To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Claire Eldridge-Karr entitled "An Investigative Study of Predictive Characteristics Associated With Alumni Planned Giving." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Education.

Robert K. Roney

Robert K. Roney, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

[illegible]

Mary Jane Connelly

John W. Lounsbury

Accepted for the Council:

[illegible]

Associate Vice Chancellor
and Dean of The Graduate School

AN INVESTIGATIVE STUDY OF PREDICTIVE CHARACTERISTICS ASSOCIATED WITH ALUMNI PLANNED GIVING

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Education

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Claire Eldridge-Karr

December, 1991

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my daughter

Lyndsey Eldridge Karr

who, as a child, has encouraged me to complete this program of study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my major professor, Dr. Robert K. Roney, for his guidance and encouragement. I would also like to thank Drs. Dan R. Quarles, John Lounsbury and Mary Jane Connelly for their suggestions, assistance and encouragement over the past several years. I would like to express my thanks to my daughter, Lyndsey, for her patience and encouragement between ages six and twelve while attempting to understand what her mother was trying to accomplish. I would like to thank Ms. Sabrina Deck for her invaluable assistance in the preparation of this manuscript along with my friend and colleague Ms. Johnnie Williams for her consultation and encouragement. Finally, I would like to express my thanks to Dr. Joseph E. Johnson, President of The University of Tennessee; Messrs. Charles F. Brakebill, Michael F. Hitchcox and Woodrow M. Henderson, Ms. Martha E. Hopkins and Mrs. Linda S. Davidson for their advice and support throughout this research.

ABSTRACT

This research attempted to develop a conceptual alumni planned (deferred) giving model based on demographic and attitudinal characteristics for public universities of higher education. A conceptual model would be linked to a computer model that could be used to screen groups of alumni to ascertain the presence of the requisite (combination of) demographic and/or attitudinal characteristics for making planned gifts. The two-phased study incorporated an abbreviated (three probes) Delphi technique in which planned giving officers at seventeen public universities participated as well as an alumni planned giving questionnaire administered to a census of alumni making planned gifts to The University of Tennessee, Knoxville and to a random sampling of University of Tennessee, Knoxville alumni aged forty years or more who had not made a planned gift. Analytical techniques included Chi-square, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and discriminant analysis. The results of analyses revealed six statistically significant (producing a squared canonical correlation of .48) variables predictive of planned giving at greater than .01 that correctly classified 81.2% of grouped cases. A conceptual model was recommended based on this exploratory research.

It was concluded that there are numerous factors involved in identifying alumni planned giving prospects and none are perfect predictors. There are sufficient predictive characteristics with the aggregate capability of discriminating among alumni to recommend a conceptual model of alumni planned giving.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Development, or fundraising, is a relatively new field in public, higher education, and debate continues in the development field as a whole as to whether fundraising is simply an occupation or a professional career path. Whichever, college and university alumni are probably the most common target of professional fundraising activities. (Blumenfeld & Sartain, 1974). In the realm of public, higher education, shortfalls in tax revenues and varied state appropriations formula funding methods among the states have resulted in some states not consistently generating sufficient annual funding for colleges and universities. Cut-backs in federal spending on higher education from student loan programs to brick and mortar funds aggravate the situation. Most state higher education officials expect the budget squeeze will extend, and perhaps intensify, through the early 1990's (Blumenstyk and Cage, 1990). Increasingly sophisticated fundraising techniques are demanded for typically small fundraising staffs. Additionally, accountability and cost efficiency are increasingly demanded, and institutions, inclusive of fundraising operations, are increasingly being scrutinized by various agencies and governing bodies ultimately representing the interests of the taxpayer.

State universities that were largely dependent on government funding in the 1970's and early 1980's have been hard hit by financial decreases. Yet these public institutions currently enroll about three-fourths (75%) of the nation's total higher education student population -- twice as many as a century ago (McNally, 1985). These public universities depended on federal, state and local government funding for about two-thirds of their total support (McNally, 1985). Federal student aid suffered cumulative cuts of major proportions in the early 1980's amounting to a 23% reduction in federal support of higher education between fiscal years 1980 and 1983 (Korvas, 1984). Social security benefits in higher education for adult students were eliminated. (Odendahl, 1990). From 1980 to 1986, education and research funding declined $19.6 billion, or eighteen percent (Odendahl, 1990). This situation forced many students to enroll at public institutions rather than higher priced private colleges, while, ironically, some state institutions were forced to limit enrollment increases because state appropriations had not increased, and in some instances, impoundments were occurring (Korvas, 1984).

In public institutions, as in all higher education, audits and assessments are performed with increasing regularity by internal and external agencies to determine a cost benefit or cost effectiveness ratio. This ratio can then be compared with those of peer institutions for a broader perspective related to accountability to state and federal offices as well as the taxpayer. For example, a 1988 performance audit of the campus development and alumni affairs program at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, revealed that during the 1987 - 1988 fiscal year, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, raised $11.8 million dollars at a cost of $835,927 (of which $470,927 was the on-going office budget) for a cost effectiveness ratio of 7% (Coxe and Associates, 1988). The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in addition to the opportunity to respond to a series of recommendations for operations improvements, has a mechanism through which to attest to its cost efficient practices to both the Board of

Trustees, the State legislature, the State's taxpayers, and, accordingly, to the larger proportion of the donors to this land-grant institution of higher education.

In the nineteen eighties, most institutions of higher education could not balance their annual operating budgets without private dollars. Few had sufficiently large endowments to fall back on in case of very many years of deficit budgets (Keller, 1985). As institutions of higher education moved into the nineteen nineties, both independent and tax-supported institutions were focusing attention on developing stronger private giving programs (Welch, 1980).

Within the context of higher education fundraising programs are planned, or deferred, giving programs. Planned giving includes gifts to non-profit organizations that provide a current tax benefit to the donor and a longer-term benefit to both the non-profit recipient (in terms of the expectation of additional principal and interest income) and the donor (in terms of reductions in estate and inheritance taxes after the death of the donor). Within the larger context of alumni giving, planned giving remains unaddressed by researchers despite the increasing need for financial support from the private sector and the increasingly larger pool of living alumni, along with budget considerations and accountability issues. As late as 1982, knowledge of alumni philanthropy was based on the conventional myth that all graduates are capable of making a contribution and may, in fact, do so at any time (Beeler, 1982). Little alumni or development literature was devoted to testing for possible differences between donors and non-donors among alumni with the intention of predicting which alumni were most likely to give (Beeler, 1982). A review of subsequent literature did not reveal any studies concerned with the characteristics or giving patterns of college and university alumni for the purpose of predicting planned gifts.

The purpose of fundraising in higher education in the future will be to enable individual institutions to succeed in a highly competitive environment (Keller, 1985). Because there are so many different types of colleges and universities, each type of institution must develop a unique strategy to acquire the private contributions required to ensure the realization of its objectives (Jones, 1979). For development personnel to solicit increased voluntary support from the private sector, the problem of differentiating between alumni as donors and non-donors based on demographic and attitudinal characteristics needs refinement. The promising national outlook for planned giving as a major source of voluntary, private support for the future warrants further study to attempt to differentiate among alumni donors.

Statement of the Problem

The problem is two-fold: 1) institutions of public higher education need substantial additional funding from the public and private sectors and 2) there is a lack of formal research on the characteristics and giving patterns of public higher education alumni for the purpose of identifying and predicting planned gifts by these alumni to their alma maters.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this exploratory study was to develop a conceptual planned (deferred) giving model based on:

1. demographic and attitudinal alumni characteristics observed by experts in the development field; and

2. the collection of demographic and attitudinal data from:

   a. a census of alumni who have made planned gifts (exclusive of insurance policies because planned giving officials at The University of Tennessee believed that inclusion of insurance policies would introduce an athletic bias), and

   b. a random sample of alumni who have not made planned gifts for the purpose of comparison with the census of alumni making planned gifts.

A resulting planned giving model could be tested subsequently in terms of its ability to screen groups of alumni to ascertain the presence of the requisite (combination of) characteristics for making planned gifts.

Research Questions

The central research question for the study was: Is there a set of demographic and attitudinal characteristics that identify or associate membership in a planned gift prospect group among a given body of alumni that could be incorporated into a screening model or device? Further stated, the research question included the following components:

1) What are the requisite, primary alumni characteristics (demographic and attitudinal) as determined by experts?

2) Which characteristics describe those alumni making a planned gift to The University of Tennessee and those alumni who have not made a planned gift to The University of Tennessee (inclusive of the following possible arrangements:

   a) making regular and/or periodic gifts as well as a planned gift to The University of Tennessee,
   b) making regular and/or periodic gifts but not a planned gift to The University of Tennessee,

c) making no regular and/or periodic gifts but making a planned gift to The University of Tennessee)?

3) To what extent can the independent variables discriminate between alumni who have made planned gifts and alumni who have not made planned gifts to The University of Tennessee?

4) Do the following characteristics appear to be independent (predictive) variables of planned gifts?

a) gender
b) academic credentials: degree/s received or attended only (did not graduate)
c) campus attended (in addition to main campus)
d) marital status
e) children
f) age group
g) employment status
h) proximity of residence to institution
i) residence type
j) gross estate size
k) financial provisions for spouse/heirs
l) gifts/contributions to the institution
m) estate planning and tax consequences
n) desire to create a permanent legacy or tribute
o) desire for recognition/prestige
p) desire to help others or society (charitable disposition)
q) feeling of allegiance or gratitude to institution
r) past and current relationship (involvement) with the institution
s) previous giving history or having an available pattern of giving to follow from family/peers
t) outgrowth of volunteer activities with the institution
u) interest or belief in supporting the institution
v) provide satisfaction of participating in the work of the institution.

Background

Gifts by bequest or will historically have been and continue to be one of the larger private gift sources of funding for institutions of higher education, both public and private. Some statistics on gifts by individuals provide an introductory overview of the proportion of planned giving, inclusive of bequests, during the past two decades. A 1976 Development Study among twenty-five colleges and universities by the Consortium on Financing Higher

Education found that gifts by individuals accounted for almost three-fourths of college support and 56% of university support from 1966 through 1975 with 38% of the university and 35% of the college support coming by way of bequests -- eight and ten percent, respectively, came via other planned gifts over the same time frame (Fink and Metzler, 1982). In its 1979 twenty-fifth anniversary issue, Giving USA reported that not only had an unprecedented $43.31 billion been contributed to all charitable causes, but also that 90% of this total was given by individuals in the form of outright gifts and planned gifts, including bequests (Fink and Metzler, 1982). The 1988 Giving USA estimates for the 1988 tax year included total giving of $86.7 billion to all charitable organizations with 83.1% in outright contributions and 6.5% in bequests (Goss, 1989). This continued the 90% proportion of individual gifts. Bequests, however, dropped slightly in 1988 in inflation-adjusted terms, reflecting an apparent return to the modest annual growth in giving (between one and three percent) typical of the 1980's (Goss, 1989).

Tax Reform and Estate Planning

A review of giving totals and their proportional components was revealing for the period of the latter 1960's through the 1988 estimates in light of Congressional tax reforms enacted during this timeframe. The Tax Reform Act of 1969 was the first federal statute to describe ways in which charitable remainder life income trusts could be established so as to qualify for tax deductions (Fink and Metzler, 1982). The 1986 Tax Reform Act has fundraising consultants still concerned about the long-term effects of this act which removed the charitable deduction for donors who do not itemize their income tax deductions as well as abolishing other tax incentives for wealthier donors (Goss, 1989). But, although there will be a greater direct economic cost to giving by individuals than in the past, the price of giving for higher income individuals is $ .72 for every dollar donated to charity (Odendahl, 1990). This means lost revenue to the government, but probably increased funds to non-profits (Odendahl, 1990).

In the Tax Reform Act of 1986, Congress accomplished the limiting of tax shelters and other losses previously used to offset taxable income (Moerschbaecher, 1987). The new rules separate 'active' income (wages, compensation, and investment) from 'passive' income (income from activities in which the taxpayer does not materially participate -- or tax shelters) (Moerschbaecher, 1987). Congress effected change in seven areas including: 1) decreased value of the charitable deduction; 2) fewer deductions (tax shelters and other losses); 3) fewer itemizers among taxpayers as nonitemizers can no longer deduct charitable gifts; and 4) increased capital gains tax. The three other areas which Congress implemented were: 5) an alternative minimum tax (AMT) which avoids the embarrassment of having wealthy citizens paying no taxes; 6) the generation skipping tax (GST) which taxes a transfer of funds from grandparent to grandchildren as if it went from grandparent to parent to grandchildren; and 7) restrictions on retirement plans (IRA's, Keogh's and pension plans for corporations and non-profits) (Moerschbaecher, 1987). Under the 1986 Act, donors subject to the alternative minimum tax may no long deduct the full fair market value of gifts of appreciated property (Goss, 1989). The impact on planned giving could be significant. In real terms, the effect of the 1986 Tax Reform Act is to make the tax code less redistributive (Odendahl, 1990). One result, as Fink and Metzler (1982) stated, is that since 1969, major capital gifts are more likely to be realized where a prospect has received information on charitable remainder life income (irrevocable, planned) gifts by way of cultivation. Most deferred giving efforts [now] focus on "planned giving" which more frequently involves the transfer during the lifetime of the donor(s) of money and/or property in exchange for some form of retained life income for the donor and his or her beneficiary(ies) (Broce, 1986).

History has shown that people still support charitable causes after tax reform, and as some of the old incentives to charitable giving fade, however, planned giving grows especially attractive (Moerschbaecher, 1987). According to Moerschbaecher, looking at the donor's assets, identifying potential tax problems, and proposing the most appropriate planned giving vehicle are essential to successful fundraising in the nineteen-nineties (1987). Although the charitable deduction is now worth less (in 1986 a $100 charitable gift was worth as much as $50 in savings to a high-income donors; in 1987, after tax reform, it was worth only $38.50; in 1988, the value dropped to $28), the "loss-in-value" of the deduction is relevant only if one compares last year's tax structure with [this] next year's. Odendahl's (1990) study of the philanthropic elite found that taxes, although they are important, were not the prime motive for charitable giving among the wealthy. The other benefits of philanthropy -- business connections, control, influence, status, as well as personal pleasure -- will prevent any great loss of contributions to non-profit organizations (Odendahl, 1990). Taxpayers - or potential donors - examine all their options in a given year, and charitable deductions may give them the best solution to the current year's tax problems (Moerschbaecher, 1987). The charitable deduction is generic; it is not subject to the active income and passive income categories, so it can be used to offset any type of increase -- an outright or a planned gift could provide a taxpayer with a different sort of shelter (Moerschbaecher, 1987).

Planned giving raises the issue of revocable and irrevocable gift vehicles in planned giving programs in institutions of higher education. Both F. Roger Thaler of the Williamsburg Foundation and Conrad Teitell of the Philanthropy Tax Institute and editor of Taxwise Giving pointed to the advantages and disadvantages of gift plans or vehicles in which most of the benefits to the recipient institutions are deferred until after the donor's death (Broce, 1986). While currently gifts by will account for most planned giving, a bequest by will can be changed or revoked at any time by the donor. In fact, Martin (1990) observed that the average donor reviews and updates his or her will every five years. Thus both Thaler and Teitell have encouraged the adoption of the forms of irrevocable, planned gifts if the donor is agreeable (Broce, 1986). Martin (1990) noted that bequest donors are ideal prospects for current gifts of 'upgrades' to irrevocable planned gifts; if the planned giving officer knows how much of their estates the bequest donor plans to leave to the institution, he or she may be able to suggest mutually beneficial ways to accelerate the gifts resulting in the donor's being able to see and enjoy the results of their largesse while still alive. The issue common to both revocable and irrevocable gift transactions is the net value of the gift to the recipient institution (Fink and Metzler, 1982). Fink and Metzler referred to this as the "present value" of the gift with the qualification that "the present value of such [deferred] gifts is affected by cost of acquisition, [and] the cost of management in the case of a life income trust is a second factor . . ." (1982).

Determining the "present value" of planned gifts raises the notion of developing procedures to be able to establish gift acceptance criteria. Several attempts have been undertaken to approach the development of such criteria. The best known attempt is the 1979 Pomona Plan study by Ernst and Whinney. The Pomona College study eventually incorporated institutional self-studies of planned giving programs at both Wellesley and Grinnell Colleges as well as spawning an independent study at Harvard. Norman Fink, who was associated directly with the Pomona College study and indirectly with the Wellesley and Grinnell studies, summarized that the Ernst and Whinney study of the Pomona College program served the two important purposes of establishing a basic analytical methodology for measuring the current or present value of a planned giving program and of identifying the factors which have the greatest impact on the program's ultimate benefits (Fink and Metzler, 1982). A key finding of the Pomona College study was that the duration of the agreement management period was the single factor that affects program profitability (Fink and Metzler, 1982).

Assumptions

1. The responses by alumni planned giving donors and alumni making no planned gift (those alumni in the census and the random sample respectively) to the demographic and attitudinal characteristics contained in the planned giving questionnaires would be honest, accurate, and sufficient in number to compare matched characteristics between these groups as necessary.

2. Planned giving experts, having met the criteria for expertise described under the section entitled Development of the

Abbreviated Delphi Technique in Chapter III, would reach consensus on the demographic and attitudinal characteristics to be included in the two alumni questionnaire formats within three rounds.

3. Few alumni, if any, making planned gifts would be less than forty years of age.

<u>Delimitations</u>

1. The predictive characteristics associated with planned giving were derived from the observations, experience, and consensus of planned giving and other high-ranking development officials with planned gift experience as well as from related literature on alumni and other charitable giving.

2. The census of alumni planned gift donors (planned gift expectancies) excluded those alumni taking insurance policies and stipulating The University of Tennessee and/or its programs and funds as beneficiary as these are not considered bona fide planned gifts by development officials at The University of Tennessee (Brakebill and Hitchcox, 1989).

3. Any predictive model for planned giving developed in this study is applicable only to The University of Tennessee because of possible influence of the Southeastern Conference athletics programs in the census of planned gift donors. The model would be adaptable, but not necessarily adoptable, by other public institutions of higher education.

4. Both the census and the random sample drawn carried the following delimitations:

   a) inclusion of living alumni of The University of Tennessee (Knoxville campus) with valid addresses as carried on the University's Alumni Development Information System;

   b) exclusion of alumni requesting no delivery of University mailings;

   c) exclusion of alumni who have made planned gifts through life insurance policies, and

   d) the random sample included living alumni age forty and over.

Definitions of Terms

1. Estate: The estate consists of all of a person's property.

2. Estate Planning: Estate planning concerns the disposition of assets to assure transfer of a decedent's property to beneficiaries of his or her choice at the lowest possible tax and administrative costs. Major methods of estate planning include: wills, gifts, inter vivos trusts, testamentary trusts, life insurance, and retirement plan benefits.

3. Planned (Deferred) Giving: Planned giving includes gift annuities, pooled funds, separately managed trusts, and bequests. (Ernst & Whinney, 1980).

   a) Planned (Deferred) Gift Expectancy is a planned gift known to have been made by an alumnus/a but not yet made available to the institution.

   b) Realized Planned (Deferred) Gift is a planned gift already known and available to the institution.

4. Acceptance Criteria: Acceptance criteria are the standards or rules which govern the decision to accept or reject a given gift agreement. Acceptance criteria generally include such considerations as the number of beneficiaries, their age and life expectancy, the nature and value of the assets which make up the gift, the returns expected by the donor, the investment returns achieved and likely to be achieved, and the likelihood of additional subsequent gifts. (Ernst & Whinney, 1980).

5 Agreement: Each individual gift annuity contract or each pooled fund trust, unitrust or annuity trust created as the result of a gift by a donor. constitutes an agreement. (Ernst & Whinney, 1980).

6. Agreements in Force: All agreements involving at least one living income recipient are agreements in force. (Ernst & Whinney, 1980).

7. Agreement Maintenance: The activities of a planned (deferred) giving program related to managing a gift after it has been obtained include, but are not limited to, gift accounting, investment management, paying and receiving, and donor counseling. (Ernst & Whinney, 1980).

8. Beneficiary: Any individual named in a gift annuity contract or a charitable remainder trust agreement who is now, or may at a future date, receive income payments under the terms of the

contract or trust agreement is a beneficiary. (Ernst & Whinney, 1980).

9. Cultivation and Solicitation: includes all of the marketing and promotional efforts related to seeking gifts. With respect to any single donor, cultivation and solicitation has been assumed to cease with the signing of a gift agreement. (Ernst & Whinney, 1980).

10. Outright Bequest: is a bequest in which the gift amount is immediately available for use by the institution. This term is used to distinguish these gifts from bequests which establish annuity or trust agreements. (Ernst & Whinney, 1980).

11. Release: is the termination of an annuity or trust agreement and the related availability of the remaining principal amount of a gift. The principal amount is sometimes described as the corpus. (Ernst & Whinney, 1980).

12. Endowment: is a gift of a principal amount usually for a designated purpose such as scholarships, fellowships, professorships, research funds or library support. Income from the endowment is distributed according to the designated wishes of the donor. Many endowment fund agreements with donors add as much as one-third of the income to the principal annually to enhance the future value of the fund thus also preserving the endowment against inflation in years ahead.

13. Prospect: is an individual, usually an alumnus/a, deemed capable by collegiate/university fundraising staff of making a gift in a defined period of time. An average time frame in which a prospect makes a major gift is eighteen months from initial contact with the prospect until a gift is requested and a commitment is made by the prospect (donor).

Importance of the Study

The ability to predict which members of an alumni constituency should be planned giving prospects based on an established set of characteristics would enable fundraisers in higher education to screen and to focus their prospect identification activities as well as to better target their cultivation and solicitation efforts. Institutional fundraisers would be able to move beyond massive, undirected, broadcast appeals to alumni based on unsystematic research to be able to selectively target alumni capable of making ultimate or planned gifts based on systematic research. A simultaneous result would be an improved cost/benefit ratio for the institution's overall development operation. Such a predictive model would allow for the development of increased alumni planned gift expectancies and realizations, in addition to outright bequests. Institutional alumni data bases would be able to maintain planned giving information on alumni capable of such gifts, flagging or coding these prospects for easy identification and retrieval.

Results of this exploratory study, while specific to The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, should be of interest to development professionals and higher education officials both directly and indirectly involved in planned giving. Planned gifts are expected to constitute an increasingly larger portion of annual gift receipts. A conceptual model developed at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville could be adaptable for other colleges and universities, but it unlikely would be adoptable in toto. At The University of Tennessee, which has two full-time planned giving officers, planned gifts, still largely bequests, currently comprise 30% of total fiscal year giving. University officials are planning for this portion of total giving to increase substantially to help generate the level of annual interest income on endowment required for scholarships and fellowships as well as professorships and supplemental professorships (Brakebill and Hitchcox, 1989). University officials then would be able to justify, budget and account for increased activity in the planned giving area based on targeted efforts that would sustain acceptable or better cost/benefit ratios and promote balanced annual operational budgets.

Organization of the Study

The study is divided into the following chapters:

Chapter I includes the introduction, statement of the problem, purpose, research questions, background, delimitations and limitations, definitions, importance of the study, and organization of the study.

Chapter II contains a review of the literature related to alumni fundraising and motivation for charitable giving along with a recent history of planned (deferred) giving.

Chapter III presents the research design, procedures, data gathering processes, and methodology.

Chapter IV includes findings and an analysis of the data.

Chapter V contains the summary, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Traditions and Trends in Alumni Giving

The American tradition of alumni financial support for colleges and universities began at Harvard in the 17th century and has evolved through five distinct periods -- seminal beginnings, organization, maturation, sophistication, and finally, professionalism (Korvas, 1984). Increased professionalism in alumni affairs and fundraising has been demanded since the mid-nineteen seventies as a result of the increased pressures facing colleges and universities (Korvas, 1984). Research on the attitudes and characteristics of alumni donors has assumed increasing importance as this group has become a key ingredient of an institution's reputation, success, or, even, survival (Chewning, 1985). Yet Beeler's 1982 study of selected demographic and attitudinal variables related to alumni giving at a private college noted that although some potential predictors of alumni giving had been suggested, they required further substantial testing in comprehensive multi-variable designs.

The decades of the 1970's and the 1980's revealed the following evidence that alumni are both a vital source of financial support and an important barometer of the institutional climate (Chewning, 1985):

- from 1972-73 to 1982-83, alumni have more than doubled their giving;
- for the same period, the percentage of alumni participation has increased from 17.4 to 19.4 percent for all institutions;
- since 1972-73, colleges and universities have increased their number of alumni donors by more than 1.6 million individuals;

- in 1982-83, for the third consecutive year, estimated support from alumni exceeded $1 billion, according to figures from the Council for Financial Aid to Education; and
- in 1982-83, alumni giving made up 24 percent of total voluntary support of higher education, the largest percentage from any one source. (Other sources included nonalumni individuals, friends, corporations, religious groups, and fundraising consortia).

Spaeth and Greeley's 1970 landmark work combined the National Opinion Research Center's longitudinal study of June, 1961 college graduates with the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education's interest in the views of recent alumni on several important issues related to higher education -- loyalty to one's college, reactions to one's college education, and attitudes toward financing higher education. Their findings indicated that the three most important variables related to alumni giving were characteristics of the college (specifically, quality and control), the person's loyalty to it, and [his] family background (socio-economic status). Alumni of independent liberal arts colleges were most likely (68%) to made a contribution, alumni of state colleges were least likely to do so (17%), while alumni of public universities were second lowest in percentage (29%). By 1968, as a group, the June, 1961 alumni were moderately attached to their colleges though less so than they were at the time of graduation (Spaeth and Greeley, 1970). College quality was more highly related to financial support among alumni of private colleges (ranging from 68% to 32%) than among those of public colleges (below 26%). In sum, Spaeth and Greeley concluded that their 1970 findings were "disturbingly like the results of many other survey research studies,"

> On the face of it, the factors that help predict whether a person will give money to [his] college tend not to be of the kind that the college might be able to change. Giving is related to the characteristics of the institution, particularly whether it is public or

> private. Except for emotional attachment, nothing seems to increase greatly the probability that a public college alumnus will made a contribution. [Therefore],it seems unlikely that multi-universities are going to be able to do much to increase alumni loyalty in the present state of American higher education (Spaeth and Greeley, 1970).

During the 1980's, two comprehensive nationwide surveys were conducted -- a 1982 survey of American attitudes toward higher education directed by Walter K. Lindenmann of the Group Attitudes Corporation and a 1985 study about charitable behavior of Americans conducted by Yankelovich, Skelly and White, Inc., commissioned by The Rockefeller Brothers Fund. The 1982 Lindenmann study revealed the following about alumni giving:

- approximately one-fourth (26 percent) of all respondents who had attended college claimed to have made some form of donation to their undergraduate college.
- of those who donated, 69.5 percent said that belief in supporting higher education was the major reason for their contributions. The second most important reason, according to 62.3 percent of this group, was loyalty to alma mater.
- whether alumni said they made donations to "repay" the institution for financial aid they received depended on the age of the alumni. Nearly 61 percent of donors in the 18-to-29 year-old group felt this was important, compared to 12.8 percent in the 40-to-49 age group. Only l.6 percent of those who were 60 or older cited this as a motivation to give.
- a little more than half (52.3 percent) of those who had not made donations said that they could not afford to at the time, while 25.1 percent said they had not been asked.

More broadly, the 1985 Yankelovich, Skelly and White study of the charitable behavior of Americans tested a limited series of hypotheses to begin to identify some key motivations and behaviors that influence giving. Generally, their survey confirmed a pattern of giving found in earlier, similar surveys -- charitable giving tends to increase with age, education, income, and occupational status. Previously unavailable findings included five major indicators of giving in rank order for all respondents who gave 2 percent of more of their incomes to charity: 1) they attended religious services weekly; 2) they perceived that they had a moderate amount or a lot of discretionary income; 3) they had no worries about having enough money in the future; 4) they volunteered in the last year; and 5) they worried only moderately or a little about money (Yankelovich, Skelly and White, 1985).

The Yankelovich, Skelly and White (1985) study was self-described as unique in that persons with higher incomes were sufficiently sampled and that giving as a percentage of household income was provided for the categories of religious giving, other giving, and total giving. According to Yankelovich, Skelly and White (1985), by using percentage of income as an indicator of the level of giving, persons could be viewed by the resources they had available rather than on the amount of income alone. Primary motivations for giving to educational charities with the associated percentage responses in the Yankelovich, Skelly and White (1985) study included:

Close involvement, loyalty to the organization, personal experience	38%
A worthy cause/interest in the function of the charity/charity helping my favorite groups	23%
Feel obligated/responsible	8%
Helps poor, needy, less fortunate	6%
All other reasons for giving	25%
	100%

Large donors (those who contributed $500 or more per year) to educational charities reported that their primary motives were loyalty to the organization and that they were supporting a worthy cause (Yankelovich, Skelly and White, 1985). Almost one-half (45 percent) reported that they gave because a) the cause or group was worthy; b) the charity helped the poor and needy; c) the donation was deductible from salary; or d) that they had a close involvement or loyalty to the organization (Yankelovich, Skelly, and White, 1985). Although educational charity, arts and culture, and hospitals had a smaller proportion of donors among large donors, the mean contributions to colleges and universities were higher than for any other charities -- $270 versus $250 (Yankelovich, Skelly and White, 1985). A unique finding of the Yankelovich, Skelly and White survey was that among large donors, 40 percent of the respondents gave their gift to their favorite charity without being asked, with a 36 percent response among those contributing to education (1985). This last finding provided a contrasting point regarding the observation made by Spaeth and Greeley (1970) that college fundraisers, when approaching potential alumni donors of large gifts, use the rate of alumni giving as indicative of the extent of loyalty to alma mater and thus of the institution's worthiness for further support. These authors had suggested that an institution's ability to raise [other] large gifts was largely a function beyond its control (Spaeth and Greeley, 1970).

The Yankelovich, Skelly and White (1985) also study found:

- there was a relationship between contributed time (volunteerism) and giving. The average contribution of those who volunteered was higher;

- discretionary income influenced the amount persons give to charities. Regardless of income, people who perceive that they have a moderate amount of discretionary income give more than those who feel they only have enough income to pay for basic necessities;

- demographic characteristics had some influence on giving: persons who are married or widowed, have higher education, are Protestants, are in professional occupations, are between the ages of 50 and 64, and have higher incomes are among the most generous givers to both religious and other charities. Persons over 65 years of age are among the most generous of givers, but they give most of their contributions to religious charities.

- persons who pledged specific dollar amounts or percentages of income to charities gave two to three times as much on average to charities as those who did not pledge . . . [although] less than ten percent of Americans pledged either dollar amounts or proportions of their incomes to other than religious charities;

- large donors were most likely to respond to a solicitation approach in which a person they knew well asked them to give.

While their findings suggested that persons under thirty-five years of age might have less commitment, or have a major potential to increase their giving in future years, the 1985 Yankelovich, Skelly and White study reached a more optimistic conclusion than the 1970 Spaeth and Greeley study. Yankelovich, Skelly and White (1985) determined that over 90% of respondents reported that they did not pledge a specific amount to charities other than religious charities. In those cases where persons did pledge to either (religious or other-than-religious), average contributions were two to three times higher. Their findings suggested that were Americans more aware of how much to give or how to plan for their giving, total giving could increase measurably (1985).

<u>Philanthropic Motivation</u>

A 1953 historical review of philanthropy by Andrews (1953) summarized that until about that point in time, most of past philanthropy was prompted by pity, or else a desire to serve one's own interests or even salvation -- little of it proceeded from thoughtful efforts to prevent the ills from which men suffered, or to promote the conditions of health and creative living. Andrews' opinion was that since the government had taken over many of the primary needs of society that voluntary philanthropy could move further into the more rewarding areas of prevention, building health and happy living, and true creativity, if it could continue to get funds (1953). According to Odendahl (1990), for fifty years welfare provision has been considered a State responsibility. The Social Security system, introduced after the Great Depression, and the War on Poverty programs of the 1960's and 1970's, led Americans to expect that the government would fund certain primary services. Odendahl's (1990) research on the American philanthropic elite pointed out that most wealthy people, along with those of lesser means, continue to assume that the federal government is responsible for a welfare safety net. A 1988 survey of charitable behavior entitled "Giving and Volunteering in the United States" conducted by the Independent Sector indicated that a majority of Americans in all income groups agreed that the government has a basic responsibility to take care of people who cannot take care of themselves (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1988).

Chewning (1985) concluded that although there is no one major motivation to give, some [motivations] are more important than others. Sarnoff's 1962 work entitled Personality Dynamics and Development claimed that the psychology of personality was largely the psychology of motivation -- that almost every trait of personality connoted an actual or potential intention on the part of the individual to whom the trait was attributed. Writing on motivation and the uniqueness of an individual's personality structure, Sarnoff

(1962) observed that each person brings a patterned and consistent set of needs, attitudes, values, expectations, hopes and fears into his or her social situations and that because of this patterning of peoples' personalities, they experience the same situations in different ways. Allport, (1937) wrote that individuals attain personality as the form of survival most suitable to their individual needs within the particular environmental framework provided. The central nervous system in the process of effecting the necessary adjustments between the organic cravings (associated with infancy) and the exigencies of the environment develops certain characteristic habits, attitudes, personal traits, forms of sublimation and thought, and it is these characteristic modes of adjustment that, taken collectively, comprise personality (Allport, 1937).

According to Allport, one of the chief characteristics of the mature personality is its possession of sophisticated and stable interests and of a characteristic and predictable style of conduct with convictions and habits of expression definitely centered, evaluations sure, actions precise, and individual goals well-defined (1937). Of the more enduring components of the personality structure, Sarnoff stated that various sources of stimulation ceaselessly impinge upon people and that these stimuli induce endless pressures for behavioral changes; however, some of the components of personality were more resistant to the impact of new stimuli than others (1962). The substantive (versus expressive) components of personality referred to the cognitive properties of the individual's motives, beliefs, values and attitudes, and therefore, a full description of these substantive components would reveal what a person believes, is motivated by and what he or she considers worthwhile (Sarnoff, 1962). Allport found adult motives to be infinitely varied, self-sustaining, contemporary systems, growing out of antecedent systems (infancy needs, instinct, genetic), but functionally independent of them (1937). Motivation is always contemporary or dynamic, and lasting interests are recurrent sources of discontent, which from their incompleteness derive their forward impetus (Allport, 1937).

According to Sarnoff (1962), many socially learned motives reflect our exposure to a variety of conceptions regarding the worthy ends of human life. Insofar as individual's adopt these conceptions as their own, they are motivated to behave in accordance with their special cognitive properties, and these abstract concepts may come to function as the internal stimuli that provoke us to undertake enduring and arduous strivings on their behalf (Sarnoff, 1962). These types of motives may be described as functionally autonomous, a phrase coined by Allport (1937) referring to the fact that learned motives may not only persist over long periods of time, but also lead the individual to behave in ways quite different from those required by physiological motives (Sarnoff, 1962). Finally, the capacity to form abstract concepts, including the concept of self, develops in the course of childhood, influenced by interpersonal experiences. The cognitive elements of the self-concept may serve as the basis for socially learned motives (Sarnoff, 1962).

Reviewing the motivation to give from an historical perspective, Andrews described several key motivational factors including the giver's social group -- peoples' giving habits vary widely with the religious community to which they belonged, their income brackets, their local community, and the persons with whom they daily associated (1953). Patterns of giving were largely built up by community practices, social pressures and the mores of the groups to which the individual belongs (Andrews, 1953). Other bases for much giving included sheer habit as well as imitation of others, volunteer work, and personal contact with the problem (Andrews, 1953). Odendahl's 1990 study described (through one of its members) the attitude and incentive for giving well among America's elite philanthropists -- "there is a feeling of power that goes along with all this and a feeling a being able to hand it out." These observations fit into the context of Sarnoff's statement that as members of a culture, individuals acquire many motives which reflect the values of the social milieu in which they were raised; for example, the desires for prestige and power, or the wish to contribute to human welfare (1962). Simultaneously, our culture teaches individuals how to reduce the tension that these socially learned motives generate (Sarnoff, 1962). He defined a motive as an internally operative tension-producing stimulus that provokes the individual to act in such a way as to reduce the tension generated by it and that is capable of being consciously experienced by the individual (Sarnoff, 1962). Further, a motive can be consciously experienced and protracted in that many of the most important motives persist over many years and determine a great many of the individual's actions -- these tensions can only be requited at the expense of considerable outpouring of the individual's supply of available energy (Sarnoff, 1962).

As a result of their social training, individuals differ in the strength with which they feel bound to uphold their moral scruples; however, most people probably develop an abiding conscience which functions as a stable element in the structure of their personalities (Sarnoff, 1962). Expressed as a function of degree of satisfaction in respect to an individual's perception of himself or herself, the level of dissatisfaction with ourselves may have to become very intense before we take action to reduce it; the particular outcome of this pressure toward change depends upon a host of other factors including our level of education and material resources, along with the agents of change in our environment and our social and religious values (Sarnoff, 1962).

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN

The purpose of this study was to develop a conceptual model of alumni planned giving based on a two-phased data collection process:

1) a ranked collection of demographic and attitudinal characteristics (independent variables) associated with alumni planned giving from a panel of experts in the field planned giving using an abbreviated Delphi technique; and

2) a questionnaire developed from the first phase administered to a census of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, alumni who have made planned gifts (dependent variable) to The University of Tennessee and to a random sample of University of Tennessee, Knoxville, alumni who have not made a planned gift to The University of Tennessee for the purpose of comparison between these two groups of University of Tennessee, Knoxville, alumni.

Research Questions

The central research question for this study was: Is there a set of characteristics (demographic and/or attitudinal) that identify or associate membership in a planned giving prospect group among a given body of alumni that could be incorporated into a screening model or device? The research question included four components which are detailed on pages 5 and 6 of Chapter 1.

The demographic and attitudinal characteristics (see pages 5 and 6, Chapter 1) comprised the independent variables for this study and were selected based on the results of the abbreviated Delphi technique, as well as a review of related literature on alumni giving and charitable giving in general. The variables were expected to be predictive of alumni planned giving.

Approval for the Study

The Executive Vice President/Vice President for Development at The University of Tennessee approved and endorsed the concept of and the materials developed for the study. The Executive Vice President/Vice President for Development participated in the data collection portions of the study by signing the cover letters to the two alumni groups involved in the second phase of the study. The Senior Associate Vice President for Development assisted during the first phase of the study with the recruitment of the panel members for the abbreviated Delphi technique involving seventeen planned giving officers (see Appendix A).

Development of the Abbreviated Delphi Technique

The abbreviated Delphi technique design included three iterations or probes in an attempt to achieve consensus on the characteristics (demographic and attitudinal) to be included in two similar questionnaires to be mailed to a random sample of University of Tennessee alumni making other than or no-planned gifts to The University of Tennessee and to the population of University of Tennessee alumni who had made planned gifts to The University of Tennessee (Thornton, Tanner and Cooper, 1975). For this portion of the study, a group of seventeen planned giving experts (see Appendix B for the list of institutions and planned giving officers participating) was empaneled. Membership was based on the following criteria:

a) represented a public institution of higher education ranked by the Council for the Advancement of Education (CFAE) as one of the top twenty institutions in overall alumni giving in its 1988 annual report;

b) had a minimum of 3 years of planned giving experience in a public institution or system of higher education; and

c) held a title of Director or higher in his/her institution or system.

The initial probe consisted of an open-ended questionnaire (see Appendix C) requiring participating planned giving officers to list, based on their experience in the field, the top 10 demographic and attitudinal characteristics associated with alumni making planned gifts to public institutions of higher education. The second probe (see Appendix D) asked the participating planned giving officers to rate each of eighteen demographic and/or attitudinal characteristics identified by at least four of the panel members in the initial probe on a scale of 1 - 10 (10 = very important) according to their perceptions of the characteristic's importance to alumni planned giving. In the third and final probe (see Appendix E), mean group responses by item were recorded for each of the eighteen characteristics listed in the second probe. Also recorded by each item was each panel member's rating for each characteristic associated with alumni planned giving. Panel members were asked to modify or to give the reason(s) they did not wish to modify their ratings if those ratings fell outside the mean group rating for each item by more than + or - 1.0. This last probe was an attempt to reach consensus or establish a rank order of importance of the independent variables included in this first phase of the study. Cover letters (see Appendices C, D and E) accompanied each of the three probes. Business reply mail envelopes were included with each probe for the convenience of each panel member.

Upon completion of the three iterations of the abbreviated Delphi technique, the characteristics derived from this procedure were compared with those discerned from the review of the literature on alumni and other charitable giving. This was done to assist with verification of the characteristics or to reveal areas of disagreement requiring final determination by the researcher regarding the selected demographic and attitudinal characteristics to be incorporated into the alumni survey portion or second phase of the study.

Development of the Alumni Planned Giving Questionnaires

Two questionnaire formats were subsequently developed by the researcher incorporating the attitudinal and demographic characteristics determined from the abbreviated Delphi technique portion of the study. The first questionnaire contained twenty-two items asking the alumni comprising the census group (University of Tennessee, Knoxville, alumni who had made a planned gift to The University) to 1) respond to each demographic characteristic by supplying information based on categories provided and 2) rate the relative importance on a Likert-type scale of selected attitudinal characteristics involved in making a planned gift. A cover letter from the Executive Vice President/Vice President of Development at the University of Tennessee accompanied each questionnaire explaining the purpose and the importance of the research, introducing the researcher, and requesting participation with confidentiality insured. The questionnaire format was reviewed by four planned giving officers at The University of Tennessee and was completed by four development support staff members to help insure the instrument was understandable and useable by respondents. Revisions were made based on recommendations for improvements in wording, comprehension and ease of completion from these two groups. Postage-paid, addressed return envelopes were included for the respondents' use. (See Appendix F for a copy of the census group questionnaire with its accompanying cover letter.)

A second, similar questionnaire was developed by the researcher containing twenty-two items to gather data from a randomly selected group of University of Tennessee, Knoxville, alumni, forty or more years of age who to date had not made a planned gift to The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, regardless of other gifts made to the University. This second questionnaire was reviewed for readability, comprehension and formatting concerns similar to the process used for the first questionnaire as detailed above. A final version based on recommended revisions was produced. A cover letter from the Executive Vice President/Vice President of Development at The University of Tennessee accompanied each questionnaire explaining the purpose and the importance of the research, introducing the researcher, and requesting participation with confidentiality insured. Postage-paid, addressed return envelopes were included for respondents' use. (See Appendix G for a copy of the random sample group questionnaire with its accompanying cover letter.)

Census and Sampling

A census of living University of Tennessee, Knoxville (Knoxville campus) alumni who had made planned gifts (revocable and irrevocable gifts, exclusive of insurance policies) to The University of Tennessee was undertaken for the collection of data on demographic and attitudinal characteristics related to alumni status and the considerations in making a planned gift. As of April 20, 1989, the Alumni Development Information System at The University of Tennessee carried 410 planned gift expectancies (representing living alumni) of which 304 (74%) were made by Knoxville campus alumni (Hopkins, 1989). Of the 304 Knoxville campus alumni planned gift expectancies, it is notable that 266 (87.5%) were outright bequests, although several (7) of these alumni had multiple planned gift vehicles recorded as individual expectancies. Due to the sensitive nature of the research, only 285 alumni who had made planned gifts were mailed the planned giving questionnaires. The balance were removed from the study based on decisions made by the Executive Vice President/Vice President of Development, the Senior Associate Vice President of Development, the University's planned giving officers, and the researcher for reasons such as ill health or recent death in the family.

Based on Hauskin's table "Estimating Sample Size," a randomly selected sample (N = 378) was drawn from a population of 31,410 living University of Tennessee (Knoxville campus) alumni (as of October 1, 1990) from The University of Tennessee Alumni Development Information System. According to Hauskin (1963) this sample is sufficiently large to provide confidence at the .05 level that it is reflective of the population. Further parameters defining this population included Knoxville campus alumni with valid addresses (excluding any alumni requesting no University mailings), who were forty years of age or more, and who had not made a planned gift to The University of Tennessee as of October 1, 1990.

Data Collection

On October 26, 1990, the first Alumni Planned Giving Questionnaire was mailed to the 285 alumni comprising the alumni census group. The mailing included a cover letter from the Executive Vice President and Vice President for Development at The University of Tennessee explaining the purpose of the research and clearly communicating that all individual responses would be held strictly confidential, the questionnaire (which carried a numerical code), and a postage-paid business reply mail envelope. (A copy of the questionnaire and the accompanying cover letter can be found in Appendix F.) Within fifteen days of the initial mailing, two questionnaires were returned indicating the intended recipient was deceased, reducing the group N to 283. By November 14, 1990, 121 questionnaires (43%) had been returned fully completed.

On November 14, 1990, 162 questionnaires were mailed to all non-respondents in the census group with a second cover letter from the Executive Vice President/Vice President for Development encouraging alumni response and stressing the importance of the research and its confidentiality on an individual basis. Questionnaires and new accompanying cover letters (see Appendix H for cover letter) were again mailed first-class, and postage-paid, addressed business reply mail envelopes were included. The coding system in the initial mailing provided for identifying non-respondents, and the second mailing continued the same coding system for subsequent follow-up purposes. By December 13, 1990, 182 completed, useable questionnaires (64%) had been returned.

On January 8, 1991, 378 questionnaires were mailed to the randomly-selected alumni (those who had not made a planned gift to The University of

Tennessee as of October, 1, 1990) with a personalized introductory cover letter from the Executive Vice President/Vice President for Development explaining the nature and importance of the research and requesting alumni participation in the study (See Appendix G). Questionnaires were numerically encoded for control purposes, and each questionnaire was accompanied by a postage-paid, addressed business reply mail envelope for the respondent's use. One questionnaire was returned by the U.S. mail system as undeliverable, reducing the number to 377. Seventy-nine completed questionnaires (21%) were received by January 22. On January 23, 1991, a second questionnaire and a new cover letter from the Executive Vice President/Vice President for Development encouraging alumni participation was mailed to 298 non-respondents. (See Appendix I for cover letter.) Non-respondents were determinable through the numerical encoding system used at the outset, and again, a postage-paid, addressed business reply mail envelope accompanied the questionnaire and the cover letter. A final reply date of February 8, 1991, was requested in both the cover letter and on the last page of the questionnaire, similar to the previous questionnaires. By February 16, 1991, a total of 127 useable, completed questionnaires had been returned, along with 9 unusable (partially incomplete or returned blank) questionnaires, for a final response rate for the randomly-selected alumni group of 34%.

Non-respondent Telephone Questionnaire

Since the response rate among the randomly selected alumni group was low, the researcher elected to survey a randomly selected group of the non-respondents to determine if they were sufficiently similar to the respondents to warrant the researcher's continuing analysis to develop findings and conclusions. The researcher developed an abbreviated telephone version of the random sample alumni questionnaire (with an introductory section explaining who was calling on behalf of The University of Tennessee, why the alumnus was being called, and the importance of the research and the individual's assistance) along with a telephone call report cover/edit sheet for interviewer call-status recording purposes (Dillman, 1978). (See Appendix J.) The telephone questionnaires collected data for seven demographic and three attitudinal characteristics. Of the 242 non-respondents in the random-sample group of alumni, the researcher attempted to contact 80 non-respondents by telephone to see if they would participate in the abbreviated version of the questionnaire (Hauskin, 1963). Alpha was set at .05 for consistency of analysis purposes. Alumni telephone numbers (alumni preferred) were used from the Alumni Development Information System (ADIS) for the telephone survey (largely home telephone numbers). Weekday evening and Saturday morning calling was used primarily throughout the surveying period. An interviewing staff was trained, and telephone calling to the 80 non-respondents began on March 5, 1991, and by March 12, 34 useable telephone questionnaires had been completed. Results of the telephone questionnaires were sufficiently similar to those of the mailed questionnaires in the judgement of the researcher for analysis to continue.

Treatment of the Data

The first section of the data analysis presents a summary of the results of the abbreviated Delphi technique that identify the more important (top eighteen) demographic and attitudinal characteristics associated with alumni planned giving from the perspective of experienced planned giving officers in public higher education. The next section describes the results of the telephone questionnaire effort with non-respondents (to the mailed questionnaires) in the random sample group. Statistical techniques from the SAS Series in Statistical Applications utilized included Chi-square analyses and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for demographic and attitudinal characteristics respectively for the ten independent variables included in the telephone format. The third section presents the results of the Chi-square analyses for Questionnaire Part A - demographic characteristics data collected for comparison between the alumni census (planned giving) group and the randomly selected alumni group making no planned gift or other-than-planned gifts. A fourth section describes the results of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for Questionnaire Part B - attitudinal characteristics data collected for similar comparative purposes. Tabular data are presented throughout the third and fourth sections for the independent variables that tested statistically significant at .05 alpha.

The major focus of this exploratory study on alumni planned giving was two-fold: 1) to determine if any or all of the alumni characteristics (independent variables) about which data were collected through the two alumni questionnaires predict an alumni planned gift (dependent variable) and 2) to determine the extent to which these demographic and attitudinal characteristics discriminate between alumni who have made planned gifts and alumni who have made no planned gifts or other-than-planned gifts to The University of Tennessee. Subsequent sections report the results of discriminant analysis in which the variables are considered in relation to one another. Discriminant

Analysis was employed to determine if there is a set of demographic and attitudinal characteristics that identify or associate membership in a planned gift prospect group among a given body of alumni that could be incorporated into a screening model or device. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Chi-square procedures assess the applicability of discriminant analysis (Beeler, 1982).

Discriminant analysis is a statistical technique that allows the researcher to study the differences between (or among) two or more groups of objects with respect to several (independent) variables simultaneously (Klecka, 1980). The objective of discriminant analysis is to distinguish statistically between groups of cases by comparing the groups on all of the independent variables selected for the study, taking into consideration the interrelationships of the variables and powerful combinations of variables (Beeler, 1982). To perform discriminant analysis, the computer weights and linearly combines the discriminating variables in such a way as to force the optimal distinction between the groups (Beeler, 1982).

The actual linear combination of discriminating variables is the "discriminant function" (Beeler, 1982) reported in Chapter IV for each set of group comparisons. The basic prerequisites are that two or more groups exist which presumably differ on several variables and that those variables can be measured, according to Klecka (1980), at the interval or the ratio level. The techniques available through the SAS Series in Statistical Applications software package with a Discriminant Analysis subprogram allow discriminant analysis to analyze the differences between the groups and/or provide a means to assign (classify) any case into the group which it most closely resembles (Klecka, 1980).

Discriminant analysis cannot answer fully the question about the extent to which (and in what manner) the independent variables discriminate between alumni who have made planned gifts and alumni who have not made a planned gift (the dependent variable). It cannot indicate the extent to which the independent variables explain variations in the dependent variable. The subprogram Stepwise Discriminant Analysis was employed to answer the question: which independent variables were better predictors of the dependent variable? Stepwise Discriminant Analysis evaluates all the independent variables in relation to one another and seeks to maximize the difference between the two groups to derive the discriminant function (Beeler, 1982).

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

The central research question for the study was: Is there a set of demographic and attitudinal characteristics that identify or associate membership in a planned gift prospect group among a given body of alumni that could [then] be incorporated into a screening model or device? The following questions are components of the central research question: a) what are the requisite, primary alumni characteristics as determined by planned giving experts; b) which characteristics describe those alumni making a planned gift and those alumni not making a planned gift; c) to what extent can the independent variables discriminate between alumni who have made a planned gift and alumni who have not made a planned gift; and d) which alumni characteristics appear to be predictive of planned giving? Results of the study are described below including the abbreviated Delphi technique used with the planned giving experts and the comparative data generated by both the census group of alumni and the random sampling of alumni through the questionnaire series.

The Abbreviated Delphi Technique

Seventeen public university planned giving officers (who met the criteria set forth in Chapter 3) comprised the panel of experts, who, from their experience and observation in the field of alumni planned giving, identified the more important demographic and attitudinal characteristics associated with alumni making planned gifts. Average years of experience for the panel of seventeen planned giving officers was 10.9 years. Each characteristic included in Table 1 was identified for inclusion during Round 1 of the study by at least four panel members. Characteristics mentioned fewer times were dropped from the study. Between Rounds 2 and 3, only three characteristics had ratings change sufficiently to create a new ranking based on mean group ratings: past and current relationship/involvement with the institution; age; and desire to create a permanent legacy or perpetual tribute. Seventy-eight changes of ratings occurred over all characteristics between Rounds 2 and 3 ranging from 2 to 7 changes per characteristic in the attempt to reach a (rated) consensus among the panel members and develop a rank order of importance of the characteristics based on mean group ratings. The results between Rounds 2 and 3 as shown in Table 1 indicate substantial consensus among the panel members.

Non-Respondent (Random Sample Group)Telephone Questionnaire Results

Results of the non-respondent telephone questionnaire are presented next in order to establish the framework within which the findings and discussion associated with the responses to the two mailed questionnaires can be developed in a comparative and cohesive manner. The non-respondent (random sample group) telephone questionnaire was developed to address possible concerns associated with the relatively low response rate of the random sample (no planned giving) group to the mailed questionnaire (see Chapter 3, p. 34).

Chi-square analysis revealed no statistically significant difference between respondents to the mailed and telephone questionnaires for the following demographic characteristics: marital status, having/had children,

TABLE 1

MEAN VALUES AND RANKINGS FOR EIGHTEEN CHARACTERISTICS ASSOCIATED WITH ALUMNI PLANNED GIVING

Characteristics	Round 2 Mean	Rank	Round 3 Mean	Final Rank
Charitable disposition (intent/desire to help others or society)	8.882	1	8.941	1
Allegiance/gratitude to institution	8.823	2	8.911	2
Satisfaction/positive feeling associated with participation in the work of the institution (research and academics; faculty/staff member inculcating importance of institution's work)	8.117	3	8.118	3
Interest/belief in supporting institution or particular program (desire to enhance reputation of institution/program)	8.000	4	8.117	4
Involvement/relationship with institution (past and current)	7.764	6	7.854	5
Age (60 + years; likely retired; life-transcending perspective)	7.647	7	7.800	6
Desire to create permanent legacy/perpetual tribute	7.823	5	7.694	7
Childless	7.470	8	7.494	8
Financial benefit to donor (estate planning and tax consequences)	7.117	9	7.211	9
Financial provisions in place for spouse/heirs	6.470	10	6.852	10
Previous giving history or has available pattern of giving to follow by family/peers	6.411	11	6.294	11
Single or widowed	5.823	12	5.764	12
Estate size ($1 million or more)	5.705	13	5.747	13
Seeks recognition/prestige opportunities	5.000	14	5.000	14
Female	4.647	15	4.564	15
Volunteerism	4.529	16	4.470	16

TABLE 1 continued

Characteristics	Round 2 Mean	Rank	Round 3 Mean	Final Rank
Residence in selected retirement areas of U.S.	3.882	17	3.794	17
Proximity to institution (resides within 100 miles of institution)	3.705	18	3.647	18

age group and proximity of residence to the University. One-way ANOVA (analysis of variance) also revealed no statistically significant difference between groups for the following attitudinal characteristics: desire to help others or society and feeling of allegiance or gratitude to the institution. Three of the remaining demographic and one of the attitudinal variables included in the telephone questionnaire require explanation but do not require a conclusion that the non-respondents differ as a group from the larger randomly-selected alumni group from which they were, in turn, randomly drawn.

Within the demographic category of academic credentials (degree or degrees received from the University), the Alumni Development Information System (ADIS) was used in lieu of the respondents completing an additional item. The result of ADIS selecting on "preferred degree" (meaning the alumnus' declaration of his or her preferred degree from among several possible degrees) resulted in the selection of only one degree per alumnus or selecting the preferred status of "1" indicating the System had incomplete information on the degree status of the alumnus. Analyzing degree levels individually using Chi-square revealed a statistically significant difference between groups for "bachelors degree" (realizing an individual might hold more than a bachelors degree from the University) and for "attended but did not graduate," for which the Chi-square analysis showed a warning that 25% of the cells had expected counts less than 5 and might be an invalid test. The eight (observed) incomplete records on alumni degree data (preferred degree status "1") were recorded by default into the category "attended but did not graduate," resulting in the situation not only of incomplete data for eight of thirty-five cases, but also of 25% of the cells having expected counts of less than 5.

Collapsing the degree levels to perform a Chi-square analysis using "less than a Masters degree" and "a Masters degree or greater" resulted in no statistically significant difference between the two groups. On this basis, the researcher concluded that there was no reason to believe the two groups were substantially dissimilar.

A Chi-square analysis of gender revealed a statistically significant difference between groups. Observed frequencies revealed that 15 (44%) of the non-respondents were male and 19 (55%) were female, whereas 84 (66%) of the random sample respondents were male and 43 (34%) were female. Expected frequencies varied from actual frequencies by 6 in each cell with fewer males in the non-respondents group and fewer females in the randomly selected alumni sample than expected. It is possible that a gender bias inadvertently entered the (telephone) non-respondent questionnaire process, a consideration future researchers may need to attempt to control. Chi-square analysis of this variable for the two larger groups of alumni participating in the two mailed questionnaires revealed no statistically significant difference between groups. In fact the proportion of the two groups on this factor were identical. Given the above-stated considerations, the researcher determined that it was important to proceed with the analysis of the initial empirical data collected through this study.

An initial Chi-square analysis of the data about contribution(s) to the University resulted in a warning that 36% of the cells had expected counts less than 5. The researcher decided to collapse the data as follows: no gift and all gift levels (from small <$100, occasional gifts through large $5000 or more, occasional gifts). The calculated Chi-square value of 25.322 was statistically significant at the .05 level. The researcher decided not to abandon further analysis of the data collected for the two (larger) alumni groups as such analysis might indicate that alumni participating in the University's general alumni giving programs tend to make planned gifts more frequently than alumni not participating in these giving programs. Further, it is reasonable to expect a higher participation rate among alumni sufficiently interested in giving at a higher rate than among alumni who have not tended to give and who have not responded to the (two) mailed questionnaires from the University.

Of the three attitudinal characteristic items contained in the telephone non-respondent questionnaire, only the hypothetically-phrased statement "If I made a planned gift, it would reflect my past and current relationship (involvement) with the University" resulted in an (ANOVA) F value of 6.66 which was statistically significant at the .05 level. On the scale of 1 (not at all important) through 6 (very important), the mean score for the non-respondents (N = 31) was moderately important at 4.19 (SD = 1.70) and for the randomly selected alumni (N = 107) was somewhat important at 3.32 (SD = 1.63). This same variable was statistically significant at the .05 level between the two larger alumni groups (planned giving and random sample/no planned gift) Further analysis with the two larger alumni groups within this empirical study might indicate that alumni making planned gifts to the University tend to remain more involved with the University than alumni who do not make planned gifts to the University.

In sum, the non-respondent group was significantly different from the random sample group on three variables. In general, however, the two groups appear to be similar.

Chi-Square Analyses: Questionnaire Part A -Demographic Data

Comparative analyses of the responses to the demographic characteristics questions on the two alumni (mail) questionnaire formats are presented in Table 2. A series of Chi-square tests were conducted to determine significant differences between the alumni groups for each demographic characteristic included in the study. The overall alpha level was set at .05 for the tests. Results of tests significant at the .05 level are noted by asterisks in Table 2. Table 2 presents the demographic variables in the same order in which they are listed under the research questions in Chapter 1. For the following demographic characteristics there were no statistically significant differences between alumni making planned gifts and alumni not making planned gifts: gender; age group; employment status; proximity of residence to the institution; type of residence; and gross estate size. It is noted here that within the alumni planned giving group the percentage of each gender making a planned gift was the same (59%). Also, among the alumni planned giving group, it was assumed that few, if any, would be less than 40 years of age. Thirty-eight respondents from this group, however, fit the category "less than 40 years," rendering the assumption, as stated in this study, invalid. Regarding gross estate size, the results reflect the reasonable expectation that alumni with greater wealth make larger numbers of planned gifts than alumni with lesser wealth.

Statistically significant differences between groups were found for the following six demographic characteristics under study: 1) academic credentials (holding a terminal degree including Ph.D., Ed.D., J.D., M.D., D.D.S., or D.V.M.); 2) attended The University of Tennessee only (not graduating); 3) marital status; 4) children (have or do not have);

TABLE 2

COMPARISONS BETWEEN ALUMNI MAKING PLANNED GIFTS AND ALUMNI NOT MAKING PLANNED GIFTS ON DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Group	Frequencies and Percentages		Chi Square	df	prob
Gender	Male	Female			
Planned Gift (N=182)	121 59%	61 59%			
No Planned Gift (N=127)	84 41%	43 41%	.004	1	.950
Academic Credentials:					
a) Degrees	Bachelors	No Bachelors			
Planned Gift (N=182)	142 57%	40 67%			
No Planned Gift (N=127)	107 43%	20 33%	1.855	1	.173
	Masters	No Masters			
Planned Gift (N=182)	43 57%	139 59%			
No Planned Gift (N=127)	32 43%	95 41%	.100	1	.751
	Terminal	No Terminal			
Planned Gift (N=182)	37 80%	145 55%			
No Planned Gift (N=127)	9 20%	118 45%	10.354*	1	.001
b) Campus Attended	UT (Main) Knoxville	Other UT Campus			
Planned Gift (N=182)	154 57%	28 68%			
No Planned Gift (N=127)	114 43%	13 32%	1.723	1	.189
c) Attended UT Only	Do not hold UT degree	Hold UT Degree			
Planned Gift (N=182)	15 83%	167 57%			
No Planned Gift (N=127)	3 17%	124 43%	4.714*	1	.030
Marital Status	Married	Single/ Widow or Widower			
Planned Gift (N=182)	125 55%	57 71%			
No Planned Gift (N=127)	104 45%	23 29%	6.802*	1	.009
Children	Have	Do not Have			
Planned Gift (N=169)	83 43%	86 88%			
No Planned Gift (N=121)	109 57%	12 12%	52.903*	1	.000

TABLE 2 (continued)

Group	Frequencies and Percentages		Chi Square	df	prob
Age Group	40-44	45-49			
Planned Gift (N=144)	15 39%	17 50%			
No Planned Gift (N=127)	23 61%	17 50%	5.556	4	.235
	50-54	55-59			
Planned Gift	15 47%	22 54%			
No Planned Gift	17 53%	19 46%			
	60+				
Planned Gift	75 60%				
No Planned Gift	51 40%				
Employment Status	Fully Retired	Partially Retired			
Planned Gift (N=182)	50 62%	17 53%			
No Planned Gift (N=127)	31 38%	15 47%			
	Employed Full-time	Homemaker			
Planned Gift	103 60%	12 50%			
No Planned Gift	69 40%	12 50%	1.563	3	.668
Proximity of Residence to UTK	100 miles or less	More than 100 miles			
Planned Gift (N=182)	83 61%	99 58%			
No Planned Gift (N=127)	54 39%	73 42%	.288	1	.591
Residence Type	House	Condominium			
Planned Gift (N=182)	155 57%	10 67%			
No Planned Gift (N=127)	117 43%	5 33%	7.567	3	.056
	Apartment	Retirement Community			
Planned Gift	15 88%	2 40%			
No Planned Gift	2 12%	3 60%			
Gross Estate Size	Less than $1M Total Value	More than $1M Total Value			
Planned Gift (N=178)	151 58%	27 61%			
No Planned Gift (N=126)	109 42%	17 39%	.168	1	.682

TABLE 2 (continued)

Group	Frequencies and Percentages		Chi Square	df	prob
Financial Provisions For Spouse/Heirs	Already Made	Not Yet Made			
Planned Gift (N=178)	137 56%	18 55%			
No Planned Gift (N=125)	109 44%	15 45%	14.809*	2	.001
	No Spouse or Heirs				
Planned Gift	23 96%				
No Planned Gift	1 4%				
Gifts to UT	No Gift(s)	Small Occasional & <$100 Annual			
Planned Gift (N=181)	9 35%	73 52%			
No Planned Gift (N=127)	17 65%	68 48%	16.728*	2	.000
	Large Occasional & >$100 Annually				
Planned Gift	99 70%				
No Planned Gift	42 30%				

*significant at .05 level

5) financial provisions for spouse/heirs; and 6) gifts/contributions to the institution. These significant variables will be described first in the sections below.

Terminal Degree and Attended But Hold No Degree

The data for those holding terminal degrees (N=46) revealed that the planned giving group had more terminal degree holders than expected (N = 37 or 80%). A Chi-square of 10.4 ($p < .05$) was calculated. Only 55% of the alumni who did not hold terminal degrees had made planned gifts.

Chi-square analysis of alumni who attended but did not graduate from the University also revealed there is a relationship between alumni attending the institution but not graduating and group membership with 83% of the alumni attending but not graduating who had made planned gifts (15 of 18). By comparison, only 57% of those holding a University of Tennessee degree had made a planned gift. A Chi-square of 4.7 was significant at the .05 level.

Marital Status

A statistically significant difference between the two alumni groups was found regarding marital status (Chi-square = 6.8, $p < .05$). The results showed that 71% (57 of 80) of those who were single, including widows and widowers, had made planned gifts. Married alumni also had made planned gifts, but at only a 55% participation rate. Nonetheless, 69% of the group who had made a planned gift were married indicating that marriage is not a deterrent from making a planned gift. It should be noted here, also, that members of the planned giving group were asked to respond to marital status at the time they made the planned gift, and some may have become single after the fact of the planned gift.

Children

A statistically significant difference (Chi-square = 52.9; $p < .05$) also was found between the alumni groups who had and who did not have children. The results showed that 88% of the alumni who did not have children had made a planned gift. Alumni with children also made planned gifts, but only at a 43% participation rate. The alumni planned giving group, however, was virtually equal on this characteristic (49% with children and 51% without children) based on total responses for the group ($N=169$).

Financial Provisions for Spouse/Heirs

A Chi-square analysis revealed that there is a relationship (Chi-square = 14.8; $p < .05$) between financial provisions for spouse/heirs and group membership. Among alumni who had no spouses/heirs for whom to provide, 96% had made a planned gift. Among alumni who had spouses/heirs for whom to provide and who already had made such provisions, 56% had made a planned gift. Finally, among alumni who had spouses/heirs for whom to provide but had not yet made such provisions, 55% had made a planned gift. Among alumni who had spouses/heirs for whom to make financial provisions and had already made such provisions, 44% had not made a planned gift. Since insurance policies as a vehicle for providing for spouses/heirs were not screened out for the random sample group of respondents in advance, it is speculated that some of these financial provisions were insurance policies (revocable provisions, rather than testamentary or irrevocable provisions).

Contribution(s) to Institution (and Level)

The final statistically significant difference (Chi-square = 16.7; $p < .05$) was the level of alumni contributions to the University. The results revealed that 70% (N=141) of alumni making large, occasional gifts and/or annual gifts of $100 or more had made a planned gift to the University. Sixty-five percent (17 of 26) of alumni making no annual contributions had made no planned gift to the University. Among alumni making small, occasional or annual gifts of less than $100, 52% had made a planned gift to the University.

Analysis of Variance: Questionnaire Part B - Attitudinal Characteristics

The Part B questionnaire (see Appendices F and G) format for each alumni group was consistent, using a Likert-type scale of 1 through 6 in which 1 is not at all important and 6 is very important. No opinion was provided for in a separate column alongside the scale format for each item and was assigned a value of 0 when the data files were built. No response was accounted for, assigning a period (.) when building the data files. Calculations of group mean values and ANOVAs eliminated both the 0 value and the non response (s).

For each independent variable, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure was applied to test for significant between-group differences in mean scores. In an ANOVA procedure test variables are considered individually for their ability to distinguish among groups. (Hinkle and Associates, 1979). The research hypothesis tested was that the group means (planned giving group versus no planned giving random sample group) differed for the independent variables under study. The procedure for testing the research hypothesis is as implied -- the analysis of variance of the scores on the dependent variable (planned gift) (Hinkle and Associates, 1979).

No statistically significant differences were found for the following attitudinal characteristics tested as presented in Table 3: receiving (desire for) recognition or prestige; charitable disposition (desire to help others or society); previous giving history or available pattern of giving by family or peers; outgrowth of volunteer activities with the institution; and satisfaction of participating in the work of the institution. (Appendix K details the results of ANOVA testing for all ten attitudinal variables.)

Estate Planning and Tax Consequences

Respondents from each alumni group were compared on the basis of opinion regarding estate planning and tax consequences in making a planned gift. A significant difference (F = 34.9; df = 1 - 281) was found between alumni making a planned gift and alumni not making a planned gift as groups (Table 3). The planned gift group mean (2.56) indicates that the estate planning and tax consequences of making a planned gift are less than somewhat important while for those who had not made a planned gift (random sample group mean = 3.87) they were moderately important.

Creating a Permanent Legacy or Tribute

Comparing opinions between each alumni group regarding the importance of creating a permanent legacy or tribute in making a planned gift showed a significant difference (F = 33.3; df = 1 - 275) between group means (Table 3). Alumni making planned gifts (group mean = 3.87) believed creating a permanent legacy or tribute through a planned gift was moderately important, whereas alumni not making a planned gift (group mean = 2.50) believed this was less than somewhat important.

TABLE 3

ANOVA FOR ATTITUDINAL CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	F
Estate planning and tax consequences	34.9*
Permanent legacy or tribute	33.3*
Recognition or prestige opportunity	0.9
Charitable disposition (help others or society)	0.6
Allegiance/gratitude to institution	35.7*
Past and current relationship with institution	25.3*
Previous giving history or available pattern of giving by family or peers	1.3
Outgrowth of volunteer activities	2.4
Interest or belief in supporting the institution	9.0*
Satisfaction of participating in the work of the institution	0.8

*significant at .05 level

Feeling of Allegiance or Gratitude to Institution

The ANOVA procedure revealed a significant difference (F = 35.7; df = 1 - 287) between group means for this attitudinal variable (Table 3). The group mean (5.16) for alumni making a planned gift indicated that it was of substantial importance as a motivating factor in making a planned gift whereas for alumni who have not made a planned gift (random sample group mean = 4.27), it was of moderate importance as a motivating factor.

Past and Current Relationship (Involvement) with the Institution

The overall difference between the two alumni groups for this variable (Table 3) was significant at the .05 level (F ratio = 25.3; df = 1 - 273). Alumni making planned gifts attached moderate importance (group mean = 4.33) to this factor in making a planned gift compared with alumni who have not made planned gifts (group mean = 3.33) who would accord some (somewhat important) importance to this factor when/if they should make a planned gift.

Interest or Belief in Supporting the Institution (Enhance Reputation)

The between-group difference regarding interest or belief in supporting the institution (Table 3) was significant at the .05 level (F = 9.0; df = 1 - 281). Substantial importance was attached to this attitudinal characteristic by the planned giving group (group mean = 5.01), while for alumni not making a planned gift it was of moderate-to-substantial importance (random sample group mean = 4.52).

Other Reasons for Making a Planned Gift

The questionnaire formats for both alumni groups included provision for two open-ended responses accompanied by the same Likert-type scale used throughout Part B. No data are included for analysis in this study because respondent participation in these two optional categories did not produce sufficient new information warranting analysis. The majority of responses in both alumni groups to these two options reiterated items already included in the study in slightly varied language.

Discriminant Analysis: Alumni Making Planned Gifts versus Alumni Not Making Planned Gifts

To analyze the differences between the two groups of alumni -- planned giving and no planned giving (random sample) -- SAS System program Discriminant Analysis was used to apply a two-group discriminant function analysis to the data. The discriminant analysis generates measures of group separation. It also generates a classification equation which is used to assess the ability of the independent variables to select the actual group membership of the respondents. The coefficients derived in discriminant analysis are developed by the computer to maximize correct classification, and the linear combination of coefficients of discriminating variables constitute the 'discriminant function' (Beeler, 1982).

The Discriminant Function

To derive the discriminant function, all of the independent variables were evaluated relative to one another using the SAS Stepwise Discriminant Analysis selection method which seeks to maximize the difference between the two groups (Beeler, 1982). The resulting discriminant function is reported in Appendix L for the seven variables significant at the .05 level and records the amount of variance accounted for by each individual variable with the effects of all other variables held constant. Children entered the equation first for which the R^2 was .21. Allegiance/gratitude to the University entered second (.18), followed by desire to create a permanent tribute or legacy (.07); estate planning and tax consequences (.07); terminal degree (.04); desire to help others and society (.04); and attended but hold no degree (.02). None of the remaining variables contributed significantly (at the .05 level) to the effort to discriminate among groups (regarding membership); each accounted for less than .01 of the variance respectively.

Optimal Classification Equation

The optimal classification equation is derived by using variables which prove their discriminating power by ranking high on a list of discriminant function (standardized) coefficients corresponding to each of the independent variables (Beeler, 1982, p. 69). The coefficients represent the relative contributions of each associated variable to the discriminant function (Nie et al., 1975). The sign of the coefficient indicates whether the variable makes a positive or negative contribution, but the sign is ignored in evaluating the relative importance of the coefficient (Beeler, 1982, p. 68). The standardized discriminant coefficients for the top seven variables (which had proved their discriminating power) selected for the optimal classification equation are displayed in Table 4. The squared canonical correlation was .48.

Classification is the process of identifying the likely group membership of cases when case values on the discriminating variables are the only data

TABLE 4

STANDARDIZED DISCRIMINANT COEFFICIENTS

Variable	Coefficients Planned Giving	 Random Sample
Children	8.56831	6.05387
Allegiance/gratitude	1.71350	1.05991
Estate planning/ tax consequences	0.20195	0.64421
Permanent tribute/legacy	0.50341	-0.03058
Terminal degree	2.69779	1.25908
Help others/society	0.52025	0.81590
Attended/no degree	3.86248	2.46029
(Constant)	-13.61798	-8.20427

available (Beeler, 1982). Group membership (planned giving group or no planned giving/random sample group) of the study cases as predicted by the discriminant equation is compared with the actual group membership of the planned giving/random sample cases (Beeler, 1982, p. 70). This comparison generates a table of "hits and misses" which reports the percentage of cases correctly classified by the discriminant equation. Table 5 shows that 81.2% of the cases were correctly classified as planned giving or no planned giving.

Discussion

The central research question for the study was: Is there a set of characteristics that identify or associate membership in a planned gift prospect group among a given body of alumni that could be incorporated into a screening model or device? (See Chapter 4, p. 40 for a reiteration of the component research questions.)

Six of the fourteen demographic variables included in the two alumni questionnaires tested statistically significant at the .05 level using the Chi-square analysis. These were as follows: 1) terminal degree; 2) attended but hold no degree; 3) marital status; 4) children; 5) financial provisions for spouse/heirs; and 6) gifts/contribution(s) to the institution (see Table 2) Three of these demographic variables were among the eight demographic variables ranked by the planned giving experts in the Delphi probe (refer to Table 1) -- marital status; children; and financial provisions for spouse/heirs.

Of alumni holding terminal degrees (N=46), 80% had made planned gifts. Fifty-five percent of alumni without a terminal degree made planned gifts. The greater tendency of terminal degree holders to make planned gifts reflects the survey research findings that individuals with higher education and

TABLE 5

DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS
CLASSIFICATION SUMMARY

Actual Group	Predicted Group Membership		Percent Correct
	Planned Giving	Random Sample	
Planned Giving (N=164)	130	34	79.3
Random Sample (N=118)	19	99	83.9

Percent of "grouped" cases correctly classified 81.2

professional occupations are among the more generous donors to all charitable organizations (Yankelovich, Skelly and White, 1985). Eighty-three percent of alumni who attended but held no degree had made planned gifts, an unexpected finding in this research. As a stand-along outcome, this particular variable warrants further research with other public university alumni groups. The proportions of alumni holding a University of Tennessee degree are roughly equal between those making planned gifts (57%) and those not making planned gifts (43%). These two variables were collected routinely through the two alumni group questionnaires (but were not variables emerging from the Delphi probe with the planned giving experts) under the category of academic credentials.

Of single/widowed alumni, 71% had made planned gifts, whereas 55% of married alumni had made planned gifts indicating a stronger tendency for single/widowed alumni toward making planned gifts. Single/widowed ranked 12th out of the 18 variables rated by planned giving experts and 4th among the demographic variables listed (see Table 1).

For alumni without children, there was a marked tendency (88%) toward making planned gifts, whereas 43% of alumni with children had made planned gifts. Being "childless" ranked 8th of the 18 variables rated by the planned giving experts, second among the eight demographic variables rated (see Table 1).

Among alumni with spouses/heirs, 56% of alumni had already made financial provisions for these individuals and made a planned gift; 44% had not made a planned gift. These groups are proportionally similar. Among alumni with no spouses/heirs, however, 96% had made a planned gift. Financial provisions in place for spouses/heirs ranked 10th out of 18 on the listing of characteristics rated by planned giving experts and 3rd among the eight demographic variables rated by this panel (see Table 1).

Alumni making planned gifts also showed a stronger tendency to make other periodic and/or regular contributions to the University than alumni not making planned gifts. Seventy percent of alumni making planned gifts (versus 30% of alumni not making planned gifts) gave large, occasional gifts and/or >$100 annually. Sixty-five percent of alumni making no planned gifts had contributed nothing versus 35% of alumni making planned gifts. Roughly equal proportions of both alumni groups (52% among the planned giving group and 48% among the random sample group) gave in the remaining categories: small, occasional gifts and <$100 annually. Like the academic credentials data, contribution(s) data were collected in addition to the planned giving experts' listing of alumni planned giving characteristics.

Of ten attitudinal variables included in the two alumni questionnaires, five tested statistically significant at the .05 level using the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). These were as follows: 1) allegiance/gratitude to the institution; 2) interest/belief in supporting the institution; 3) past/current relationship with the institution; 4) create a permanent legacy/tribute; and 5) estate planning and tax consequences. It is noted here that the variable help others/society (charitable disposition) (refer to Table 3) did not test as statistically significant in the ANOVA procedure. Mean values for each alumni group on this variable were 4.67 (planned giving group) and 4.81 (random sample group), or a rating of moderate-to-substantial importance by both alumni groups. It is speculated that insufficient difference between group means here may be due to both alumni groups treating this variable as the underlying basis in making any kind of charitable gift. It is notable that this variable predicted 4% of the dependent variable (planned gift) according to the Stepwise Discriminant Analysis, a fact that may simply reinforce this variable as a given.

Comparing the group mean ratings as presented in Table 6 (scale: 1 is not at all important through 6 is very important) for each of the statistically significant attitudinal variables revealed the relative importance each alumni group attached to the variable. Allegiance/gratitude to the institution was substantially important to the planned giving group (mean = 5.16), while it was moderately important to the random sample (no planned gift) group (mean = 4.27). Interest/belief in supporting the institution was substantially important to the planned giving group (mean = 5.01), while it was moderately-to-substantially important to the random sample group (mean = 4.52). Past/current relationship with the institution was moderately important to the planned giving group (mean = 4.33), while it was only somewhat important to the random sample group (mean = 3.33). Creating a permanent legacy/tribute was moderately important to the planned giving group (mean = 3.87) while it was less than somewhat important to the random sample group (mean = 2.50). Estate planning and tax consequences were less than somewhat important to the planned giving group (mean = 2.56), while these were moderately important to the random sample group (mean = 3.87).

A comparative rank ordering of the importance of the attitudinal variables (between the planned giving group and the random/sample group making no planned gifts) is presented in Table 7. While the range of group mean values (1.77 to 4.81) is slightly more compressed for the random sample/no planned gifts group than for the planned giving group (1.92 to 5.16), the similarity of rankings of the attitudinal variables between the two

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF MEAN VALUES AND RANKINGS
OF ATTITUDINAL CHARACTERISTICS BY ALUMNI GROUP

	Alumni Making Planned Gifts (Census)			Alumni Not Making Planned Gifts (Random Sample)		
	M	SD	Rank	M	SD	Rank
*Allegiance/gratitude to institution (N=289)	5.16	1.088	1	4.27	1.452	4
*Interest/belief in supporting institution (N=283)	5.01	1.224	2	4.52	1.457	2
Help others/society (Charitable disposition) (N=289)	4.67	1.544	3	4.81	1.469	1
Satisfaction of participating in work of institution (N=270)	4.47	1.545	4	4.30	1.493	3
*Past/current relationship with institution (N=275)	4.33	1.595	5	3.33	1.630	6
*Permanent legacy/tribute (N=277)	3.87	2.031	6	2.50	1.650	7
*Estate planning/ tax consequences (N=283)	2.56	1.798	7	3.87	1.833	5
Previous giving history/available pattern of giving (N=261)	2.45	1.565	8	2.23	1.347	8
Outgrowth of Volunteer activities (N=254)	2.33	1.698	9	2.02	1.325	9
Recognition/prestige desire (N=280)	1.92	1.324	10	1.77	1.286	10

*significant at .05 level

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF MEAN VALUE RANKINGS OF ATTITUDINAL VARIABLES BY (TWO) ALUMNI GROUPS AND PLANNED GIVING PANEL

Variable	Alumni Making Planned Gifts (Census)	Alumni Not Making Planned Gifts (Random Sample)	Planned Giving Panel
	Rank	Rank	Rank*
Allegiance/gratitude to institution	1	4	2
Interest/belief in supporting institution	2	2	4
Help others/society (charitable disposition)	3	1	1
Satisfaction of participating in work of institution	4	3	3
Past/current relationship with institution	5	6	5
Permanent legacy/tribute	6	7	7
Estate planning and tax consequences	7	5	9
Previous giving history or available pattern of giving	8	8	11
Outgrowth of volunteer activities	9.	9	16
Desire for recognition/prestige	10	10	14

*Ranked group of eighteen characteristics given by planned giving experts.

alumni groups is striking (refer to Table 6). It should be noted, also, that four of the attitudinal variables for the random sample (no planned gifts) group were moderately important to substantially important to that group (group mean values of 4.30 through 4.81), whereas six of the attitudinal variables were rated moderately important to substantially important by the planned giving group (group mean values of 3.87 through 5.16). Only four attitudinal variables within the planned giving group fell below a group mean value of 3.00 (somewhat important): a) estate planning and tax consequences (2.56); b) previous giving history or available pattern of giving (2.45); c) outgrowth of volunteer activities (2.33); and d) desire for recognition/prestige (1.92). For the random sample group, four attitudinal variables fell below a group mean value of 2.50 (less than somewhat important). Three were the same variables as in the planned giving (census) group (b, c, and d above); the fourth was creating a permanent legacy/tribute (random sample group mean = 2.50)

Further comparing the alumni attitudinal variable rankings (refer to Table 7) with the variable rankings by the planned giving experts (refer to Table 1) reveals substantial similarity regarding the relative importance of these attitudinal variables. As borne out through the testing of the attitudinal and demographic variables from the two alumni questionnaires, the major finding from the data collected from the planned giving experts (see Table 1) was that attitudinal characteristics generally supercede demographic characteristics in importance in their collective experience. Only three demographic variables ranked in the top ten of eighteen (total) variables rated by the planned giving experts (rankings were determined using mean group ratings by variable): age (ranked 6th); childless (ranked 8th); and financial provisions in place for spouse/heirs (ranked 10th). Subsequent testing results in this research using

Stepwise Discriminant Analysis, however, attest to the importance of an equal number of selected (categorical) demographic and attitudinal variables in the making of a planned gift (refer to Table 4). It is notable, however, that, while the planned giving experts rated eighteen demographic and attitudinal variables in the aggregate (of which eight tested as statistically significant from the two alumni questionnaires at the .05 level), their rankings for the attitudinal variables fell in similar order to the rank ordering of the attitudinal variables alone for each alumni group (see Table 7).

Finally, selected findings from the study corroborate some of the previous research done in the field of alumni giving to higher education and charitable giving to education in general. Allegiance/gratitude to the institution (loyalty) was a primary motivation for alumni giving as described by Yankelovich, Skelly and White (1985), Lindemann (1982), and Spaeth and Greeley (1970). Interest/belief in supporting the institution was found to be an important variable in alumni giving by Yankelovich, Skelly and White (1985) and Lindemann (1982). Past/current (close) relationship with the institution was found to be important in alumni giving by Yankelovich, Skelly and White (1985). Demographic characteristics found by Yankelovich, Skelly and White (1985) to have influence on giving included married and widowed individuals with higher education and a professional occupation.

In sum, demographic characteristics describing alumni making planned gifts include alumni who tend to be childless; single/widowed; have no spouse/heirs for whom to provide; hold a terminal degree or attended only (did not hold a degree); and have made previous gifts/contributions to the institution in the range of >$100 annually and/or large, occasional gifts. Attitudinal considerations most important to an alumni planned giving profile include allegiance/gratitude to the institution; interest/belief in supporting the institution; past/current relationship with the institution; and creating a permanent legacy/tribute. It was notable in this study, although not a statistically significant difference between alumni groups, that the number of men and women making planned gifts was about equal as were the proportions of alumni making planned gifts with a gross estate size of more than one million dollars and of less than one million dollars.

Subsequent testing using Stepwise Discriminant Analysis (to determine the extext to which the independent variables discriminate between alumni who have made planned gifts and alumni who have not made planned gifts) found that seven variables (within six categories) had significant F values at the .05 level and, therefore, were making a contribution to (were predictive of) the dependent variable, planned gift. The seven variables with their R^2 values in order of entry into the equation were: 1) children (.21), 2) allegiance/gratitude to the institution (.18), 3) permanent legacy/tribute (.07), 4) estate planning and tax consequences (.07), 5) terminal degree (.04), 6) help others/society (charitable disposition) (.04), and 7) attended institution but hold no degree (.02). Children, predicting 21% of the dependent variable and allegiance/gratitude to the institution predicting 18% of the dependent variable were established as primary characteristics in predicting an alumni planned gift. These two variables were ranked as #8 and #2 respectively by the planned giving experts (refer to Table 1). The outcomes for allegiance/gratitude to the institution and charitable disposition (help others or society) fit with the survey research findings of Lindemann (1982), Yankelovich, Skelly and White (1985), and Spaeth and Greeley (1970). Additionally, it is notable that charitable disposition (help others or society) predicted 4% of the dependent variable (planned gift) according to the Stepwise Discriminant Analysis, a fact that may, as stated earlier, simply reinforce this variable as an underlying basis for giving.

Discriminant analysis looks for like kinds of things to classify them -- the dependent variable (planned gift) is dichotomous rather than continuous (as with regression analysis). The discriminant function predicts membership in "each" group (planned gift or no planned gift) to determine the proportion going into each set. The percentage correctly predicted into each group reflects the goodness of fit (R^2 values determine the proportion going into each set). A good fit occurs if 75%+ can be predicted correctly. In corroboration of this information and more meaningful in nature is the squared canonical correlation which in this study was .48. Feeding the standardized discriminant coefficients derived for these seven variables (See Table 4) into an equation generating a classification summary resulted in a percent of "grouped" cases correctly classified of 81.2% (with a corresponding error rate of 18% as shown in Table 5). By alumni group, 79.3% of alumni making a planned gift were correctly classified, and 83.9% of alumni not making a planned gift were correctly classified. Since the percent of "grouped" cases correctly classified is in excess of 75%, a good fit has occurred. In terms of "hits" and "misses," misclassifying 21% of alumni considered to be capable of making a planned gift is a reasonable risk until further research improves the percentage of correct classifications. Garnering a 16% rate of planned gifts from alumni misclassified as alumni not having the characteristics predictive of planned gifts could substantially offset the time and costs associated with cultivating the 21% misclassified as alumni with the characteristics predictive of planned gift donors. Given the infancy of the research on planned giving at this time, these results are a reasonable trade-off.

It is notable that seven variables (representing six of the twenty-two alumni characteristics itemized in Chapter 1) appear from the results of Stepwise Discriminant Analysis to be predictive of alumni planned giving. Two categorical demographic variables -- children and academic credentials are discussed first. Children, terminal degree, and attended but do not hold a degree had statistically significant F values based on Chi-square analysis and entered the Stepwise Discriminant Analysis equation first, fifth, and seventh respectively with R^2 values of .21 (children), .04 (terminal degree), and .02 (attended but do not hold a degree). Three attitudinal variables -- 1) allegiance/gratitude to institution; 2) creating a permanent legacy/tribute; and 3) estate planning and tax consequences had statistically significant F values based on one-way analysis of variance testing and entered the Stepwise Discriminant Analysis equation in the following order respectively: 2, 3 and 4. The R^2 values, respectively were .18 (allegiance/gratitude to institution); .07 (creating a permanent legacy/tribute); and .07 (estate planning and tax consequences). A fourth attitudinal variable -- help others/society (charitable disposition) did not test as statistically significant in the one-way ANOVA procedure, but entered the Stepwise Discriminant Analysis equation sixth. Accordingly, from the outcomes of this empirical research, it appears that at least seven individually tested variables representing six of twenty-two alumni characteristics listed for study are predictive of alumni planned giving at greater than .01 with a squared canonical correlation of .48.

Based on Chi-square and ANOVA testing, the data for the two groups of alumni also showed that there were statistically significant differences between groups at the .05 level for five categorical characteristics itemized in Chapter 1 inclusive of three demographic variables and two attitudinal variables. The three demographic variables as determined by Chi-square analysis were: 1) marital status; 2) previous regular/periodic gifts to the institution; and 3) financial provisions for spouses/heirs. The two attitudinal variables as determined by one-way analysis of variance were: 1) interest/belief in supporting the institution and 2) past and current relationship with the institution. Stepwise Discriminant Analysis revealed R^2 values of less than .01 for each of these five variables. Based on these testing outcomes, however, subsequent research is warranted on these five alumni characteristics, along with verification of the seven variables determined in this research to be predictive of alumni planned giving.

The remaining demographic and attitudinal characteristics listed in Chapter 1 did not reveal statistically significant differences between alumni groups based on Chi-square and one-way analysis of variance testing and produced R^2 values of less than .01. These characteristics were: gender; campus attended (in addition to main campus); age group; employment status; proximity of residence to institution; residence type; gross estate size; along with previous giving history or available pattern of giving; outgrowth of volunteer activities; desire for recognition/prestige; and satisfaction of participating in the work of the institution. Also, within the category of academic credentials, two component variables -- bachelors and masters degree -- did not test as statistically significant (between groups) and produced an R^2 value of less than .01. Further research regarding these last listed characteristics is warranted as this is the first empirical research of which the researcher is aware in the area of alumni planned giving, public or private. A different study construct involving other alumni groups in public higher education might yield other results.

Finally, Table 8 presents a comparison of significant findings by source for the eighteen characteristics associated with alumni planned giving and ranked by the planned giving experts plus the two academic credentials (terminal degree and attended but hold no degree). This table not only summarizes the findings described throughout Chapter 4, but also reveals that two of the top-ten ranked variables included by the planned giving experts were not corroborated by the findings of this study -- satisfaction of participating in the work of the institution (#3) and age group (#6).

Returning to the central research question: is there a set of demographic and attitudinal characteristics that identify or associate membership in a planned giving prospect group among a given body of alumni that could be incorporated into a screening model of device, it appears, based on the results presented to this point that at least seven variables are candidates for inclusion in any proposed model. These seven independent variables (with a square canonical correlation of .48) have correctly classified 81.2% of grouped cases through the discriminant analysis function (refer to Table 5) for the two groups of alumni under study, proving within the parameters of this study that these characteristics are predictive of alumni planned giving. The three demographic variables are children, terminal degree, and attended but hold no degree. As is described in the earlier in this discussion portion of the analysis, 88% of alumni with no children made planned gifts (almost twice as frequently as those with children). Eighty percent of alumni holding terminal degrees made planned gifts, and 83% of alumni who attended but do not hold a degree made planned gifts.

TABLE 8

COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS BY SOURCE FOR EIGHTEEN CHARACTERISTICS ASSOCIATED WITH ALUMNI PLANNED GIVING

Items in rank order by planned giving panel	Chi Square	Anova (F)	Discriminant Analysis	Alumni/Charitable Giving Literature
1. Charitable disposition			X	X
2. Allegiance/gratitude to institution		X	X	X
3. Satisfaction of participating in the work of the institution				
4. Interest/belief in supporting the institution		X		X
5. Past and current relationship with the institution		X		X
6. Age group				
7. Create permanent legacy/tribute		X	X	
8. Children	X		X	
9. Estate plan and tax consequences		X	X	
10. Financial provisions for spouse/heirs	X			
11. Previous giving history or available pattern of giving to follow by family/peers	X			
12. Marital status	X			X
13. Gross estate size				
14. Desire for recognition/prestige				
15. Gender				
16. Outgrowth of volunteer activities				
17. Residence in selected retirement areas of U.S.				
18. Proximity of residence to institution				

TABLE 8 continued

Items in rank order by planned giving panel	Chi Square	Anova (F)	Discriminant Analysis	Alumni/Charitable Giving Literature
<u>Not on panel list:</u>				
19. Attended but hold no degree	X		X	
20. Terminal degree	X		X	X

The four attitudinal characteristics that are candidates for inclusion in an alumni planned giving screening model or device were also described fully in the course of Chapter 4 and are summarized here. Allegiance/gratitude to the institution was a substantially important consideration for alumni making planned gifts, whereas it was only a moderately important consideration for those alumni not making planned gifts. Estate planning and tax consequences were, on the other hand, less than somewhat important considerations to alumni making planned gifts, whereas it was a moderately important consideration for alumni who had not made planned gifts. Creating a permanent legacy/tribute was a substantially important consideration for alumni making planned gifts, while it was a considerably less (somewhat) important consideration for alumni not making planned gifts. Helping others/society (charitable disposition) did not test statistically significant at the .05 level during one-way analysis of variance testing between groups. In the Stepwise Discriminant Analysis, however, helping others/society entered the equation 6th of the 7 variables with an R^2 value of .04. The group mean values attest that this consideration in making a planned gifts is moderately important to both groups of alumni and is sufficiently important for further consideration for inclusion at this time in an alumni planned giving screening model. Of particular importance in continuing research is developing the tangible means to measure and collect data for each of the attitudinal variables described above.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this exploratory study was to develop a conceptual planned (deferred) giving model based on demographic and attitudinal alumni characteristics observed by experts in the development field and the collection of demographic and attitudinal data from: a) a census of alumni who have made planned gifts (exclusive of insurance policies to avoid any possible introduction of an athletic bias) and b) a random sample of alumni who have not made planned gifts for the purpose of comparison with the census of alumni making planned gifts. Any resulting planned giving (computerized screening) model could be tested subsequently in terms of its ability to screen groups of alumni to ascertain the presence of the requisite (combination of) characteristics for making planned gifts. The central research question for the study was: Is there a set of demographic and attitudinal characteristics that identify or associate membership in a planned gift prospect group among a given body of alumni that could be incorporated into a screening model or device?

Based on the findings, analysis and discussion in Chapter 4, the following highlights are noted:

1) using chi-square analysis, five demographic variables distinguished alumni planned givers versus non-givers:

- academic credentials -- terminal degree and attended but hold no degree. (80% of alumni holding terminal degrees made planned gifts);
- marital status (71% of single/widowed alumni made planned gifts);
- children (88% of alumni with no children made planned gifts -- more than twice the rate of alumni with children);
- financial provisions in place for spouse/heirs (96% of alumni with no spouse/heirs made planned gifts);
- previous giving history or available pattern of giving to follow by family/peers (70% of alumni making large, occasional or regular annual gifts of $100 or more also made planned gifts).

Other notable tendencies regarding alumni who made planned gifts include:

- 55% of alumni with no terminal degree made planned gifts;
- 57% of alumni who held UT degrees made planned gifts;
- 55% of alumni who were married made planned gifts;
- 55% of alumni who had not yet made financial provisions for their spouse/heirs made planned gifts; and
- 52% of alumni who made small, occasional and/or annual gifts of less than $100 also made planned gifts.

Despite these additional tendencies and with limited resources available, planned giving professionals would be well advised to seek alumni meeting the criteria outlined in 1) above (demographic characteristics) and 2) below (attitudinal characteristics) until further research indicates the inclusion of these other tendencies in an alumni planned giving (screening) model.

2) five attitudinal variables distinguished alumni planned givers versus non-givers using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA):
   - estate planning and tax consequences (not very important to alumni making planned gifts);
   - desire to create a permanent legacy or tribute (of moderate importance to alumni making planned gifts);
   - allegiance/gratitude to institution (of substantial importance to alumni making planned gifts);
   - past and current relationship with the institution (of moderate importance to alumni making planned gifts);
   - interest/belief in supporting the institution (of substantial importance to alumni making planned gifts).

3) employment of Stepwise Discriminant Analysis revealed six statistically significant (independent) variables predictive of alumni planned giving with a squared canonical correlation of .48.

4) the six statistically significant variables from the Stepwise Discriminant Analysis correctly classified 81.2% of grouped cases through the discriminant analysis function (optimal classification equation) for the two groups of alumni under study. Children (.21) and allegiance/gratitude to the institution (.18), therefore,are the primary variables for an alumni planned giving (screening) model emerging from this study. These six independent variables accounted for .48 of the variance of planned giving (they are not additive).

Based on these findings, a profile describing alumni making planned gifts include alumni who tend to be childless; single/widowed; have no spouse/heirs for whom to provide; hold a terminal degree; and have made gifts/contributions to the institution in the range of $100 or more annually and/or large, occasional gifts. Attitudinal characteristics most important to alumni making planned gifts include allegiance/gratitude to the institution; interest/belief in supporting the institution; past/current relationship with the institution; and creating a permanent legacy/tribute.

The following conclusions can be drawn relative to the development of an alumni planned giving model:

- there are numerous demographic and attitudinal factors involved in identifying alumni planned giving prospects and none are perfect predictors; and
- there are sufficient predictive characteristics with the aggregate capability of discriminating among alumni to recommend a conceptual model for alumni planned giving at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

These findings and conclusions lead to the recommendation that the following conceptual model be adopted to promote the increase of alumni planned giving:

<u>Office of the University President</u>

- set and sustain the priority (charge) throughout the university community regarding the importance of alumni planned giving to the University community;
- promote awareness/alertness among all University personnel regarding the development of the key attitudinal characteristics

among alumni making planned gifts (allegiance/gratitude/loyalty to the institution) based on the individual student's experience at the University;

- stress the importance of the quality and adequacy of all academic programs and student support services and the appropriate treatment of all students by University personnel in reference to their impact on alumni decisions to make planned gifts (based on attitudinal considerations) at later points in their lives.
- Chancellors and Deans would, in turn, promote similar awareness/alertness throughout member campuses and colleges respectively.

Student Affairs

- conduct (insuring use of the results) regular institution-wide assessments of the quality and adequacy of student support services including the treatment of students in all areas and at all levels by all University personnel. Random sampling would be adequate to provide this information. (I recommend assist/support the assessment activity) Assessment should include University policies, procedures and personnel attitudes. The product would be regular reports of results and recommendations for improvements to the President and the Chancellor of each member campus. Chancellors would have the responsibility to oversee the implementation of recommended improvements at their respective campuses.

Academic Affairs

- conduct (insuring use of results) regular evaluations of faculty and academic courses including attitudinal considerations among all students (levels). Attitudes of faculty members toward students and the quality of interaction with students as perceived by students are to be included. The product would be regular academic affairs reports to Deans of the member colleges with a summary report to the Chancellors and the President inclusive of recommendations for improvements from each Dean. (Deans are expected to hold heads of departments/divisions/programs accountable for implementing recommendations specific to individual faculty members.)

Alumni Affairs

- Collect demographic and attitudinal data on alumni on a regularly-scheduled (on-going) basis from exiting seniors and graduate students including exiting students who will not earn a degree from the institution (attended but received no degree).
- Periodically (yet regularly) collect demographic and attitudinal data from alumni through mailed questionnaires (random sampling is recommended if surveying a population is not financially feasible).
- Input data collected from these two efforts into the institutional alumni data base utilized by institutional alumni affairs and development personnel.

Institutional Research

- Routinely retrieve and format collected characteristics data from the alumni data base and perform discriminant function calculations to determine the squared canonical correlation and the resulting predictive characteristics from Stepwise Discriminant Analysis. It is anticipated that predictive characteristics would reveal shifts periodically and hence monitoring is warranted on a routine basis (to be determined by the institution). The Institutional Research Office also would develop a prototype (subsequently refining the prototype into an operational model) alumni planned giving screening model for development personnel to use in conjunction with the institutional alumni data base.
- Routinely scheduled performance of these activities will provide verification of predictive characteristics (determination of grouped cases percentages, or misclassification), and insure that shifts in predictive characteristics are captured in a timely manner.
- Submit results to planned giving staff, senior alumni affairs/development personnel, as well as the campus Chancellors and the President.

Development

- Based on predictive characteristics determined to be valid at any point in time, routinely screen groups of alumni to identify primary potential alumni planned giving prospects utilizing the operational screening model developed by the Office of Institutional Research.

- Collect data on increased alumni planned giving to produce periodic reports and recommendations for improvements in the identifying, cultivating, soliciting, and stewardship activities associated with alumni planned giving. Reports from planned giving personnel would be presented to senior alumni affairs/development personnel, Deans and collegiate development personnel, Chancellors and the President to sustain, in a cyclical fashion, the priority (charge) from the President to personnel throughout the institution.

Additionally, these findings and conclusions lead to the following recommendations:

1) replicate this study (the comparative alumni portions) with other public university alumni groups to verify the demographic and attitudinal variables recommended for inclusion in the alumni planned giving model, as well as to determine whether or not the remaining variables producing R^2 values of .01 should be included in such a model;
2) develop the tangible means to measure and collect data for each of the attitudinal variables recommended for inclusion in an alumni planned giving model;
3) develop a prototype alumni planned giving model based on the conceptual model in which demographic and attitudinal variables (collected as data) can be assigned numerical values allowing them to be tested to identify membership in an alumni planned giving prospects group;

4) conduct further research on the demographic variable "attended but hold no degree" (especially giving attention to alumni who ultimately took terminal degrees at another institution) to determine if it warrants inclusion in an alumni planned giving model or was simply unique to University of Tennessee alumni;

5) remove the following two variables from the "top ten" variables listed by the panel of planned giving experts (refer to Table 8, p. 74) as they were not corroborated in the findings of this study: satisfaction of participating in the work of the institution and age group.

6) replicate this study including the athletic phenomenon to determine if an alumni planned giving model should incorporate this area of alumni interest.

7) conduct further quantitative research using alumni of public universities willing to participate in in-depth interviews regarding their decisions to make planned gifts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allport, G. W. (1937). Personality: A Psychological Interpretation. New York: Henry Holt & Company.

American Council on Education. (1983). Student Aid Cuts in the Reagan Administration. (Research Report). Washington, D. C.: Author.

Andrews, F. E. (1953). Attitudes Toward Giving. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Beeler, K. J. (1982). "A Study of the Predictors of Alumni Philanthropy in Private Universities." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Blumenfeld, W. S. and Sartain, P. L. (1974). Predicting Alumni Financial Donation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59 (4), 522 - 523.

Blumenstyk, G. and Cage, M. C. (1990). As State Legislatures Convene, Many Colleges Brace for Bad News. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 36 (16), 1+.

Brakebill, C. F. Interview, March 20, 1989. Senior Associate Vice President for Development, University of Tennessee.

Broce, T. E. (1986). Fund Raising: The Guide to Raising Money From Private Sources. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Chewning, P. B. (1985). What's On Their Minds? Studies on What Alumni Donors Think. Currents, Vol. 11, No. 7, 30+.

Council for Financial Aid to Education. (1983). 1981 - 1982 Voluntary Support for Education. (Annual Report). New York: Author.

Coxe, F. and Kennedy, N. B. (1988). Performance Audit of the Campus Development and Alumni Affairs Program at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Atlanta: Coxe and Associates.

Dillman, D. A. (1976). Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method. New York: Wiley.

Ernst & Whinney. (1980). Cost Benefit Analysis of the Pomona College Plan. Pomona: Author.

Fink, N. S. and Metzler, H. C. (1982). The Costs and Benefits of Deferred Giving. New York: Columbia University Press.

Goss, K. A. (1989). Charitable Donations Top $100-Billion for the First Time, but Growth Slows. The Chronicle of Philanthropy, Vol. 1, No. 17, 1+.

Hauskin, C. A. (1963). Estimating Sample Size. Journal of Research Services, Vol. 3, No. 1, 3.

Hinkle, D. E. and Associates. (1979). Applied Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.

Hitchcox, M. F. Interview, March 28, 1989. Director of Planned Giving, University of Tennessee.

Hodgkinson, V. A. and Weitzman, M. S. (1988). Giving and Volunteering in the United States: Findings From a National Survey. Washington, D. C.: Independent Sector.

Hodgkinson, V. A. and Weitzman, M. S. (1986). The Charitable Behavior of Americans: A National Survey Conducted by Yankelovich, Skelly and White, Inc. Washington, D. C.: Independent Sector.

Hopkins, M. Interview, November 27, 1989. Director of Alumni Data Systems, University of Tennessee.

Jones, L. W. (1979). Private Support for Higher Education. New Directions for Higher Education, 7 (4), 67 - 81. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. EJ219760.)

Keller, M. J. C. (1982). "An Analysis of Alumni Donor and Non-Donor Characteristics at the University of Montevallo." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Alabama.

Klecka, W. R. (1980). Discriminant Analysis. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Korvas, R. J. (1984). "The Relationship of Selected Alumni Characteristics and Attitudes to Alumni Financial Support at a Private College." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Missouri - Kansas City.

Lindemann, W. K. (1970). American Attitudes Toward Higher Education: A Survey of College Graduates . New York: McGraw-Hill.

McNally, F. E. (1985). "An Analysis of Alumni Philanthropy Related to Personal, Academic, and Social Characteristics." Ed.D. Dissertation, University of San Francisco.

Martin, G. J. (1990). Thanks in Advance: How Recognizing Planned Gifts Can Help You Get More and Bigger Donations. Currents, Vol. 16, No. 5, 22+.

Moerschbaecher, L. (1987). The New Planned Giving Landscape: Fund-raising Opportunities. Currents, Vol. 13, No. 6, 8+.

Nie, N. H. et al. (1975). SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Odendahl, T. (1990). Charity Begins at Home: Generosity and Self-Interest Among the Philanthropic Elite. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Sarnoff, I. (1962). Personality Dynamics and Development. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Spaeth, J. L. and Greeley, A. M. (1970). Recent Alumni and Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Teitell, C. Interview, June 28, 1989. Editor, Taxwise Giving.

Thornton, G. D., Tanner, C. K., and Cooper, H. H., (1975). Decision Making with Delphi Techniques, Bayesian Procedures and Monte Carlo Simulations. Planning and Changing, Vol. 6, No.1, 1+.

Welch, P. A. (1980). Annual Giving: An Overview. New Directions for Institutional Advancement, 7, 1+. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. EJ224058).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

May 30, 1990

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY, STATE ZIP

Dear SAL:

As those of us in the alumni development field are patently aware, there is a lack of research on the characteristics and giving patterns of public higher education alumni for the purpose of identifying and predicting planned gifts by these alumni to their alma maters. At the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, an exploratory study is underway to develop a conceptual planned giving model focusing on planned giving by alumni. While we know that many planned gifts come from non-alumni, we have elected to direct our attention to alumni planned giving to improve planned givingefforts among alumni and for reasons of manageability. We invite you to participate and to receive a set of the results upon completion of the study. An introduction to the study accompanies this letter along with the first of three-part questionnaire series.

The study entitled "Predictive Characteristics Related to Alumni Planned Giving at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville" is being undertaken by Ms. Claire Eldridge-Karr who is the Director of Development for the College of Liberal Arts here. This study has University approval and endorsement and should result in beneficial, predictive information relative and adaptable to alumni planned giving programs in public higher education.

We invite you to participate on a panel of fifteen experts for the three-part series portion of the study in your role as (insert title) at (insert name of institution). The (insert name of institution) is ranked by the Council for the Advancement of Education (CFAE) as one of the top institutions in overall alumni giving in recent years.

We encourage your participation in this three-part questionnaire series to reach consensus on the most important demographic and/or attitudinal characteristics predictive of planned giving by alumni from your experience. Each of the three successive questionnaires will not require much time (approximately ten minutes each), and they are scheduled for completion within eight weeks (roughly one questionnaire every two weeks). The first questionnaire is enclosed along with a business reply mail envelope for your convenience. Return of the completed first questionnaire indicates your commitment to participate. Individual responses will not be identifiable throughout the three-part series.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation and assistance with this important research in alumni planned giving.

Sincerely,

Mr. Charles F. Brakebill
Sr. Associate Vice President
for Development

CFB:sdg

Attachments (2)

cc: Dr. Joseph E. Johnson
Executive Vice President and
Vice President for Development

APPENDIX B

Ms. Aviva Shiff Boedecker
Acting Director of the Office of Trusts and Bequests
University of California - Berkeley
2440 Bancroft Way, Suite 301
Berkeley, CA 94720

Mrs. Carolyn K. Curtis
Director of Planned Giving
University of Texas at Austin
Development Office
P. O. Box 7458
Austin, TX 78713

Mr. Gary Dicovitsky
Director of Planned Giving
University of Virginia
Office of University Development, The Rotunda
P. O. Box 9013
Charlottesville, VA 22906-9013

Mr. David R. Dierks
Director of Planned and Major Gifts
University of Iowa Foundation
Alumni Center
Iowa City, IA 52242

Mr. Ken R. Dildine
Director of Planned Giving
University of Arizona Foundation
1111 N. Cherry Avenue
Tucson, AZ 85721

Mr. Kenneth C. Eckerd
Director of Trusts and Bequests
University of Michigan
301 East Liberty
Ann Arbor, MI 48104-2260

Mr. Michael D. Fellows
Director of Trusts and Estates
Ohio State University
2400 Olentangy River Road
Columbus, OH 43210

Mr. Michael F. Hitchcox
Assistant Vice President for
Estate Planning and Deferred Gifts
The University of Tennessee
615 Andy Holt Tower
Knoxville, TN 37996-0165

Mrs. Jayne Irvin
Director of the Center for Estate Planning
University of Missouri - Columbia
125 Alumni Center
Columbia, MO 65211

Ms. Betsy Mangone
Vice President for Gift and Estate Planning
University of Colorado
P. O. Box 1140
Boulder, CO 80306

Mr. Gary Martin
Director of Planned Giving
610 Sterling C. Evans Library
TAMU Development Foundation
College Station, TX 77843

Mr. Tom McGlasson
Vice President and Counsel
Indiana University Foundation
Showalter House
46N By-Pass
Bloomington, IN 47405

Mr. Roger Meyer
Director of Planned Giving
University of California at Los Angeles
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Mr. Frank Minton
Director of Planned Giving and Senior Counsel
434 Administration Building, AI - 10
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195

Ms. Leslie Saftig
Director of Planned Giving
Pennsylvania State University
1 Old Main
University Park, PA 16802

Mr. William T. Sturtevant
Director of Trust Relations and Planned Giving
University of Illinois Foundation
224 Illini Union
1401 West Green Street
Urbana, IL 61801

Mr. Craig C. Wruck
Director of Planned Giving
University of Minnesota
120 Morrill Hall
100 Church Street, S.E.
Minneapolis, MN 55455

APPENDIX C

INTRODUCTION

The ability to predict which members of an alumni constituency should be planned giving prospects based on an established set of demographic and attitudinal characteristics would enable fundraisers in public higher education to screen alumni records and to focus their prospect identification activities as well as to better target their cultivation and solicitation efforts. Institutional fundraisers would be able to target selectively alumni capable of making planned gifts based on systematic research, simultaneously resulting in an improved cost/benefit ratio for the institution's overall development operation. Institutional alumni data systems would be able to maintain planned giving information on alumni capable of such gifts, flagging or coding these prospects for easy identification and retrieval.

APPENDIX C (continued)

Name
University/Foundation Name

ALUMNI PLANNED GIVING

Questionnaire #1

Based on your experience, please list the top 10 demographic and/or attitudinal characteristics associated with alumni making planned gifts to public institutions of higher education.

1. ______________________________

2. ______________________________

3. ______________________________

4. ______________________________

5. ______________________________

6. ______________________________

7. ______________________________

8. ______________________________

9. ______________________________

10. ______________________________

Reply Requested By June 22, 1990

THANK YOU

APPENDIX D

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Office of Development
Suite 600, Andy Holt Tower
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-0165
Telephone (615) 974-2471
974-2115

July 9, 1990

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY, STATE ZIP

Dear SAL:

Thank you for participating in the University of Tennessee, Knoxville's alumni planned giving study and your prompt response to the first of the three-part questionnaire series. Attached is Questionnaire #2 which lists the eighteen more frequently listed characteristics associated with alumni planned giving identified by the participating panel members.

In an attempt to reach consensus on the relative importance of these **characteristics associated with alumni planned giving,** you are asked in Questionnaire #2 to rate the importance of each characteristic using the scale shown on the questionnaire form.

We would appreciate receiving your response on Questionnaire #2 by **July 24.** A business reply mail envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Thank you for your continuing assistance. Questionnaire #3 will be the final round of the series which I plan to send you in early August.

Sincerely,

Claire Eldridge-Karr
Director of Development
College of Liberal Arts

CEK:sdg

Enclosures (2)

cc: Mr. Charles F. Brakebill
Senior Associate Vice President
for Development
Dr. Joseph E. Johnson
Vice President and
Executive Vice President

NAME
University/Foundation Name

ALUMNI PLANNED GIVING

Questionnaire #2

Thank you for completing Questionnaire #1. The eighteen more frequently listed demographic and/or attitudinal characteristics associated with alumni making planned gifts you and the other fourteen panel members submitted are listed below in Part B (column one).

A) Please indicate the total years of experience you have in the field of planned giving: ______________ years.

B) Please rate each characteristic listed below (using column two) according to your perception of its importance in alumni planned giving.

Not Important									Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

	Characteristic	Rating
1.	Financial benefit to donor (estate planning and tax consequences)	____
2.	Estate size ($1 million or more)	____
3.	Age (60 + years; likely retired; life-transcending perspective)	____
4.	Residence in selected retirement areas of U.S.	____
5.	Single or widowed	____
6.	Female	____
7.	Childless	____
8.	Financial provisions in place for spouse/heirs	____
9.	Desire to create permanent legacy/perpetual tribute	____
10.	Seeks recognition/prestige opportunities	____
11.	Charitable disposition (intent/desire to help others or society)	____
12.	Allegiance/gratitude to institution	____
13.	Previous giving history or has available pattern of giving to follow by family/peers	____
14.	Involvement/relationship with institution (past and current)	____
15.	Volunteerism	____
16.	Proximity to institution (resides within 100 miles of institution)	____
17.	Interest/belief in supporting institution or particular program (desire to enhance reputation of institution/program)	____
18.	Satisfaction/positive feeling associated with participation in the work of the institution (research and academics; faculty/staff member inculcating importance of institution's work)	____

Please return Questionnaire #2 by July 24 in the post-paid, pre-addressed envelope provided.

THANK YOU

APPENDIX E

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Office of Development
Suite 600, Andy Holt Tower
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-0165
Telephone (615) 974-2471
974-2115

August 21, 1990

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY,STATE ZIP

Dear SAL:

Thank you for completing Questionnaire #2 of the **Alumni Planned Giving Study. At this time**, I am attaching the third and final questionnaire which I earnestly hope you will complete **and return by September 7.**

In Questionnaire #3 you are asked to **consider your initial ratings** (shown in Column 3) of the listed eighteen characteristics associated with alumni planned giving from Questionnaire #2 **with the mean group rating for each characteristic** (shown in Column 2). If your initial rating for any characteristic listed was above or below the mean group rating by **more than** + or - 1.0, would you either:

1. modify your rating (use Column 4) or

2. explain why you do not want to modify your rating (use Column 5).

*** If all of your initial ratings were within the range described above relative to the mean group ratings, you need only sign your initials on the space provided and return your questionnaire in the enclosed business reply envelope.***

Again, it would be of great assistance if you would reply by **September 7.** I would like to complete this phase of the larger study by early October so that I can send each of you a set of results from this first effort in a timely manner to recognize your participation.

In the interim, thank you for your continuing cooperation -- and I do need a response to Questionnaire #3 from every participant -- or my statistics go out the window!

Sincerely,

Claire Eldridge-Karr
Director of Development

CEK:sdg

Enclosures (2)

cc: Mr. Charles F. Brakebill
Dr. Joseph E. Johnson

APPENDIX E (continued)

Name
University/Foundation Name

ALUMNI PLANNED GIVING

Questionnaire #3

Group responses (mean group response by item) are recorded in column two below for each of the eighteen characteristics you were asked to rate in Questionnaire #2. Column three shows your individual rating for each characteristic associated with alumni planned giving. If your response to any characteristic fell outside the mean group response by more than +/- 1.0 and you do not wish to change your rating, please state your reason in column five. Your new ratings, if any, should be placed in column four based on the scale below.

Not Important									Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

	Characteristic	Mean Group Rating	Your Q#2 Rating	Your New Rating	Reason For Not Changing Your Rating If Outside Range Stated	
	Col. 1	Col.2	Col.3	Col.4	Col.5	
1.	Financial benefit to donor (estate planning and tax consequences)	___	___	___	___	1
2.	Estate size ($1 million or more)	___	___	___	___	2
3.	Age (60 + years; likely retired; life-transcending perspective)	___	___	___	___	3
4.	Residence in selected retirement areas of U.S.	___	___	___	___	4
5.	Single or widowed	___	___	___	___	5
6.	Female	___	___	___	___	6
7.	Childless	___	___	___	___	7
8.	Financial provisions in place for spouse/heirs	___	___	___	___	8
9.	Desire to create permanent legacy/perpetual tribute	___	___	___	___	9
10.	Seeks recognition/prestige opportunities	___	___	___	___	10
11.	Charitable disposition (intent/desire to help others or society)	___	___	___	___	11
12.	Allegiance/gratitude to institution	___	___	___	___	12
13.	Previous giving history or has available pattern of giving to follow by family/peers	___	___	___	___	13
14.	Involvement/relationship with institution (past and current)	___	___	___	___	14
15.	Volunteerism	___	___	___	___	15
16.	Proximity to institution (resides within 100 miles of institution)	___	___	___	___	16
17.	Interest/belief in supporting institution or particular program (desire to enhance reputation of institution/program)	___	___	___	___	17
18.	Satisfaction/positive feeling associated with participation in the work of the institution (research and academics; faculty/staff member inculcating importance of institution's work)	___	___	___	___	18
	Col. 1	Col.2	Col.3	Col.4	Col.5	

*** ______________________________

Initials Date

THANK YOU

APPENDIX F

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

data a-l.doc

Office of the Executive Vice President
and Vice President for Development
605 Andy Holt Tower
Knoxville 37996-0166
Telephone (615) 974-2206
Fax (615) 974-2663

October 26, 1990

name
addr1
if addr2 addr2
endif
city , state zip

Dear sal :

I would like to acquaint you with a study underway here at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, that we feel will assist all of us who are concerned about building for the financial future of this University. As you are well aware, we increasingly are having to look beyond State funding sources to the private sector if we are to continue to be the "flagship" public institution of higher education for Tennesseans.

This study has University approval and endorsement and is designed to fill in a lack of information about our alumni who have already elected to make planned, or deferred, gifts to The University of Tennessee. A planned gift includes gifts through your will, charitable trusts, or other deferred gift types. We feel this study, being undertaken by Ms. Claire Eldridge-Karr who is the Director of Development for the College of Liberal Arts here, should result in beneficial information about our alumni and the considerations they have when deciding to make a life-transcending gift to the University.

I ask you to assist us by completing the enclosed, very brief questionnaire. All of your responses will be kept strictly confidential. Return of your questionnaire will be considered your informed consent to participate. While it is extremely important for us to have your involvement, your participation is voluntary. If you would like assistance with any aspect of this questionnaire, please feel free to telephone Ms. Karr collect at (615) 974-5045. She will be happy to work with you. A postage paid envelope is enclosed also for your convenience. **We would very much appreciate having your response by November 20, 1990.**

Thank you so much for your kind cooperation and good help as we seek to build an even better future for the University of Tennessee.

Yours truly,

Joseph E. Johnson, Ed.D.
Executive Vice President
and Vice President for Development

JEJ:sdg

Enclosures (2)

cc: Mr. Charlie F. Brakebill
Mr. Michael F. Hitchcox
Mr. Woodrow (Woody) Henderson

University of Tennessee, Knoxville
ALUMNI PLANNED GIVING
QUESTIONNAIRE

PART A. Please mark (X) beside the correct response:

1. I am
   ( ) male
   ( ) female

2. I:
   ( ) hold the following degree(s) from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (please check all that apply)
      ( ) Bachelors
      ( ) Masters
      ( ) Doctorate
      ( ) other ______________________________
   ( ) attended a UT campus other than Knoxville:(please check campus)
      ( ) UT Martin
      ( ) UT Memphis
      ( ) UT Chattanooga
      ( ) other
   ( ) attended but do not hold a degree from UT

2. At the time I made my planned gift to the University of Tennessee, Knoxville:

   I was
   ( ) married
   ( ) single, a widow, a widower

3. I
   ( ) had children
   ( ) was childless

4. My age group was
   ( ) less than 40 years
   ( ) 40 - 44 years
   ( ) 45 - 49 years
   ( ) 50 - 54 years
   ( ) 55 - 59 years
   ( ) 60 or more years

5. I was
   ( ) fully retired
   ( ) partially retired
   ( ) employed full-time
   ( ) a homemaker

6. I resided
   ( ) 100 miles or less from UT, Knoxville
   ( ) more than 100 miles from UT, Knoxville

7. I resided in a(n)
   ( ) house
   ( ) condominium
   ( ) apartment
   ( ) retirement community

8. My gross estate size was
   ( ) less than $1 million in total value
   ( ) more than $1 million in total value

CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

PG -

9. I had
   ( ) already made financial provisions for my spouse/heirs
   ( ) not yet made financial provisions for my spouse/heirs
   ( ) no spouse/heirs for whom to make financial provisions

10. I had previously contributed to the University of Tennessee, making
   ( ) small, occasional gifts
   ( ) annual gifts at the following level (most recent level):
      ( ) less than $100
      ( ) Century Club ($100 - $499)
      ( ) U-500 Club ($500 - $999)
      ( ) Presidents' Club ($1000+)
      ( ) between $1000 and $4999
   ( ) large, occasional gifts of $5,000 or more
   ( ) other:________________________

****

PART B: Using the scale shown below, **please rate the importance** to you of the ten considerations listed **at the time you were making your planned gift** to the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

(CIRCLE the number of the response that best represents your opinion at that time): <u>If you have no opinion about an item, please mark (X) on the blank line under No Op. for the items(s).</u>

Not at all Important **Very Important**

1_____2_____3_____4_____5_____6

		NOT IMP					VERY IMP	NoOp.
1.	In making a planned gift, the financial benefit to me, the donor, regarding estate planning and tax consequences was	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
2.	In making a planned gift, my desire was to create a permanent legacy or a permanent tribute	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
3.	In making a planned gift, the fact that I received recognition/prestige was important	1	2	3	4	5	6	____

CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

y

APPENDIX F (continued)

(CIRCLE the number of the response that best represents your opinion at that time): <u>If you have no opinion about an item, please mark (X) on the blank line under No Op. for the items(s).</u>

Not at all Important **Very Important**

1 2 3 4 5 6

		NOT IMP					VERY IMP	NoOp.
4.	Making a planned gift reflected my desire to help others or to help society	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
5.	Making a planned gift reflected my feeling of allegiance or gratitude to the University	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
6.	Making a planned gift reflected my past and current involvement (relationship) with the University	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
7.	Making a planned gift was a result of my previous giving history or my having an available pattern of giving to follow from my family and/or my peers	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
8.	Making a planned gift was the outgrowth of my volunteer activities with the University	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
9.	Making a planned gift reflected my interest or belief in supporting the University (my desire to enhance the reputation of the University or a particular program in the University)	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
10.	Making a planned gift provided me with the satisfaction of participating in the work of the University (its research and academic programs; or faculty or staff inculcating the importance of the University's work)	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
11.	Any other reason(s) for your planned gift:							
	________________________	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
	________________________	1	2	3	4	5	6	____

Thank You

Please return your questionnaire in the post-paid envelope provided by November 20, 1990.

APPENDIX G

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Office of the Executive Vice President
and Vice President for Development
605 Andy Holt Tower
Knoxville 37996-0166
Telephone (615) 974-2206
Fax (615) 974-2663

January 8, 1991

name
address
city, state zip

Dear sal:

I would like to acquaint you with a study underway here at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, that we feel will assist all of us who are concerned about building for the financial future of this University. As you are well aware, we increasingly are having to look beyond State funding sources to the private sector if we are to continue to be the "flagship" public institution of higher education for Tennesseans.

This study has University approval and endorsement and is designed to provide us with better information about our alumni regarding why they might elect to make gifts to The University of Tennessee -- in particular planned, or deferred, gifts. A planned gift includes gifts through your will, charitable trusts, or other deferred gift types. In the first part of this study, we asked 285 of our Knoxville alumni who have made planned gifts to respond to the same question content that we are asking you to respond to at this time -- just from a different perspective. We feel this study, being undertaken by Ms. Claire Eldridge-Karr who is the Director of Development for the College of Liberal Arts here, should result in beneficial information about our alumni and the considerations they may have when they consider making a life-transcending gift to the University.

I ask you to assist us by completing the enclosed, very brief questionnaire. All of your responses will be kept strictly confidential, unidentifiable individually -- this is not for solicitation purposes. Your name, along with 399 others, has been selected through a random sampling procedure from among 401,000 Knoxville alumni. Return of your questionnaire will be considered your informed consent to participate. While it is extremely important for us to have your involvement, your participation is voluntary. If you would like assistance with any aspect of this questionnaire, please feel free to telephone Ms. Karr collect at (615) 974-5045. She will be happy to work with you. A postage-paid envelope is enclosed for your convenience. **We would very much appreciate having your response by February 1, 1991.**

Thank you so much for your kind cooperation and good help as we seek to build an even better future for the University of Tennessee.

Yours truly,

Joseph E. Johnson, Ed.D.
Executive Vice President
and Vice President for Development

JEJ:sdg

Enclosures (2)

cc: Mr. Charlie F. Brakebill
Mr. Michael F. Hitchcox
Mr. Woodrow (Woody) Henderson

University of Tennessee, Knoxville
ALUMNI PLANNED GIVING
QUESTIONNAIRE

PAGE 1 OF 3

PART A. Please mark (X) beside the correct response:

1. I am
   ( ) male
   ( ) female

2. I:
   ( ) hold the following degree(s) from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (please check all that apply)
      ( ) Bachelors
      ( ) Masters
      ( ) Doctorate
      ( ) other ______________________
   ( ) attended a UT campus other than Knoxville:(please check campus)
      ( ) UT Martin
      ( ) UT Memphis
      ( ) UT Chattanooga
      ( ) other
   ( ) attended but do not hold a degree from UT

3. I am
   ( ) married
   ( ) single, a widow, a widower

4. I
   ( ) have children
   ( ) am childless

5. My age group is
   ( ) less than 40 years
   ( ) 40 - 44 years
   ( ) 45 - 49 years
   ( ) 50 - 54 years
   ( ) 55 - 59 years
   ( ) 60 or more years

6. I am
   ( ) fully retired
   ( ) partially retired
   ( ) employed full-time
   ( ) a homemaker

7. I reside
   ( ) 100 miles or less from UT, Knoxville
   ( ) more than 100 miles from UT, Knoxville

8. I reside in a(n)
   ( ) house
   ( ) condominium
   ( ) apartment
   ( ) retirement community

9. My gross estate size is
   ( ) less than $1 million in total value
   ( ) more than $1 million in total value

CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

RS -

10. I have
( ) already made financial provisions for my spouse/heirs
( ) not yet made financial provisions for my spouse/heirs
( ) no spouse/heirs for whom to make financial provisions

11. I contribute/have contributed to the University of Tennessee, making
( ) small, occasional gifts
( ) annual gifts at the following level (most recent level):
    ( ) less than $100
    ( ) Century Club ($100 - $499)
    ( ) U-500 Club ($500 - $999)
    ( ) Presidents' Club ($1000+)
    ( ) between $1000 and $4999
( ) large, occasional gifts of $5,000 or more
( ) other:____________________

****

PART B: Using the scale shown below, **please rate the importance** to you of the ten considerations listed **if you were thinking about making a planned gift** to the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

(CIRCLE the number of the response that best represents your opinion): If you have no opinion about an item, please mark (X) on the blank line under No Op. for the items(s).

Not at all important — **Very important**

1 2 3 4 5 6

		NOT IMP					VERY IMP	NoOp.
1.	If I made a planned gift, the financial benefit to me, as the donor, regarding estate planning and tax consequences would be	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
2.	If I made a planned gift, my desire would be to create a permanent legacy or a permanent tribute	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
3.	If I made a planned gift, the fact that I would receive recognition/prestige would be important	1	2	3	4	5	6	____

CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

(CIRCLE the number of the response that best represents your opinion): If you have no opinion about an item, please mark (X) on the blank line under No Op. for the items(s).

Not at all Important **Very Important**

1 2 3 4 5 6

		NOT IMP					VERY IMP	NoOp.
4.	If I made a planned gift, it would reflect my desire to help others or to help society	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
5.	If I made a planned gift, it would reflect my feeling of allegiance or gratitude to the University	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
6.	If I made a planned gift, it would reflect my past and current involvement (relationship) with the University	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
7.	If I made a planned gift, it would be a result of my previous giving history or my having an available pattern of giving to follow from my family and/or my peers	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
8.	If I made a planned gift, it would be the outgrowth of my volunteer activities with the University	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
9.	If I made a planned gift, it would reflect my interest or belief in supporting the University (my desire to enhance the reputation of the University or a particular program in the University)	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
10.	If I made a planned gift, it would provide me with the satisfaction of participating in the work of the University (its research and academic programs; or faculty or staff inculcating the importance of the University's work)	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
11.	Would there be any other reason(s) for your making a planned gift:							
	________________________________	1	2	3	4	5	6	____
	________________________________	1	2	3	4	5	6	____

Thank You

Please return your questionnaire in the post-paid envelope provided by February 1, 1991.

APPENDIX H

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Office of the Executive Vice President
and Vice President for Development
605 Andy Holt Tower
Knoxville 37996-0166
Telephone (615) 974-2206
Fax (615) 974-2663

November 14, 1990

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY, STATE ZIP

Dear SAL:

We at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville are most anxious to have your participation in our alumni planned giving study. The busy holiday season is almost upon us, and **we want to encourage your response on the alumni planned giving questionnaire by NOVEMBER 28.**

The information collected through this study is truly important to our planning for the financial future of UT, Knoxville. Once again, confidentiality of all individual responses will be maintained throughout the study.

A fresh questionnaire is enclosed for your use along with a post-paid reply envelope. We look forward to your good help and thank you for your assistance. I send our best wishes for the holiday season.

Sincerely,

Joseph E. Johnson, Ed. D.
Executive Vice President and
Vice President for Development

JEJ:sdg

Enclosures (2)

cc: Mr. Charlie Brakebill
Mr. Mike Hitchcox
Mr. Woodrow Henderson

APPENDIX I

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Office of the Executive Vice President
and Vice President for Development
605 Andy Holt Tower
Knoxville 37996-0166
Telephone (615) 974-2206
Fax (615) 974-2663

January 23, 1991

NAME
ADDRESS
CITY, STATE ZIP

Dear SAL:

We at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville are most anxious to have your participation in our alumni planned giving study. **We want to encourage your response to the alumni planned giving questionnaire by FEBRUARY 8.**

The information collected through this study is truly important to our planning for the financial future of UT, Knoxville. Once again, confidentiality of all individual responses will be maintained throughout the study.

A fresh questionnaire is enclosed for your use along with a post-paid reply envelope. We look forward to your good help and thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Joseph E. Johnson, Ed.D.
Executive Vice President
and Vice President for Development

JEJ:sdg

Enclosures (2)

cc: Mr. Charlie F. Brakebill

APPENDIX J

Name:____________________

Tele#:____________________

Tele#:____________________

CALL REPORT
COVER SHEET

Date:	Time:	Result:	Code for Recalls:

Abbreviations:

NA = no answer

NH = not home

WR = will return (when)

REF = refused (when, why)

IC = interview completed

PC = partially completed

WN = wrong number

DISC = disconnected

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX J (continued)

Hello. May I speak with ______________. This is Sabrina Glenn at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. I am calling you about the UT alumni planned giving questionnaire we sent you recently. Would you please take the time to answer 6 questions -- it would only take two-to-three minutes?

IF YES, "Thank you." and continue

IF NO, Thank you and Have A Good Evening. (Complete call report).

Let me assure you that all answers will be kept strictly confidential. If you are ready, we'll begin with 3 general questions about yourself:

1. Are you married?

YES	1
NO	2

2. Do you have children?

YES	1
NO	2

3. In which age grouping does your age fall?

(Pause between each group)

less than 40 years	1
40 - 44 years	2
45 - 49 years	3
50 - 54 years	4
55 - 59 years	5
60 or more years	6

APPENDIX J (continued)

Now, I'm going to ask you to respond to each of the following 3 statements in terms of how important they WOULD BE TO YOU IF YOU were an alumnus making a planned gift to UT. I will use a scale of VERY IMPORTANT, MODERATELY IMPORTANT, SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT and NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL: OKAY?

a)	If I made a planned gift, it would reflect my desire to help others or to help society.	VERY IMP MOD. SOME NOT IMP. NO OP.	6 4.5 2.5 1 --
b)	If I made a planned gift, it would reflect my feeling of allegiance or gratitude to the University.	VERY IMP MOD. SOME NOT IMP. NO OP.	6 4.5 2.5 1 --
c)	If I made a planned gift, it would reflect my past and current relationship (involvement) with the University.	VERY IMP MOD SOME NOT IMP. NO OP.	6 4.5 2.5 1 --

And that completes this section. Thank you for taking the time to answer these alumni questions. You've been very helpful. Good-bye.

EDITS:

1) Male
   Female

2) Bachelors
   Masters
   Ph.D., Ed.D., J.D., M.D.
   Other
   Attended only

3) Resides 100 mi. or less from UTK
   Resides 100 mi. or more from UTK

4) Has contributed to UT
   Has NOT contributed to UT

APPENDIX K

ANOVA
ESTATE PLANNING AND TAX CONSEQUENCES AND PLANNED GIFT STATUS

Source	MS	df	F	P
Between	114.60490	1	34.9*	0.000
Within	3.2797	281		

Group	N	Mean	SD
Planned Gift	176	2.56	1.80
No Planned Gift	107	3.87	1.83

*significant at .05 level

ANOVA
PERMANENT LEGACY OR TRIBUTE AND PLANNED GIFT STATUS

Source	MS	df	F	P
Between	120.1916	1	33.3*	0.000
Within	3.6062	275		

Group	N	Mean	SD
Planned Gift	174	3.87	2.03
No Planned Gift	103	2.50	1.65

*significant at .05 level

APPENDIX K (continued)

ANOVA
RECOGNITION OR PRESTIGE OPPORTUNITY AND PLANNED GIFT STATUS

Source	MS	df	F	P
Between	1.4950	1	0.9	0.352
Within	1.7171	278		

Group	N	Mean	SD
Planned Gift	176	1.92	1.32
No Planned Gift	104	1.77	1.29

ANOVA
CHARITABLE DISPOSITION (HELP OTHERS OR SOCIETY) AND PLANNED GIFT STATUS

Source	MS	df	F	P
Between	1.3231	1	0.6	0.448
Within	2.2945	287		

Group	N	Mean	SD
Planned Gift	175	4.67	1.54
No Planned Gift	114	4.81	1.47

APPENDIX K (continued)

ANOVA
ALLEGIANCE/GRATITUDE TO INSTITUTION
AND PLANNED GIFT STATUS

Source	MS	df	F	P
Between	55.0674	1	35.7*	0.000
Within	1.5408	287		

Group	N	Mean	SD
Planned Gift	177	5.16	1.09
No Planned Gift	112	4.27	1.45

*significant at .05 level

ANOVA
PAST AND CURRENT RELATIONSHIP WITH INSTITUTION
AND PLANNED GIFT STATUS

Source	MS	df	F	P
Between	65.4036	1	25.3*	0.000
Within	2.5881	273		

Group	N	Mean	SD
Planned Gift	168	4.33	1.60
No Planned Gift	107	3.33	1.63

*significant at .05 level

APPENDIX K (continued)

ANOVA
PREVIOUS GIVING HISTORY OR AVAILABLE PATTERN
OF GIVING BY FAMILY OR PEERS
AND PLANNED GIFT STATUS

Source	MS	df	F	P
Between	2.9102	1	1.3	0.252
Within	2.2067	259		

Group	N	Mean	SD
Planned Gift	161	2.45	1.56
No Planned Gift	100	2.23	1.35

ANOVA
OUTGROWTH OF VOLUNTEER ACTIVITIES
AND PLANNED GIFT STATUS

Source	MS	df	F	P
Between	5.7620	1	2.4	0.126
Within	2.4452	252		

Group	N	Mean	SD
Planned Gift	155	2.33	1.70
No Planned Gift	99	2.02	1.32

APPENDIX K (continued)

ANOVA
INTEREST OR BELIEF IN SUPPORTING THE INSTITUTION
AND PLANNED GIFT STATUS

Source	MS	df	F	P
Between	15.6223	1	9.0*	0.003
Within	1.7373	281		

Group	N	Mean	SD
Planned Gift	174	5.01	1.22
No Planned Gift	109	4.52	1.46

*significant at .05 level

ANOVA
SATISFACTION OF PARTICIPATING IN THE WORK OF THE
INSTITUTION AND PLANNED GIVING STATUS

Source	MS	df	F	P
Between	1.9358	1	0.8	0.362
Within	2.3241	268		

Group	N	Mean	SD
Planned Gift	162	4.47	1.55
No Planned Gift	108	4.30	1.49

APPENDIX L

STEPWISE DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS

Order of Entry		Partial R^2	F	Prob
1.	Children	0.21	69.9	0.00
2.	Allegiance/gratitude	0.18	55.6	0.00
3.	Permanent legacy/tribute	0.07	20.5	0.00
4.	Estate planning/ tax consequences	0.07	19.1	0.00
5.	Terminal (Doctoral) degree	0.04	11.5	0.00
6.	Help others/society	0.04	9.5	0.00
7.	Attended/no degree	0.02	4.4	0.04

VITA

Claire Eldridge-Karr was born in Rye, New York on January 16, 1947. She attended Midland Elementary School in Rye and graduated from Rye High School in 1965. The following September she entered Connecticut College for Women and in June 1969 received the A.B. in History with a minor in Political Science. In September, 1970 she entered Boston College and in May, 1972 received the M.A.T. in American History. In January, 1986, she entered the Ed.D. program in Higher Education Leadership at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, where she has been employed as the Director of Development for the College of Liberal Arts since August, 1988.