

Who “greens” the field? an examination of donor characteristics and motivations at a division I athletics institution

Abstract

This paper examines athletics donors' characteristics and motivations at a metropolitan Division I university. A volunteer survey consisting of 32 questions to donors of a Division I athletics institution was administered via email. The survey was sent to 2,228 donors and was made available and open for one month (30 days), with email reminders sent to donors. A total of 228 donors completed the survey, nearly a 10% response rate. The survey was analyzed using statistical and observational methods to determine the donor characteristics and their motivations to give to the institution. Results show gender, race, income level, and alumni status influence the donors' decisions to donate to the institution. Primary motivation to donate was affinity to the overall institution, not specifically athletics, which differs from previous research. Conclusion and the implications for future research are provided.

Volume 3 Issue 2 - 2019

Mitsunori Misawa,¹ Adam G Walker²¹Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, USA²Department of Leadership, University of Memphis, USA

Correspondence: Mitsunori Misawa, Ph.D., Adult Learning (PhD) and Adult Education (MS), Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling, College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences, 1126 Volunteer Blvd, 521 Bailey Education Complex, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996, Tel 865-974-5440, Email mmisawa@utk.edu

Received: June 17, 2018 | Published: March 29, 2019

Introduction

The objective of this paper is to investigate the donor motivations and characteristics at a Division I athletics' institution. While some have suggested that athletic donations are not philanthropically based,^{1,2} but rather contributions are for personal gain (tickets, parking, events), our survey aimed to determine athletic donors' primary motivation for giving. A volunteer survey was constructed to evaluate the characteristics and motivations of athletic donors to the institution. The landscape of college athletics is ever evolving and the need to investigate and understand the demographics of a donor base (who “greens the field”), and why they donate is critical. College athletics is a gateway for an institution for many financial supporters. Understanding who they are and what motivates them, will facilitate institutions to better target their gift cycle: identification, qualification, cultivation, solicitation, and stewardship of major gift donors. Factors such as geographic location, age, and income may affect philanthropic.³⁻⁶ This case study incorporates the above variables (location, age, and income), along with other self-identified factors such as gender, race, alumni/friend affiliation, occupation, consecutive years donating, and motivation compared against the amount of donations to determine significance and patterns. The research questions that guided this study were:

- 1) Does the amount of wealth or capacity determine the size of contribution?
- 2) Does previous giving history guide future philanthropy?
- 3) Which characteristics motivate giving?

The implications of this research will enhance future operational policy by determining what factors are associated with increased giving. By understanding these factors, future efforts and resources can be dedicated to these populations and motivations. Limitations and areas for growth are also identified.

Review of literature

Donor identification and affiliation

Psychological identification with a group or organization is

defined as “the perception of sharing experiences of a focal group and sharing characteristics of the group’s members”.⁷ This phenomenon allows individuals to vicariously enjoy the group’s or team’s accomplishments beyond individual capabilities.⁷ When people identify with an organization or team, a sense of connectedness is perceived, and they begin to define themselves in terms of the program – researchers studying this have consistently shown that such feelings lead to increased member loyalty to an organization, and decreased turnover.⁸

Identification is seen as a “perceptual/cognitive construct that is not necessarily associated with any specific behaviors or affective states”.^{9,10} Identification is also “relational and comparative,”^{11,12} meaning that it is defined in individuals compared to other individuals. Although classifications do tend to be categorical, such as gender, the amount of identification experienced is a matter of degree.⁷ Given the relational and comparative nature of individual identification, social identity theory would maintain that individual’s motivation for identifying is partly to increase self-esteem,¹³ thus individuals “tend to invest more of their self-concept in valued personas and tend to view their social identities positively”.¹⁴ As a result, a group failure (team loss) can be quite painful and even debilitating for those who consider themselves members.¹²

Research has suggested that strong emotions of identification lead to brand loyalty, and positive word of mouth.⁸ Donors often identify themselves with a particular team. Identification is also likely to be associated with maintained contact with the organization.⁸ However, brand loyalty and identification differ, while brand loyalty has been defined as “a deliberate prior tendency to purchase a brand, often stemming from positive past experiences with its use,” identification is “necessarily tied to the causes or the goals that an organization embodies”.⁸ Instead of loyalty found from positive experiences, identification reaches a deeper level of connectedness by tapping into the values of an individual which they believe are found in the organization. These levels of definitions would lead an organization to prefer the donors to identify themselves with the department, rather than assert brand loyalty with a positive experience, since identification is longer lasting and deeper. Thus logic would suggest that membership itself would create a sense of belongingness—if an

individual thinks highly of himself or herself, and they are a member of a certain group, said group must certainly be admirable and upstanding in order to deserve their membership. Language can be a tool for cultivating a sense of identification, using a membership-reminiscent vocabulary.

Here an important distinction should be made, as social identification and organizational identification are similar but not identical concepts. While identification allows the individual to vicariously partake in accomplishments beyond his or her powers, organizational identification is a “specific form of social identification where the individual defines him or herself in terms of membership in a particular organization”.⁷ Identification, both social and organizational, is not necessarily a behavioral concept, although it often can lead to behavioral change. It is a perceptual/cognitive construct, and to experience identification, an individual can see themselves as “psychologically intertwined with the face of the group; behavior and affect are viewed only as potential antecedents and consequences”.⁷ In athletic terms identification can be seen in fanatical aspects with vocalization of support, wearing of apparel, and attendance, viewing, or heightened awareness of scheduled games.

Affiliation is the individual motivation to “seek group entry through the act of donation, which provides reassurance that one is a member of the group...group affiliation is usually accompanied by positive feelings of “oneness” or “we-ness”.¹⁵ This “oneness” feeling is consistent with models of organizational identification, and suggests that donation behavior is closely related to similar constructs of cohesiveness, solidarity, sentimentality, and unity.¹⁵ Affiliation is seen as a powerful and motivational force for private giving, as a sense of connection is a determinant for donation behavior. In collegiate athletics, team affiliation can be influenced by the increased sense of community, and make individuals feel involved through their donations. Athletics literature refers to this idea “in a social sense, relating participation in an event with friendships created through sport consumption”.¹⁶ Past studies have shown that identification with a university’s athletics department is a significant predictor of giving behavior.^{7,15}

Given the social identification perspective, “the extent to which a perceived organizational identity influences the level of identification of a member hinges on the attractiveness of the image... the attractiveness of an organizational image depends on the extent to which it enables self-continuity, self-distinctiveness, and self-enhancement”.⁸ Ultimately, identification or lack thereof stems from the concept of self. If the image is attractive, the self-concept would be bolstered if individuals were to align themselves with that organization. If the image is not attractive that they identify with, but individuals finds themselves in need of a self-concept boost, they would logically take whatever steps were necessary to improve the image of the organization with which they identify, both in their own minds and in the minds of peer groups. This would speak to whether the donors identify themselves with the organization (deeper connection) or are simply brand loyal (based on past experiences). This can be seen with downturns of the image of the organization; those that identify with the organization will continue supporting its cause to enhance the image, while those not closely aligned may choose to stop supporting the organization that has a negative experience or image (losing program).

The key therefore is for organizations to develop identification and not just an affiliation based on the brand loyalty (past experiences,

e.g. winning or losing). Social identification researchers suggest that “satisfaction with the organization, the reputation of the organization, frequency of contact, and the visibility of affiliation influence the members’ level of identification”.⁸ Essentially, identification is strengthened if a group member (e.g. donor/fan) believes the organization’s values and goals are aligned with their own values and goals. The stronger the identification is with an organization, the greater likelihood that a member will be satisfied with the organization’s product and results—in addition, strong identification also prompts prolonged retention.⁸ All told, an increase in feelings of identification is linked to an increase in donation behavior intent.⁷ Motivation to give or intent is significantly related to actual giving.¹⁷

Donor motivation

There is a recent shift of people giving more financially than through acts of volunteerism.¹⁸ Therefore, it is important to understand people’s motivation for monetary giving versus their time. Charitable contributions include a moral component, of which a sense of personal obligation is paramount.¹⁹ In research on charitable giving, there have been doubts as to whether altruism even exists, especially in regards to college athletics. Altruism has can be defined as “

- a) An intention to help another person;
- b) That the act is initiated by the helper voluntarily; and
- c) That it is performed without expectation of reward from external sources”.²⁰

Empirical studies have shown that altruistic behavior is based upon feelings of sympathy for another person or cause,^{21,22} but these feelings do not necessarily have to be viewed as the primary motivation for the individual. The feelings can be considered having a value-expressive function in allowing the giving individual to remain true and even bolster personally held norms.^{20,23,24} There are mixed reviews concerning reasons for giving among the literature, including such items as supplying the feeling of heroism, a way of “atoning for sins” or otherwise easing a conscience (sense that the donor owes the organization), or making the giver feel special.²⁰ It is arguably the beneficiary who primarily benefits from a philanthropic exchange, however the donor can benefit greatly psychologically. Most philanthropic gifts are made with no direct or tangible benefit to the giver, and this type of donor motivation is characterized by the psychological benefit known as the “warm glow” effect.²⁵ While some athletics contributors may also exhibit this “warm glow” effect, there are also many tangible benefits associated with their giving (seats, parking, events, gifts, etc.).

When and how much people give is also subject to social norms and individual motivation. It can be reasoned that as the regularity of donation increases, that behavior is strengthened and gradually seen as a strongly held value of the donor. Researchers have found that past behavior is the best predictor of future behavior,²⁶ and some have even argued that past behavior is a more reliable predictor than attitudes or beliefs.²⁷ Therefore, it is essential to focus on donor stewardship and retention. It is much more difficult for an organization to retain a current donor than to cultivate a new donor, and that recurring donor is much more likely to renew the following year. The reasons individuals donate also include attachment to the organization and an expectation of mutual benefit.²⁸ Demonstrated need from an organization can influence one’s propensity to engage in private.²⁹ Satisfaction of the organization’s needs “occurs when individuals

engage in actions that support their individual psychological growth fulfillment...philanthropy is generally a prosocial behavior with intrinsic benefits for the giver”.¹⁵ One of these intrinsic benefits is vicarious achievement, where personal success is achieved through the success of the organization,¹⁵ similar to the theory of identification. As the organization becomes more successful in the eyes of the donor, the psychologically attached individual will feel an increased sense of achievement.

Predictive factors

Demographic variables such as age and income have been found to predict private contributions. The growth rate of donations has been shown to coincide with the age-income profile of donors, however become negative at retirement age.⁶ The percentage of alumni overall who donate to their alma mater is low. The average percentage of alumni in the United States making gifts is 9.2 percent.³¹ Graduates of private institutions are more willing to make a donation than those of public institutions.³² Membership in an alumni association is positively correlated with being a donor to the university, and having positive experiences as alumni.³³ Alumni associations and other donor engagement such as athletic events attempt to successfully foster a sense of camaraderie and exclusivity in their membership services, as a reminder to members of nostalgic days at the institution. Alumni and supporters who are satisfied with their university are more likely to remain engaged with the university than those who are not; engaged alumni are more likely to remain informed regarding university news than those who are not; and informed alumni are more likely to understand the needs of the university and therefore more likely to give than those who are less informed.³⁴ Donors who live within close proximity to their alma mater are more likely to make a contribution.³⁻⁵

Demographic factors influencing giving include age, ethnicity, income, gender, location, and affinity. Researchers have found that older supporters are more likely to give than younger ones.³³ Income is another major determinant, with higher rates of giving for wealthier supporters.³³ Okunade & Berl³⁵ found that married alumni are more likely to donate than non married, and alumni who are married to a fellow alumna or alumnus are more likely to donate. However, other researchers^{3,36,37} have found that unmarried alumni are better prospects than married. Research is also mixed regarding gender. While most studies indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in regards to gender contributions,³⁷⁻⁴⁰ one study found that men are more likely to donate than women.⁵ Another indicated that women are more likely to donate than men.³ Clotfelter³⁸ found that there was no statistically significant difference between the frequency of gifts from men and women, but that men, on average, gave gifts which were twice the size of that from women. Still another study found that women tend to donate more often than men do, and that the largest potential source for significant giving is older women, as women live longer than men and inherit 70% of all estates.¹⁷ When dealing in planned gifts, this is an essential fact to keep in mind. Belfield and Beney³⁶&Holmes⁴¹ also found that the size of donations from women are smaller than those from men, but that women make more frequent gifts than men. While research on gender may be mixed, incorporating

both genders if married in the cultivation and solicitation may be a wise decision.

Methodology

Methodology is a strategy, process or plan behind the choice or use of methods in a research project. Methodology links the choice and use of methods to the desired outcomes. As a road map to the research the choice of methodology provides guidance for the researcher from the beginning of the research to the end. The choice of a specific methodology is based on the researchers’ assumptions about the world and what they view as valuable knowledge. The methodology used in this study to examine the characteristics and motivations of the donors at a Division I institution was through a survey research study and the method used to gather data was an online questionnaire. Survey research provides a quantitative description of trends by studying a sample of the population. Based on the survey research of donors’ characteristics and their motivation to give, the researchers were able to generalize the characteristics and motivations of donors at the institution. Since the purpose of the study was to examine the characteristics and motivation of current donors, the researchers used a survey methodology to capture the nature of the characteristics of the current donors. The questionnaire was chosen as the data collection method for this study because it provided a “numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions” of the donors related to their motivation to give monetary support and contribute to the athletic department. A volunteer survey questionnaire consisting of 32 questions that included questions about demographics, motivations, and characteristics of the donors of a Division I athletics institution was administered via email to 2,228 current donors with email addresses, who had contributed in the most recent fiscal year. The survey was made available and open for one month, with email three (3) reminders sent to donors. The response rate was nearly 10 percent, as 228 donors completed the survey. Results from the survey were analyzed using descriptive statistical methods to determine the characteristics and motivation of the donors. Means, standard deviation (SD), percentages, and averages were calculated based off of the results. These statistics were analyzed to gather characteristics and motivations regarding the donor base.

Results

Table 1 shows the demographic information of the participants of the study. As indicated, most of the participants were White (n=222, 97.4%), men (n=162, 71.1%), and over 55 years old (n=165, 72.4%). Data indicates that White populations are over represented because the institution is a historically White institution and historically the athletics department has been supported by men who tend to like to see men’s sports. In addition, the demographic information about the participants’ age indicates that most of the participants were over 55 (n=165, M=60.5, SD=12.37), which indicates that the participants seem to be in the phrase of generatively. In that identity development phase, people want to make sure that they pass on their resources like finance and knowledge. Since older people give more to the institution, there seems to be a correlation between age and giving as noted by.⁴²

Table 1 Demographic Characteristics of All Respondents to the 2014 Tiger Scholar Fund (TSF) Donor Survey (N = 228)

Characteristic	N	%
Gender		
Male	162	71.10%
Female	66	28.90%

Table Continued....

Characteristic	N	%
Race		
White	222	97.40%
Non-White (African American, Hispanic, Native American/Alaskan, Asian/Pacific Islander, and Mixed)	6	2.60%
Age		
25 or younger	2	0.90%
26-35	8	3.50%
36-45	21	9.20%
46-55	32	14.00%
56-65	77	33.80%
66-75	74	32.50%
76-85	13	5.70%
86 or older	1	0.40%

Table 2 above shows the income of the donors in this study. The researchers of the study wanted to figure out what type of people, in terms of income, contribute to the athletics department in the university. This study indicates that people with annual incomes of more than \$50,000 tend to give money to the institution (n=215, 94.3%). This is similar to the point that Tajfel & Turner^{11,12} made that donors tend to compare with others in terms of how much they make and how much they contribute to the athletics. It functions as a social status to them. Also, surprisingly, over a third (n = 77, 33.8%) of the donors in this study earned more than \$150,000. This is also similar to what Abrams & Hogg,¹³ Gould,⁹ and Turner¹¹ said about donor identification and affiliation. As stated in the literature section, they discussed that individuals have some tendencies to invest or give more to institutions or organizations if they feel those institutions and organizations provide positive direct and indirect benefits. Also, that indicates that the more financial power people have, the more money they seem to donate to the institution.

Table 2 Household Income (N = 228)

Please Identify Your Average Income	N	%
\$0-\$24,000	1	0.40%
\$25,000-\$49,000	12	5.30%
\$50,000-\$74,000	34	14.90%
\$75,000-\$99,000	29	12.70%
\$100,000-\$124,000	38	16.70%
\$125,000-\$149,000	27	11.80%
\$150,000 or more	77	33.80%
Other	10	4.40%

Table 3 shows the alumni status of the participants. In order to obtain the data, the researchers used two questions: Are you alumni of the university? And How many years have you been a donor for the scholarship. Over half of them (n = 153, 67.1%) graduated from the university. This confirmed the point made by Bhattacharya, Rao & Glynn⁸ that if individuals are alumni of the university, they most likely tend to make donation more frequently than non-alumni of the university. Also, Newman & Petrosko's³³ results were echoed; their results indicated that membership in an alumni association is positively

correlated with being a donor to the university and having positive experiences as alumni. Interestingly, over one-quarter of the donors (32.9%) did not graduate from the university, but they nevertheless wanted to contribute to the athletic department of the university. That indicated that a quite large number of non-alumni actually contribute donations to the athletics department at the university.

Table 3 Alumni Status (N = 228) Alumni Status N % Are you Alumni of the University of Memphis? Yes 153 No 75 How many years have you been a Tiger Scholarship Fund Donor?

Alumni Status	N	%
Are you Alumni of the University of Memphis?		
Yes	153	
No	75	
How many years have you been a Tiger Scholarship Fund Donor?		
0-5	42	
6-10	47	
11-15	33	
16-20	24	
21-25	25	
26-30	19	
31 or longer	38	

When looking at the number of years a donor had been a scholarship fund donor, a majority of the donors contributed to the scholarship fund for less than 15 years (n=122, 53.5%). However, 16.7% of them reported that they had been a donor for over 31 years. Of those donors, six out of 38 reported that they had been a donor since the establishment of the athletics department at the university. That indicates that there are many founding supporters among the donors, which Mael & Ashford⁷ referred to as a psychological identification with a group or organization being an important factor for a donor's giving to an athletics program at a university.

Table 4 shows the participants' donation levels, benefits, and satisfaction. For this section, the researchers intended to figure out the

participants’ donation level and determine how satisfied they were in terms of the benefits offered for their donation level. Two questions were asked:

- a) Are the benefits offered at your level sufficient?
- b) What is your scholarship fund donation level?

Table 4 Donation Levels, Benefits, and Satisfaction (N = 228)

Donation Levels, Benefits, and Satisfaction	N	%
Are the benefits offered at your level sufficient?		
Yes	168	0.737
No	60	0.263
What is your scholarship fund donation level?		
\$25-\$99	8	0.035
\$100-\$249	17	0.075
\$250-\$499	26	0.114
\$500-\$999	24	0.105
\$1,000-\$2,499	58	0.254
\$2,500-\$4,999	38	0.167
\$5,000-\$9,999	35	0.154
\$10,000-14,999	10	0.044
\$15,000-\$24,000	8	0.035
\$25,000 and above	3	0.013
Other	1	0.004

Most of the participants (n = 168, 73.3%) indicated that the current benefits that the athletics department offers are sufficient. That means they are satisfied with what they are offered by the athletic department. Like Brady, Noble, Utter, & Smith²⁸ and KO YJ, Rhee, Walker, & Lee¹⁵ discussed, individuals donate because they get satisfaction from the mutual benefits of donating and the material attachment to the organization. However, over one-quarter of the participants stated they did not think the benefits offered at their donor level were sufficient. Further investigations into those who are not satisfied with the donor benefits is necessary in order to better serve donors for the athletics department.

When looking at the participants’ donation levels, most of them, about 89%, donated between \$100 and \$9,999 (n= 198, M=\$2,000). As Brady, Noble, Utter, & Smith²⁸ stated, donors need to have some degree of satisfaction from their donations to athletics departments and programs and to a university in order for them to continue to make donations. So, in order for the athletics department to increase donations, the athletics department will need to strategize ways to sustain current donor satisfaction while increasing the number of the donors who give more than \$10,000. Table 5 shows the participants’ motivation to make donations to the athletics department. The researchers asked one major question to get an idea about donors’ motivations to give. A majority of them (n =190, 83.3%) reported that they simply like to support the university. Like Burgoyne¹⁹ discussed, charitable contributions include a sense of personal obligation to support college athletics. That means that because of the nature of the institution, which is located in an urban setting where there is a strong tie between the institution and the community, donors who are also the members of the community want to see the institution continue to be successful. Also, the second highest motivating factor was that the donors seem to be enjoying the benefits that they are receiving as donors of the scholarship fund.

Table 5 Donor Motivation (N = 228)

Donor Motivation	N	%
What motivates you to donate to the Tiger Scholarship Fund?		
I like to support the university.	190	0.833
I believe a strong college program is important to the university.	4	0.018
I enjoy benefits associated with being a donor	10	0.044
I want to help student-athletes.	4	0.018
I understand the financial needs of the Athletic Dept.	0	0
I love sports.	7	0.031
I like the tax deduction.	0	0
I believe a strong college athletic program is important to the community.	5	0.022
I enjoy being a fan.	6	0.026
Other	2	0.009

Conclusions and implications for future research

The purpose of this study was to investigate the donor motivations and characteristics at a Division I athletics’ institution. The largest predictor of donor motivation was “I like to support the University” suggesting a philanthropic intent and affinity towards the overall institution and not just athletically related benefits. Even though these were athletic donors, athletic motivations were not highly represented.

This is in stark contrast to several studies,¹ in which they conclude the primary benefit is personally motivated by athletically related benefits.

Our study instead found the largest motivation was supporting the overall university and not personal benefits related to athletics. This motivation is similar to KO, Rhee, Walker, & Lee¹⁵ in that there is a sociological behavior and is intrinsically motivated by being a part of a group of donors giving to the same cause. This may be a shift in athletically related philanthropy in which donors have a stronger

affinity towards the overall university and a better understanding of the need for contributions. Such characteristics of the donors enhance the financial ability of the athletic department to compete with enhanced resources for student-athletes and athletic programs. Since most athletic departments are subsidized by the university, philanthropic giving lessens the burden on the institution financially, and frees up those resources for other parts of campus. The results of the study also indicate that the donors could be characterized as an older population. These donors have been donating and been members of the scholarship fund for an extended period of time. There are a larger portion of male donors compared to female donors. A majority of donors are alumni compared to non-alumni or friends. A significant majority of the donors are white/Caucasian, which does not reflect the current demographic at the institution (nearly 35% minority student population). The donors seem to be satisfied by the benefits that they are currently receiving and seem to be the main supporters not only of the athletics department but also of the university and the university community at large. Income of the donors has a positive relationship in regards to their donation level; increasing income level results in larger donations.

Utilizing the donor responses to the survey, the researchers concluded several characteristics and motivations exist in relation to their philanthropy. These include Giving capacity, Intent, Fit, and Timing (G.I.F.T.). Using our GIFT Theory, hypothesizes that each of these characteristics must be present to initiate or maximize philanthropic financial contributions. First the individual must be capable of making a financial contribution (having the financial means to do so), which correlates to giving capacity. The second characteristic that should be present is intent, or being philanthropically inclined. The individual may have the financial means to make a gift, however if they are not intent on being philanthropic, they will not be inclined to contribute. The third trait is fit, or affinity for the project or organization. The individual may have capacity and is philanthropic (possessing the first two traits), but should find the project, organization, or cause worthy in their rational of receiving their financial contribution. The last characteristic is timing; this could be timing in regards to their financial resources (right time of month/year to give), or timing in reference to their generativity. This is part of Eric Erikson's⁴³ Stages of Psychosocial Development;⁴⁴ generativity refers to the sense of one's ability to make a difference on future generations or to give back to humanity. All four of these characteristics should be present for optimal giving. These four characteristics or traits of the GIFT Theory are a confluence of motivators that initiates or maximizes philanthropic contributions. Since this study is one of the first on donor characteristics and motivations at the university, there should be enhanced future studies. The researchers identified that future research should include a survey question asking if these athletic donors also gave to the academic side of the institution. An expanded scale should be introduced in regards to donors' income (highest level was \$150,000+). Since this study solely focused on direct donations and donors in the athletics department, it did not consider other monetary donations to academics. It would be interesting to understand if athletics donors are giving to the other entities or academic departments at the university. Lastly, more research should be done on the introduced GIFT Theory to verify and reinforce the characteristics and motivators of individual philanthropy.

Acknowledgments

None.

Conflicts of interest

The author declares there is no conflict of interest.

References

1. Bass RJ, Achen R, Gordon B. Motivations for athletic giving: Examining don-renewed donors. *Applied Research in Coaching and Athletics Annual*. 2014;30(1):166–186.
2. Tsiotsou R. Motivation for donations to athletic programs. *Cyber Journal of Sport Marketing*. 1988. 140 p.
3. Bruggink TH, Siddiqui K. An econometric model of alumni giving: A case study for a liberal arts college. *The American Economics*. 1955;39(2):65–81.
4. Hueston FR. Predicting alumni giving: A donor analysis test. *Funding Raising Management*. 1992;20(1)18–23.
5. Lindahl WE, Winship C. A Logit model with interactions for predicting major gift donors. *Research in Higher Education*. 1994; 35(6):729–743.
6. Olsen K, Smith AL, Wunnava PV. An Empirical Study of the Life–Cycle Hypothesis with Respect to Alumni Donations. *The American Economist*. 1989;33(2):60–63.
7. Mael F, Ashforth BE. Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 1992;13(2):103–123.
8. Bhattacharya CB, Rao H, Glynn MA. Understanding the Bond of Identification: An Investigation of Its Correlates Among Art Museum Members. *Journal of Marketing*. 1955;59(4):46–57.
9. Gould SB. *Organizational Identification and commitment in two environments*. Lansing: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University; 1975. 47 p.
10. Turner JC. Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1982. 528 p.
11. Tajfel H, Turner JC. *The social identity theory of intergroup behavior Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. 2nd ed. Chicago: Nelson–Hall; 1985. 9 p.
12. Turner JC. *The experimental social psychology of intergroup behavior*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 1981.235 p.
13. Abrams D, Hogg MA. Comments on the motivational status of self-esteem in social identity and intergroup discrimination. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 1988;18(4):317–334.
14. Burke PJ, Franzoi SL. Studying situations and identities using experiential sampling methodology. *American Sociological Review*. 1988;53(4):559–568.
15. KO YJ, Rhee YC, Walker M, et al. What Motivates Donors to Athletic Programs: A New Model of Donor Behavior? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 2014;43(3):523–546.
16. Milne GR, McDonald MA. *Sport marketing: Managing the exchange process*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett; 1999. 169 p.
17. Sun X, Hoffman SC, Grady ML. A Multivariate Causal Model of Alumni Giving: Implications for Alumni Fundraisers. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*. 2007;7(4):307–332.
18. Carey C. Renewing the spirit of volunteerism: Recent studies on charitable giving suggest Americans are donating more to charities and nonprofits, but are giving less of their time. *ABA Banking Journal*. 2016;108(5):132–156.

19. Burgoyne CB, Young B, Walker CM. Deciding to give to charity: A focus group study in the context of the household economy. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*. 2005;15(5):383–405.
20. Radley A, Kennedy M. Charitable Giving by Individuals: A Study of Attitudes and Practice. *Human Relations*. 1955;48(6):685–706.
21. Batson CD. How social an animal? The human capacity for caring. *American Psychologist*. 1990;25:336–346.
22. Fultz J, Batson CD, Fortenbach VA, et al. Social evaluation and the empathy–altruism hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1986;50(4):19–27.
23. Clary EG, Snyder M. A functional analysis of altruism and prosocial behavior: The case of volunteerism. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1991;12(2):119–148.
24. Schwartz, S. Normative influences on altruism. *Advances in experimental social psychology*. 1977;10:221–279.
25. Sargeant A, Woodliffe L. Building donor loyalty: The antecedents and role of commitment in the context of charity giving. *Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing*. 2007;18(2):47–68.
26. Connor M, Norman P, Bell R. The theory of planned behaviour and healthy eating. *Healthy Psychology*. 2002;21(2):195–201.
27. Bozionelos G, Bennett P. The theory of planned behaviour as predictor of exercise: The moderating influence of beliefs and personality variables. *Journal of Health Psychology*. 1999;4(4):517–529.
28. Brady MK, Noble CH, Utter DJ, et al. How to give and receive: An exploratory study of charitable hybrids. *Psychology & Marketing*. 2002;19(11):919–944.
29. Merchant A, Ford JB, Sargeant A. Charitable organizations’ storytelling influence on donors’ emotions and intentions. *Journal of Business Research*. 2010;63(7):754–762.
30. Robinson MJ, Trail GT. Relationships among spectator gender, motives, points of attachment and sport preference. *Journal of Sport Management*. 2005;19(1):58–80.
31. Lauerman J. *College Donations Slowed in 2012 as Alumni Giving Dropped*. Bloomberg. 2013.
32. Harrison WB. College relations and fund–raising expenditures: Influencing the probability of alumni giving to higher education. *Economics of Education Review*. 1995;14(1):73–84.
33. Newman MD, Petrosko JM. Predictors of Alumni Association Membership. *Research in Higher Education*. 2011;52(7):738–759.
34. Pearson J. Comprehensive research on alumni relationships: Four years of market research at Stanford University. *New Directions for Institutional Research*. 1999;26(1):5–21.
35. Okunade AA, Berl RL. Determinants of charitable giving of business school alumni. *Research in Higher Education*. 1977;38(2):201–214.
36. Belfield CR, Beney AP. What determines alumni generosity? Evidence for the UK. *Education Economics*. 2008;18(1):65–81.
37. Monks J. Patterns of giving to one’s alma mater among younger graduates from selective institutions. *Economics of Education Review*. 2003;22(2):121–130.
38. Clotfelter CT. Who are the alumni donors? Giving by Two Generations of Alumni from Selective Colleges. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*. 2003;12(2):119–138.
39. Marr KA, Mullin CH, Seigfried JJ. Undergraduate financial aid and subsequent alumni giving behavior. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*. 2005;45:123–143.
40. Okunade AA. Graduate school donations to academic funds: Micro–data evidence. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*. 1966;55(2):213–229.
41. Holmes J. Prestige, charitable deductions and other determinants of alumni giving: Evidence from a highly selective liberal arts college. *Economics of Education Review*. 2008;28(1):18–28.
42. Wunnava PV, Lauze MA. Alumni giving at a small liberal arts college: Evidence from consistent and occasional donors. *Economics of Education Review*. 2001;20(6):533–543.
43. Erikson EH. *Childhood and Society*. New York, NY: WW. Norton & Company. 1950. p. 242.
44. Council for Advancement and Support of Education. *Fundraising Fundamentals*. 2015.