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Abstract

Throughout the literature, HBCU alumni non-donors were perceived to possess the opposite characteristics of alumni that do give financially. In order to further examine the lack of alumni giving at HBCUs, this study evaluated previously identified characteristics of HBCU alumni that choose not to financially support their alma maters. The purpose of this study was to examine how income, student experience, religious charitable giving, alumni perceptions, and alumni engagement, relate to alumni giving at HBCUs. An explanatory correlational design was used to address the research questions posed in this study. The 4,500 person sample, which consisted of donors and non-donors, was selected from two HBCUs using a stratified random sampling process. Data collection occurred through an 18-question online survey. The large majority of the participants were donors, while 44% of the non-donors reported not being contributors due to a limited discretionary income. The participants were overwhelmingly satisfied with their academic experience, extracurricular experience, decision to attend their alma mater, and post-graduation success. In addition, a large percentage of the participants attended a church and made charitable contributions on a weekly basis. All of the relationships were found to be statically significant ($p < .05$) except for religious charitable giving and alumni giving, and alumni involvement and alumni giving. The results of this study suggest: (a) HBCU donors and non-donors have positive overall undergraduate experiences; (b) religious charitable giving and attendance may not influence alumni giving at HBCUs as much as previously assumed by earlier researchers; and (c) the low annual income of African Americans was not as high of a justification for not giving by non-donors as previously assumed by other scholars.
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Chapter I

Introduction

W.E.B. DuBois, one of the first graduates of Fisk University, publicly advocated for his fellow alumni to support financially their alma mater. He stated “very little of the University’s new million dollar endowment has come from us” (Cohen, 2006, p. 201). Fisk University, a historically Black college (HBCU) continues to struggle with this same issue in the new millennium. DuBois’ beloved institution was one of many HBCUs that were placed on probationary status throughout the 2000s from their respective accrediting agency due to a lack of financial stability (Hawkins, 2004). One could question whether some HBCUs could be more financially stable, if larger numbers of their respective graduates heeded DuBois’ challenge to provide financial support to their cash strapped alma maters.

During the 1990s, HBCU graduates frequently displayed a sense of loyalty toward their alma maters. On any given Saturday, 60,000 plus HBCU students, alumni, staff and community supporters eagerly flocked to fill stadiums on Saturday afternoons to support HBCU football legends and future NFL greats such as Jerry Rice (Mississippi Valley State University), Steve McNair (Alcorn State University), Michael Strahan (Texas Southern University), and Walter Payton (Jackson State University) (Gamble, 2013; SWAC Legends, 2013). HBCU students and alumni proudly wore their HBCU alumni apparel as African American high school students religiously watched the CBS “A Different World” sitcom to gain insight into the college life at an HBCU (Carter, 2011; Stuart, 2012). HBCU students and graduates outwardly expressed their affections for their respective institutions, yet the alumni giving rates at most HBCUs were dismal. In the mid-1990s, Howard University had one of the higher HBCU alumni giving rates of 11%, while Ivy League institutions during the same time frame had rates that ranged from
31% to 64% (Reaves, 2006; “The Solid Alumni Base,” 2000).

Fast forward to 2013, and HBCU graduates, for the most part, continue to have pride in the institutions that they attended. Although not in the same numbers as the 1990s, HBCU athletic events are still heavily attended. Since 1978, the Southwestern Athletic Conference (SWAC), one of two HBCU Division 1 athletic conferences, has received 34 out of the 35 NCAA FCS level top conference attendance awards (Johnson, 2013). In 2012, the SWAC averaged almost 14,000 fans a game for home football games, while some neutral site games reached over 66,000 fans (Birdsong, 2012). HBCU athletic contests are still celebrated, homecoming weeks are major events and current students and graduates display their pride via paraphernalia and social media networks (Birdsong, 2012; CIAA, 2012; Johnson, 2013; Morrison & Freeman, 2011).

Although the attendance of HBCU alumni at their alma maters sporting events has slightly waned, there is little evidence to suggest a decline in overall institutional pride. Yet, as noted with earlier generations of HBCU graduates, that level of pride for their respective alma maters has not translated into large quantities of alumni donations since HBCU alumni giving rates remain at extremely low levels. In 2012, national alumni giving rates were a little over 30%, while the rate at HBCUs was less than 9% (Gasman & Bowman, 2012). Unfortunately in the current economic climate, the need for development officers at colleges and universities to increase their fundraising efforts, particularly through alumni gifts, has become even more important than when Dubois initially challenged HBCU graduates to support their institutions financially. Since alumni pride appears not to be contributing to the low giving rates, it is imperative that HBCU administrators determine what issues deter their graduates from becoming donors.
Background of the Study

In the HBCU realm, endowments continued to decline in total dollar amounts and return on investments (ROI) (Cohen, 2006; Gasman, Lundy-Wagner, Ransom, & Bowman, 2010). In 2012, only one HBCU saw a positive double digit ROI (“Top 12 HBCU Endowments,” 2013). Collectively, the HBCUs with the 10 largest endowments saw a decrease of $100 million, while the PWIs with the 10 largest endowments experienced an increase of over $100 million dollars (“Top 12 HBCU Endowments,” 2013). Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs) consistently raise more funds than their HBCU counterparts (Ayers & Ayers, 2002; Cross & Slater, 1994; Gasman & Bowman, 2012). In 2005-2006, the combined endowment of the 41 private HBCUs was far less than the endowment of one small, private PWI that had a student enrollment of only 1,400 (Cross & Slater, 1994). While some HBCUs have created alternative funding sources such as corporate sponsorships and grants, the alumni giving rates at many of those institutions have not been on par with their PWI counterparts. In 2002, the average alumni gift to an HBCU was less than $100, while gifts made to their PWI counterparts were often double or triple that amount (“State-Chartered Black Universities,” 2002). Despite the marginal giving rates of their graduates, HBCUs are still important and serve a purpose in the American higher education system.

In 2004, HBCUs accounted for over 23% of the nation’s African American graduates (Hawkins, 2004). As recently as 2012, HBCUs were responsible for training over half of all African American teachers in the United States, while Xavier University of Louisiana was recognized as the top producer of African American undergraduates that gained admission into medical school (Gasman & Bowman, 2012). Consistently, HBCUs account for over 40% of African American engineers and 33% of the nation’s minority doctors (Elliot, Strenta, Adair,
Matier, & Scott, 1996; Hawkins, 2004). Therefore, losing a Fisk University or a Texas College due to financial strife could limit the opportunities for some minority students to obtain a college degree. As a result, W.E.B. DuBois’ charge to fellow graduates of Fisk University to give back financially has become the war cry of HBCU presidents and chancellors to their respective alumni bases.

Some institutions have conducted capital fundraising campaigns, but much of the fundraising at HBCUs has relied on support from foundations and corporations. However, corporations have decreased their charitable giving as it relates to percentage of pretax profits. Corporate pretax charitable contributions have fallen from 2.1% in 1986 to .08% in 2012 (Stern, 2013). The aforementioned coupled with the instability of the economy, resulted in a 3.2% decline in corporate charitable contributions in 2013 (Daniels, 2014). HBCU philanthropy scholars predicted that this usually reliable revenue stream would eventually begin to decline as an option and HBCUs would need to rely more on their graduates for financial support (Cohen, 2006; Gasman, 2010). As a result, HBCU presidents must develop successful fundraising campaigns that are geared toward their institutions’ graduates. In order to do so, HBCU administrators must ask the hard questions to better evaluate the lack of alumni giving among HBCU graduates who are not donors of their respective alma maters. Are HBCU alumni not engaged with the university? Have HBCU alumni not been asked to give back? Are HBCU alumni not financially secure enough to contribute when asked? Are HBCU alumni not satisfied with their academic and extracurricular experiences? Do HBCU alumni attribute a less than stellar professional career to a poor collegiate academic experience? Are HBCU alumni active participants in other charitable activities, such as religion, which take priority over alumni giving?
Statement of the Problem

One of the primary reasons scholars believe alumni do not give back to their alma maters is because they have not been asked to contribute financially (Gasman et al., 2010). Either HBCU development officers have failed to ask alumni to contribute consistently, or conversations about giving have not occurred at all. Additionally, researchers studying minority alumni from PWIs (Gasman & Bowman, 2013) and HBCU alumni that are active donors (Holloman, Gasman, & Anderson-Thompkins, 2003) claim that unsatisfactory collegiate experience have kept some alumni from giving back. However, that hypotheses should not be so readily accepted since the research on HBCU alumni giving is limited. Furthermore, the available research, such as Holloman, Gasman, and Anderson-Thompkins (2003) study, overwhelmingly used alumni donors as the participants rather than non-donors. Therefore, few if any studies have yet to be conducted that challenged the assumptions of why HBCU alumni that are non-donors choose not to give.

Other researchers claim that HBCU graduates make less than PWI graduates and are unable to financially commit significant gifts to their alma maters (Holloman et al., 2003; “State-Chartered Black Universities,” 2002). Yet, other than economic theories (Barsky, Bound, Charles, & Lupton, 2002; Conley, 2000), there is no known research to back up this claim at this time. While economic theories give a historical account of why African Americans have not acquired as much wealth as Whites, they do not explain how African Americans choose to spend their discretionary income. Likewise, the economic buying power of African Americans is expected to exceed one trillion US dollars by 2015 (“Nielsen Report,” 2012). Consequently, it appears that African Americans, which make up the largest percentage of HBCU graduates, may have a much higher giving capacity than previously documented or assumed (Gasman &
Other authors have attributed the lack of alumni giving among HBCU graduates to a lack of philanthropic tradition among HBCUs and African Americans in general (Hunter, Jones, & Boger, 1999; “State-Chartered Black Universities,” 2002). Yet, Holloman et al. (2003) researched the historic philanthropic activity in the Black church and discussed how that large-scale spirit of giving should translate to philanthropy at African American colleges and universities despite the widespread notion that Blacks are not predisposed to giving back. In addition, researchers revealed that HBCU graduates that were donors consistently contribute charitable gifts to their religious institutions as well (Hunter, Jones, & Boger, 1999; Reaves, 2006), but there are no known studies with HBCU alumni who were non-donors as the participants. Therefore, it appears that more research is needed on this subject. While empirical research studies on philanthropy at HBCUs are limited, there are a few documented studies related to the subject.

For instance, Cohen (2006) conducted a study on the attitudes, perceptions, and giving behaviors of HBCU alumni. He focused on determining the engagement levels and giving rationales of HBCU graduates who were donors of their respective institutions. Cohen (2006) recommended that a study was needed to determine the attitudes and perceptions of HBCU graduates who do not financially contribute to their alma mater. Gasman and Bowman (2013) surveyed alumni of color from PWIs to try to understand the reasons why these alumni choose to give or not to give back financially to their alma maters. While the information obtained in the research is useful within the field of philanthropy in general, none of the interviewees were HBCU graduates. The aforementioned studies and others that will be discussed more thoroughly in the next chapter, primarily focused on the perceptions and characteristics of HBCU graduates.
who are current donors, or alumni of color at PWIs. In an attempt to increase financial contributions from alumni, it would benefit HBCU administrators to have data from HBCU alumni who are non-donors. This will allow HBCU administrators to better understand and address the problems, concerns and barriers that deter HBCU graduates from making a financial commitment to their alma mater.

**Purpose of the Study**

In order to further examine the lack of alumni giving at HBCUs, this study evaluated previously identified characteristics of HBCU alumni that choose not to financially support their alma maters. As discussed throughout the literature, HBCU alumni non-donors were perceived to possess the opposite characteristics of alumni that do give financially. According to scholars, HBCU alumni donors tend to be satisfied with their overall collegiate experience and perceived post-graduation success (Allen, 1981; Bowels, 1976; Evans, 1987; Hunter et al., 1999; Reaves, 2006). They also consistently contributed financially to a church, and were actively engaged with their alma mater through alumni association participation and/or by receiving university communications (Allen, 1981; Bowels, 1976; Evans, 1987; Hunter et al., 1999; Reaves, 2006). Consequently, the purpose of this study was to examine how income, student experience, religious charitable giving, alumni perceptions, and alumni engagement, relate to alumni giving at HBCUs.

**Research Questions**

After reviewing the literature on alumni giving at HBCUs and selecting the appropriate theoretical frameworks, this study addressed the following questions:

1. Is there a relationship between income (socioeconomic status and monthly discretionary income) and alumni giving by HBCU graduates?
2. Is there a relationship between student experience (academic and extracurricular) and alumni giving by HBCU graduates?

3. Is there a relationship between religious charitable giving (frequency of attendance and donations to religious organizations) and alumni giving by HBCU graduates?

4. Is there a relationship between alumni perceptions (satisfaction with decision to attend their alma mater and perceived post-graduation success) and alumni giving by HBCU graduates?

5. Is there a relationship between alumni engagement (alumni involvement and frequency of communication with the alma mater) and alumni giving by HBCU graduates?

**Delimitations and Limitations**

This study was delimited to only two HBCUs because of time constraints and familiarity with one geographic region. The two participating HBCUs were chosen using convenience sampling. Both institutions were public HBCUs located in the Southwestern region of the United States. Thus, this small sampling of the HBCU population may hinder the generalizability of the findings of this study to the overall HBCU population.

The available participants were limited to 2,500 and 2,000 respectively from each school, due to the small percentage of email addresses maintained by each participating institution’s alumni relations and advancement offices. Another limitation was the results of this study were based on self-reported responses from the participants. There was no way to ensure that participants were honest in their responses. Despite conducting a pilot test, there was no way to ensure that all participants fully understood all of the survey questions.

**Significance of the Study**

This study analyzed the relationships between certain characteristics and alumni giving of
HBCU graduates, using a sample of donors and non-donors. Overall, the results of this study will help HBCU administrators have a better understanding of why some of their graduates choose not to financially support their alma maters.

Through this research, HBCU presidents and institutional advancement officials can identify the reasons that some of their graduates have not become donors of their respective institutions. The main objective of the study was identifying why non-donors have chosen not to provide a financial contribution to their respective alma maters. The findings will equip institutional advancement and development officers with the necessary information to increase the number of alumni donors needed to create better alumni centered fundraising campaigns.

Prior to this study, the known related research studies focused on asking current donors why they assume non-donors do not give financially. However, this study utilized non-donors as participants to solicit their responses and perspectives on why they chose not to give.

In addition, university administrators and development staff members will recognize how to reach and engage potential alumni donors who have not given back to the university. Data were collected regarding the participants’ engagement with their university as a student and as an alumnus. Analysis of that data will help HBCU administrators determine if engagement with the university as a student or an alumnus affects a non-donor’s decision not to financially contribute to their alma mater. Thus, HBCU administrators will be able to identify issues with their current student and alumni engagement models.

Furthermore, faculty and staff members can make sure they are abreast of the concerns of future HBCU graduates. Results from this study hopefully will reveal issues that arose from the students’ college experience that may have negatively impacted their decision to financially support his or her alma mater. This will enable HBCU administrators to be proactive and address
any avoidable problems that are deterring their graduates from becoming alumni donors.

Lastly, the results of this study will be a valuable addition to existing research on HBCU alumni. It will be one of the first studies to utilize HBCU graduates that are non-donors as participants. HBCU administrators across the country will be able to use the results of this study to strengthen their alumni relations programs and adapt the questionnaire to conduct similar studies at their respective institutions.

**Definition of Key Terms**

Several important terms were used throughout this study. In order to provide understanding and consistency, the key terms associated with this study are defined below.

**Alumni.** The plural form of alumnus.

**Alumni giving.** A financial contribution made to a college or university by an alumnus.

**Alumnus.** A graduate of one of the HBCUs participating in this study.

**Donor.** A HBCU alumnus that has financially supported his or her alma mater through gifts of money, stock, land, or other items with a monetary value (Lackie, 2010).

**Extracurricular activity.** An activity that an alumnus might have participated in as a college student, such as athletics, student organizations, choir, band, or intramural programs.

**Historically Black College or University (HBCU).** An institution defined by Congress whose principal mission was and is the education of Black Americans (“About HBCUs,” 1999).

**Non-donor.** A HBCU alumnus that has not made a financial contribution to his or her alma mater post-graduation.
Predominantly White Institution (PWI). The term used to describe institutions of higher learning in which Whites account for 50% or greater of the student enrollment. These institutions may also be understood as historically White institutions in recognition of the segregation supported by the United States prior to 1964 (Brown & Dancy, 2010).

Religious contribution. A financial contribution made to a church.

Theoretical Frameworks

There were three theories that comprised the theoretical frameworks that guided this study. In an effort to answer the question of why HBCU alumni do not financially support their alma maters, this study was conducted through the theoretical lens of the social exchange theory, rational choice theory, and the racial wealth gap concept.

The social exchange theory is based on the premise that two sides receive mutual rewards after a predetermined exchange or transaction occurs between both parties (Emerson, 1976). Scholars that have focused on philanthropy and alumni giving have consistently used this theory to explain the relationship between a donor and a college or university (Cook & Lasher, 1996; Drezner, 2009). For the purposes of this study, the social exchange theory was utilized to understand if HBCU graduates consider their undergraduate experiences to be rewarding enough to provide a financial gift to their alma mater in exchange for their college experience.

Author John Scott explained the rational choice theory as a concept that “sees social interaction as social exchange modelled on economic action. People are motivated by the rewards and costs of actions and by the profits that they can make” (2000, p. 11). This theory is closely related to the social exchange theory, yet it denies the existence of any other decision making that is not purely rational and calculated (Scott, 2000). Scholars that subscribe to this theory believe all decisions are well thought out and calculated to determine the risks, losses, and
gains associated with each choice. John Scott (2000) observed:

In rational choice theories, individuals are seen as motivated by the wants or goals that express their preferences. As it is not possible for individuals to achieve all of the various things that they want, they must also make choices in relation to both their goals and the means for attaining these goals. Rational choice theories hold that individuals must anticipate the outcomes of alternative courses of action and calculate that which will be best for them. Rational individuals choose the alternative that is likely to give them the greatest satisfaction. (p. 8)

In essence, people make decisions based on how much they will benefit or receive satisfaction from their long-term and short-term choices. While the literature identified the lack of discretionary income as a potential barrier for HBCU alumni to financially support their alma maters, it failed to account for the recent developments in the significant buying power of African Americans and increase in discretionary income within the United States (“Nielsen Report,” 2012). The rational choice theory was applicable to this study because people determine how they will use their discretionary funds based on rational choices. An HBCU graduate’s decision to give or not to give to their college may be based on a rational decision to utilize their funds in other areas that give them greater satisfaction. For example, HBCU graduates that support their churches, but not their alma mater, may not see their respective colleges and universities as a rational choice or preference for charitable support through the use of their discretionary income. In this study, the rational choice theory was used to better understand how HBCU alumni establish charitable preferences and make calculated, rational decisions to financially support or not support their alma maters beyond graduation.

The racial wealth gap theory postulates that an apparent gap between the wealth accumulated between African Americans and White Americans exists (Barsky et al., 2002; Conley, 2000). According to Conley (2000), the racial wealth gap exists due to differences in the type of assets that African Americans and White Americans choose to accumulate. While the
findings of the Barsky et al. (2002) study suggested that the distribution of income among African Americans and White Americans plays a significant role in the racial wealth gap, they also agreed that it is important to note that African Americans have historically accumulated assets with lower values. In addition, both studies acknowledged the fact that White Americans are more likely than African Americans to accumulate transferable forms of wealth, such as inheritance, trust funds, stock, and land (Barsky et al., 2002; Conley, 2000).

Consequently, it was important to consider the implications that the racial wealth gap may have had on an HBCU graduate’s decision to make a financial contribution to his or her postsecondary institution. Conley (2000) argued that African American philanthropy, no matter the context, should not be studied without considering the impact of the racial wealth gap. For the purposes of this study, the racial wealth gap was used as a theoretical framework to better understand the impact that the presumed lack of wealth and discretionary income among HBCU graduates has had on the low alumni giving rates at HBCUs.

Chapter Summary

Despite the institutional pride displayed by HBCU graduates (Carter, 2011; Stuart, 2012), HBCU alumni giving rates are significantly lower than those at PWIs (Reaves, 2006; “The Solid Alumni Base,” 2000). Earlier research studies claimed that HBCU graduates give less than PWI graduates because African Americans do not have the wealth or cash flow to give to charitable causes (Barsky et al., 2002; Conley, 2000). However, African Americans have been documented as being consistent financial contributors to the Black church (Holloman et al., 2003; Hunter, Jones, & Boger, 1999; Reaves, 2006) and are projected to have a buying power of $1.1 Trillion in 2015 (“Nielsen Report,” 2012). Hence, those previous assumptions regarding alumni giving at HBCUs need to be revisited.
In order to increase low alumni giving rates, research must be conducted to determine why so many HBCU graduates choose not to support their alma maters financially. Other research studies have questioned current HBCU alumni donors on why some of their peers choose not to give, but few studies, if any, have utilized non-donors as participants. The purpose of this study was to validate previously identified characteristics of HBCU alumni that choose not to financially support their alma mater.
Chapter II

Review of Relevant Literature

Reviewing the literature associated with alumni giving at HBCUs is important. However, in order to understand fully the underlying problem of this study and purpose of this research, it is necessary to have an historical context of HBCUs, philanthropy in higher education and alumni giving. This chapter will further present literature on African American philanthropy, fundraising at HBCUs, and research studies related to HBCU alumni donors. The sections on African American philanthropy and fundraising at HBCUs provide an overview of how African Americans have contributed philanthropically in America. Lastly, the discussions on fundraising at HBCUs and research studies related to HBCU alumni donors discusses the limited fundraising and alumni giving initiatives at HBCUs, while ultimately establishing the rationale for this study.

A Brief History of HBCUs

There are currently 105 HBCUs in the United States (“Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Higher Education Desegregation,” 1991). These institutions are categorized as two and four-year institutions, as well as public and private. Historically, Black colleges were founded to provide an opportunity for African American students to obtain postsecondary education during a time when the United States education system was segregated (“Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Higher Education Desegregation,” 1991; Lucas, 2006). In the modern post racial society, HBCUs actively recruit and educate students from all races and ethnicities.

The first HBCU, Cheney University in Pennsylvania, was created in 1837 (Redd, 1998). Lincoln University of Pennsylvania in 1854 and Wilberforce University in Ohio in 1856 followed the founding of Cheney University. Prior to the Civil War, White religious
philanthropists that sought to educate runaway slaves and free Blacks on religious principles and basic trade skills established these postsecondary institutions (Redd, 1998). There were White institutions, such as Amherst College, University of Delaware, Bowdoin University, and Middlebury College that secretly allowed some Blacks to attend their institutions, but Oberlin College and Berea College were the only institutions prior to the Civil War to openly accept Black students from their inception (Titcomb, 2013). Not surprisingly, most of the institutions that are now referred to as HBCUs were created after the Civil War.

After President Abraham Lincoln signed the emancipation proclamation, more privately funded HBCUs were established, such as Tuskegee Institute, Fisk University, St. Pauls College, Hampton Institute, and Howard University (Titcomb, 2013). Black religious organizations and government entities such as the Freedman’s Bureau and White philanthropists established and financially supported these institutions (Allen, Jewell, Griffin, & Wolf, 2007; Gasman, 2012). Many early HBCUs focused on training newly freed slaves on the basic academic skills with a vocational emphasis rather than the liberal arts education being promoted at predominately White institutions (PWIs) at that time (Titcomb, 2013; Watson & Johnson, 2004). Black intellectuals W.E.B. Du Bois and Booker T. Washington debated whether Black education should consist of a liberal arts education or vocational training. Both believed that education could progress the Black population.

However, Du Bois believed that a liberal arts education was the way for Blacks to advance in society, while Washington agreed with many Whites during the Reconstruction era that Blacks should focus more on vocational training as an economic vehicle (Watson & Johnson, 2004). Unlike Washington, some Whites, particularly Southerners, believed a liberal arts education would enable Blacks to increase their mental capacity and decrease their
subservient nature (Watson & Johnson, 2004). Therefore, many White philanthropists that supported these upstart HBCUs financially were often more willing to donate if the institution implemented a vocational training program rather than a liberal arts curriculum (Watson & Johnson, 2004). Between 1865 and 1900 over 100 colleges were established for the sole purpose of educating Black America (Minor, 2008). The surge of higher education institutions was not only a result of the efforts of generous philanthropists, but also of indirect actions of the federal government.

The federal government passed a law known as the Morrill Act of 1862 that allowed states to sale land and use the proceeds to establish colleges and universities within their territories (Minor 2008). The senator that sponsored the bill sought to expand the United States westward so he encouraged the states to sell the land in those areas (Lucas, 2006). The opportunity for the states to utilize the funds from the land sales to establish colleges and universities was a byproduct of the bill, and inadvertently public higher education within the United States was created. Thus, the intention of the Morrill Act of 1862 was to increase the expansion of families into the loosely populated western hemisphere of the United States, not create a system of publicly funded colleges and universities. Yet, three decades later the Second Morrill Act of 1890 provided more land and higher education funding opportunities to states. In order to accept the funds, states were required to use some of the funding to establish or enhance an already existing public college for Blacks (Minor, 2008). Thus, public land grant HBCUs, such as Prairie View A&M University and Alcorn State University, were established.

The *Plessy v. Ferguson* decision of 1896 maintained the “separate, but equal” doctrine across various public entities, including higher education. It was illegal until 1954 for Blacks and Whites to be educated within the same institution. As a result, HBCUs became the primary
avenue for Blacks to receive a postsecondary education and advance within society (Allen, et al., 2007; Minor, 2008). In 1954, the Plessy v Ferguson ruling was challenged in a Topeka, Kansas secondary education related court case. The U.S. Supreme Court determined that the “separate, but equal” doctrine from the historic Brown v Board of Education, Topeka, Kansas case was unconstitutional and required states to integrate public secondary and higher education institutions (Allen, et al., 2007; Titcomb, 2013). Integration improved access, equity, and options for Black students seeking educational opportunities. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 also addressed inequities within education. Title VI of the Act required colleges and universities that received federal funding to integrate and discontinue institutional discrimination practices based on race (Allen, et al., 2007; Civil Rights Act of 1964). As a result of integration and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requirements, HBCUs began to see an exodus of students, particularly high-achieving Black students, who opted to attend PWIs, in large numbers during the 1960s and 1970s (Allen et al., 2007; Titcomb, 2013).

A lasting impact of desegregation was unequal financing of HBCUs when compared to the PWIs within their respective states (Allen et al., 2007). In 1965, the federal government recognized the huge gap in funding, infrastructure and other resources. As a means to rectify the situation, the Higher Education Act of 1965 was passed, which included a clause to provide additional funding to HBCUs in an attempt to bring them up to par with their PWI counterparts (Allen et al., 2007; Titcomb, 2013). Some state court cases also awarded additional funding to public HBCUs in their respective states, but the funding gaps continued (Allen et al., 2007). Despite funding inequities and struggles, HBCUs have a long history of educating students and training leaders (Titcomb, 2013). Individuals that have made a lasting impression on society, such as Oprah Winfrey, Thurgood Marshall, Barbara Jordan, Mickey Leland and Langston
Hughes, were all educated at HBCUs (Allen et al., 2007; Minor, 2008; Titcomb, 2013).

Additionally, in 2011, HBCUs represented only 3% of the colleges and universities in the United States, but enrolled over 11% of the Black students (Gasman, 2012).

HBCUs were established for the sole purpose of educating Blacks pre- and post-Civil War. While the motivations sometimes differed, Blacks and Whites established and financed the institutions. Until 1954, HBCUs were the only legal option for Blacks to obtain a college education until the Brown v. Board of Education, Topeka, Kansas United States Supreme Court decision overturned the “separate, but equal” clause from Plessy v Ferguson. As a result of integration, federal regulations and funding inequities, HBCUs have struggled financially and still continue to do so in 2014, while striving to educate generations of students from various backgrounds and ethnicities.

**Brief History of Philanthropy in Higher Education**

Since the decrease of state funding for higher education has continued, philanthropic funds have become more important to higher education than previous years (Okunade, Wunnava, & Walsh, 1994). However, individuals and corporations have contributed to higher education since the 1600s. Harvard University’s founding was possible due to donations from individuals and a bequest from the institution's eventual namesake, John Harvard (Curti & Nash, 1965; Lucas, 2006). Although colonies made some minimal appropriations to fledgling colleges, the majority of those funds supported professor salaries and student scholarships (Curti & Nash, 1965). What are now considered to be modern state funded colleges and universities did not exist prior to the 1800s, so philanthropy played a significant part in the start of all institutions prior to that time. During the establishment of the colonial colleges, donations were sought via individual solicitations (Curti & Nash, 1965; Sears, 1990). In 1644, Harvard conducted the first noted
annual appeal to the citizens of the newly formed colonies. Representatives from the college encouraged colonial members to donate a quarter bushel of grain or the monetary equivalent in a means to keep the college afloat. This annual solicitation continued successfully for over a decade (Curti & Nash, 1965; Lucus, 2006; Sears, 1990). During its’ early inception, Harvard also achieved successful campaigns to fund building projects, scholarships, faculty salaries, and endowed professorships. Early institutions also received in-kind gifts, such as land and books that college administrators would choose to utilize or convert to cash (Curti & Nash, 1965; Lucus, 2006; Sears, 1990). Institutions developed marketing materials to attract donors that were used during individual solicitation visits, which was a fundraising tactic first used by universities in England (Curti & Nash, 1965; Sears, 1990).

Many institutions founded in the early stages of American higher education were funded by churches or individuals wishing to promote religious doctrine and train clergy. Conversely, institutions founded after the colonial era begin to see new donors wishing to invest in institutions that utilized a practical curriculum (Curti & Nash, 1965; Lucas, 2006; Sears, 1990). As many other colleges were established, philanthropic funds were sought in order to develop the institutions or sustain their progress. Some of the donors placed restrictions on their gifts, while other contributions were made with no limitations (Curti & Nash, 1965). Some of those restrictions involved early calls to diversify the student body. For instance, one of the first donations to the College of Rhode Island came with the condition to admit Jewish students without any restrictions (Curti & Nash, 1965). While most donors gave without conditions, some were made to promote new ideas, progress moral or religious doctrines, and advance personal agendas (Curti & Nash, 1965; Lucas, 2006). Even so, the gifts were needed and readily accepted. Those early gifts achieved through philanthropic efforts were often used to address overdue
debts, pay faculty salaries, award student scholarships, and sustain the college (Curti & Nash, 1965; Lucas, 2006).

Brief History of Alumni Giving

Prior to WWI, marketing campaigns and appeals were made to the general public, rather than to alumni of the respective institutions. Hence, alumni did not constitute the largest donor base in fundraising campaigns. Individuals and corporations with no direct connections to the institutions were the primary contributors prior to WWI (Curti & Nash, 1965). Some institutions had alumni donors, but no single alumni group were the primary financial supporters of their respective institution. Corporations donated millions to universities in order to progress the educated workforce in their local communities (Curti & Nash, 1965). Local business owners made gifts during their lifetime, as well as bequests that would support the colleges after their deaths. Yet while alumni giving campaigns sparingly existed, the overarching response to the early campaigns was dismal at best.

Prior to the 1900s, the collective gifts made by alumni to early established colleges were typically less than $100, with only a few colleges receiving alumni gifts as high as $5,000 (Curti & Nash, 1965). Conversely, between 1852 and 1895 non-alumni had contributed more than $1.3 million to Dartmouth while alumni had given less than $370,000 (Curti & Nash, 1965). As a result, college presidents challenged alumni to support their alma maters as a way to repay the institution for educating them. Many college presidents believed current graduates were indebted to their alma maters for their success, particularly because many of them had not paid the total cost of attendance (Curti & Nash, 1965). Yet, some alumni that were disconnected with the institution did not subscribe to the president’s theory of indebtedness (Curti & Nash, 1965).

While there were some graduates who supported their institutions’ financial growth, the
most significant alumni gifts did not begin to surface until the mid-1930s when college
administrators began to address their lack of engagement with graduates. As a result, college and
university administrators began to take an interest in the needs and wants of their alumni.
College graduates begin to voice a desire for competitive athletic teams and timely
communication from their alma maters. Those concerns were addressed and alumni were also
selected to serve on advisory committees and as board of trustee members. In addition, colleges
and universities heavily promoted institutional achievements and new academic offerings to
alumni. They were informed about any scholarship needs or capital projects that needed financial
support to sustain new growth (Curti & Nash, 1965). Due to the new attitude toward engaging
graduates, alumni giving vastly improved.

In the early 1900s, institutions, such as Harvard University, were able to enlist alumni to
participate in campaigns that focused on securing funding to keep the institution afloat or provide
student scholarships to support institutional growth (Curti & Nash, 1965). However, very few
institutions, if any, had conducted annual alumni giving campaigns that would provide an annual
source of income for colleges and universities. In 1890, Yale University pioneered this effort by
starting the Yale Alumni Fund with a goal of raising $104,000 solely from Yale graduates (Curti
& Nash, 1965). Unfortunately, it took over 15 years for Yale University to reach the goal, and
another 25 years before the idea expanded to other institutions. During this time frame, colleges
and universities begin to see a shift in socioeconomic levels among graduates. Prior to 1900,
most institutions were graduating teachers and clergymen who were receiving menial salaries. In
the early to mid-1900s, college and universities were graduating more businessmen and other
professionals with higher incomes than previous graduates (Curti & Nash 1965). Thus, these
individuals had more money to contribute to charitable causes such as their alma maters.
Likewise, the Association of Alumni Secretaries was formed in 1913 to provide assistance to colleges and universities for engagement and fundraising matters related to alumni (Curti & Nash, 1965). After this association was established, colleges and universities regularly launched full-scale alumni giving campaigns. The first million dollar alumni giving campaign occurred at the University of Michigan during the 1914-1915 school year (Curti & Nash, 1965). Since then, targeted alumni campaigns and the hiring of professional fundraisers in higher education has become a normal and necessary occurrence. Furthermore, due to a change in the alumni engagement approach, the increase of more affluent alumni, and the creation of the Association of Alumni Secretaries, alumni giving and alumni involvement increased rapidly (Curti & Nash, 1965).

**African Americans and Philanthropy**

With few exceptions, African Americans participated in and benefited more from philanthropy after the Civil War than before. According to Leak and Reid (2010), the earliest example of Black philanthropic contributions was the creation of the Black Freemasons by a man named Prince Hall. Hall begin the Masonic based organization as a mutual aid entity that would provide protection and financial assistance to those in need within the African American community. Hall enlisted other Blacks to pay dues in order to raise money that would be placed back into the Black community. Other organizations such as the Free African Society, were created and followed suit by fundraising through membership dues and special events (Leak & Reid, 2010). According to the researchers, the fundraising philosophies began to change in the Black community due to a need to support institutions that promoted freedom and equality rather than survival and protection (Leak & Reid, 2010). Within the Black community, churches were seen as the common place to voice concerns and identify solutions to combat racial inequalities.
As a result, churches became the entity that many Blacks chose to support financially (Leak & Reid, 2010).

Once slavery was abolished, Northern philanthropists, religious denominations, and others funneled donations to establish education centers for newly freed Blacks (Curti & Nash, 1965; Peeps, 1981). Families and individuals also provided financial assistance to the cause to establish Black colleges. Funds funneled by families through the Freedman’s Aid Society served as the foundation for Claflin University, Philander Smith College, and Meharry Medical School (Curti & Nash, 1965). A government program, the Freedmen’s Bureau, assisted many of the church affiliated associations with supplemental funding during the formation of educational institutions for Blacks from 1865 to 1872 (Anderson & Moss, 1999; Curti & Nash, 1965). Many Whites, particularly Southerners, were not interested in donating to institutions that taught a traditional liberal arts curriculum (Anderson & Moss, 1999; Curti & Nash 1965; Lucas, 2006; Peeps, 1981). They believed Blacks would benefit more from a trade based curriculum rather than learning how to think through a liberal arts educational lens. The argument continued within the African American community.

Black leaders, W.E.B. Du Bois and Booker T. Washington differed on the ideologies concerning the most appropriate educational approach for Black America. Washington, who would go on to be the President of Tuskegee Institute, believed that Blacks should temporarily yield to the discrimination from many White Southerners in order to gain a type of education that would increase their skillset and economic mobility (Anderson & Moss, 1999; Lucas, 2006; PBS, 1995). He primarily promoted a farming and industrial mechanics educational curriculum. Conversely, Du Bois, a Harvard educated civil rights advocate, encouraged Blacks that were more academically inclined to pursue an educational format that would teach them how to think
for themselves (Lucas, 2006; PBS, 1995). He believed this would create social mobility for the top Blacks in society, whom he coined the Talented Tenth (Lucas, 2006; PBS, 1995; Peeps, 1981).

According to Du Bois (1903), it was important to educate the top 10% of the African American race because they would be able to lead and teach other Blacks how to acquire education, freedom, activism, prosperity, and a better way of life. Du Bois believed a classical liberal arts education was the way to educate the Talented Tenth, or the Blacks he believed had the greatest potential (Anderson & Moss, 1999; Peeps, 1981). Many Whites were more inclined to support Washington’s institutions for fear of an educated Black race, hence many of the early Black colleges used a farming and industrial mechanics based curriculum. Even many Northerners supported the vocational approach to education as a compromise with Southern Whites who overwhelmingly did not want Blacks being educated at all (Anderson & Moss, 1999; Curti & Nash, 1965).

Thus, W.E.B. Du Bois urged Blacks to find ways to fund their own educational institutions. Du Bois believed that allowing Whites to control the curriculum through donations was a mental form of re-enslavement (Anderson & Moss, 1999; Curti & Nash, 1965; Peeps, 1981). Despite his outcry against allowing Whites to fund Black colleges, Whites continued to support Black colleges that used a trade based curriculum, primarily Tuskegee Institute and Hampton Institute. These institutions were unique because they maintained Black leadership and were the wealthiest of the Black Colleges after receiving a two million dollar donation from a White philanthropist (Curti & Nash, 1965).

During the Great Depression and after WWII, White philanthropists and foundations began to cut back on donations to Black colleges. With the economic situation and the growing
number of Black colleges, White foundations, families, and individuals were unable to sustain their past levels of support (Curti & Nash, 1965). Ultimately, this led to the opportunity for Blacks to increase the level of financial support they provided to Black colleges. In 1943, The United Negro College Fund (UNCF) was founded to support the fundraising efforts of the Black colleges. The UNCF’s formation began when Frederick Patterson, the president of the Tuskegee Institute, contacted the presidents of 27 other small, private HBCUs to inquire about their financial situations (Gasman, 2007; Tucker 2002).

When Patterson realized that the other presidents were facing similar financial constraints as Tuskegee, he proposed conducting a national fundraising campaign similar to the American Red Cross. His vision was for the national campaign to support the small, private HBCUs at that time (Gasman, 2007; Tucker, 2002). The first UNCF campaign received support from individuals such as Franklin Roosevelt, John D. Rockefeller Jr., and William Aldrich of Chase Bank Corporation (Tucker, 2002). Within the first year, the organization doubled the funds raised for the Black Colleges since the decline of contributions from White philanthropists (Curti & Nash, 1965; Gasman, 2002; Tucker, 2002). Future endeavors of the UNCF included successful Black organized fundraisers to support endowments and capital projects. Since its’ inception, the UNCF has raised over $3.6 billion dollar for its member institutions (UNCF, 2014).

In her book, *An Untapped Resource: Bringing African Americans into the College and University Giving Process*, Gasman (2002) reviewed literature related to the historical context of African Americans as donors and beneficiaries of philanthropic efforts. She considered the giving patterns and motivations of Blacks within an educational, family, and community setting. Gasman found that even before the UNCF’s efforts to mobilize Blacks to support HBCUs and other educational endeavors, Blacks were philanthropic participants. They historically supported
organizations and causes that promoted racial uplift, social justice, and economic progress (Gasman, 2002). Slaves, freedmen, and runaway slaves gave significantly from the small amount of resources to support initiatives that promoted freeing slaves to the North (Gasman & Bowman, 2013). Eventually, these initiatives turned into mutual aid societies and the Underground Railroad, which were precursors to larger efforts to combat slavery and racism (Gasman 2002; Gasman & Bowman, 2013).

Although W.E.B. Du Bois and others historically called for Blacks to support their own educational institutions financially, Black churches have been the principal recipients of African American philanthropy since slavery. Free Blacks from the Northern states gave funds to establish Black churches to give Blacks a place to gather and worship (Holloman, Gasman, & Anderson-Thompkins, 2003). African Americans historically have supported the Black church through tithes and offering, which consistently accounts for 60% of all African American philanthropy (Gasman, 2002; Gasman & Bowman, 2011). Gasman (2002) claimed this occurs because Blacks are taught from a young age that they are obligated to give to the church. According to Gasman (2002), the Black church is the most important institution involved in Black philanthropy because it is has historically served as a training ground for young Blacks to learn the importance of giving back. Hence, it is not surprising when Gasman (2002) explained that the Black church has been one of the top beneficiaries of all giving from the Black community.

Gasman (2002) focused on the business, professional, and fraternal organizations, such as Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity or the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), that were established to further Blacks culturally, economically, and socially. She concluded that African Americans supported these entities due to trusting relationships and
transparency of how the funds were used to advance the Black race. African American donors were able to see the direct results of the NAACP, the Black church, and the other organizations. As a result, they were more inclined to trust those organizations enough to contribute.

Gasman’s research provided insight into the often overlooked contributions of African American philanthropists to their community. Yet, it lacked in providing a sufficient discussion on the African American philanthropic contributions to higher education. The title of the book, *An Untapped Resource: Bringing African Americans into the College and University Giving Process*, suggested that Gasman (2002) would discuss African American philanthropy as it relates to higher education in greater detail. Yet, excluding the section on the UNCF’s contributions to higher education, the topic was very limited. Even so, Gasman provided a rare glimpse of the overall history and motivations associated with African American giving, despite not focusing on higher education.

**Fundraising at HBCUs**

The topic of fundraising strategies at HBCUs has attracted very few researchers. The limited studies directly related to the topic are discussed in this section.

Leak and Reid (2010) conducted a study using historical analysis methods to examine how Black churches supported HBCUs in the late nineteenth to early twentieth centuries. The researchers utilized historical newspaper accounts and their knowledge of W.E.B. Du Bois’ contributions to the Atlanta University studies to address the purpose of their study, which was to explain how the Black church has historically affected Black philanthropy and higher education. The Atlanta University studies were 24 papers that derived from conferences that took place at the university, from 1886 - 1947 (Leak & Reid, 2010). The conferences at the Atlanta, Georgia based HBCU were often lead by W.E.B. Du Bois who introduced speakers and writings on
politics, race relations, economics, religion, and education as they related to the Black community. Leak and Reid’s conclusion after reviewing the historical documents were that the Black church was responsible for most of the philanthropic efforts that occurred within the Black community.

According to Leak and Reid (2010), during the third Atlanta University conference, Du Bois enlisted a group of researchers to study what ways Blacks were helping themselves after years of receiving aid from Whites. The researchers determined that the Black church was serving as a catalyst for charitable causes and mutual aid for philanthropy coming from within the Black community. Du Bois stated, “It is natural therefore that charitable and rescue work among Negroes should first be found in the churches and reach there its greatest development” (Du Bois, 1898, p. 4). According to Leak and Reid (2010), over one-third of all charitable contributions made by the Black community originated in the Black church. The researchers believed that number was probably much higher due to a number of the charitable gifts made by Black churches were unreported (Leak & Reid, 2010).

In addition, Leak and Reid, discussed a few of the Black church’s fundraising efforts to assist fledging higher education institutions that would educate Black students. Arkansas Baptist College was established primarily due to funds raised by Black church congregations throughout the state of Arkansas. Even when the school suspiciously burned to the ground in 1893, the professors, school leaders, and local churches raised the money to rebuild (Leak & Reid, 2010). Leak and Reid (2010) saw these fundraising efforts of the Black church for higher education purposes as a direct result of a call to action made at the third convention at Atlanta University. According to the researchers, Du Bois and other leaders stressed for parents to make financial sacrifices in order to send their children to college (Du Bois, 1898).
Leak and Reid (2010) stated that Du Bois was able to begin measuring the charitable contributions of Black churches by annually surveying various denominations about their giving patterns to HBCUs. By reviewing Du Bois findings, Leak and Reid determined that Black churches gave in a variety of ways. Most denominations set aside funds from their budgets to assistance HBCUs associated with their affiliations on an annual basis. In addition, Black church congregations would raise funds for HBCUs on an individual basis. Many of those congregational fundraising initiatives were conducted in order to address a specific need at an HBCU, such as a new building, student needs, or to expand academic offerings (Leak & Reid, 2010).

Overall, Leak and Reid’s findings after reviewing the Atlanta University studies revealed the significance of the Black church as a catalyst for teaching the importance of fundraising in the Black community, among HBCUs. The researchers expounded upon the idea that African Americans are taught through the Black church from a young age to give back. In addition, Leak and Reid (2010) provided recommendations and fundraising strategies for HBCU development officers based on their findings. According to the researchers, in order to increase alumni giving rates, HBCU fundraising professionals should cultivate a community spirit among students and promote social responsibility as the Black church has done with its members. In addition, Leak and Reid (2010) encouraged HBCU fundraisers to emulate the Black church by providing evidence that actual needs exist at the school due to a lack of funding and celebrate the impact that philanthropic contributions have on students and the institutions. Other researchers had similar recommendations for HBCU fundraising professionals and like findings in their respective studies.

A study by Holloman et al. (2003), examined the relationship of the Black church and its
members in regards to giving and explained how that knowledge could enhance fundraising tactics at HBCUs. The researchers utilized historical analysis as well as interviews with HBCU alumni that attended Black churches to conduct this study. Holloman et al. (2003) used historical inquiry by reviewing relevant literature on the Black church. The interviews were tape recorded and lasted no longer than one hour. The participants were chosen using purposive sampling based on race, age, college affiliations, educational attainment, and alumni status (Holloman et al., 2003).

The researchers selected participants from a sample of 35 HBCU graduates from Morris Brown College, Lincoln University - Pennsylvania, Clark Atlanta University, Albany State University, and the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff. A total of 15 individuals declined the invitation to participate, so 20 interviews were conducted. According to the interviewees, they gave to their church mainly out of an obligation to give, of which they were taught at a young age. Many participants discussed how they were taught as children the importance of giving back to the church by their parents, as well as by church leadership. Similar to Leak and Reid (2010), the researchers suggested that HBCU fundraisers could learn from the success of the Black church in securing funds from its members and translate those practices and techniques into securing funds from alumni.

Like earlier researchers, Holloman, et al. (2003) suggested that HBCU development staffs should focus on educating students about giving while they are still students at the institution. This became more apparent when the interviewees stated they never heard about giving back to their alma mater until after they graduated. Most research participants said they had great collegiate experiences. Participants also mentioned their transparent relationship with the church. Many respondents discussed how church leadership was transparent with church
members about how their donations, tithes, and offering made an impact at the church and within the community. The researchers suggested that HBCU advancement professionals should consider providing more information about how donations are used by their alma mater. In addition, they recommended making the community more aware of the needs of HBCUs, as the Black church openly discusses its mission and financial needs with those who are willing to listen (Holloman, et al., 2003).

Another trend among the respondents was their willingness to support their church by being involved in various church ministries and consistent service attendance. Thus, the researchers suggested that HBCU administrators should offer consistent and meaningful opportunities for their graduates to give back (Holloman, et al., 2003). This would increase alumni engagement, which can lead to an increased alumni giving rate. Lastly, the researchers found that many of the participants claimed that the consistency of the church leadership to ask members for donations helped them remember to give more often (Holloman, et al., 2003). Many members acknowledged that the weekly appeals by the pastor aided in their decision to willingly support their respective churches. According to the researchers, the application of any of the fundraising techniques used in the Black church by HBCU administrators could increase the alumni giving rates (Holloman, et al., 2003). They acknowledged that HBCU alumni giving rates ranged from 5% - 10% in 2003, while the giving rates of Black church members ranged from 85% -95% (Holloman, et al., 2003). Therefore, they deduced that even by applying a few of the techniques used by the Black church, HBCU administrators could see a significant increased alumni giving rates.

While the work of Holloman, et al. was an important addition to the literature on fundraising at HBCUs, it had some apparent limitations. All of the participants in the study were
engaged and actively involved in their respective churches. The lack of participants who were not as engaged or active in church could have created a skewed perception. Not all African Americans hold Christian beliefs nor attend church regularly, thus all HBCU graduates may not share the obligation to give back as those who do. Furthermore, even if alumni hold those beliefs, it is not clear if HBCU graduates act on any obligation to give beyond their paying tithes and offering to the church. In addition, the researchers used a convenience sampling process when selecting their participants. This process decreased the generalizability of the study (Creswell, 2012)

Tindall (2007) reviewed the fundraising tactics at HBCUs from a different perspective. According to Tindall, HBCU advancement offices were ill equipped to utilize the appropriate public relations approaches that are associated with fundraising best practices. The researcher examined the fundraising models at HBCUs in relation to public relations and marketing efforts. Tindall surveyed 30 HBCU advancement offices that were members of the prominent fundraising organization, Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). She concluded that HBCUs limit their ability to properly steward, build relationships, and engage in two-way communication with potential donors because the advancement staffs at these institutions were relatively small and under-resourced. The researcher noted that HBCUs utilized the publicity approach rather than the two-way communication approach, which would allow them to promote stewardship, enhance communication, and build relationships more effectively with potential donors (Tindall, 2007). The overused approach of publicity, which relies on being able to transmit positive stories to a widespread donor base, has not been easy for HBCU staffs to achieve (Tindall, 2007).

While Tindall’s findings added to body of literature, Gasman (2001) conducted a study,
which discussed several successful fundraising models that were implemented at HBCUs in the modern era. Gasman’s research study used document analysis and interviews of individuals that worked with Johnetta Cole and Charles Johnson. These past presidents of Spelman College and Fisk University, respectively, conducted two of the largest fundraising initiatives at an HBCU since the 1950s (Tindall, 2007). According to Gasman’s research findings, Johnson was a successful fundraiser because he was involved and connected within the community he served. Cole however, had little to no fundraising background or key philanthropic connections within the Atlanta area, where Spelman College resides. Yet, Gasman (2001) found that Cole had a positive attitude and personality along with tenacity and passion that assisted her ability to become a great fundraising.

Both Cole and Johnson dealt with the challenge of securing funds from their respective alumni, which Gasman (2001) attributed to low income levels for African Americans. It is important to note that Cole was able to solicit more alumni donations when she developed a program to educate students about the importance of giving. The students held a campaign to raise money for future Spelman students that netted over $75,000 (Gasman, 2001). However, alumni giving rates were still relatively low, which ultimately led Cole and Johnson to find innovative ways to attract White donors and corporations for their institutions. They each learned how to build relationships with White donors and bridge the gap between the different cultures (Gasman, 2001). They also understood the importance of educating corporations on how future business and workforce needs could benefit from making an investment into their respective institutions. Gasman’s revealed that neither Cole nor Johnson engaged in reactionary or survival fundraising tactics that exist at other HBCUs (2001). Unlike many of their presidential HBCU counterparts, they were able to set the agenda and priorities at their HBCUs, rather than have
them determined by the type of restricted funding they received from government or foundation grant initiatives. In short, Cole and Johnson were successful due to their tenacity, passion, willingness to study the motivations of potential donors, nontraditional fundraising approaches, such as focusing on the positive areas of the institution, rather than the deficiencies, engaging in proactive fundraising practices, and finding ways to cultivate relationships and solicit support in the Black and White communities (Gasman, 2001).

Gasman’s study took a unique approach to this topic by conducting research through document analysis and interviews. While the researcher’s intentions were to highlight the successful fundraising tactics used by the HBCU presidents, it would have been useful for Gasman to have gone into greater detail regarding the negative impact of the implementation of those tactics. In addition, it is interesting to note that while this is an earlier study by the researcher, in later works Gasman dispels the belief that African American alumni do not give solely because they have low income levels, which was the root cause of the problem discussed in this study (Gasman & Bowman, 2013; Gasman & Bowman, 2012; Holloman, et al., 2003). Despite its shortcomings, this study revealed notable information that had not appeared in the literature prior to this study.

Leak and Reid (2010), Holloman, et al. (2003), Tindall (2007), and Gasman (2001) each utilized different approaches within their research and provided an array of information. Leak and Reid (2010) made the argument that the Black church was a catalyst for teaching the importance of giving in the Black community and encouraged HBCU fundraisers to learn from the Black church on how to engage potential donors. Similarly, Holloman, et al. (2003) highlighted how the fundraising history and tactics used within the Black church, could be implemented within the HBCU realm to stimulate alumni giving. The researchers believed a key
barrier preventing alumni from giving back to their postsecondary institution was due to not being asked. Conversely, Gasman’s 2001 article claimed HBCU alumni fail to give back partly because of low family income levels. Furthermore, Tindall (2007) blamed the lack of fundraising from alumni and corporate entities were largely due to the small advancement offices at HBCUs. Tindall (2007) claimed the lack of employees engaged in fundraising initiatives deterred HBCU advancement professionals from using best practices and innovative marketing and public relations approaches when conducting fundraising initiatives.

In essence, Tindall (2007) concluded that the public relations and marketing approaches could be updated in order to increase engagement with potential donors at HBCUs. Hence, while research is fairly limited on the topic of fundraising approaches and tactics at HBCUs, there is no clear consensus among researchers as to the primary reason for the lack of sustained fundraising success at HBCUs.

**Relevant Studies: Alumni Giving at PWIs**

There are a few studies conducted at PWI campuses that provide further insight into this study. It is important to review the relevant studies conducted at PWIs and compare them with the findings of studies conducted on HBCU campuses. The relevant studies at HBCUs will be discussed later in this chapter.

Caruthers (1973) conducted a study at Oklahoma State University (OSU), a PWI, that sought to understand the reasons behind why some alumni gave to OSU and others did not. The purpose of the study was to determine how alumni donors and non-donors differed in five categories that included demographics, student experiences, academic experiences, alumni support, and alumni involvement (Caruthers, 1973). The researcher also sought to develop a profile of OSU alumni donors. The researcher randomly selected 100 alumni donors from the
9,783 active alumni on file in the OSU Foundation. The 125 non-donors were randomly selected from the 35,000 inactive alumni files at the OSU Foundation. Caruthers mailed each participant a 29-question survey, with each question corresponding to one of the five categories.

After analyzing the data from the participants’ responses, Caruthers (1973) found that significant differences existed between donors and non-donors in the number of visits to campus, participation in alumni clubs, academic major, age and number of children, current distance from campus, and attitude toward their experiences as an OSU student. According to Caruthers’ findings, the profile of a potential OSU donor was an individual with older children that majored in engineering, business, or agriculture that participates in an alumni club, visits campus at least annually, had a great student experience at OSU and would recommend it to others (Caruthers, 1973).

Clotfelter (2001) reviewed data from a national survey of graduates from 14 private, selective colleges and universities to determine patterns in alumni giving. The national survey was the College and Beyond questionnaire that was submitted to cohorts of alumni that entered one of the colleges as an undergraduate in 1951 or 1976. The survey asked questions about the participant’s college and post-college experiences. Clotfelter’s analysis of the survey results found that half of all donations to the 14 institutions came from 1% of their alumni. When compared to non-donors, the donors tended to have higher incomes, mentorship in college, were involved in extracurricular activities in college and held a student leadership position, satisfied with their undergraduate experience, and received awards during college.

Lackie (2010) conducted a study at a PWI in Arkansas to examine college experiences and motivations as predictors of alumni giving behavior. The dependent variables in the study included demographics, perceptions of college experience, alumni involvement, attitudes about
Arkansas Tech University (ATU) and the independent variable was alumni giving. The outcome of the study produced profiles of donors and non-donors at ATU. Participants were eligible for the study if they graduated from ATU between 1975 and 1995 and had a valid email address on file in the ATU Development Office. The researcher submitted electronic surveys to 2,215 participants and 565 completed the survey. The researcher found no significant difference between donors and non-donors among gender, major of study, or the distance of the current residence from ATU.

There were significant differences found with alumni involvement, college experience, and postgraduate attitude toward ATU. Sixty-nine percent of donors were actively involved as alumni compared to over 60% of alumni non-donors that were not actively involved. Seventy-five percent of non-donors were involved in at least one student organization, while 84% of donors were involved in at least one student organization. Seventy-three percent more non-donors held a negative perception/attitude toward ATU than donors. Forty percent of non-donors reported that they chose not give back to ATU because they believe there were other charitable causes with a greater need than ATU, 25% said that they could not afford to give, and 30% stated other reasons (Lackie, 2010).

Johnson and Lara (2008) conducted a study that utilized existing economic models to create an econometric model that predicted alumni giving patterns in an attempt to identify high probability alumni donors. The researchers developed their econometric model on the consumer economic theory, which is based on the idea that something is received in return for a monetary transaction. For the purposes of their study, the monetary transaction was a philanthropic gift given in exchange for a tax deduction or a positive feeling from supporting the institution.
The econometric model was tested on data from over 27,000 alumni at a private liberal arts college. Johnson and Lara (2008) used the following dependent variables:

- Age, gender, their choice of major, their choice to have a double or triple major, involvement in college sports, student government, sororities or fraternities, recorded number of school related functions attended as a student, marital status, whether they are married to an alumnus, their physical distance from campus, highest degree attained, number of activities attended as an alumnus, number of relatives who have attended Colorado College, and income. (p. 12-14)

The independent variable was alumni giving.

The researchers used the econometric model to predict alumni participation in an annual fund and alumni participation in a major gift program. By analyzing the variables using their econometric model, the researchers found several variables that were statistically significant for either predicting an alum’s participation in the annual giving or major gifts program. Variables that were statistically significantly for predicting alumni annual fund involvement included higher income, increased age, active alumni, fraternity/sorority involvement, relatives connection to the institution, honors participation as a student, married to an alum, additional educational attainment, and participation as a former student leader. Variables that were statistically significant for predicting alumni major gift participation included high income, increased age, active alumni involvement, living a longer distance from alma mater, and majoring in education (Johnson & Lara, 2008). Johnson and Lara’s study was significant because it potentially could assist advancement officers at this liberal arts institution with predicting alumni giving rates for their annual fund and major gifts programs, especially considering the high accuracy rate revealed for the econometric model when testing data from previous years.

Nirschel (1997) conducted a qualitative study to examine the influence of ethnicity, gender, giving potential, volunteer membership on alumni giving by Cuban alumni and Jewish alumni at the University of Miami. The nation of birthplace was also tracked to see how that
influenced alumni giving among Cuban alumni only. The purposes of the study were to determine how ethnicity, gender, giving potential, and volunteer membership influenced alumni giving, and to examine motivations for giving among Cuban alumni and Jewish alumni from the University of Miami. The researcher also sought to understand whether these two ethnic groups perceived charitable giving as an obligation or option (Nirschel, 1997). The population for this study consisted of all Jewish and Cuban that graduated with an undergraduate degree from University of Miami between 1971 and 1981. The University of Miami Advancement Office electronic database had valid contact information for 690 Jewish alumni and 373 Cuban alumni. Nirschel (1997) purposively selected 80 Jewish alumni and 51 Cuban alumni to participate in telephone interviews, while 60 Jewish alumni and 37 Cuban agreed to be interviewed. Both groups contained alumni that were donors and non-donors. The researcher utilized content analysis methods to analyze the responses.

Nirschel (1997) found that membership in alumni volunteer organizations was the most significant predictor of financial giving to the university for both groups of graduates. Cuban alumni and Jewish alumni donated at similar percentages to the University of Miami, but Jewish alumni gave more and at higher levels than Cuban alumni. For Jewish alumni, gender was relevant as being male was a significant predictor of giving to the university, while it was not among Cuban alumni. If members of both ethnic group held religious beliefs, then they viewed giving to the University of Miami as an obligation. Similarly, Cuban alumni felt that they were indebted to University of Miami because of their post-graduation success and held that as a motive for giving (Nirschel, 1997). Cuban alumni tended to support other organizations that were related to children, church, or promoted a need in the local community, while Jewish alumni supported other charitable organizations that were focused on addressing social issues at
a national level. Tax deductions in exchange for giving were not factors for either group, but both ethnicities made statements that suggested that donor recognition was important (Nirschel, 1997).

Wallace (2012) conducted a qualitative study to understand the African-American philanthropic motivations and fundraising strategies employed to increase African-American alumni giving at a PWI. The purpose of the study was to explore the motivation of African American alumni to volunteer their time, talent, and financial contributions to the alma mater. The researcher sought to identify race specific fundraising strategies for the university’s development department to use when soliciting funds from African American alumni (Wallace, 2012). The population of the study was the African American alumni of a PWI in the Midwestern region of the United States, while the researcher’s sample consisted of the African American Alumni Council's Board of Directors (AAAC). In order to conduct the research study, Wallace (2012) interviewed seven members of the council and reviewed previous AAAC meeting minutes, letters from engaged African American alumni, and AAAC member giving histories and profiles. Data obtained through those avenues was triangulated to find commonalities. The researcher also observed AAAC meetings and analyzed those field notes thematically.

Wallace (2012) found that all of the AAAC Board of Directors self-reported that their Christianity and church involvement shaped their philanthropic philosophies. Each member explained that they give 10% of their monthly income to the church out of obedience to God. Despite some individuals experiencing racism and unpleasant experiences at the university, each board member expressed an overwhelming pride and appreciation for their alma mater. Some board members explained that most African American students developed their own positive
experiences and sense of belonging. This often occurred by creating positive experiences among other African American students, faculty, and staff members because the university did very little to promote inclusion or a welcoming environment for students of color.

In addition, all board members expressed discontentment with being an afterthought of the university as a student and an alumnus. For example, the board members revealed that the university did not immediately accept the suggestion to begin the AAAC, as it was the original idea of a group of African American alumni. Older members of the board of directors admitted that prior to the formation of the AAAC, giving back to the university was not important. All members of the board held the expectation that their financial gifts individual and through AAAC would be used to support African American students at the university. According to Wallace (2012), the overwhelming and explicit theme that emerged from the findings was the call for better inclusion measures of African-American students and alumni by the university. Many interviewees discussed not feeling welcomed as a student in university related events or activities on campus (Wallace, 2012). In addition, the researcher found that despite the negative experiences due to racism and marginalization, the African-American alumni were motivated to give to their alma mater because of the positive memories and relationships that were formed during their college experience. Lastly, the expectation of the AAAC Board of Directors was that their financial support to the university would support the African-American students and staff of the university (Wallace, 2012).

Gasman and Bowman (2013) coauthored a book on philanthropy in communities of color. This book discussed the results of a study that focused on how to engage alumni of color at PWIs. According to Gasman and Bowman (2013), the purpose of the book was to “demonstrate the power of giving among people of color and alumni of color and to provide
ideas, suggestions, and evidence that alumni of color can and will contribute to the future of colleges and universities” (p. x). The researchers argued that colleges and universities understand that they need to diversify their fundraising staffs and prospective donor pools, but they did not act upon it. Data for the study discussed in the book originated from a comprehensive review of the existing literature on communities of color and philanthropy, interviews from fundraising staffs at 19 colleges and universities, and the survey results from 800 alumni from institutions across the country. The authors did not reveal how the 800 alumni were selected, but they did report a 35.8% response rate through the use of Survey Monkey.

The 19 development staffs that were interviewed were selected from the 61 American Association of Universities affiliated institutions because they had at least one program for alumni of color and represented a cross-section of the United States. According to Gasman & Bowman (2013), other institutions were asked to participate as well, but they declined in fear that their progress towards cultivating relationships with students and alumni of color would be questioned. The authors found that only 21% of the members of the two major organizations for advancement professionals, Association of Fundraising Professionals and the Council for Advancement and Support for Education, are people of color (Gasman & Bowman, 2013). While the research study was not designed to determine if there was a direct correlation between alumni giving rates of minority graduates and the number of minority fundraisers, that finding is important to highlight. The authors’ research revealed numerous reasons why PWI alumni of color choose whether to support their alma maters or not.

According to Gasman and Bowman’s (2013) findings, the biggest reason African American alumni at PWI institutions do not give back to their alma maters was because they are not asked to do so. The authors attributed this to the misconception that African Americans are
recipients of philanthropy not the donors. In Gasman’s previous work, she discussed the importance for African Americans to give to communal efforts that support the uplifting of the entire race that might include other ways of giving back besides charitable gifts (Gasman, 2002; Gasman & Bowman, 2013). However, Gasman and Bowman (2013) noted that these efforts, such as the giving of time and talents, are not always recorded through research efforts. Overall, the authors determined that minority alumni at PWIs tend to give regularly to initiatives that promote diversity, support students of color, to continue university traditions, sense of obligation to current and future students of color, and an emotional connection to the institution (Gasman & Bowman, 2013).

Gasman and Bowman’s (2013) research revealed numerous reasons why Black alumni at PWIs do not contribute financially to their postsecondary institutions. Chief among those reasons were as follows: (a) they were not asked to contribute, (b) they did not understand the financial needs of their alma mater, (c) they experienced a lack of communication and connection with their school, (d) they had a poor college experience, and (e) they experienced racism or felt marginalized as students.

Overall, the majority of all the studies discussed revealed that alumni donors had a good student experience or formed an emotional connection with their institution, were active alumni, and were involved in on campus activities as a student (Caruthers, 1973; Clotfelter, 2001; Gasman & Bowman, 2013; Lackie, 2010; Lara & Johnson, 2008; Nirschel, 1997; Wallace, 2012). Furthermore, two of the studies conducted on alumni of color at PWIs revealed that religion shaped their decision to support their alma maters (Nirschel, 1997; Wallace, 2012) and all three studies showed evidence that minority donors at PWIs gave out of a sense of obligation (Gasman & Bowman, 2013). However, neither of the studies conducted on minority graduates of
PWIs provided evidence that non-donors were not giving due to low income or inadequate finances (Gasman & Bowman, 2013; Nirschel, 1997; Wallace, 2012). This is interesting to note since the statements not based on research regarding the lack of alumni giving at HBCUs, suggested that African Americans could not afford to give back to their institutions due to low incomes (Barsky et. al., 2002; Holloman et al., 2003).

**Relevant Studies: HBCU Alumni Donors**

One of the first documented studies on HBCU alumni donors was conducted in 1976. The researcher sought to provide a better database to increase the effectiveness of the management of the alumni affairs office at Alcorn State University in Mississippi (Bowles, 1976). In order to gain more information from the graduates, the researcher looked at the alumni attitudes toward specific aspects of Alcorn. Over 1,000 alumni that graduated from 1871-1975 were selected to participate in the study. The participants were divided into three groups based on the time period in which they attended the institution. They were sent a 56-question survey and 829 alumni responded. Bowles found that a positive attitude towards one’s alma mater was not significantly related to one’s willingness to support their alma mater financially. Bowles (1976) discovered that most of the respondents actually had positive collegiate experiences and pride in their university, but few were donors. This differed from many of the research studies on characteristics of alumni donors at PWIs (Caruthers, 1973; Clotfelter, 2001; Lackie, 2010; McDearmon & Shirley, 2009; Mills, 1975; Taylor & Martin, 1995; Weerts & Ronca, 2007), which found that alumni donors typically had more positive experiences than non-donors. Bowles’ findings at Alcorn seem to be consistent with more recent studies on HBCU alumni and paralleled studies conducted on alumni of color at PWIs (Nirschel, 1999; Wallace, 2012). Allen (1981), Evans (1987), Hunter, Jones, and Boyer (1999), and Reaves (2006), all conducted
research studies related to the characteristics of HBCU alumni donors and/or their attitudes towards alumni giving. One of the consistent outcomes from each study was that the majority of participants expressed an appreciation for their respective institutions.

Allen (1981) wanted to distinguish between the specific behaviors and characteristics that HBCU alumni exhibit when choosing to support or not support their alma mater financially. In addition, athletics, alumni pride, alumni involvement, and the ability of alumni to make a financial gift impacted the attitude of alumni toward their alma mater. He surveyed 750 alumni from five small, religious affiliated HBCUs. Like Bowles (1976), Allen found no significant difference between the attitudes of donors and non-donors toward their alma mater. Donors and non-donors both expressed a sense of pride and appreciation toward their institution for the education and career preparation that they received. Evans (1987) found communication to be important when she conducted a similar study by surveying over 650 alumni from six HBCUs. Evans wanted to determine if a relationship existed between the financial giving of HBCU alumni and their attitudes toward their alma mater. Again, 77% of participants stated they had a good experience and 63% felt they were prepared for their respective careers.

Hunter, Jones, and Boger (1999) conducted a mixed method study at Livingstone College in South Carolina to determine the motivations and attitudes of their donors. The target population was individuals that had contributed to the alumni giving program at Livingstone College from June 1990 to July 1996. The researchers utilized mail questionnaires to gather information from their respondents. For the qualitative portion of the research, the researchers conducted phone interviews with major donors to understand why they decided to make a major financial gift to their alma mater (Hunter et al., 1999). The purpose of the study was to determine if relationships existed among the 31 characteristics identified by the researchers and alumni
donors at Livingstone College (Hunter et al., 1999). Some of those characteristics included undergraduate experience, frequency of alumni giving, amount of alumni giving, current alumni involvement, and present circumstances (Hunter et al., 1999). The results determined that a significant relationship existed among all 31 of the characteristics and alumni giving. The findings of the interviews revealed that the major donors decided to give simply because they “loved their alma mater and wanted to give back” (Hunter et al., 1999, p. 536). While this information is beneficial for that specific institution, the results cannot be generalized to other HBCUs because the sample size consisted of a single institution. In addition, like other studies, the researchers spoke to graduates who were currently giving to the institution, rather than graduates or former students that were not financial contributors to their alma mater (Hunter et al., 1999).

Reaves’ (2006) study was specifically conducted to determine what factors facilitate or impede HBCU alumni from giving to their colleges. She interviewed current alumni association members about their perceptions of why their fellow graduates were not financially supporting their alma mater. Her findings were not consistent with earlier studies on HBCU alumni donors (Bowles, 1976; Evans, 1987; Hunter et al., 1999). According to the participants, HBCU graduates have less disposable income to give due to the lack of wealth transfer from their elders, less access to resources when compared to Whites, and the responsibility to take care of extended family members (Reaves, 2006). The interviewees also claimed that negative undergraduate experiences have created barriers for HBCU graduates to give back, but only 1 out of the 19 participants expressed having a bad collegiate experience. Other barriers to HBCU alumni giving noted by the participants included fear of embarrassment due to a small gift, lack of progress within the university, lack of alumni giving as a financial priority, and a disconnect with the
university (Reaves, 2006).

These perceptions of the participants in Reaves’ study regarding why other HBCU alumni do not give back are not closely related to previous studies conducted with HBCU alumni or alumni of color at PWIs (Gasman & Bowman, 2013; Nirschel, 1997; Wallace, 2012). Alumni giving was not seen as a priority in one study (Wallace, 2012), but once the alumni got involved within an alumni organization, that perception changed and no study reported financial hardship as a reason for not giving back. However, Bowman & Gasman (2013) found that non-donors attribute a disconnect with the university as a reasoning for not giving financially. Yet, that rationale was a direct response to a lack of communication on part of the institution. Even so, it is important to note that Reaves’ study utilized current HBCU alumni donors to provide their perceptions of why others are not giving, rather than using non-donors as participants.

Cohen (2006) conducted a study to examine the perceptions, attitudes, and giving behaviors of HBCU alumni. Utilizing a quantitative research design, he administered a 48-question survey to the participants by mail. Cohen’s sample size consisted of 1,000 alumni donors, which was obtained by requesting 250 graduates from four HBCUs (2006). The four HBCUs were purposively selected, but differed in their degree offerings and represented a cross-section of the United States. Cohen’s finding revealed that alumni believed that giving back had a much broader definition than making a financial contribution. The participants in this study viewed giving back to include mentoring, volunteering, recruiting, etc. Also, most of the respondents frequently contributed financially to their respective religious organizations (Cohen, 2006).

This finding was similar to the Holloman et al. (2003) study, as well as Leak and Reid’s (2010) historical analysis that revealed that African American philanthropy is highly prevalent
and consistent within churches and religious organizations. In addition, Cohen’s (2006) research revealed that alumni felt obligated to give and believed that giving was important, despite the fact that many respondents believed their alma mater would survive without alumni donations. Furthermore, the belief that religion positively impacted an HBCU alumni’s decision to make a financial contribution to their alma mater was also prevalent throughout the results of Cohen’s study. The notion that religion positively impacts alumni giving among HBCU graduates was consistent with other studies as well (Nirschel, 1997; Wallace, 2012). Even so, the recurring limitation of using current donors as the sample, small sample sizes, and low response rates occurred as with other works within this body of literature.

A later study by Cohen in 2008 somewhat contradicted his 2006 study. The purpose of Cohen’s research was to explore the history of HBCU alumni involvement and highlight significant contributions to higher education philanthropy. He reviewed relevant literature, analyzed historical documents, and used his knowledge of higher education philanthropy and HBCU history to present the argument that HBCU alumni have given back to their institutions since their inception. Even so, the small body of literature on HBCU giving, including Cohen’s previous work, overwhelming states that HBCU graduates fail to give back to their institutions (Allen, 1981; Bowles, 1976; Evans, 1987; Hunter et al., 1999; Reaves, 2006).

Cohen began his review of literature with analyzing the W.E.B. Du Bois’ statements concerning alumni giving at HBCUs. As mentioned earlier, in 1924 Du Bois challenged the alumni of his alma mater, Fisk University, to support the institution financially. While Cohen (2008) acknowledged that Du Bois was trying to increase the financial contributions of graduates to his institution, Cohen disagreed that alumni were simply standing by idly watching HBCUs crumble. The author explained that HBCU alumni formed alumni associations soon after PWIs.
The first alumni association was established at Williams College in 1821, while the first HBCU alumni association was started at Lincoln University of Pennsylvania in 1869 (Cohen, 2008). Many other HBCUs followed and immediately begin contributing to the progress of their alma maters. The alumni associations raised funds for scholarships, which led to an immediate increase in the enrollment of HBCUs.

Cohen (2008) claimed that Southern HBCUs, began organizing in the mid-1880s and early 1890s. They developed alumni publications, alumni awards, fundraising events, and alumni chapters based on location, majors, and organizational membership, while college administrators formed alumni affairs offices to cultivate relationships with the eager graduates. Institutions became accustomed to receiving larger gifts from alumni annually during Charter Day and Founders’ Day celebrations (Cohen, 2008). Some of those gifts were as high as $150,000 in the early to mid-1990s. While alumni saw raising funds for their institutions as a priority, they also worked to ensure that Black professors were receiving employment opportunities, trustee appointments, appropriate salaries, and adequate facilities (Cohen, 2008). Hence, alumni were advocates for not only current and future students, but the faculty members as well. Cohen used these examples as evidence that HBCU alumni have historically supported their respective alma maters.

Cohen (2008) alleged that the current issues with alumni giving at HBCUs are indirectly related to desegregation. He believed that HBCUs were no longer attracting the best African American students who were seeking admission to PWIs. Cohen (2008) also claimed that HBCUs did a better job of engaging their graduates prior to desegregation. He encouraged HBCU administrators to utilize pre-segregation alumni affairs tactics in order to better connect graduates with alumni associations and the financial needs of their alma maters. Yet, Cohen
(2008) provided no evidence that current HBCU administrators were not utilizing pre-segregation tactics to engage alumni and solicit donations. In addition, his use of history as evidence that HBCU graduates supported their institutions was not found by other researchers. For instance, while HBCU graduates prior to segregation were actively engaged and contributed financially to their institutions, that did not dispel data that showed recent HBCU graduates gave at rates as low as 5% (“The Solid Alumni Base,” 2000). Other HBCU researchers also acknowledged the historical contributions of HBCU alumni (Evans, 1987; Gasman, 2002; Gasman & Bowman, 2013).

In addition, the literature provided evidence that African Americans contribute heavily to other charitable causes (Holloman, et al, 2003; Leaks & Reid, 2010; Nirschel, 1997; Wallace, 2012). More specifically, HBCU alumni and PWI alumni donors of color have been associated with making regular contributions to churches and other religiously affiliated entities (Cohen, 2006; Gasman, 2002; Gasman & Bowman, 2013; Holloman et al., 2003; Leak & Reid, 2010; Nirschel, 1997; Wallace, 2012), but little research exists regarding non-contributing HBCU alumni. Lastly, the literature revealed that undergraduate experience and alumni giving are related, but much of the data from those studies were not generalizable due to limitations with the sample (Hunter, et al., 1999; Reaves, 2006) and/or low response rates (Evans, 1987). Therefore, it is important to conduct a study that focuses on certain characteristics associated with HBCU graduates who have not contributed financially to their respective alma maters.

**Chapter Summary**

African Americans have a unique history within the United States, as it relates to philanthropy. Many Black slaves gave whatever they had to continue the fight for freedom. HBCUs were built through the efforts of White and Black philanthropists. Yet today, HBCUs
suffer from a lack of philanthropic support from those that have benefited from its efforts the most, its graduates. A review of the literature on HBCU alumni giving revealed many assumed barriers to alumni giving, such as lack of discretionary income among Blacks, lack of engagement, and not being asked to contribute. However, due to the scarce amount of studies on the topic and the limitations with the available research, it is important that more research be conducted that addresses those limitations in order to determine why HBCU financial support is lacking from its graduates.
Chapter III

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to examine how income, student experience, religious charitable giving, alumni perceptions, and alumni engagement, relate to alumni giving at HBCUs. The review of literature on alumni giving at HBCUs revealed that there is a need for a multiple campus, quantitative research study that includes alumni that are not donors as the participants. In an attempt to further the research on HBCU alumni that are non-donors, this chapter discusses the research design, participants, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis used to conduct this study. It will also provide an in-depth discussion about the survey instrument’s development, pilot test, internal reliability, and validity.

Research Design

An explanatory correlation survey design was selected to evaluate the relationship between income, student experience, religious charitable giving, alumni perceptions, and alumni engagement with alumni giving. Creswell (2008) identified various characteristics that can assist researchers in determining whether an explanatory design is appropriate for conducting their research study. Some of those characteristics included:

- Being able to correlate two or more variables, collect data at one point in time, analyze participants as a single group, obtain at least two scores for each individual in the group, use the statistical test for data analysis, and draw conclusions from those test. (p. 340)

A brief discussion of those characteristics associated with the explanatory correlation survey design describes why this design was chosen for this study.

First, this research design was used to explain the relationship between two or more variables. According to Creswell, the explanatory correlation design should be used to “explain how changes in one variable are reflected in changes in the other” (2012, p. 340). The
independent variables in this study were income, student experience, religious charitable 
contributions, alumni perceptions, and alumni engagement. The dependent variable in this study 
was alumni giving. This research design was based on examining the relationship and changes 
that occurred among those variables. Because this research study was relational, the data were 
collected at one time, and conclusions were made based on statistical results, the explanatory 
correlation survey design was an appropriate method for this study.

Participants and Sampling Procedures

The target population for this study was all alumni who received an undergraduate degree 
between 1950 and 2012 with a valid email address on file at two HBCUs in the Southwestern 
region of the United States. The 1950 to 2012 time frame was selected because the participating 
institutions had more contact information from graduates within that period of time. These 
institutions were selected due to their willingness to participate in the study and ability to contact 
their respective alumni via email. Creswell (2012) described convenience sampling as a 
procedure with the central premise of selecting available and willing participants. Hence, a 
convenience sampling procedure was used to select the two HBCUs that participated in this 
study. However, while the selected institutions had similar characteristics, such as admission 
standards, geography, and the federal designation as HBCUs, they were not homogenous. They 
varied in size of undergraduate enrollment size, campus setting, and degree offerings.

The study sample consisted of the 4,500 alumni that were selected to participate in this 
study. The alumni relations directors from the two HBCUs collectively provided the alumni that 
comprised the sample population of participants. One of the directors selected 2,000 alumni, 
while the other chose 2,500 alumni to participate in the study. Both directors only selected 
alumni with valid addresses from their respective databases. The first director was only able to
select 2,000 alumni for participation due to a shortage of alumni with valid email addresses. Both institutions utilized the Blackbaud database product Raisers Edge to manage alumni and donor data, such as giving history, contact information, notable affiliations as a student, notable post-graduation information, and alumni engagement activities/participation. The participants in the sample were selected using stratified random sampling procedures. Creswell (2012) described stratified random sampling as a procedure where the population is split into strata or segments based on shared attributes. Participants are then randomly selected from each strata giving every potential participant the same opportunity of being selected for the study.

In order to ensure the sample population included alumni donors and non-donors, the alumni directors used segmented reporting procedures to stratify the population. Each director generated two separate reports in Raisers Edge with specific parameters. The first report included graduates with a valid email address who earned an undergraduate degree between 1950 and 2012, and that had a giving history on file (donors). The second report included alumni with valid email addresses and who graduated with an undergraduate degree from the institution between 1950 and 2012, but did not have a giving history on file (non-donors). The first director selected 1,000 participants that were donors from the first report and 1,000 participants that were non-donors from the second report. The second director selected 1,250 participants that were donors from the first report and 1,250 participants that were non-donors from their second report. This was accomplished by alphabetizing each report and selecting every 25th prospect from each list until the target numbers was reached. Once these processes were completed, the sample of 4,500 participants for this study was formed.

Instrumentation

Survey instrument development. An 18 question online survey that addressed the five
research questions was designed for this study. The survey consisted of two open-ended questions, one Likert scale question with 13 sub-questions, one Likert scale question with 19 sub-questions, and 14 single-item multiple choice questions. The online survey, created using Google Forms, was not divided into sections and all questions were listed on a single page. The survey questions were developed based on a thorough review of the relevant literature and the researcher’s firsthand knowledge working with HBCU alumni groups. Two of the questions were based on survey questions from the National Center for Higher Education Management System’s (NCHEMS) discontinued Comprehensive Alumni Assessment Survey (CAAS). NCHEMS discontinued publication and distribution of the CAAS in 2009, but Dr. Scott Gaier utilized it to complete his 2003 study.

Operationalizing variables associated with survey questions. The independent variables were income, student experience, religious charitable giving, alumni perceptions, and alumni engagement. The income variable was a composite of the participants’ self-reported socioeconomic status and discretionary income. The student experience variable was comprised of the participants’ responses to survey questions related to academic and extracurricular experiences. The religious charitable giving variable corresponded to the participants’ giving to religious entities. The alumni perceptions variable was related to survey questions about the participants’ satisfaction with the decision to attend their alma mater and perceived post-graduation success. The alumni engagement variable was comprised from survey questions related to frequency of communication with alma mater and alumni involvement. The dependent variable in this study was alumni giving.

Socioeconomic status is usually measured by determining education, income, occupation, or a composite of these dimensions (Winkleby, Jatulis, Frank, & Fortmann, 1992). To meet the
needs of this study, socioeconomic status was determined by measuring the participants’ annual income. Socioeconomic status was addressed in question eight, which specifically asked the participants’ annual income using a ratio scale of measurement. Question 16b was also associated with socioeconomic status as it asked the participants to rank which options negatively impact their ability to make financial contributions to their alma mater from least to greatest. Socioeconomic status was listed as an option on that question, which utilized an ordinal scale of measurement.

Using a definition by Owens (1991), discretionary income was defined as:

Total income less personal income taxes, unemployment insurance premiums and other compulsory payments, and household spending on necessities. What remains is discretionary income which can be spent or saved as one pleases—on vintage wines, stocks and bonds, vacations. (p. 1)

Questions 9 and 16b were associated with this variable. Question 9 used a ratio scale of measurement to ask the participants the amount of their discretionary income. Question 16b, measured on an ordinal scale and asked the participants if the amount of their discretionary income had a negative impact on their ability to make a financial contribution to their alma mater.

The level of satisfaction with academic experience was defined as the value a participant places on the education or degree obtained as an undergraduate. There were four questions associated with this variable on the final instrument. Question one asked the participants to rate the level of their academic experience based on 19 areas, such as advising, quality of instruction, contact with faculty members, access to computer and library resources, variety and availability in course offerings, and general core requirements to name a few. Question 16b was also associated with the level of satisfaction with academic experience. The question asked the participants to rank which options negatively impacted their ability to make financial
contributions to their alma mater from least to greatest. The level of satisfaction with academic experience was listed as an option on that question. Questions 3 and 4 were indirectly related to academic experience. Both questions asked the participants to describe their overall experience and level of satisfaction with the decision to attend their alma mater, respectively. All four questions were measured on an ordinal scale.

The level of satisfaction with extracurricular experience was the value a participant placed on their student involvement or out-of-classroom experience as an undergraduate. Four questions on the final instrument that corresponded with this variable. Question two asked the participant to describe their satisfaction with aspects of their organizational or extra-curricular involvement as an undergraduate student. Question 16b was also associated with the level of satisfaction with extracurricular experience. The question asked the participants to rank which options negatively impacted their ability to make financial contributions to their alma mater from least to greatest. The level of satisfaction with extracurricular experience was listed as an option on that question. Questions three and four asked the participants to describe their overall educational experience and level of satisfaction with the decision to attend their alma mater, respectively. All questions were measured on an ordinal scale.

Satisfaction with perceived post-graduation success was defined as the participant’s perception of their level of success since graduating with his or her undergraduate degree. Questions 5, 6, 7, and 16b were associated with this variable. All questions were measured on an ordinal scale. Question five asked the participants to describe their satisfaction with how their academic experience prepared them for their career. Question 6 referred to the participants’ satisfaction with their perceived level of post-graduation career opportunities, while question 7 asked the participants to describe their satisfaction with their success post-graduation. Question
16b was also associated with the satisfaction with perceived post-graduation success. The question asked the participants to rank which options that negatively impacted their ability to make financial contributions to their alma mater from least to greatest. Perceived post-graduation success was listed as an option on that question.

Religious charitable contributions was defined as the number of times a participant gives tithes, offerings, or other financial gifts to a church or other religious entity. Questions 10 and 11, both measured on an ordinal scale, were related to religious charitable contributions. Question 10 asked the participants to describe their frequency of attendance at a religious service, while question 11 referred to the participants’ frequency of giving to a religious organization.

Alumni association involvement was associated with two questions on the instrument. Questions 12 and 13 referred to this variable. Question 12, which was measured on a nominal scale, asked each participant about his or her alumni association involvement. Question 13 referred to the participant’s frequency of attendance at alumni association meetings or events, and was measured on an ordinal scale.

For the purposes of this study, the variable frequency of communication with alma mater was defined as the number of times that a college or university initiates communication with one of its undergraduate alumni via email, phone, face-to-face, or traditional mail services. Questions 14 and 15 related to the number of times participants were contacted by someone at their alma mater in general and specifically to make a donation. Question 16b was also associated with the variable frequency of communication with alma mater. The question asked the participants to rank which options negatively impacted their ability to make financial contributions to their undergraduate institution from least to greatest. The frequency of communication with the institution was listed as an option on that question. The lone dependent variable in this study,
alumni giving, was defined as a financial contribution made to an institution of higher learning by a graduate from one of their undergraduate programs.

**Pilot test.** The first draft of the survey was piloted by a group of individuals that were not potential participants. These individuals within the pilot study were graduates of other HBCUs who were asked to participate via Facebook messages and email. Twenty-one out of 30 individuals agreed to pilot the survey instrument. They were each sent a link to access the survey via email or Facebook. They were instructed to complete the survey and provide feedback on how well the survey questions addressed the research questions, the time it took to complete the survey, the clarity and readability of the survey questions, and any overall problems with the survey instrument. The pilot test participants found issues with a duplicate survey question, a lack of detail in the questions about extracurricular activities, and the order of the questions. Changes were made to develop the final survey instrument based on the feedback received during the pilot test (see Appendix A).

**Internal consistency reliability and validity.** Internal consistency reliability and validity were conducted for this study by administering the survey instrument to pilot study participants. An internal consistency reliability test determines if the survey instrument’s questions are clear and concise (Creswell, 2012). Validity is used to insure that the scores from the instrument are measuring what the questions are intended to do (Creswell, 2012). According to Creswell (2012), validity can be established by pilot test participants discussing their experiences completing the instrument. Internal reliability and validity tests were accomplished by gathering the participants’ feedback during the pilot test.

**Data Collection**

To obtain access to the research participants and to ensure there was no risk involved in
the study, the Protocol Form was submitted to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Arkansas, as well as the two participating HBCUs. Other items submitted with the IRB Protocol Form included the implied informed consent statement, a hard copy of the survey instrument, the letters to the alumni relations directors at the two participating HBCUs, the text for the two personalized introductory emails, and the text for the two personalized follow-up emails. The University of Arkansas’s IRB Office sent an IRB Approval Letter on February 10, 2014 (see Appendix B). Each participating HBCU had personalized introductory emails (see Appendix C for email from the alumni director at HBCU #1 and Appendix D for email from the alumni director at HBCU #2), but the survey questions were the same.

On February 19, 2014 the alumni relations director at the first participating HBCU sent an email to the selected participants. The alumni relations director at the second participating HBCU sent an email to selected participants on February 21, 2014. The emails explained the purpose of the research study, procedures, implied informed consent, and thanked participants for their participation. The email also included a link to complete the survey, a deadline to complete the survey, and a timeline for the research study. On March 5, 2014, both alumni relations directors sent a follow-up email (see Appendix E) to all participants. The follow-up emails were sent to all prospective participants, whether they had already answered the survey or not.

**Data Analysis**

Descriptive statistics, such as means and standard deviations, were conducted for the independent and dependent variables in the study. This provided characteristics about the participants in the study. Pearson correlations were conducted to address all five research questions. According to Creswell (2012) “Pearson correlations are used to test a relationship
between two variables” (p. 613). Each of the research questions addressed in this study examined the relationship between two variables. As a result, Pearson correlation was the appropriate statistical test for that type of analysis.

**Chapter Summary**

The purpose of this chapter was to discuss the methodology of this research study. The research design, participants, data collection procedures, and data analysis were discussed in detail. The appropriate research design for this study was an exploratory design primarily because the study focused on understanding the relationship between two or more variables. The two participating HBCUs provided 2,000 and 2,500 participants respectively for a total sample of 4,500 participants of donors and non-donors for this study. The participants were chosen using a stratified random sampling procedure, but the participating HBCUs were selected through convenience sampling procedures.

The two institutions were both located in the Southwestern region of the United States, but vary in characteristics such as enrollment size, campus setting, and degree offerings. An 18-question survey was developed to address the five research questions in this study. A pilot test was conducted with HBCU alumni not included in the participant sample to address any errors in the survey design, internal consistency reliability, and validity. Descriptive statistics and Pearson correlation were used as the statistical analysis procedures for this study. The results of these statistical tests will be presented in the next chapter.
Chapter IV

Results and Presentation of the Data

This chapter presents an analysis of data related to the lack of alumni giving at HBCUs. Data collected from graduates of two HBCUs were used to examine the relationship between income, student experience, religious charitable contributions, alumni perceptions, and alumni engagement with alumni giving. The data used and examined in this chapter was obtained through survey responses from over 100 alumni from two HBCUs. The analysis of this data and the results can help HBCU alumni relations and development professionals understand why some alumni do not give back to their alma maters. In addition, the results of this study will help HBCU alumni relations and development professionals address the concerns of alumni that are non-donors and develop new approaches to engage them with the university.

Respondents

The target population for this study was all alumni who received an undergraduate degree between 1950 and 2012 with a valid email address on file at two HBCUs in the Southwestern region of the United States. The sample consisted of the 4,500 alumni that were selected to participate in this study. One HBCU was designated as a doctoral granting institution, located in an urban setting, and had a student population over 10,000. The second HBCU is located in a rural setting, with a student population under 10,000. It is also designated as a doctoral granting institution. Out of the 4,500 individuals that were sent the survey, 161 people responded yielding a 4.025% response rate. Of those responses, 28 were deemed to be unusable because they attended an HBCU as a graduate student and/or answered less than 50% of the questions, including question 16, which asked specifically about alumni giving. After eliminating the unusable data, the corrected response rate is 3.225%.
**Research Questions**

After reviewing the literature related to alumni giving at HBCUs and selecting the theoretical frameworks for this study, five research questions were formulated as a guide. Research question one asked, “Is there a relationship between income (socioeconomic status and income) and alumni giving among HBCU graduates?” Research question two asked, “Is there a relationship between student experience (academic and extracurricular) and alumni giving among HBCU graduates?” Research question three asked, “Is there a relationship between religious charitable giving (frequency of attendance at a religious entity and frequency of donations to a religious entity) and alumni giving among HBCU graduates?” Research question four asked, “Is there a relationship between alumni perceptions (satisfaction with the decision to attend the alma mater and perceived post-graduation success) and alumni giving among HBCU graduates?” Lastly, research question five asked, “Is there a relationship between alumni engagement (alumni involvement and frequency of communication with their alma mater) and alumni giving among HBCU graduates?”

**Data Analysis**

The 2013 version of Microsoft Excel was used to analyze the data from the 133 usable surveys. In order to answer the research questions, responses to related questions were combined to create composite scores. The scores were utilized to address the research questions by performing statistical tests related to correlations. The statistical procedure, Pearson r correlation, was used to determine if a relationship existed between alumni giving and pre-identified characteristics of donors and non-donors at HBCUs. Descriptive statistics were also calculated by performing the following Microsoft Excel formulas: average, median, mode, standard deviation, min, and max. The results are explained and presented in tables under the following
sections: Alumni Giving, Income (socioeconomic status and income), Student Experience (academic and extracurricular), Religious Charitable Giving (frequency of religious affiliated attendance and donations), Alumni Perceptions (satisfaction with the decision to attend alma mater and post-graduation success), Alumni Engagement (alumni involvement and frequency of communication with alma mater), and Selected Donors vs Non-donor Characteristic Comparisons. A final section presents a summary of the responses to the open-ended question asked at the end of the survey.

Alumni Giving

The relationships between certain characteristics and alumni giving were the basis of this research study. Alumni giving was defined by the financial contributions of an alumnus from one of the two HBCUs that participated in this study.

Alumni giving was the dependent variable in this research study. Survey question 16 asked participants “What is the approximate amount of financial contributions that you have made to your alma mater in the last three years?” If a participant’s response was $0, survey question 16b asked which of the following had the greatest impact on the participant’s decision not to make a financial contribution to his or her alma mater:

- Feelings toward overall academic experience
- Feelings toward overall out-of-class (extra-curricular/non-academic experience)
- Limited amount of discretionary income
- Low annual salary/income
- Lack of communication from alma mater
- Never been asked by alma mater to contribute financially
- Feelings toward success in career
• Feelings toward career preparation received from alma mater

• Not a priority to give to alma mater

Out of 133 responses, 24.8% of participants had never contributed financially to their alma mater, making them non-donors. Out of the 100 participants that self-reported making a financial contribution to their alma mater, 52% participants reported giving $500 or less. The non-donors accounted for 24.8% of all respondents. Eighty-seven percent of the non-donors answered survey question 17, which provided an explanation for the participant’s decision not to make a financial contribution to his or her school (see Table 1).

The majority of the non-donors stated that limited monthly discretionary income had the greatest impact on their decisions not to give back financially to their alma maters. The answer choices with the next highest amount of responses were “not a priority to give to alma mater” with six responses and “feelings toward overall academic experience” with four responses (see Table 2).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alumni Giving: Gifts to Alma Mater</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gift Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Gifts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Alumni Giving: Reasons Non-donors Did Not Give*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feelings toward academic experience</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings toward extracurricular experience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of discretionary income</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low annual salary/income</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of communication from alma mater</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never been asked by alma mater to give</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings toward success in career</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings toward preparation received from alma mater</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a priority to give to alma mater</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Participants that self-reported as non-donors were asked to select which one of the above options had the greatest impact on their decision not to make a financial contribution to their alma mater.

**Alumni Income**

The income variable was characterized in this study through the evaluation of the participants’ self-reported socioeconomic status and level of monthly discretionary income. Socioeconomic status was defined as the participant’s annual salary range. Discretionary income was defined as the participant’s monthly income after taxes and personal necessities, such as shelter, food, utilities, etc. The relationships between socioeconomic status and alumni giving, and monthly discretionary income and alumni giving are utilized to address research question one. The data from those two correlations are discussed in this section.

Research question one asked “Is there a correlation between income and alumni giving
among HBCU graduates?” Survey question eight addressed this research question by asking participants to describe their annual income, which was used to determine an approximate socioeconomic status for each participant (see Table 3). Table 3 shows that slightly under a third (31.6%) of the participants reported an income under $60,000. On the other hand, 24.8% of the participants in this study had an income exceeding $100,000. The Pearson r correlation statistic calculated for socioeconomic status revealed that there was a statistically significant relationship ($p < .05$) between socioeconomic status and alumni giving (see Table 4).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Income</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-$20,000</td>
<td>4 (3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001-$40,000</td>
<td>7 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001-$60,000</td>
<td>31 (23.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001-$80,000</td>
<td>30 (22.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,001-$100,000</td>
<td>28 (21.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000+</td>
<td>33 (24.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>133 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>r-Value</th>
<th>p&lt;.05</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>5.8e-05</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The result is significant at $p < 0.05$

Survey question nine, which asked participants to describe their monthly discretionary income, also addressed research question one. Table 5 presents the frequency distribution of monthly discretionary income of all participants. The largest percentage of the participants, 39.1%, reported a monthly discretionary income greater than $1,500. The smallest percentage, 12%, was participants that reported a discretionary income of $0-$250. The Pearson r correlation statistic calculated for the discretionary income characteristic revealed that there was a
statistically significant relationship ($p < .05$) between discretionary income and alumni giving (see Table 6).

Table 5

*Income: Discretionary Monthly Income*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discretionary Income</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-$250</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$251-$500</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$501-$1000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1001-$1500</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500+</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

*Income – Discretionary Monthly Income: Relationship to Alumni Giving*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>r-Value</th>
<th>p&lt;.05</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.000373</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The result is significant at $p < 0.05$

**Academic and Extracurricular Student Experiences**

Academic experience was defined as the participants’ satisfaction with their undergraduate academic experience. Extracurricular experience was defined as an activity that an alumnus might have participated in as a college student, such as athletics, student organizations, choir, band, or intramural programs. The correlations between academic experience and alumni giving, and extracurricular experience and alumni giving were analyzed separately. The results of these two correlations are discussed under research question 2 in order to explain the relationship between student experience and alumni giving. This section contains data related to research question 2 and the student experience variable.

**Academic experiences.** Research question two asked “Is there a correlation between student experience and alumni giving among HBCU graduates?” First, data were collected to answer research question 2 from survey questions 1a – 1s which requested participants to
evaluate the following aspects of their undergraduate academic experiences:

- Course general education requirements
- Major educational requirements
- Freshman advising
- Advising in major
- Quality of faculty
- Career placement/advising
- Commitment of faculty to teaching
- Amount of contact with faculty
- Quality of instruction in non-major courses
- Quality of instruction in major courses
- Availability of required courses
- Variability of course offerings
- Access to support system (tutoring, study skills, etc.)
- Integration of general education core into major courses
- Library collection
- Access to computing resources/technology needs
- Someone on faculty that you felt comfortable expressing concerns
- Someone on staff that you felt comfortable expressing concerns
- Level of satisfaction with undergraduate academic experience

Questions 1a-1s were combined to form a composite score for the academic experience characteristic. The results of each survey questions are listed in Table 7. While some participants held negative views of the academic experiences, the responses were overwhelmingly positive.
Results of these questions were analyzed using Pearson r correlation. The Pearson r correlation statistic calculated for the academic experience composite score revealed that there was a statistically significant relationship \((p < .05)\) between academic experience and alumni giving (see Table 8).

Table 7

*Student Experience: Evaluation of Academic Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course general education</td>
<td>1 (.79%)</td>
<td>3 (2.4%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>42 (33%)</td>
<td>78 (61%)</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major educational requirements</td>
<td>6 (12%)</td>
<td>1 (2.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (4.3%)</td>
<td>29 (81%)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman advising</td>
<td>8 (6%)</td>
<td>29 (22%)</td>
<td>8 (6%)</td>
<td>29 (22%)</td>
<td>38 (29%)</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising in major</td>
<td>8 (7%)</td>
<td>22 (18%)</td>
<td>9 (7.3%)</td>
<td>28 (23%)</td>
<td>56 (46%)</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (2.4%)</td>
<td>50 (40%)</td>
<td>68 (54%)</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career placement/advising</td>
<td>17 (15%)</td>
<td>16 (14%)</td>
<td>16 (14%)</td>
<td>27 (24%)</td>
<td>35 (32%)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment of faculty to teaching</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (3.2%)</td>
<td>32 (26%)</td>
<td>85 (68%)</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of contact with faculty</td>
<td>3 (2.4%)</td>
<td>10 (8%)</td>
<td>6 (5%)</td>
<td>28 (22%)</td>
<td>78 (62%)</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of instruction in non-major courses</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td>7 (6%)</td>
<td>54 (45%)</td>
<td>54 (45%)</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of instruction in major courses</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (1.6%)</td>
<td>29 (24%)</td>
<td>85 (70%)</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of required courses</td>
<td>6 (5%)</td>
<td>12 (10%)</td>
<td>3 (2.4%)</td>
<td>40 (32%)</td>
<td>63 (51%)</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability of course offerings</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
<td>19 (15%)</td>
<td>7 (6%)</td>
<td>46 (37%)</td>
<td>49 (39%)</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to support system (tutoring, etc.)</td>
<td>8 (7%)</td>
<td>17 (15%)</td>
<td>19 (17%)</td>
<td>33 (30%)</td>
<td>34 (31%)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of general education core into major courses</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>7 (6%)</td>
<td>23 (19%)</td>
<td>42 (36%)</td>
<td>43 (36%)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library collection</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>14 (11%)</td>
<td>18 (15%)</td>
<td>43 (35%)</td>
<td>45 (37%)</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to technology needs</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
<td>14 (14%)</td>
<td>15 (15%)</td>
<td>36 (36%)</td>
<td>27 (27%)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone on faculty that you felt</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>9 (8%)</td>
<td>10 (9%)</td>
<td>24 (21%)</td>
<td>66 (59%)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comfortable expressing concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone on staff that you felt</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>10 (8%)</td>
<td>14 (12%)</td>
<td>25 (22%)</td>
<td>65 (56%)</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comfortable expressing concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of satisfaction with</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>7 (6%)</td>
<td>40 (33%)</td>
<td>70 (58%)</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undergraduate academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* “Not applicable” or “did not answer” responses were not included in the statistical analysis of this study.

Table 8

*Student Experience - Academic Experience: Relationship to Alumni Giving*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>r-Value</th>
<th>p&lt;.05</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>The P-Value is 0.013474</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The result is significant at p < 0.05.

**Extracurricular experiences.** Survey questions 2a - 2m were also used to address research question 2. Questions 2a - 2m asked the participants to address their level of satisfaction with the following aspects of their extracurricular experience:

- Types of extracurricular opportunities offered
- Welcoming environment within the extracurricular opportunities
- Diversity of extracurricular offerings
- Supportive environment within the extracurricular experience
- Networking opportunities within the extracurricular experience
● Professional development opportunities within the extracurricular experience
● Personal growth opportunities provided within the extracurricular experience
● Career preparation opportunities within the extracurricular experience
● Availability of extracurricular opportunities
● Opportunity to work with diverse individuals within the extracurricular experience
● Quality of advisors within the extracurricular experience
● Overall satisfaction with extracurricular offerings
● Overall satisfaction with extracurricular experience

These survey questions were combined to form a composite score for the extracurricular experience characteristic. The results of those survey questions are presented in Table 9. The large majority of participants were very satisfied or satisfied with their extracurricular experience. Results of these questions were analyzed using Pearson r correlation. The Pearson r correlation statistic calculated for the extracurricular experience composite score revealed that there was a statistically significant relationship ($p < .05$) between extracurricular experience and alumni giving (see Table 10).
Table 9

*Student Experience: Extracurricular Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of extracurricular opportunities offered</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming environment within the extracurricular opportunities</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>4 (4%)</td>
<td>9 (8%)</td>
<td>44 (40%)</td>
<td>51 (46%)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of extracurricular offerings</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>7 (6%)</td>
<td>11 (10%)</td>
<td>39 (35%)</td>
<td>51 (46%)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive environment within the extracurricular experience</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>14 (13%)</td>
<td>10 (9%)</td>
<td>47 (42%)</td>
<td>38 (34%)</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking opportunities within the extracurricular experience</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>9 (8%)</td>
<td>13 (12%)</td>
<td>38 (35%)</td>
<td>46 (42%)</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development opportunities within the extracurricular experience</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>17 (16.5%)</td>
<td>18 (17.4%)</td>
<td>32 (33%)</td>
<td>31 (30%)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal growth opportunities provided within the extracurricular experience</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
<td>13 (12%)</td>
<td>17 (16%)</td>
<td>34 (31%)</td>
<td>40 (37%)</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career preparation opportunities within the extracurricular experience</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>21 (20%)</td>
<td>18 (17%)</td>
<td>28 (27%)</td>
<td>33 (31%)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of extracurricular opportunities</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>13 (12%)</td>
<td>14 (12.3%)</td>
<td>40 (35%)</td>
<td>44 (39%)</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to work with diverse individuals within the extracurricular experience</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
<td>9 (8%)</td>
<td>24 (22%)</td>
<td>40 (37%)</td>
<td>27 (25%)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cont.)
Quality of advisors within the extracurricular experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>13 (12%)</td>
<td>19 (18%)</td>
<td>36 (34%)</td>
<td>34 (32%)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall satisfaction with extracurricular offerings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (2.6%)</td>
<td>13 (12%)</td>
<td>13 (12%)</td>
<td>45 (40%)</td>
<td>38 (34%)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall satisfaction with extracurricular experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
<td>9 (8%)</td>
<td>14 (13%)</td>
<td>43 (38%)</td>
<td>41 (37%)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. “Not applicable” or “did not answer” responses were not included in the statistical analysis of this study.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>r-Value</th>
<th>p&lt;.05</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.037527</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The result is significant at p < 0.05.

Religious Charitable Giving

The frequency of attendance at a religiously oriented service and frequency of donations to a religious entity were used to characterize the religious charitable giving variable in this study. The correlations between the frequency of attendance at a religious service and alumni giving, and the frequency of donations to a religious entity and alumni giving were analyzed separately to address research question three. The data from these two correlations are discussed in this section in order to explain the relationship between religious charitable giving and alumni giving.

Research question three asked, “Is there a correlation between consistent religious charitable giving and alumni giving among HBCU graduates?” Survey questions 10 and 11 were
used to address research question eight. These two survey questions asked the participants’ frequency of attending a religious service and frequency of contributing financially to a religious entity. Survey questions 10 and 11 were used to create the composite score for the religious charitable giving characteristic. The results from these two survey questions are reported in Table 11. Sixty-seven percent of participants attended a religious service on a weekly basis, while 8% participants reported never attending a service. Thirty-nine percent of participants made a donation to a religiously affiliated organization on a weekly basis compared to 5% that have never made a contribution. The Pearson r correlation statistic calculated for the religious charitable giving characteristic composite score revealed that there is not a statistically significant relationship between religious charitable giving and alumni giving (see Table 12).

Table 11

**Religious Charitable Giving**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never (8%)</th>
<th>Annually (5%)</th>
<th>Monthly (17%)</th>
<th>Weekly (67%)</th>
<th>Daily (2%)</th>
<th>n (99%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious service attendance</td>
<td>11 (8%)</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
<td>23 (17%)</td>
<td>88 (67%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to religious organizations</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
<td>20 (15%)</td>
<td>53 (40%)</td>
<td>52 (39%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

**Religious Charitable Giving: Relationship to Alumni Giving**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>r-Value</th>
<th>p&lt;.05</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>The P-Value is 0.906884</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The result is not significant at p < 0.05*

**Alumni Perceptions of Overall Collegiate Experience and Preparation**

The participants’ satisfaction with the decision to attend their alma mater and perceived
post-graduation success are the two components of the alumni perception variable in this study. The correlations between the satisfaction with the decision to attend the alma mater and alumni giving, and perceived post-graduation success and alumni giving were conducted separately to address research question four. The data from these two correlations are discussed in this section in order to explain the relationship between alumni perceptions and alumni giving.

Research question four asked, “Is there a correlation between alumni perceptions and alumni giving among HBCU graduates?” First, survey questions three and four were used to address research question three. The survey questions asked participants “How would you describe your overall experience with attending your alma mater” and “How would you describe your level of satisfaction with the decision to attend your alma mater,” respectively. These two survey questions were used to form the composite score for the satisfaction with the decision to attend your alma mater characteristic. All of the responses to each survey question were reported in Table 13. Over 80% of the participants answered both questions either “very satisfied” or “satisfied”. The Pearson r correlation statistic calculated for the satisfaction with decision to attend alma mater composite score revealed that there is a statistically significant relationship ($p < .05$) between the satisfaction with the decision to attend alma mater and alumni giving (see Table 14).

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall experience at alma mater</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>52 (39%)</td>
<td>67 (50%)</td>
<td>133  (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to attend alma mater</td>
<td>8 (6%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
<td>46 (35%)</td>
<td>72 (54%)</td>
<td>133  (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey questions five, six, and seven were also used to address research question four. These three survey questions, which asked how the participants valued the academic preparation gained at their alma mater and the level of satisfaction with their post-graduation success, were used to form the composite score for the perceived post-graduation success factor. The data from all three survey questions are reported in Table 15. More than 75% of all participants reported being “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their academic preparation, post-graduation career opportunities and post-graduation career success. The Pearson r correlation statistic calculated for the perceived post-graduation success factor composite score revealed that there is a significant relationship between the perceived post-graduation success and alumni giving (see Table 16).

Table 15

*Alumni Perceptions: Perceived Post-graduation Success*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Preparation</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Opportunities</td>
<td>8 (6%)</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
<td>13 (1%)</td>
<td>38 (29%)</td>
<td>66 (51%)</td>
<td>130 (98%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Success</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
<td>8 (6%)</td>
<td>42 (32%)</td>
<td>70 (53%)</td>
<td>132 (99%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

*Alumni Perceptions - Perceived Post-graduation Success: Relationship to Alumni Giving*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>r-Value</th>
<th>p&lt;.05</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>The P-Value is 0.011746</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The result is significant at p < 0.05

**Alumni Engagement with Alma Mater**

Alumni involvement and frequency of communication with the alma mater were the two characteristics associated with the alumni engagement variable in this study. The correlations between alumni involvement and alumni giving, and the frequency of communication with alma mater and alumni giving were conducted separately to address research question five. The results of these two correlations are discussed in this section in order to explain the relationship between alumni engagement and alumni giving.

Survey questions 12 and 13 were used to address research question 5. These two survey questions that focused on determining the participants’ level of alumni involvement and engagement collectively formed the composite score for the alumni involvement characteristic. Sixty-three percent of participants were members of an alumni association, but 58% had never attended an alumni association meeting or event. The complete data on survey questions 12 and 13 are found on Table 17. The Pearson r correlation statistic calculated for the alumni involvement composite score revealed that a statistically significant relationship did not exist between alumni involvement and alumni giving (see Table 18).
Table 17

Alumni Engagement with Alma Mater: Alumni Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Annually</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni association meeting or event attendance</td>
<td>77 (58%)</td>
<td>33 (25%)</td>
<td>22 (17%)</td>
<td>132 (99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni association membership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83 (63%)</td>
<td>49 (37%)</td>
<td>132 (99%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18

Alumni Engagement with Alma Mater - Alumni Involvement: Relationship to Alumni Giving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r-Value</th>
<th>p&lt;.05</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>The P-Value is 0.057212</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The result is not significant at p < 0.05

Survey questions 14 and 15 were also used to address research question 5. The composite score for the frequency of communication factor was developed by combining survey questions 14 and 15, which focused on how often the participants were contacted by their alma mater to make a donation and with general information. Forty-three percent of all participants had been contacted by their alma mater at least five times, while 11% had not been contacted at all. Twenty-three percent of participants had been contacted to give a gift to their university, while 11% had never been asked to give a donation. The complete responses to survey questions 14 and 15 can be found in Table 19. The Pearson r correlation statistic calculated for the frequency of communication with alma mater composite score revealed that there was a statistically significant relationship (p < .05) between the frequency of communication with alma mater and alumni giving (see Table 20).
Table 19

*Alumni Engagement with Alma Mater: Frequency of Communication*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of times contacted by alma mater (annually)</th>
<th>Zero (11%)</th>
<th>Once (6%)</th>
<th>Twice (19%)</th>
<th>Three (12%)</th>
<th>Four (9%)</th>
<th>Five Times or More (43%)</th>
<th>N (100%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of times asked by alma mater to contribute financially (annually)</td>
<td>15 (11%)</td>
<td>15 (11%)</td>
<td>39 (30%)</td>
<td>23 (17%)</td>
<td>9 (7%)</td>
<td>31 (23%)</td>
<td>132 (99%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20

*Alumni Engagement with Alma Mater - Frequency of Communication: Relationship with Alumni Giving*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>r-Value</th>
<th>p&lt;.05</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>The P-Value is 0.001495</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The result is significant at p < 0.05

**Selected Characteristics of Non-donor vs. Donor Comparisons**

Many of the survey questions resulted in similar outcomes when comparing non-donor and donor responses. For instance, survey questions pertaining to satisfaction with the decision to attend the alma mater, church attendance, overall experience at the alma mater, and charitable contributions to a religious entity all resulted in very similar responses among donors and non-donors. Fifty-three percent of donors were “very satisfied” with the decision to attend their alma mater, compared to 58% of non-donors. Similarly, 52% of donors and 45% of non-donors were "very satisfied” with the overall experience at their alma mater. Non-donors gave more to churches on an annual basis (21% to 13%), but donors gave more on a weekly basis (42% to 30%). However, the percentage of participants that gave to a religious organization on a monthly basis was relatively the same. Donors and non-donors reported 40% and 39%, respectively.
These results can be found in Tables 21 - 24 below. However, there were certain survey questions that resulted in distinct differences among non-donor and donor participants.

Table 21

*Level of Satisfaction with Decision to Attend Alma Mater*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-donors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>46 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>72 (54%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>133 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22

*Level of Satisfaction with the Overall Experience at Alma Mater*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-donors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>67 (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>133 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23

Frequency of Contributions to a Religious Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donors n</th>
<th>Donors %</th>
<th>Non-donors n</th>
<th>Non-donors %</th>
<th>Total n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>77 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>132 (99%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24

Frequency of Attendance at a Religious Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donors n</th>
<th>Donors %</th>
<th>Non-donors n</th>
<th>Non-donors %</th>
<th>Total n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>88 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>132 (99%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey question 1d asked participants to discuss their satisfaction with the advising they received as an undergraduate student. Forty-seven percent of alumni donors were “very satisfied” with the level of advising they received at their alma maters, while only 28% of non-donors were “very satisfied”. Thirty-one percent of non-donors were either “very dissatisfied” or
“dissatisfied” with advising, compared to 20% of donors that reported some level of dissatisfaction (see Table 25).

Table 25

Level of Satisfaction with Advising in Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-donors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey question 1e asked participants to explain their level of satisfaction with the quality of faculty members at their alma mater. The majority of donors stated that they “very satisfied” with the quality of faculty, while only 39% of non-donors were “very satisfied” (see Table 26).
Table 26

**Quality of Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-donors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>50 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>68 (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>132 (99%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey question 1f asked participants to describe their satisfaction with career advising/placement services provided by their alma mater. Twenty-one percent of non-donors were “very dissatisfied” compared to only 1% of donors (see Table 27).

Table 27

**Career Advising/Placement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-donors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>27 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>132 (99%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More donors were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the availability of required courses and the variety of courses offered. Eighty-six percent of donors were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with the availability of courses and 78% were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the variety of the courses offered. In comparison, only 57% and 48% of non-donors were satisfied or very satisfied, respectively. The results are reported below in tables 28 and 29.

Table 28

*Availability of Required Courses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-donors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>63 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>131 (98%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29

*Variety in Course Offerings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-donors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>45 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cont.)
Survey question 1p asked the participants to describe their level of satisfaction regarding the access to computer resources and technology needs at their alma mater. Sixty-three percent of non-donors were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” compared to 45% of donors (see Table 30).

Table 30

*Access to Computer Resources/Technology Needs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-donors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants’ satisfaction with their undergraduate academic experience was described in survey question 1s. Sixty-nine percent of non-donors were “very satisfied” or “satisfied”, while 87% of donors reported one of those responses (see Table 31).
Survey question 2e focused on the networking opportunities afforded to the participants during extracurricular activities. The majority of the donors were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their networking opportunities, while 39% of non-donors were satisfied or “very satisfied” (see Table 32).

Table 32

Networking Opportunities within Extracurricular Experiences
Survey questions 8 and 9 focused on the participants’ annual income and discretionary income by asking them to describe their socioeconomic status and monthly discretionary income levels. The majority of the donors reported an income of $60,000 or more, while 24% of the non-donors fell into this category. Twelve percent of non-donors reported an income of $20,000 or less, while none of the donors self-reported within this income level. Forty-five percent of non-donors reported having a monthly discretionary income of $500 or less, while 44% of donors reported a discretionary income of $1,500 or more each month. The results from survey questions 8 and 9 are reported in tables 33 and 34 below.

Table 33

**Socioeconomic Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-donors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>131 (98%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey questions 8 and 9 focused on the participants’ annual income and discretionary income by asking them to describe their socioeconomic status and monthly discretionary income levels. The majority of the donors reported an income of $60,000 or more, while 24% of the non-donors fell into this category. Twelve percent of non-donors reported an income of $20,000 or less, while none of the donors self-reported within this income level. Forty-five percent of non-donors reported having a monthly discretionary income of $500 or less, while 44% of donors reported a discretionary income of $1,500 or more each month. The results from survey questions 8 and 9 are reported in tables 33 and 34 below.

Table 33

**Socioeconomic Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-donors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0-$20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001-$40,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001-$60,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001-$80,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,001-$100,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than $100,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>133 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 34

*Monthly Discretionary Income*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Non-donors</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-$250</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$251-$500</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$501-$1000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1001-$1500</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than $1,500</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>52 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>133 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey questions 12 and 13 asked participants how often they attended alumni meetings or events, and if they were alumni association members. Seventy-six percent of non-donors stated that they had never attended an alumni meeting or event, compared to 53% of donors (see Table 35). Over 70% of donors are members of their alma mater’s alumni association, while 33% of non-donors are members (see Table 36).

Table 35

*Alumni Association Meetings/Events Attendance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Non-donors</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>77 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>33 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>132 (99%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 36

*Alumni Association Membership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Non-donors</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>82 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>50 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>132 (99%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey questions 14 and 15 asked the participants to describe how often they had communication with their alma mater in general and how frequently the university requested a donation. In regards to general communications, the majority of donors had more interaction with their alma maters than non-donors (see Table 37). When asked for a donation, non-donors and non-donors were asked approximately the same number of times (see Table 38). However, 8% of donors claimed they were never asked to give compared to 18% of non-donors who said they were never asked to make a donation.

Table 37

*Frequency of Annual Communication with Alma Mater*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Non-donors</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17 (13%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cont.)
### Table 38

*Frequency of Communication with Alma Mater Regarding a Donation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donors</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-donors</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Times or More</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td>56 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>133 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Open-ended Responses

The final question on the survey allowed participants to provide comments about their experiences with their alma mater. Out of the 133 usable responses, 57 participants answered survey question 18. All of the unedited responses to this question can be found in Appendix F. While some of the responses overlapped, they all fit within one of the following categories: positive responses, responses that provided suggestions or explanations, and negative responses.

**Positive responses.** The responses were overwhelmingly positive. Thirty-one answers
were categorized as being a positive response. Many of these responses exhibited gratitude toward the alma mater for the role it had contributed to the respondents’ success. Other comments expressed a disdain for those individuals that chose not to give back to their respective alma mater. The majority of the participants that provided positive responses said they gave back financially because of the great experiences and memories they had at their institutions.

**Responses that provided suggestions or assumptions.** A majority of the open-ended responses in this category provided suggestions for ways to engage other alumni in order to get them to contribute financially, or assumptions as to why some alumni chose not to give. Some individuals suggested that HBCU administrators should do better encouraging alumni involvement and support before students graduate. Other participants suggested that more communication from the university was needed. In addition, suggestions portrayed in the responses revealed assumptions about why some HBCU graduates may choose not to continue financially to their alma maters. These respondents mainly highlighted bad experiences with alma mater, low salary or discretionary income, and less than expected career success as the main reasons some HBCU graduates are non-donors.

**Negative responses.** The next largest group of responses to survey question 18 exhibited negative undertones. Most of these respondents discussed bad encounters they had with their alma mater as a student or alumni. Some recanted bad customer service experiences, while others expressed concern for the lack of career preparation. Individuals that reported issues as alumni were largely due to concerns with donations not being applied to the correct funding area or never being asked to contribute. Many of these respondents claimed these issues and others had deterred them from continuing to give financially to their alma mater, if they had given at all. There were a few participants that conveyed obvious negative experiences and feelings toward
their alma maters, but included support or a sense of respect for certain aspects of the institution within their comments.

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to present the data collected from the survey and Pearson correlations conducted during this study. The large majority of the participants were donors, while 44% of the non-donors reported not being contributors due to a limited discretionary income. Overall, 24% of the participants reported an income over $100,000. The participants were overwhelmingly satisfied with their academic experience, extracurricular experience, decision to attend their alma mater, and post-graduation success. In addition, a large percentage of the participants attended a church and made charitable contributions on a weekly basis. All of the relationships were found to be statically significant ($p < .05$) except for religious charitable giving and alumni giving and alumni involvement and alumni giving.
Chapter V

Conclusions and Recommendations

Fundraising and institutional advancement have become increasingly important to the progress of higher education over the years. With a continued decline in higher education funding, external sources have become even more necessary than in the formative years of American colleges and universities (Gasman & Bowman, 2012; Zusman, 2011). Furthermore, HBCUs have much smaller endowment levels than their PWI counterparts (Cohen, 2006; Cross & Slater, 1994; Gasman, et al., 2010; “Top 12 HBCU Endowments,” 2013) so obtaining additional funding sources may be even more imperative at these institutions. While there are various avenues where college and university development officers can acquire additional revenue, the most logical donor base would be former students and alumni. Unfortunately for HBCU administrators, PWI graduates give back at much higher rates than their respective alumni (Gasman & Bowman, 2012; “State-Chartered Black Universities,” 2002). So, while alumni may be a common funding source for fundraisers at PWIs, HBCUs are not as likely to be able to utilize alumni gifts to fill funding gaps (Gasman & Bowman, 2012). Hence, in order to increase alumni giving at HBCUs, it is important to determine why HBCU alumni that are non-donors chose not to give financially to their respective alma maters.

Historically, blanket statements were made to explain why HBCU graduates have not financially supported their alma maters. Authors with little to no evidence to support their claims alleged that lack of income, limited philanthropic tradition, and little connection with alma mater were important factors (Barsky et al., 2002; Conley, 2000). While African Americans may not have acquired as much wealth as their White counterparts, they do have the ability to give. For instance, the buying power of African Americans, which is the largest percentage of students at
HBCUs nationwide, will reach $1.1 trillion in 2015 (“Nielsen Report,” 2012). Consequently, African Americans could have the financial means to support their alma maters, whether they chose to do so or not. Despite the low alumni giving rates, HBCU graduates have been noted as supporters of their respective alma maters, as they attend sporting events and other alumni gatherings in large numbers (Birdsong, 2012; CIAA, 2012; Gamble, 2013; Johnson, 2013; Morrison & Freeman, 2011; SWAC Legends, 2013). Additionally, while they may not give to their former college or university, HBCU graduates tend to support other charitable causes, most notably their church or other religious institutions (Holloman et al., 2003; Hunter, Jones, & Boger, 1999; Reaves, 2006).

Subsequently, the purpose of this study was to examine how income, student experience, religious charitable giving, alumni perceptions, and alumni engagement, relate to alumni giving at HBCUs. This chapter will provide a brief summary of the study, discussion of the findings and conclusions from the research, limitations, recommendations for future research, and recommendations for practice and policy.

**Overview of the Study**

This research study used an explanatory correlational design to address the five research questions posed. An 18-question survey was distributed to the participants online. The survey questions were a mix of multiple choice and open-ended questions. The majority of the questions were derived from the literature on relevant studies, while two questions were based on a discontinued alumni survey developed by NCHEMS.

The target population for this study was all alumni who received an undergraduate degree between 1950 and 2012 with a valid email address on file at two HBCUs in the southwestern region of the United States. The two HBCUs were chosen using convenience sampling.
procedures. The study sample consisted of the 4,500 alumni that were selected to participate in this study. The participants in the sample were selected using a stratified random sampling process. In order to ensure the sample population included alumni donors and non-donors, the alumni directors used segmented reporting procedures to stratify the population.

One alumni director randomly selected 1,000 participants that were donors and 1,000 participants that were non-donors. The second director randomly selected 1,250 participants that were donors and 1,250 participants that were non-donors. This was accomplished by alphabetizing donor and non-donor lists from an alumni database and selecting every 25th prospect from each list until the target numbers was reached. Once these processes were completed, the sample size of 4,500 participants for this study was formed. All 4,500 participants were sent the survey with an invitation to participate in the study, but only 161 individuals responded. Only 133 of those responses resulted in usable data, yielding a 3.23% response rate.

**Summary of Research Findings**

This section provides a summary of the research findings developed during the study. It is organized around the five research questions posed.

**Research question 1.**

“Is there a relationship between income and alumni giving by HBCU graduates?” The responses to survey questions eight and nine were related to the socioeconomic status and discretionary income, which were associated with the income variable for this study. The correlations between socioeconomic status and alumni giving, and monthly discretionary income and alumni giving were examined separately to address this research question. After calculating the Pearson r correlation statistic for socioeconomic status, no statistically significant relationship \((p<.05)\) existed between socioeconomic status and alumni giving. Comparably, the
Pearson r correlation calculation for the discretionary monthly income characteristic revealed that there was a statistically significant relationship ($p<.05$) between discretionary income and alumni giving. The discretionary income characteristic in this study was defined as the funds remaining after taxes and personal necessities, such as food, shelter, etc (Owens, 1991).

Overall, 33 out of 133 (24.8%) respondents reported a gross income level of over $100,000 and 58 (43.6%) had an income over $60,000 but less than $100,000. Thirty-one or 23.3% of the participants indicated their gross income ranged between $40,000 and $60,000. Only 8.3% or 13 of all participants reported a gross income level of 40,000 or less. Similarly, 39.1% of all respondents reported a monthly discretionary income of $1,500 or more. When comparing donors to non-donors, 18% of non-donors reported an annual income of less than $40,000, while only 5% of donors fell into that category. Conversely, 30% of non-donors and 24% of donors reported a monthly discretionary income of $1,500 or more.

**Research question 2.**

“Is there a relationship between student experience and alumni giving by HBCU graduates?” Responses to survey questions 1a-1s (19 items) and 2a-2m (13 items) asked participants questions about their academic and extracurricular experiences, respectively. The correlations between academic experience and alumni giving, and extracurricular experience and alumni giving were analyzed separately. The results of these two correlations were used to explain the relationship between student experience and alumni giving.

The Pearson r correlation statistic calculated for the academic experience composite revealed that there was a statistically significant relationship at the $p<.05$ level between academic experience and alumni giving. Likewise, the Pearson r correlation statistic calculated for extracurricular experience revealed a statistically significant relationship ($p<.05$) between
extracurricular college experience and alumni giving. Overall, the participants were overwhelmingly satisfied with their academic and extracurricular experiences. Several individual questions related to alumni academic college experience such as freshman advising, advising in the major, and career placement advising yielded a frequency response of “dissatisfied” or “very dissatisfied” by over 23% of the participants. Nonetheless, the study respondents indicated that they were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” on all but three of 19 items (educational requirements in the major, career placement advising, and access to technology needs).

When comparing donors and non-donors, similarly the responses to all of the survey questions were overwhelmingly “satisfied” or “very satisfied”. Yet, there were six survey questions where more than 20% of the respondents reported being “very dissatisfied” or “dissatisfied”. Twenty-four percent of non-donors were “very dissatisfied” or “dissatisfied” with their freshmen advising compared to 29% of donors. The survey question related to satisfaction with advising within major courses resulted in 31% of non-donors and 30% of donors being “dissatisfied” or very “dissatisfied”. Career placement/advising and variability of courses had the largest level of dissatisfaction among non-donors. Thirty-six percent of non-donors and 12% of donors were “very dissatisfied” or “dissatisfied” with their institutions’ career placement/advising, while 39% of non-donors and 12% of donors were “very dissatisfied” or “dissatisfied” with the variability of courses. The responses to the survey question related to availability of required courses resulted in 30% of non-donors and 8% of donors being “very dissatisfied” or “dissatisfied”. Lastly, professional development within extracurricular experience resulted in 24% of non-donors and 14% of donors “very dissatisfied” or “dissatisfied”, and career preparation within extracurricular experiences resulted in 21% of non-donors and 19% donors were “very dissatisfied” or “dissatisfied”.
Research question 3.

“Is there a relationship between religious charitable giving and alumni giving by HBCU graduates?” Survey questions 10 and 11 asked participants to answer questions about how often they attended a religious service and their frequency of financial contributions to a religious organization, respectively. The frequency of attendance at a religiously affiliated service and frequency of donations to a religious entity were used to characterize the religious charitable giving variable in this study. The relationships between the frequency of attendance at a religious service and alumni giving, and the frequency of donations to a religious entity were analyzed separately to address research question three. The data from these two correlations were used to explain the relationship between religious charitable giving and alumni giving. Pearson r correlation statistic calculated for this variable revealed that there was not a statistically significant ($p<.05$) relationship between religious charitable giving and alumni giving.

Overall, 67% of the respondents attended a religious service on a weekly basis and 80% of them made a contribution to a religious entity on a monthly or weekly basis. Sixty-one percent of non-donors and 69% of donors attended church weekly. Sixty-nine percent of non-donors and 82% of donors made weekly or monthly financial contributions to a religious organization.

Research question 4.

“Is there a relationship between alumni perceptions and alumni giving by HBCU graduates?” The satisfaction of alumni with their decision to attend the alma mater and perceived post-graduation success were the two components of the alumni perception variable in this study. The correlations between satisfaction with the decision to attend their alma mater and alumni giving, and perceived post-graduation success and alumni giving were conducted separately to address research question four. The data from these two correlations were used to explain the
relationship between alumni perceptions and alumni giving.

Survey questions three and four formed the satisfaction with the decision to attend alma mater composite score, while questions five, six, and seven collectively formed the perceived post-graduation success composite score. Survey questions three and four asked the participants to describe their overall experience with attending their alma mater and the level of satisfaction with their decision, respectively. Survey questions five, six, and seven asked the participants to describe their level of satisfaction with academic preparation for career success, post-graduation career opportunities, and post-graduation career success.

Pearson r correlation statistic calculated for the decision to attend alma mater composite score revealed that there is a significant relationship between the graduates’ satisfaction with the decision to attend their alma mater and alumni giving at the $p<.05$ level. Likewise, there was also a statistically significant relationship ($p<.05$) between perceived post-graduation success and alumni giving. Overall, as well as among donors and non-donors, the majority of participants were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their overall experience at their alma mater, decision to attend their alma mater, academic preparation for their career, post-graduation career opportunities, and post-graduation career success.

Eighty-four percent of participants were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their post-graduation career success, compared to 9% that were “dissatisfied” or “very dissatisfied”. Seventy-five percent were “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their post-graduation career opportunities, while less than 15% were “dissatisfied” or “very dissatisfied”. The participants’ levels of discontentment with academic preparation were relatively low at 1%, while there were similar results for overall academic experience and decision to attend their alma mater. Less than 1% of participants reported being “very dissatisfied” or “dissatisfied” with each of those
characteristics.

**Research question 5.**

“Is there a relationship between alumni engagement and alumni giving by HBCU graduates?” The correlations between alumni involvement and alumni giving, and the frequency of communication with alma mater and alumni giving were conducted separately to address research question five. The results of these two correlations were used to explain the relationship between alumni engagement and alumni giving. The alumni involvement characteristic was a composite score created from the responses to survey questions 12 and 13, which asked the participant to describe their attendance at alumni association meetings/events and alumni association membership. The responses to survey questions 14 and 15 formed the composite score for the frequency of communication with alma mater characteristic.

The Pearson r correlation statistic revealed that there was not a statistically significant ($p<.05$) relationship between alumni involvement and alumni giving, but a statistically significant relationship did exist between the frequency of communication and alumni giving ($p<.05$). More than 58% of the participants had never attended an alumni association meeting or event, and 63% were not members of their respective alumni association. Seventy-six percent of non-donors had never attended an alumni association meeting or event, while 53% of donors had never attended an event. Thirty-three percent of non-donors and 72% of donors were not alumni association members. Regarding communication with the alma mater, non-donors and donors were contacted relatively about the same amount of times for a donation, but non-donors were contacted fewer times than donors when the frequency of general communication occurred at least four times.
Discussion of the Findings and Conclusions

This study sought to examine how specific characteristics impacted alumni giving among HBCU graduates. Those characteristics, income, student experience, religious charitable contributions, alumni perceptions, and alumni engagement were identified by reviewing and identifying gaps in the relevant literature. Because of the continued decline in funding for higher education, it is important for fundraisers and advancement professionals to determine why graduates that are non-donors are not contributing to their institutions.

The conclusions and implications for future research and practice derived from this study will help the fundraising professionals at the two HBCUs participating in this study understand why non-donors are not contributing financially. The conclusions will also help those institutions determine how to address issues that are deterring alumni from becoming donors. Additionally, why these results cannot be generalized to all HBCUs, advancement professionals from other institutions may be able to apply some of the findings to improve processes or practices at their colleges and universities.

Income. The relevant literature regarding how income affects alumni giving among HBCU graduates was inconclusive. Some of the researchers found characteristics related to income to be significant (Clotfelter, 2001; Johnson & Lara, 2008; Reaves, 2006), while others did not (Bowels, 1976; Evans, 1987; Hunter et al., 1999). The findings of this study were similar to those that found a relationship between income and giving. The self-reported income levels were higher among donors, and 12% of non-donors reported an income level less than $20,000 compared to no donors reporting within that category. In addition, the relationships between socioeconomic status and alumni giving, and income and alumni giving were found to be statistically significant ($p<.05$). Yet, other than Reaves’ (2006) study, this was not similar to the
findings of other studies with HBCU alumni and minority graduates from PWIs as the participants (Bowels, 1976; Evans, 1987; Hunter et al., 1999). However, while Reaves (2006) determined that income was the reason why HBCU graduates did not give back, she did not utilize non-donors as participants in her study. Therefore, current HBCU donors were merely speculating in their responses why their HBCU peers were not giving back to their alma mater. Yet, like the studies that focused on PWI graduates (Clotfelter, 2001; Johnson & Lara, 2008), this study's findings suggest that income is related to alumni giving among HBCU graduates. However, a very low percentage of non-donors selected “low annual gross income” as the reason for not giving, yet, 44% chose “limited discretionary income” as their rationale.

**Student academic and extracurricular experiences.** The relationships between academic experiences and alumni giving and extracurricular experiences and alumni giving were found to be statistically significant \( (p<.05) \) in this study. Overwhelmingly, the participants in this study were satisfied with their undergraduate experiences. While a few participants, donors and non-donors, mentioned individual instances of displeasure with their undergraduate experience, overall experiences were extremely positive. However, the participants indicated three areas of academic experiences in which more than 20% were not satisfied, freshman advising, advising in the major, and career placement advising. Only 18% of non-donors and 6% of donors were “very dissatisfied” or “dissatisfied” with their extracurricular experience, 6% of non-donors and 2% of donors were “very dissatisfied” or “dissatisfied” with their academic experience, and 12% of non-donors and 7% of donors were “very dissatisfied” or “dissatisfied” with their overall experience. Despite the low levels of dissatisfaction in each category, non-donors always displayed the highest levels of displeasure.
These findings differed from the studies conducted in general at PWIs (Caruthers, 1973; Clotfelter, 2001; Lackie, 2010; McDearmon & Shirley, 2009; Mills, 1975; Taylor & Martin, 1995; Weerts & Ronca, 2007), while similar with research conducted on minority alumni from PWIs (Nirschel, 1999; Wallace, 2012) and HBCU graduates (Allen, 1981; Evans, 1987; Hunter, et al., 1999; Reaves, 2006). The findings from general studies conducted at PWIs concluded that alumni donors had significantly more positive experiences than non-donors. This differed from this study’s findings and others conducted at HBCUs or with minorities at PWIs. Regardless of donor status, all of these studies conclusively found that minority alumni at PWIs and HBCUs were satisfied with their overall undergraduate experiences.

These previous research studies suggest that student academic and extracurricular experiences may influence alumni giving at PWIs in general, but not necessarily at HBCUs or among minority PWI graduates. More research is needed in this area to determine why these differences occur among the various groups. Furthermore, while student experiences were vastly positive, the categories where some level of dissatisfaction were expressed reveal areas that the administrators at the two participating HBCUs can try to address. For example, while not a large percentage, 15% of the non-donors reported that feelings toward their academic experience played the most significant role in their decision not to give back to their alma mater. Conducting further research or simply having conversations with students and faculty to determine what problems exist on the academic side that may impact a student’s experience may be warranted. To alleviate these deterrents to giving, the participating HBCUs may want to work closely with faculty, staff, and key decision makers to determine strategies that will improve the problem areas.
Religious attendance and giving. The relationship between religious charitable giving and alumni giving was not found to be statistically significant \((p<.05)\). However, the majority of the participants, donors and non-donors, attend religious services and make donations on a regular basis. Fewer than 10% of donors and non-donors do not attend church services or make donations to religious institutions. Therefore, religion and religious charitable giving are important to the majority of the participants. This finding was similar to the studies that were discussed in Chapter II. In those studies, alumni donors at HBCUs and minorities at PWIs were overwhelmingly engaged with their churches (Cohen, 2006; Gasman, 2002; Gasman & Bowman, 2013; Holloman et al., 2003; Leak & Reid, 2010; Nirschel, 1997; Wallace, 2012). Those researchers concluded that the donors’ religious backgrounds may have influence their decisions to give back to their alma maters. Contrarily, because only two of the non-donors reported never attending a religious service, that conclusion could not be confirmed from the findings of this present study.

Likewise, the suggestions by other researchers (Gasman & Bowman, 2013; Holloman et al., 2003) to apply similar fundraising tactics as churches implement may not be applicable for the two participating HBCUs in this study. According to Gasman & Bowman (2013) and Holloman et al. (2003), churches are successful at acquiring a regular influx of donations due to a frequent ask being made, as well as the churches ability to teach its’ members the importance of financially supporting the church on a regular basis. In order to determine if these tactics would be applicable, more research on the relationship between HBCU alumni that are non-donors and religious contributions may be needed. This would help determine why a non-donor’s religious background has not translated to other forms of charitable giving, such as colleges and universities.
Alumni perceptions. The relationships between the satisfaction with the decision to
attend a particular alma mater and alumni giving, and perceived post-graduation success and
alumni giving were both found to be statistically significant ($p<.05$). Relevant literature
discussed in Chapter II revealed that donors and non-donors in studies conducted at HBCUs
were found to display a sense of pride for their institutions (Allen, 1981; Evans, 1987; Hunter, et
al., 1999; Reaves, 2006) and expressed appreciation for the career preparation they received at
their alma mater (Allen, 1981; Evans, 1987). A PWI study that focused on alumni perceptions
concluded that more non-donors held negative perceptions of their alma mater than alumni
donors (Lackie, 2010). Conversely, within this present study the majority of the participants were
“satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the decision to attend their alma mater, the academic
preparation that they received, post-graduation opportunities, and post-graduation success.
Therefore, while some PWI studies revealed that non-donors were more likely to have negative
views toward their institution, this study and the others conducted on HBCU alumni differ.

Additionally, while 15% of non-donors within this study did report a negative overall
academic experience as their reasoning for not giving, no non-donors selected feelings toward
career success or feelings toward academic preparation as a barrier to alumni giving. This might
suggest that although HBCU alumni may have had negative experiences from their time on
campus, overall they do feel as though their alma mater prepared them for success. However,
although this survey question was related more to academic preparation than post-graduation
career success, it is important to note that 36% of non-donors were “dissatisfied” or “very
dissatisfied” with career placement and/or advising at their alma mater. This may be an area that
administrators at the two participating HBCUs may want to seek improvement by working with
student affairs professionals and faculty members.
**Alumni engagement.** The relationship between alumni involvement and alumni giving was not found to be statistically significant, while the relationship between frequency of communication with the alma mater and alumni giving was statistically significant ($p < .05$). The fact that alumni involvement was not found to be statistically significant differed from all other studies discussed in Chapter II. Alumni involvement was significant of alumni giving in all relevant literature reviewed in this study. However, while alumni involvement was not statistically significant, it is important to note that 72% of donors were involved within their respective alumni association, compared to only 28% of non-donors. Yet, neither donor status group heavily attended meetings and/or events. This may suggest that while some non-donors are involved within an alumni association, they are not being asked to give and/or the alumni association is not explaining the importance of giving to its members.

Lastly, alumni association members that are non-donors may consider their alumni association dues as a donation to the alma mater. Hence, educating graduates on what a donation to the college or university entails may be needed among alumni association members in order to capture those non-donors within the association. Thus, HBCU advancement professionals may want to collaborate with alumni relations staff and alumni association leadership to increase awareness of the importance of alumni giving and the purpose of the alumni association. In relation to the frequency of communication with alma mater, non-donors were contacted fewer times than donors in general and specifically for donations. This is consistent with a study by Gasman and Bowman (2013) who suggested that alumni do not give because they are not asked. Therefore, the advancement professionals at the participating HBCUs may want to increase their cultivation, engagement, and solicitation opportunities with non-donors in order to increase donations.
Why Black alumni do not give back. Gasman and Bowman (2013) cited the following reasons why Black alumni at PWIs do not give back: (a) they are not asked to contribute, (b) they do not understand the financial needs of their alma mater, (c) they experience a lack of communication with their school, (d) they had a poor college experience, and (e) they experienced racism or felt marginalized as students. Lackie (2010) found the following reasons why graduates from one PWI chose not to give back: (a) they believed other charitable causes had a greater need, (b) they did not think a public university needed private support, (c) they could not afford to give back, and (d) they did not agree with the direction that the institution has gone in since they graduated. Reaves’ (2006) qualitative study that was conducted with HBCU alumni donors, rather than non-donors revealed the following as reasons alumni did not make donations to their alma mater: (a) HBCU graduates have less disposable income, (b) negative undergraduate experiences, (c) fear of embarrassment due to a small gift, (d) lack of progress within the university, (e) alumni giving not a priority, and (f) a disconnect with the university.

In the present study the following factors were examined as reasons for non-contributions: (a) feelings toward overall academic experience, (b) feelings toward extracurricular experience, (c) limited monthly discretionary income, (d) low annual income, (e) lack of communication from alma mater, (f) feelings toward success in career, (g) feelings toward career preparation, and (h) feelings about the priority of giving back to the alma mater. All of these reasons were mentioned in the previous studies discussed in Chapter II except for the questions related to career success or preparation. Although this study had a low response rate, it is important to note that none of the non-donors reported that “feelings toward extracurricular experience”, “success in career”, or “academic preparation for career” negatively influenced their decision to give. Additionally, “low annual income” and “never been asked to give” were
reported as reasons for not giving by less than 10% of respondents. Even so, the two participating HBCUs may want to consider working with administrators, faculty, and staff to address the areas that non-donors selected as reasons that hindered them from financially supporting their alma mater.

The first theoretical framework used in this study, the racial wealth gap, postulates that a gap in wealth exists between African Americans and Whites in America. According to theorists and researchers, this wealth gap is due to African Americans historically possessing fewer assets than Whites, as well as achieving lower income levels (Barsky et al., 2002; Conley, 2000). Hence, the researchers suggested that African Americans may not be capable of charitable giving because of a lack of income or wealth accumulation. Consequently, a lack of discretionary income was the number one reason why non-donors did not give, while a low gross annual income was selected by less than 10% of the participants. This suggest that while level of income does impact HBCU alumni giving, low discretionary income may be the more important characteristic for HBCU administrators to understand.

Furthermore, the next largest group of non-donors, 21%, reported that they were not giving because it was not a priority. This could actually suggest that non-donors have the funds to spend toward alumni giving, but do not consider it as important as other things or causes they may choose to purchase or support with their money. This conclusion is supported by the 2012 Neilsen Report mentioned in Chapter I, which suggests that African Americans will have a buying power of $1.1 Trillion by 2015. Therefore, despite this study’s findings of low discretionary income being significant, if more African Americans used their portion of the projected $1.1 Trillion to support HBCUs, alumni giving rates could be much higher. So in order to increase donations from graduates, HBCU administrators should focus on engaging HBCU
alumni and expressing the importance of why giving back is necessary. This will empower more HBCU graduates to consider alumni giving as a priority within their budgeting and spending habits.

Therefore, while the racial wealth gap exists, the results of this study and the 2012 Nielsen Report do not support the idea that African Americans do not give due to low wealth or income accumulation. Additionally, these results could also suggest that some HBCU graduates do not budget wisely. For instance, Africans Americans possess a relatively high amount of buying power, yet many non-donors in this study reported a “low discretionary income” as their reason for not giving to their alma mater. While this may not be the case across the board, there may be some non-donors that have low monthly discretionary incomes because they spend more than their financial lifestyle allows. Thus, HBCU administrators may consider hosting financial literacy and budget setting workshops for their graduates in order to teach them how to budget, save, and spend wisely so they may contribute to charitable causes, including their alma mater.

The final two theoretical frameworks for this study were the social exchange theory and the rational choice theory. As mentioned in Chapter I, the social exchange theory is based on the premise that two sides receive mutual rewards after a predetermined exchange or transaction occurs between both parties (Emerson, 1976). For the purposes of this study, the social exchange theory was utilized to understand if HBCU graduates consider their undergraduate experiences to be rewarding enough to provide a financial gift to their alma mater in exchange for their college experience. While 13.8% of the non-donors mentioned that their feelings toward their overall academic experience was the reason they chose not to give, overwhelming the donors and non-donors in the study had a positive and rewarding student experience. The non-donors decided that those positive experiences were not rewarding enough to “exchange” for a financial gift to
their alma mater. Additionally, 40% of the donors gave a gift of $500 or less. Therefore, while 75% of the participants were donors, the majority generally gave smaller gifts. Hence, it would be beneficial for the two participating HBCUs to identify which aspects of the student experience need improvement. Improving the student experience could produce new donors and increase the amount of gifts from current donors.

The remaining theoretical framework was the rational choice theory. As mentioned in Chapter I, Scott (2000) explained that scholars who subscribe to this theory believe all decisions are well thought out and calculated to determine the risks, losses, and gains associated with each choice. Non-donors that indicated that it was not a priority to give back financially to their alma mater possibly determined that there was no value or gain in doing so. Therefore, participating HBCUs may want to consider improving the education and cultivation tactics with potential donors. They must be able to convey to prospective donors why every gift, no matter how small, is a valuable and rewarding exchange. HBCUs must do a better job of telling their story and the differences they make in the lives of their students. Non-donors may choose to prioritize alumni giving with a better understanding of why charitable donations, particularly those from alumni, are so important.

Limitations

There were several limitations associated with this study. Many of the following limitations, including low response rate and low number of participants, limit the ability for the findings of this study to be generalized to other HBCUs:

1. The sample consisted of only 4,500 participants. The alumni relations offices had limited email addresses on file, which limited the number of potential participants for this study.
2. The study had a small number of non-donor participants and included only undergraduate degree alumni. Only 24.8% of the participants were non-donors.

3. Only two HBCUs in the Southwestern region of the U.S. were included in this study. These two institutions may not have been representative of the 105 HBCUs across the U.S.

4. The study produced a low response rate of 3.225%.

5. Pearson r correlation was the chosen statistical test for this study, instead of a t-test. Due the small sample size and low response rate, conducting a Pearson r correlation instead of a t-test may have violated the principle of a normal distribution and effect size. Furthermore, this may have decreased the validity of the correlations.

6. The requirement of using email addresses to identify and connect with participants through the alumni offices at the two participating HBCUs may have unintentionally eliminated individuals that were older, less technology savvy, or did not have an email addresses on file with the alumni relations offices participating in this study.

7. Limited demographic data were collected. Demographic information such as location, age, degree earned was not collected. Hence, data analysis limited the ability to compare donor and non-donor characteristics/profiles with those found in other studies, which may have been helpful.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This study serves as a starting point for others wanting to conduct research on why HBCU alumni, particularly non-donors choose not to give back to their alma maters. The survey and variables developed for this study were primarily grounded in a review of the literature. Most, if not all, of the variables were mentioned as potential reasons for the lack of alumni
giving by other researchers. While this study does not examine the exhaustive list of possible variables that may have a relationship with alumni giving among HBCU graduates, this study can serve as a framework for researchers examining this topic. The following are recommendations for future researchers wanting to build upon this study:

1. This study should be replicated as a national study, using this survey instrument and randomly selecting the participating institutions from among the 105 HBCUs. This will result in a higher response rate and will enable the study’s findings to be more generalizable.

2. This study should be replicated to include only non-donors as participants. Since non-donors are a problem for HBCUs, a larger-scale study of this nature could increase our understanding why non-donors do not contribute to colleges and universities.

3. A qualitative study of non-donors should be conducted to better understand their reasons for not giving to HBCUs and how non-donors prioritize their spending and charitable giving.

4. A national study that collects demographic data from participants should be conducted in order to develop a profile of HBCU donors in order to compare it with those studies that have produced profiles of alumni donors at PWIs.

5. A quantitative study to determine why overall student experience may be related to alumni giving at PWIs in general, but not necessarily at HBCUs or among minority PWI graduates. The findings of this study and others related to alumni giving among HBCU graduates and minority PWI graduates all revealed that non-donors had good student experiences. Therefore, more research is needed in this area.
6. A quantitative study on the relationship between HBCU alumni that are non-donors, but make religious contributions. This may help determine why a non-donor’s religious background may not translate to other forms of charitable giving, such as colleges and universities, as previously suggested by other researchers.

7. A national study should be conducted using a mixed methods research design to determine the effectiveness of the messaging, public relations tools, and engagement approaches that are used by HBCU development officers in cultivating relationships with prospective donors and increasing gifts from current donors.

**Recommendations for Improved Practice and Policy**

This study provides a number of key recommendations that may improve alumni giving. Due to the limitations associated with this study, these recommendations are submitted for consideration to the two HBCUs that participated in the study, but may be valuable for all HBCUs. However, after reviewing the literature, other institutions may be able to apply one or more of the following recommendations to improve their alumni giving rates:

1. Create a culture of giving by starting conversations with students as undergraduates about why their financial support is so important post-graduation, and educate prospective alumni donors about the importance of giving back. These approaches may decrease the number of non-donors in the future that select “not a priority” as a reason for not giving.

2. The participating HBCUs may want to work closely with faculty, staff, and key decision makers to determine strategies that will improve the problem areas identified in this study. Any area that a non-donor or donor identified as being unsatisfactory may be able to be addressed prior to it becoming a barrier to giving.
for future alumni. Specifically, the two HBCUs may want to work closely with student affairs professionals and faculty members to improve academic advising and career placement/advising. Thirty-six percent of non-donors were “dissatisfied” or “very dissatisfied” with career placement and/or advising at their alma mater.

3. Increase the frequency of cultivation, engagement, and solicitation opportunities among non-donors in order to increase donations. The non-donors in this study were contacted more often to give than they were for cultivation or engagement opportunities.

4. HBCUs might consider working more closely with alumni association leadership to improve post-graduate engagement in campus activities ensure the message of the importance of giving to the university is properly conveyed to all members of the association, donors and non-donors. There were participants in this study that were alumni association members, but were non-donors.

5. The two participating HBCUs may want to consider working with administrators, faculty, and staff to address the areas that non-donors indicated as reasons that hindered them from financially supporting their alma mater.

Chapter Summary

Finding new ways to increase alumni giving at HBCUs is extremely important. Yet, in order to do so administrators must first understand why certain groups of alumni decide not to make a financial contribution. In order to do so, this study examined the relationships between five variables and alumni giving. Those five variables were income, student experience, religious charitable contributions, alumni perceptions, and alumni engagement. Each relationship was
found to be significant except religious charitable giving and alumni giving, and alumni involvement and alumni giving.

While further research is needed, this study provides advancement professionals at the two participating HBCUs with a basic understanding of why their specific non-donors are choosing not to give back. In addition, this study directs HBCU advancement professionals to key areas of concern when devising alumni giving strategies. The study further suggests that HBCUs may need to consider changes to improve overall student academic and extracurricular experiences and communication with alumni after graduation. In short, this study has expanded upon the limited body of research concerning alumni giving by focusing on understanding alumni giving from the both the donor and the non-donor perspective.
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Appendix A: Final Survey Instrument

HBCU Alumni Giving Survey

Greetings [Name] University Graduate!

My name is Jasmine A. Pope, and I am a 2007 HBCU graduate and current doctoral candidate at the University of Arkansas. I am conducting a study on the perceptions of HBCU graduates and alumni giving. Graduates from your alma mater, and one other HBCU has been invited to participate in this study.

This study has two objectives:

1. Provide insight into the reasons why an HBCU graduate may decide not to make a financial contribution to his or her alma mater

2. Provide insight into situations that may hinder an HBCU graduate from having a positive undergraduate experience

The survey will take approximately 10 – 15 minutes to complete. All survey responses are given anonymously. No names, addresses, phone numbers or emails are solicited. Once the survey response time of two and a half weeks has passed, the survey questions will be removed from the Internet and all responses will be printed and kept under lock and key.

Although there is no direct benefit to you as a participant, you will contribute to the small research base on HBCU alumni giving rates. Without participation from HBCU alumni in surveys like this one, researchers and HBCU administrators are unable to effectively tell the stories of HBCU graduates. We can change that with your help and participation. More importantly, findings from the study will help HBCU administrators better understand and address the problems, concerns and barriers that deter HBCU graduates from making a financial commitment to their alma mater. Furthermore, the findings will seek to improve the overall academic and extracurricular experiences of current and future HBCU students. Lastly, HBCU advancement and development administrators can use the data to determine how to improve alumni giving rates.

Participation in this research and completion of this survey are completely voluntary. There are no payments for participation. You are free to refuse to participate in the research and to withdraw from this study at any time. Any decision to withdraw or not participate will bring no negative consequences or penalty to you. Completing this survey serves as your consent to participate in this study.

If you have any questions about this survey, I will be happy to answer them via email. I may be contacted at japope@uark.edu. Thank you in advance for your assistance with this research study.

If you have questions or concerns about this study, you may contact myself or Dr. John Murry at
(479) 575-3082 or by e-mail at jmurry@uark.edu. For questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, please contact Ro Windwalker, the University’s IRB Coordinator, at (479) 575-2208 or by e-mail at irb@uark.edu.

Sincerely,
Jasmine A. Pope

**How would you evaluate the following aspects of your undergraduate academic experience?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course general education requirements</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major educational requirements</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman advising</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising in major</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of faculty</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career placement/advising</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment of faculty to teaching</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of contact with faculty</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of instruction in non-major courses</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of instruction in major courses</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of required courses</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variability of course offerings</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to support system (tutoring, study skills, etc.)</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of general education core into major courses</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library collection</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to computing</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### How would you evaluate the following aspects of your undergraduate extra-curricular experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types of extracurricular opportunities offered</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming environment within the extracurricular opportunities</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of extracurricular offerings</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive environment within the extracurricular experience</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking opportunities within the extracurricular experience</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development opportunities</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within the extracurricular experience</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal growth opportunities provided within the extracurricular experience</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career preparation opportunities within the extracurricular experience</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of extracurricular opportunities</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to work with diverse individuals within the extracurricular experience</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of advisors within the extracurricular experience</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction with extracurricular offerings</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction with extracurricular experience</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
<td>()</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How would you describe your overall experience while attending your alma mater?**

○ ( ) Very dissatisfied
( ) Dissatisfied
( ) Undecided
( ) Satisfied
( ) Very satisfied

How would you describe your level of satisfaction with the decision to attend your alma mater?
( ) Very dissatisfied
( ) Dissatisfied
( ) Undecided
( ) Satisfied
( ) Very satisfied

How would you describe your satisfaction with the academic preparation that you received from your alma mater for your current career?
( ) Very dissatisfied
( ) Dissatisfied
( ) Undecided
( ) Satisfied
( ) Very satisfied

How would you describe your satisfaction with your post-graduation career opportunities?
( ) Very dissatisfied
( ) Dissatisfied
( ) Undecided
( ) Satisfied
( ) Very satisfied

How would you describe your satisfaction with your post-graduation career success?
( ) Very dissatisfied
( ) Dissatisfied
How would you describe your annual income?
[$0 - $20,000 √]

How would you describe your monthly amount of discretionary income?
Discretionary income is defined as total income minus personal income taxes, unemployment insurance premiums and other compulsory payments, and household spending on necessities. What remains is discretionary income which can be spent or saved as one pleases.
[$0 - $250 √]

How often do you attend a religious service?
○ ( ) Never
○ ( ) Annually
○ ( ) Monthly
○ ( ) Weekly
○ ( ) Daily

How would you describe the frequency of your charitable contributions to religious organizations?
○ ( ) Never
○ ( ) Annually
○ ( ) Monthly
○ ( ) Weekly
○ ( ) Daily

Are you an Alumni Association member?
○ ( ) Yes
○ ( ) No

How often do you attend Alumni Association meetings or events?
○ ( ) Never
○ ( ) Annually
○ ( ) Monthly
How often are you contacted via phone, face-to-face, traditional mail services or email by your alma mater on annual basis?

- ( ) Zero
- ( ) Once
- ( ) Twice
- ( ) Three times
- ( ) Four times
- ( ) Five times or more

How often are you asked by a representative from your alma mater via phone, face-to-face, email, or traditional mail services to make a donation to the institution on an annual basis?

- ( ) Zero
- ( ) Once
- ( ) Twice
- ( ) Three times
- ( ) Four times
- ( ) Five times or more

What is the approximate amount of financial contributions that you have made to your alma mater in the last three years?

If you answered $0, which of the following has had the greatest impact on your decision not to make a financial contribution to your alma mater?

[Feelings toward overall academic experience √]

Are there any additional comments that you would like to share about alumni giving and/or your undergraduate experience?
Never submit passwords through Google Forms.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Jasmine Pope  
    John Murry

FROM: Ro Windwalker  
    IRB Coordinator

RE: New Protocol Approval

IRB Protocol #: 14-01-449

Protocol Title: *Why Don't They Give Back?: A Multi-Campus Study of the Lack of Alumni Giving at Historically Black Colleges and Universities*

Review Type: ☐ EXEMPT ☐ EXPEDITED ☐ FULL IRB

Approved Project Period: Start Date: 02/10/2014  Expiration Date: 02/09/2015

Your protocol has been approved by the IRB. Protocols are approved for a maximum period of one year. If you wish to continue the project past the approved project period (see above), you must submit a request, using the form *Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects*, prior to the expiration date. This form is available from the IRB Coordinator or on the Research Compliance website (http://vpreuark.edu/210.php). As a courtesy, you will be sent a reminder two months in advance of that date. However, failure to receive a reminder does not negate your obligation to make the request in sufficient time for review and approval. Federal regulations prohibit retroactive approval of continuation. Failure to receive approval to continue the project prior to the expiration date will result in Termination of the protocol approval. The IRB Coordinator can give you guidance on submission times.

This protocol has been approved for 5,000 participants. If you wish to make any modifications in the approved protocol, including enrolling more than this number, you must seek approval prior to implementing those changes. All modifications should be requested in writing (email is acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact me at 210 Administration Building, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.
HBCU Alumni Giving Survey

Greetings [Name] Graduate!

I am conducting a study on the perceptions of HBCU graduates and alumni giving. Graduates from your alma mater, and one other HBCU have been invited to participate in this study.

This study has two objectives:
1. Provide insight into the reasons why an HBCU graduate may decide not to make a financial contribution to his or her alma mater.
2. Provide insight into situations that may hinder an HBCU graduate from having a positive undergraduate experience.

The survey will take approximately 10 - 15 minutes to complete. All survey responses are given anonymously. No names, addresses, phone numbers or emails are solicited. Once the survey response time of two and a half weeks has passed, the survey questions will be removed from the Internet and all responses will be printed and kept under lock and key.

Click [here](#) to participate in the survey. Thank you for your participation.

Office of Alumni Relations
Appendix D: First Email from Alumni Director at HBCU #2

From: <Bowman>, Nelson Bowman <nebowman@pvamu.edu>
Date: Wednesday, February 19, 2014 at 5:34 PM
To: Nelson Bowman <nebowman@pvamu.edu>
Subject: HBCU Alumni Giving Survey

Greetings University Graduate!

A colleague of mine Jasmine A. Pope, is conducting a study on the perceptions of HBCU graduates and alumni giving. Graduates from Prairie View, and one other HBCU has been invited to participate in this study. Jasmine is a 2007 HBCU graduate and current doctoral candidate at the University of Arkansas.

This study has two objectives:

1. Provide insight into the reasons why an HBCU graduate may decide not to make a financial contribution to his or her alma mater

2. Provide insight into situations that may hinder an HBCU graduate from having a positive undergraduate experience

The survey will take approximately 10 – 15 minutes to complete. All survey responses are given anonymously. No names, addresses, phone numbers or emails are solicited. Once the survey response time of two and a half weeks has passed, the survey questions will be removed from the Internet and all responses will be printed and kept under lock and key. If you have any questions about this survey, please email Jasmine at japope@uark.edu. To take the survey, click the following link: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1dMbrZKWTjK9nUMIT-wBziAbmt4TO-IgngWtyH75RjY/viewform.

Thank you in advance for your assistance with this research study.
From: [mailto:tsualumni@tsu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, Wednesday March 5, 2014 2:36 PM
To: Cochran, Connie L.
Subject: Alumni Survey

HBCU Alumni Giving Survey

Greetings [your name] Graduate!

I am conducting a study on the perceptions of HBCU graduates and alumni giving. Graduates from your alma mater, and one other HBCU have been invited to participate in this study.

This study has two objectives:
1. Provide insight into the reasons why an HBCU graduate may decide not to make a financial contribution to his or her alma mater.
2. Provide insight into situations that may hinder an HBCU graduate from having a positive undergraduate experience.

The survey will take approximately 10 - 15 minutes to complete. All survey responses are given anonymously. No names, addresses, phone numbers or emails are solicited. Once the survey response time of two and a half weeks has passed, the survey questions will be removed from the Internet and all responses will be printed and kept under lock and key.

Click [here](#) to participate in the survey. Thank you for your participation.

Office of Alumni Relations
Greetings Prairie View A&M University Graduate!

A colleague of mine, Jasmine A. Pope, is conducting a study on the perceptions of HBCU graduates and alumni giving. Graduates from Texas Southern University, and one other HBCU, have been invited to participate in this study. Jasmine is a 2007 HBCU graduate and current doctoral candidate at the University of Arkansas.

This study has two objectives:

1. Provide insight into the reasons why an HBCU graduate may decide not to make a financial contribution to his or her alma mater.

2. Provide insight into situations that may hinder an HBCU graduate from having a positive undergraduate experience.

The survey will take approximately 10 – 15 minutes to complete. All responses are given anonymously. No names, addresses, phone numbers or emails are solicited. Once the survey response time of two and a half weeks has passed, the survey questions will be removed from the Internet and all responses will be printed and kept under lock and key. If you have any questions about this survey, please email Jasmine at japope@uark.edu. To take the survey, click the following link: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1dMbrZKWTjK9nUMIT-wBziAAbnt4TO-1nggWtyH75RjY/viewform.

Thank you in advance for your assistance with this research study.
Appendix F: Complete Responses to Open-ended Question

18. Are there any additional comments that you would like to share about alumni giving and/or your undergraduate experience?

- I recently started last year to contribute to My [Redacted] I finally was contacted for support. I Love My HBCU and will be contributing from now own. I got a great Education that prepared me well.

- Currently, I am in graduate/professional school, so my funds are limited. I do have a desire/plan to give back once I have a full-time job

- This is an awesome school. The career fairs and the career placement could be tighter, other than that, there is nothing better in this country, pound for pound [Redacted] is a must attend school!

- I give quite extensively and significantly to my graduate institute as they tend to be more aggressive in soliciting funds. My Alma Mater has just in recent years started calling and typically are asking for very small donation (not significant). In the past, when active in the Alumni Association over 10 yrs ago, I always gave more extensively to the university and supported scholarships. I am very appreciative my my experience and it was quite positive and prepared me well for my career. This survey has prompted me to take a more active role and the initiative to support the Univ. in a greater way & I will follow through with more significant contributions that can qualify for matching funds.

- I contribute as often as I can, and also have purchased alumni license plates for my vehicle. My siblings are doing the same. My college years were simply the best part of my early adult life. I really love me some [Redacted].

- At my class' 50th Reunion, our class presented the University a check for over $312,000.
• I think as a recent graduate, lots of people can't afford to give significant amounts back to the alumni. But once, we are established we don't mind giving back but may not be solicited or in the loop.

• The only time I receive information from the University is when it is a financial contribution request.

• I had an humble start in life and had support from my high school teachers which influenced my decision to attend college. I was in a wholesome and caring learning environment while in college. Despite some of the not-so-desirable experiences, they did not affect my heart. I think one gives from the heart, whether to church, their Alma Mater, or for any other worthy cause generally comes from the heart.

• Horrible experience

• I'm excited to be a part in helping with the build of the new sports center. I can't wait to see my name as an alumni member who helped contribute to the build.

• Although it is hard to give immediately after you graduate, one should give anything possible. Your degree and career make it possible for your success. Your salary is more than a person that do not have a degree. If alumni members do not give to their HBCU, they will fold.

• Answers based on services from the early 1980's.

• Housing was bad. No privacy in dorm room to study. Two selections of meals regardless of diet. No healthy choices.

• Career choice was never available in Career Services.

• The administration at the school was cheap and treated the students who were not their favorite like trash. If you weren't connected you got nothing. The job market knew how
bad you were taught so unless you were an engineer you didn’t get good job offers. The federal government came to my school due to settlement with law suite in Houston and only 3 of was hired and that was because we both had above 3.5 in accounting

- I feel that most HBCU alumni don't give because they were not encouraged to give while they were in school which would instill in them a sense of pride that their contributions would definitely make a difference in any concerns that they felt were problems. In addition, there are many who had bad financial experiences (registration process) who just want to forget about what they really accomplished while attending here that actually helped them to achieve what they have become today.


- For some reason some Alumni wish to wait for someone else to do the work of supporting their school. I choose not to do so. Every generation of alumni must do their part to grow the university for future generations.

- University needs to publicize the alumni giving by name and class to stimulate a culture of giving.

- No, I am sure it depends on their situation and or circumstances.

- "Very satisfied overall. It's very important for Blacks to attend and support our HBCU's, particularly as undergraduates. The HBCU's offer students positive experiences that they cannot receive otherwise."

- I don't understand why alums don't give. I guess they feel they paid for whatever they got, and don't really care about paying it forward.

- Overall, my fellow alumni do not exhibit an obligation to contribute to [ ].

- My undergraduate experience at [ ] very rewarding."
• I contributed to my alma mater within the first 5 years after graduating in 1983. I provided, thorough sponsorship of my employer, over $1 million dollars of lab equipment, internships and job opportunities for students attending my alma mater. AT this time, I only receive request for $$ for a dome...not academics...I am more interested in supporting academic advances...not necessarily sport programs.

• I don't attend alumni association meetings anymore, as they do not seem to be in the business of doing anything, just socially. When I was very active in the organization, our goal was to support the university financially, provide academic scholarships and to recruit students to attend the university. That doesn't seem to be the case now."

• We need more communication.

• "There are many positives about the university. It has a rich history and I had the opportunity to meet some very nice and helpful faculty, staff, and students. The reason why I (and I would presume many others) choose not to give back is the experience that we were put through at the institution. While there I was subject to rude treatment in the transfer process, financial aid, and other areas. The enrollment services is the first impression that many have of the university and the rude treatment set a not so good tone. I support the foundation's goal of raising money to build athletic facilities, but I would like to add that a university is more than just athletic programs. I feel that they should add additional degree programs.

• Upon transferring I had to beg and plead to have my credits transfer over. I ended up taking this matter to the Office of the Provost in order to have it resolved. That did not sit well with me, but after a long process they did end up accepting most of them.
• I can recall one semester that I was on financial aid that the financial aid office told my lender not to disburse the funds until after the payment due date. With that being said I was charged a late fee due to no fault of my own. I went to the financial aid office (after waiting a long time due to many others being there also) to speak with them. After explaining the situation over and over I was told that I would receive the refund. It never came.

• Finally, after graduating I submitted a form to receive a tuition rebate. I was not told this while I was there and I wanted to follow up. They never responded to me. I had to continually track them down with no success.

• I recall protests being held regarding the ineffective financial aid office. Additionally, after graduation I returned to the university for a job fair. Upon registering I said "thank you, Mrs. ____." She immediately insisted that I address her as "Dr. ________." How did she know that I had no such title to be addressed as?

• It all boils down to the rude treatment that was received while I was there. There seemed to be a culture of not caring. Having said that the question comes down to "why would I donate to an institution that seemed to not care about me while I was there?" The faculty were great, but institutionally there is much work to be done. I proudly promote the university, but those experiences still concern me.

• Thank you.

• Yes I plan to make donation to alma mater! Just keep putting it off. I will be making a contribution.
• I was a non-traditional student, and did not participate in extra-curricular activities. I am also a university employee. This may have attributed to more positive experiences than traditional students. PVAMU has been nothing but a blessing in my life.

• I am making a commitment to give more. I want to give back to the school.

• "All three of my children attended and graduated for PVAMU. I think that constitutes for a lot of giving on my part. After all I sent you the best that I have to give and supported academic programs and extracurriculars.

• Why don't you set up a Donations RV on the yard during home coming. I am parked out there every year...?"

• "I had an Awesome experience at PVAMU!! I am a product of numerous family members who attended PVAMU before and even after. I was a member of the Marching Band under the direction of the late J.P. Mosbely. I was a KAPPA Bunny and KAY Queen/Sweetheart for 2 years. I remained on the Dean's list while enjoying EVERY facet of the University experience. Furthermore, I met people at the age of 17 that became good friends then and now at 61 years of age, they are like "family!" So Definitely I am a PROUD AND PRODUCTIVE advocate for PVAMU. I have made it my goal within the last 5 five years to devote some of my funds to the Foundations of PVAMU and I am enthusiastically awaiting the start and completion of the STADIUM COMPLEX. GO PVAMU PANTHERS!!

• I plan to increase my financial support in the future!!

• No
• Proud to be a graduate of [university name]. Please provide graduates with a list of your organized financial projects that will assist [university name]. You have not because you ask not. Let us know how we can help. I will surely do my best.

• If you don't have a system that rewards working and paying your way. You will never get people to give.

• The HBCU experience in general, and the [university name] experience in particular had a very significant positive impact in my development as a man. My classmate and Fraternal relationships have been sustained for more 43 years. [university name] provided me with much needed cultural enrichment. Thank God for the [university name] experiences.

• I am a frequent contributed of my alma mater. My donation increased as my income increased.

• I AM PUZZLED BY THOSE GIVING ZERO...I GUESS WHEN SOME GET OFF THE UNDERGROUND RAILROAD, THEY RUN AS FAR AND AS FAST AS THEY CAN...LIKE THEY ARE ASHAMED!

• Are there any additional comments that you would like to share about alumni giving and/or your undergraduate experience?

• My undergraduate experience was undermined by the lack of cohesiveness in the university. Many faculty and staff are not on the same page with regards to decision-making. My advisor was not knowledgeable about class rotations and availability of classes when advising my on course selection and I was forced to wait a semester for one class. Many times, the advisor and department chair would not agree and often times my and my classmates' schedules were switched by the start of the semester. Additionally, customer service at [university name] is not a high priority. Many staff and faculty treated
students in very unprofessional manner and always had students going from department to department because they were not on the same page with regards to policies and procedures. Had it not been for the extra-curricular opportunities and my extra-curricular advisor that helped many of us navigate the university, many of us would have left the university.

- I don't feel safe to give, because I don't know what [redacted] actually does with the money and have seen and experienced poor communication among various departments."

- HBCU may want to explore payroll pretax deduction which makes it easier for people to contribute. Since it is a tax deduction anyway, it will make it easier for the money to come out and maybe the workplace can send the funds to the institution monthly or quarterly. Doing the deduction automatically and electronically before taxes reduces the burden of having to write a check, or go online to perform that task.

- Although I am a four time graduate, the university seemingly does not acknowledge this, leading to an aura of disrespect.

- The university should conduct campaigns through local churches where alumni are members to offer more opportunities for giving.

- People have to be reminded more often about Giving Campaigns through local media spots, on the internet, as well as billboards along the highways. Reach out to alumni who are not always in the spotlight.

- My concern is on my student debt not giving to my school. Recently, I gave because my debt got lower.

- As for my experience during school, there was not much of any to claim. I worked, had a family to adhere, and school. Those three things took up a lot of my time. Upon
graduation, the career guidance was rather general i.e. lawyer, nurse, grad school for psychology, etc..

- But, I do appreciate the education I received and am very proud to claim [redacted] as my alma mater."

- I am very grateful for the opportunity to have attended [redacted]. I hope to be more mindful of giving back in the future with the resources I have gained because of my success at [redacted].

- I graduated from [redacted] pharmacy school in 1980. Since that time I have never been contacted by a local [redacted] alumni association. At that time maybe 40% of the black pharmacist here in LA were from [redacted]. So I think we really dropped the ball putting a strong alumni group together in this city. I know most of our grads were from Houston...but I've never even heard from them! Back in my day, the Pharmacy school and the Law school was in heart of [redacted], and I believe need to put more effort into organizing those alumni.

- It's tough on fixed income to make significant contributions. Possibly in my will.

- I am a firm believer in giving back to my alma mater in what ever capacity that I am able to do in financial contribution.

- I attended [redacted], '82, giving back is expected.

- A local chapter in my area would be helpful.

- Be nice if the school was into bringing speakers from the community. John Carlos had to speak at Shape Center

- The university lack basic customer service, students are made to feel that they are a burden to administrators's, advisors and some faculty.
• My experience was satisfactory. I just don't have much discretionary income at this time. I would love to give more and I don't mind being asked to give.

• I don't understand how this survey will help determine why HBCU graduates do not "give back" to their alma maters. I think that it is a lack of training by the university/alumni association in re-enforcing the support of the university when they are still undergraduates (a trained behavior). And, perhaps community perception of graduates who graduate from our schools which ultimately leads to no employment opportunities or lower salaries as compared to other non-HBCU colleges. As a result, limited discretionary income.

• The University should be more supportive of the students while they are in school in every way possible. There should be formal activities geared toward careers post-graduation. Alumni should be encouraged to return to the campus. Incentives should be allotted to Alumni who contribute time, talent or treasure to the University.

• Thanks for all the emails

• One reason alumni may feel some type of way about donating is because, the university has had a past record of misappropriating funds and there is a possibility that their hard earned money could be misused or lost. Also due to certain things that happened during their experience at the university, can alter ones opinion about the school's integrity. Some strongly believe that certain things are allowed to happen to students and the university may have shown lack of responsibility for it's faculty's actions, which results in a feeling of not caring about the university because of it's lack of caring for the individual while they were attending.

• No!
I'll always give back to TSU.

Freshman students orientation was the key to the success of graduates back then. I think all HBCU's should have a comprehensive Freshman Orientation that last at least one semester to a year.

The current perception of the university hinders alumni giving. The perception of internal corruption and mismanagement of funding makes givers cautious. TSU must work on improving its perception in the community. Disgruntled employees and staff influence the perception that others have of the university.

Not at this time

TSU needs to make better use of its alumna in helping current students learn about career opportunities and the importance of professional networking

Peace Within. Joyonya! I enjoy being a Alumni.

I think the college could do better by alumni during Homecoming week. Recently there seems to be no regard for traditions that have been a part of the alumni and undergraduate experience for generations. That creates a certain amount of disconnect for those of us who move away from the college and look forward to participating in traditions when we return annually for Homecoming.

When I did contribute did not put money where I told them to

Faculty served as mentors to me during my experience in college.

Initially after graduating, I knew there would be time before I contributed to the university. There were so many factors that contributed to a poor experience at the
university that could not be represented in this survey, although the survey was written well.

- Now 12 years later I am now feeling as if I can financially contribute on some level i.e. the Alumni Association in my current city.
- I was in an alumni association last year and enjoyed the events planned although the meeting is on a night in which I could never attend."
- I am hoping to establish a scholarship foundation within the next 5 years for students attending [blank]. I really do feel like it was the best experience of my adult life. However, when I attended many, many, many years ago, there wasn't as much diversity. Not a big deal, then, although I understand its importance now. I think [blank] has come a long way. There is no alumni assoc where I live; however, I do receive info about school through email.
- I have a life time membership with the [blank] Alumni Association.
- I would like to hear the [blank] Alumni Association on the radio a great deal. This could help obtain new members. The Alumni Association should have a table at all the [blank] Sporting events. Thank you.
- 1) My undergraduate experience was excellent.
   2) I think that all alumni members should give some money to their alma mater no matter how small the amount.
   3) I am very pleased with the advancements my alma mater, [blank] has made for the School, Faculty, Students and Alumni.
- no
I am a [redacted] alumnus, Class of 1957, attempting to provide you the answers you want to your survey, however, I feel that my responses to the individual questions would not, in my opinion, provide you a realistic viewpoint regarding my experience at [redacted] and with the alumni association. Also, during the 1950's the educational and employment situation in [redacted] of strict segregation and discrimination would cause a distorted comparison of my college and workplace experiences in [redacted] with what one may have experienced in other places and institutions in the country. This hinders me from providing concrete answers regarding your survey. Below are other points I wish to make that may explain my viewpoint:

I received a BS in Architectural Engineering and an officer's commission in the Army in 1957. When I entered college in 1953, [redacted] was the only institutional in [redacted] that would enroll Blacks in the School of Engineering. In light of this, I am unable to meaningfully evaluate or compare my engineering education with other [redacted] institutions. Further, upon receiving the degree no companies in Texas would hire me due to their discrimination and segregation practices — not my capacity to perform.

At graduation time and in spite of receiving a degree and commission from [redacted], I left [redacted] angry because I felt that I was mistreated by some professors and the administration, and did not want any future involved with the college. In discussing my experience with younger graduates, I find some of them had a similar feelings as I did after graduation, be it valid or not. While at [redacted], I do not remember being informed about an alumni association. Later during my workplace experience and my joining the local [redacted] Washington DC Chapter alumni, I had a change of heart about [redacted] and began to support.
my college with donations and activities, such as visiting PV to recruit graduating engineers to work for my agency, Dept of Veterans Affairs, and giving speeches to PV students about my experiences as supervisor and manager. I continue to be active in the local alumni chapter and actively donate to PV. I believe I could have done more in broad fundraising last year for our local chapter, but received strong push back from the alumni association regarding my approach to fundraising. Finally, though my achievements and positions held over the years in the workplace, I am thankful for the education provided by PV and my parents, and conclude that the important way to success is by the initiatives and levels of involvement in which individuals apply their talent and ability -- the primarily path to success and eventually to the financial resources to donate to our institutions.