

Factors That Influence Alumni Major Giving at Doctoral Research Universities

Research Report

Michael S. Dean, Ph.D., M.B.A.
Assistant Dean
Walter F. George School of Law
Mercer University
Macon, Georgia

CASE V Conference
Executives in Advancement
Chicago, Illinois
December 11, 2007

Researcher Contact Information

Michael S. Dean, Ph.D., M.B.A.
Assistant Dean
Walter F. George School of Law
Mercer University
1021 Georgia Avenue
Macon, Georgia 31207

Telephone: (478) 301-2607
Email: dean_ms@law.mercer.edu
Web Site: www.law.mercer.edu

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of chief development officers about the influence of socio-demographic, alumni involvement, and student experience factors of alumni on major giving to higher education institutions. This study also involved the investigation of differences between institutions with respect to institution type and alumni population size. Additionally, the researcher constructed a profile of chief development officers from the respondents' demographic information.

The population of this study consisted of chief development officers from each of the 283 Carnegie classified Doctoral Research Universities (Carnegie Foundation, 2007). Of the 283 institutions included in this study, eight private, for-profit, institutions did not have official fundraising programs. This resulted in a net population of 275 institutions, from which 25 were used in the pilot study. Of the 250 surveys mailed, 166 were returned for a response rate of 66%.

Five socio-demographic factors were found to have a positive influence on alumni major giving. Married to another alumnus ($M = 4.37$, $SD = .60$), annual household income greater than \$100,000 ($M = 4.13$, $SD = .68$), undergraduate college or school was business ($M = 4.06$, $SD = .61$), graduation year or time since degree earned ($M = 4.04$, $SD = .69$), and earned more than one degree from the institution ($M = 4.04$, $SD = .71$) were the most positive socio-demographic influences on major giving.

Eleven alumni involvement factors were found to have a positive influence on major giving. Serves on university volunteer boards and committees ($M = 4.71$, $SD = .47$), positive attitude toward stewardship of gifts ($M = 4.62$, $SD = .51$), identifies with the institution's mission ($M = 4.55$, $SD = .57$), identifies with institutional leadership ($M = 4.47$, $SD = .59$), overall influence of alumni involvement ($M = 4.44$, $SD = .58$), visits campus frequently ($M = 4.39$, $SD = .59$), feeling of obligation to the institution ($M = 4.23$, $SD = .63$), attends alumni events ($M = 4.16$, $SD = .64$), reads alumni publications ($M =$

4.14, $SD = .51$), perceived need of the institution ($M = 4.08$, $SD = .60$), and visits alumni Web Site frequently ($M = 4.01$, $SD = .59$) were rated between somewhat of a positive influence and strong positive influence.

Three student experience factors were found to have a positive influence on alumni major giving. Satisfaction with the quality of faculty ($M = 4.50$, $SD = .58$), overall influence of student experience ($M = 4.33$, $SD = .57$), and developed positive peer relationships ($M = 4.10$, $SD = .58$) were the student experience factors that had the greatest effect on alumni major giving.

A significant difference was found between public and private institutions ($t = 2.01$, $DF = 161$, $p < .05$) with respect to the influence of student experiences on alumni major giving. Chief development officers from private institutions weighted the influence of student experience factors on giving more heavily than chief development officers from public institutions.

The mean age of chief development officers was slightly over 50 years. Chief development officers had been in their position for over five years, had slightly more than 20 years of fundraising experience, and had been working in higher education institutional advancement for over 18 years. Chief development officers worked at institutions having more than 19,600 FTE students enrolled, more than 145,000 alumni, and having a minimum major gift amount of \$54,000. Thirty-eight percent of chief development officers were female and 62% were male. Ninety-three percent of chief development officers were Caucasian, 5% were African-American, and slightly more than 1% were Hispanic/Latino.

Purpose

The purpose of this nationwide study was to investigate the perceptions of chief development officers about the influence of socio-demographic, alumni involvement, and student experience factors of alumni on voluntary financial support to their alma mater. This study also entailed the investigation of differences between institutions with respect to public and private designation and alumni size.

Additionally, a search of the literature revealed no study to construct a profile of chief development officers. Due to the nationwide scope of this study and the necessity to collect demographic information about respondents, a profile of chief development officers was constructed from the demographic information collected.

Research Questions

Six primary research questions guided this study.

1. According to the perceptions of chief development officers, how do socio-demographic factors of alumni influence the propensity of alumni to give a major gift?
2. According to the perceptions of chief development officers, how do alumni involvement factors of alumni influence the propensity of alumni to give a major gift?
3. According to the perceptions of chief development officers, how do student experience factors of alumni influence the propensity of alumni to give a major gift?
4. According to the perceptions of chief development officers, what is the difference between public and private institutions with respect to socio-demographic, alumni involvement, and student experience factors' influence on the propensity of alumni to give a major gift?
5. According to the perceptions of chief development officers, what is the difference between institutions with 100,000 alumni or greater and institutions with less than 100,000 alumni with respect to socio-demographic, alumni involvement, and student experience factors' influence on the propensity of alumni to give a major gift?
6. What is the profile of chief development officers at Carnegie classified Doctoral Research Universities?

Background

The Council for Aid to Education (2006) reported that in 2005, voluntary financial gifts from all sources to higher education totaled \$25.6 billion. Of all financial gifts received, \$11.9 billion was given by individuals, alumni and nonalumni, representing 47.2% of all gifts. Alumni gave \$7.1 billion and accounted for 27.7% of all private giving to higher education (Council for Aid to Education, 2006).

Colleges and universities are continually striving to increase the amount of financial support from alumni. In recent times, higher education institutions have suffered from government allocations and tuition prices that lag behind inflation rates. In instances when tuition rates and government allocations have increased, alumni giving continues to be crucial in that it supports the expenses for campus expansions, facility and technology upgrades, recruiting and retaining the best faculty, and recruiting the brightest students, expenses that government allocations and tuition dollars cannot cover (Cash, 2001; Cockrum, 2005).

Institutional leaders, presidents and boards of trustees, place greater expectations on development operations annually. In order to constantly increase the amount of

money raised from alumni, development professionals look for ways to fine tune their fundraising efforts (Eversden, 2004; Ferrell, 2005).

Delimitations

This study included chief development officers from the 283 Carnegie classified Doctoral Research Universities. Variables of alumni giving utilized for this study came from the literature and the researcher's professional experience in institutional advancement. The influence of selected variables on alumni giving were measured through the perceptions of chief development officers.

Method

The population of this study consisted of chief development officers from each of the 283 Carnegie classified Doctoral Research Universities (Carnegie Foundation, 2007). The rationale for selecting Carnegie classified Doctoral Research Universities as the population for this study was threefold: the 10 largest college and university endowments belong to institutions in this classification, to extend the study across multiple institutions, and to limit the number of institutions to a manageable quantity. The Carnegie Foundation provided a classification system that groups institutions by similar size and scope.

The researcher developed a 40-item survey instrument to collect data for this study. The survey instrument contained the following sections: 1) Alumni socio-demographic factors; 2) Alumni involvement factors; 3) Student experience factors; and 4) Respondent demographic and institutional data. Respondent demographic and institutional data were fill-in-the-blank and multiple-choice items. A 5-Point Likert-type scale ranging from strong positive influence to strong negative influence measured socio-demographic, alumni involvement, and student experience factors.

The survey instrument was designed to measure the perceptions of chief development officers. To establish validity of the survey instrument, a pilot study was conducted. A pilot study was an appropriate means to collect content-related and convergent evidence of validity for the survey instrument (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003).

A random sample of 25 chief development officers was selected for the pilot study. Of the 25 surveys mailed to the pilot study sample, 12 were returned for a response rate of 48%. Respondents indicated that the time it took to complete the questionnaire, approximately eight minutes, was acceptable. Of the 12 respondents, nine indicated that the directions for the survey instrument were clear. One respondent suggested adding the option of writing "N/A" next to an item that did not apply to the respondent's institution. Of the 12 respondents, 11 indicated that the survey words/items were clear. One respondent indicated that a few items were "too wordy."

Changes were made to the survey instrument based upon the feedback from respondents in the pilot study. Within the directions on the survey instrument, respondents were asked to write “N/A” beside an item if it did not apply to their institution. Additionally, the survey instrument was edited to reduce the number of words where appropriate.

Statistical means were computed for items on the survey instrument to check for similarity in responses. These means provided evidence that respondents held a similar understanding of the items on the survey instrument (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003).

Response Rate

The population of this study consisted of chief development officers from each of the 283 Carnegie classified Doctoral Research Universities (Carnegie Foundation, 2007). Of the 283 institutions included in this study, eight private, for-profit, institutions did not have official fundraising programs or institutional foundations. This resulted in a net population of 275 institutions, from which 25 were used in the pilot study. For the 250 surveys mailed to chief development officers, 166 responses were received for a response rate of 66%.

The goal of this study was to obtain a 60% response rate in order to achieve a 95% confidence interval with a +/- 5% margin of error. As with any survey instrument, a number of respondents did not complete every item. There was no pattern of non-response to a given item on the survey instrument. Table 1 shows the number of survey responses (N = 166) segmented by institution type, public or private.

Table 1
Response Rate

Institution Type	Number		Response	
	Mailed	Responses (N)	By Type	Totals
Public	150	109	73%	109/250 = 43%
Private	100	54	54%	54/250 = 22%
Type Not Indicated		3		3/250 = 1%
Total	250	166		166/250 = 66%

Results for Research Question One

The nine survey items in the socio-demographic section of the survey instrument requested chief development officers to rate the influence of 24 factors. Of the 24 socio-demographic factors, five were rated between somewhat of a positive influence and strong positive influence on giving. Married to another alumnus ($M = 4.37, SD = .60$), annual household income greater than \$100,000 ($M = 4.13, SD = .68$), undergraduate

college or school was business ($M = 4.06, SD = .61$), graduation year or time since degree earned ($M = 4.04, SD = .69$), and earned more than one degree from the institution ($M = 4.04, SD = .71$) were the most positive socio-demographic influences on major giving. Two factors, annual household income of less than \$50,000 ($M = 1.68, SD = .68$) and has outstanding educational debt balances ($M = 1.85, SD = .92$), rated between somewhat of a negative influence and strong negative influence, were the most negative socio-demographic influences on major giving. Table 2 shows a ranked order of chief development officers' mean responses.

Table 2
Ranked Mean Response for Socio-Demographic Factors

Factor	Survey			
Description	Item	N	Mean (M)	Std. Dev. (SD)
Marital status: Married to another graduate	2b	164	4.37	0.60
Annual household income: Greater than \$100,000	4c	163	4.13	0.68
Undergraduate college/school: Business	5b	160	4.06	0.61
Graduation year/time since degree earned	1	159	4.04	0.69
Earned more than one degree from the institution	7	165	4.04	0.71
Overall influence of socio-demographic factors	9	159	3.76	0.65
Undergraduate college/school: Engineering	5e	154	3.65	0.73
Marital status: Married	2a	164	3.62	0.60
Undergraduate college/school: Science	5g	161	3.51	0.57
Undergraduate college/school: Social Work	5h	148	3.45	0.69
Gender: Female	3b	159	3.43	0.65
Marital status: Widowed	2e	161	3.32	0.55
Holds degrees from multiple institutions	8	164	3.25	0.71
Undergraduate college/school: Education	5d	157	3.24	0.69
Undergraduate college/school: Communications	5c	154	3.22	0.60
Undergraduate college/school: Fine Arts	5f	154	3.19	0.62
Gender: Male	3a	159	3.18	0.62
Marital status: Single	2f	162	3.11	0.60
Undergraduate college/school: Applied Sciences and Arts/Technical	5a	140	3.01	0.68
Marital status: Partner	2c	155	2.99	0.50
Marital status: Divorced	2d	162	2.79	0.54
Annual household income: \$50,000 to \$100,000	4b	159	2.60	0.86
Has outstanding educational debt balances	6	162	1.85	0.92
Annual household income: Less than \$50,000	4a	158	1.68	0.68

Scale: 5 = Strong positive influence 4 = Somewhat of a positive influence 3 = No influence 2 = Somewhat of a negative influence 1 = Strong negative influence

Results for Research Question Two

The 10 survey items in the alumni involvement section of the survey instrument requested chief development officers to rate the influence of 22 factors. All 22 of the alumni involvement factors had a positive influence on major giving. The following 11 factors influenced major giving the most and were rated between somewhat of a positive influence and strong positive influence on giving: serves on university volunteer boards and committees ($M = 4.71$, $SD = .47$), positive attitude toward stewardship of gifts ($M = 4.62$, $SD = .51$), identifies with the institution's mission ($M = 4.55$, $SD = .57$), identifies with institutional leadership ($M = 4.47$, $SD = .59$), overall influence of alumni involvement ($M = 4.44$, $SD = .58$), visits campus frequently ($M = 4.39$, $SD = .59$), feeling of obligation to institution ($M = 4.23$, $SD = .63$), attends alumni events ($M = 4.16$, $SD = .64$), reads alumni publications ($M = 4.14$, $SD = .51$), perceived need of the institution ($M = 4.08$, $SD = .60$), and visits alumni Web Site frequently ($M = 4.01$, $SD = .59$).

Table 3
Ranked Mean Response for Alumni Involvement Factors

Factor Description	Survey Item	N	Mean (M)	Std. Dev. (SD)
Serves on university volunteer boards and committees	15	165	4.71	0.47
Alumni attitudes: Positive attitude toward stewardship of gifts	19b	164	4.62	0.51
Alumni attitudes: Identifies with the institution's mission	19d	165	4.55	0.57
Alumni attitudes: Identifies with institutional leadership	19e	165	4.47	0.59
Overall influence of alumni involvement	20	162	4.44	0.58
Visits campus frequently	17	165	4.39	0.59
Alumni attitudes: Feeling of obligation to institution	19a	164	4.23	0.63
Attends alumni events	12	165	4.16	0.64
Reads alumni publications (newsletter, magazine)	11	163	4.14	0.51
Alumni attitudes: Perceived need of the institution	19c	165	4.08	0.60
Alumni Web Site and electronic communications: Visits Web Site frequently	14c	164	4.01	0.59
Member of alumni chapter or constituency group	16	162	3.97	0.58
Alumni Web Site and electronic communications: On-line networking with other alumni (member of on-line community)	14a	159	3.93	0.69
Holds season tickets to athletic events	18a	158	3.90	0.73
Alumni Web Site and electronic communications: Reads electronic publications	14d	165	3.79	0.57
Holds season tickets to performing arts events	18b	159	3.77	0.66
Alumni association membership	10	158	3.76	0.64
Participates in alumni affinity marketing programs: Travel program	13a	160	3.73	0.77

Participates in alumni affinity marketing programs: Purchased/uses alumni directory	13c	164	3.70	0.70
Alumni Web Site and electronic communications: Receives e-mail communications (university news, upcoming events)	14e	163	3.64	0.56
Alumni Web Site and electronic communications: On-line career services	14b	161	3.45	0.64
Participates in alumni affinity marketing programs: Carries university-sponsored credit card	13b	161	3.31	0.60

Scale: 5 = Strong positive influence 4 = Somewhat of a positive influence 3 = No influence 2 = Somewhat of a negative influence 1 = Strong negative influence

Results for Research Question Three

The seven survey items in the student experience section of the survey instrument requested chief development officers to rate the influence of 11 factors. All 11 of the student experience factors had a positive influence on major giving. The following three factors influenced major giving the most and were rated between somewhat of a positive influence and strong positive influence on giving: satisfaction with the quality of faculty ($M = 4.50$, $SD = .58$), overall influence of student experience ($M = 4.33$, $SD = .57$), and developed positive peer relationships ($M = 4.10$, $SD = .58$).

Table 4
Ranked Mean Response for Student Experience Factors

Factor Description	Survey Item	N	Mean (M)	Std. Dev. (SD)
Satisfaction with academic experiences: Quality of faculty	25b	164	4.50	0.58
Overall influence of student experience	27	163	4.33	0.57
Developed positive peer relationships	24	164	4.10	0.58
Satisfaction with academic experiences: Quality of career counseling/placement	25c	161	3.98	0.72
Satisfaction with academic experiences: Received financial aid through scholarships or grants	25e	163	3.87	0.74
Satisfaction with academic experience: Interaction with university staff	25d	162	3.81	0.65
Involvement in a department club or organization	23	162	3.73	0.58
Satisfaction with academic experiences: Advising	25a	162	3.72	0.64
Membership in student alumni organization or student foundation	21	156	3.69	0.68
Membership in a Greek organization	22	158	3.66	0.68
Participated in intercollegiate athletics	26	162	3.13	0.69

Scale: 5 = Strong positive influence 4 = Somewhat of a positive influence 3 = No influence 2 = Somewhat of a negative influence 1 = Strong negative influence

Results for Research Question Four

Five factors, 4a, 5f, 5h, 6a, and 8a, were expected to have a high negative mean response. In order to create comparable composite means, these items were reverse

scored. To determine if differences existed between public and private institutions, *t*-tests were conducted to compare the composite means of each group for each factor category. As shown in Table 5, a significant difference was found between public and private institutions ($t = 2.01$, $DF = 161$, $p < .05$) with respect to the influence of student experiences on alumni giving. Chief development officers from private institutions weighted the influence of student experience factors on giving more heavily than chief development officers from public institutions.

Table 5
Results of t-tests for the Comparison of Means Between Public and Private Institutions

Factor	Public		Private		DF	<i>T</i>
	N	M	N	M		
Socio-Demographic	109	3.53	54	3.55	161	0.45
Alumni Involvement	109	4.02	54	4.03	161	0.34
Student Experience	109	3.79	54	3.89	161	2.01*

* $p < .05$

Results for Research Question Five

Five factors, 4a, 5f, 5h, 6a, and 8a, were expected to have a high negative mean response. In order to create comparable composite means, these items were reverse scored. Following the same procedure as in research question four, these items were reverse scored to compute comparable composite means. To determine if differences existed between institutions according to alumni population, *t*-tests were conducted to compare the composite means of each group for each factor category. As shown in Table 6, no significant differences were found.

Table 6
Results of t-tests for the Comparison of Means Between Institutions with 100,000 Alumni or Greater and Institutions with Less Than 100,000 Alumni.

Factor	100,000 or Greater		Less Than 100,000		DF	<i>t</i>
	N	M	N	M		
Socio-Demographic	103	3.52	62	3.56	163	1.34
Alumni Involvement	103	4.07	62	4.10	163	0.11

Student Experience	103	3.80	62	3.86	163	1.13
--------------------	-----	------	----	------	-----	------

* $p < .05$

Results for Research Question Six

Items 28 through 40 on the survey instrument were used to answer research question six. Each of these items represented a demographic characteristic about the chief development officer or his/her institution. In all, information for 13 demographic categories was collected and organized to present a profile of chief development officers at Carnegie classified Doctoral Research Universities. The 13 demographic categories consisted of age, gender, ethnic background, position title, highest academic degree earned, undergraduate major, years in current position, years of fund raising experience, years in institutional advancement, institution's enrollment, institution's alumni population, institution type, and major gift amount.

Tables 7 and 8 display means of chief development officers' responses for age, years in current position, years of fund raising experience, years in institutional advancement, institution's enrollment, institution's alumni population, and institution's minimum major gift amount. Table 7 displays these means for all chief development officers and Table 8 displays these means segregated by institution type.

As Table 7 shows, the mean age of chief development officers ($N = 163$) was slightly over 50 years ($M = 50.8, SD = 7.8$). Chief development officers had been in their position for over five years ($M = 5.5, SD = 4.3$), had slightly more than 20 years ($M = 20.1, SD = 6.9$) of fund raising experience, and had been in institutional advancement over 18 years ($M = 18.7, SD = 7.1$). Chief development officers worked at institutions having more than 19,600 FTE students enrolled ($M = 18,835.3, SD = 11,715.3$), more than 145,000 alumni ($M = 145,006.3, SD = 89,473.3$), and having a minimum major gift amount of \$54,000 ($M = 54,000.0, SD = 83,101.7$).

Table 7
Means of Chief Development Officers' Personal and Institutional Demographics

Factor Description	N	Mean (M)	Std. Dev. (SD)
Age	163	50.8	7.8
Years in current position	164	5.5	4.3
Years of fundraising experience	164	20.1	6.9
Years in institutional advancement	164	18.7	7.1

Institution's enrollment	163	18,835.3	11,715.3
Institution's alumni population	160	145,006.3	89,473.3
Institution's minimum major gift	159	54,000.0	83,101.7

As Table 8 shows, the mean age of chief development officers at public institutions (N = 108) was slightly over 51 years ($M = 51.2$, $SD = 7.5$) and just under 50 years ($M = 50.0$, $SD = 8.3$) at private institutions (N = 54). Chief development officers at public institutions (N = 109) had been in their position for five years and six months ($M = 5.5$, $SD = 4.4$), had slightly more than 21 years of fund raising experience ($M = 21.1$, $SD = 6.8$), and had been in institutional advancement more than 19 years ($M = 19.9$, $SD = 7.8$). Chief development officers at private institutions (N = 54) had been in their position for more than five years and six months ($M = 5.6$, $SD = 4.2$), had slightly more than 18 years of fund raising experience ($M = 18.1$, $SD = 6.6$), and had been in institutional advancement just over 16 years ($M = 16.3$, $SD = 7.3$).

Chief development officers at public institutions worked at institutions having more than 22,000 FTE students enrolled ($M = 22,315.7$, $SD = 12,129.1$), over 164,300 alumni ($M = 164,336.5$, $SD = 96,577.0$), and having a minimum major gift amount of nearly \$42,900 ($M = 42,897.2$, $SD = 36,121.1$). Chief development officers at private institutions worked at institutions having more than 14,000 FTE students enrolled ($M = 105,711.9$, $SD = 56,585.6$), more than 105,700 alumni ($M = 105,711.5$, $SD = 56,585.6$), and having a minimum major gift amount of nearly \$77,400 ($M = 77,372.6$, $SD = 135,038.1$).

Table 8
Means of Chief Development Officers' Personal and Institutional Demographics by Institution Type

Factor Description	N	Public	
		Mean (M)	Std. Dev. (SD)
Age	108	51.2	7.5
Years in current position	109	5.5	4.4
Years of fundraising experience	109	21.1	6.8
Years in institutional advancement	109	19.9	7.8
Institution's enrollment	108	22,315.7	12,129.1
Institution's alumni population	107	164,336.5	96,577.0
Institution's minimum major gift amount	107	42,897.2	36,121.1
Factor Description	N	Private	
		Mean (M)	Std. Dev. (SD)
Age	54	50.0	8.3
Years in current position	54	5.6	4.2
Years of fundraising	54	18.1	6.6

experience			
Years in institutional advancement	54	16.3	7.3
Institution's enrollment	54	14,038.0	18,690.8
Institution's alumni population	52	105,711.5	56,585.6
Institution's minimum major gift amount	51	77,372.6	135,038.1

Table 9 is a frequency table showing the number of chief development officers by gender along with corresponding percentages. Of the 166 respondents, 163 indicated their gender. Table 10 shows the gender of respondents segregated by institution type. Of the 163 respondents who indicated their gender, 162 specified their institution type.

Table 9 shows a 24% difference between the numbers of female and male respondents. Sixty-three or 38% of chief development officers were female. One hundred or 62% were male. Of the 163 respondents who indicated their gender, 162 indicated their institution type. As Table 10 shows, female chief development officers accounted for 49 or 45% of respondents of public institutions while males accounted for 59 or 55%, a difference of 10%. A 52% difference between the numbers of female and male respondents existed within private institutions. Thirteen or 24% of respondents were female from private institutions while 41 or 76% were male.

Table 9
Gender of Chief Development Officers

Gender	N	%
Female	63	38%
Male	100	62%
Total	163	100%

Table 10
Gender of Chief Development Officers by Institution Type

Gender	Public		Private		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Female	49	45%	13	24%	62	38%
Male	59	55%	41	76%	100	62%
Total	108		54		162	

Table 11 displays the means of chief development officers' responses for age, years in current position, years of fund raising experience, years in institutional advancement, institution's enrollment, institution's alumni population, and institution's minimum major gift amount by gender. As Table 11 shows, the mean age of female chief development officers (N = 63) was nearly 50 years ($M = 50.0$, $SD = 6.9$) and the

mean age of male chief development officers (N = 100) was just over 51 years ($M = 51.3$, $SD = 8.2$). Female chief development officers (N = 63) had been in their position for almost five years ($M = 4.9$, $SD = 4.0$), had slightly more than 20 years of fund raising experience ($M = 20.1$, $SD = 5.5$), and had been in institutional advancement for more than 18 years ($M = 18.6$, $SD = 7.4$). Male chief development officers (N = 100) had been in their position for almost six years ($M = 5.9$, $SD = 4.5$), had slightly more than 20 years of fund raising experience ($M = 20.1$, $SD = 7.6$), and had been in institutional advancement more than 18 years ($M = 18.8$, $SD = 8.1$).

Female chief development officers worked at institutions having more than 19,300 FTE students enrolled ($M = 19,306.5$, $SD = 9,456.0$), more than 147,700 alumni ($M = 147,721.3$, $SD = 88,453.6$), and having a minimum major gift amount of over \$58,700 ($M = 58,770.5$, $SD = 127,940.9$). Male chief development officers worked at institutions having more than 19,900 FTE students enrolled ($M = 19,927.5$, $SD = 17,738.2$), nearly 144,500 alumni ($M = 144,489.8$, $SD = 90,230.3$), and having a minimum major gift amount of over \$51,400 ($M = 51,453.6$, $SD = 33,079.1$).

Table 12 is a frequency table showing the number of chief development officers by ethnic background along with corresponding percentages. Of the 166 respondents, 160 indicated their ethnic background. As shown in the table, 93% of chief development officers indicated that their ethnic background was Caucasian, distantly followed by African American at 5% and Hispanic/Latino at slightly more than 1%. Other ethnic backgrounds including Asian/Pacific Islander and Native American accounted for less than 1% of chief development officers. The one respondent who selected “other” as his/her ethnic background indicated that he/she was bi-racial.

Table 11
Means of Chief Development Officers’ Personal and Institutional Demographics by Gender

Factor	Female		
Description	N	Mean (M)	Std. Dev. (SD)
Age	63	50.0	6.9
Years in current position	63	4.9	4.0
Years of fundraising experience	63	20.1	5.5
Years in institutional advancement	63	18.6	7.4
Institution's enrollment	62	19,306.5	9,456.0
Institution's alumni population	61	147,721.3	88,453.6
Institution's minimum major gift amount	61	58,770.5	127,940.9

Factor	Male		
Description	N	Mean (M)	Std. Dev. (SD)
Age	100	51.3	8.2

Years in current position	100	5.9	4.5
Years of fundraising experience	100	20.8	7.6
Years in institutional advancement	100	18.8	8.1
Institution's enrollment	100	19,927.5	17,738.2
Institution's alumni population	98	144,489.8	90,230.3
Institution's minimum major gift amount	97	51,453.6	33,079.1

Table 12
Ethnic Background of Chief Development Officers

Ethnicity	N	%
African American	8	5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%
Caucasian	149	93%
Hispanic/Latino	2	1%
Native American	0	0%
Other	1	1%
Total	160	100%

Table 13 shows the number of chief development officers participating in the study by ethnic background delineated by institution type. Of the 160 respondents who indicated their ethnic background, 159 indicated their institution type.

As Table 13 shows, Caucasians accounted for the largest number of chief development officers in both public and private institutions, 100 and 48, respectively, or 94% and 90%. Of all respondents from public institutions, African Americans accounted for five or 5%. African Americans accounted for three respondents or 6% of respondents from private institutions. An 88% disparity between Caucasians and all other ethnic backgrounds of respondents existed within public institutions and, within private institutions, an 80% disparity existed between Caucasians and all other ethnic backgrounds.

Table 13
Ethnic Background of Chief Development Officers by Institution Type

Ethnicity	Public		Private		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
African American	5	5%	3	6%	8	5%

Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Caucasian	100	94%	48	90%	148	93%
Hispanic/Latino	1	1%	1	2%	2	1%
Native American	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other	0	0%	1	2%	1	1%
Total	106		53		159	

Table 14 displays the job titles specified by the chief development officers. Of the 164 respondents specifying a title, 76 (46%) indicated vice president/vice chancellor as their title. Another 41 (25%) respondents specified their title as associate vice president/associate vice chancellor. Executive director and director accounted for 15 (9%) and 10 (6%) of the respondents' titles respectively. Six (4%) respondents reported president to be their title and senior vice president, senior director, and assistant vice president accounted for five (3%) each. One respondent specified his/her title as assistant chancellor and one respondent reported a dual title of vice president of development and president of the university foundation.

Table 14
Chief Development Officers' Titles

Title	N	%
Vice president/vice chancellor	76	46%
Associate vice president/associate vice chancellor	41	25%
Executive director	15	9%
Director	10	6%
President	6	4%
Assistant vice president	5	3%
Senior director	5	3%
Senior vice president	5	3%
Assistant chancellor	1	<1%
Total	164	100%

Table 15
Highest Academic Degree Earned by Chief Development Officers

Highest Degree Earned	N	%
Bachelor's	38	23%
Master's	91	55%
Doctorate	29	18%
Professional – JD	7	4%
Total	165	100%

Presented in Table 15 are the highest academic degrees earned by the respondents. Of the 165 respondents who reported their highest academic degree, 91 (55%) respondents reported to have earned a master’s degree and 38 (23%) respondents reported to have earned a bachelor’s degree. There were 29 (18%) respondents who had earned a doctoral degree and seven (4%) who had earned a juris doctor degree.

Table 16 shows undergraduate majors reported by chief development officers. Many chief development officers reported more than one major. The first major indicated on the survey instrument was used to inform the table. Also, due to the variety of undergraduate majors reported, majors were grouped according to major disciplines. These major disciplines included business, communications, computer science, education, engineering and computer science, liberal arts, science, and social science. Table 17 is a complete list of the various majors reported.

Table 16
Undergraduate Majors of Chief Development Officers

Major	N	%
Liberal Arts	64	39%
Social Science	29	18%
Education	22	14%
Communications	21	13%
Business	18	11%
Science	5	3%
Engineering and Computer Science	4	2%
Total	163	100%

Table 17
List of Undergraduate Majors of Chief Development Officers

Major	N	N
Business	18	Accounting
		2

		Business Administration	14
		Marketing	2
Communications	21	Advertising	2
		Communications	13
		Journalism	5
		Public Relations	1
Education	22	Education	19
		Elementary Education	3
Engineering and Computer Science	4	Computer Science	1
		Engineering	3
Liberal Arts	64	American Studies	1
		Economics	8
		English	12
		Entertainment Management	1
		Foreign Language	2
		Health	1
		History	11
		International Studies	1
		General Liberal Arts	3
		Linguistics	1
		Music	4
		Philosophy	5
		Psychology	8
		Religious Studies	5
		Restaurant Management	1
Science	5	Biology	2
		Chemistry	1
		Physiology	2
Social Science	29	Child Development	1
		Criminal Justice	2
		Political Science	14
		Sociology	12

According to Tables 16 and 17, the most common undergraduate major among chief development officers was liberal arts. Of the 64 (39%) liberal arts majors, English was the most common major with 12 respondents followed by history with 11. Twenty-nine (18%) respondents had majors in social science with political science and sociology being the most common majors at 14 and 12 respectively. Education majors accounted for 22 (14%) of the respondents who indicated general education and elementary

education at 19 and 3, respectively, as their majors. General communications topped the communications major totaling 13 followed by journalism at five. Business administration was the most common business major with 14 respondents.

References

- Ashcraft, R. F. (1996). An analysis of alumni donation and nondonation related to selected personal, involvement and outcome factors (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56(7), 2570A.
- Baker, P. C. (1998). The relationship of selected characteristics and attitudes of professional school alumni to financial support within a public research university (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59(5), 1477A.
- Boland, H. G. (2002). No longer emerging, fund raising is a profession. *The Case International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 3(1), 7-19.
- Brittingham, M. W. (2000). Campus and constituent alumni groups: A new look at alumni. In P. M. Buchannan (Ed.), *Handbook of institutional advancement* (pp. 251-254). Washington, DC: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Carnegie Foundation. (2007). *The Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education basic classification database*. Retrieved February 9, 2007, from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/>.
- Cash, J. M. (Ed.). (2001). *Private fund-raising for public higher education*. Lyndhurst, NJ: Available from Marts & Lundy Consultants, Inc.
- Cockrum, L. L. (2005). The impact of presidential leadership behavior on success in fundraising (Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(12), 4484A.
- Coleman, J. T. (2000). Chapter and clubs: The role of geography in programming and delivery. In P. M. Buchannan (Ed.), *Handbook of institutional advancement* (pp. 247-250). Washington, DC: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Conley, A. T. (2000). Student organization membership and alumni giving at a public, research I university (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(8), 2825A.
- Council for Aid to Education. (2006). *Voluntary support of education, 2005*. Washington, DC: Author.

- Daniels, L. (1989, December 17). Raising money tops colleges' agenda for '90's. *New York Times*, p. 46.
- Daniels, T. R. (2000). A profile of Black alumni constituent groups at predominantly white institutions (Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(10), 3614A.
- Dillman, D. A. (1978). *Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Dionne, J. L., & Keane, T. (1995). *Breaking the social contract: The fiscal crisis in higher education*. New York: Council for Aid to Education and the Commission on National Investment in Higher Education.
- Duderstadt, J. J. (1997). Successful fund raising at a large public research university. In F. H. T. Rhodes (Ed.), *Successful fund raising for higher education*. Phoenix, AZ: Council for the Advancement of Education/Oryx Press.
- Evans, D. L., Jr. (2006). Attitudes of engineering donors toward the use of electronic communications for fundraising in the College of Engineering at the University of Idaho (Doctoral dissertation, University of Idaho, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66(7), 2449A.
- Eversden, G. K. (2004). Characteristics of selected fundraising programs: Case studies of two Carnegie I research-extensive universities (Doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(1), 83A.
- Farrell, T. J. (2005). Comprehensive fundraising campaigns in the 21st century: Non-financial factors and elements associated with major campaigns at doctoral-extensive universities (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts International* 66(3), 902A.
- Gaier, S. E. (2004). The impact of alumni satisfaction with their undergraduate academic experience on alumni giving and alumni participation (Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 2003). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(3), 849A.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction* (7th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Gallo, P. J., & Hubschman, B. (2003, April). *The relationship between alumni participation and motivation on financial giving*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Hatch, M. J. (1997). *Organization theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Heintzelman, J. R. (2000). Major gifts: Up close and personal. In P. M. Buchanan (Ed.), *Handbook of institutional advancement* (pp. 315-320). Washington, DC: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Hunter, C. S. (2002). A study of the relationships between alumni giving and selected characteristics of alumni donors of Livingstone College (Doctoral dissertation, Fayetteville State University, 1997). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62(10), 3311A.
- Ikenberry, J. P. (2000). Alumni institutional commitment: Connecting student involvement with alumni involvement and institutional commitment (Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1999). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(7), 2402A.
- Johnson, B. L., Jr. (1995). *Resource dependence theory: A political economy model of organizations*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED387871)
- Kelly, T. F. (2000). Organization of the development program. In P. M. Buchanan (Ed.), *Handbook of institutional advancement* (pp. 347-352). Washington, DC: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 55-57.
- Leslie, L. L., & Ramey, G. (1988). Donor behavior and voluntary support for higher education institutions. *Journal of Higher Education*, 59(2), 115-132.
- Lewis, M. M. (1997). What motivates doctoral level alumni to contribute? Response to a segmented university fundraising appeal (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57(9), 3844A.
- Millard, J. E. (2002). Student debt and undergraduate giving to one's alma mater (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri – Kansas City, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63(2), 451A.
- National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. (1992). *Comprehensive Alumni Assessment Survey (four-year institution)*. Boulder, CO: NCHEMS Publications.
- Okunade, A. A., & Berl, R. L. (1997). Determinants of charitable giving of business school alumni. *Research in Higher Education*, 38(2), 201-214.
- O'Neill, P. P. (2005). The impact of undergraduate Greek membership on alumni giving at the College of William and Mary (Doctoral dissertation, College of William and Mary, 2005). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 66(2), 516A.

- Parsons, F. R., Jr. (1999). Residential life as a correlate to higher education fund-raising (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59(9), 3371A.
- Patouillet, L. D. (2000). Alumni association members: Attitudes toward university life and giving at a public AAU institution (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(6), 2214A.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Robinson, D. M. (1997). A study of selected characteristics of alumni financial support to their alma mater (Doctoral dissertation, Grambling State University, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57(7), 2873A.
- Rosser, A. W. (1998). A stratificational analysis of the relationship between and among selected variables related to alumni annual giving to the Association of Former Students of Texas A&M University (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, 1997). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58(11), 4147A.
- Schmidt, J. C. (2002). Mining philanthropic data: Models for predicting alumni/us giving at a medium-sized public master's university (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 2001). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62(10), 3318A.
- Schroeder, F. W. (2000). Annual giving: The front door to your development program. In P. M. Buchannan (Ed.), *Handbook of institutional advancement* (pp. 303-307). Washington, DC: Council for Advancement and Support of Education.
- Taylor, A. L., & Martin, J. C. (1993, May). *Predicting alumni giving at a public research university*. Paper presented at the 1993 Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Chicago, IL.
- Teague, B. B. (2001). The satisfaction, influence, and attitude among donors to the Athletics Foundation of The University of Mississippi (Doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi, 2000). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62(1), 46A.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.