by increasing awareness of philanthropy. The purpose of student advancement programs is to foster and enhance student involvement in all areas of advancement from alumni relations and communications to fundraising, marketing and related areas (CASE, 2013). In addition, student advancement programs alert students and their advisors of advancement opportunities, resources, and career paths (CASE, 2013). Once the students graduate, these former students often become the volunteers and board members of their alma mater (Feudo, 2010). This early involvement also allows "younger graduates to assume leadership positions in alumni associations much sooner than the students of the 1960's and 1970's did" (Feudo, 2010, p.124). Currently, many institutions have student alumni networks that typically provide support to the alumni associations in reaching out to prospective or current students (Feudo, 2010). Students who are engaged and involved during their time on campus tend to become more active alumni (Feudo, 2010). The alumni association's programming efforts are vital to the success of the entire institution's efforts to maintain a lifelong link to the most important resource which is the current and future student body. Students are future volunteers in alumni clubs and chapters, the members of school's advisory councils, future mentors to students, and ultimately donors (Feudo, 2010). Kang (2005) found that experience in contributing during college years has a significant and positive effect on future giving patterns (Drezner, 2010). Nayman, Gianneschi, and Mandel (1993) suggested turning students into donors is a socialization process that involves orienting stu-

dents to the notion of voluntary giving, actively engaging them in varied institutional advancement activities and strategically timing program initiatives (Drezner, 2010), while they are still students at the college or university.

Involvement in extra-curricular activities has also been found to increase the chances of becoming a future donor, although the level of extracurricular involvement of donors varies. Although Shim's (2001) study did not relate to the frequency or magnitude of subsequent gifts, student involvement in campus activities does have an impact (Wastyn, 2009). Students who are involved, in other words become members of clubs and organizations, participate on athletic teams, or participate in extra-curricular activities recognize the "importance of giving back to their alma mater, not only financially but also through their ongoing involvement as volunteers, their willingness to share their expertise, experience and time to enhance the future of their alma mater" (Feudo, 2010, p. 129). Engaging and cultivating students during their undergraduate years is critical to the success of a robust alumni program. In other words, students' involvement as undergraduates becomes the direct correlation to their willingness to donate to their alma mater and stay involved beyond graduation. In addition to involvement on campus, the overall student experience plays a role in alumni's willingness to donate to their alma mater.

Student Experience

Student experience is another factor that influences alumni inclination to get involved or contribute to their alma mater. Numerous studies have found undergraduate student experiences to have a significant impact upon alumni giving behavior (Beeler, 1982; Belfield & Beney, 2000; Bruggink & Siddiqui, 1995; Clotfelter, 2003b; Hanson

2000; Mael & Ashforth, 1992; Monks, 2003; Stutler & Calvario, 1996), with positive experiences translating to greater alumni giving (Newman & Petrosko, 2011). In addition to a positive student experience, academic success has also been found to have an impact on young alumni giving rates (McDearmon & Shirley, 2009). Marr, Mullin, and Siegfried (2005) found that academic success shares a positive relationship with alumni giving as measured by both GPA and SAT scores (Clotfelter, 2003b; Cunningham & Cochi-Ficano, 2002, as cited in Newman & Petrosko, 2011).

Financial aid is another factor related to demographics that has been studied by researchers (Beeler, 1982; Marr et. al., 2005) who found that receipt of scholarships or grant awards as an undergraduate, results in greater levels of giving after graduation (Newman, & Petrosko, 2011). On the other hand, Clotfelter (2003a) and Monks (2003) discovered that individuals with undergraduate need-based loans tended to give less to their alma mater than alumni who did not receive student loans (Newman & Petrosko, 2011).

The number of transfer students, commuting students, unprepared students, and students of color are enrolling in colleges and universities are increasing at a steady rate (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2014). Results from the 2014 NSSE suggested that institutional culture, policy, and practices can make a difference in the quality of the student experience. According to the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (2014), when new college students' expectations were met, they were more likely to be satisfied with their college experience and more socially and academically integrated into their campus community.

All of these findings suggest that demographics such as social economic status and academic experiences during college can have an impact on the willingness for this new generation of recent graduates to make financial contributions years after they graduate (McDearmon & Shirley, 2009).

Communication

In the 1970's, communication with alumni consisted of handwritten letters and flyers (Feudo, 2010). Modern alumni professionals continue to develop communication strategies to foster relationships with alumni and increase awareness of alumni related programs. Through traditional publications (i.e. newsletters, alumni-targeted magazines, and informational flyers), alumni are able to touch, feel, and see attractive, and well-designed printed publications that help rekindle their time on campus as students. However, young alumni generally do not communicate the same way as other generations of alumni (Feudo, 2010). Young alumni want their messages delivered in an electronic method, whether by email or through social media (Catlett, 2010). Less than 58 percent of annual donors in 2012 came from mail appeal or phonathon programs, according to the Annual Giving Network (Allen, 2014). The remaining 42 percent arrived through online channels and other sources (Allen, 2014).

Thus, in the 1990's alumni associations moved to establish online communities (Feudo, 2010). These online community websites typically included an "online alumni directory, event calendar, notification and event registration tools, job posting pages, class notes, and photo albums" (Feudo, 2010, p. 114). More recently, millennial alumni are likely to use social media sites such as LinkedIn, Facebook, and Twitter to stay con-

nected (Catlett, 2010). These sites allow alumni to self-identify by school and sometimes interact on the basis of their school affiliation. Because research shows that many institutions substantially used social media to help students connect with student groups, organizations, and other students (NSSE, 2014), connecting recent alumni through these means is an extension of their experience.

The use of social media sites has resulted in a decrease in the use of alumni-only communities and an increase in the number of individual alumni and current students creating profiles on free and open social networks (Feudo, 2010). For example, some universities created online portals so that alumni could find their classmates and keep in touch via a third-party online vendor. Partially as a response to the decreasing use of their own online community sites, alumni associations have gradually moved from the formal exclusivity of private sites to participate in online networks outside their own online communities (Feudo, 2010). Thus, alumni can find classmates and communicate without going through the university's portal. In the era of e-mail, instant messaging, online directories, Facebook, and LinkedIn and dozens of other networking tools, "alumni do not need the office of alumni relations any more to stay in touch with each other nor the institution" (Feudo, 2010, p. 232). Thus, due to the era of social media, alumni professionals are having a hard time engaging and connecting to young alumni using traditional communication methods.

In contrast, Facebook alumni groups can be both informational and effective (Farrow & Yuan, 2011). The messages that are exchanged among peers carry an authenticity

that targeted e-mails sent from the university do not, and hence are more persuasive in shaping positive attitudes about giving (Farrow & Yuan, 2011). Since all the posts on Facebook are on public display, social networking site members can reinforce each other's positive attitude toward the university and the importance of volunteering for or giving to their alma mater.

The next section examines the factors that motivate alumni of all ages to give. The researcher begins by discussing motivating factors that influence alumni to give and to get involved, regardless of age. Finally, the researcher highlights factors that motivate millennial alumni specifically.

Motivating Factors to All Alumni Giving

There are many motivating factors that influence alumni to give to their alma mater. Today's colleges and universities regularly solicit alumni for donations using intrinsic and extrinsic benefits as motivation (Drezner, 2010). Extrinsic motivators may include small gifts to the donors; invitations to campus activities, listing of names in widely read annual reports, membership in giving societies, or the belief that alumni participation and monetary gifts increase their alma mater's reputation and therefore the value of their own degree (Drezner, 2010). In contrast, intrinsic motivations for giving include scholarships to help others attend college (Harbaugh, 1998).

Regardless of whether alumni are intrinsically or extrinsically motivated to give, the relationship alumni maintain with the school after graduation influences subsequent giving (Goldseker & Moody, 2013). Shim (2001) found that certain aspects of involve-

ment, the number of recent campus visits and contact with a person from the college, correlate significantly with the magnitude of gifts among donors (Wastyn, 2009, p. 98), while on the other hand, Connor (2005) uncovered no difference in these aspects of involvement between donors and non-donors in her study. Thus, these studies indicate that the relationship between alumni and an institution after graduation could possibly influence an alumnus' willingness to donate to their alma mater.

In addition to relationships between alumni and institutions, Blacks, multi-racial respondents, married individuals, and non-US citizens donate significantly less to their undergraduate institutions (Monks, 2003, p. 124). Monks (2003) concluded that regardless of most demographic characteristics, the most significant determinant of alumni giving levels is the individual's satisfaction with his or her undergraduate experience.

Whether students are enrolled at a public or private institution, they are paying more for their education than their predecessors did 10 or 20 years ago (Scully, 2013). The Committee for Economic Development recently published a report indicating that tuition at public and private institutions in the United States has increased 570% in the past quarter-century (Scully, 2013). According to a recent study, "fifty-eight percent of respondents who reported having the largest amount of debt (more than $15,000) were categorized as non-donors" (McDearmon & Shirley, p. 90, 2009). This is compared with the forty-two percent of respondents who had no debt, and indicated that they were donors to a higher education institution (McDearmon & Shirley, 2009). Out of all the categories of debt, the majority of those who still owed some amount in student loans were mostly non-donors (McDermott & Shirley, 2009). Alumni who received a need-based loan

lowers the probability of giving to their alma mater by 13% (Monks, 2003). On the other

hand, receipt of grants rather than need based loan raises the probability of giving 12%

(Monks, 2003, p. 122). Thus, those who received need-based financial aid tended to give

less to their alma mater. The notion that alumni are still paying a student loan could be a

reason that they are not donating versus the alumni who obtain grants. Studies have also

found a consistent link between individual income and household income and the dollar

contributions to one's alma mater (Monks, 2003). The higher the salary the more likely

an alumnus will donate to their alma mater. In sum, demographics (i.e. age, race, gender,

and social economic status,), intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and student loans play a

major role in determining in alumni support for their alma mater.

Motivating Factors to Millennial Alumni Giving

There are many motivating factors that influence millennial alumni to contribute

to their alma mater. In a study conducted by the Johnson Center at Grand Valley State

University, when asked who has the most influence on giving, millennials responded by

"stating that their parents had the most influence followed by their grandparents, close

friends, and peers (Goldseker & Moody, 2013, p. 19). The data showed that a commit-

ment to philanthropy is instilled in these millennials often referred as "next-gen" donors

very early on, largely by their families. According to the NextGenDonors study, "66.9%

of millennial alumni are more likely to make a gift to education than to other organiza-

tions" (Goldseker & Moody, 2013, p. 23). Generally, millennial alumni philanthropic

giving is often predicated on personal connections between the donor and the recipient

(Drezner, 2010). Rather than waiting until the sunset of their lives to decide who they are as philanthropists and what legacies they want to leave, millennial donors at present actively craft their identities now and think about their own legacies (Goldseker & Mood, 2013). While these next gen donors want to make a difference in the world, they want to do so in responsible ways, honoring the past while improving the future (Goldseker & Mood, 2013).

Another factor that drives millennial alumni philanthropy is values. Although millennial alumni have the same philanthropic values as their parents, they also want to explore new philanthropic methods and investing tools as well. Next-gen donors are most interested in conducting "due diligence," being proactive rather than reactive in finding recipients for goal-driven giving, and searching for information about organizational impact, efficiency, and leadership to inform decision-making. They also consider it vital to fund efforts to "address root causes and attempt systemic solutions" (Goldseker & Moody, 2013, p.40). In addition to family and personal influences, another factor influencing millennial giving is their proximity to their alma mater as well as perceptions of their alma mater. For example, the closer the alumni are geographically to the campus the more likely they will stay involved. Lastly, millennial alumni want to see the impact their contributions make (Goldseker & Moody, 2013).

Although, some millennial alumni are philanthropic in nature, there are a several factors that prohibit other young alumni from making a gift to their alma mater. One of those factors includes a correlation between student loan debt and motivation to give. In the last decade, the price index for U.S. College tuition rates grew by nearly 80 percent (Allen,

2014). Thus, millennial alumni who have debt for student loans are less likely to give than alumni without student debt (McDearmon & Shirley, 2009). Other reasons why millennial alumni do not give to their alma mater include the following: they consider college a commodity not a charity; they do not believe the college needs their money; they have misperceptions and uncertainties about giving; and they do not make their giving decisions logically (Wastyn, 2009, p.100).

Some millennial alumni feel that they have completed the collegiate phase of their life and wish to move on (Wastyn, 2009). For example, students purchase a good education and get a commodity in exchange (a degree). In a recent study non donors indicated that the messages they receive contain perceptions and narratives that bias them against making a gift (for example instead of defining their student days as beginning of a life-long association with the college, the non-donors defined it as a stop in their day or as a service for which they paid an agreed upon price) (Wastyn, 2009). Even for the "traditional-aged students, college is becoming closer to the non-traditional student's experience where college fits among non-school obligations for jobs and families to become a 'stop in the day'" (Wastyn, 2009, p. 104).

Alumni relations professionals need to create their own narratives that tell the story of the college's needs in a way that resonates with the personal narratives developed by these non-donors. Alumni relations professionals need to find a way to appeal to non-traditional students and engage millennial alumni beyond a solicitation letter. Often times, millennial alumni do not read or open solicitation letters. To effectively engage

millennial alumni fund-raising must extend to the alumni's family, and demonstrate the value of the gift to include the alumni, their spouse, and children.

Relationship between Donor and University

It is important for alumni relation professionals to establish a relationship with millennial donors. The process of creating and maintaining a relationship with all potential donors is at the heart of any successful fund-raising campaign (Winter, 2000). According to Kelly (2000) four main elements of stewardship must be present in an organization's fundraising plan: reciprocity, responsibility, reporting, and relationship nurturing. However, of the four elements, relationship nurturing is the most important piece of the stewardship puzzle. If alumni relations professionals want to keep millennial alumni engaged and ensure that they make a gift annually, then they must have a stewardship plan. Rosso (1993) argued that if an organization wants to ensure its longevity then it should be prepared to dedicate time to developing relationships with its donors (Waters, 2008). If millennial alumni do not have a personal connection or relationship to the university, then they are less likely to get involved or make a financial contribution. One way many colleges are building that relationship is by offering enhanced career services to alumni in particular young alumni. Because 2008 of the recession and economic downfall, many recent graduates are using free career services (i.e. career coaching, resume building, interviewing skills) offered by their university to help them obtain jobs. Often times this is the type of connection and relationship that enables millennial alumni the desire to want to give back to their alma mater. This is a useful tool in combating employment concerns and opens the door for meaningful engagement (Scully, 2013).

Theoretical Review

There are two theories that provide a theoretical framework for engagement among millennial alumni. These include social exchange theory and social identity theory.

Social exchange theory is defined as a two-sided mutually contingent, and mutually rewarding process involving transactions or a simple exchange (Emerson, 1976). According to Homan (1974), four propositions undergird social exchange theory:

1.) The success proposition. For all actions taken by persons, the more often a particular action of a person is rewarded, the more likely the person is to perform the action (Emerson, 1976). For example, if millennial alumni are rewarded with incentives or other freebies, than they are more likely to continue to give to their alma mater.

2.) The stimulus proposition. If in the past the occurrence of a particular stimulus, or set of stimuli, has been the occasion for which a person's action has been rewarded, then the more similar the present stimuli are to the past ones, the more likely the person is to perform the action, or similar action (Emerson, 1976). For instance, if alumni are invited to special events for donors only, they are more likely to continue to donate.

3.) The deprivation-satiation proposition. The more often in the recent past a person has received a particular reward, the less valuable any further unit of that reward becomes for him (Emerson, 1976). For example, millennial alumni do not value

having their name printed in an honor roll of donors or a president's report. Instead, millennial alumni value direct impact and exchange.

4.)   The value proposition. A person is more likely to perform an action if he or she highly values the result of the action (Emerson, 1976). For example, if millennial alumni value community service as a student then they are more likely to donate toward a service scholarship.

In addition, to the four propositions, social exchange theory explains the interdependent relationship that exists between donor and alma mater. Under this theory, alumni donate when they understand that their interests align with the needs and interests of the institution (Drezner, 2009). Kelly (2002) found that based on social-exchange theory; the mixed motive model of giving describes two level of donor motivation: 1) raising the amount of common good and 2) receiving some private good in return. These mixed motivates, evident in social exchange theory, (success, stimulus, deprivation-satiation, and value propositions) align with the intrinsic and extrinsic influences of prosocial behavior where donors and volunteers participate for various reasons (Drezner, 2009). Based on social exchange theory, if millennial alumni see a benefit to being involved or donating to their alma mater, they are likely to continue to remain active donors.

In addition to social exchange theory, organization identification, a part of social identity theory, "occurs when an individual defines himself or herself by an organization" (Drezner, 2009, p.150). In the context of higher education, "I am an alumna of..." is an example of organizational identification (OID) (Drezner, 2009, p. 150). According to

social identity theory, the self-concept is comprised of a personal identity (i.e. certain abilities and interests) and social identity (Mael & Ashforth, 1990). Individuals tend to identify themselves with various social groups, such as organizations, gender, and graduating class cohorts. Social identification then, is the perception of belongingness to a group classification (Mael & Ashforth, 1990). In other words, alumni may identify themselves as members of an alumni association or alumni affinity groups (i.e. Young Alumni Chapter). Through social identification, an individual perceives him or herself as psychologically intertwined with the fate of the group, as sharing a common destiny, and experiencing its successes and failures (Tolman, 1943 as cited in Mael & Ashforth, 1990).

Mael and Ashforth suggested that alumni conceptualize organizational identification as follows:

1.) College can be considered a "holographic organization" that is one where members share a common organization-wide identity and are less likely to experience competing demands from say, department-level or occupational identities (Drezner, 2009, p. 150).

2.) Since alumni constitute a particularly critical source of support for colleges, alumni identification is likely to strongly affect the welfare of their respective alma maters (Drezner, 2009, p. 150). Therefore, alumni who donate typically have a strong identification with their alma mater.

Mael and Ashforth (1992) proposed that organizational identification in which aspects of both the institution and the individual feed into the organizational identity of an alum-

nus, leads to an organizational consequence of alumni supporting their alma mater (Drezner, 2009). Institutional tradition and prestige also influenced alumni contributions (Drezner, 2009). Using social identity theory as a basis for understanding motivating factors of alumni giving, Mael and Ashforth predicted "that alumni identification with their alma mater corresponds to participation in gift campaigns, alumni relations events, and encouraging others to attend the institution" (Drezner, p. 150, 2009). Other factors that affect a person's organizational identity are: time spent at the institution, overall satisfaction, and perceptions of the academic reputation; these all have positive effects. An alumnus relationship with their alma mater is often an important motivator in giving (Drezner, 2009). Thus, building relationships between the institution and its current and prospective donors is arguably the most important aspect of successful solicitation and alumni relations.

In sum, social exchange theory and social identity (OID) theory, work together as they focus on developing and maintaining relationships between alumni and the alma mater. In this study, the author used the social exchange theory to determine if millennial alumni who remain involve (i.e. volunteers) are more likely to donate to an alma mater. Utilizing the framework of the social identity (OID) theory, the author will appraise the research by examining the relationship between student experiences and involvement and their donor status.

Critique of Literature

There are still abundant questions about what motivates alumni donors to give to their alma mater that have not been addressed in the literature. The vast majority of the philanthropic literature is based on large scale quantitative surveys and does not focus on how individuals are encouraged to give at specific types of institutions, fund-raising practices, or the impact that alumni programs have on alumni giving. Thus, this study bridges the gap between student and academic experiences as it pertains to giving among millennial alumni. Most of the literature examines studies that measure alumni satisfaction based on their academic experience, overall student satisfaction, and perception of the university. There is limited research on retention rates among types of donors like LYBUNTS (last year but not this year) and SYBUNTS (some years but not this year) donors, as well as attitudes toward alumni programs and services. While there are a few known published studies of predictors of alumni giving, there is limited research on millennial alumni giving at religious institutions as well as unique student experiences such as enrollment status, campus living, and student involvement.

In effort to fill the gaps in the literature, it is important to conduct a study to determine the factors that motivate students and young alumni to make financial contributions to a Catholic institution. It is also important to know the ways in which young alumni wish to engage with their alma mater. For example, is a Catholic young alumnus who graduated from a Catholic institution more likely to stay engaged and donate to their alma mater than non-Catholic young alumni? It is also important to know if there is a direct link to alumni programs and services to giving among millennial alumni. By understanding the factors that influence specific young alumni to stay active and engaged at a

specific type of institution, alumni relations professionals at those types of institutions will have the ability to better create more effective programs and solicitation campaigns.

Summary

The review of literature presented was organized by a broad overview of philanthropy and alumni giving in American higher education followed by studies related to student involvement, student experience, communication and the role it has on philanthropy. Based on the literature reviewed, the following factors will be analyzed in the study: 1.) *Awareness of Alumni activities.* Millennial consumers use interactive media to gather information including promotional media (Moore, 2012). Facebook alumni groups can be effective in spreading information (Farrow & Yuan, 2011). 2.) *Connection to faculty.* An alumnus kinship with their alma mater is often an important motivator in giving (Drezner, 2009). 3.) *Connection.* Clotfelter (2003a) found that alumni of private liberal arts colleges are more likely to donate than alumni from other private universities, and alumni of more selective private institutions are more likely to give than alumni from less selective colleges or universities (Newman & Petrosko, 2011). 4.) *Remain involved.* Involvement after graduation positively impacts the giving rates of alumni (McDearmon & Shirley, 2009). Young alumni enjoy sharing their successes with current students by serving as mentors (Feudo, 2010). 5.) *Gender.* Belfield and Beney (2000) and Holmes (2008) found that women who attend private colleges make more frequent gifts than men but the size of the donations from women are smaller than those from men (Newman & Petrosko, 2011). 6.) *Salary.* Studies have found a consistent link between individual income and the dollar contributions to one's alma mater (Monks, 2003). 7.) *Academic reputation.*

38

Institutional tradition and prestige are factors that influence alumni contributions (Drezner, 2009). 8.) *Overall experience*. Alumni involvement begins with a positive student experience (Feudo, 2010). Clotfelter (2003) found that donations made by alumni were highly correlated to their expressed satisfaction with their own college experience (McDearmon & Shirley, 2009). 9.) *Major*. College major is a predictor of alumni giving with alumni who earned degrees in social science fields more likely to donate than alumni who majored in the arts (Newman & Petrosko, 2011). 10.) *Student involvement* (i.e. student clubs, intercollegiate athletics, study abroad, spiritual involvement). Students who are engaged and involved during their time on campus tend to become more active alumni (Feudo, 2010).

The chapter also discussed factors that motivate alumni and millennial alumni to donate to their alma mater. The chapter concluded with an overview of the theoretical framework utilized in the study which includes social exchange theory, social identity theory, and relationship marketing theory. The next chapter will discuss the methodology utilized in the study to address the research questions and gaps in the literature.

CHAPTER THREE-METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the methodology utilized to conduct the research. The purpose of this study was to identify the significant relationships between student experiences, alumni activities, and connection to the university that impact giving among millennial alumni. This study utilized Marymount University's Annual Alumni Survey to build on previous research outlining characteristics of millennial alumni and philanthropy patterns. According to Creswell (2012), quantitative research is appropriate when a researcher identifies multiple concrete variables and seeks to measure and compare them. Thus, to determine the characteristics that predicted giving among millennial alumni, the author used a binary logistic regression to analyze the results of selected questions from the alumni survey, particularly items related to student experiences, alumni engagement, and overall perception of Marymount. This chapter includes detailed information pertaining to the research questions, instrument, study population and sample, variables, data transformation, data analysis, limitations and summary. The survey included in this study along with IRB form, and letter of support from Marymount University are included in Appendices A, B, and C.

The research addressed the following research questions:

1. Is there a statistically significant relationship between student experiences (i.e. major; student involvement to include student clubs, intercollegiate athletics, spiritual involvement, community service; institutional aid; academic success (final G.P.A.); academic reputation; academic quality; enrollment status; transfer/first college; class location; and campus living) and giving for millennial alumni?

2. Is there a statistically significant relationship between awareness of alumni activities and giving among millennial alumni?

3. Is there a statistically significant relationship between connectedness (i.e. alumni involvement, connection to faculty and the university) and giving amongst millennial alumni?

4. Do student experiences, awareness of alumni activities, alumni involvement, connection to faculty and the university predict millennial alumni giving?

It was hypothesized that:

1. H1: The researcher hypothesizes that if millennial alumni had a positive overall experience at Marymount University then they are more likely to donate.

2. H2: The researcher hypothesizes if millennial alumni lived on campus at some point during their academic career then they are more likely to donate money to their alma mater. Thus, a significant difference in the status of donor versus non donor among millennial alumni who lived on campus versus commuted.

3. H3: The researcher hypothesizes that if millennial alumni received institutional aid, then they are more likely to donate to their alma mater. Thus, there will be a significant difference in the status of donor versus non donor among millennial alumni who received institutional aid versus those who did not.

Research Design

To address the research questions and hypotheses, a quantitative research design was utilized, more specifically binary logistic regression. A qualitative research method was most appropriate for this study because qualitative research seeks to measure differences and the magnitude of those differences among two or more groups or measure change over time in individuals (Creswell, 2012). The author decided to use binary logistic regression because the goal of this study was to predict membership (donor versus non-donor) from scores on several predicator variables. According to Creswell (2012), a binary logistic regression model may include predictor variables that are quantitative, dummy-coded categorical, or both.

Logistic regression uses different summary statistics to provide information about overall model fit and the nature of the relationship between predictors and group membership (Warner, 2013, p. 1007). There are several assumptions for logistic regression which include the following:

1. The outcome variable is dichotomous (usually the scores are coded 1 and 0).

2. Scores on the outcome variable must be statistically independent of each other.

3. The model must correctly specify; that is, it should include all relevant predictors and it should not include any irrelevant predictors.

4. The categories on the outcome variable are assumed to be exhaustive and mutually exclusive; that is each person in the study is known to be a member of one group or the other but not both (Warner, 2013, p. 1008).

Binary logistic regression does not require normally distributed scores on the Y outcome variable, a linear relation between scores on Y and scores on quantitative X predictor variables, or homogeneous variance of Y across levels of X (Warner, 2013). Binary Logistic Regression does not perform well when many cells have expected frequencies less than 5 (Warner, 2013). Thus, a total of twenty-five independent variables were examined in this study.

Instrument and Data Collection

Marymount University's Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness conducted a survey of Marymount's alumni every fall. The survey asked alumni to evaluate their experience at Marymount and report professional and educational achievements since graduation. Survey results are used to examine Marymount's effectiveness in providing its students with a quality educational experience and to identify where to make improvements. The survey consisted of thirty-four open and closed-ended questions.

Validity

The questionnaire was field tested by sending out the alumni survey to thirty alumni advisory board members and other alumni volunteers to determine the validity of the questions and format. Once the field test was conducted, the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness correlated the responses from the graduating survey with the alumni survey to measure the strength and confidence of the relationships. The indicators from the validation was 0.9 and above.

Data Collection

The responses were compiled, analyzed, and published by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness at Marymount University on an annual basis. Only questions pertaining to student's academic experience, student involvement, and alumni experience, among millennial undergraduate alumni were utilized in the study. In addition, only annual surveys administered in 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011 were utilized (see Appendix C).

A paper survey was mailed to alumni within one year of their graduation date and again five years later. Alumni who did not respond by mail received an email reminder as well as a link to complete the survey electronically. The survey was available online to alumni from November until March each year. On average the overall response rate for each survey was 25% which include undergraduates and graduates (Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, 2015). When alumni completed the survey, they received either a Marymount Alumni shirt or a five dollar gift card to Barnes and Noble. The incentives were paid for by the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness.

Participants

44

In an effort to determine the number of millennial alumni at Marymount University, a dataset with 3,425 millennial (i.e. individuals born between 1980 and 1988) alumni earning undergraduate degrees during 2002-2010, was obtained by the office of advancement. After obtaining IRB approval to conduct the study from Marymount University and George Mason University (see Appendix B), the author then worked with the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness to determine the number of millennial alumni who actually participated in the annual alumni survey between 2007-2011. Non-survey participants were removed from the dataset. A total of n = 801 millennial alumni respondents were included in the data set. Participants included in this study were between the ages of 25-33 and obtained an undergraduate degree from Marymount University between 2002 and 2010. The participants in the study represent 10 % of the total millennial alumni population and 2% of the total alumni population. The participant sample of millennial undergraduate alumni represented a variety of different academic and racial backgrounds.

Variables

The dependent variable in this study is lifetime giving amount as reported by the office of advancement at Marymount University. Based on the literature review, the author selected and analyzed the following independent demographic variables in this study: *Gender*, Belfield and Beney (2000) and Holmes (2008) found that women who attend private colleges make more frequent gifts than men but the size of the donations from women are smaller than those from men (Newman & Petrosko, 2011). *Race*, Blacks, multi-racial respondents, married individuals, and non-US citizens donate signifi-

cantly less to their undergraduate institutions (Monks, 2003, p. 124). *Salary,* studies have

found a consistent link between individual income and the dollar contributions to one's

alma mater (Monks, 2003). In addition to demographic variables, the researcher used the

social exchange theory in selecting the remaining variables. Social exchange theory is a

two-sided, mutually contingent rewarding process involving transactions, or simply, ex-

changes (Emerson, 1976). The theory explains the interdependent relationship that exists

between donor and their alma mater. Under this theory, alumni donate when they unders-

tand that their interests align with the needs and interests of the institution (Drezner,

2009). Thus, the researcher selected the following independent variables: *Academic repu-*

tation, institutional tradition and prestige are factors that influence alumni contributions

(Drezner, 2009). 4.) *Overall experience*, alumni involvement begins with a positive stu-

dent experience (Feudo, 2010). Clotfelter (2003) found that donations made by alumni

were highly correlated to their expressed satisfaction with their own college experience

(McDearmon & Shirley, 2009). 5.) *Major*, college major is a predictor of alumni giving

with alumni who earned degrees in social science fields more likely to donate than alum-

ni who majored in the arts (Newman & Petrosko, 2011). The researcher also utilized the

organizational identification theory which is the perception of identification with, or be-

longingness to, an organization, where individuals define themselves as part of the orga-

nization in which he or she is a member (Mael & Ashforth, 1990), to select variables that

are likely to have a relationship with giving and millennial alumni. Mael and Ashforth

(1992) predicted that alumni identification with their alma mater corresponds to partici-

pation in gift campaigns, alumni relations events, and encouraging others to become in-

volved with the institution (Drezner, 2009). Thus, the following variables were selected and analyzed: *Student involvement* (i.e. student clubs, intercollegiate athletics, study abroad, spiritual involvement), students who are engaged and involved during their time on campus tend to become more active alumni (Feudo, 2010). Awareness of *Alumni activities* (informed), Millennial consumers use interactive media to gather information including promotional media (Moore, 2012). Facebook alumni groups can be both information and effective (Farrow & Yuan, 2011). *Connection to faculty,* an alumnus kinship with their alma mater is often an important motivator in giving (Drezner, 2009). *Remain involved*, involvement after graduation positively impacts the giving rates of alumni (McDearmon & Shirley, 2009). Young alumni enjoy sharing their successes with current students by serving as mentors (Feudo, 2010). *Connection*, Clotfelter (2003a) found that alumni of private liberal arts colleges are more likely to donate than alumni from other private universities, and alumni of more selective private institutions are more likely to give than alumni from less selective colleges or universities (Newman & Petrosko, 2011). Table 3.1 describes all variables utilized in this study.

Table 3.1

Description and Coding of Variables

Variable	Description	Coding
LTGiving2	Lifetime giving/donor status	1= $1.00-$1,649; 0= 0
Age	Age of participant	1= 25-29; 2= 30-33
Gender	Gender of participant	1= Female; 0=Male
White	Race of participant	1= White; 0=Non-White
Black	Race of participant	1= Black; 0= Non-Black
Asian	Race of participant	1= Asian; 0= Non-Asian
AcademicQuality2	Perception of academic quality	1= Poor, 2= Needs Improvement, 3= Adequate, 4= Good, 5= Excellent
Academic_Reputation	Perception of academic reputation	1= Poor, 2= Needs Improvement, 3= Adequate, 4= Good, 5= Excellent
Alumni_Activities	Awareness of alumni activities	1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3=No opinion, 4= Agree, 5=Strongly Agree
Campus_Living	Residence as a student	1= Never lived on campus, 2= Less than 1 year, 3=1 to 2 years, 4= 3 to 4 years
Class_Location	Location of majority classes	1= Loudoun/Reston, 2= Ballston, 3=Main campus
Clubs2	Involved in student clubs	0= No, 1= Yes
Connection	Connection to the university	1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=No opinion, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree
Description2	Start at Marymount	1= First College, 2= Transfer
Enrollment_ Status2	Enrollment status	1= Part-time, 2= Full-Time
Experience2	Perception of overall experience	1= Poor/needs improvement, 2=Adequate, 3=Good, 4= Excellent
Faculty	In touch with faculty	1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= No opinion, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree
FinalGPA2	Academic Success	1= 2.002-2.501, 2= 2.508-3.003, 3= 3.015-3.500, 4= 3.503-3.992, 5= 4.0 and above
Intercollegiate2	Involved in Athletics	0= No, 1= Yes
MAward	Obtained institutional Aid	0= No, 1= Yes
Major	Business major	0= No, 1= Yes
Salary	Salary after graduation	1= Under $10,000; 2= $10,000-$19,999, 3- $20,000-$29,999, 4= $30,000-$39,999, 5=$40,000-$49,000, 6=$50,000-$59,000, 7=$60,000-$69,999, 8= $70,000-$79,999, 9=$80,000-$89,999; 10-$90,000 and above
Spiritual2	Involved in Spiritual Activities	0= No, 1= Yes
Service2	Involved in Community Service	0= No, 1= Yes
Remaining_Involved	Willingness to remain involved	0=No, 1= Yes

By focusing on the variables listed above, the researcher addressed the research questions and hypotheses presented earlier.

Data Transformation

Upon selecting the variables for the study, the author dummy coded all of the categorical variables (see table 3.1). The author also recoded lifetime giving to make it a dichotomous variable so if someone donated $1.00 to $1,640 they were coded with (1) and if someone donated zero than the variable was coded (0). The author examined z-scores to identify extreme scores with a greater z-score of 3.29 and outliers. The author identified twenty-two cases with extreme scores and removed them from the dataset. The author noticed that an additional twenty cases had outliers and those cases were removed, for a n=779. Frequencies were then run on all of the variables to determine the extent and value of the missing value codes. Marital status was removed from the dataset because more than 94% of the data was missing. The author also deleted degree completion because more than 50% of the data was missing. The largest percentages of the legitimate missing values were specifically related to race (i.e. White, Black, and Asian) and salary. Since demographics were the most salient to the research study, imputation was used to replace the missing values. It was determine that the values were missing due to the alumni not reporting their race. According to Park and Kim (2006), imputation are utilized to facilitate analyses using complete data analysis methods and to ensure that the results obtained by different analyses are consistent with one another. Therefore, the author used the mean to handle the remaining missing scores for the following variables: race, salary, enrollmentstatus2, description2, spiritual2, clubs2, intercollegiate2, service2,

faculty, alumni, remaining involved. It was determine that n=756 for the final data analysis. Table 3.2 provides information regarding the number of missing scores.

Table 3.2

Missing Value Codes

Variable	Percentage Missing
Asian	14.5
Black	14.5
White	14.5
Alumni_Activities	0.4
Clubs2	1.9
Description2	0.4
EnrollmentStatus2	0.3
Faculty	0.3
Spiritual2	2.4
Intercollegiate2	2.6
Remaining_Involved	0.4
Service	2.5

After the completion of coding, recoding, and removing extreme cases, the researcher checked for multicollinearity among the predictor variables as well as mahalanobis values. According to Creswell (2012), multicollinearity occurs when two or more predictors in the model are correlated and provide redundant information about the response. The author computed correlations between all pairs of predictors and confirmed that multicollinearity among the predictor variables did not exist nor did values exceed the chi-square criterion. In other words the tolerance was not greater than 0.10 or close to

1. The goodness of fit tests (chi-square) indicated that some of the categories had too many missing cells. According to Creswell (2012), the expected value of the number of sample observation in each level of the variable must be at least 5. Thus the author collapsed categories to ensure that the category had at least five respondents and recoded the following variables: salary2, academicquality2, academic reputation, and experience2. For instance, less than four alumni respondents earned more than $100,000 and above in salary, therefore the author combined $90,000 and $100,000 to ensure that the category was above five. Less than four people indicated that academic quality, academic reputation, and experience was poor. Thus, the author combined poor/needs improvement to ensure that the category had more than five respondents.

Table 3.3 provides detailed information pertaining to the frequency conducted for demographic characteristics of millennial alumni. Approximately, 83.5% of the respondents were female and 16.5 were male. A one-way between S-NOVA was performed to assess whether mean lifetime giving differed significantly between female and male millennial alumni. A test of homogeneity of variance assumption was requested (the Levene test). The Levene test was statistically significant : F(1,754)=44, p=.000. Thus, there was statistically significant difference between the variance of lifetime giving for the male and female groups. The mean for lifetime giving for men was .34 and the mean for female was .18. The difference between the mean for males and females was statistically significant at the conventional $\underline{\alpha}$ =.05 level; F(1, 754)=16, p=.000. The difference between the means (Male .34-.18 Female) was + 16.

More than half of the respondents (57.4%) of the respondents were between the ages of 30-33 and less than half of the respondents (42.6%) were between the ages of 25-29. More than half of the respondents self-identified as White (61.8%) on the other hand 8.6% of the respondents self-identified as Asian and 8.3% self-identified as Black. The percentage of respondents is representative of the total alumni population at Marymount University, whereas 79% of alumni are female and 20% male, 5.5% of the total alumni population are Asian, 8.3% Black, and 61% White. Less than twenty percent of the re-spondents indicated that they earned a salary of $40,000-$49,999.

Table 3.3

Frequency Distributions for Demographic Alumni Characteristics

Variable	N	%
Gender		
Male	125	16.5
Female	631	83.5
Age2		
25-29	322	42.6
30-33	434	57.4
Race		
White	467	61.8
Asian	65	8.6
Black	63	8.3
Not Reported	109	14.4
Salary		
Under $10,000	126	16.7
$10,000-$19,999	15	2.0
$20,000-$29,999	28	3.7
$30,000-$39,999	120	15.9
$40,000-$49,999	141	18.7
$50,000-$59,999	117	15.5
$60,000-$69,999	46	6.1
$70,000-$79,999	21	2.8
$80,000-$89,999	17	2.2
$90,000 and above	10	1.3
Not Reported	115	15.2

Note. Gender (1= Male, 0= Female); Age (1=25-29, 2=30-33); Race (0=Non-White, 1= White; 0= Non-Asian, 1= Asian; 0= Non-Black, 1= Black)Salary (1=Under $10,000, 2=$10,000-$19,999,3=$20,000-$29,999, 4=$30,000-$39,999, 5=$40,000-$49,999, 6=$50,000 to $59,999, 7=$60,000-$69,999, 8=$70,000-$79,999, 9=$80,000-$89,999, 10= $90,000 and above).

Table 3.4

Descriptive Statistics for Demographic Alumni Variables

Variable	M	SD
Salary	4.47	2.06
Age	1.57	.495

Note. The average salary range is $40,000-$49,999 and the average is 29.

Table 3.5 shows the frequency distributions for variables related to student experiences. Majority of the respondents (61.4%) never lived on campus whereas 27.1% lived on campus for three to four years. Marymount University has a large commuter campus and nearly 50% of the undergraduate population commute to campus or move off of campus at some point during their academic career. More than half (75.9%) of respondents were involved in spiritual activities and 21.7% indicated that they were never involved in spiritual activities. Approximately 56.6% of respondents were involved in clubs and organizations and 41.5 were not involved. A large percentage (82.9%) of the millennial alumni who completed the survey indicated that they were involved in intercollegiate athletics and 14.4% were not involved. Marymount University strongly promotes service to others and community service as a part of its mission. Thus, a total of 69% of the respondents were involved with community service and 28.4% were not involved. More than half (59.5%) of the respondents obtain aid (i.e. scholarships or grants) from Marymount and 40.5% did not obtain aid from Marymount.

Table 3.5

Frequency Distributions for Categorical Student Experience

Variable	N	%
CampusLiving2	756	100
Never lived on campus	464	61.4
Less than 1 year	12	1.6
1 to 2 years	75	9.9
3 to 4 years	205	27.1
Spiritual2	756	100
Yes	574	75.9
No	164	21.7
Not Reported	18	2.4
Clubs2	756	100
Yes	428	56.6
No	314	41.5
Not Reported	14	1.9
Intercollegiate2	756	100
Yes	627	82.9
No	109	14.4
Not Reported	20	2.6
MAwards	756	100
Yes	450	59.5
No	306	40.5

Note. CampusLiving (1= Never lived on campus, 2= Less than 1 year, 3= 1 to 2 years and 4= 3 to 4 years. Spiritual2 (0=No, 1=Yes), Clubs2 (0=No, 1= Yes), Intercollegiate2 (0=No, 1=Yes), Service2 (0=No, 1=Yes), MRawards (0=no aid from Marymount, 1= yes aid from Marymount).

Table 3.6 shows that majority of the respondents 66.9% took their classes at the

Loudoun/Reston campus, whereas 32% took their classes at the Ballston campus, and

1.1% had most of their courses at the main campus. The Ballston campus houses the

school of business as well as graduate degree programs, whereas the Loudoun/Reston campus houses majority of the transfer students and students living in Fairfax County. When asked about their perception of Marymount's academic reputation, nearly half of the participants (49.1%), ranked the academic reputation as good. Respondents were also asked about their overall academic experience and over half (53.4%) indicated that it was good. Additionally over half (51.1%) indicated that the academic quality at Marymount is good. The researcher analyzed the final grade point averages among the respondents and almost half (45.1%) of the respondents earned between 3.503-3.992 GPA. Business majors are the largest number of graduates from Marymount University and represented 7.3% of the sample size. The findings revealed that approximately 92. 1% of the respondents were enrolled full-time and 7.4% were part-time. The majority of the respondents entered Marymount as freshmen (79.9%) and 21% transferred to Marymount.

Table 3.6

Frequency Distributions for Academic Experience

Variable	N	%
AcademicQuality2	756	100
Poor/Needs to be improved	34	4.5
Adequate	81	10.7
Good	386	51.1
Excellent	255	33.7
AcademicReputation	756	100
Poor	6	0.8
Needs to be improved	50	6.6
Adequate	161	21.3
Good	371	49.1
Excellent	168	22.2
Business Major	756	100
Yes	55	7.3
No	701	92.7
ClassLocation	756	100
Loudoun/Reston	506	66.9
Ballston	242	32.0
Main Campus	8	1.1
Description2	756	100
First College	597	79.9
Transfer	159	21.0
Enrollment_Status2	756	100
Part-time	56	7.4
Full-time	700	92.6
Experience2	756	100
Poor/Needs to be improved	27	3.6
Adequate	94	12.4
Good	403	53.3
Excellent	232	30.7
FinalGPA2	756	100
2.002-2.501	49	6.5
2.508-3.003	114	15.1
3.015-3.500	230	30.4
3.503-3.992	341	45.1
4.0 and above	22	2.9

Note. AcademicQuality2 (1= Poor/needs improvement, 2= Adequate, 3= Good, 4= Excellent); Academic Reputation (1=Poor, 2=Needs to be improved, 3=Adequate, 4=Good, 5=Excellent); Business Major (0=Non-Business major, 1=Business major); Class location (1=Loudoun/Reston, 2= Ballston, 3=Main Campus); Description2 (0=Transfer, 1=First College); Enrollment_Status2(1=part-time, 2=full-time); Experience2 (1=Poor/needs to be improved, 2= Adequate, 3= Good, 4= Excellent); FinalGPA2 (1= 2.002-2.501, 2= 2.508-3.003, 3= 3.015-3.500, 4= 3.503-3.992, 5= 4.0 and above).

Table 3.7 shows that 15.3% of respondents indicated that they strongly disagreed that they were aware of alumni activities, 40.3% disagreed, 17.7% had no opinion, 21.3% agreed, and 5.3% strongly agreed.

Table 3.7

Frequency Distributions for Awareness of Alumni Activities

Variable	N	%
Alumni_Activities	756	100
Strongly disagree	116	15.3
Disagree	305	40.3
No opinion	134	17.7
Agree	161	21.3
Strongly agree	40	5.3

Note. Alumni_Activities (Awareness of alumni activities: 1=Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3=No opinion, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree).

Table 3.8 displays frequency distributions for alumni characteristics as well as the percentage of donors and non-donors. The majority of the respondents (79.5) have never made a donation to the university and 20.5% made a contribution to the university. A total of 35.8% of respondents indicated that they disagree about having a connection to the university after graduation, 23.1 % had no opinion, 21.6% agreed, 8.9% strongly agreed and 10.6 strongly disagreed. When asked if alumni remained in contact with faculty after graduation 10.3% strongly disagreed, 35.3% disagreed, 13.9% had no opinion, 33.7% agreed, and 12% strongly agreed. When asked if alumni were willing to remain involved

in the university, 14.3% strongly disagreed, 38.6% disagreed, 27.4% had no opinion, 14

% agreed, and 5.7% strongly agreed.

Table 3.8

Frequency Distributions for Categorical Alumni Experience

Variable	N	%
LTGiving2	756	100
Yes	155	20.5
No	601	79.5
Connection	756	100
Strongly disagree	80	10.6
Disagree	271	35.8
No opinion	175	23.1
Agree	163	21.6
Strongly agree	67	8.9
Faculty	756	100
Strongly disagree	78	10.3
Disagree	271	35.3
No opinion	105	13.9
Agree	255	33.7
Strongly agree	91	12.0
Remaining_Involved	756	100
Strongly disagree	108	14.3
Disagree	292	38.6
No opinion	207	27.4
Agree	106	14.0
Strongly agree	43	5.7

Note. LTGiving2 (Lifetime donor (0= never donated, 1= donated at least $1.00 or more), Connection (Connection with the university: 1=Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3=No opinion,4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree); Faculty (In touch with faculty: 1=Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree,3=No opinion, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree); Remaining_Involved (Willingness to remain involved- 1=Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3=No opinion, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree).

Data Analysis

IBM SPSS Statistics 22 was used to statistically analyze the responses to the closed-ended survey questions from Marymount University's annual alumni survey. Data were inclusive of alumni who obtained an undergraduate four-year degree between 2002-2011, and were born between 1980-1988. The goal of this study was to predict giving among millennial alumni from scores on several predictor variables (see Table 1). In the first stage of the analysis the author conducted a Pearson correlation to determine the strength and relationships among the independent variables and the dependent variable of lifetime giving. Once the pertinent independent variables were identified the author used a binary logistic regression model on a sample of n=756 to determine the predictive value of donating among millennial alumni. Predictive modeling is the application of statistical analysis to predict future outcomes from an investigation of historical data (Baer & Mitchell, 2013). Therefore, the dependent variable of whether or not millennial alumni donated to their alma mater was regressed on twenty-five predictor variables (see Table 1).

In the second stage, the author used four blocks of variables and assessed statistical significance and effect size for an overall model, including an entire set of predictor variables. When the overall model was significant the researcher examined the contribution of the individual predictor variables to assess whether each predictor variable was significantly related to the outcome and the nature and strength of each predictor variable's association with the outcome.

In the final stage, the author used four blocks of variables concerning millennial alumni's demographics, student experiences, academic experiences, and alumni involvement. The author conducted several regression models using a combination of variables in the blocks, until the final model was selected using an enter method. The final blocks consisted of the following:

- The first block included: campus living, Mawards, Male, Age, connection, clubs, and intercollegiate.

- The second block consisted of location, final GPA, Academic quality, Experience2, and Service2.

- The third block consisted of White, Black, Asian, descsription2, and spiritual2.

- The fourth block consisted of enrollment, alumni_activities, remaining_involved, faculty, salary, business.

Based on the full regression model, the author was able to determine the predicting characteristics of donating among millennial alumni.

Limitations

Caution should be used when making generalizations based on the research findings alone, due in part to the following: a.) The study was limited to undergraduate millennial alumni at Marymount University. Thus the number of respondents in the study does not reflect the characteristics of graduate millennial alumni. b.) The survey instrument utilized in this study was created by the university's Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness and the questions on the survey changed yearly. c.) Pertinent data relevant to predicting alumni giving was not obtained in the alumni survey such as student loan debt to income ratio, current location and proximity of residence to campus,

legacy alumni, marital status, household income, number of children, the number of campus visits post- graduation, and religious affiliation. Studies have also found a consistent link between individual income and household income and the dollar contributions to one's alma mater (Monks, 2003).

As mentioned above, every year the alumni survey questions changed. Thus, the author eliminated many responses from the questionnaire to ensure that data analyzed was consistent. The questions removed included: awareness of alumni benefits (MU online community, Lifetime email account, GEICO insurance, Kaplan Test Prep, Bally's Gym Discount, Alumni Audit Courses, Bank of America Discount, Alumni Discount at the Bookstore, Alumni ID card) and awareness of alumni communications (monthly newsletter, website, correspondence, social media), event attendance, and awareness of events. The questions above were only asked in 2011, which is the rationale for removing them from the study. In addition, several variables were removed from the study due to the large percentage of missing data such as marital status, employment while enrolled, and highest educational level. Another limitation is that only responses 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011 surveys were included in the study.

A total of sixty-four majors are captured in the study however the researcher only analyzed one major which is business. The author decided to compare business majors to non-business majors because not only is it the highest enrolled program; it also had the highest response rate (58 millennial alumni). The researcher could have examined other majors thus this is a limitation. The final limitation is that a large percentage of respond-

ents did not provide information pertaining to their race, gender, or salary. The percentage of missing data was often inconsistent when conducting various tests. Therefore, it was a challenge to analyze the data. Likewise, the sample size only includes information from one institution and should not be generalized. Only limited variables relative to alumni philanthropy are utilized based on the available data for this study. Yet this study laid a foundation on which to build more studies relevant to millennial alumni donors.

Summary

This chapter provided a description of the survey instrument and dataset to include the purpose of the study, research questions addressed and the original sample size. The research design was outlined along with the process for variable selection, data transformation process, and the data analysis procedures were specified. In addition, some of the major limitations of the current reach study were highlighted to include the generalizability of the study since data was collected from one institution; variables selected, and sample size for undergraduate millennial alumni. The extent to which demographics, student experiences, academic experiences, and alumni involvement predicts donating among millennial alumni was measured through a binary logistic regression. The following chapter will provide the results of the aforementioned analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR— RESULTS

Introduction

Chapter three focused on the methodology utilized to conduct the research. This chapter presents the resulting data for each of the predictor variables and their relationships to donating outcomes.   This research examines characteristics of millennial alumni based on their student involvement, alumni experience, and overall experience with the university. The purpose of this study was to determine characteristics that are likely to influence millennial alumni to become lifetime donors at their alma mater. Data was collected through an alumni survey and the university's database. A binary logistic regression model was selected for this study because this model may include one or several predictor variables which can be quantitative variables, dummy-coded categorical variables, or both (Warner, 2013). This chapter begins with an overview of the analysis of the quantitative data collected from the annual alumni survey. The overview of the analysis will include a description of the method utilized in the study and a summary of the prediction.

Overview of analysis

Frequency reports were generated to determine that 16.5% of the respondents were male respondents whereas 83.5% were females. Thus, alumni characteristics revealed that participants responding to the alumni survey were more likely to be female

than male. Frequency reports were generated to determine that 79.5% of the respondents were non-donors and 20.5% were donors. In this study, 94% of millennial alumni are more likely to not make a contribution to their alma mater. Thus, without considering any other information, the likelihood or probability is that millennial alumni will not make a contribution in their lifetime. A Pearson correlation was also produced on all variables. According to Creswell (2012), Pearson's correlation is used to describe the strength of relationships between two quantitative variables. Lastly, a binary logistic regression was used to estimate the probability of lifetime donors among millennial alumni. The dependent variable (Lifetime Donor) was regressed on the following twenty four independent variables (see table 3.1).

Demographics

Demographic information such as age, race, and gender was obtained from the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness as those questions were not asked on the annual alumni survey. The author obtained data pertaining salary from the following question "What is your salary range?" A Pearson correlation was produced to measure the strength and significance of the relationship between demographics and donor status and the following variables were significant (age2, gender, and White). The variables aforementioned also had a positive relationship: age ($r = .128$), gender ($r = .144$), and White ($r = .083$). A positive correlation indicates that as the scores for age, gender, and White increase, the scores for lifetime giving increases as well. On the other hand, a negative relationship existed for the following variables Black ($r = -.054$, Asian ($r = -.057$), or Salary2 ($r = -.032$). A negative correlation indicates that as the scores for Black, Asian,

and salary increases, the scores for lifetime giving decreases. The resulting analysis is presented in table 4.1.

Table 4.1

Correlation between Alumni Demographics and Lifetime Donors

Variable	Correlation Coefficient
LTGiving2	1.00
Age2	.128**
Gender	.144**
Race	
White	.083**
Black	-.054
Asian	-.057
Salary2	-.032

*Note. N=756. **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) and *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Research Question 1

To determine if student and academic experiences predict giving for millennial alumni, the author examined responses from Marymount University's annual alumni survey. Utilizing the variables in table 4.1, a Pearson correlation between lifetime giving and the following variables (academic quality, academic reputation, campus living, class location, clubs2, description2, enrollmentstatus, finalGPA2, intercollegiate athletics, major, spiritual2, Service2) were produced to determine the strength and if relationship between variables were statistically significant. Data pertaining to final grade point average and financial aid were obtained from the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness

because it was not asked on the annual alumni survey. Table 4.2 displays the type of questions retrieved from the Annual Alumni Survey pertaining to student experiences.

Table 4.2

Marymount Alumni Survey Questions: Student Experiences

Questions	Response options
At which location did you take the majority of your classes?	Rating scale
What was your primary enrollment status?	Rating scale
Please indicate your major?	Open ended
Which of the following statements describe your start at MU?	Rating scale
From your experience at MU, How would you rate the following:	Likert scale
Overall Experience	
Academic Quality	
Academic Reputation	
How many years did you live on campus?	Rating scale
Please indicate if you participated in the following:	Dichotomous scale
MU spiritual development activities	
MU service opportunities	
Student clubs	
Intercollegiate athletics	

Table 4.3 displays correlations the resulting analysis between student experience variables and the dependent variable (0= non-donor, 1= donor). The Pearson correlation revealed that the following variables were significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ (academic success/finalGPA2, campusliving, classlocation, enrollmentstatus, experience2, Mawards, student clubs, intercollegiate athletics, spiritual2, and service). There was a positive correlation between the dependent variable (Lifetime donor) and the following variables: campus living (r=.323), experience2 (r= .129), financial aid (r=.272), and enrollment status (r=.081). The positive relationship means that as the scores increase for campus liv-

ing, class locations, enrollment status, overall experience, and institutional aid the likelihood that the scores among lifetime giving will increase.

On the other hand there was a negative correlation between the dependent variable (life time donor) and academic success (G.P.A.) (r= -.134), class location (r= -.163), intercollegiate athletics (r= -.233), spiritual activities(r= -.211), and community service (r= -.178). The negative relationship indicate that as scores for academic success, class location, intercollegiate athletics, spiritual activities, and community service increase, the scores for lifetime giving decreases. However, according to Creswell (2012), correlations does not imply causations, thus the interpretation of this effect is unclear.

Table 4.3

Correlations between Student Experience Variables and Lifetime Donors

Variable	Correlation Coefficient
LTGiving2	1.00
Academic Success (FinalGPA)	-.134**
Academic Quality	.024
Academic Reputation	.026
Both2	-.023
Campus Living	.323**
Class location	-.163**
Description2	.005
Enrollment Status	.081*
Experience2	.129**
Financial aid (MAward)	.272**
Major (Business)	.022
Student Involvement	
Clubs2	-.286**
IntercollegiateAthletics	-.233**
Spiritual2	-.211**
Service2	-.178**

*Note. N=756. **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) and *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Research Question 2

To determine if feelings of awareness of alumni activities predict millennial alumni to give to their alma mater, the author reviewed the response from the following question asked on Marymount's Annual Alumni Survey "I am well informed about activities for alumni". Secondly, the author conducted a Pearson correlations analysis to examine the strength of the relationship between the two variables and to determine if there was a statistically significant relationship.

Table 4.4 displays correlations the resulting analysis between awareness of alumni activities and the dependent variable (0= non-donor, 1= donor). The Pearson correlation revealed that awareness of alumni activities was significant at $\alpha = 0.05$. There was a negative correlation between awareness of alumni activities and lifetime giving. A negative correlation indicates that as scores increase for awareness of alumni activities, scores for lifetime donating decrease. This may mean that if millennial alumni are unaware of alumni activities then they are unlikely to donate to their alma mater.

Table 4.4

Correlation between Awareness of Alumni Activities and Lifetime Donors

Variable	Correlation Coefficient
LTGiving2	1.00
Alumni_Activities	-.141**

*Note. N=756. **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) and *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Research Question 3

To determine if a relationship between connectedness (i.e. alumni involvement, connection to faculty and the university) predicted giving amongst millennial alumni, the author examined responses from Marymount University's annual alumni survey (see Table 4.5).

Table 4.5

Marymount Alumni Survey Questions: Connectedness

Question	Response options
Please indicate how strongly you agree with each of the statements:	Likert scale
I am still in touch with faculty and advisors	
I feel connected to Marymount	
I am interested in remaining involved with Marymount	

To determine if there was a statistically significant relationship between the dependent variable (lifetime giving) and the independent variables (connection to university, connection to faculty, and willingness to remain involved), a Pearson correlation was produced. The Pearson correlation indicated that connection to the university and willingness to remaining involved had a significant relationship with lifetime giving. However, all three of the variables had a negative correlation which indicates that as scores for connection, faculty connection, and remaining involved increases, the scores for lifetime donating decreases. Table 4.6 shows that there is a negative correlation between connection, $r = -.141$ and remaining involved, $r = -.171$. There is not a relationship between faculty ($r = -.060$) and lifetime giving. The resulting analysis is shown in table 4.7.

Table 4.6

Correlation between Connectedness and Lifetime Donors

_____

Variable	Correlation Coefficient
LTGiving2	1.00
Connection	-.141**
Faculty	-.060
RemainingInvolved	-.171**

_____

*Note. N=756. **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) and *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Findings

     The overall predictive model was statistically significant (likelihood ratio chi square =7.90[8], p=.000). The independent variable of campus living (commuter) was a significant predictor of lifetime giving. The odds of millennial alumni donating were 32% higher for every one unit increase as compared to those who would donate. The predictive value of the model was modest, with an overall rate of correct classification of 80%. The overall effect size was small, with the Likelihood Ratio Index R^2 equal to .30. The -2 log likelihood statistic is 602.213 with 1 DF and p=.000. The -2 Log Likelihood is used to test the significance of the logistic model. The model chi-square statistic associated with this model is 164.813 with 26 degrees of freedom, which is significant at the .000 level. The p-value represents the statistical strength of the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable. The model chi-square statistic associated with this model is 6.975 with 8 degree of freedom, which is not significant at the p=.000 level. The regression model was significant $\alpha = 0.05$ (F(756) =37.8 ,df=1, p < 0.0001). Independent variables (Campus Living (1), p=.000; CampusLiving (3), p=.033;

MRawards, p=.033, Male (1), p=.004; Age2(1), p=.013; Clubs2, p=.001; Intercolle-

giate2_1, p=.095. Table 5 displays the all significant and insignificant predictor variables.

The null hypothesis is rejected because the significance is less than .05. The

Nagelkerke pseudo r^2 indicated that the model accounted for about 30% of the total vari-

ance. Prediction success for the cases used in the development of the model was relative-

ly high, with an overall prediction success rate of 80.6% and a correct prediction rate of

94% for millennial non-donors versus donors. Table 4.7 shows the full binary logistic

regression model.

Table 4.7

Full Binary Logistic Regression Model

Variable	B	SE	Wald	Df	Sig	Exp(B)
Campus living (1)	-1.120	.307	13.279	1	.000	.326
Campus living (2)	-1.808	1.105	2.679	1	.102	.164
Campus living (3)	-.728	.342	4.527	1	.033	.483
MRawards(1)	-.663	.312	4.524	1	.033	.516
Male(1)	-.781	.272	8.244	1	.004	.458
Age2 (1)	-.554	.228	5.924	1	.015	.368
Connection_1	-.182	.130	1.942	1	.163	.834
Clubs2	-.817	.243	11.256	1	.001	.442
Intercollegiate	-.442	.272	2.639	1	.104	.643
location	-.496	.343	2.093	1	.148	.609
FinalGPA2	-.154	.115	1.780	1	.182	.857
AcademicQuality	.018	.190	.009	1	.923	1.018
Experience2	.251	.196	1.648	1	.199	1.286
Service2_1	.175	.260	.455	1	.500	1.191
White_1	.474	.471	1.013	1	.314	1.607
Black_1	.338	.605	.312	1	.577	1.402
Asian	.414	.596	.483	1	.487	1.513
Description (1)	.435	.280	2.421	1	.120	1.545
Spiritual	-.333	.258	1.659	1	.198	.717
EnrollmentStatus (1)	.428	.556	.594	1	.441	1.535
Alumni_Activities	-.059	.113	.270	1	.603	.943
Remaining_Involved	-.089	.131	.463	1	.496	.915
Faculty_1	.022	.098	.053	1	.818	1.023
Salary2_1	-.045	.058	.585	1	.444	.956
Business (1)	-.462	.476	.944	1	.331	.248
Constant	2.198	1.409	2.435	1	.119	9.008

Note: Variable(s) entered on step 1: Enrollment_Status2_1, Alumni_Activities1, Remaining_Involved_1, Faculty_1, Salary2_1, Business.

Table 4.8 indicates that that campus living 1 *(p=.000)* and 3 *(p=.033)*, financial

aid obtained from Marymount *(p= .033)*, gender *(p=.004)*, age *(p= .015)*, and involve-

ment in student clubs (*p*=.001) makes the greatest prediction to the model. Once the *p* value is over .05, the variable is no longer a contributor to the model. Therefore, the remaining variables are not predictors of lifetime giving in this study.

Based on this model, millennial alumni who never lived on campus, lived on campus for 3 or more years, are males, obtained financial aid from Marymount, and were between the ages of 25-29 are not likely to donate to their alma mater. The following variables had a large co-efficient and contributed to the model in a negative way: Campus living (1) -1.120; Clubs2,-.817; Male(1) -.781,Campus living (3) -.728; MRawards(1) -.663; and Age2 (1) -.554. Thus, the structural equation for lifetime giving = Commuter (-1.120) + Student Club Involvement (-.817) +Female (-.781) + Residents living on campus 3-4 years (-.728) + Institutional aid (-.663) + Millennial alumni between the ages of 25-29 (-.554).

Summary

Chapter four presented the findings of data collected from Marymount University's annual alumni survey. The results indicated that campus living, financial aid received from Marymount, gender, age, and involvement in student clubs are predictors of lifetime giving and contributes to the model. The insights gained by this research study will contribute to the lack of data and information pertaining to millennial alumni giving characteristics. This study will also assist alumni and advancement professionals in making decisions when soliciting millennial alumni for donations and volunteer initiatives. A sum-

mary and discussion of the findings, along with conclusions, implications for practice, and recommendations for further research form the content of Chapter Five.

CHAPTER FIVE-CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Chapter four outlined the major findings of this study organized by four research questions and four supporting hypotheses. Based on those findings, Chapter five provides a discussion and interpretation of the findings, limitations of the study, recommendations for future research, implications for practice and conclusions.

Discussion and Interpretation of Findings

Today's students and young alumni are members of the largest generation in history and they will soon become the largest segment of prospective donors (Catlett, 2010). Recent graduates bring a wealth of knowledge to alumni associations and have much to offer at a young age (Feudo, 2010). Additionally, new graduates often have more disposable income then they have ever had (Catlett, 2010). Yet, millennial alumni are the least likely to donate to their alma mater than other generations. The millennial generation includes population born between 1980 and 2000 and includes approximately 78 million members (Moore, 2012). The greater the number of young alumni that institutions can connect with soon after graduation, the more likely that they will stay engaged and reengaged later (Catlett, 2010). Alumni engagement is defined as making a financial contribution, attending alumni related activities or serving in a leadership role within an alumni association (Waters, 2008). In this study, utilizing social exchange and organizational identification theories, the author examined twenty-four independent variables to deter-

mine the relationship between student experiences and alumni involvement to donor status among millennial alumni undergraduates at Marymount University. According to the measured results, the researcher offers the following discussion for each research question and supporting hypothesis presented in this study.

Of the 756 millennial alumni surveyed, more than half (83.5%) of the respondents were female (n=631) and (16.5%) male (n=125). Marymount University was founded in 1950, as a two-year college for females which later became a four-year institution offering undergraduate and graduate degrees. The university became a co-educational institution in 1989. Thus, this data is comparable to the overall total alumni population as 79% of the total alumni base are females and 20% are males (Marymount University, Office of Advancement, 2014). Additionally, the author found a significant positive relationship between females and lifetime giving (p=.004). However, as the predictor variable in this case gender increases the odds of a millennial alumni donating to their alma mater decreases (Exp B)=.458). Thus, gender is a predictor of lifetime giving in this study. This finding is consistent with previous research, as Belfield and Beney (2000) and Holmes (2008) found that women who attend private colleges make more frequent gifts than men but the size of the donations from women are smaller than those from men (Newman & Petrosko, 2011).

In this study, 42.6% of the respondents were ages 25-29 (n=322) and 57.4 % were ages 30-33 (n=434). The author found that age had a positive correlation to lifetime giving (p=.015). As the age of millennial alumni increase the age odds of donating decreases (Exp (B) = .368). This is also congruent with previous literature, that the age of the alum-

nus is one of the many other factors, having an effect on giving and participation rates (Beeler, 1982; Grill, 1988; Markoff, 1978 as cited in Taylor & Martin, 1995; McKinney, 1978; Oglesby, 1991 and Shadoian, 1989). Often times, millennial alumni will make a donation soon after graduation because they are still connected with their coaches, faculty, mentors (i.e. staff), and the university. However, as millennial alumni get older and loose contact with their former coach, faculty, and staff, the relationship between the millennial alumni and the affinity to the university also fades away. Thus, it is important for coaches, faculty, and staff to stay connected with millennials after graduation. Millennial alumni are more likely to make a donation to the university if the "ask" is from a former teacher, mentor, coach than someone that they do not have a relationship with such as a development officer.

Studies have also found a consistent link between individual income and household income and the dollar contributions to one's alma mater (Monks, 2003). The higher the salary the more likely an alumnus will donate to their alma mater. The majority of respondents (18.7%, n =141) in this study reported earning a yearly salary of $40,000-$49,000 and a small portion (1.3%, n=10) indicated that they earned $90,000 and above. However, surprisingly in this study, salary was not a significant predictor of donating to the university, ($p= .444$). Hence, as salary increase, the odds of a millennial alumni donating to their alma mater decreases (Exp (B) = .956). Thus, the finding in this study differs from previous research pertaining to the correlation of salary and lifetime giving. Frequently, millennial alumni are still paying college loans within ten years after graduation. Thus, the more money they earn, the more likely that they will use the additional

funds to pay off student loans. In addition, millennial alumni may not see the impact or benefit of donating a small amount of money. Therefore, advancement officers should provide various gift levels and opportunities for millennial to give back in a way that they can be recognize for their contribution to the university. Lastly, similar to the the restaurant tip card, many millennial alumni need guidance on how to give a donation of $100 over a period of time. By providing guidance on ways to give, may encourage millennial to give back as their salary increase overtime.

In this study, 8.6% (n= 65) self-reported as Asian, 8.3% (n=63) Black, and 61.8 % (n=467) White. This is comparable with the total alumni population as Asian represents 5.5%, Black= 8.3% and White 61%. As it pertains to the likelihood of donating, White millennial alumni are 1.6 times more likely to donate to their alma mater than other races. In addition, there was a positive correlation (n=.083) between White millennial alumni and lifetime giving. The finding in this study is consistent with previous research, as Blacks, multi-racial respondents, and non-US citizens donate significantly less to their undergraduate institutions (Monks, 2003, p. 124). In sum, majority of the demographic data analyzed in this study was consistent with previous research except for the relationship between salary and lifetime giving.

Research Question 1

Using social identity theory as a basis Mael and Ashforth predicted "that alumni identification with their alma mater corresponds to participation in gift campaigns, alum-

ni relations events, and encouraging others to attend the institution" (Drezner, p. 150, 2009). Other factors that affect a person's organizational identity are: time spent at the institution, overall satisfaction, and perceptions of the academic reputation; these all have positive effects. An alumnus relationship with their alma mater is often an important motivator in giving (Drezner, 2009).

Organization identification, a part of social identity theory, "occurs when an individual defines himself or herself by an organization" (Drezner, 2009). Individuals tend to identify themselves with various social groups, such as organizations, gender, and cohort. Social identification then, is the perception of belongingness to a group classification (Mael & Ashforth, 1990). Based on these two theories, the author sought to identify the relationship between student experiences (i.e. major, student involvement (clubs, intercollegiate athletics, spiritual involvement, community service), financial aid, academic success (i.e. grade point average), academic reputation, academic quality, enrollment status, transfer/first college, class location, and campus living) and lifetime giving among millennial alumni.

In this study, major among millennial did not have a significant relationship between lifetime giving in this study. Although, business majors are among the highest number of alumni, this particular major did not predict lifetime giving. Therefore, major was not included in the final binary logistic regression equation.

Guided by the social exchange theory, the author found that the following variables had a significant relationship with lifetime giving: involvement in student clubs (r= -

.286); intercollegiate athletics (r= -.233); spiritual (r= -.211); and community service (r= -.178). Thus, there is a correlation between the variables listed above and donating to a university. While the relationship between involvement in student clubs and athletics and lifetime giving is consistent with previous research, the author is surprised that it has an inverse relationship which is inconsistent with previous research. The researcher also found that as involvement in student clubs, athletics, spiritual activities, and community service increases, the odds of the millennial alumni donating decreases. This is not comparable with recent studies, as students who are engaged and involved during their time on campus tend to become more active alumni (Feudo, 2010).

One of the reasons for the lack of donors among the former students whom were involved in campus life, is the notion that they may consider volunteering as an alumni or attending student activities is a form of giving back or supporting the university post-graduation. For example, if alumni athletes attend sporting events post -graduation and pay for admission into a game, they may consider the cost of the ticket a form of giving back and supporting the university. However, admission fees to sporting events and other student activities are not captured nor tracked by the Office of Advancement nor considered a donation. Community service is often correlated to time spent and not donations. Thus, if millennial alumni donate their time by volunteering at an alumni related activity, then they may not feel compelled to donate their money. Additionally, millennial alumni with a religious affiliation may donate funds to their local church and not feel compelled to donate to their alma mater since they are no longer participate in spiritual activities at Marymount.

Marymount University like many colleges and universities provide students with institutional aid for various reasons such as students who graduated from a Catholic high school, 3.5 grade point average or higher, live on campus, among many other factors to assist with tuition costs. In the study, the author found that a positive statistically significant relationship between institutional aid and lifetime giving existed. If students receive grants and does not have to pay back loans then they are more likely to give back to their alma mater. In addition, they are more likely to give to the particular scholarship that they received as an undergraduate student.

A positive statistically significant relationship between enrollment status and lifetime giving among millennial alumni existed. Millennial alumni enrolled full-time are more likely to donate than part-time students. The time spent as a full-time student versus a part-time student can certainly have an impact on giving.

Conversely, academic success and class location had a statistically significant negative relationship between lifetime giving. If the millennial alumni earned a low final grade point average, then they are less likely to donate to their alma mater. If their academic career was a struggle then they may not see the impact or importance of giving back financially to their alma mater. Likewise, the location of majority of millennial alumni courses had a negative relationship to lifetime giving. Marymount University offer courses at three locations, one main campus and two satellite campuses. If millennial alumni took majority of their courses at a satellite campus and were not afforded all of the resources that is housed at the main campus then perhaps they did have the same aca-

demic experience. Thus, the difference in class location and environment has an impact on giving among millennial alumni.

The first supporting hypothesis stated that if millennial alumni had a positive overall experience at Marymount University then they are more likely to be a donor. The statistics revealed that this is true, as there was a positive correlation (r= .129) between lifetime giving and overall experience. This is comparable with the literature which states that a positive student experience has also been found to have an impact on young alumni giving rates (McDearmon & Shirley, 2009).

The second supporting hypothesis stated if millennial alumni received aid (i.e. scholarships) from their alma mater then they are more likely to donate money to the university. The author found that millennial alumni who obtained institutional aid from Marymount were more likely to donate. As the financial aid received by Marymount increases the odds of the millennial alumni donating increases (Exp (B) = .516). The positive correlation is consistent with the literature as well as the fact that most students leave college with an average of $27,000 in student loan debt (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2013). Thus, aid receive from Marymount is a predictor of lifetime giving among millennial alumni.

The third supporting hypothesis stated that if millennial alumni lived on campus at some point during their academic career than they are more likely to donate money to their alma mater. Statistics revealed that a positive correlation (r= .323) existed between campus living and lifetime giving however the majority of students who never lived on

campus or lived on campus three to four years are least likely to donate. Over half of millennial alumni at Marymount University commute to campus at some point. Many millennial either commute the entire four years or decide at some point that they want to live off campus because of their proximity to their primary residence. Scholars have not researched the impact among giving and campus living in the past. Thus, this information will add to the literature in that residence as a student predicts millennial alumni giving.

In sum, the results to research question 1; is consistent with previous theoretical conceptualizations of factors predicting alumni giving. The author found significant relationships between lifetime giving and the following variables were found: academic success (final G.P.A.), residence of students, class location, enrollment status, institutional aid, overall experience, and involvement in student clubs, athletics, spiritual services, and community service. The author did not find a significant relationship between academic reputation, which has been found to be a factor that influence alumni giving in previous studies (Drezner, 2009). Uniquely, the author found that the enrollment status (i.e. full/part-time) has a positive significant relationship between lifetime giving. This adds to the literature because if a student is full-time then they are more likely to donate to their alma mater.

Research Question 2

The second research question asked how do feelings of awareness of alumni activities influence millennial alumni to give to their alma mater. To examine research question two, a correlation analysis was calculated to examine the strength of the rela-

tionship between the dependent variable (lifetime giving) and awareness of alumni activities. Statistics revealed that awareness of alumni activity had no significant influence on millennial alumni donating to their alma mater, (*p*= .603). However, the statistics revealed that a negative correlation existed between lifetime giving and awareness of alumni activities, (r= -.141). This is not comparable to previous studies as awareness of alumni activities and attendance at university reunions, which are typically planned and implemented by alumni associations (Newman & Petrosko, 2011). However, if millennial alumni are unaware of alumni activities then they are unlikely to donate.

Research Question 3

Mael and Ashforth suggested that alumni conceptualize organizational identification as follows:

1.) College can be considered a "holographic organization" that is one where members share a common organization-wide identity and are less likely to experience competing demands from say, department-level or occupational identities (Drezner, 2009, p. 150).

2.) Since alumni constitute a particularly critical source of support for colleges, alumni identification is likely to strongly affect the welfare of their respective alma maters (Drezner, 2009, p. 150). Therefore, alumni who donate typically have a strong identification with their alma mater.

Additionally, social exchange theory explains the interdependent relationship that exists between donor and alma mater. Under this theory, alumni donate when they understand

that their interests align with the needs and interests of the institution (Drezner, 2009). Based on social exchange theory, if millennial alumni see a benefit to getting involved or donating to their alma mater, they are likely to continue to remain active donors. Guided by the organizational identity and social exchange theories, the author sought to determine if there were a statistically significant relationship between connectedness (i.e. alumni involvement, connection to faculty and the university) and giving amongst millennial alumni.

To examine the relationship between the dependent variable (lifetime giving) and the independent variables (alumni involvement, connection to faculty, and willingness to remain involved), the researcher conducted a correlation analysis. Statistics revealed that alumni involvement (p=.496), connection to the university (p= .163), and contact with faculty (p=.818) did not contribute to the model. Additionally, a negative correlation existed between connection to the university, (r= -.141) and remaining involved, (r= -.171). There is not a significant relationship between faculty (r= -.060) and lifetime giving. This is not consistent with most studies which state that an alumnus kinship with their alma mater is often an important motivator in giving (Drezner, 2009). However, if faculty retire or leave the university then probability that millennial alumni will stay connected is decreased. In addition, if they received poor advising and guidance then their connection to their faculty will also be negative. Involvement in an institution after graduation has been demonstrated in several studies to positively impact the giving rates of alumni (McDearmon, & Shirley, 2009). Typically, young alumni enjoy sharing their successes

with current students by serving as mentors (Feudo, 2010). Thus, the findings in this study is different.

The fourth hypothesis stated that the more connected to the university then the more likely they will be a donor. Thus, there will be a significant difference in the donor versus non-donor status of millennial alumni who are connected to the university. The statistics revealed that a negative correlation (r= -.141) between connection to the university and donating to the university existed. Thus, this hypothesis is rejected. If millennial alumni did not have school pride and felt connected as a student, then the likelihood that the sense of connection after graduation will also not exist.

Correspondingly, binary logistic regression was used to determine the predictive value of student experiences, awareness of alumni activities, alumni involvement, connection to faculty and the university on millennial alumni giving? The findings revealed that high predictors of millennial alumni giving includes students who never lived on campus and students who lived on campus for three or more years, millennial alumni who obtained institutional aid, women, millennial alumni between the ages of 25-29, involved in student clubs and athletics.

Delimitations

The primary limitation from this study was that the results are from one institution. The analysis in this study focused on responses from millennial undergraduate alumni at Marymount University. Thus, the findings may not be generalizable to other institutions of higher education. Utilizing secondary data from Marymount University's

88

annual alumni survey and existing data from the offices of institutional effectiveness and advancement limited the scope of the findings and conclusions drawn. For example, the author did not create the survey therefore; the design and implementation of the survey could not be altered. In addition, the study utilized self-reported survey data from human subjects thereby increasing the probability of measurement error (Lohr, 2010). Lohr (2010) defined measurement error as stated responses being inconsistent with true responses. For example, if respondents were asked to provide their salary range, the respondent could easily select a salary range that is untrue. Additionally, due to the large amounts of missing data associated with the demographic variables imputation was used to replace the missing values.

There were several variables that were not included due to the large percentage of missing variables that could have enhanced the results. The variables missing included marital status, alumni benefits, and current location of residence. The study did not include information pertaining to social media. Now that many millennials are using social media to obtain information about their institution a variable pertaining to social media should be utilize in future studies. Based on the aforementioned concerns and the varying ways in which this study's results can be interpreted, additional research is still greatly needed to ascertain the extent to which ways to motivate millennial alumni giving.

Recommendations for Further Study

Based on the results presented and conclusions drawn for this study, the following recommendations for further research can be made. The survey was limited to under-

graduate millennial alumni at one institution. Thus, the study could be replicated within multiple small, private, Catholic institutions to determine any differences or similarities that may exist between the responses. In addition, the study could be expanded to include graduate millennial alumni. Colleges and universities are seeing an increase in millennials enrolling in graduate school immediately after undergraduate school. Similarly, undergraduates pursue their graduate degree at the same institution as their undergraduate school. The study could also be expanded by comparing and contrasting millennial alumni based on various academic schools and majors.

The correlation between legacy millennial alumni and sweethearts (i.e. married alumni) could be further analyzed to determine if results varied based on their affinity to the university. Finding out if alumni had relatives who graduated from the university and therefore determining their likelihood to donate or become more active might also be helpful to fundraising efforts. Additionally, obtaining information about couples who meet in college and marry could also provide insight on millennial alumni who give back. Monks (2003) found that legacy alumni and those who were satisfied with their undergraduate experience tended to make larger donations to their alma mater (Monks, 2003). Lastly, Lindahl and Winship (1994) and Okuande and Berl (1997) found that a significant predictor of alumni giving was past giving, with the best prospects being alumni who made more frequent and recent gifts (Newman & Petrosko, 2011). Further research pertaining to the correlation between alumni volunteers and alumni who obtained alumni benefits (i.e. alumni ID card, participate in the insurance discounted programs, etc.) could also be analyzed to determine if their loyalty to their alma mater predicts giving among

millennials. This study could also be expanded by analyzing the current location of residence (proximity) to the campus and the relationship with donating to an alma mater. Newman & Petrosoko (2011) found that the closer alumnus live to campus, the more likely they will donate and stay involved with an alma mater beyond graduation.

Future research pertaining to online giving and millennial alumni should also be researched. Less than 58 percent of annual donors in 2012 came from mail appeal or phonathon programs, according to the Annual Giving Network (Allen, 2014). The remaining 42 percent arrived through online channels and other sources such as crowdfunding. Crowdfunding sites allow people with a great idea or worthy cause to bypass traditional funding methods and take their case directly to web-savvy investors (Jarrell, 2013). Investors can share and promote their favorite social networks, see real-time results as their causes are funded, and interact with the beneficiaries of their gifts. Crowdfunding platforms make giving more immediate, direct, and personal for donors who increasingly want to see the tangible impact of their gifts (Jarrell, 2013). Many small gifts pooled together to make a big impact. Thus, crowdfunding could be the solution for increasing annual fund donors among millennial alumni. Lastly, advancement professionals could look at the high number of active university alumni Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram users to determine if their affinity to the university, volunteerism, and donations has increased.

Future research pertaining to religious affiliation is also recommended. Many student convert or practice new religious beliefs and values once they enter adulthood or college. By asking millennial alumni their religious affiliation and comparing the

religious faiths could provide insight or the likely of a millennial donating based on their religious affiliation. Likewise, comparing millennial alumni between other faith based institutions to determine if religious institution has an impact or role.

Future research on the aspects mentioned above could assist leaders in higher education by learning the factors that will enhance millennial alumni involvement, broaden the donor base and providing institutions with better data about giving patterns. However, there are still some practical implications that advancement professionals, faculty, staff, and administrators could do to increase donations among millennial alumni.

The role of mentoring and faculty should also be examined to determine if millennial alumni who were mentored by a peer, faculty, staff, or coach influence their willingness to donate to their alma mater. Many colleges and universities offer peer mentoring programs and other mentoring programs for first-generation, minorities, and at-risk students. By examining the role of mentoring programs and millennial alumni giving, could increase the support and retention among millennial students.

Implications for Practice

Based on the results in this study, the author recommends that every institution conduct an alumni attitude survey targeted specifically to millennial alumni. By obtaining feedback from millennial alumni institutions are able to learn about their alumni's experiences which could help the overall university but it also provide advancement professionals the ability to gain insight on ways to keep them engaged beyond their donation. Ad-

ditionally, advancement professionals will learn from their alumni preferences of communication, programs, and modes for making a donation.

In addition to annual alumni surveys, advancement professionals should conduct an evaluation of alumni programming at the completion of each alumni event. By collecting data through event evaluations advancement professionals are able to obtain updated information and understand ways to improve alumni engagement and programming. It is important for advancement professionals to know their millennial alumni population and have the ability to provide services and resources to them at all stages of their life.

If institutions can encourage alumni to make a donation early (i.e. before graduation), then there is a much greater chance the donor will continue to donate for life (Feudo, 2010). Institutions must create a culture of philanthropy while students are still enrolled. There are many practical strategies that colleges and universities can employ to create this culture such as conduct classroom presentations about the importance of giving back and explaining how scholarships are funded by donors, encourage students to write thank you cards to scholarship benefactors, encourage student club leaders to conduct fundraisers, provide opportunities for students to volunteer during homecoming, key donor events, and phone-a-thons and senior class gifts (i.e. Pay it Forward). Many millennials are first generation college graduates may need guidance on how much to give back. So if advancement professionals are specific and guide the millennial in the process, then they may want to give back.

This study found that student and academic experiences are factors in predicting whether an individual will donate to a university. Campus living, enrollment status (part-time versus full-time), grade point average, financial aid situation and overall experience all have a positive correlation to donating to a university. Therefore, institutions need to realize that motivating factors for giving back to a university begin with a student's academic and overall experience. Thus, the pressure should not rely only on advancement professionals, it is faculty, residential services, campus life, and student services,all employees who have an impact in alumni's decision to stay involved with their alma mater or donate.

For the first point of contact after graduation, advancement professionals should reach out to recent graduates to obtain new contact information and inform them about career resources and other upcoming events on campus. Perhaps, creating and distributing a young alumni guide by providing new graduates a bit of real-world information they may not have been exposed to before (i.e. careers, housing, finances, insurance, and life as an alum (Catlett, 2010).

Advancement professionals should remember December and August graduates when reaching out to alumni. Often times, advancement professionals focuses on May graduates and forget the other populations. The leading trend in keeping millennial alumni connected to their alma mater is through career services and professional development opportunities (Feud, 2010). Perhaps, providing career resources beyond graduation; use LinkedIn as a way for professional development, and offering webinars and seminars for millennials may help ensure that they are gainfully employed. Career services could in-

clude the following: career assessment and interpretation, invitations to career fairs, career counseling both face to face and virtual, graduate school advising, mock interviews, online job posting, workshops and career programs (Parpos, E., 2010).

This study revealed that the respondents were not connected to the university after graduation nor were they aware of alumni events. Thus, advancement professionals can create young alumni task forces, offer recognition programs to acknowledge outstanding young alumni, offer incentives for young alumni who contribute, provide competition among recent graduates to encourage them to return to campus after graduation. Recent graduates need to feel the same nurturing, caring, and supportive efforts as alumni as they did when they were students. The relationship between alumni and the institution should mimic their student experience. Kang (2005) found that experience in contributing during college years has a significant and positive effect on future giving patterns (Drezner, 2010). Nayman et al. (1993) suggested turning students into donors is a socialization process that involves orienting students to the notion of voluntary giving, actively engaging them in varied institutional advancement activities and strategically timing program initiatives (Drezner, 2010) while they are still students at the college or university.

Lastly, communicating with millennial alumni should be different. Advancement professionals should craft messages that are quick and easy to remember. So, they should ask faculty, coaches, and staff members to send personalized email messages to former students to solicit their financial support and encourage them to attend university events. Many millennials are using social media to obtain information, perhaps sharing pictures and images of campus using Snapchat, twitter, Instagram, or Facebook, will keep millen-

nials aware of alumni activities. Video blogging during alumni events will enable millennials to view the video and share it with others which may spur them to attend the event in the future. Advancement professionals should also avoid using fundraising jargon or dollar amounts needed for the campaign. Millennial alumni may feel that their donation will not make an impact and fundraising jargon will prevent them from making a donation. Instead, provide millennial alumni with the number of donors needed to reach their goal and focus on impact. Any communication targeted toward young alumni should be reviewed and written by person in the same generation (Catlett, 2010). Overall, millennial alumni want to know the impact of their gift and benefits of giving back.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine factors that would predict giving among millennial alumni at Marymount University by examining responses from the annual alumni survey. Insights gained through this study will provide college and university administrators, advancement and alumni professionals, and faculty with quantitative data regarding characteristics that will motivate millennial alumni to give back to their alma mater. The findings from this study could prove beneficial in developing talking points that may allow college administrators to more effectively find ways to improve giving trends among millennial alumni. The data suggested that where a student lives whether they are is commuting to campus or living in the residential halls, predicts if they will contribute to their alma mater after graduation. The researcher also found that millennial alumni who are involved in student clubs and obtain aid from their university are also predictors of millennial alumni donating to their alma mater. Thus, rather than waiting

until the sunset of their lives to decide who they are as philanthropists and what legacies they want to leave, millennial donors actively craft their identities as students and think about their own legacies (Goldseker & Mood, 2013).

Millennial advancement professionals need to create their own narratives that tell the story of the college's needs in a way that resonates with the personal narratives developed by these non-donors. Alumni relations professionals need to find a way to appeal to transfer, commuter, and non-active students to engage millennial alumni beyond a solicitation letter. The process of creating and maintaining a relationship with all potential donors is at the heart of any successful fund-raising campaign (Winter, 2000). Alumni relations professionals want to keep millennial alumni engaged and ensure that they make a gift annually, then they must have a stewardship plan. If millennial alumni do not have a personal connection or relationship to the university, then they are less likely to get involved or make a financial contribution. Instead, millennial donors expect accountability, information, details, and expediency (Kish, 2013.)The millennial alumni population will continue to increase as enrollment increases. Thus, it is important that colleges and universities find ways to keep millennial alumni connected, engaged, and lifetime donors.

Office of Research Integrity and Assurance

Research Hall, 4400 University Drive, MS 6D5, Fairfax, Virginia 22030
Phone: 703-993-5445; Fax: 703-993-9590

DATE: March 5, 2014

TO: Jaime Lester

FROM: George Mason University IRB

Project Title: [576666-1] Millennial Alumni Giving: Factors for donating to colleges and universities

SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project

ACTION: DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT STATUS

DECISION DATE: March 5, 2014

REVIEW CATEGORY: Exemption category #4

Thank you for your submission of New Project materials for this project. The Office of Research Integrity
& Assurance (ORIA) has determined this project is EXEMPT FROM IRB REVIEW according to federal
regulations.

Please remember that all research must be conducted as described in the submitted materials.

Please note that any revision to previously approved materials must be submitted to the ORIA prior to

initiation. Please use the appropriate revision forms for this procedure.

If you have any questions, please contact Karen Motsinger at 703-993-4208 or kmotsing@gmu.edu.

Please include your project title and reference number in all correspondence with this committee.

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within George Mason
University IRB's records.

APPENDIX B

MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY

February 20, 2014

Bess Diffenbach
Senior IRB Compliance Specialist
George Mason University
4400 University Drive, MS 6D5
Fairfax, VA 22030

Dear Ms. Bess Diffenbach:

This is to inform you that the Office of Planning and Institutional Effectiveness at Marymount University will give Yolanda Gibson access to Alumni Survey data to complete her dissertation. The requested data will be given to Ms. Gibson in line with the rules and regulations of Marymount University.

If you have questions, please contact Cassandra Jones at cjones@marymount.edu.

Sincerely,

Cassandra Jones

Director of Institutional Assessment

APPENDIX C

For each of the following skills, please indicate how well you believe your education prepared you to:

	Poor	Needs to be Improved	Adequate	Good	Excellent
Find appropriate sources of information	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Evaluate the quality of information (e.g. scholarly articles, newspapers)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Conduct research to support a position	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Find a job in your field	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Attain a promotion within your existing employment situation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Pursue more education in your field	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Develop a coherent written argument	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Deliver a coherent oral presentation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Use quantitative/qualitative techniques within your professional field	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Determine the most ethically appropriate response to a situation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Understand the major ethical dilemmas in your field	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Work as part of an effective team	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lead a team	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Manage time effectively	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Use technology effectively in a workplace environment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Apply knowledge and skills to new situations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Solve problems in your field using your knowledge and skills	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please indicate how much your education and Marymount contributed to the development of:

	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	To a great extent
Interest in lifelong learning	☐	☐	☐	☐
Awareness of global issues	☐	☐	☐	☐
Self-confidence	☐	☐	☐	☐
Openness to new experiences	☐	☐	☐	☐
Interest in culture different from your own	☐	☐	☐	☐
Leadership skills	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please indicate if you participated in or used the following while attending MU. If yes, evaluate its impact on your personal or professional growth and development.

	No	Yes		No Impact	Some Impact	Major Impact
MU spiritual development activities	☐	☐	If Yes →	☐	☐	☐
MU service opportunities	☐	☐	If Yes →	☐	☐	☐
Student clubs	☐	☐	If Yes →	☐	☐	☐
Cultural activities	☐	☐	If Yes →	☐	☐	☐
Intercollegiate athletics	☐	☐	If Yes →	☐	☐	☐
Intramural athletics	☐	☐	If Yes →	☐	☐	☐
Study abroad program	☐	☐	If Yes →	☐	☐	☐
Internship/Clinical/Practicum/Student Teaching	☐	☐	If Yes →	☐	☐	☐
Career Center	☐	☐	If Yes →	☐	☐	☐

Page 2

102

REFERENCES

About advancement (n.d.) www.case.org Retrieved on October, 10, 2013.

Allen, D. (2014, October). Class exodus-The alumni giving rate has dropped 50 percent over the last 20 years. How can you rethink your value to graduates? *Currents*, *40*(8), 26-30.

Altbach, P.G., Berdahl, R.O. & Gumport, P.J. (2005). American higher education in the twenty-first century (2nd ed). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Anderson, J. C. & Narus, J.A. (1990). A model of distributor firm and manufacturer firm working partnerships. *Journal of Marketing*, 54 (1), 42-58.

Astin, A. (1999). Student Involvement: A Developmental Theory for Higher Education. *Journal of College Student Development*. 40(5).

Baade, R.A. & Sundberg, J.O. (1996b). What determines alumni generosity? *Economics of Education Review,* 15, 75-81.

Baer, B. & Mitchell, K. (2013). Using predictive modeling to guide resource allocation in annual giving and alumni relations. Academic Impression: Monograph. University of Pennsylvania.

Barton, C., Fromm, J., Egan, F. (2012). The millennial consumer: Debunking stereotypes. The Boston Consulting Group. http://www.brandchannel.com/images/papers/536_BCG_The_Millennial_Consumer_Apr_2012%20(3)_tcm80-103894.pdf

Bass, B. (1990). From Transactional to Transformational Leadership, learning to share the vision. Organizational Dynamics.

Beeler, K.J. (1982). A study of predictors of alumni philanthropy in private universities. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Connecticut.

Belfield, C.R. & Beney, A.P (2000). What determines alumni generosity? Evidence for the UK.. *Education Economics*, 8(1), 65-81.

Bess, J.L. & Dee, J. R. (2008). *Understanding college and university organization: Theories for effective policy and practice* (Vol. 2). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Bess, J.L. & Dee, J. R. (2008). *Understanding college and university organization: Theories for effective policy and practice* (Vol. 1). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Bolman, L & Deal, T. (2008). *Reframing organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Bristol, Ralph B. (Summer 1990). The life cycle of alumni donations. *The Review of Higher Education*,*13*(4), 503-518.

Bruggink, T.H. and Siddiqui, K. (1995) An econometric model of alumni giving: A case study for a liberal arts college. *American Economist* 39 (2), 53-60.

Catlett., S. (2010). Successful young alumni programming. In Feudo, J., Alumni relations. A newcomer's guide to success, (pp. 131-142). Council for Advancement and Support of Education. Washington, DC.

Chadwick-Jones, J.K. (1976). Social exchange theory: Its structure and influence in social psychology. London: Academic Press.

Clotfelter, C. (2003). Alumni giving to elite private colleges and universities. *Economics of Education Review*, 22 (3), in Monks, J. (2003). Patterns of giving to one's alma mater among young graduates from selective institutions. *Economics of Education Review* 22, 121-130.

Clotfelter, C.T. (2003a). Alumni giving to elite private colleges and universities. *Economics of Education Review*, 22, 109-120.

Clotfelter, C.T. (2003b). Who are the alumni donors? *Nonprofit Management and Leadership,* 12 (2), 119-138.

Connolly, M.S. & Blanchette, R. (1986). Understanding and predicting alumni giving behavior. In J.A. Dunn (Ed.), Enhancing the management of fundraising. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Council for Advancement and Support of Education Reporting Standards & Management Guidelines. (2009). Washington, DC.

Council for Advancement and Support of Education. http://www.case.org/About_CASE/About_Advancement.html. Retrieved October 18, 2013.

Council for Advancement and Support of Education Principles of Practice for
Fundraising Professionals at Educational Institutions. (2005).
Washington, DC.

Creswell, J. (2012). Educational Research, Planning, conducting, and evaluating
quantitative and qualitative research. Pearson: Boston, MA.

Drezner, N. (2010). Private Black Colleges' encouragement of student giving and
volunteerism: An examination of prosocial behavior development. *International
Journal of Educational Advancement,* 10 (3), 126-147 doi: 10.1057/ijea.2010.14.

Drezner, N. (2009). Why give?: Exploring social exchange and organization
identification theories in the promotion of philanthropic behaviors of African-
American millennials at private-HBCU's. *International Journal of Educational
Advancement*. 9 (3),147-165.

Dugan, K., Mullin, C. & Seiegried, J. (2000). Undergraduate financial aid and subsequent
giving behavior. Williams Project on the Economics of Higher Education
Discussion Papers. DP-57 in Monks, J. (2003). Patterns of giving to one's alma
mater among young graduates from selective institutions. *Economics of Education
Review* 22, 121-130.

Eckel, C.C., &Grossman, P.J. (1998). Are women less selfish than men?: Evidence from
dictator experiments. *Economic Journal*, 108 (448), 726-735. In Monks, J.
(2003). Patterns of giving to one's alma mater among young graduates from se-
lective institutions. 22,121-130.

Education Advisory Board. www.educationadvisoryboard.com

Emerson, R. (1976). Social exchange theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2, 335-362.

Farrow, H. & Yuan, C. (2011). Building stronger ties with alumni through facebook to
increase volunteerism and charitable giving. *Journal of computer-mediated
communication*,16 (3), 445.

Feudo, J. (2010). Alumni Relations. A newcomer's guide to success. Council for
Advancement and Support of Education. Washington, DC.

Gaier, S. (2005). Alumni satisfaction with their undergraduate academic experiences and
The impact on alumni giving and participation. *International Journal of Educa-
tional Advancement, 5* (4), 279-288.

Grant, I.C. (2005). Young people's relationships with online marketing practices: an intrusion too far? *Journal of Marketing Management*, 21 (5/6), 607-623.

Grant, I.C. & O'Donohoe, S. (2007). Why young consumers are not open to mobile marketing communication. *International Journal of Advertising*, 26 (2), 223-246.

Grant, J., & Lindauer, D. (1986). The economics of charity life-cycle pattern of alumnae contributions. *Eastern Economic Journal*, 12(2), 129-141.

Goldseker, S & Moody, M., (2013). NextGenDonor Report.

Gunsalus, R. (2004). The relationship of institutional characteristics and giving participation rates of alumni. *International Journal of Advance,* 5(2), 162-170.

Haddad, F.D. (1986). An analysis of the characteristics of alumni donors and nondonors at Butler University, ED Dissertation, Butler University.

Harrison, W. B. (1995). College relations and fundraising expenditure: Influencing the probability of alumni giving to higher education. *Economics of Education Review*, 14(1), 73-84.

Heckman, R. & Guskey, A. (1998). The Relationship between alumni and university: Toward a theory of discretionary collaborative behavior. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 6(2), 97-112.

Henrie, K.M. & Taylor, D.C. (2009). Use of persuasion knowledge by the millennial generation. *Young Consumers*, 10(1), 71-81.

Holmes, J. (2008). Prestige, charitable deductions and other determinants of alumni giving: Evidence from a highly selective liberal arts college. *Economics of Education Review*, 22, 1-11.

Horn, K. & Peter, K. (2012). What colleges contribute. Institutional aid to full-time undergraduate attending 4-year colleges and universities. National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved March 12, 2015 http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2003/2003157.pdf

Hovey, H.A. (1999). State spending for higher education in the next decade: The battle to sustain current support. Washington DC: The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.

Hueston, F.R. (1992). Predicting alumni giving: A donor analysis test. *Fundraising Management,*18-23.

Jarrell, A. (2013, May/June). Crowd around-expanding your donor pool with crowd
    funding. *Currents, 39* (5)*,* 40-44.

Kaplan, A. (2012) Press Release: COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES RAISE $31
    BILLION IN 2012. Council for Aid to Education New York, NY.

www.cae.org akaplan@cae. Retrieved October 15, 2013.

Kavounis, Y. (2008). The millennial effect. Brand Strategy, October, 49-51.

Keller, M.J.C. (1982). An analysis of alumni donor and nondonor characteristics at the
    University of Montevallo. Ph.d. dissertation. University of Alabama.

Kelly, K.S. (2000). Stewardship the missing step in the public relations process in Health,
    RI (ed), Handbook of Public Relations, Sage Thousand Oaks, CA.

Kim, J. & Park, H. (2006). Imputation Using Response Probability. The Candandian
    Journal of Statistics. Vol. 34 N. 1 (March) pp. 171-182.
    http://www.jstor.org/stable/20445192. Published by Statistical Society of Canada.

Kish, B. (2013, July/August). Thank you isn't good enough. Many non-profits show
    small-gift donors the impact of their generosity. Why can't we? *Currents, 39*(6)*,*
    15-16.

Leslie, L.L., & Ramey, G. (1998) Donor Behavior and voluntary support for higher
    education institutions. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 59(2), 115-132.

Lindahl, W.E. & Winship, C. (1994) A logit model with interactions for predicting major
    gift donors. *Research in Higher Education,* 35(6), 729-743.

Lohr, S. L. (2010). *Sampling: Design and analysis* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Brooks/Cole.

Mael, F. & Ashforth, B. (1990). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the
    reformulated model of organizational identification.

Mann, T. (2007). College fundraising using theoretical perspective to understand donor
    motives. In *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 7 (1), 35-46.

Marr, K., Mullin, C., and Siegfried, J. (2005). Undergraduate financial aid and Subse-
    quent alumni giving behavior. The *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance,*
    45*(1),* 123-143.Marymount University (2014) Fact Book.

McDearmon, J. & Shirley, K. (2009). Characteristics and institutional factors related to

young alumni donors and non-donors. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 83-95.

McKenna, R. (1991). Marketing is everything. *Harvard Business Review*, 65-79.

Monks, J. (2003). Patterns of giving to one's alma mater among young graduates from selective institutions. *Economics of Education Review(* 22), 121-130. Northouse, P.G. (2006). Leadership theory and Practice. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Moore, M. (2012). Interactive media usage among millennial consumers. Journal of Consumer Marketing, 29(6), 436-444.

National Survey of Student Engagement Annual Survey Results 2014 . Center for Postsecondary Research Indiana University School of Education. Retrieved on March 12, 2015. http://nsse.iub.edu/NSSE_2014_Results/pdf/NSSE_Annual_Results.pdf#page=8.

Nayman, R., Gianneschi, H., and Mandel, J. (1993). Turning students into alumni donors. New Directions for Student Services ,63 (Fall),85-94. DOI: 10.1002/ss.37119936310.

Newman, M. & Petrosko, J. (2011). Predictors of alumni association membership. Research in Higher Education,52 (7), 738-759. DOI: 10.1007/s11162-011-9213-8

Nycz-Conner, J. (2013). The young & the generous. Washington Business Journal. April 15, 2013.

Olsen, K. Smith, A.L., & Wunnava, P.V. (1989). An empirical study of the life-cycle hypothesis with respect to alumni donations. *American Economist*, 33 (2), 60-63.

O'Neil, J. (2007). The link between strong public relationships and donor support. *Public Relations Review*, 33 (1), 99-102.

Parpos, E. (2010). Alumni Career Services in Feudo, J. (2010). Alumni Relations. A newcomer's guide to success (pp. 173-187). Council for Advancement and Support of Education. Washington, DC.

Pearson, M., Stoops, G., & Gessner, G. (1992). Deflection Flagging: A customer retention strategy. *Connect with Success,* 77-85.

Pumerantz, R. (2005). Alumni-in-Training: A public roadmap for success. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 5(4), 289-300.

Radwin, D., Wine, J., Siegel, P., and Bryan, M. (2013). 2011-2012 National Postsecondary Study Aid Study (NPSAS: 12): Student Financial Aid Estimates for 2011-2012 (NCES 2013-165). Institute for Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved March 12, 2015 http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch.

Reisenwitz, T.H. & Iyer, R. (2009). Differences in generation X and generation Y: implications for the organization and marketers. *The Marketing Management Journal*, 19(2), 91-103.

Ross, N (2009). Organized Anarchies: A Garbage Can Model. http://bucknellorgtheory09.wordpress.com/2009/03/06/organized-anarchies-a-garbage-can-model/ Retrieved October 16, 2013.

Schewe, C.D. & Meredith, G. (2004). Segmenting global markets by generational cohorts: determining motivations by age. *Journal of Consumer Behavior*, 4(1), 51-63.

Scully, M. (2013). Star treatment. Many alumni have an increasing sense of entitlement. here's how to cope. *Currents, Generation Me, 39* (5).

Shim, J.M. (2001). Relationship of selected alumnae characteristics to alumnae financial support at a woman's college. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, in Wastyn, L. (2009). Why alumni don't give a qualitative study of what motivates non-donors to higher education. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*. 9 (2).

Stutler, D. & Calvario, D. (1996). In alumni support, satisfaction matters. *Fund Raising Management*, 27 (9), 12-14.

Taylor, A. & Martin, J., Jr. (1995). Characteristics of alumni donors and nondonors at a Research I, Public University. *Research in Higher Education*, (3) 36, 283-302.

Tom, G. & Elmer, L. (1994). Alumni willingness to give and contribution behaviour. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 8 (4): 57-62. In Wastyn, L. (2009). Why alumni don't give a qualitative study of what motivates non-donors to higher education. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 9 (2).

Todd. J. (2004).Alumni Involvement in Fund-Raising: A Tie that Binds, Jeffrey S. Todd, Director of the Alumni Relations and The Wooster Fund College of Wooster from the Handbook of Institutional Advancement, 3rd Edition.

Van Slyke, D.M. and Brooks, A.C. (2005). Why do people give? New evidence and

strategies for nonprofit managers. *American Review of Public Administration,* (3) 35, 199-122.

Wallin, D. (2010). Looking to the future: Change leaders for Tomorrow's Community Colleges, New Directions for Community Colleges.

Wastyn, L. (2009). Why alumni don't give a qualitative study of what motivates non-donors to higher education. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 9 (2).

Waters, R. D. (2008). Applying relationship management theory to the fundraising process for individual donors. *Journal of Communication Management*, 12 (1), 73-87.

Webster, F. E. (1992). The changing role of marketing in the corporation. *Journal of Marketing*, 56 (4), 1-17.

Wedgeworth, R. (2000) Donor relations as public relations: Toward a philosophy of fund-raising. *Library Trends* 48(3), 530-540.

Weerts, D. J. & Ronca, J.M. (2007). Profiles of supportive alumni: Donors, volunteers, and those who "do it all". *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 7 (1), 20-35.

Weerts, D. J. & Ronca, J.M. (2008). Characteristics of alumni donors who volunteer at their alma mater. *Research in Higher Education.* 49 (3), 274-292. DOI: 10.1007/s11162-007-9077-0.

Weinberg, C. (2013). Federal student loan debt crosses $1-trillion threshold. Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved on March 16. https://chronicle.com/article/Federal-Student-Loan-Debt/140427/.

Willeman, T., Goyal, A, Van Deven, M., & Thukral, I. (1994). Alumni giving: The influences of reunion, class, and year. *Research in Higher Education,* 35(5), 609-629.

Wunnava, P. & Lauze, M. (2001). Alumni giving at a small liberal arts college: Evidence from consistent and occasional donors. *Economics of Education Review*, (20), 533-543.

BIOGRAPHY

Yolanda Barbier Gibson grew up in Lynchburg, Virginia. She attended Marymount University, where she received her Bachelor of Arts in Communications and Business Administration in 2004. She went on to receive her Master of Arts in Community College Education from George Mason University in 2010. She then received her Doctorate in Higher Education Administration from George Mason University in 2015. Currently, she serves as the Associate Dean, First Year Experience at Marymount University.