To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Phyllis Lee Bohannon entitled "A Demographic Profile and Attitudinal Study of Donors to the Tennessee 4-H Program." I have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Agricultural and Extension Education.

Randol G. Waters, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Associate Vice Chancellor
and Dean of The Graduate School

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master's degree at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, I agree that the Library shall make available to borrowers under rules of the Library. Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of the source is made. Permission for extensive quotation from or reproduction of this thesis may be granted by my major professor, or in his absence, by the Head of Interlibrary Services when, in the opinion of either, the proposed use of the material is for scholarly purposes. Any copying or use of the material in this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature Phyllis Lee Bohannon

Date 4-29-92

A DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE AND ATTITUDINAL STUDY OF DONORS TO THE TENNESSEE 4-H PROGRAM

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Science

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Phyllis Lee Bohannon

May, 1992

AG-VET-MED.
THESIS
92
.B632

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to
my parents, Mr. and Mrs. J. D. Bohannon.
Without their love, support, and
encouragement, achieving my
goals would never have been possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation to the many individuals who were a part in the completion of this study. I want to especially thank Dr. Randol G. Waters, the chair of my committee, for his interest, support, and leadership during completion of this study. Appreciation is also expressed to the other members of my committee Dr. Roy R. Lessly, Dr. Greg K. Pompelli, and Ms. Teresa Goddard. Without their guidance, the study could not have been accomplished. Also, a special thanks to Teresa for presenting this idea to me. I wish I could name every individual who has been an inspiration to me during the completion of this work, but space will not allow it. I would like to thank all of the Extension Agents I have met during Extension Winter School because they truly helped me decide that a career in Extension is worthwhile. A special thanks to Cynthia McCall and Bo Freeman who helped me get through my first graduate class, to Beth Bell and Randall Kimes for showing me the ropes, and to Nancy Graham, Katherine Wallace, and Catherine Jessee who always had listening ears. The best part of Winter School may have been "Pickin' and Grinin'" in 1992. Of course, I have to thank everyone in the Department of Ag. & Ext. Education for putting up with me for two years, especially Missy, Glendon, and Mioko for all their help when I needed it. I would also like to thank all of the undergraduate and graduate students who helped me out when it was time to mail the questionnaires. Again, I would like to thank my parents for their continued support because without them, I would not be where I am today.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was twofold. The first purpose was to develop a demographic profile of the individual and corporate donors to the Tennessee 4-H program. The second purpose was to measure these donors' attitudes toward the Tennessee 4-H program and determine if attitude in any way affected the donors' contributions to the Tennessee 4-H program.

The final sample was composed of 567 randomly selected individual and corporate donors. The donors returned a mailed questionnaire developed to measure donors' total opinion of the Tennessee 4-H program, perceptions about the 4-H objectives, perceptions about the life skills 4-H attempts to teach youth, and gather demographic information.

The individual donors were described according to gender, age, residence, education, involvement with 4-H, employment status, income, and philanthropic history. Corporate donors were described according to gender, age, involvement with 4-H, employment status, and philanthropic history. Additionally, the demographic variables were described along with their relationship to the donors' philanthropic giving patterns.

The attitude measurements were described along with their relationship to the demographic variables and were correlated with philanthropic giving patterns.

The study revealed that the majority of donors, both individual and corporate, were male. Most were aged 30 to 44 or 45 to 59 and had B.S. degrees or advanced degrees.

Descriptive statistics and appropriate inferential tests were used in the analysis.

The demographic variables were compared with the philanthropic giving pattern to determine if any relationships existed. According to the findings, the demographic variable education had a relationship to the amount of money contributed in 1990-91 for individual donors and corporate donors. Those donors with bachelor's degrees and those with advanced degrees indicated donating more money to 4-H in 1990-91 than those with a high school education.

From the donors responding, the majority of the individual donors indicated they would be receptive to a more aggressive fund raising campaign for the Tennessee 4-H program. However, of the corporate donors responding, the majority would not be receptive to a more aggressive fund raising campaign.

Finally, there was no correlation found between donors' attitudes about 4-H and their philanthropic giving patterns.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Need for the Study 3
Purpose of the Study 4
Objectives 5
Definition of Terms 6

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE 7

History of Tennessee Foundation and
National 4-H Council 7
Attitudes 10
Summary 17

III. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES 19

Subjects 19
Instrumentation 19
Procedures 21
Data Analysis 22
Objectives 22

IV. DISCUSSION OF DATA 24

Findings 26

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 92

Summary 92
Comparison With Other Studies 97
Conclusions and Implications 97
Recommendations for Further Study 98

BIBLIOGRAPHY 101

APPENDIXES 105

Appendix A 106

Appendix B 114

VITA 122

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Demographic Profile of Tennessee 4-H Donors	27
2.	Demographic Characteristics Regarding Times and Amounts Contributed to 4-H	37
3.	Contributions to 4-H	38
4.	Demographic Profile of Individual Tennessee 4-H Donors	41
5.	Individual Donors' Demographic Characteristics Regarding Times and Amounts Contributed to 4-H	50
6.	Individual Donors' Contributions to 4-H	52
7.	Demographic Profile of Corporate Tennessee 4-H Donors	54
8.	Corporate Donors' Characteristics Regarding Times and Amounts Contributed to 4-H	61
9.	Corporate Donors' Contributions to 4-H	62
10.	T-Test for Dollars Donated in 1990-91 by Individual Donors and Gender	65
11.	ANOVA for Dollars Donated in 1990-91 by Individual Donors and Age	65
12.	ANOVA for Dollars Donated in 1990-91 by Individual Donors and Residence	65
13.	ANOVA for Dollars Donated in 1990-91 by Individual Donors and Education	65
14.	Table of Means for Dollars Donated in 1990-91 by Individual Donors and Educations	66
15.	ANOVA for Dollars Donated in 1990-91 by Individual Donors and Income	66

16. T-Test for Dollars Donated in 1990-91 by Individual Donors and Career 66

17. T-Test for Number of Times Donated in Past 10 Years by Individual Donors and Gender 69

18. ANOVA for Number of Times Donated in Past 10 Years by Individual Donors and Age 69

19. ANOVA for Number of Times Donated in Past 10 Years by Individual Donors and Residence 69

20. ANOVA for Number of Times Donated in Past 10 Years by Individual Donors and Education 69

21. ANOVA for Number of Times Donated in Past 10 Years by Individual Donors and Income 70

22. T-Test for Number of Times Donated in Past 10 Years by Individual Donors and Career 70

23. T-Test for Dollars Donated in 1990-91 by Corporate Donors and Gender 72

24. ANOVA for Dollars Donated in 1990-91 by Corporate Donors and Age 72

25. Means for Dollars Donated in 1990-91 by Corporate Donors and Age 72

26. T-Test for Dollars Donated in 1990-91 by Corporate Donors and Career 72

27. T-Test for Number of Times Donated in Past 10 Years by Corporate Donors and Gender 73

28. ANOVA for Number of Times Donated in Past 10 Years by Corporate Donors and Age 73

29. T-Test for Number of Times Donated in Past 10 Years by Corporate Donors and Career 73

30. T-Tests for Individual Donors' Attitudes About 4-H and Gender 77

31. ANOVAs for Individual Donors' Attitudes About 4-H and Age 77

32. Means for Individual Donors' Total 4-H Opinion and Age 78

33. ANOVAs for Individual Donors' Attitudes About 4-H and Residence 78

34. ANOVAs for Individual Donors' Attitudes About 4-H and Education 79

35. ANOVAs for Individual Donors' Attitudes About 4-H and Income 79

36. T-Tests for Individual Donors' Attitudes About 4-H and Career 80

37. T-Tests for Corporate Donors' Attitudes About 4-H and Gender 83

38. ANOVAs for Corporate Donors' Attitudes About 4-H and Age 83

39. Means for Corporate Donors' Total 4-H Opinion and Age 84

40. T-Tests for Corporate Donors' Attitudes About 4-H and Career 84

41. Correlation Coefficients Between Individual Donors' Attitudes About 4-H and Their Philanthropic Giving Patterns 88

42. Correlation Coefficients Between Corporate Donors' Attitudes About 4-H and Their Philanthropic Giving Patterns 90

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION

Tennessee 4-H is a non-profit organization that has approximately 2,900 individual and corporate donors contributing to it. This study characterized a demographic profile of Tennessee 4-H donors and assessed some of the donors' attitudes about 4-H. These attitudes may be an indication why these donors chose to contribute to this particular non-profit organization.

4-H has long been regarded as a worthwhile organization for young people. "The County Agent", a painting by Norman Rockwell is the stereotypic perception of 4-H by much of the public. The scene of the painting includes a girl and her show calf, the County Agent pointing out the girth of the calf, a brother and a sister ready to share their 4-H projects, and proud, but apprehensive parents looking on with intense interest. Many still visualize this image or one similar to this when asked about 4-H. Of course, the Extension Service's first responsibility in 4-H is working with rural youth. However, 4-H is experiencing changes to meet the changing needs of society. Small towns as well as metropolitan cities have active 4-H clubs. What began as the corn clubs and canning clubs of the early 1900's has evolved into the largest informal youth education program for both rural and urban youth (Wessel and Wessel, 1982).

With the passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914, 4-H and youth development became an integral part of the Cooperative Extension Service (Reck, 1952). Adults realized that youth needed a way to learn some of the life skills that would aid in developing them into useful, productive citizens.

The 4-H Club is the informal youth education program of the Cooperative Extension Service and is conducted by the U. S. Department of Agriculture, State Land-Grant Universities, county governments and combines the work of federal, state and local Extension staff and volunteer leaders. Participation in the 4-H program is open to all interested youth, regardless of race, color, sex, creed, national origin, or handicap. Participants are primarily between the ages 9 and 19 and reside in every demographic area; farm, city, and in between. (Wessel and Wessel, 1982 p. 331).

In Tennessee, Extension Service personnel work with volunteer leaders, advisory boards, school administrators, and faculty to provide a variety of 4-H programs for youth. Some examples of ways to participate in the Tennessee 4-H program include organized 4-H clubs, 4-H special interest or short-term groups, 4-H school enrichment programs, 4-H camping, and individual 4-H projects.

The mission of 4-H is to "assist youth in acquiring knowledge, developing life skills, and forming attitudes that will enable them to become self-directing, productive and contributing members of society" (Wessel and Wessel, 1982). With the help of parents, volunteer leaders and a host of others, the 4-H mission is carried out. There are many ways that 4-H members experience the learn-by-doing educational process. Some of these include participation on judging teams, completing project book activities, and attending 4-H camps. The 4-H program is also involved in international programs and conferences. These along with national, regional, state, district, county, and local activities are helping youth develop and apply leadership skills, a positive self-concept,

and respect and cooperation when working with others. The most recent statistics indicate there are approximately 5 million youth involved in the youth education program of the Cooperative Extension Service. Since 1914 over 40 million youth from all states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and Guam have participated in 4-H (Wessel and Wessel, 1982).

NEED FOR THE STUDY

At its onset, 4-H used visual demonstrations and challenging activities as a means of further educating rural youth and their parents. Today, 4-H continues to educate rural and urban youth about citizenship, leadership, and personal development with a variety of activities. To continue projects like those mentioned above and encourage and develop new activities, financial support is necessary to keep 4-H a leading youth organization. The 4-H program can no longer assume that its donors know all of the objectives and goals of the organization. Of course, 4-H works with rural youth; however, a number of 4-H members now reside in an urban setting. These urban 4-H members may work on different activities than the rural 4-H members. Because of residential changes and a number of other related demographic changes, 4-H objectives have changed to meet the needs of the 4-H members. Changes like these may not be obvious, and 4-H donors may not be aware of the changes in contemporary 4-H programming. A non-profit organization, like 4-H, cannot effectively solicit funds if the organization's goals and objectives are not known by donors. There was a need to learn more about the people who support 4-H financially in Tennessee. Specifically, there was a need to assess the attitudes of these donors and determine if there was a relationship between these attitudes

and their understanding of the goals and objectives of the organization. Additionally, the donors' attitudes were studied and described to determine if attitude related to their giving patterns. For 4-H to continue to elicit the desired donor responses and reach potential donor audiences, information about the 4-H program and its mission must be shared. The Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation, Inc. allows continued 4-H growth. Much of the financial assistance for Tennessee 4-H comes from private contributions; much of this assistance is generated from the Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation, Incorporated. A summarized history of the Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation, Inc. is included in the Review of Literature.

The State 4-H office and the Board of Directors of the Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation, Inc. indicated a need for a demographic profile of current donors to Tennessee 4-H. There was not a record of who makes up the donor audience. Any non-profit organization such as 4-H needs to express its objectives and goals to its donors if it expects continued success in donor contributions. The Tennessee State 4-H staff, like the leaders in any non-profit organization, wanted to learn what motivates its donors to give.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to identify demographic characteristics of the Tennessee 4-H donor audience and then study the relationship of these demographic characteristics to donors' attitudes about 4-H and their giving patterns to charitable organizations. A number of characteristics were studied to determine if there was a difference in giving patterns among donors based on varying demographics. This study

developed a demographic profile of donors to the Tennessee 4-H program. The study explored the relationships among certain factors of philanthropic giving and possible reasons why people give to the Tennessee 4-H program. The study evaluated donors' general attitude about the Tennessee 4-H program, the donors' beliefs about the Tennessee 4-H objectives, and the value of the various components comprising the Tennessee 4-H program.

OBJECTIVES

The following objectives were developed to accomplish the overall purpose of the study:

1.) to develop a demographic profile of 4-H donors by describing the following characteristics

A. gender

B. age

C. residence

D. education

E. involvement with 4-H

F. employment status

G. income

H. philanthropic history,

2.) to study the relationships between the demographic variables and respondents' philanthropic giving patterns,

3.) to study the relationships between the demographic variables and respondents' attitudes about 4-H, and

4.) to study the relationship between respondents' attitudes about 4-H and their philanthropic giving patterns.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

For purposes of this study, it is necessary to define a number of terms which have particular meaning related to this analysis. These terms follow.

Donor- For purposes of this study, a donor was defined as either a private individual or a person responsible for the management of corporate donations. The corporate donor representative may have been the person in a corporation who actually decides how much money is contributed to 4-H from the corporation, or it may have been the person who represents 4-H efforts when it is time for funds to be distributed to charitable organizations. In other words, the corporate representative is the person who should understand the most about the Tennessee 4-H program.

Potential donor- those people on the mailing list who have not contributed to 4-H in 1990 or 1991 but may have contributed at a time prior to these years. These potential donors were used as a comparison of current donors and those not donating to 4-H.

Attitude- summation of donors' opinion about the total Tennessee 4-H program and the donors' perceptions about the 4-H objectives and the life skills 4-H attempts to teach youth.

Philanthropic giving pattern- defined as the amount of money contributed to 4-H in 1990-91 by the individual or corporate donor and the number of times a donor had contributed to 4-H in past ten years.

CHAPTER II.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This review of literature addresses the history of the National 4-H Council and the Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation, Incorporated and identifies appropriate supporting studies and information related to attitudes and motivations of donors to charitable organizations. It also identifies how certain demographic information may influence donor giving patterns.

HISTORY OF TENNESSEE FOUNDATION AND NATIONAL 4-H COUNCIL

Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation, Incorporated

The Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation was legally incorporated April 10, 1953. (Goddard, 1983). There is no documented evidence as to why the Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation was established but most likely it was because the Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service found it increasingly difficult to handle the privately donated funds for the 4-H program. The Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service shares a unique relationship with the Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation, Inc. The Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation, Inc. is a private, non-profit organization that has the objective of enriching, through financial support, the programs and activities of Tennessee 4-H which are staffed, managed, and promoted by the professionals of the Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service. Its history is in part due to the establishment of the National 4-H Foundation. According to personal discussion with the State 4-H office, the name, National 4-H Foundation, has since changed to National 4-H Council (T. Goddard, personal communication, February 25, 1992).

During the 1940's 4-H grew in many directions. National 4-H Camp had begun, and there was talk of an international exchange program. However, for these and many other plans to work, it was obvious that 4-H needed an avenue with which to handle privately donated funds. The National 4-H Committee had been accustomed to managing money for the 4-H club, but this was really not part of their purpose so the idea for a National 4-H Foundation evolved.

> At the meeting of the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (hereinafter referred to as ECOP) in September, 1948, the 4-H subcommittee formally requested approval for plans to establish a 4-H Foundation. ECOP agreed to the request and established a committee to prepare a constitution, bylaws, and other necessary procedures to create a foundation. At the next meeting in November, ECOP approved a proposed constitution and agreed that a 4-H Foundation should be incorporated under the laws of Delaware to receive funds and operate programs not otherwise possible under existing restraints on Extension. Wessel and Wessel (cited in Goddard, 1983, p. 5) The Extension Service announced the establishment of the National 4-H Club Foundation of America on November 19, 1948; ECOP had approved the idea for establishing a foundation. The National Foundation's charter empowered it to receive funds and endowments given to 4-H and administer the money for educational purposes. Edward W. Aiton took leave from the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) in January 1951, to become the first executive director of the National 4-H Club Foundation. He did much work to further secure property for the

National 4-H Center and to initiate the International Exchange Program. On February 14, 1951 the National 4-H Center was dedicated. "Following the dedication of the 4-H Center, Aiton outlined fund-raising and program plans for the coming years... The first item of business he suggested was the creation of the National 4-H Club Builders' Council. Perhaps the most ambitious proposal was a plan to raise $10 million by 1955." (Wessel and Wessel, 1982 p. 70). From the beginning, the National 4-H Foundation took the steps to initiate fund-raising for a total 4-H program.

During this same time period, Tennesseans were following the example of the National 4-H Foundation and became one of twelve states to establish a state foundation. During the first few years of its existence, the Tennessee 4-H Foundation could not generate the funds as it intended. As time passed, numerous suggestions were made as to how to run the foundation. In the 1960's the foundation simply handled the funds for State 4-H Congress. Then in 1979, the foundation hired an employee to work with the State 4-H Office to establish guidelines for resource development.

Members of the foundation include persons, firms, partnerships, corporations, or associations that are "nominated jointly by the Dean of the Agricultural Extension Service, University of Tennessee, and the President of the 4-H Club Foundation if approved by the Board of Directors" (Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws, 1953/1988). All of those who contribute money or gifts to Tennessee 4-H are not members of the Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation, Inc. The Foundation members' goals are seeking funds for 4-H programming. (Goddard, 1983). As of 1991, the by-laws of

the Tennessee 4-H Foundation, Inc. were amended. The membership status of the Foundation members has changed to the following:

> Any person, partnership, firm or association who contributes at the donor level of $25.00 or more and expresses an interest in actively supporting the Foundation's activities shall be invited to become a member of the Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation, Inc., for the next fiscal year and shall have full voting rights (Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws 1953/1991).

These are the current qualifications one must meet to be eligible for membership in the Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation, Inc. Other membership changes were made regarding qualification of century, perpetual, additional, and honorary lifetime members. All members of the Foundation in 1991 shall remain as members until the 1993 annual meeting, unless the member requests his/her name be dropped. At that time, the privileges of membership will be eliminated unless the member qualifies under the new qualifications.

ATTITUDES

Defining Attitude

The word attitude is a common term; one in which most people have a general idea of its meaning; however, the meaning has changed through the years. Originally meaning a "person's bodily position or posture", the term attitude now refers to a "person's posture of the mind" (Allport, 1935), rather than the body. A survey of the literature indicates measuring a population's attitude requires inferences because attitudes cannot be measured in any direct manner. Even when measuring attitudes with a type

of attitudinal scale the degree of the behaviors and beliefs of the respondents will be different. This may ultimately affect the validity of an opinion study relying on attitudes (Oskamp, 1977). Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) indicate the effectiveness of attitude measures as predictors of behavior are not accurate. This is because attitudes are based on opinions, not researched facts. An attitude is an attempt to measure or make an inference about an individual's opinion on a particular subject, and this measure may be different in different situations. Grunig and Hunt (1984) state the following: "attitudes are also held on the individual level. They are evaluations about objects or ideas and suggest an orientation to the object. Attitudes are what people say about images they have".

Before any attempt can be made to determine an individual's attitude, the components comprising an attitude need to be studied. This may be more easily accomplished by saying what an attitude is not. According to Allport (1935), who developed a much cited, comprehensive definition of attitude, an attitude is not a behavior. It is not something a person does; it is a preparation for a behavior or an inclination to act in a particular way.

The two methods used to measure attitude for this particular study include Semantic Differentials and Likert-scales. A Semantic Differential gives a quantitative rating of an attitude using a variety of bi-polar adjectives about an individual's attitude toward a subject area. The Likert-scales used in the study give a summation of an attitude using a number of statements that respondents rate whether or not they are in agreement or disagreement of the statements.

Attitudes Toward Giving

According to Giving USA (1990), the nineties will experience a change in public attitudes toward giving. There has been a shift in motivation by donors; they would now rather donate more to programs and charities where there seems to be a need. Youth groups, such as boy scouts, girl scouts, and 4-H, received an average of $28 per household in 1990. Donors are expressing their values through private contributions. Research is now showing that people contribute money to non-profit organizations for a number of specific reasons. According to a March 1989 poll by the Roper organization, 86 percent of the people polled surveyed "whether the organization's programs serve its purpose or mission" to be the primary factor when deciding to give to a charitable organization. Based on in-depth interviews with 2,727 American adults, conducted by the Gallup Organization (Giving and Volunteering in the United States, 1990), $96.4 million was contributed by individuals and corporations in 1989. Donors to Tennessee 4-H are a part of this group. Additionally, the Roper (1989) study reports that of the 86 percent of Americans who donate to organizations, 54 percent are volunteers to the organization(s) they donate to.

There are a number of demographic characteristics that have been associated with individuals who donate to non-profit organizations. Anne L. Bailey (1990) stated that women generally give less money to charitable organizations than men. In 1989, women averaged giving $693 per person while men averaged giving $1,294 per person. Bailey also indicated that the "average American adult" individual gave $734 to charitable organizations in 1989. Youth organizations were among the largest beneficiaries of

increases in charitable giving from the years 1987-1990. The Bailey study also indicated the wealthy give proportionately less than the middle or poor classes. However, there is no definition given to clarify the wealthy class or subsequently the middle and poor classes of society. According to the Gallup Poll (1990), of those with incomes between $75,000 and $100,000, 92 percent made charitable donations in 1989. Another demographic characteristic to consider is age of the donors. The Chronicle of Philanthropy (October, 1990) reports the largest percentage of donors to charitable organizations (86 percent) are in the 35-44 age range. These are known as the "baby boomers", and this age group is advancing into its giving years. This is the peak earning time for the "baby boomers", and they begin to contribute more time and money to charity at this time in life. Another study by Yankelovich, Skelly, and White, as cited in Ledingham's study (1988) extended the age range from 35-64 years old and stated that these are the most likely people to contribute to charitable organizations. Furthermore, those 50 to 64 years of age are the biggest contributors to charitable organizations. The Gallup study of 1989 supports the Yankelovich et. al study as it indicates that 79.4 percent of those aged 55-64 donate to charitable organizations closely followed by 76.3 percent of those aged 45-54.

There is usually not a single reason for a contribution to be made to an organization. However, there is likely to be an incentive to make a contribution. This incentive may even be from one's peers. (Keating, Pitts, and Appel, 1981).

Ledingham's (1988) study on public image and reasons that people give found the public contributes to charitable organizations because they expect to have services

rendered in return. From this perspective, charitable services are seen not unlike a packaged product, with donors weighing the worth of the anticipated services in the same way a consumer considers the attributes of a product. "The donor offers money to the organization and the organization offers an understanding that the funds will be distributed to and used by the member organizations." (Keating et. al cited in Ledingham p. 9). In other words, donors to charitable organizations give with expectations of their donations being used to benefit that particular organization.

A survey of the literature has indicated a number of psychologies that influence donor motivation. According to Weinberg's study (1988) there are identifiable patterns of motives that influence individuals who make gifts to non-profit institutions. Weinberg relayed the following reasons as relevant when donors decide to give:

Belief in a cause- For example, individuals who have been involved in 4-H as youth know the benefits that can be gained by participating whether these be monetary or personal benefits. As a result, these individuals are inclined to give because they believe in the cause of the organization as a result of participating.

Challenge of making an impact- Individuals become excited with the prospect of making a gift that is large enough to assure the success of a campaign or program, whether it is a youth club or a social organization for adults.

Compelling need to benefit personally- This involves selfish but powerful motives, i.e., an individual may fear death so to "buy salvation" a large gift may provide acceptance for that individual.

Desire to help others- This strong motivator constitutes the basis for developing most cases for donating support and is one of mankind's highest values.

Feeling of loyalty and obligation- These noble motives relate to appreciation for personal or family help, benefits, past family service to an organization, remembrance of a key person and love of past participation in an organization.

Need to be recognized- Most people want to be recognized, appreciated, approved of and remembered, some for the present among peers (competition and power) and some for posterity (or immortality). Memorial contributions attest to this need.

Response to being asked for a gift- Most people like to be asked. Development officers and fund raisers place this as the most important motive and priority.

Combination of motives- Although there is usually a dominant motive, more than likely, several motives are at work and are therefore influential in making a donation.

Socio-economic "status" values- Most donors give to peer-level friends and leaders and do not give or give less to those below their status. It simply works that way.

Weinberg's study further states some basic truisms of giving: people give to people, not to institutions; people give for people; donors make major commitments to winning causes, not to needy organizations; and the habit of giving generates generosity. Individuals who give every year consistently give more generously in succeeding years. The organization is more personalized as time passes. Finally, the study relates that business leaders look to private philanthropic organizations to increase their ability of public relations excellence in the corporate world.

The Gallup Poll supports Weinberg's study presenting individual and corporate donors' positive attitudes toward giving. Personal values, motives of those donors experiencing a joy for helping a cause, and increasing opportunities for others, are other possible personal incentives for individual and corporate donors.

Bailey's report on the Gallup Poll findings also tell why some individuals and corporations have stopped contributing to charitable organizations. Of the individuals and corporations who have ended their giving 18 percent did so because they suspected a misuse of their donations, 17 percent lacked money to continue giving, and 12 percent felt a distrust about the organization. In this same report, 19 percent of the individual and corporate donors polled were first time contributors to an organization. Youth development received 9 percent of the first time donor group's contributions. Thirty percent of these individual and corporate donors made a first-time gift because they had received a letter asking them to give, while 23 percent had been asked to give by someone they knew well and 17 percent had received a phone call asking them to give. Following are other ways of contacting donors for contributions to organizations (Bailey 1990):

- someone coming to the door and asking for a contribution
- being asked at work to donate
- reading/hearing a news story about an organization
- seeing a television commercial asking for a donation
- being asked to give in a special campaign

The following reasons were found by the Gallup Poll (1990) as major motivations individual donors have about giving:

- feeling that those who have more should help those with less
- gaining a sense of personal satisfaction
- meeting religious beliefs or commitments
- insuring the continuation of activities, organizations, or institutions from which my family has received benefit
- giving back some of the benefits I have been given
- serving as an example to others
- being asked to contribute by a personal friend or business associate
- fulfilling a business or community obligation
- creating a remembrance of me or my family
- being encouraged by an employer
- tax considerations and deductions

SUMMARY

Tennessee has a great number of donors to the 4-H program. It is important that an accurate demographic record of these donors is known especially for future reference. Knowing who makes up the donor audience is a way to provide this reference. Descriptive research was needed so benchmarks could be established for future study. As the 4-H program changes to meet the needs of society, there will be some changes in organizational structure, educational teaching methods and clientele. Without benchmark studies, there can be less certainty to the direction and degree of change in

4-H educational efforts. A demographic profile of current 4-H donors can now be used to learn who comprises the audience of Tennessee 4-H donors and how their attitudes about the Tennessee 4-H program may relate to their giving patterns to the Tennessee 4-H program.

Evidence strongly supports the notion that the more positive an attitude is about an idea or situation, the more likely support will be in the form of financial assistance. From the review, it can be concluded that the key elements influencing donor motivation are (1) belief in an organization; (2) excitement over possibility of making an impact; (3) individual benefits such as altruism; and (4) the need to be recognized or remembered.

CHAPTER III.

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

SUBJECTS

There are approximately 2,900 names on the donor and potential donor list to the Tennessee 4-H program. A random sample of 567 subjects was drawn from all of the current 4-H donors that are included in the mailing list of the Tennessee 4-H Foundation. The sample size of 567 was adequate to allow greater than 95 percent confidence in findings, assuming the respondents were non-biased.

INSTRUMENTATION

After a review of literature related to this particular study, two questionnaires were developed consisting of four sections of an attitudinal and demographic nature (see Appendix A and Appendix B). There were separate questionnaires for the individual and corporate donors. The questionnaires were color coded to distinguish the difference between the two subgroups in the sample. Questions were developed to study respondents' attitudes about the 4-H program and potential reasons they donate to this particular organization and to provide demographic information to the State 4-H office about these donors. The attitude questions were the same for the individual and corporate donors. These questions were developed after reviewing much literature about motivation for contributing to charitable causes. Questions were developed after also reviewing alumni and donor studies from other states; however, no other study addressing these specific objectives was identified.

The demographic questions varied for the individual and corporate donors because different information was needed from these two groups. For example, this research was not concerned with where a corporation was located. On the other hand, it was important to learn the place of residence of the individual donors. There may be differences in a donor's giving pattern depending on his/her place of residence.

The first section of the questionnaire included a Semantic Differential scale indicating extreme opinions about the Tennessee 4-H program. This section measured an individual or corporate donor's opinion about the total 4-H program. The individual or corporate donor's attitude about the 4-H program was compared to the philanthropic giving pattern to determine if there was a relationship between amount of money contributed and attitude regarding the 4-H club.

The second section of the questionnaire was comprised of ten items related to the individual or corporate donor's attitude regarding the objectives of the Tennessee 4-H program. A Likert-scale was developed to measure the respondents' positive and negative beliefs about these 4-H objectives. These objectives were taken from the Volunteer Leaders' Handbook for Tennessee (1986). After measuring a donor's attitude about the Tennessee 4-H objectives, the donor's philanthropic giving pattern to 4-H was compared to the attitude measure. Then, there was an analysis to determine if there was a relationship between the respondent's attitudes and the philanthropic giving pattern.

The third attitude measure was constructed with another Likert-type scale. These statements were designed to study respondents' perceptions of the 4-H program's ability to effectively teach the various life skills. "Life skills" were identified in the

questionnaire and explained and respondents were asked to respond by indicating how effective individual 4-H activities were in accomplishing these life skills.

Finally, the fourth section identified demographic characteristics about Tennessee 4-H donors. A study of the relationship between these demographic variables and respondents' philanthropic giving patterns was conducted. Also, the relationship between demographic characteristics and respondents' attitudes about the 4-H Club was studied.

PROCEDURES

This research was completed by the use of a mail questionnaire. It was examined by a panel of experts to increase content validity prior to mailing. The questionnaire was pilot tested using the Board of Directors for the Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation, Inc. as respondents to gather additional validity and reliability information. Suggestions made from the panel and results of the pilot test were used to improve the instrument before it was mailed to the respondents.

The questionnaire was mailed to each of the respondents and included a pre-addressed, stamped return envelope. Also included were instructions for completing and returning the surveys. A response date was identified to ensure efficient return responses.

A cover letter was designed to explain the purpose of this study and to encourage participation from the selected respondents. The questionnaires were coded for ease of data analysis; however, respondents were assured of confidentiality of their responses.

Follow-up procedures as outlined in Dillman's book, Mail and Telephone Surveys The Total Design Method (1978), were utilized for those non-respondents at the

appropriate time. Approximately, two weeks after sending out the questionnaires, a second questionnaire was sent to non-respondents. Four weeks following this, the response rate was assessed. An analysis was done between early and late respondents. This analysis indicated no apparent differences between early and late respondents so it was assumed that this sample was like the entire population.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data from this questionnaire was analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistics. The main frame computer at the University of Tennessee Computing Center in Knoxville was used to analyze the data. The Statistical Package for the Social Scientist Software package was used to summarize the data (SPSS release 4.0, SPSS Reference Guide, 1990). An alpha level of .05 was selected for all probability testing.

OBJECTIVES

Demographic Information

Demographic characteristics were described using frequency counts and percentages of the respondents' answers. Frequency counts described the sample population. Six frequency tables were developed to fully describe the demographic variables in the study. Additionally, three tables of means were developed to describe the remainder of the demographic variables in the study. Frequencies and percentages were used to describe gender, age, residence, education level, involvement with 4-H, employment status, income, and philanthropic history of the total group of donors and of the individual donors. Corporate donors were not asked residence, education level,

and income. Means and standard deviations were used to describe the amount of money contributed to 4-H and the number of times contributed to 4-H in the past ten years.

Demographic Variables and Philanthropic Giving Pattern

A series of T-tests and ANOVA's were used to test the relationship between the dependent demographic variables and the independent philanthropic giving pattern variables.

Demographic Variables and Attitude Toward 4-H

T-tests and ANOVA's were again used to test the relationship between the dependent demographic variables and the independent attitudes about 4-H. For objectives two and three, a separate analysis of variance test was run on each of the sets of variables. When the F-statistic indicated a significant relationship existed, post hoc tests were run on those independent variables which contained more than two categories.

Relationship Between Attitude Toward 4-H and Philanthropic Giving Pattern

Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to determine the relationship between attitude toward 4-H and philanthropic giving pattern. Each of the three independent variables comprising attitude toward 4-H was correlated with the two dependent variables comprising philanthropic giving pattern.

CHAPTER IV.

DISCUSSION OF DATA

Questionnaires were mailed to 567 donors of the Tennessee 4-H Club. Of this total, 66 were mailed to corporate donors, and 501 were mailed to individual donors. These names were randomly selected from the mailing list of Tennessee 4-H donors obtained from the Tennessee State 4-H Office.

Prior to questionnaires being mailed, two pilot tests were conducted to ensure validity of the questionnaire's content. The first pilot study was conducted with the Tennessee 4-H Foundation Board of Directors. Since this group had some prior knowledge of the research being conducted, it was decided to randomly select another 30 donors from the mail list to complete the questionnaire. The questionnaire was edited based upon the results of the pilot to improve its face and content validity.

There was a 31.5 percent response rate to the initial mailing. One hundred forty-eight individuals and 31 corporate donors responded. Approximately two weeks after the first mailing, a follow-up questionnaire was mailed to non-respondents which resulted in the return of an additional 51 questionnaires for a total response rate of 40.5 percent. Of those surveys returned, 15 were non-usable due to incomplete data making the overall usable response rate 37.9 percent. An analysis of differences between early and late respondents failed to produce any evidence that early and late responders differed significantly, so additional mailings and phone surveys were not made as it was assumed that late responders were similar to non-

responders (Goldhor, 1972). It was concluded that findings from this sample were generalizable to the larger population from which it was drawn.

The data were analyzed according to the objectives of the study which were:

1. to develop a demographic profile of 4-H donors by describing their following characteristics,

A. gender

B. age

C. residence

D. education

E. involvement with 4-H

F. employment status

G. income

H. philanthropic history,

2. to study the relationships among the demographic variables and respondents' philanthropic giving patterns,

3. to study the relationships among the demographic variables and respondents' attitudes about 4-H, and

4. to study the relationship among respondents' attitudes about 4-H and their philanthropic giving patterns.

FINDINGS

Demographic Profile of Tennessee 4-H Donors

The first objective of the study was to develop a demographic profile of the Tennessee 4-H donors. Demographic information sought from individual donors included gender, age, place of residence, education, employment status, income, involvement with 4-H, and philanthropic history. Corporate donors were asked to respond to all of the prior items except place of residence, education, and income. Table 1 summarizes the demographic data for all participants.

Donor Type. Data in Table 1 report there were 177 (82.3 percent) individual donors and 38 (17.7 percent) corporate donors.

Gender. As reported in Table 1, 148 (68.8 percent) were male and 66 (30.7 percent) were female. There was one case (.5 percent) of missing data.

Age. Respondents indicated their age by selecting one of four mutually exclusive age categories ranging from 18 to over 60. As reported in Table 1, 15 (7.0 percent) of the respondents were from 18 to 29 years old, 72 (33.5 percent) were from 30 to 44 years old, 68 (31.6 percent) were from 45 to 59 years old, and 59 (27.4 percent) indicated they were 60 years of age or older. There was one case (.5 percent) of missing data.

Residence. Respondents indicated their place of residence by selecting one of seven mutually exclusive categories. These were collapsed to five categories when it was apparent that some of these did not apply to the respondents. As reported 66 (30.7

TABLE 1. DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF TENNESSEE 4-H DONORS

Characteristics		Respondents	
		Number	Percent
Donor Type			
Individual		177	82.3
Corporate		38	17.7
	Total	215	100.0
Gender			
Male		148	68.8
Female		66	30.7
Missing		1	0.5
	Total	215	100.0
Age			
18 to 29		15	7.0
30 to 44		72	33.5
45 to 59		68	31.6
60 years or older		59	27.4
Missing		1	0.5
	Total	215	100.0
Residence			
Farm		66	30.7
Rural Non Farm		25	11.6
Town		24	11.2
City		60	27.9
Missing*		40	18.6
	Total	215	100.0
Education			
High School or Below		13	6.0
Some College		37	17.2
Bachelor's Degree		43	20.1
Some Graduate Study		24	11.2
Advanced Degree		59	27.4
Missing*		39	18.1
	Total	215	100.0

Table 1 (continued)

Characteristics		Respondents Number	Respondents Percent
Involvement with 4-H			
4-H Alumni			
Yes		159	74.0
No		55	25.5
Missing		1	0.5
	Total	215	100.0
Serve(d) as 4-H Volunteer Leader			
Yes		110	51.2
No		104	48.3
Missing		1	0.5
	Total	215	100.0
Spouse 4-H Alumni			
Yes		78	36.3
No or Not Applicable		135	62.8
Missing		2	0.9
	Total	215	100.0
Spouse serve(d) as 4-H Volunteer Leader			
Yes		56	26.0
No or Not Applicable		156	72.6
Missing		3	1.4
	Total	215	100.0
Are/were your child(ren)/ grandchild(ren) 4-H members			
Yes		106	49.3
No or Not Applicable		108	50.2
Missing		1	0.5
	Total	215	100.0

Characteristics		Respondents Number	Respondents Percent
Involvement with 4-H (con't)			
Parents 4-H members and/or 4-H Volunteer Leaders			
Yes		74	34.4
No		138	64.2
Missing		3	1.4
	Total	215	100.0
Relatives, friends, and/or neighbors 4-H members or Volunteer Leaders			
Yes		198	92.1
No		15	7.0
Missing		2	0.9
	Total	215	100.0
Employees and/or employers 4-H Volunteer Leaders			
Yes		90	41.9
No		117	54.4
Missing		8	3.7
	Total	215	100.0
Employment Status			
Agriculture		105	48.8
Non-Agriculture		106	49.3
Missing		4	1.9
	Total	215	100.0
Income			
Less than $25,000		20	9.3
$25,000 to $34,999		26	12.1
$35,000 to $44,999		32	14.9
$45,000 to $64,999		40	18.6
$65,000 or Greater		39	18.1
Missing*		58	27.0
	Total	215	100.0

Table 1 (continued)

Characteristics		Respondents Number	Respondents Percent
Philanthropic History			
Religious Organizations			
Yes		168	78.1
No		46	21.4
Missing		1	0.5
	Total	215	100.0
Arts			
Yes		32	14.9
No		182	84.6
Missing		1	0.5
	Total	215	100.0
FFA			
Yes		47	21.9
No		167	77.6
Missing		1	0.5
	Total	215	100.0
Girl and/or Boy Scouts			
Yes		67	31.2
No		147	68.3
Missing		1	0.5
	Total	215	100.0
YMCA and/or YWCA			
Yes		8	3.7
No		206	95.8
Missing		1	0.5
	Total	215	100.0
Campfire Girls			
Yes		1	0.5
No		213	99.0
Missing		1	0.5
	Total	215	100.0
Educational Organizations			
Yes		105	48.8
No		109	50.7
Missing		1	0.5
	Total	215	100.0

Table 1 (continued)

Characteristics		Respondents Number	Respondents Percent
Philanthropic History (con't)			
Health Organizations			
Yes		70	32.5
No		144	67.0
Missing		1	0.5
	Total	215	100.0
4-H			
Yes		120	55.8
No		94	43.7
Missing		1	0.5
	Total	215	100.0
FHA			
Yes		18	8.4
No		196	91.1
Missing		1	0.5
	Total	215	100.0
Junior Achievement			
Yes		9	4.2
No		205	95.3
Missing		1	0.5
	Total	215	100.0
Other			
Yes		52	24.2
No		162	75.3
Missing		1	0.5
	Total	215	100.0
Last Time Contributed to 4-H			
3 years ago or less		110	51.2
4 to 6 years ago		11	5.1
7 to 9 years ago		3	1.4
10 or more years ago		8	3.7
Missing		83	38.6
	Total	215	100.0

*These questions were not asked to corporate donors.

percent) indicated residing on a farm, 25 (11.6 percent) indicated living in a rural non farm area, 24 (11.2 percent) indicated living in a town, 60 (27.9 percent) indicated they lived in a city, and 40 (18.6 percent) were not reported. Thirty-eight of these cases were corporate donors who were not asked this question.

Education. Respondents were asked to respond to their education level by selecting one of nine mutually exclusive categories. The nine were collapsed to five because the categories did not apply to some of the respondents. As reported in Table 1, 13 (6.0 percent) of the respondents had a high school education or less, 37 (17.2 percent) had some college, 43 (20.1 percent) indicated they had a bachelor's degree, 24 (11.2 percent) had some graduate study, 59 (27.4 percent) had an advanced degree, and 39 (18.1 percent) were not reported. Thirty-eight of these cases were corporate donors who were not asked this question.

4-H Involvement. Respondents were asked to answer a series of questions regarding their involvement with 4-H. Responses to these questions were weighted equally and summed to develop a "total 4-H involvement score" which was used in later analysis. However, responses to the individual involvement questions are reported in Table 1. As reported in Table 1, 159 (74 percent) of the respondents were 4-H alumni, and 55 (25.5 percent) were not. The remaining .5 percent failed to answer this question. Almost as many donors had never served as volunteer leaders as those who had. One hundred ten (51.2 percent) of responding donors currently served or had served as 4-H volunteer leaders and 104 (48.3 percent) had never served as volunteer leaders.

As reported in Table 1, 78 (36.3 percent) of the respondents had spouses who were 4-H alumni, 135 (62.8 percent) spouses were not 4-H alumni or the question was not applicable and 2 (.9 percent) of the respondents failed to answer this question. Fifty-six (26.0 percent) of the respondents indicated their spouse had served or currently served as a 4-H volunteer leader, 156 (72.6 percent) indicated their spouse had not served as a volunteer leader or this question was not applicable, and 3 (1.4 percent) of the respondents failed to answer this question.

One hundred six (49.3 percent) of the respondents indicated they had children and/or grandchildren who had been 4-H members, 108 (50.2 percent) indicated they did not have children and/or grandchildren involved in 4-H or this question was not applicable, and one respondent (.5 percent) failed to answer this question.

Seventy-four (34.4 percent) of the respondents had parents who had participated in 4-H or had served as 4-H volunteer leaders, 138 (64.2 percent) indicated their parents had not participated in 4-H, and 3 (1.4 percent) failed to answer the question.

One hundred ninety-eight (92.1 percent) of the responding donors had some involvement with 4-H by knowing some relatives, friends, or neighbors who are/were 4-H members and/or 4-H volunteer leaders, 15 (7.0 percent) indicated no 4-H involvement in this manner, and 2 (.9 percent) of the respondents did not answer this question.

Finally, 90 (41.9 percent) of the respondents had employees and/or employers who served or had served as 4-H volunteer leaders, 117 (54.4 percent) indicated they

did not have employees and/or employers involved with 4-H as volunteer leaders, and 8 (3.7 percent) failed to answer this question.

Employment. The respondents had the opportunity to indicate a specific career title. Some examples of agricultural careers were agricultural sales, production agriculture, and Agriculture Extension Service. Non-agriculture career titles included medical/dental career, government, and non-agriculture education. Ultimately, the researcher combined these titles to agriculture or non-agriculture career categories. One hundred five (48.8 percent) of those responding selected an agriculture career title, 106 (49.3 percent) selected a non-agriculture title, and 4 (1.9 percent) did not answer this question.

Income. The respondents were asked to indicate their annual income by selecting one of five mutually exclusive categories. As reported in Table 1, 20 (9.3 percent) were in the less than $25,000 income range, 26 (12.1 percent) were in the $25,000 to $34,999 income range, 32 (14.9 percent) were in the $35,000 to $44,999 income range, 40 (18.6 percent) were in the $45,000 to $64,999 income range, 39 (18.1 percent) were in the $65,000 or greater income range, and 58 (27.0 percent) of the respondents failed to answer this question. Thirty-eight of those not responding were corporate donors who were not asked this question.

Philanthropic History. The donors' philanthropic history included a number of charitable organizations; each respondent could check as many organizations as he/she contributed to. One hundred sixty-eight (78.1 percent) of the respondents checked religious contributions, 46 (21.4 percent) did not and 1 (.5 percent)

respondent did not answer this question. Thirty-two respondents (14.9 percent) contributed to the arts, 182 (84.6 percent) did not and 1 (.5 percent) did not answer this question; 47 (21.9 percent) indicated they donated to FFA, 167 (77.6 percent) indicated they did not contribute to FFA, and 1 (.5 percent) failed to answer this question; 67 (31.2 percent) checked Girl and/or Boy Scouts, 147 (68.3 percent) did not, and 1 (.5 percent) did not answer this question; 8 (3.7 percent) indicated a donation to the YMCA and/or YWCA, 206 (95.8 percent) indicated they did not contribute to either of these organizations, and 1 (.5 percent) did not answer this question; 1 (.5 percent) indicated contributing to Campfire Girls, 213 (99.0 percent) indicated they did not contribute to Campfire Girls, and 1 (.5 percent) did not answer this question; 105 (48.8 percent) checked educational organizations, 109 (50.7 percent) did not check educational organizations, and 1 (.5 percent) failed to answer this question; 70 (32.5 percent) indicated they had donated to health organizations, 144 (67.0 percent) indicated they had not donated to health organizations, and 1 (.5 percent) failed to answer the question; 120 (55.8 percent) indicated contributing to 4-H, 94 (43.7 percent) indicated they did not contribute to 4-H, and 1 (.5 percent) failed to answer the question; 18 (8.4 percent) indicated contributing to FHA, 196 (91.1 percent) indicated they did not contribute to FHA, and 1 (.5 percent) did not answer the question; 9 (4.2 percent) of the respondents checked Junior Achievement, 205 (95.3 percent) did not check Junior Achievement), and 1 (.5 percent) failed to answer the question; 52 (24.2 percent) indicated contributing to other organizations,

162 (75.3 percent) indicated they did not contribute to other organizations, and 1 (.5 percent) did not answer the question.

Also making up the donors' philanthropic history were questions relating to the last time contributed to 4-H, number of times contributed to 4-H in ten years, and the amount contributed to 4-H at the local, district, and state levels in 1990-91. As reported in Table 1, 110 (51.2 percent) of the respondents contributed to 4-H in the last three years, 11 (5.1 percent) contributed 4 to 6 years ago, 3 (1.4 percent) contributed 7 to 9 years ago, 8 (3.7 percent) contributed 10 or more years ago, and 83 (38.6 percent) did not answer this question.

Table 2, a table of means, reports the intervally scaled variables that summarize the number of times contributed to 4-H in 10 years, and the amounts donated to 4-H at the local, district, and state levels. As reported in Table 2, respondents reported giving an average of 5.44 times (s.d.= 9.91). Individual responses ranged 0 to 99 times contributed to 4-H in 10 years. As indicated by those responding, the amount contributed locally to 4-H averaged $90.00 (s.d.= 278.38), the district mean was $32.37 (s.d.= 117.60), and the state mean was $293.81 (s.d.= 1241.49). The range of contributions was from $0 to $10,000.

Designated for Specific Fund. Other information which is summarized in Table 3 is whether or not the donation was designated for a specific scholarship or fund, how a donor was contacted for a donation, and whether the Tennessee 4-H program should attempt a more aggressive fund raising campaign. Of those contributing, 67 (31.2 percent) designated the money be used for a specific scholarship or fund; 69

TABLE 2. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS REGARDING TIMES AND AMOUNTS CONTRIBUTED TO 4-H

	Respondents	
Characteristics	x	s.d.
Times Contributed to 4-H in 10 Years	5.44	9.91
Amount Donated to 4-H Local	90.00	278.38
Amount Donated to 4-H District	32.37	117.60
Amount Donated to 4-H State	293.81	1241.49

TABLE 3. CONTRIBUTIONS TO 4-H

Characteristics		Respondents Number	Respondents Percent
Donate to a Specific Scholarship or Fund			
Yes		67	31.2
No		69	32.1
Missing		79	36.7
	Total	215	100.0
Contacted Personally for a Donation			
Yes		67	31.2
No		95	44.2
Missing		53	24.6
	Total	215	100.0
Contacted by Mail for a Donation			
Yes		46	21.4
No		116	54.0
Missing		53	24.6
	Total	215	100.0
Percent Contacted by Telephone for a Donation			
Yes		18	8.4
No		144	67.0
Missing		53	24.6
	Total	215	100.0
Contacted by Other Methods for a Donation			
Yes		18	8.4
No		144	67.0
Missing		53	24.6
	Total	215	100.0
Should 4-H Attempt a More Aggressive Fund Raising Campaign			
Yes		88	40.9
No		78	36.3
Missing		49	22.8
	Total	215	100.0
Would you Contribute More if There was Such a Campaign			
Yes		90	41.9
No		82	38.1
Missing		43	20.0
	Total	215	100.0

(32.1 percent) did not, and 79 (36.7 percent) did not answer this question. The question may not have applied to them because they had not contributed to 4-H or they simply may have chosen not to answer the question.

Contacted for Donation. Sixty-seven (31.2 percent) of the donors were contacted personally for a donation, 95 (44.2 percent) had not been, and 53 (24.6 percent) did not answer the question; 46 (21.4 percent) of the donors had been contacted by mail, 116 (54.0 percent) had not, and 53 (24.6 percent) failed to answer the question; 18 (8.4 percent) were contacted by telephone, 144 (67.0 percent) had not been contacted by this method, and 53 (24.6 percent) did not answer this question; 18 (8.4 percent) were contacted by some other means for a 4-H donation, 144 (67.0 percent) had not been contacted by some other means, and 53 (24.6 percent) did not answer this question.

Fund Raising Campaign. Eighty-eight (40.9 percent) thought Tennessee 4-H should attempt a more aggressive fund raising campaign, 78 (36.3 percent) did not think Tennessee 4-H should do this, and 49 (22.8 percent) did not answer this question. Ninety (41.9 percent) would contribute more if such a campaign were to occur, and 82 (38.1 percent) would not contribute anymore for various reasons, and 43 (20.0 percent) failed to answer this question.

Demographic Profile of Individual Donors

Where Table 1 dealt with both individual and corporate donors, Table 4 shows the findings of only the individual donors. An individual donor is defined as a private individual contributing to the Tennessee 4-H program.

Gender. As reported in Table 4, 115 (65.2 percent) were male and 61 (34.5 percent) were female. There was one case (.3 percent) of missing data.

Age. Respondents indicated their age by selecting one of four mutually exclusive age categories ranging from 18 to over 60. As reported in Table 4, 13 (7.3 percent) of the respondents were from 18 to 29 years old, 59 (33.3 percent) were from 30 to 44 years old, 55 (31.1 percent) were from 45 to 59 years old, and 49 (27.7 percent) indicated they were 60 years of age or older. There was one case (.6 percent) of missing data.

Residence. Respondents indicated their place of residence by selecting one of seven mutually exclusive categories. These were collapsed to five when it was apparent that some of the categories did not apply to the respondents. As indicated 66 (37.3 percent) indicated residing on a farm, 25 (14.1 percent) indicated living in a rural non-farm area, 24 (13.6 percent) indicated living in a town, 60 (33.9 percent) indicated they lived in a city, and 2 (1.1 percent) failed to answer this question.

Education. Respondents were asked to indicate their education level by selecting one of nine mutually exclusive categories. The nine categories were collapsed to five because the several categories did not apply to some of the respondents. As reported in Table 4, 13 (7.3 percent) of the respondents had a grade school or high school

TABLE 4. DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF INDIVIDUAL TENNESSEE 4-H DONORS

Characteristics		Respondents	
		Number	Percent
Gender			
Male		115	65.2
Female		61	34.5
Missing		1	0.3
	Total	177	100.0
Age			
18 to 29		13	7.3
30 to 44		59	33.3
45 to 59		55	31.1
60 years or older		49	27.7
Missing		1	0.6
	Total	177	100.0
Residence			
Farm		66	37.3
Rural Non Farm		25	14.1
Town		24	13.6
City		60	33.9
Missing		2	1.1
	Total	177	100.0
Education			
High School or Below		13	7.3
Some College		37	20.9
Bachelor's Degree		43	24.3
Some Graduate Study		24	13.6
Advanced Degree		59	33.3
Missing		1	0.6
	Total	177	100.0
Involvement with 4-H			
4-H Alumni			
Yes		137	77.4
No		39	22.0
Missing		1	0.6
	Total	177	100.0

Table 4 (continued)

Characteristics		Respondents Number	Respondents Percent
Involvement with 4-H (con't)			
Serve(d) as 4-H Volunteer Leader		98	55.4
Yes		78	44.1
No		1	0.5
Missing	Total	177	100.0
Spouse 4-H Alumni			
Yes		66	37.3
No or Not Applicable		109	61.6
Missing		2	1.1
	Total	177	100.0
Spouse serve(d) as 4-H Volunteer Leader			
Yes		51	28.8
No or Not Applicable		123	69.5
Missing		3	1.7
	Total	177	100.0
Are/were your child(ren)/ grandchild(ren) 4-H members			
Yes		93	52.5
No or Not Applicable		83	46.9
Missing		1	0.6
	Total	177	100.0
Parents 4-H members and/or 4-H Volunteer Leaders			
Yes		68	38.4
No		107	60.5
Missing		2	1.1
	Total	177	100.0

Characteristics		Respondents Number	Respondents Percent
Involvement with 4-H (con't)			
Relatives, friends, and/or neighbors 4-H members or Volunteer Leaders			
Yes		166	93.8
No		9	5.1
Missing		2	1.1
	Total	177	100.0
Employees and/or employers 4-H Volunteer Leaders			
Yes		67	37.9
No		103	58.2
Missing		7	3.9
	Total	177	100.0
Employment Status			
Agriculture		85	48.0
Non-Agriculture		89	50.3
Missing		3	1.7
	Total	177	100.0
Income			
Less than $25,000		20	11.3
$25,000 to $34,999		26	14.7
$35,000 to $44,999		32	18.1
$45,000 to $64,999		40	22.6
$65,000 or Greater		39	22.0
Missing		20	11.3
	Total	177	100.0
Philanthropic History			
Religious Organizations			
Yes		157	88.7
No		19	10.7
Missing		1	0.6
	Total	177	100.0

Table 4 (continued)

Characteristics		Respondents Number	Respondents Percent
Philanthropic History (con't)			
Arts			
Yes		23	13.0
No		153	86.4
Missing		1	0.6
	Total	177	100.0
FFA			
Yes		29	16.4
No		147	83.0
Missing		1	0.6
	Total	177	100.0
Girl and/or Boy Scouts			
Yes		57	32.2
No		119	67.2
Missing		1	0.6
	Total	177	100.0
YMCA and/or YWCA			
Yes		5	2.8
No		171	96.6
Missing		1	0.6
	Total	177	100.0
Campfire Girls			
Yes		1	0.6
No		175	98.8
Missing		1	0.6
	Total	177	100.0
Educational Organizations			
Yes		86	48.6
No		90	50.8
Missing		1	0.6
	Total	177	100.0

Table 4 (continued)

Characteristics		Respondents Number	Respondents Percent
Philanthropic History (con't)			
Health Organizations			
Yes		61	34.5
No		115	64.9
Missing		1	0.6
	Total	177	100.0
4-H			
Yes		88	49.7
No		88	49.7
Missing		1	0.6
	Total	177	100.0
FHA			
Yes		7	3.9
No		169	95.5
Missing		1	0.6
	Total	177	100.0
Junior Achievement			
Yes		3	1.7
No		173	97.7
Missing		1	0.6
	Total	177	100.0
Other			
Yes		45	25.4
No		131	74.0
Missing		1	0.6
	Total	177	100.0
Last Time Contributed to 4-H			
3 years ago or less		81	45.8
4 to 6 years ago		11	6.2
7 to 9 years ago		3	1.7
10 or more years ago		8	4.5
Missing		74	41.8
	Total	177	100.0

education, 37 (20.9 percent) had some college, 43 (24.3 percent) indicated they had a bachelor's degree, 24 (13.6 percent) had some graduate study, 59 (33.3 percent) had an advanced degree, and 1 (.6 percent) failed to answer this question.

4-H Involvement. Respondents were asked to answer a series of questions regarding their involvement with 4-H. Responses to these questions were weighted equally and summed to develop a "total 4-H involvement score" which was used in later analysis. However, responses to the individual involvement questions are reported in Table 4. As reported in Table 4, 137 (77.4 percent) of the respondents were 4-H alumni, and 39 (22.0 percent) were not. The remaining 1 (.6 percent) failed to answer this question.

Ninety-eight (55.4 percent) of responding donors currently served or had served as 4-H volunteer leaders and 78 (44.1 percent) had never served as volunteer leaders, and 1 (.5 percent) did not answer this question.

As reported in Table 4, 66 (37.3 percent) of the respondents had spouses who were 4-H alumni, 109 (61.6 percent) spouses were not 4-H alumni or the question was not applicable and 2 (1.1 percent) of the respondents failed to answer this question. Following this, 51 (28.8 percent) of the respondents indicated their spouse had served or currently served as a 4-H volunteer leader, 123 (69.5 percent) indicated their spouse had not served as a volunteer leader or this question was not applicable, and 3 (1.7 percent) of the respondents failed to answer this question. Ninety-three (52.5 percent) of the respondents indicated they had children and/or grandchildren who had been 4-H members, 83 (46.9 percent) indicated they did not have children

and/or grandchildren involved in 4-H or this question was not applicable, and one respondent (.6 percent) failed to answer this question.

Sixty-eight (38.4 percent) of the respondents had parents who had participated in 4-H or had served as 4-H volunteer leaders, 107 (60.5 percent) indicated their parents had not participated in 4-H, and 2 (1.1 percent) failed to answer the question.

One hundred sixty-six (93.8 percent) of the responding donors had some involvement with 4-H by knowing some relatives, friends, or neighbors who are/were 4-H members and/or 4-H volunteer leaders, 9 (5.1 percent) indicated no 4-H involvement in this manner, and 2 (1.1 percent) of the respondents did not answer this question.

Finally, 67 (37.9 percent) of the respondents had employees and/or employers who served or had served as 4-H volunteer leaders, 103 (58.2 percent) indicated they did not have employees and/or employers involved with 4-H as volunteer leaders, and 7 (3.9 percent) failed to answer this question.

Employment. Eighty-five (48.0 percent) of those responding selected an agriculture career title, 89 (50.3 percent) selected a non-agriculture title, and 3 (1.7 percent) did not answer this question.

Income. The respondents were asked to indicate their annual income by selecting one of five mutually exclusive categories. As reported in Table 4, 20 (11.3 percent) were in the less than $25,000 income range, 26 (14.7 percent) were in the $25,000 to $34,999 income range, 32 (18.1 percent) were in the $35,000 to $44,999 income

range, 40 (22.6 percent) were in the $45,000 to $64,999 income range, 39 (22.0 percent) were in the $65,000 or greater income range, and 20 (11.3 percent) of the respondents failed to answer this question.

Philanthropic History. The donors' philanthropic history for 1990-91 included a number of charitable organizations; each respondent could check as many organizations as he/she contributed to. One hundred fifty-seven (88.7 percent) of the respondents checked religious contributions, 19 (10.7 percent) did not and 1 (.6 percent) respondent did not answer this question; 23 (13.0 percent) indicated arts contributions, 153 (86.4 percent) did not and 1 (.6 percent) did not answer this question; 29 (16.4 percent) indicated they donated to FFA, 147 (83.1 percent) indicated they did not contribute to FFA, and 1 (.6 percent) failed to answer this question; 57 (32.2 percent) checked Girl and/or Boy Scouts, 119 (67.2 percent) did not, and 1 (.6 percent) did not answer this question; 5 (2.8 percent) indicated a donation to the YMCA and/or YWCA, 171 (96.6 percent) indicated they did not contribute to either of these organizations, and 1 (.6 percent) did not answer this question; 1 (.6 percent) indicated contributing to Campfire Girls, 175 (98.8 percent) indicated they did not contribute to Campfire Girls, and 1 (.6 percent) did not answer this question; 86 (48.6 percent) checked educational organizations, 90 (50.8 percent) did not check educational organizations, and 1 (.6 percent) failed to answer this question; 61 (34.5 percent) indicated they had donated to health organizations, 115 (64.9 percent) indicated they had not donated to health organizations, and 1 (.6 percent) failed to answer the question; 88 (49.7 percent) indicated contributing to 4-

H, 88 (49.7 percent) indicated they did not contribute to 4-H in 1990-91, and 1 (.6 percent) failed to answer the question; 7 (3.9 percent) indicated contributing to FHA, 169 (95.5 percent) indicated they did not contribute to FHA, and 1 (.6 percent) did not answer the question; 3 (1.7 percent) of the respondents checked Junior Achievement, 173 (97.7 percent) did not check Junior Achievement, and 1 (.6 percent) failed to answer the question; 45 (25.4 percent) indicated contributing to other organizations, 131 (74.0 percent) indicated they did not contribute to other organizations, and 1 (.6 percent) did not answer the question. Also making up the donors' philanthropic history were the last time contributed to 4-H, number of times contributed to 4-H in ten years, and the amount contributed to 4-H at the local, district, and state levels in 1990-91. As reported in Table 4, 81 (45.8 percent) of the respondents contributed to 4-H in the last three years, 11 (6.2 percent) contributed 4 to 6 years ago, 3 (1.7 percent) contributed 7 to 9 years ago, 8 (4.5 percent) contributed 10 or more years ago, and 74 (41.8 percent) did not answer this question.

Table 5, a table of means, reports the intervally scaled variables that summarize the number of times contributed to 4-H in 10 years, and the amounts donated at the local, district, and state levels to 4-H. As reported in Table 5, respondents reported giving a mean of 4.06 times (s.d. = 7.65). Individual responses ranged from 0 times to 83 times contributed to 4-H in 10 years. As indicated by those responding, the amount contributed locally to 4-H had a mean of $34.20 (s.d. =

TABLE 5. INDIVIDUAL DONORS' DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS REGARDING TIMES AND AMOUNTS CONTRIBUTED TO 4-H

	Respondents	
Characteristics	$\bar{x}$	s.d.
Times Contributed to 4-H in 10 Years	4.06	7.65
Amount Donated to 4-H Local	34.20	75.52
Amount Donated to 4-H District	13.89	56.61
Amount Donated to 4-H State	142.41	957.63

75.52), the district mean was $13.89 (s.d.= 56.61),and the state mean was $142.41 (s.d.= 957.63). The range of contributions was from $0 to $10,000.

Designated for Specific Fund. Table 6 includes the demographic information regarding whether or not the donation was designated for a specific scholarship or fund, how a donor was contacted for a donation, and should the Tennessee 4-H program attempt a more aggressive fund raising campaign. As reported in Table 6, of those contributing, 48 (27.2 percent) designated the money be used for a specific scholarship or fund; 56 (31.6 percent) did not, and 73 (41.2 percent) did not answer this question. The question may not have applied to them because they had not contributed to 4-H or they simply may have chosen not to answer the question.

Contacted for Donation. Forty-nine (27.7 percent) of the donors were contacted personally for a donation, 81 (45.8 percent) had not been, and 47 (26.5 percent) did not answer the question; 34 (19.2 percent) of the donors had been contacted by mail, 96 (54.2 percent) had not, and 47 (26.5 percent) failed to answer the question; 6 (3.4 percent) were contacted by telephone, 124 (70.1 percent) had not been contacted by this method, and 47 (26.6 percent) did not answer this question; 16 (9.0 percent) were contacted by some other means for a 4-H donation, 114 (64.4 percent) had not been contacted by some other means, and 47 (26.6 percent) did not answer this question.

TABLE 6. INDIVIDUAL DONORS' CONTRIBUTIONS TO 4-H

Characteristics		Respondents	
		Number	Percent
Donate to a Specific Scholarship or Fund			
Yes		48	27.2
No		56	31.6
Missing		73	41.2
	Total	177	100.0
Contacted Personally for a Donation			
Yes		49	27.7
No		81	45.8
Missing		47	26.5
	Total	177	100.0
Contacted by Mail for a Donation			
Yes		34	19.2
No		96	54.2
Missing		47	26.6
	Total	177	100.0
Contacted by Telephone for a Donation			
Yes		6	3.4
No		124	70.1
Missing		47	26.5
	Total	177	100.0
Contacted by Other Methods for a Donation			
Yes		16	9.0
No		114	64.4
Missing		47	26.6
	Total	177	100.0
Should 4-H Attempt a More Aggressive Fund Raising Campaign			
Yes		74	41.8
No		61	34.5
Missing		42	23.7
	Total	177	100.0
Would you Contribute More if There was Such a Campaign			
Yes		78	44.1
No		62	35.0
Missing		37	20.9
	Total	177	100.0

Fund Raising Campaign. Seventy-four (41.8 percent) thought Tennessee 4-H should attempt a more aggressive fund raising campaign, 61 (34.5 percent) did not think Tennessee 4-H should do this, and 42 (23.7 percent) did not answer this question. Seventy-eight (44.1 percent) would contribute more if such a campaign were to occur, and 62 (35.0 percent) would not contribute anymore for various reasons, and 37 (20.9 percent) failed to answer this question.

Demographic Profile of Corporate Donors

Table 7 reports the demographic data regarding the 38 corporate donors returning questionnaires. Corporate donors were defined as the people responsible for the management of corporate donations to the Tennessee 4-H program. As stated earlier, these representatives had the closest link to the 4-H program.

Gender. As reported in Table 7, 33 (86.8 percent) were male and 5 (13.2 percent) were female.

Age. Respondents indicated their age by selecting one of four mutually exclusive age categories ranging from 18 to over 60. As reported in Table 7, 2 (5.3 percent) of the respondents were from 18 to 29 years old, 13 (34.2 percent) were from 30 to 44 years old, 13 (34.2 percent) were from 45 to 59 years old, and 10 (26.3 percent) indicated they were 60 years of age or older.

4-H Involvement. Respondents were asked to answer a series of questions regarding their involvement with 4-H. Responses to these questions were weighted equally and summed to develop a "total 4-H involvement score" which was used in later analysis. However, responses to the individual involvement questions are reported in Table

TABLE 7. DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF CORPORATE TENNESSEE 4-H DONORS

Characteristics		Respondents	
		Number	Percent
Gender			
Male		33	86.8
Female		5	13.2
	Total	38	100.0
Age			
18 to 29		2	5.3
30 to 44		13	34.2
45 to 59		13	34.2
60 years or older		10	26.3
	Total	38	100.0
Involvement with 4-H			
4-H Alumni			
Yes		22	57.9
No		16	42.1
	Total	38	100.0
Serve(d) as 4-H Volunteer Leader			
Yes		12	31.6
No		26	68.4
	Total	38	100.0
Spouse 4-H Alumni			
Yes		12	31.6
No or Not Applicable		26	68.4
	Total	38	100.0
Spouse serve(d) as 4-H Volunteer Leader			
Yes		5	13.2
No or Not Applicable		33	86.8
	Total	38	100.0

Table 7 (continued)

Characteristics		Respondents Number	Respondents Percent
Involvement with 4-H (con't)			
Are/were your child(ren)/ grandchild(ren) 4-H members			
Yes		13	34.2
No or Not Applicable		25	65.8
	Total	38	100.0
Parents 4-H members and/or 4-H Volunteer Leaders			
Yes		6	15.8
No		31	81.6
Missing		1	2.6
	Total	38	100.0
Relatives, friends, and/or neighbors 4-H members or Volunteer Leaders			
Yes		32	84.2
No		6	15.8
	Total	38	100.0
Employees and/or employers 4-H Volunteer Leaders			
Yes		23	60.6
No		14	36.8
Missing		1	2.6
	Total	38	100.0
Employment Status			
Agriculture		20	52.6
Non-Agriculture		17	44.8
Missing		1	2.6
	Total	38	100.0
Philanthropic History			
Religious Organizations			
Yes		11	28.9
No		27	71.1
	Total	38	100.0

Table 7 (continued)

Characteristics		Respondents Number	Respondents Percent
Philanthropic History (con't)			
Arts			
Yes		9	23.7
No		29	76.3
	Total	38	100.0
FFA			
Yes		18	47.4
No		20	52.6
	Total	38	100.0
Girl and/or Boy Scouts			
Yes		10	26.3
No		28	73.7
	Total	38	100.0
YMCA and/or YWCA			
Yes		3	7.9
No		35	92.1
	Total	38	100.0
Campfire Girls			
Yes		0	0.0
No		38	100.0
	Total	38	100.0
Educational Organizations			
Yes		19	50.0
No		19	50.0
	Total	38	100.0
Health Organizations			
Yes		9	23.7
No		29	76.3
	Total	38	100.0
4-H			
Yes		32	84.2
No		6	15.8
	Total	38	100.0

Table 7 (continued)

Characteristics		Respondents Number	Respondents Percent
Philanthropic History (con't)			
FHA			
Yes		11	28.9
No		27	71.1
	Total	38	100.0
Junior Achievement			
Yes		6	15.8
No		32	84.2
	Total	38	100.0
Other			
Yes		7	18.4
No		31	81.6
	Total	38	100.0
Last Time Contributed to 4-H			
3 years ago or less		29	76.3
Missing		9	23.7
	Total	38	100.0

7. As reported in Table 7, 22 (57.9 percent) of the respondents were 4-H alumni, and 16 (42.1 percent) were not. Twelve (31.6 percent) of responding donors currently served or had served as 4-H volunteer leaders and 26 (68.4 percent) had never served as volunteer leaders.

As reported in Table 7, 12 (31.6 percent) of the respondents had spouses who were 4-H alumni, 26 (68.4 percent) spouses were not 4-H alumni or the question was not applicable. Five (13.2 percent) of the respondents indicated their spouse had served or currently served as a 4-H volunteer leader, 33 (86.8 percent) indicated their spouse had not served as a volunteer leader or this question was not applicable.

Thirteen (34.2 percent) of the respondents indicated they had children and/or grandchildren who had been 4-H members, 25 (65.8 percent) indicated they did not have children and/or grandchildren involved in 4-H or this question was not applicable.

Six (15.8 percent) of the respondents had parents who had participated in 4-H or had served as 4-H volunteer leaders, 31 (81.6 percent) indicated their parents had not participated in 4-H, and 1 (2.6 percent) failed to answer the question.

Thirty-two (84.2 percent) of the responding donors had some involvement with 4-H by knowing some relative, friend, or neighbor who are/were 4-H members and/or 4-H volunteer leaders, 6 (15.8 percent) indicated no 4-H involvement in this manner.

Finally, 23 (60.6 percent) of the respondents had employees and/or employers who served or had served as 4-H volunteer leaders, 14 (36.8 percent) indicated they

did not have employees and/or employers involved with 4-H as volunteer leaders, and 1 (2.6 percent) failed to answer this question.

Employment. Twenty (52.6 percent) percent of the corporate donors responding selected an agriculture career title, 17 (44.8 percent) were in the non-agriculture category, and 1 (2.6 percent) did not answer this question.

Philanthropic History. The corporate donors' philanthropic history included a number of charitable organizations; each respondent could check as many organizations as his/her corporation contributed to. Eleven (28.9 percent) of the respondents checked religious contributions, 27 (71.1 percent) did not; 9 (23.7 percent) indicated arts contributions, 29 (76.3 percent) did not; 18 (47.4 percent) indicated they donated to FFA, 20 (52.6 percent) indicated they did not contribute to FFA; 10 (26.3 percent) checked Girl and/or Boy Scouts, 28 (73.7 percent) did not; 3 (7.9 percent) indicated a donation to the YMCA and/or YWCA, 35 (92.1 percent) indicated they did not contribute to either of these organizations; 38 (100.0 percent) indicated they did not contribute to Campfire Girls; 19 (50.0 percent) checked educational organizations, 19 (50.0 percent) did not check educational organizations; 9 (23.7 percent) indicated they had donated to health organizations, 29 (76.3 percent) indicated they had not donated to health organizations; 32 (84.2 percent) indicated contributing to 4-H, and 6 (15.8 percent) indicated they did not contribute to 4-H in 1990-91. Eleven (28.9 percent) indicated contributing to FHA, 27 (71.1 percent) indicated they did not contribute to FHA; 6 (15.8 percent) of the respondents checked Junior Achievement, 32 (84.2 percent) did not check Junior Achievement;

7 (18.4 percent) indicated contributing to other organizations, 31 (81.6 percent) indicated they did not contribute to other organizations.

Also making up the donors' philanthropic history are the last time contributed to 4-H, number of times contributed to 4-H in ten years, and the amount contributed to 4-H at the local, district, and state levels in 1990-91. As reported in Table 7, 29 (76.3 percent) of the respondents contributed to 4-H in the last three years, and 9 (23.7 percent) did not answer this question.

Table 8, a table of means, reports the intervally scaled variables that summarize the number of times contributed to 4-H in 10 years, and the amounts donated at the local, district, and state levels to 4-H. As reported in Table 8, respondents reported giving an average of 11.97 times (s.d.= 15.53). Individual responses ranged from 0 times to 99 times contributed to 4-H in 10 years. As indicated by those responding, the amount contributed locally to 4-H had a mean of $307.40 (s.d.= 553.08), the district mean was $101.21 (s.d.= 220.69), and the state mean was $868.10 (s.d.= 1896.01). The range of contributions was from $0 to $10,000.

Designated for Specific Fund. Table 9 summarizes information included in the demographic profile including whether or not the donation was designated for a specific scholarship or fund, how a donor was contacted for a donation, and should the Tennessee 4-H program attempt a more aggressive fund raising campaign. Of those contributing, 19 (50.0 percent) designated the money be used for a specific

TABLE 8. CORPORATE DONORS' CHARACTERISTICS REGARDING TIMES AND AMOUNTS CONTRIBUTED TO 4-H

	Respondents	
Characteristics	$\bar{x}$	s.d.
Times Contributed to 4-H in 10 Years	11.97	15.53
Amount Donated to 4-H Local	307.40	553.08
Amount Donated to 4-H District	101.21	220.69
Amount Donated to 4-H State	868.10	1896.01

TABLE 9. CORPORATE DONORS' CONTRIBUTIONS TO 4-H

Characteristics		Respondents	
		Number	Percent
Donate to a Specific Scholarship or Fund			
Yes		19	50.0
No		13	34.2
Missing		6	15.8
	Total	38	100.0
Contacted Personally for a Donation			
Yes		18	47.4
No		14	36.8
Missing		6	15.8
	Total	38	100.0
Contacted by Mail for a Donation			
Yes		12	31.6
No		20	52.6
Missing		6	15.8
	Total	38	100.0
Contacted by Telephone for a Donation			
Yes		12	31.6
No		20	52.6
Missing		6	15.8
	Total	38	100.0
Contacted by Other Methods for a Donation			
Yes		2	5.3
No		30	78.9
Missing		6	15.8
	Total	38	100.0
Should 4-H Attempt a More Aggressive Fund Raising Campaign			
Yes		14	36.9
No		17	44.7
Missing		7	18.4
	Total	38	100.0
Would you Contribute More if There was Such a Campaign			
Yes		12	31.6
No		20	52.6
Missing		6	15.8
	Total	38	100.0

scholarship or fund; 13 (34.2 percent) did not, and 6 (15.8 percent) did not answer this question. The question may not have applied to them because they had not contributed to 4-H or they simply may have chosen not to answer the question.

Contacted for Donation. Eighteen (47.4 percent) of the donors were contacted personally for a donation, 14 (36.8 percent) had not been, and 6 (15.8 percent) did not answer the question; 12 (31.6 percent) of the donors had been contacted by mail, 20 (52.6 percent) had not, and 6 (15.8 percent) failed to answer the question; 12 (31.6 percent) were contacted by telephone, 20 (52.6 percent) had not been contacted by this method, and 6 (15.8 percent) did not answer this question; 2 (5.3 percent) were contacted by some other means for a 4-H donation, 30 (78.9 percent) had not been contacted by some other means, and 6 (15.8 percent) did not answer this question.

Fund Raising Campaign. Fourteen (36.9 percent) thought Tennessee 4-H should attempt a more aggressive fund raising campaign, 17 (44.7 percent) did not think Tennessee 4-H should do this, and 7 (18.4 percent) did not answer this question. Twelve (31.6 percent) would contribute more if such a campaign were to occur, and 20 (52.6 percent) would not contribute anymore for various reasons, and 6 (15.8 percent) failed to answer this question.

Relationships Among Demographic Variables and Individual Donors' Philanthropic Giving Patterns

The second objective was to study and describe the relationships among the demographic variables and respondents' philanthropic giving patterns. The specific demographic variables used for this objective included gender, age, residence,

education, involvement with 4-H, employment status, and income for individual donors.

The respondents' philanthropic giving pattern was measured as two separate dependent variables during this analysis. The first variable was simply a sum of the total amount of money donated at the local, district, and state levels by each donor for 1990-91. The second variable was the number of times each donor had contributed to 4-H over the past 10 years. It should be noted that one outlying contributor was deleted prior to analysis of this objective, since this contribution did not reflect the group norm. Although this person contributed greater than $10,000, other contributions ranged from $0 to $1,000.

Tables 10 through 16 describe the relationships between the total dollars donated in 1990-91 and the various demographic variables for the individual donors. T-test and analysis of variance procedures were used to test the significance of relationships.

TABLE 10. T-TEST FOR DOLLARS DONATED IN 1990-91 BY INDIVIDUAL DONORS AND GENDER

Gender	n	$\bar{x}$	s.d.	t	P
Male	67	102.82	1210.79	.50	.621
Female	47	87.55	177.56		

TABLE 11. ANOVA FOR DOLLARS DONATED IN 1990-91 BY INDIVIDUAL DONORS AND AGE

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Age	147738.25	3	49246.08	2.14	.099
Error Variance	2530012.17	110	23000.11		
Total	2677750.42	113			

TABLE 12. ANOVA FOR DOLLARS DONATED IN 1990-91 BY INDIVIDUAL DONORS AND RESIDENCE

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Residence	111120.52	3	37040.17	1.58	.199
Error Variance	2557230.11	109	23460.83		
Total	2668350.64	112			

TABLE 13. ANOVA FOR DOLLARS DONATED IN 1990-91 BY INDIVIDUAL DONORS AND EDUCATION

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Education	238687.27	4	59671.82	2.67	.036
Error Variance	2439063.15	109	22376.73		
Total	2677750.42	113			

TABLE 14. TABLE OF MEANS FOR DOLLARS DONATED IN 1990-91 BY INDIVIDUAL DONORS AND EDUCATION

Education	n	$\bar{x}$		
High School or Less	7	5.71	A	
Some College	22	42.27	A	
Bachelor's Degree	28	98.21	A	B
Advanced Degree	45	110.98	A	B
Some Graduate Study	12	190.83		B
Total	114			

TABLE 15. ANOVA FOR DOLLARS DONATED IN 1990-91 BY INDIVIDUAL DONORS AND INCOME

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Income	155035.34	4	38758.84	.71	.587
Error Variance	1376145.65	97	14187.07		
Total	1531180.99	101			

TABLE 16. T-TEST FOR DOLLARS DONATED IN 1990-91 BY INDIVIDUAL DONORS AND CAREER

Career	n	$\bar{x}$	s.d.	t	P
Ag	54	109.70	136.66	-1.03	.307
Non Ag	59	80.17	166.01		

Gender. Table 10 reports the group means for males and females regarding total dollars donated in 1990-91. As reported in Table 10 there is no evidence to suggest there is a relationship between gender and total dollars donated ($t = .50$, $df = 81.98$, $P = .621$).

Age. Table 11 reports the relationship between dollars donated in 1990-91 and age. As shown, there is no reason to conclude there is a relationship between dollars donated in 1990-91 and age ($F = 2.14$, $df = 3$, $P = .099$).

Residence. Table 12 reports the analysis of variance for the relationship between dollars donated and residence. Based on the evidence in the table, there is no reason to conclude that donors who reside in a specific area such as on a farm or in rural area or town contribute more or less than those residing in a city ($F = 1.58$, $df = 3$, $P = .199$).

Education. Table 13 reports the relationship between dollars donated and education. There is evidence to suggest there is a relationship ($F = 2.67$, $df = 4$, $p = .036$). Table 14, a table of means, follows to describe the differences in the categories pertaining to individual donors' educational level and these donors' contributions to 4-H. Since this independent variable had more than two categories, the Duncan's post hoc test was used to determine where the differences lie. Individuals who had pursued some graduate study gave significantly more money to 4-H in 1990-91 than those who had an education level of high school or less and those who had some college. There is evidence to suggest that the greater the education level, the more dollars contributed to 4-H.

Income. Table 15 reports the relationship between the dollars donated and income. There is no evidence to suggest that such a relationship exists within the population ($F = .71$, $df = 4$, $p = .587$).

Career. Table 16 reports the T-test which tests the significance of the relationship between dollars donated and career. Again, there is no evidence to suggest that such a relationship exists ($t = -1.03$, $df = 60.46$, $P = .307$).

Tables 17 through 22 describe the relationship between the number of times individual donors contributed to 4-H in the past 10 years and demographic variables of individual donors.

Gender. Table 17 reports the average number of times males and females contributed to 4-H in the past 10 years. Based on this evidence there is no reason to conclude that either gender contributes more to the Tennessee 4-H program ($t = -1.12$, $df = 67.61$, $P = .265$).

Age. In Table 18 an analysis of variance was reported for the number of times individual donors contributed to 4-H in the past 10 years and age. Based on the findings, there is no reason to believe that age makes any difference when analyzing the number of times contributed to 4-H in the past ten years in relation to a donor's age ($F = .835$, $P = .477$).

Residence. Table 19 describes the relationship between number of times individual donors contributed to 4-H in the past 10 years and residence. Again, based on the evidence, there is no reason to suggest that such a relationship exists in the population of individual donors ($F = .32$, $df = 3$, $P = .811$).

TABLE 17. T-TEST FOR NUMBER OF TIMES DONATED IN PAST 10 YEARS BY INDIVIDUAL DONORS AND GENDER

Gender	n	$\bar{x}$	s.d.	t	P
Male	106	3.43	4.61	-1.12	.265
Female	58	5.17	11.27		

TABLE 18. ANOVA FOR NUMBER OF TIMES DONATED IN PAST 10 YEARS BY INDIVIDUAL DONORS AND AGE

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Age	147.82	3	49.27	.84	.477
Error Variance	9443.79	160	59.02		
Total	9497.61	163			

TABLE 19. ANOVA FOR NUMBER OF TIMES DONATED IN PAST 10 YEARS BY INDIVIDUAL DONORS AND RESIDENCE

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Residence	57.35	3	19.12	.32	.811
Error Variance	9498.63	159	59.74		
Total	9555.98	162			

TABLE 20. ANOVA FOR NUMBER OF TIMES DONATED IN PAST 10 YEARS BY INDIVIDUAL DONORS AND EDUCATION

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Education	519.34	4	129.84	2.28	.064
Error Variance	9072.27	159	57.06		
Total	9591.61	163			

TABLE 21. ANOVA FOR NUMBER OF TIMES DONATED IN PAST 10 YEARS BY INDIVIDUAL DONORS AND INCOME

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Income	273.76	4	68.44	1.09	.363
Error Variance	9023.81	144	62.67		
Total	9297.57	148			

TABLE 22. T-TEST FOR NUMBER OF TIMES DONATED IN PAST 10 YEARS BY INDIVIDUAL DONORS AND CAREER

Career	n	$\bar{x}$	s.d.	t	P
Ag	76	3.88	4.90	-.23	.819
Non Ag	86	4.15	9.55		

Education. Table 20 presents the relationship between number of times individual donors contributed to 4-H in the past 10 years and education level. There is no reason to believe such a relationship exists based on the findings although the F statistic does approach the significance level (F= 2.28, df= 4, P= .064).

Income. Table 21 is an ANOVA describing the number of times individual donors contributed to 4-H in the past 10 years and income range. There is no evidence to suggest a relationship exists (F= 1.09, df= 4, P= .363).

Career. In Table 22 the relationship between number of times individual donors contributed to 4-H in the past 10 years and career title are described. Again, there is no evidence to suggest a relationship in the population of individual donors (t= -.23, df= 130.20, P= .819)

Relationships Among Demographic Variables and Corporate Donors' Philanthropic Giving Patterns

The second objective included corporate as well as individual donors. Tables 23 through 29 summarize the findings from the corporate donors. As previously defined, corporate donors are representatives of a particular business, and these representatives are the direct link the 4-H program has with the industry.

Gender. The T-test in Table 23 is used to determine if gender makes a difference when analyzing total dollars donated to 4-H. According to the evidence, there is no reason to believe that there is a difference between males and females regarding total dollars donated to 4-H during 1990-91 and gender (t= -.04, df= 27, P= .970).

Age. Table 24 reports an analysis of variance for the relationship between total dollars donated in 1990-91 and age. There is reason to believe that such a

TABLE 23. T-TEST FOR DOLLARS DONATED IN 1990-91 BY CORPORATE DONORS AND GENDER

Gender	n	x	s.d.	t	P
Male	24	1269.83	2224.36	-.04	.970
Female	5	1310.00	1822.91		

TABLE 24. ANOVA FOR DOLLARS DONATED IN 1990-91 BY CORPORATE DONORS AND AGE

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Age	61876350.20	3	20625450.07	7.91	.001
Error Variance	65221311.11	25	2608852.44		
Total	127097661.30	28			

TABLE 25. MEANS FOR DOLLARS DONATED IN 1990-91 BY CORPORATE DONORS AND AGE

Age	n	x		
30 to 44	9	505.67	A	
45 to 59	12	1106.25	A	
60 years or older	7	1492.86	A	
18 to 29	1	8750.00		B
Total	29			

TABLE 26. T-TEST FOR DOLLARS DONATED IN 1990-91 BY CORPORATE DONORS AND CAREER

Career	n	x	s.d.	t	P
Ag	14	1819.71	2740.78	1.44	.166
Non Ag	14	664.29	1212.66		

TABLE 27. T-TEST FOR NUMBER OF TIMES DONATED IN PAST 10 YEARS BY CORPORATE DONORS AND GENDER

Gender	n	x	s.d.	t	P
Male	30	12.30	16.79	.75	.459
Female	5	10.00	.00		

TABLE 28. ANOVA FOR NUMBER OF TIMES DONATED IN PAST 10 YEARS BY CORPORATE DONORS AND AGE

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Age	897.14	3	299.05	1.27	.302
Error Variance	7301.83	31	235.54		
Total	8198.97	34			

TABLE 29. T-TEST FOR NUMBER OF TIMES DONATED IN PAST 10 YEARS BY CORPORATE DONORS AND CAREER

Career	n	x	s.d.	t	P
Ag	18	9.00	2.68	-.72	.474
Non Ag	16	9.88	4.27		

relationship exists (F= 7.91, df= 3, P= .001). A table of means, Table 25, reports the relationship. Using Duncan's post hoc test, the corporate donors from age 18 to 29 contributed significantly more money than those from 30 to 44, 45 to 59, and those 60 years of age or older. One should interpret this table with caution due to extremely low numbers in some cells.

Career. Table 26 presents the findings regarding total dollars donated to 4-H in 1990-91 and career. Based on the evidence from the table, there is no reason to believe that corporate representatives involved in agriculture careers contribute any differently than those involved in non-agriculture careers (t= 1.44, df= 17.90, P= .166).

Gender. In Table 27 a T-test is used to determine if there is any difference between number of times contributed to 4-H in the past 10 years and gender among corporate donors. There is no reason to believe that gender makes a difference with regard to the number of times donated to 4-H in the past 10 years (t=.75, df= 29.00, P= .459).

Age. Table 28 is an analysis of variance reporting the relationship between the number of times donated to 4-H in the past 10 years and age. There is no reason to conclude that age makes any difference in number of times corporate donors have contributed to 4-H in the past 10 years (F= 1.27, df= 3, P= .302).

Career. Finally, table 29 reports the relationship between the number of times donated in the past 10 years and career title. There is no reason to believe that

those in agriculture careers contributed any differently than corporate donors involved in non-agriculture careers (t= -.72, df= 32, P= .474).

Relationships Between Attitudes About 4-H and Demographic Variables of Individual Donors

The third objective of the study was to describe the relationship between attitudes about 4-H and demographic variables of the individual and corporate donors. This particular section discusses the findings related to the individual donors. For purposes of this study, attitude about 4-H was determined with three dependent variable scales. The first scale was a Semantic Differential that measured a donor's total 4-H opinion; the scale included six sets of adjective pairs. Each pair of adjectives reflected opposing ends of an opinion continuum regarding the respondents attitudes about 4-H. The scale scores could range from six to forty-two with six being the most positive attitude one could have about 4-H. The other two dependent variables were measured with Likert Scales. One Likert-scale measured the donors' perception of the objectives of the Tennessee 4-H program. This scale listed ten objectives of the Tennessee 4-H program, and respondents reacted by answering how much they agree those objectives are being met. This score was simply determined with a summation of the variables within the scale. The scores could range from ten to fifty with ten being the most positive opinion a donor could have about the Tennessee 4-H objectives. The third dependent variable was also measured by using a Likert Scale. This scale listed a variety of activities that are used in 4-H to teach life skills. There were nine statements that included these activities and respondents rated these activities regarding how effective the activity

was in helping to teach one or more of the life skills. This score was a summation of the donors' perception of the life skills the Tennessee 4-H program attempts to teach youth. A low score meant the donor believes 4-H is accomplishing the goal of teaching life skills to youth involved in the 4-H program. The most positive attitude was represented by a score of nine, and the most negative score was 45. Tables 30 through 36 summarize the findings for the individual donors.

Gender. Table 30 describes the relationship between the attitudes individual donors have about the 4-H program and gender. Based on the evidence, there is no reason to believe that such a relationship exists between gender and any of the three variables used to measure respondents' attitudes about 4-H ($t=.84$, $df= 150$, $P= .400$), ($t= 1.24$, $df= 170$, $P= .216$), ($t= .27$, $df= 166$, $P= .785$).

Age. Table 31 is an ANOVA that describes the relationship between the three attitude variables and age. The findings suggest that age does affect an individual donor's total 4-H opinion ($F= 3.26$, $df= 3$, $P= .023$). Table 32, follows to describe the differences. However, there does not seem to be a relationship between age and an individual donor's perceptions of the 4-H objectives ($F= .73$, $df= 3$, $P= .535$) or age and the perceptions of the life skills 4-H attempts to teach youth ($F= .76$, $df= 3$, $P= .516$).

Table 32 uses Duncan's post hoc test to determine which categories of age groups are different than the others when analyzing the relationship between an individual donor's total 4-H opinion and age. According to the findings those in the

TABLE 30. T-TESTS FOR INDIVIDUAL DONORS' ATTITUDES ABOUT 4-H AND GENDER

Gender	n	x	s.d.	t	P
Total 4-H Opinion					
Male	97	15.04	4.81	.84	.400
Female	55	14.38	4.30		
4-H Objectives					
Male	112	18.00	5.14	1.24	.216
Female	60	16.98	5.08		
Life Skills of 4-H					
Male	112	16.46	3.88	.27	.785
Female	56	16.29	3.61		

TABLE 31. ANOVAS FOR INDIVIDUAL DONORS' ATTITUDES ABOUT 4-H AND AGE

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Total 4-H Opinion					
Age	200.18	3	66.73	3.26	.023
Error Variance	3031.90	148	20.49		
Total	3232.08	151			
4-H Objectives					
Age	57.90	3	19.30	.73	.535
Error Variance	4439.46	168	26.43		
Total	4497.37	171			
Life Skills of 4-H					
Age	32.89	3	10.96	.76	.516
Error Variance	2355.39	164	14.36		
Total	2388.28	167			

TABLE 32. MEANS FOR INDIVIDUAL DONORS' TOTAL 4-H OPINION AND AGE

Age	n	x		
18 to 29	11	12.18	A	
60 years or older	39	13.56	A	
45 to 59	48	15.29	A	B
30 to 44	54	15.80		B
Total	152			

TABLE 33. ANOVAS FOR INDIVIDUAL DONORS' ATTITUDES ABOUT 4-H AND RESIDENCE

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Total 4-H Opinion					
Residence	96.06	3	32.02	1.50	.212
Error Variance	3134.57	147	21.32		
Total	3230.64	150			
4-H Objectives					
Residence	41.28	3	13.76	.52	.670
Error Variance	4424.03	167	26.49		
Total	4465.31	170			
Life Skills of 4-H					
Residence	86.00	3	28.67	2.05	.109
Error Variance	2282.82	163	14.01		
Total	2368.81	166			

TABLE 34.ANOVAS FOR INDIVIDUAL DONORS' ATTITUDES ABOUT 4-H AND EDUCATION

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Total 4-H Opinion					
Education	39.19	4	9.80	.45	.771
Error Variance	3192.88	147	21.72		
Total	3232.08	150			
4-H Objectives					
Education	00.31	4	00.08	.20	.941
Error Variance	37.37	170	00.40		
Total	37.68	174			
Life Skills of 4-H					
Education	33.23	4	8.31	.58	.681
Error Variance	2355.05	163	14.45		
Total	2388.28	167			

TABLE 35. ANOVAS FOR INDIVIDUAL DONORS' ATTITUDES ABOUT 4-H AND INCOME

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Total 4-H Opinion					
Income	33.18	4	8.29	.381	.822
Error Variance	2828.71	130	21.76		
Total	2861.88	134			
4-H Objectives					
Income	101.34	4	25.33	.923	.452
Error Variance	4089.21	149	27.44		
Total	4190.55	153			
Life Skills of 4-H					
Income	37.25	4	9.31	.615	.652
Error Variance	2209.47	146	15.13		
Total	2246.72	150			

TABLE 36. T-TESTS FOR INDIVIDUAL DONORS' ATTITUDES ABOUT 4-H AND CAREER

Career	n	x	s.d.	t	P
Total 4-H Opinion					
Ag	71	15.03	4.46	.61	.546
Non Ag	79	14.57	4.78		
4-H Objectives					
Ag	82	18.07	5.90	1.09	.276
Non Ag	88	17.20	4.25		
Life Skills of 4-H					
Ag	80	16.71	3.90	1.05	.293
Non Ag	86	16.09	3.67		

age group 30 to 44 have a more negative total opinion of 4-H than those donors aged 18 to 29 and those 60 years or older. However, those aged 45 to 59 have a similar total 4-H opinion as those in the 30 to 44 age group and the 18 to 29 age group and the 60 years or older group. All groups tend to have a high opinion of the 4-H program.

Residence. Table 33 is an ANOVA describing the relationship between residence and total 4-H opinion, perceptions of 4-H objectives, and perceptions of the life skills 4-H attempts to teach. Based on the findings, there is no reason to conclude that such a relationship exists between residence and total 4-H opinion ($F = 1.50$, $df = 3$, $P = .212$), perceptions of 4-H objectives ($F = .52$, $df = 3$, $P = .670$), or perceptions of the life skills 4-H attempts to teach ($F = 2.05$, $df = 3$, $P = .109$).

Education. Table 34 provides the information to determine if education makes any difference regarding an individual donor's attitude toward 4-H. Again, based on the findings, there is no reason to believe there is a relationship between education level and a donor's total 4-H opinion ($F = .451$, $df = 4$, $P = .771$), perceptions of the 4-H objectives ($F = .195$, $df = 4$, $P = .941$), or perceptions of the life skills 4-H attempts to teach ($F = .575$, $df = 4$, $P = .681$).

Income. Table 35 is an ANOVA table reporting the relationship between attitude about 4-H and income. From the evidence, there is no reason to conclude that income makes any difference regarding an individual donor's total 4-H opinion ($F = .381$, $df = 4$, $P = .822$), perceptions of the 4-H objectives ($F = .923$, $df = 4$, $P = .452$), or the life skills 4-H attempts to teach youth ($F = .615$, $df = 4$, $P = .652$).

Career. Finally, to complete the individual donor section of the third objective, a T-test in Table 36 tests the significance of the relationship between attitudes about 4-H and career. From the findings, there is no reason to believe that those in agriculture careers have a significantly different total 4-H opinion (t= .61, df= 148, P= .564), perception about the 4-H objectives (t= 1.09, df= 146.31, P= .276), or perception about the life skills (t= 1.05, df= 164, P= .293) than do those with non agriculture careers.

Relationships Between Attitudes About 4-H and Demographic Variables of Corporate Donors

To complete the third objective, a discussion of the findings regarding the relationships between attitudes about 4-H and the corporate donors follow. As stated in the previous section, for purposes of this study, attitude about 4-H was determined with three dependent variable scales. These scales are explained in the section preceding this discussion on page 77. Tables 37 through 40 summarize the findings for the corporate donors.

Gender. Table 37 describes the relationship between the attitudes corporate donors have about the 4-H program and gender. According to the data, there is reason to believe a relationship exists between total opinion of the Tennessee 4-H program and gender (t= 3.34 df= 31, P= .002). The male corporate donor had an average total opinion of 16.57 (s.d.= 3.61), and the female corporate donor had an average total opinion of 10.40 (s.d.= 4.98). As previously explained, the lower the total opinion score, the more positive the donor perceives the total 4-H program, female

TABLE 37. T-TESTS FOR CORPORATE DONORS' ATTITUDES ABOUT 4-H AND GENDER

Gender	n	x	s.d.	t	P
Total 4-H Opinion					
Male	28	16.57	3.61	3.34	.002
Female	5	10.40	4.98		
4-H Objectives					
Male	32	18.06	3.29	3.38	.002
Female	5	12.80	2.78		
Life Skills of 4-H					
Male	33	17.06	3.41	1.56	.129
Female	5	14.60	2.19		

TABLE 38. ANOVAS FOR CORPORATE DONORS' ATTITUDES ABOUT 4-H AND AGE

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P
Total 4-H Opinion					
Age	182.96	3	60.99	4.13	.015
Error Variance	428.67	29	14.78		
Total	611.64	321			
4-H Objectives					
Age	37.95	3	12.65	.93	.437
Error Variance	448.48	33	13.59		
Total	486.43	36			
Life Skills of 4-H					
Age	24.10	3	8.03	.70	.562
Error Variance	393.27	34	11.57		
Total	417.37	37			

TABLE 39. MEANS OF CORPORATE DONORS' TOTAL 4-H OPINION AND AGE

Age	n	x		
45 to 59	12	12.58	A	
30 to 44	13	16.92		B
18 to 29	2	18.00	A	B
60 years or older	6	18.17		B
Total	33			

TABLE 40. T-TESTS FOR CORPORATE DONORS' ATTITUDES ABOUT 4-H AND CAREER

Career	n	x	s.d.	t	P
Total 4-H Opinion					
Ag	18	16.83	4.05	1.78	.085
Non Ag	15	14.20	4.44		
4-H Objectives					
Ag	20	18.95	3.22	3.22	.003
Non Ag	17	15.47	3.34		
Life Skills of 4-H					
Ag	20	17.85	3.10	2.23	.032
Non Ag	17	15.47	3.38		

respondents perceive the 4-H program more positively. Additionally, there is reason to believe a relationship exists between the perceptions corporate donors have about the objectives of the Tennessee 4-H program and gender (t= 3.38, df= 35, P= .002). Male donors scored an average of 18.06 (s.d.= 3.29) on the scale rating the perceptions of the objectives of the 4-H program, and females had an average score of 12.80 (s.d.= 2.78). Again, females in the study had a significantly more positive perception of the 4-H objectives than did males. Finally, there is no reason to believe a relationship exists between the perceptions corporate donors have about the life skills 4-H attempts to teach youth and gender (t= 1.56, df= 36, P= .129).

Age. Table 38 is an ANOVA table that describes the relationship between total 4-H opinion, perceptions of the 4-H objectives, and perceptions of the life skills 4-H attempts to teach youth and age. The findings suggest that age does relate to corporate donors' total 4-H opinion (F= 4.13, df= 3, P= .015). A table of means, Table 39, follows to explain the differences. However, there does not seem to be a relationship between corporate donors' perceptions of the 4-H objectives and age (F= .93, df= 3, P= .437) or the perceptions of the life skills 4-H attempts to teach youth (F= .70, df= 3, P= .562).

Table 39 reports the Duncan's post hoc test to explain the differences among the age categories when analyzing the relationship between an individual donor's total 4-H opinion and age. According to the findings, those in the age group 45 to 59 are like those in the 18 to 29 age group and different than those corporate donors aged 30 to 44 and those 60 years or older. However, those aged 30 to 44 are no

different than the 18 to 29 age group or the 60 years or older category. Those corporate donors in the age group 45 to 59 had the most positive total 4-H opinion. As stated, this group is similar to those 18 to 29 years of age even though this group had a more negative total opinion of 4-H. However, all groups tended to have a favorable opinion of the 4-H program.

Career. Lastly, to complete the corporate donor section of the third objective, a T-test in Table 40 tests the significance of the relationship between attitudes about 4-H and career. Although the relationship approaches significance, there is no reason to believe that those corporate donor representatives in agriculture careers have a significantly different total 4-H opinion than those involved in non agriculture careers ($t = 1.78$, $df = 31$, $P = .085$). However, the data suggest a relationship between corporate donors' perceptions about the 4-H objectives ($t = 3.22$, $df = 35$, $P = .003$), and perception about the life skills 4-H attempts to teach youth ($t = 2.23$, $df = 35$, $P = .032$) and career. Those corporate donors involved in agriculture careers had an average perception of the 4-H objectives of 18.95 (s.d. = 3.22). Those not involved in agriculture careers had an average perception of the 4-H objectives of 15.47 (s.d. = 3.34). Those donors with non-agriculture careers have a more positive opinion of the Tennessee 4-H program. Furthermore, those in agriculture careers had an average perception of the life skills 4-H attempts to teach youth of 17.85 (s.d. = 3.10), and those in non agriculture careers had an average perception of the life skills of 15.47 (s.d. = 3.38).

Relationship Between Individual Donors' Attitudes About 4-H and Their Philanthropic Giving Patterns

The fourth objective of the study was to study and describe the relationship between respondents' attitudes about 4-H and their philanthropic giving patterns. Table 41 summarizes the findings for this objective regarding individual donors. To answer this objective, correlation coefficients were used to determine if such a relationship existed between respondents' attitudes about 4-H and their philanthropic giving patterns.

Although statistical significance is important to note in any relationship, according to Davis (1971), the magnitude of a correlation coefficient can provide more information to the researcher than statistical significance. The magnitude scale suggested by Davis (1971) was used to determine the "practical" (Davis, 1971) significance of the relationship if any existed. The findings in Table 41 suggest that there is no reason to believe any relationships of considerable magnitude exist. Using Davis' convention a negative negligible relationship exists between an individual donor's total 4-H opinion and the total amount of dollars contributed in 1990-91 ($r = <.01$, $r^2 = <.01$). In addition, a negative negligible relationship exists between an individual donor's perception of the 4-H objectives and the total amount of money donated in 1990-01 ($r = -.03$, $r^2 = <.01$). Finally, a low negative relationship exists among an individual donor's perception of the life skills 4-H attempts to teach and the total amount of money donated in 1990-91 ($r = -.17$, $r^2 = <.01$).

TABLE 41. CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL DONORS' ATTITUDES ABOUT 4-H AND THEIR PHILANTHROPIC GIVING PATTERNS

	Total Dollars Donated 1990-91		Number Times Donated in Past 10 Yrs.	
	r	r^2	r	r^2
Total 4-H Opinion	<.01	<.01	-.15	<.01
4-H Objectives	-.03	<.01	-.05	<.01
Life Skills of 4-H	-.17	<.01	-.05	<.01

The second part of the definition of philanthropic giving pattern was the number of times the donor had contributed to 4-H in the past ten years. These findings are also reported in Table 41. Again, from the findings there is no reason to believe that respondents' attitudes about the Tennessee 4-H program influence their giving pattern to 4-H in any way. According to the findings, there is a low negative relationship between an individual donor's 4-H opinion and the number of times the donor has contributed to 4-H in the past 10 years ($r = -.15$, $r^2 = <.01$). Also, there is a negative negligible relationship between individual donors' perceptions about the 4-H objectives ($r = -.05$, $r^2 = <.01$) and perceptions about the life skills ($r = -.05$, $r^2 = <.01$) and the number of times an individual donor has contributed to 4-H in the past ten years.

Relationship Between Corporate Donors' Attitudes About 4-H and Their Philanthropic Giving Patterns

In observing the relationship of respondents' attitudes about 4-H and the philanthropic giving pattern for corporate donors, there was a low relationship between corporate donors' total 4-H opinion and the amount of money donated to 4-H in 1990-91 ($r = .16$, $r^2 = .03$). There were low negative relationships between the corporate donors' perception scores about the 4-H objectives and the total dollars donated in 1990-91 ($r = -.12$, $r^2 = .01$) and for the perceptions about the life skills and the total dollars donated in 1990-91 ($r = -.21$, $r^2 = .04$). These findings are reported in Table 42.

TABLE 42. CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN CORPORATE DONORS' ATTITUDES ABOUT 4-H AND THEIR PHILANTHROPIC GIVING PATTERNS

	Total Dollars Donated 1990-91		Number Times Donated in Past 10 Yrs.	
	r	r^2	r	r^2
Total 4-H Opinion	.16	.03	-.04	<.01
4-H Objectives	-.12	.01	-.08	<.01
Life Skills of 4-H	-.21	.04	-.05	<.01

Also, reported in Table 42 are the correlations between corporate donors' attitude scores about 4-H and the number of times donated in the past ten years. All of the findings suggest a negative negligible relationship when examining corporate donors' total 4-H opinion scores ($r = -.04$, $r^2 = <.01$), perception scores for the 4-H objectives ($r = -.08$, $r^2 = <.01$), and perception scores regarding the life skills 4-H attempts to teach youth ($r = -.05$, $r^2 = <.01$) when associated with the number of times corporate donors have contributed to 4-H in the past ten years. It should be noted here that an analysis was also completed regarding donors and non-donors. A non-donor was defined as someone who did not contribute any money to the Tennessee 4-H program in 1990-91. The correlation coefficients were also supported using the T-tests. The T-test reported no statistically significant differences between donors and non-donors with regard to the three attitude scores.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to develop a demographic profile of the Tennessee 4-H donors and describe their attitudes about the Tennessee 4-H program. Literature provides evidence that the more positive an attitude is supporting an organization, the more likely a contribution will be made. Donors to the Tennessee 4-H program include both private individuals and corporate representatives who act on behalf of their businesses.

The final sample for this study was composed of 567 individual and corporate donors. These donors were selected to participate in this study from the approximate 2,900 donors to the Tennessee 4-H program. Of the 567 donors selected 215 responses were used in the analysis of this study.

The donors returned a mailed questionnaire developed to measure 4-H attitudes and determine specific demographic information. Individual donors were described according to gender, age, residence, education level, involvement with 4-H, employment status, income, and philanthropic history. Corporate donors were described according gender, age, involvement with 4-H, employment status, and philanthropic history.

Attitudes were measured using Likert scales and a Semantic Differential. These scales measured a donor's total opinion of the Tennessee 4-H program, perceptions about the objectives of 4-H, and perceptions about the life skills 4-H

attempts to teach youth. These attitudes were described in relation to the respondents' demographic information.

Specific objectives of the study were to

(1.) develop a demographic profile using the demographic characteristics mentioned above for individual and corporate donors,

(2.) study the relationships between the demographic variables and respondents' philanthropic giving patterns,

(3.) study the relationships between the demographic variables and respondents' attitudes about 4-H, and

(4.) study the relationships between respondents' attitudes about 4-H and their philanthropic giving patterns.

For the first objective, a series of nominally and intervally scaled variables were used as the dependent variables to answer the demographic characteristics of the individual and corporate donors. Frequency counts and means were used to complete the description of the sample. Numbers and percentages were used to describe the demographic characteristics that were named above. In addition, means and standard deviations were used to describe the amount of dollars donated at the local, district, and state levels and for the number of times donated to 4-H in the past ten years. The summation of these variables make up the independent variable, philanthropic giving history.

The study revealed that 115 of the individual donors were male and 59 of the individual donors were in the 30 to 44 or 45 to 59 age group. The greatest number

of individual donors resided on farms (66) or cities (60), and most individual donors had an advanced degree or had completed a bachelor's degree (43). One hundred thirty-seven of the individual donors were at one time members of 4-H, and 98 served at one time as a volunteer leader. Primarily, individual donors had some involvement with 4-H either through relatives, friends, or neighbors (166) involved with the 4-H program. Eighty-nine of the individual donors had careers other than agriculture, and 40 earned in the $45,000 to $64,999 income category. One hundred fifty-seven of the individual donors contributed to religious organizations. Eighty-eight respondents had donated to 4-H, and 88 respondents had not contributed to 4-H. Eighty-one of those responding had donated to 4-H in the past three years. Of those responding, 74 of the individual donors believed 4-H should attempt a more aggressive fund raising campaign, and of those responding, 78 would contribute more money if such a campaign took place.

Regarding corporate donors, it was found that demographics for the corporate donors were similar to the individual donors responding in the study. However, more corporate donors had careers in agriculture (20) rather than non-agriculture careers (17). Of those responding, there was also a difference between individual and corporate donors regarding whether or not the Tennessee 4-H program should attempt a more aggressive fund raising campaign. Of the corporate donors responding, 17 of the corporate donors did not believe 4-H should attempt a more aggressive fund raising campaign, and of those responding, 20 would not contribute more money if such a campaign took place.

Objective two used the measurements of the independent demographic variables previously explained plus the dependent variables comprising a donor's 4-H attitude. These dependent variables included the Semantic differential measuring the donors' total 4-H opinion, and it included the Likert scales measuring the donors' perceptions of the 4-H objectives and the perceptions of the life skills 4-H attempts to teach youth.

From the individual donors' findings, it was determined that the greater the education level, the more likely one is to contribute money to the 4-H program. There appeared to be no difference though when analyzing dollars donated in 1990-91 and gender, age, residence, income, and career. For the corporate donors, there appeared to be no differences when analyzing the dollars donated in 1990-91 with the independent demographic variables. As reported, corporate donors contributed an average of $307.40 at the local level, $101.21 at the district level, and $868.10 at the state level.

The third objective of the study was to study the relationships between the demographic variables and respondents' attitudes about 4-H. To measure this objective, a series of T-tests and ANOVA tables were constructed. Again, the demographic variables were either nominally or intervally scaled. The respondents' attitudes were measured with the Semantic Differential or the Likert Scales.

The summarized data indicated there is no difference in individual donors' attitude regardless of gender of the 4-H donors. Data indicated a difference in attitude with regard to age. Those in the age category of 18 to 29 and 60 years or

older had a more positive attitude regarding 4-H than those in the age category of 30 to 44 years. However, those in the 30 to 44 age group are similar in attitude to those 45 to 59 years of age. There is no significant relationship between education, residence, income, and career and attitudes about 4-H. This difference of opinion may result because the 30 to 44 age group and the 45 to 59 age group may actually be working the closest with the 4-H program.

When summarizing the data of the corporate donors for objective three, the results presented evidence to suggest there are gender differences in total 4-H opinion and 4-H objectives. Females tended to have a higher 4-H opinion than did males, and females tended to rate the 4-H objectives higher than did males. There was no difference though in the attitude about the life skills 4-H attempts to teach youth. There was also evidence to suggest that age made a difference when describing the attitudes about 4-H with corporate donors. Those aged 60 years or older had a lower total 4-H opinion than did those 45 to 59 years. However, those aged 45 to 59 had a similar opinion to those aged 18 to 29. Also, for corporate donors there appeared to be a difference in attitude about 4-H depending upon career. Those in agriculture careers tended to have a more positive attitude concerning the perceptions of the total 4-H objectives and the perceptions of the life skills than those not involved in agriculture careers.

The fourth objective was to determine if there was a correlation between donors' attitudes about 4-H and their philanthropic giving patterns. For both

individual and corporate donors, there was no indication from the data that attitude about 4-H made any difference on the donors' philanthropic giving patterns.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER STUDIES

Several of the findings of this study were similar to findings of other studies researched. According to The Chronicle of Philanthropy (1990), the so called "baby boomers" comprise the largest donor audience. According to the findings of this study, those aged 30 to 44 and those aged 45 to 59 on the average gave more than the other age groups. However, findings from this study did not ultimately support Bailey's (1990) findings that males on the average give more money than do females. Informally, it was learned that people like to give to people. The reason is because they know the dollars are working; the donors are making a difference. This supports Weinberg's (1988) study that says people give to make a difference.

Of course, this study did not support the idea that the more positive an attitude is about an organization, the more likely someone is to contribute. In other words, there was no substantive correlation between attitude and philanthropic giving pattern.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The results of this study indicate that most of the donors to the Tennessee 4-H program have a generally high opinion of the organization. However, many indicated a need for a "modernizing", or more changes to the Tennessee 4-H program. This fact and others similar to this are provided by anecdotal quotes returned with the questionnaires. An important conclusion reached from this study

is that individual donors indicated they are more receptive to the potential of a fund raising campaign than are the corporate donors.

Based on these conclusions and the other findings from the study, the following are recommendations to the Board of Directors of the Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation, Inc.:

(1.) The Tennessee 4-H program should consider attempting a more aggressive fund raising campaign. From the findings, it appears this campaign may particularly be directed at reaching more individual donors according to the donors and potential donors who responded to this study's questionnaire.

(2.) Consideration should also be given to using more and varied techniques for identifying potential donors. Of those donors responding that had been contacted for a contribution, most indicated being reached by personal contacts. There should be other strategies developed for contacting donors and tracking potential donors.

(3.) It is strongly recommended that a donor data base be computerized and frequently updated. Throughout the study, much time could have been saved if the mailing list had been more up to date.

(4.) Based on the review of literature and results of this study, corporate sponsorship should be sought from those corporations not already donating to Tennessee 4-H.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

After completing this study, the following recommendations for future research are made.

(1.) This study needs to be periodically replicated to continue to understand the demographic characteristics of the donors to the Tennessee 4-H program.

(2.) Further research should be conducted regarding the relationships between gender and attitude about 4-H. Males tended to have lower opinions of the 4-H program. Further analysis should be conducted to determine if there is a significant reason why.

(3.) Additional study should be done to determine if level of involvement with 4-H makes any difference in amount of contributions to 4-H or attitudes concerning the Tennessee 4-H program.

(4.) In this study, the perceptions about the entire objectives of 4-H were measured whereas another study could examine the objectives of one particular 4-H project or activity.

(5.) A study could be done to determine the giving pattern of those who were involved with 4-H and their achievement level in 4-H. Achievement level would have to be determined as offices held, contests participated in, or recognition received for example. However, this could be done for the purposes of further study.

(6.) A study could be conducted to assess donors' attitudes about perceptions of the life skills and whether or not these are being accomplished by the 4-H program.

(7.) A study could be done to determine if a change in income level is a factor to consider when donors are making a contribution.

(8.) Another study could be conducted using the residents of Tennessee as the general population from which to draw the sample. It would be interesting to learn the perceptions of 4-H by the general population.

(9.) Finally, more indepth studies could be conducted to learn about the Tennessee 4-H donor population of 1990-91. Donors could be questioned about specific 4-H activities, programs, and events.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allport, G. W. (1935). A Handbook of Social Psychology. Worcester, MS: Clark University Press.

Bailey, A. L. (1986). Non-Profit Coalition Launches Campaign to Double Charitable Gifts to $160 Billion. Journal of Higher Education, 33(10), 29-31.

Chewning, P. B. (1985). What's On Their Minds? Currents, 11(7), 30-32.

Davis, J. A. (1971). Elementary Survey Analysis. Englewood, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and Telephone Surveys The Total Design Method. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Feasibility Study for Missouri 4-H Foundation. (1989). Prepared by Nike B. Whitcomb Associates, Inc. Chicago, IL.

Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. (1972). Attitudes and Opinions. Annual Review of Psychology, 42, 17-31.

Foster, G. S. & Henderson, M. R. (1986). 4-H Local Leaders' Handbook. Publication 316, Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

4-H Long Range Study. (1986). Survey Questionnaire for County 4-H Donors. State 4-H Office Cooperative Extension Service, The University of Georgia, Athens.

Future of 4-H in Indiana Preparing Head, Heart, Hands, and Health for the Twenty-First Century. (1990). Marketing Research Feasibility Study conducted by The Bill Heim Company, Granville, OH.

Gallup Organization. (1990). Giving and Volunteering in the United States, Nationwide Poll.

Goddard, T. (1983). The History of the National and Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation, Inc., Agricultural and Extension Education 5210, Unpublished Manuscript, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Goldhor, H. (1972). The Use of Late Responders to Estimate the Nature of Non-Responders. (Eric Document, EDO3309, TMO03274).

Grunig, J. E. & Hunt, T. (1984). Managing Public Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hastings, A. L. (1987). Media Use and Public Image of Blount County's 4-H Program. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Henerson, M. E., Morris, L. L. & Fitz-Gibbon, C. T. (1978). How to Measure Attitudes. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Keating, B., Pitts, R. & Appel, D. (1981). United Way Contributions: Coercion, Charity or Economic Self-Interest? Southern Economics Journal, 47, 816-823.

Ladewig, H. & Thomas, J. K. (1987). Does 4-H Make a Difference? The 4-H Alumni Study. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, Texas A & M University, College Station.

Ledingham, J. A. (1987). The Kindness of Strangers: Predictor Variables in a Public Information Campaign. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communications. San Antonio, TX.

Millar, B. (1990). Baby Boomers Give Generously to Charities, Survey Finds, but Their Willingness to Do Volunteer Work Is Questioned. The Chronicle of Philanthropy, 2, 48-51.

Millar, R. (1979). A Life Skills Approach to Leadership Development. A 4-H Staff Assistant Report for Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.

Mueller, D. J. (1986). Measuring Social Attitudes. New York: Teachers College Press.

Nichols, J. E. (1990). Philanthropic Trends for the 1990s. Fund Raising Management, vol. 21(6), 45-48.

Oskamp, S. (1977). Attitudes and Opinions. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Overkamp, S. J. (1990). Not-for-Profits: A New Ball Game. Public Relations Journal, 23, 22-23.

Reck, F. M. (1951). The 4-H Story. A History of 4-H Club Work. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press.

Reese, C. C. (1982). 4-H Alumni: Techniques and Strategies of Identifying and Involving 4-H Alumni. National 4-H Club Foundation, Extension Service (DOA) Washington, D. C.

Roper Study. (1990). The Public and Charitable Giving. The Roper Organization.

SPSS Inc. (1990). SPSS Reference Guide. Chicago, IL: Library of Congress (89-043279).

Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation, Inc. Articles of Incorporation and By-Laws. (1988, 1991). (Original articles published 1953).

Weber, N. (Ed.) (1990). Giving USA '90 The Annual Report on Philanthropy for the Year 1989. AAFRC Trust for Philanthropy, Inc.: Joanne Hayes Publisher.

Weinberg, B. M. (1990). Scholarship Fund Development: The Art of Successful Begging. Anne Arundel Community College, Arnold, MD. (ERIC document Reproduction Service No. ED 316 305).

Wessel, T. and M. Wessel. (1982). 4-H: An American Idea 1900-1980. Chevy Chase, Maryland: National 4-H Council.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

INDIVIDUAL DONORS'

COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE

November 1, 1991

Dear Friend:

We're sure you realize the impact the 4-H youth organization has on the young people in Tennessee. Your support of 4-H helps maintain quality programs and activities for 4-H members. To continue this standard of excellence, the Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation Board of Directors is seeking your input to gain a better understanding of attitudes people have about the Tennessee 4-H program.

You have been selected from a large group of friends and former members of 4-H to share your opinion regarding the goals and objectives of the Tennessee 4-H program. Participation in this study is voluntary, there is, of course, no penalty for not responding. However, for the results of our study to be representative of this group, it is important that each questionnaire be returned. It should take you no longer than 10-15 minutes to complete the questionnaire and it can be returned in the self-addressed stamped envelope enclosed. **We would greatly appreciate your response by November 15, 1991.**

You will notice a code number in the upper right corner of the questionnaire. This number is used to follow-up non-respondents to assure they received their copy of the questionnaire. Your name will be removed from our follow-up list as soon as we receive your completed questionnaire. **Your name will never be linked with your individual response, and all results will be reported in aggregate form only. You may be assured of complete confidentiality.**

The results of this study will be made available to the state 4-H Club office, the Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation Board of Directors, and all interested citizens. If you wish to receive a summary of the study's results, please write "copy of results requested" on the back of the return envelope and print your name and address below it. Please do not put this information on the questionnaire itself.

If you have questions concerning this study, please feel free to call Ms. Phyllis Bohannon at (615) 974-7308 or Ms. Teresa Goddard at (615) 974-7434. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Mel Carr, President Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation, Inc.	Teresa Goddard 4-H Resource Development	Phyllis Bohannon Graduate Assistant Agr. & Ext. Education

I. The following is a list of adjective pairs which indicate extreme opinions about a particular subject. Please think about the Tennessee 4-H program and place a check on each scale evaluating your general attitude about 4-H. Please place your mark in the middle of the space:

Like This Not Like This

:____:✓:____::____:____✓____:

THE TENNESSEE 4-H CLUB IS:

1. Important____:____:____:____:____:____:____Unimportant
2. Active____:____:____:____:____:____:____Passive
3. Unchanging____:____:____:____:____:____:____Changing
4. Powerful____:____:____:____:____:____:____Powerless
5. Weak____:____:____:____:____:____:____Strong
6. Successful____:____:____:____:____:____:____Unsuccessful

II. Below is a list of statements regarding the objectives of the Tennessee 4-H program. Please indicate your attitude concerning these objectives by circling the appropriate number located to the right of each statement.

4-H HELPS YOUNG PEOPLE:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Gain new knowledge, skills, and attitudes through "real life experiences"	1	2	3	4	5
2. Realize the satisfaction and dignity of work	1	2	3	4	5
3. Develop leadership talents and abilities	1	2	3	4	5
4. Recognize the value of research and learn the decision-making process	1	2	3	4	5
5. Understand how agriculture and home economics contribute to the economy and human welfare	1	2	3	4	5
6. Explore career opportunities and continue needed education	1	2	3	4	5
7. Practice healthful living and constructive use of leisure time	1	2	3	4	5
8. Appreciate nature and apply conservation principles	1	2	3	4	5
9. Strengthen personal standards and citizenship ideals	1	2	3	4	5
10. Cultivate desire and ability to cooperate with others	1	2	3	4	5

III. One purpose of the 4-H program is to teach youth valuable "life skills" through involvement in numerous club events and activities. The following is a list of some of those life skills 4-H attempts to teach:

- **accept responsibility**
- **career choices**
- **master practical work skills and habits**
- **adjust to stress and peer pressure**
- **communicate well with others**
- **practice wise consumerism**
- **develop socially and physically**
- **make intelligent decisions**
- **appreciate the need for financial planning and record keeping**
- **develop confidence in oneself and self-esteem**

Following is a list of some of the more common 4-H events and activities which members can participate in. Realizing that no single event or activity teaches all of these life skills, please consider each of these events or activities and indicate your perception of how effective it is in teaching life skills in general. Please circle your response beside each statement.

	Strongly Effective	Effective	Undecided	Ineffective	Strongly Ineffective
1. Judging teams (such as foods and nutrition or dairy products)	1	2	3	4	5
2. Livestock shows	1	2	3	4	5
3. Camping program	1	2	3	4	5
4. Citizenship and leadership events (such as Round-Up and Congress)	1	2	3	4	5
5. Individual project work (such as demonstrations and record book keeping, project work in arts & crafts, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
6. Competitive activities (such as public speaking, poster contest, and conservation skills competition)	1	2	3	4	5
7. Skills activities (such as automotive driving and egg cookery)	1	2	3	4	5
8. Exchange trips	1	2	3	4	5
9. Fairs and exhibitions	1	2	3	4	5

IV. We would like to know a little bit about you personally. This information will be used only for purposes of characterizing our respondents, and your personal responses will never be linked with your identity.

Please check one:

1. _____ Male _____ Female

2. To which age category do you belong?

_____ 18 to 29 years
_____ 30 to 44 years
_____ 45 to 59 years
_____ 60 years or older

3. Which best describes where you live?

_____ farm
_____ rural, but not on a farm
_____ in a town of less than 2,500 residents
_____ in a town of 2,500 to 10,000 residents
_____ in a small city (10,000 to 50,000 population)
_____ in a medium-sized city (50,000 to 100,000 population)
_____ in a large city or metropolis (over 100,000 population)

4. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

_____ grade school
_____ high school
_____ some college (including vocational or technical schools)
_____ associate's degree
_____ bachelor's degree
_____ some graduate study
_____ master's degree
_____ hours toward doctoral degree
_____ doctoral degree

5. Were you ever a 4-H member?

_____ Yes _____ No

6. Are you currently, or have you ever served as a 4-H volunteer leader?

_____ Yes _____ No

7. Was your spouse a 4-H member?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Not Applicable

8. Is your spouse currently or ever been a 4-H volunteer leader?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Not Applicable

9. Have your child(ren) and or grandchild(ren) ever been 4-H members?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Not Applicable

10. Were your parents 4-H members and/or 4-H volunteer leaders?

_____ Yes _____ No

11. Do you have other friends, relatives, or neighbors who were 4-H members or 4-H volunteer leaders?

_____ Yes _____ No

12. Do you have employees or an employer(s) who are 4-H volunteer leaders or were 4-H members?

_____ Yes _____ No

13. Please indicate the job title that most closely matches your current career. Select from category I below if you consider your work to be agriculturally related or from category II on the following page if it is not an agricultural career. Please check only one.

I. Agricultural Careers

_____ Agricultural Sales

_____ Agricultural Financial Specialist/Analyst

_____ Ornamental Horticulture/ Landscape Design

_____ Parks/Forestry Specialist

_____ Product Development

_____ Water/Soil Conservationist

_____ Agricultural Engineer

_____ Production/Management

_____ Production Agriculture (crops, livestock, diversified)

_____ Agricultural Extension Service

_____ Wildlife/Fisheries Biologist

_____ Quality Control Specialist

_____ Veterinarian

_____ Food Inspector/Buyer/Distributor

_____ Agricultural Education

_____ Other_____

II. Non-Agriculture Careers

_____ Administration

_____ Clerical/Support Staff

_____ Education (non-agriculture)

_____ Government

_____ Law

_____ Public Safety

_____ Sales/Marketing

_____ Service (Restaurant, gasoline, etc.)

_____ Clergy

_____ Construction

_____ Finance/Banking

_____ Homemaker

_____ Medical/Dental

_____ Real Estate/Development

_____ Self Employed

_____ Other_____

14. Please indicate your household income range:

_____ Less than $15,000

_____ $15,000-$24,999

_____ $25,000-$34,999

_____ $35,000-$44,999

_____ $45,000-$64,999

_____ $65,000-$99,999

_____ $100,000-$199,999

_____ $200,000 and up

15. Please check all of the following charitable organizations that you contributed to in 1990 or 1991.

_____ Religious organization(s)

_____ Arts

_____ FFA

_____ Girl Scouts/Boy Scouts

_____ YMCA/YWCA

_____ Campfire Girls

_____ Education organizations

_____ Health Organizations

_____ 4-H

_____ FHA

_____ Junior Achievement

_____ Other_____

16. How many times over the past ten years have you donated to the Tennessee 4-H program?

_____ time(s)

_____ I have never contributed

IF YOU HAVE NEVER CONTRIBUTED, PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION #21.

17. When was the last time you donated to the Tennessee 4-H program?

_____ 3 years ago or less

_____ 4-6 years ago

_____ 7-9 years ago

_____ 10 or more years ago

18. Approximately, how much did you contribute at each level to the Tennessee 4-H program the last year you donated?

$_____ local or county

$_____ district

$_____ state

19. Was that donation marked for a specific 4-H program, scholarship, or fund?

_____ Yes _____ No If yes please specify which one_____

20. How were you contacted for your 4-H donation? (Please check all that apply)

_____ personal contact _____ telephone

_____ mail _____ other_____

21. Do you feel that the Tennessee 4-H program should attempt a more aggressive fund raising campaign?

_____ Yes _____ No

22. If such a fund raising campaign occurred, would you consider donating more money to 4-H?

_____ Yes _____ No

23. If applicable, please tell us why you have donated to the Tennessee 4-H program over the past ten years.

_____

_____

_____

_____

24. In the event you are not contributing to the Tennessee 4-H program, please tell us why.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please use the back of this sheet to provide any additional information or suggestions you would like to offer.

Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope by November 15, 1991.

APPENDIX B

CORPORATE DONORS'

COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE

November 1, 1991

Dear Friend:

We're sure you realize the impact the 4-H youth organization has on the young people in Tennessee. Your company's support of 4-H helps maintain quality programs and activities for 4-H members. To continue this standard of excellence, the Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation Board of Directors is seeking your input to gain a better understanding of attitudes people have about the Tennessee 4-H program.

As your company's representative, you have been selected from a large group of friends and former members of 4-H to share your opinion regarding the goals and objectives of the Tennessee 4-H program. Participation in this study is voluntary, and there is, of course, no penalty for not responding. However, for the results of our study to be representative of this group, it is important that each questionnaire be returned. It should take you no longer than 10-15 minutes to complete the questionnaire, and it can be returned in the self-addressed stamped envelope enclosed. **We would greatly appreciate your response by November 15, 1991.**

You will notice a code number in the upper right corner of the questionnaire. This number is used to follow-up non-respondents to assure they received their copy of the questionnaire. Your name will be removed from our follow up list as soon as we receive your completed questionnaire. **Neither your name or your company's name will be linked with your individual response, and all results will be reported in aggregate form only. You may be assured of complete confidentiality.**

The results of this study will be made available to the state 4-H Club office, the Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation Board of Directors, and all interested citizens. If you wish to receive a summary of the study's results, please write "copy of results requested" on the back of the return envelope, and print your name and address below it. Please do not put this information on the questionnaire itself.

If you have questions concerning this study, please feel free to call Ms. Phyllis Bohannon at (615) 974-7308 or Ms. Teresa Goddard at (615) 974-7434. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Mel Carr, President Tennessee 4-H Club Foundation, Inc.	Teresa Goddard 4-H Resource Development	Phyllis Bohannon Graduate Assistant Agr. & Ext. Education

I. The following is a list of adjective pairs which indicate extreme opinions about a particular subject. Please think about the Tennessee 4-H program and place a check on each scale evaluating your general attitude about 4-H. Please place your mark in the middle of the space:

Like This Not Like This
:____:✓:____::____✓____:____:

THE TENNESSEE 4-H CLUB IS:

1. Important____:____:____:____:____:____:____Unimportant
2. Active____:____:____:____:____:____:____Passive
3. Unchanging____:____:____:____:____:____:____Changing
4. Powerful____:____:____:____:____:____:____Powerless
5. Weak____:____:____:____:____:____:____Strong
6. Successful____:____:____:____:____:____:____Unsuccessful

II. Below is a list of statements regarding the objectives of the Tennessee 4-H program. Please indicate your attitude concerning these objectives by circling the appropriate number located to the right of each statement.

4-H HELPS YOUNG PEOPLE:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Gain new knowledge, skills, and attitudes through "real life experiences"	1	2	3	4	5
2. Realize the satisfaction and dignity of work	1	2	3	4	5
3. Develop leadership talents and abilities	1	2	3	4	5
4. Recognize the value of research and learn the decision-making process	1	2	3	4	5
5. Understand how agriculture and home economics contribute to the economy and human welfare	1	2	3	4	5
6. Explore career opportunities and continue needed education	1	2	3	4	5
7. Practice healthful living and constructive use of leisure time	1	2	3	4	5
8. Appreciate nature and apply conservation principles	1	2	3	4	5
9. Strengthen personal standards and citizenship ideals	1	2	3	4	5
10. Cultivate desire and ability to cooperate with others	1	2	3	4	5

III. One purpose of the 4-H program is to teach youth valuable "life skills" through involvement in numerous club events and activities. The following is a list of some of those life skills 4-H attempts to teach:

- **accept responsibility**
- **career choices**
- **master practical work skills and habits**
- **adjust to stress and peer pressure**
- **communicate well with others**
- **practice wise consumerism**
- **develop socially and physically**
- **make intelligent decisions**
- **appreciate the need for financial planning and record keeping**
- **develop confidence in oneself and self-esteem**

Following is a list of some of the more common 4-H events and activities which members can participate in. Realizing that no single event or activity teaches all of these life skills, please consider each of these events or activities and indicate your perception of how effective it is in teaching life skills in general. Please circle your response beside each statement.

	Strongly Effective	Effective	Undecided	Ineffective	Strongly Ineffective
1. Judging teams (such as foods and nutrition or dairy products)	1	2	3	4	5
2. Livestock shows	1	2	3	4	5
3. Camping program	1	2	3	4	5
4. Citizenship and leadership events (such as Round-Up and Congress)	1	2	3	4	5
5. Individual project work (such as demonstrations and record book keeping, project work in arts & crafts, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
6. Competitive activities (such as public speaking, poster contest, and conservation skills competition)	1	2	3	4	5
7. Skills activities (such as automotive driving and egg cookery)	1	2	3	4	5
8. Exchange trips	1	2	3	4	5
9. Fairs and exhibitions	1	2	3	4	5

IV. We would like to know a little bit about you and your company's philosophy about philanthropic giving. This information will be used only for purposes of characterizing our respondents and your personal responses will never be linked with your identity.

1. Please check one:

_____ Male _____ Female

2. To which age category do you belong?

_____ 18 to 29 years _____ 30 to 44 years

_____ 45 to 59 years _____ 60 years or older

3. Are you a 4-H alumni?

_____ Yes _____ No

4. Are you currently, or have you ever served as a 4-H volunteer leader?

_____ Yes _____ No

5. Was your spouse a 4-H member?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Not Applicable

6. Is your spouse currently or ever been a 4-H volunteer leader?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Not Applicable

7. Are/were your child(ren) and or grandchild(ren) 4-H members?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Not Applicable

8. Were your parents 4-H members and/or 4-H volunteer leaders?

_____ Yes _____ No

9. Do you have other relatives, friends, or neighbors who were 4-H members or 4-H volunteer leaders?

_____ Yes _____ No

10. Do you have employees or an employer(s) who are 4-H volunteer leaders or were 4-H members?

_____ Yes _____ No

11. Please indicate the job title that most closely matches your current career. Select from category I if you consider your work to be agriculturally related or from category II if it is not an agricultural career. Please check only one.

I. Agricultural Careers

_____ Agricultural Sales

_____ Agricultural Financial Specialist/Analyst

_____ Ornamental Horticulture/ Landscape Design

_____ Parks/Forestry Specialist

_____ Product Development

_____ Water/Soil Conservationist

_____ Agricultural Engineer

_____ Production/Management

_____ Production Agriculture (crops, livestock, diversified)

_____ Agricultural Extension Service

_____ Wildlife/Fisheries Biologist

_____ Quality Control Specialist

_____ Veterinarian

_____ Food Inspector/Buyer/Distributor

_____ Agricultural Education

_____ Other_____

II. Non-Agriculture Careers

_____ Administration

_____ Clerical/Support Staff

_____ Education (non-agriculture)

_____ Government

_____ Law

_____ Public Safety

_____ Sales/Marketing

_____ Service (Restaurant, gasoline, etc.)

_____ Clergy

_____ Construction

_____ Finance/Banking

_____ Homemaker

_____ Medical/Dental

_____ Real Estate/Development

_____ Self Employed

_____ Other_____

12. Please check all of the following charitable organizations that your company contributed to in 1990 or 1991.

_____ Religious organization(s) _____ Education organizations

_____ Arts _____ Health Organizations

_____ FFA _____ 4-H

_____ Girl Scouts/Boy Scouts _____ FHA

_____ YMCA/YWCA _____ Junior Achievement

_____ Campfire Girls _____Other_____

13. How many times over the past ten years has your company contributed to the Tennessee 4-H program?

_____ time(s) _____ The company has never contributed

IF THE COMPANY HAS NEVER CONTRIBUTED, PLEASE SKIP TO QUESTION # 18.

14. When was the last time your company donated to the Tennessee 4-H program?

_____ 3 years ago or less _____ 7-9 years ago

_____ 4-6 years ago _____ 10 or more years ago

15. Approximately, how much did your company contribute at each level to the Tennessee 4-H program the last year your company donated?

$_____ local

$_____ district

$_____ state

16. Was your company's donation marked for a specific 4-H program, scholarship or fund?

_____ Yes _____ No If yes please specify which one_____

17. How was your company contacted for a donation? (Please check all that apply)

_____ personal contact _____ telephone

_____ mail _____ Other_____

18. Do you feel that the Tennessee 4-H program should attempt a more aggressive fund raising campaign?

_____ Yes _____ No

19. If such a fund raising campaign occurred, would your company consider donating more money to 4-H?

_____ Yes _____ No

20. If applicable, please tell us why your company has donated to the Tennessee 4-H program over the past ten years.

_____

_____

_____

_____

21. In the event your company is not contributing to the Tennessee 4-H program, please tell us why.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please use the remaining space (or the back of this sheet) to provide any additional information or suggestions you would like to offer.

Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope by November 15, 1991.

VITA

Phyllis Lee Bohannon was born on January 4, 1968 in Cookeville, Tennessee. She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John D. Bohannon of Cookeville, Tennessee. She graduated from Cookeville High School in May of 1985 and from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville in December of 1989 with a Bachelor of Science in Agriculture Business. While an undergraduate at U.T., Phyllis served as Panhellenic President, student member of the U.T. Board of Trustees, and as a member of Zeta Tau Alpha sorority. In January 1990, she began as a graduate assistant in the Department of Agricultural and Extension Education at U.T. While a graduate student, she served as graduate student advisor to the Ag. Business Club, graduate student representative on the Ag. Student/Faculty Council to the Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources, and was a charter member and Vice-President of the Knox County Young Farmers and Homemakers Club. She is a member of Gamma Sigma Delta and Phi Kappa Phi national honor societies.

In March 1992, she began a career with the Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service as an Assistant Extension Agent working with 4-H Agriculture in Franklin County, Tennessee. In May 1992, she graduated with her Master's of Science Degree in Agricultural and Extension Education.