University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

2017

Examining Hybrid-Gift Philanthropy in Division I Intercollegiate Athletics: A Mixed Methods Study

John Thomas O'Sullivan
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Sports Management Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

O'Sullivan, John Thomas, "Examining Hybrid-Gift Philanthropy in Division I Intercollegiate Athletics: A Mixed Methods Study" (2017). *Dissertations*. 84.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/84>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

EXAMINING HYBRID-GIFT PHILANTHROPY IN DIVISION I
INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS: A MIXED METHODS STUDY

by

John Thomas O'Sullivan

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

April 20, 2017

Dissertation Committee

Fred J. Galloway, Ed.D.
Laura Deitrick, Ph.D.
Elliot Hirshman, Ph.D.

University of San Diego

Copyright page (blank if not copyrighted)

UNIVERSITY OF SAN DIEGO
SCHOOL OF LEADERSHIP AND EDUCATION SCIENCES

CANDIDATE'S NAME: John Thomas O'Sullivan

TITLE OF
DISSERTATION: EXAMINING HYBRID-GIFT PHILANTHROPY IN
DIVISION I INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS: A MIXED
METHODS STUDY

APPROVAL:

Fred J. Galloway, Ed.D.

Chair

Laura Deitrick, Ph.D.

Member

Elliot Hirshman, Ph.D.

Member

DATE: April 20, 2017

ABSTRACT

Over the past few decades, the money and attention associated with Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) has exploded. At the same time, however, many ICA departments claim to be at a financial crossroads with coaching salaries and operational costs soaring upwards. Not surprisingly, ICA departments are responding by focusing on increasing their fundraising in innovative ways. Perhaps the most interesting of these is in the area of hybrid—or blended—giving, which combines cash with a deferred gift. While these gifts have the potential to help generate substantially more revenue for ICA, unfortunately there is limited empirical research surrounding them.

In an effort to broaden this research base, this study examined hybrid gifts in Division I ICA at both the macro and micro levels. Specifically, an explanatory sequential mixed methods design was used to assess the state of hybrid-gift development among all 346 Division I ICA departments. This was accomplished through an online survey of the senior development director at every Division I ICA department; the 33-question survey had a 64% response rate and employed demographic, Likert-style, and open-ended questions. Following this mapping of the current Division I ICA hybrid-gift landscape, two purposely selected comparative case studies of Division I ICA departments were undertaken to better explain the complexity of hybrid gifts by digging deeper into the nuances of ICA philanthropy and hybrid-gift development.

Analysis of the data indicates hybrid-gift development is trending upward with a number of unique and new opportunities. Findings centered on building a culture of philanthropy and strategic process that includes education, communication, and collaboration; identifying the trajectory of hybrid-gift donors; and the new opportunities

that hybrid gifts create, such as both short- and long-term approaches, re-cultivation of donors, and elevated partnerships. Further analysis used the lens of behavioral economics, specifically, framing, anchoring, loss aversion, and what you see is all there is to enrich the findings.

Taken together, the study responds to a yawning gap in the literature on philanthropy. In particular, the study informs best practices for ICA development, leaders, and donors, and generates potentially transferable philanthropic insights into higher education and nonprofit philanthropy.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my beautiful wife, Laura O'Sullivan. Her love and unwavering support is my inspiration. She continually makes me want to be a better person.

I love you Laura.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have helped and supported me along this PhD journey. The following are a few of the people that it is important to thank. I owe them so much.

I want to express deep gratitude to my advisor and committee chairman, Dr. Fred Galloway. His guidance, feedback, framing, and enthusiasm made this project both possible and enjoyable. I am forever indebted for his advice and counsel. Thank you for helping me build a bridge towards my next career.

I also wish to thank Dr. Laura Deitrick. Her encouragement and counsel for the research design and survey instrument for this study were crucial. Without her knowledge and nonprofit expertise this project would not have happened.

I am also very grateful to San Diego State University President Elliot Hirshman. He deserves recognition for giving me the idea for this project, challenging me to make this a more robust study, and enjoying the intellectual pursuit of the process. In addition, he and Johanna Ortiz deserve special thanks for making the time for this committee.

My gratitude is also extended to Dr. Tim O'Malley. In reality, he should have been the fourth member of this committee. He is a philanthropic mentor and provided critical in-depth support and technical expertise to a number of elements for this project.

Many thanks are also extended to Dr. Bob Donmoyer, Dr. Zachary Green, Dr. Lea Hubbard, Dr. Karen Lee, Dr. George Reed, Dr. Paula Cordeiro, and Dr. René Molenkamp. Each of them played a vital role in my doctoral studies. Thank you for being so generous with your wisdom and time.

Next, I would like to give a special thank you to Lisa Burgert. Her patience, availability, and library guidance was essential in this study.

I am also grateful to the late Dr. Walt Heinecke. His kindness, tour guiding skills, and infectious laughter were the perfect introduction to the University of San Diego Leadership Studies doctoral program.

Further acknowledgements are given to my colleagues and fellow Ph.D. students at the University of San Diego. We learned together, laughed together, and pushed each other to improve. I am excited to watch us go out and put a ding in the universe. Also, a special thanks goes to Dr. Corinne Brion and Dr. Peter Maribei for their research assistance.

I also owe a great deal of thanks to Ky Snyder and Steve Becvar. They were my gateway into Intercollegiate Athletics administration at the University of San Diego. They are tremendous mentors that were generous with their time and knowledge.

I would also like to thank all my colleagues at the San Diego State University Athletic Department, specifically, Bob Moosbrugger, Mandy McKinley Huiras, and the development staff for their help driving up the survey response rate and providing numerous insights into the research. Also, thanks to Andy Humes, Kelly Giblin, Lori Mitchell, and Jessica Hasson for their understanding and support in pursuit of this Ph.D.

Additionally, a special thanks goes to the volunteers that graciously gave their time and effort to this study. This type of research does not happen in a vacuum, and their participation, openness, and candor provided the essence of this study.

I would also like to give a special thanks to my family and friends. In particular, I want to thank my parents, Margaret and the late John O'Sullivan, for their love, encouragement, and competitive fire. Importantly, I also must mention my Mom's "research assistant" role was critical in driving up the survey response rate with

numerous phone call reminders. And thanks to my brother, Patrick, for his friendship and fearlessness. He is simply the boldest dude I know.

I also benefited tremendously from the support of my in-laws, George and Becky Galdorisi, whose enthusiasm and generosity knows no bounds. Thank you for all your support.

To our three children, Jack, Larkin, and Davis, thank you for the love, joy, and energy that you each bring to our family.

Finally, I want to express my deepest gratitude to my wife Laura. Her love, patience, encouragement, and inspiration were invaluable. This is our accomplishment to share together.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
LIST OF TABLES	xxii
LIST OF FIGURES	xxiii
CHAPTER ONE: OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Purpose of the Study	5
Research Questions	6
Methodology	6
Limitations and Delimitations.....	7
The Hybrid-Gift Terminology Problem.....	7
Phase One Methodology Delimitations and Limitations	8
Phase Two Methodological Limitations	9
The Positionality Limitations.....	10
Significance of the Study	11
ICA Development	11
ICA Leaders	12
Nonprofit Literature	12
CHAPTER TWO: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	13
Key Terms.....	14
Philanthropy in American Higher Education.....	15

Institutional Advancement	16
Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA)	17
ICA Development	18
Winning.....	19
Television.....	22
ICA Giving Motivations	23
Measurement tools.....	25
Unique institutions.....	26
Gender.....	27
Former student-athletes.....	28
ICA Constraints	28
Measurement tools.....	29
Unique institutions.....	30
Gender constraints.....	31
Former student-athletes.....	31
ICA Literature Limitations	32
Major Gift Analysis Gap.....	33
Lifetime Value	34
Practitioner-Heavy Field.....	34
Planned Giving.....	35
Hybrid Gifts	36
Behavioral Economics	36
Framing.....	37

Anchoring	38
What You See Is All There Is (WYSIATI)	38
Loss Aversion	38
Conclusion to the Chapter.....	39
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	40
Overview of the Research Design and Methodology	40
Phase One.....	41
Development of the Survey Instrument	41
Pilot Testing the Survey Instrument	42
Conducting the Survey.....	43
Analyzing the Survey Data	44
Phase Two	46
Rationale for a Comparative Case Study Design.....	47
Sampling	47
Data Collection Process	48
Collection of documents.	48
Observations.	48
Interviews.....	49
Analysis of the Case Studies.....	50
First-level coding.	50
Analytic memos.	51
Second-level coding.....	51
Validity and Reliability/Trustworthiness and Triangulation	51

Conclusion to the Chapter.....	53
CHAPTER FOUR: SURVEY FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	54
ICA Philanthropic Survey.....	54
Population Demographics.....	55
Descriptive Statistics on Survey Participants	55
Institution type.	56
Football subdivision.....	56
Conference.	57
Location.	59
Gender.....	59
Age.....	59
Alumni.	59
Staffing.....	60
Donors.....	62
Annual-fund donors.	62
Major-gift donors.....	62
Gift Amount Minimums	63
Major-gift minimums.....	63
Endowment minimums.	64
Development Costs and Revenues.....	65
Operating budget.....	65
Fundraising goal last fiscal year.	65
Dollars raised last fiscal year.	66

Planned Gifts.....	66
Endowments.....	67
Institutional.	67
National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO).	68
Respondent reliability.	68
Athletic.....	69
Tangible benefits.....	70
Age.....	71
Planned giving trends.....	72
Hybrid Gift Characteristics	73
Hybrid Gifts	73
Hybrid-gift scale.	74
Hybrid-gift strategies.	76
Hybrid-gift donor trajectories.	77
Hybrid-gift trends.....	78
Inferential Analysis	80
Independent sample t-tests.....	80
Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Test.....	81
Conclusion to the Chapter.....	82
CHAPTER FIVE: CASE STUDIES FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS.....	84
Selection of the Case Studies	85
Organization of Case Studies.....	86

Inter-Coder Reliability	87
Case Study 1	88
Description of Great Lake University (GLU)	88
Great Lake University overview	88
Great Lake University athletic history	89
Culture of Philanthropy	90
Strategic Process	91
Education.	92
Development-officer education.	92
Donor education	93
Communication	94
Inspiration.	94
Collaboration	95
Co-marketing.	97
Authentic relationships.	97
Long-term view	99
Re-cultivation	99
Incentives.	100
Customized experiences	100
Recognition.	101
Intentionality.	102
Hybrid Gifts	103
Trend.	104

Tool	105
Opportunity	106
Stretch technique.....	106
Don't have to give up the airplane.	108
Leaving money on the table.....	109
Elevated partnership.....	110
Hybrid Gift Donor Trajectory	112
Capacity.	112
Age.....	112
Family.	114
History.....	115
Passion.	116
Looking Forward	116
Case Study 2	117
Description of Ocean State University (OSU).....	117
Ocean State University overview.....	117
Ocean State University athletic history.....	118
Culture of Philanthropy.....	119
Strategic Process	120
Education.	121
Three buckets.	121
Challenge.	123
Communication.....	123

Messaging.	124
Co-market.	125
Storytelling.....	126
Technology.	127
Collaboration.....	128
Hybrid Gifts	129
Vehicle maximization.	129
Legacy.....	130
Capital projects.	130
Flexibility.....	132
Ease tensions.	132
Shut-up gift answer.	133
Benefits.	134
Misalignment.	135
Donor Trajectory Identification	136
Passion.	136
History.....	137
Age.....	137
Generational component.	137
Re-cultivation.....	139
Widows.	139
Planned gifts first.	140
Community donors.....	141

Looking Forward	142
Fourth Bucket.....	142
Trends.	142
IRA rollovers.	143
Planned gifts first.	143
Re-cultivation.....	144
Long-term mindset.....	144
Summary of Case Studies	145
Common Findings.....	145
Unique Findings.....	148
Conclusion to the Chapter.....	149
CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	150
Summary and Discussion of Primary Findings	151
Culture of Philanthropy.....	152
Strategic Process	153
Education.	153
Communication.....	154
Collaboration.....	155
Benefits.	155
Hybrid-Gift Donor Trajectory Identification	156
Expected trajectories.	156
Surprise trajectories.	157
New Opportunities	158

Re-cultivation.....	159
Planned gift first donors.....	159
Widows.	159
Younger donors.....	160
Elevated partnership.....	160
Short- and long-term combination approach.	160
Conclusions to Summary of Primary Findings	162
Behavioral Economics and Hybrid Gift Findings.....	162
Framing	163
Anchoring	164
What You See Is All There Is (WYSIATI)	164
Loss Aversion	165
Conclusions to Behavioral Economics and Hybrid Gifts Findings	165
Implications and Recommendations	166
ICA Leaders and Development Practitioners	166
Education.	167
Communication.....	167
Assign an internal hybrid-gift lead.	167
Create a Planned-Giving Council.	167
Survey donors.	168
Earlier collaboration.....	168
Stretch technique.....	168
Lead with a hybrid-gift ask.	169

Align benefits.....	169
Re-cultivation.....	169
Naming opportunities.....	169
Combination lens.	170
ICA Donors and Prospects.....	170
Larger gifts.....	170
Enjoy the impact.	171
Ease tensions.	171
Elevated partnership.....	171
Suggestions for Future Research	171
Conclusions to the Chapter	173
REFERENCES	175
Appendix A: Division I Intercollegiate Athletics Philanthropy Survey	184
Appendix B: Emailed Survey Introductory Letter.....	199
Appendix C: Emailed Survey Reminder Message.....	201
Appendix D: Emailed Survey Reminder Video Message.....	203
Appendix E: Case Study Consent Form	205
Appendix F: Interview Guide: Development Practitioner	208
Appendix G: Interview Guide: Hybrid-Gift Donor	211
Appendix H: Analytic Memo Example	214
Appendix I: Second-Level Coding Example	216

Appendix J: ICA Philanthropy Survey Respondent Locations.....	219
Appendix K: ICA Philanthropy Survey Respondent Gender Demographics	221
Appendix L: ICA Philanthropy Survey Respondents by Age	223
Appendix M: ICA Development Operating Budget in the Last Fiscal Year, by Subdivision	225
Appendix N: ICA Fundraising Goal in the Last Fiscal Year, by Subdivision.....	227
Appendix O: ICA Fundraising Totals in the Last Fiscal Year, by Subdivision	229
Appendix P: Institutional Endowments Totals in the Last Fiscal Year, by Subdivision	231
Appendix Q: Factor Analysis.....	233
Appendix R: Inter-Coder Codes	236
Appendix S: Inter-Coder Example Text	238
Appendix T: Ocean State Three Buckets.....	240

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Comparison of ICA Division I Population and Sample, by Subdivisions	57
Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for Total Full-Time Equivalent Staff Size for ICA Development, by Subdivision	61
Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for the Number of Annual Fund Donors for the Last Fiscal Year, by Subdivision	62
Table 4. Descriptive Statistics for the Number of Major Gift Donors for the Last Fiscal Year, by Subdivision	63
Table 5. Descriptive Statistics for ICA Major Gifts, by Subdivision	64
Table 6. Descriptive Statistics for ICA Endowment Gifts, by Subdivision	64
Table 7. Descriptive Statistics for ICA Current Endowments, by Subdivision	70
Table 8. Distribution of the Age that ICA Pursue Planned Gifts	71
Table 9. Select Responses When Asked to Describe Trends in Planned Giving	72
Table 10. Means and Standard Deviations for the Hybrid Gift (HG) Scale and its Seven Components	75
Table 11. Descriptive Statistics for the Hybrid Gift Scale, by Subdivision	76
Table 12. Select Responses When Asked to Describe Hybrid Gift Donor Strategies.....	76
Table 13. Select Responses When Asked to Describe Hybrid Gift Donor Trajectories ...	77
Table 14. Select Responses When Asked to Describe Hybrid Gift Donor Trends	79
Table 15. Independent T-Test Analysis of Hybrid-Gift Total Score Means based on Institution Type	81
Table 16. Mean Hybrid-Gift Scale Total Score Differences Based on Football Subdivision.....	82

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Distribution of respondents by conference	58
---	----

CHAPTER ONE: OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

The money and attention associated with Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) has exploded over the last few decades. For example, the University of Texas generated \$25.6 million in revenue from football in 2000-2001; that revenue quadrupled in just over a decade to \$103.8 million by 2011-2012 (Chemi, 2013). In fact, in 2015 ICA was a \$13 billion industry (Chudacoff, 2016). A number of elements have helped accelerate and elevate the money and attention associated with ICA, and television is one of the driving forces. Indeed, the television popularity of ICA has taken interest to new levels. Specifically, twenty-four hour a day sports channels such as ESPN, Fox Sports, and NBC Sports, conference channels such as the Big 10, SEC, or Pac-12 Networks, and even institutional channels such as Longhorn TV or BYU TV provide mass entertainment. Nonetheless, even with ICA attention surging to all-time highs, shining a spotlight on ICA is not a new phenomenon.

Intercollegiate Athletics has been embedded in America's higher education system for generations (Fisher, 2007), and the relationship between ICA and American higher education has often been complicated and uneasy (Duderstadt, 2003). The first ICA competition, for example, took place in 1852 and was a rowing competition between Harvard and Yale. The Lake Winnepesaukee, New Hampshire event was a promotional venture for the Boston, Concord, and Montreal Railroad Company to introduce a new rail system to the region (Smith, 2011). This first ICA competition foreshadowed some of the complications ICA has encountered over the years because this event blurred the line between the supposed amateur status of ICA and commercialism. Since that first rowing competition in 1852, "Student-Athletes" have not been paid per se, but sponsors and

high-paid professional coaches and administrators have benefited economically. This apparent contradiction has helped create a uniquely American model of ICA (Nocera & Strauss, 2016). Though college athletes have continued to operate under the veil of “amateurism,” their coaches and administrators now often command astronomical salaries (Schwarz & Trahan, 2017). Some scholars, in fact, hint that ICA is at an economic tipping point (Meyer & Zimbalist, 2017).

Certainly, many ICA departments are at a financial crossroads, and the financial situation is growing increasingly dire (Meyer & Zimbalist, 2017). Coaching salaries and operational costs continue to rise, and more often than not, budgets and revenues lag behind. For example, in 2013, only 8% of Division I ICA departments were profitable, and the figure was only 16% for the Football Bowl Subdivision, which was at the time ICA highest level of football (Burnsed, 2014; Fulks, 2014). These financial realities have led to a cultural divide on many campuses between academics and athletics, and, on many campuses, the divide is widening (Hessel & Perko, 2010). Indeed, many of the critics of ICA believe the divide between academics and athletics is growing at an unsustainable rate.

The idea that athletic spending is growing at a rate faster than academic spending is certainly troublesome (Stinson & Howard, 2010). Nevertheless, many schools continue to pursue big-time ICA, namely, Division I football and men’s basketball. As a result, revenue sources have become crucial, but many revenue opportunities such as ticket sales, media rights, and sponsorship opportunities are finite. Therefore, ICA departments are focusing on bridging the gap on their balance sheets through donations, which have no ceiling (Hixson, 2012; Shapiro, 2008). Recently, in fact, fundraising accounted for

23% of generated revenue and averaged nearly \$7 million for each Division I ICA department (McEvoy, Morse, & Shapiro, 2013). Quite simply, philanthropy is a key component for the long-term success of ICA.

Statement of the Problem

There is a growing body of literature on philanthropy, but the study of philanthropy is less than 40-years old. Further, the study of institutional advancement (i.e., philanthropy for higher education) and ICA development (i.e., philanthropy for ICA) has occurred over an even shorter period. Consequently, there is even less literature focused on these topics. In the higher education and ICA philanthropic literature that is currently available, the studies of motivations and annual fund research are robust (Proper & Caboni, 2014). However, the research on ICA giving has failed to create much generalizable knowledge because many studies examine contributions to a single institution for a single year using only a quantitative methodology, usually, focusing on an annual fund (McEvoy, 2002; Meer & Rosen, 2009; O'Neil & Schenke, 2006; Stinson & Howard, 2010). This type of research creates interesting quantitative case studies, but it lacks utility for most practitioners other than those who happen to work at the institution where the case study took place (Proper & Caboni, 2014). Moreover, annual funds only generate a small portion of most ICA fundraising revenue; the majority of the Division I ICA fundraising revenue comes from major gifts¹ and planned giving, 90 percent of which are bequests (Hixson, 2012; Johnson, 2010).

¹ For this study, a major gift is a category of ICA donations for contributions usually over \$25,000. It is important to note that this threshold varies at every institution.

Thus, there is a lack of knowledge about major gifts and planned giving in ICA giving research. In addition, major gifts are often rarer (not annual) and more complicated because often no single reason exists for the gift (Panas, 1984). Furthermore, planned gifts are complicated because they are about the future (Johnson, 2010). Still, contributions through planned giving need to be studied because planned gifts are usually the largest contributions made in higher education (Proper & Caboni, 2014). Major and planned gifts have the potential to provide a more stable and sustainable future for ICA revenue.

Up to this point, however, the research on ICA development has failed to capture the nuances of major gifts and planned giving. For example, almost every major and planned gift is “*sui generis*” (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990). Additionally, some researchers have avoided studying major gifts because they have often been labeled as outliers (Meer & Rosen, 2009). However, these outliers often account for a much larger percentage of the total money raised than the aggregate of ICA annual fund donations (Meer & Rosen, 2009). Also, major and planned gifts are the core of a successful fundraising program because they often generate the largest gift of a donor’s life (Panas, 1984; Sapp & Kimball, 2002). The absence of research on major and planned gifts reveals a large knowledge gap in the field of ICA philanthropy.

Moreover, many ICA major-gift donors are experiencing donor fatigue because of the pressure in ICA to raise funds every year has resulted in over-solicitation or too many large asks for cash donations (Hixson, 2012). As a result, a new trend is emerging in higher education advancement—hybrid gifts (Brown, 2003; E. Hirshman, personal communication, August 26, 2015). Hybrid gifts combine cash and a deferred gift. In this

case, deferred giving can vary from a cash gift spread over a number of years, usually 3 to 5, to a final bequest in a will or trust and many other options in between. Furthermore, a potential hybrid-gift donor is often cash poor but asset rich. Therefore, a hybrid-gift solicitation might involve educating a donor on the many ways the donor can leverage assets (real estate, insurance, and retirement plans) or deferred giving options (bequests, trusts, and annuities) in combination with a smaller cash gift to become a “major-gift” donor and make a larger impact than his or her normal annual fund gift would create (Tempel, Seiler, & Aldrich, 2011).

These hybrid gifts have a potential to help generate more revenue for ICA. However, there is limited empirical research surrounding hybrid gifts. For example, in 2003, David Brown mentioned that hybrid gifts were an emerging trend in planned giving research. Unfortunately searches in Academic Search Premier, Business Source Premier, Education Source, Emerald, ERIC, Google Scholar, Sage Premier Journals, and Web of Science databases from 2003 to the present using the subject terms of *charitable giving*, *donations*, and *philanthropy* with the key words of *major gifts*, *planned gifts*, and *planned giving*, plus *hybrid gifts* combined with *college sports* and *college athletics* yielded no relevant results about hybrid gifts in higher education or ICA.

Clearly, at present, there is a lack of research on hybrid gifts. As a result, there is a need to investigate hybrid gifts in ICA.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine hybrid gifts in Division I ICA. The overarching goal of the study was to provide a blueprint for ICA leaders to increase ICA revenue through hybrid gifts. Currently, there was not enough data available to provide

many meaningful conclusions on hybrid gifts across higher education, let alone in ICA. This study addresses two major research needs: (1) identify the characteristics² surrounding hybrid-gift development³ in Division I ICA, and (2) explore what an in-depth examination of hybrid-gift development reveals about the answers to Question 1 suggest are both typical and atypical?

Research Questions

These hybrid gifts, until now, have received little empirical study. The following two research questions guided this study:

1. What are the characteristics of hybrid-gift development in Division I ICA?
2. What does an in-depth examination of hybrid-gift development reveal about hybrid gift giving in Division I ICA programs that the answers to Question 1 suggest are both typical and atypical?

Methodology

This is a mixed-methods study. The proposed explanatory sequential design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011) is divided into two connected phases, one phase for each research question. Initially, phase one was a quantitative survey to answer Research Question 1: What are the characteristics of hybrid-gift development in Division I ICA? Chapter Three includes a detailed discussion of phase one and describes the survey

² The term “characteristics” used here is purposively broad. It exemplifies the exploratory nature of this research. The intent is to explore any distinguishing features of hybrid-gift development across Division I ICA.

³ The term “development” is discussed in detail in Chapter Two during the literature review. However, in sum, development in this context refers to an understanding, participation, and support for all stakeholders in the hybrid-gift process.

instrument design, the pilot testing process, the survey implementation process, and the data analysis process.

Next, phase two was a qualitative comparative case study of two Division I ICA departments to answer Research Question 2: What does an in-depth examination of hybrid-gift development reveal about hybrid gift giving in Division I ICA programs that the answers to Question 1 suggest are both typical and atypical? Chapter Three contains a detailed discussion of phase two and describes the rationale for a comparative case study design, the sample, the data collection process for documents, observations, field notes, and interviews, and, finally, the analysis and comparison of the case studies.

Limitations and Delimitations

The limitations and delimitations of the study, of course, need to be clearly stated. It is important to acknowledge that although this exploratory study generated new knowledge surrounding ICA giving and the unstudied topic of hybrid gifts, the study does not provide any direct claims of causality, merely correlation.

In the following sections, I describe both the limitations and delimitations of the proposed study. I begin with describing the limitations related to the language constraints surrounding the notion of *hybrid gifts*. Then, I examine the methodology-related delimitations and limitations of both phases. I conclude by discussing limitations associated with my positionality.

The Hybrid-Gift Terminology Problem

Using the term *hybrid gifts* is a potential limitation. Because this is an exploratory study focused on an emergent concept and term, many practitioners may not use the term hybrid gifts to characterize the process of combining cash and deferred gifts. The term is

appropriate, of course, because it is mentioned in the literature, but some difficulties arose when discussing the concept with participants because some participants were unfamiliar with the term and some may have concluded erroneously that they have nothing to contribute. In fact, some practitioners used the term *blended gift* to mean essentially the same thing as a hybrid gift. During data collection, the term *hybrid gift* was often followed by both a definition and an example to help practitioners, interviewees, and readers understanding its meaning. This strategy, however, was difficult to apply during the recruitment phase of the study and, consequently, the sample may be skewed toward major-gift donors because of their perceived value.

Phase One Methodology Delimitations and Limitations

During phase one, the study only collected data about and from Division I ICA institutions. In other words, a single Division I ICA senior level development director at each institution (N = 346) was surveyed. Therefore, the survey results generated are not generalizable to other Divisions or all of ICA.

Also, the survey instrument, itself, could be viewed as a limitation. The instrument was essentially self-generated after reviewing and being informed by the existing literature. Consequently, some degree of measurement error is likely. However, I used a piloting process (n =10) with Division II and III ICA development directors and enlisted industry professionals in reviews and conversations to help finalize the survey instrument. The pilot study is discussed in greater detail later in Chapter Three.

Another limitation is the use of the survey methodology. The use of a survey can introduce a number of limitations that should be acknowledged. For example, nonresponse error or not getting participants to complete the survey can distort findings

(Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009). To minimize nonresponse error, I used the Dillman method of conducting the survey and notifying participants with varying messages and through different mediums (e.g., email, phone, and video reminders). Further, if nonresponse error proved to be an issue, I planned to ask some non-responders why they did not participate in the survey through a follow-up phone call. Also, self-report data has limitations, and the information participants provide might not be accurate. To help verify the self-report data I crosschecked one response with publically available data to help validate trustworthiness. Chapter Three discusses in detail the process I used to verify self-report accuracy.

Phase Two Methodological Limitations

Limitations associated with the qualitative comparative case studies section of the study also need to be acknowledged. Most importantly, the case study results are not generalizable. Nevertheless, the phase two results may provide transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The transferability process uses findings from one inquiry to explain a different context (Polit & Beck, 2010). Still, as in any qualitative research, what is “transferred,” is up to the reader and their evaluation of the research (Polit & Beck, 2010).

In addition, the case study phase encountered some accessibility issues. Financial information and donor information are guarded assets for many ICA development departments and most other types of fundraising units for that matter. To minimize this potential limitation, I asked about a department’s willingness to participate in the case study portion of the research during the survey in phase one. Early buy-in and inclusion helped minimize the hesitancy toward sharing some sensitive information. Further, I used

snowball sampling when conducting interviews by asking interviewees if there are other key stakeholders that I should interview to help me talk to as many different stakeholders as possible. Snowball sampling helped find participants that I would otherwise not have had access to interview.

Another limitation of phase two of the study involved time and resources. The locations of the case study sites, time at the institutions, and the financial resources attached to travel and accommodations were limitations. As a result, regional institutions were given a preference in the site selection process, but, in reality, only one case site had regional incentives.

The Positionality Limitations

My positionality or researcher biases may have influenced the study in a number of ways. First, my professional aspirations are to become a Division I ICA Athletic Director. One of this job's central roles is to generate and lead ICA philanthropic efforts, and I aim to become an expert in the field. Also, I am a former professional athlete and an ICA student-athlete. My background provides a unique lens of both privilege and a peek behind the curtain. I have a number of predetermined views of college athletics and worked diligently to acknowledge my assumptions and remain open to emerging ideas and themes. Additionally, I was drawn to this topic because of my experience as a donor. Although, I am not a hybrid-gift donor per se, I have given what I consider to be important gifts to ICA. And, I foresee the potential of giving a hybrid gift to ICA in the future. Although, I believe in the value of giving to ICA, I needed to be mindful of my biases while remaining open to new information. In addition, I have often felt that many aspects of the fundraising process originate from essentially a fundraiser's seat of their

pants decision-making process, as opposed, to researched best practices or a strategic process. Again, I need to acknowledge the potential bias I bring to the study and realize that I needed to suspend my assumptions, as well as I can, to make room for new information to emerge. Finally, I used inter-coders and provide an inter-coder reliability score and summary in Chapter Five to help increase the validity of the case study findings.

In sum, my positionality is both a strength and a limitation. It is a strength because it drew me to the topic and connects to my purpose. And, it is a limitation because it drew me to the topic, and I am so passionate about the topic. In short, I was cognizant of the blind spots my positionality created.

Significance of the Study

The study is potentially significant for a number of reasons. First, it responds to a gap in the literature on ICA giving. The gap involves both the absence of research on hybrid gifts from 2003 to the present and the absence of qualitative research that potentially can tell the stories behind the numbers that exist about ICA philanthropy. This study fills that gap with a mixed methods research design that explores hybrid gifts in Division I ICA. Furthermore, the study impacts ICA development, ICA leaders, and may have layers of a wider application toward higher education advancement and nonprofit philanthropy in general. Each of these contributions is briefly discussed below.

ICA Development

Division I ICA development is critical to help meet the escalating financial needs across many institutions. Increasing the knowledge and capacity around hybrid gifts operates as a potential bridge toward more financial revenue in ICA. Also, an

understanding of the hybrid-gift process leads to a more comprehensive understanding of other elements of the Division I ICA giving.

ICA Leaders

The study provides a framework to empower Division I ICA leaders (e.g., athletic directors, senior administrators, and development officers) to increase revenue through hybrid gifts. Research on ICA hybrid giving is significant because it is crucial for administrators to maximize their revenue opportunities. Division I ICA leaders can take the empirical evidence this study generated and hopefully craft solicitation strategies to cultivate more and larger hybrid gifts.

Nonprofit Literature

This study generated new knowledge that can hopefully be applicable toward the broader nonprofit literature. Nevertheless, it is important to note and understand the scope of this study and not to overstate the findings; however, because hybrid gift research is in its infancy across philanthropy, there is a potential for some findings to translate and transfer across nonprofit genres.

CHAPTER TWO: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) has flourished during recent years, yet many ICA departments are struggling financially. Salaries and costs continue to rise, and more often than not, budgets struggle to keep up. A perceived ICA “arms race,” which in the ICA context refers to outspending competitors on facilities and coaching salaries leads to more wins (Nixon, 2014), is in full swing and likely unsustainable (Bass, Schaeperkoetter, & Bunds, 2015; Frank, 2004; Getz & Siegfried 2012a; Gurney, Lopiano, & Zimbalist, 2017; Hessel & Perko, 2010; Humphreys & Mondello, 2007; Knight Commission, 2001; Orszag & Orszag, 2005; Sparvero & Warner, 2013). As a result, revenue sources have become crucial, but many revenue opportunities are finite. Consequently, ICA departments are focusing on philanthropy and donations that have no apparent ceiling (Hixson, 2012; Shapiro, 2008).

The revenue and spending in ICA is creating a complex environment that requires further research. The main purpose of this literature review is to assess the state of the literature on the ICA philanthropy. I begin by describing key terms. Next, I provide a brief overview of the research on philanthropy in America higher education generally to provide a frame for discussing ICA-related philanthropy. Then, I examine the literature on ICA philanthropy, followed by discussing some limitations of the literature and recommend new research directions to advance the field, including this study. And, finally, I briefly introduce behavioral economics as a theoretical framework used to enhance the understanding of some of the eventual findings.

Key Terms

Before moving forward, it is necessary to define the key terms including *charity* and *philanthropy*, *advancement*, *development*, and *hybrid gifts*.

The concepts of charity and philanthropy have more similarities than differences; however, in this literature review *charity* refers to serving the poor, while *philanthropy* takes a macro approach to bettering human kind and generating social change (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990).

For this study, *advancement* refers to the fundraising that a university or institution pursues as a whole. *Advancement* creates a broader context for mobilizing an entire institution's philanthropic approach (Worth, 2002). For example, *advancement* often consists of university-wide philanthropy units that include, but are not limited to, an annual fund, alumni relations, campaigns, communications, community and government relations, corporate relations, event planning, external relations, international relations, major gifts, marketing, parent relations, planned giving, publications, sponsorships, and volunteer relations.

The notion of *advancement*, at least as that term is being used here, is an umbrella term that encompasses another key concept employed in this study: *development*. In this study, *development* refers to ICA philanthropy and fundraising. It is a dynamic word choice made, at least in part, to ignite dialogue and reciprocal action (Seymour, 1999). University of Chicago President, Ernest DeWitt Burton, first used the term in 1924 to describe more than mere fundraising (Cutlip, 1990). Rather, *development* is a "...broad term for the planned promotion of understanding, participation, and support" (Seymour,

1999, p. 115). In sum, institutional advancement refers to a whole institution's philanthropy and development refers to only ICA philanthropy.

Finally, *hybrid gifts* are a combination of an outright cash gift and a form of deferred giving (Brown, 2004). Next, I discuss the literature on philanthropy in American higher education.

Philanthropy in American Higher Education

There is a great deal of research available on philanthropy per se (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011). Due to the scope of this review, I narrowed the examination of the literature on philanthropy to the context of American higher education or institutional advancement to help frame the evolution of research on ICA philanthropy. Furthermore, this literature review focused on individual secular giving. Giving is often tied to religion (Thelin, 2011), but this sort of giving will not be a focus in this literature review⁴.

The study of philanthropy is interdisciplinary, complex, value-laden, layered with power and socio-economic issues, and limited by access (Drezner, 2011). As a result, it is often difficult to incorporate all the relevant number of variables in a research design for a truly comprehensive and robust study (Curti, 1957). Nevertheless, philanthropy is a worthy area of study because of the critical role it plays in promoting the American spirit and sustaining the country's nonprofit sector. In the next section, I describe institutional advancement as a lead into a review of the existing literature on ICA philanthropy.

⁴ In this literature review, religious giving is tethered to the concept of giving at a weekly religious service or tithing, which is not a focus of the study. Conversely, there are many "religious" higher-education institutions (e.g., Notre Dame and BYU) that are a part of the study.

Institutional Advancement

Institutional advancement is a holistic concept that refers to the entire fundraising practices for a university. When the term is employed, the intent is to mobilize an entire institution's philanthropic approaches and strategies so that they are employed on a singular path (Worth, 2002). As the costs of American higher education grew during the twentieth century, fundraising evolved into a central institutional activity (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990; Proper & Caboni, 2014). Moreover, advancement offices created income diversification opportunities (Daly, 2013). Consequently, institutional advancement often encompasses alumni giving, annual giving, capital campaigns, planned giving, corporate giving, partnerships, and sponsorships. Each of these is critical to the financial security and sustainability of an institution. For example, 34 different billion-dollar campaigns were ongoing in American higher education during 2014 (Giving USA, 2015).

The literature reveals that institutional advancement has grown because of a few critical trends of the twentieth century: (1) fundraising became a professionalized field, (2) shared strategies were available across institutions, and (3) there was a focus on generating major gifts (Worth, 2002). Each of these blended together to impact the growth of institutional advancement.

The literature on institutional advancement has also grown over the years; however, the literature has often failed to establish a large number of best practices for practitioners. There are many reasons for this failure, but, perhaps, none is more important than the fact that the field is dense with fundraising practitioners (Proper & Caboni, 2014). Oftentimes, practitioner-scholars conduct a single study, usually for a doctoral dissertation or master's thesis, and then return to the field as practitioners and

fail to produce further research (Proper & Caboni, 2014). This creates a cycle of research repetition and stalls growth in the field because of the lack of any longitudinal research.

There is at least one more explanation for why research has not yet supplied a list of research-certified best practices: the study of philanthropy in American higher education is less than forty years old. The study of philanthropy in the context of ICA is even shorter (Drezner, 2011).

Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA)

Although philanthropy is a necessity to sustain ICA programs as they currently exist, there is a disagreement about the importance of ICA across American higher education. Nevertheless, ICA is embedded in America's higher education culture (Fisher, 2007). Intercollegiate Athletics promotes a unique collegiate culture, energy, and sense of community (Getz & Siegfried, 2012a; Hendrickson, Lane, Harris, & Dorman, 2013). The community ICA builds transcends the student-athletes, students, faculty, staff, alumni, and fans to build what many refer to as the "front porch" of a university (Daughtrey & Stotlar, 2000; Getz & Siegfried, 2012b). This analogy suggests that ICA functions as an invitation to engage with an institution; however, the question of whether the ICA actually improves a university's curb appeal, thus far has proven difficult to answer through formal empirical research. Many critics, in fact, believe ICA programs are simply jock factories, the minor leagues, or quasi-professional sports that devalue higher education (Getz & Siegfried, 2012b; Sperber, 2000). Moreover, less than a quarter of NCAA Football Bowl Subdivision university presidents think the current model of ICA is sustainable, with coaches' salaries often referred to as the greatest impediment (Hessel & Perko, 2010). The status quo is probably unsustainable, and a call for change is growing.

Until radical changes get implemented, however, private giving is going to remain critical to ICA. The importance of ICA fundraising, in fact, continues to rise to meet the growing costs of Division I ICA. Again, many critics refer to this as the ICA arms race; however, ICA is not a zero-sum game. Wins and losses on the field, yes, but the impact of ICA transcends the scoreboards to create a deeper meaning for many collegiate communities. Regardless, the opportunity cost of ICA donations is not zero. Could the money go elsewhere to better serve an institution's mission (Getz & Siegfried 2012a)? This question is important.

Furthermore, the idea that ICA spending is growing at a rate faster than academic spending is troublesome (Stinson & Howard, 2007). There is often a cultural divide on campuses between academia versus athletics, and, on many campuses, the divide is widening (Hessel & Perko, 2010). The literature reveals a complicated problem that requires more research. Fortunately, the topic of ICA is growing in academic research. However, the field is in danger of becoming siloed in the burgeoning field of sports management. The literature reveals a more robust approach is needed that examines ICA from a transdisciplinary lens. This approach provides a layered set of methods and disciplines to match ICA multifaceted problems because ICA is a field of study rather than a discipline (Proper & Caboni, 2014). In the next section, I discuss the literature on ICA development.

ICA Development

College athletics is a uniquely American endeavor, and philanthropic giving is a necessity for ICA (Getz & Siegfried 2012b; Strobe, 2006). Donations to ICA, as well as its fundraising crisis, began in the 19th century (Bass, 2013; Hall & Mahony, 1997). It is

important to remember that development is more than, simply, tin cupping. Anyone can get or give a token of support. Development is a process to secure significant and long-term support (Worth, 2002). Until recently, the literature on ICA development was sparse and underdeveloped (McEvoy, 2002). Although the field has expanded in recent years, research on ICA giving is still developing. Still, over the last 20 years, significant strides have been made toward better understanding ICA donors (Baade & Sundberg, 1996; Gladden, Mahony, & Apostolopulo, 2005; Hixson, 2012; O'Neil & Schenke, 2006; Rhoads & Gerking, 2000). For example, while traditional ICA development research focused on the intangible benefits and the impact that athletic success had toward giving (Baade & Sundberg, 1996), recent ICA research has shifted toward the tangible benefits of tickets and seating priority at ICA events (Stinson & Howard, 2010).

Nevertheless, research on ICA giving over the past 30 years has failed to generate much generalizable knowledge (Martinez et al., 2010). The conflicting results and disparate research designs have muddled the capacity for researchers to identify generalizable effects of how, if at all, ICA success or winning impacts giving (Martinez et al., 2010). Regardless, intuitive ICA practitioners often rely on winning and television exposure to explain the ebbs and flows of ICA development.

Winning

Winning at ICA is critical on a number of levels including community morale and creating a positive student-athlete experience (E. Hirshman, personal communication, August 26, 2015). But, optics might be the most important reason winning is crucial. Being seen as a consistent winning program is a common goal through ICA. Many ICA development practitioners believe winning can lead to bigger and more consistent

philanthropic gifts. But, does the research match what practitioners trumpet? Does ICA winning lead to larger and more gifts?

Early studies produced contradictory and mixed findings on the impact of ICA success on giving (Daughtrey & Stotlar, 2000; Fisher, 2007; Sigelman & Bookheimer, 1983). Originally, athletic success (winning) was understood as the key influence on donor behavior. However, Booker and Klastorin (1981) and Sigelman and Bookheimer (1983) questioned the impact of winning on fundraising. However, these early studies were often focused on university advancement and not ICA development (Sigelman & Carter, 1979). Factors found to be important at the university level were not significant when reanalyzed at the ICA level (Sigelman & Bookheimer, 1983). Moreover, early studies used limited data sets (Getz & Siegfried, 2012a). And while the debate regarding the influence of winning may not ever be settled, many scholars cite evidence that winning does not significantly impact ICA giving (Baade & Sundberg, 1996; Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990; Budig, 1976; Cohen, Whisenant, & Walsh, 2010; Coughlin & Erickson, 1984; Daughtrey & Stotlar, 2000; Frank, 2004; Gaski, & Etzel, 1984; Meer & Rosen, 2009; Rhoades & Gerking, 2000). Nonetheless, practitioners continue to struggle to accept this counterintuitive finding and allow losing to explain fundraising struggles and increase a winner's myopia (Frank; Getz & Siegfried, 2012b; Meer & Rosen, 2009). At best, systematic evidence concerning the effect of ICA success at the Division I level toward increasing giving is ambiguous (Getz & Siegfried 2012b).

Since those early studies, some research has found a positive correlation between athletic success and general giving, however, mostly in the form of restricted gifts (Getz & Siegfried, 2012b; Goff, 2000). Indeed, postseason men's basketball appearances have

been shown to lead to increases in restricted giving at private institutions (Humphreys & Mondello, 2007). Other literature reported a positive relationship between athletic success, often football, and some increase in giving (Baade & Sundberg, 1996; Humphreys & Mondello, 2007; Rhoads & Gerking, 2000; Siegelman & Bookheimer, 1983). However, successful football does not guarantee increased donations (Cohen, Whisenant, & Walsh, 2010) and many successful programs do not have the most efficient development offices (Sparvero & Warner, 2013). Moreover, many studies are short-term examinations; longitudinal research is needed to reveal cumulative benefits (Gaski, & Etzel, 1984), but such longitudinal research does not currently exist. Regardless of the mixed evidence, it is important to note that people believe ICA impacts giving (Siegelman & Carter, 1979).

Another common belief is that ICA success will increase giving toward the university (Humphreys & Mondello, 2007). Intercollegiate Athletics programs have an incentive to promote the idea that they can provide indirect benefits to the larger institutions that they are part of, and so they often claim that ICA gifts are often gateway gifts to larger institutional philanthropy (Baade & Sundberg, 1996). Some research supports claims about some ICA donors that may transition to giving to the overall institution (Stinson & Howard, 2004). In fact, “SPLIT” donors—those donors that give to both academics and athletics—as Stinson and Howard (2010) refer to them, are some of the most lucrative and loyal donors a university can cultivate; they give more consistently and in larger sums than athletic or academic only donors.

In sum, the research on whether ICA success impacts donations is mixed. Unobservable heterogeneity across institutions and limited data sources, such as, case

studies, cross-sectional data, and panel data have made generalizability difficult (Frank, 2004; Humphreys & Mondello, 2007). Furthermore, it remains difficult to believe that winning does not lead to consistent donations (Daughtrey & Stotlar, 2000). Nevertheless, successful ICA programs are more than revenue creation. ICA programs create indirect benefits of belongingness and community (Fisher, 2007).

In short, the research connecting ICA winning and increased donations is muddled. However, the research on ICA success leading to some form of increased donations to certain institutions appears strong enough to draw meaningful conclusions of a positive correlation (Humphreys & Mondello, 2007).

Television

Beyond winning, television exposure is another force in ICA development. External relations increases identification with institutions, and television is a powerful external relations tool (Anctil, 2009). Many fans and practitioners believe football success is the dominant force driving ICA giving (Baade & Sundberg, 1996; Goff, 2000; Humphreys & Mondello, 2007; Martinez et al., 2010; McCormick & Tinsley, 1990; Rhoads & Gerking, 2000; Stinson & Howard, 2007). Televised football games become “adverainment,” for instance; they provide both entertainment (the game) and a product (the universities) to support donor cultivation (Anctil, 2009). The growth of television transformed local events into national events and increased branding opportunities (Anctil, 2009). As a result, the NCAA and a few ICA departments enjoy lucrative revenue from the spectator sports of football and men’s basketball (Thelin, 2011). Revenue from 2014 for ICA shows \$800 million from CBS for March Madness and \$610

million from ESPN for the four-team college football playoff (Sanderson & Siegfried, 2015). These numbers make the study of ICA revenue a significant topic.

Regardless of the massive dollar amounts connected to ICA television, generalizable research remains elusive. Anecdotal evidence saturates the industry, but systemically gathered and analyzed empirical evidence linking television appearances and giving is limited (Anctil, 2009). Some practitioners believe increasing spending leads to more success (Sparvero & Warner, 2013). Others think the so-called Flutie effect⁵ captures another element of athletic success; where ICA winning and television exposure increases an institution's applications (Sperber, 2000).

So, it appears that television magnifies ICA on multiple levels. Beyond the rise of television as a factor, the research exploring ICA giving becomes more nuanced and complex as the literature explores donor motivations and constraints.

ICA Giving Motivations

The early academic research on ICA donor motivation focused on characteristics and attitudes of donors rather than on their behaviors (Verner, Hecht, & Fansler, 1998). Moreover, the majority of the work from before the 1990s was descriptive rather than explanatory (Verner et al., 1998).

The early literature presented a list of disparate motives and relied upon a host of incompatible instruments that made synthesizing findings difficult for practitioners

⁵ The Flutie effect refers to an ICA programs success positively impacting an increase in applications to a university (Chung, 2013). In 1984, Doug Flutie, then quarterback of the Boston College football team led a miraculous comeback win by a "Hail Mary" over the University of Miami on a Thanksgiving Day national televised game. Two years later Boston College had a 30% surge in applications; this phenomenon is often referred to as the "Flutie Effect" (Chung, 2013).

(Gladden, Mahony, & Apostolopulo, 2005). In 1985, Billing, Holt, and Smith concluded that no single universal motive for ICA giving exists; however, some reasons to give are more common than others. Through that frame, a closer examination of these studies reveals meaningful patterns that may provide a foundation to move the field forward. Although donor motivation is a complex topic, its practical applications and financial impact on ICA makes it worthy of study (Gladden et al., 2005).

The study of donor motivations often begins with the challenges that confront ICA fundraisers: economic downturns, competing for charitable giving options, irregular giving habits, and priority seating (Gladden et al., 2005). Scholars have yet to align these challenges with satisfactory explanations of the motivations that influence the donor decision-making process (Ko, Rhee, Walker, & Lee, 2013). Perhaps the process of creating a comprehensive explanation of ICA donor motivations is futile, but the process of identifying and understanding these motivations is a popular pursuit and justified by the role that ICA plays in our society and the current model of higher education.

As mentioned previously, early studies focused on the effect of winning on donor behavior. Then, later, the impact of tangible benefits such as priority seating became the central area of research (Mahoney et al., 2003; Smith, 1989).

The framework for the research has been diverse and interdisciplinary, derived from fields of study as diverse as anthropology, biology, economics, evolutionary and developmental psychology, neurology and brain sciences, political science, evolutionary psychology, sociology, organizational behavior, marketing, and sports management (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011; Hixson 2012; Ko et al., 2013; Tsotsou, 2007). The sheer

range of approaches has led some to view the attempt to map comprehensively all the possible motivations as fruitless (Ko et al., 2013; Tsotsou, 2007).

That does not mean that scholars have stopped attempting to identify and categorize motivations. Recently, one of the most extensive and comprehensive lists was generated by Ko, Rhee, Walker, and Lee (2013) who found eight reasons people donate to ICA:

(A) Philanthropy (e.g., feel good and support the department), (b) vicarious achievement (e.g., intrinsic rewards, achievement, and basking in reflected glory), (c) commitment (e.g., love for the school and athletes), (d) affiliation (e.g., sense of belongingness), (e) socialization (e.g., associate with other donors), (f) public recognition (e.g., ego enhancement and save face), (g) tangible benefits (e.g., better seats, parking, and suites), and (h) power (e.g., involvement in programmatic decisions)(p. 5).

Little agreement exists regarding donor motivation or the possibility to develop a practical tool for measurement of the motivations (Ko et al., 2013), and this is understandable because motivation is a complex psychological construct used to try to explain human action and predict activities (Birch & Veroff, 1966). However, predictability and control cannot be achieved because of the complexity and number of variables involved in the study of motivation, which is dynamic and in flux. But research can help practitioners begin to identify valuable patterns and trajectories in ICA donor behavior. Even if no one size fits all for donor motivation (Gladden et al., 2005).

Measurement tools. The number of tools available to measure the motives of ICA donors has increased over the years as well as the number of motivations the instruments' attempt to measure. The instruments include: the Athletics Contributions Questionnaire or ACQUIRE (Billing, et al., 1985), the ACQUIRE-II (Staurowsky et al., 1996), the Donor Motivation Scale (Mahoney et al., 2003), the Giving Athletics Model

(Tsiotsou, 2007), and the Scale of Donor Motivation (Ko et al., 2013). The motivations that are measured vary across instruments; however, they consistently rely on quantitative methodology with a cross-sectional survey design (Ko et al., 2013; Mahoney et al., 2003; Tsiotsou, 2007; Verner, Hecht, & Fansler, 1998). Each instrument varies in design, but their primary limitation is in the restricted number of sites where they have been developed and field-tested. Many are limited to a single institution. This creates some interesting case studies, but limits the generalizability of the instruments until further studies apply the instruments to more institutions. These single institution case studies have created an absence of a practical tool of measurement for development officers to use in the field and has made understanding, let alone, predicting donor behavior nearly impossible for ICA departments (Ko et al., 2013).

As difficult as it is to draw concrete conclusions from these varying instruments, collectively, they suggest the importance of context in giving. Some scholars have called attention to the need to examine ICA donor motivation and, in particular, the impact of different contexts on motivation (Gladden et al., 2005; Hixson, 2012; Tsiotous, 2006). The development of unique and contextually specific lenses promises to provide ICA departments with more actionable findings.

Unique institutions. Differences in ICA donor motivations between schools emerged in several studies (Gladden et al., 2005; Hixson, 2012; Mahoney, 2003). Researchers concluded that inter-school differences are an important variable and suggested that more attention be paid to the unique context of giving to ICA at each school. If these researchers are correct, the attempt to create a generalizable list of ICA donor motivations may be misguided, although, this claim is hardly a new idea. As a

result, a more multi-institutional analysis is needed (Proper & Caboni, 2014). Sigelman and Bookheimer (1983) anticipated these arguments decades earlier when they noted that regions of the country value things differently; for example, the South's focus on football success is unequalled elsewhere.

However, while context varies widely between schools it is likely that some common factors are affecting ICA donors at similar institutions. For the purpose of this study, similar institutions are those that are either public or private, the same division, size, or level of a conference (e.g., Power 5 Conference vs. mid-major; Pac-12 vs. West Coast Conference). Another aspect of ICA development garnering academic interest is the role that gender plays in ICA donor motivations.

Gender. The study of gender in ICA donor behavior is relatively new (Tsiotous, 2006), although some scholars have been calling for gender specific research on ICA giving since the mid-1990s (Staurowsky et al., 1996). Previously studied demographic variables included wealth, education, age, ethnicity, and zip code, but gender was often ignored (Tsiotous, 2006). The recent research identifies different motivations across genders (Meer & Rosen, 2009; Tsiotous, 2006). However, the Tsiotous findings show more similarities than differences between genders. For example, both genders value priority seating as the most important variable in the decision to give (men 74% and women 63%)(Tsiotous, 2006). Based on the findings, Tsiotous (2006) recommended engaging female donors in unique female-only events, team and coach meet and greets, and more personal communication. However, the data provides evidence that men and women are more similar than initially hypothesized in Tsiotous's (2006) qualitative analysis.

Nevertheless, gender differences in ICA donor activity are only part of the story as men still provide well over two-thirds of ICA donations (Tsiotous, 2006). But, those numbers may be shifting as the financial power of women continues to grow and Title IX increases the participation of women in athletics and makes the inclusion of more former female student-athletes a reality (Shapiro & Ridinger, 2011).

Former student-athletes. By and large, evidence regarding former student-athletes' giving is ambiguous. A common misconception is that former student-athletes are less generous than non-athletes because they feel that they have already donated to their ICA departments through their participation (Holmes, Meditz, & Somers, 2008). There is scant research confirming this (O'Neil & Schenke, 2006). O'Neil and Schenke (2006) found that former student-athletes can give generously depending on their experience and success as a student-athlete. Former-student athletes are an important part of ICA fundraising. They serve important roles in maximizing ICA revenue by creating a connection to alumni, are visible department ambassadors, crave department communication, and can often generate positive influence throughout a donor base (Burchette, 2013; Holmes et al., 2008). In the following sections, I will explore the literature on the constraints surrounding ICA donors.

ICA Constraints

The study of constraints and barriers in ICA development has lagged behind the study of ICA donor motivations. However, to understand the complexity of ICA development, a closer analysis of donor constraints is required. The study of ICA donor constraints may appear to blend together with motivations, and surely some overlaps

exists; however, it is important to focus on the lack of research on ICA constraints because it helps paint a complete picture of the current body of literature.

I begin by discussing the early literature on ICA giving constraints. Then, I examine the ICA development measurement tools. Next, I discuss institutional uniqueness and gender. Finally, I explore the constraints on former student-athlete giving.

Early on, the constraints most often discussed were cost, inconvenience, lethargy, insensitivity, and the feeling of not having sufficient funds to make an impact (Sargeant, et al., 2006). Crawford, Jackson, and Godbey (1991), categorized restraints as intrapersonal, interpersonal, and structural barriers to giving. Some attempts have been made at identifying ICA development specific constraints. For example, O'Neil & Schenke (2006) used the Crawford et al. framework to construct four ICA constraint themes: Importance (e.g., priority, choosing to give elsewhere), Connection (e.g., moved away, change in coaching/administration), Communication (e.g., limited contact or lack of interest from athletic department), and Experience (e.g., how participants perceive their time as students). Shapiro et al. (2010) added a fifth theme to that formulation, Dissatisfaction (e.g., unhappy with the state of football, basketball, etc., or the whole department). Unfortunately, the tools to measure constraints to ICA lack practical utility. Practitioners want to find out why potential donors are not giving or not giving at higher levels, and the current measurement tools appear to come up short in helping provide actionable information.

Measurement tools. The instruments designed to measure donor constraints vary in methods and design but are often limited in sampling, location, and, again, usually examine only one institution (Shapiro & Giannoulakis, 2006; Shapiro et al., 2010;

Tsiotsou, 2007). The majority of studies were case studies without external validity and did not provide practitioners, outside the case sites, with actionable knowledge that they could implement. The diverse designs of these case studies include in-depth interviews (Shapiro and Giannoulakis, 2006), focus groups (Sargeant et al., 2006), and cross-sectional survey design (Shapiro, Giannoulakis, & Wang, 2010). The first qualitative work on ICA giving explored annual fund giving (Hall & Mahony, 1997; Strode, 2006). However, studies continue to be conducted at single institutions. Indeed, the semi-structured interviews and focus groups proved thick description and a fine-grained analysis of data. The surveys provide a wider sampling and larger pool of potential donors and data but lack the depth that qualitative analysis provides in understanding the nuance of barriers to ICA giving. In sum, the tools appear to provide strong internal validity and some interesting new knowledge.

Unfortunately, many conflicting results and disparate research designs have muddled the capacity for researchers to identify generalizable effects of how, or if at all, ICA impacts giving constraints (Martinez et al., 2010). Various research designs often use fundraising dollars as the dependent variable, but how those numbers are calculated varies. Some studies use aggregated institutional giving, others analyze donor behavior, alumni donors, alumni and non-alumni, ICA only, private institutions, public institutions, or both, and case studies (Martinez et al., 2010). In total, the inconsistency in research design creates a field of inquiry that is confusing and often conflicting (Martinez et al., 2010). Next, I examine the role that uniqueness plays in ICA donor constraints.

Unique institutions. The unique contexts of ICA departments make studying donor constraints difficult. To explore such uniqueness, a qualitative study with an

ethnographic design may prove useful. However, the time, access, and resources involved in ethnography are considerable. Bass (2013) attempted an ethnographic study of an ICA booster club, but because of the aforementioned difficulties and the organizational structure (booster clubs are, technically, not part of the ICA department) the findings of the “micro-ethnography” were limited to organizational and cultural dynamics and did not address donor motivations and constraints.

Scholars seem to agree that uniqueness is a factor in ICA development (Staurowsky, et al., 1996; Verner et al., 1998). At a minimum, public and private institutions should be examined separately because the governing constraints vary so widely that meaningful comparison or cross-institution generalization is unlikely (Brooker & Klastorin, 1981). Similarly, gender adds a layer of complexity.

Gender constraints. Gender plays a critical role in ICA development departments (Bass, 2013). Because there are now more women than men attending college and because women tend to outlive men and may inherit more wealth as well as accumulate their own over a longer lifespan, their importance as potential contributors to ICA cannot be overstated (Sun et al., 2007). Furthermore, women currently donate more often than men do, and as women live longer than men, it is logical that pursuing women over the course of a lifetime is an effective practice (Sun et al., 2007). Unfortunately, the research on gender dynamics and constraints in ICA giving are sparse and needs further academic focus. Research on ICA development constraints has yet to disambiguate findings by gender but has begun to increase a focus on former-student athletes.

Former student-athletes. O’Neil and Schenke (2006) examined the hypothesis that former student-athletes are constrained because they feel like they deserve particular

attention from ICA administration and development departments. Using social exchange theory, which posits that individuals seek to maximize benefits and minimize costs, the authors found that giving for former student-athletes is not significantly impacted because student-athletes do not feel as if they have already given through donating their talent and time to the ICA department (O'Neil & Schenke, 2006). This counterintuitive finding challenges some common misconceptions of many ICA administrators. However, the O'Neil and Schenke (2006) study of a medium-sized private university had such a low response rate from former student-athletes who have never donated before (9.5% response rate, 44 total) that it is unclear how representative their findings are.

Another problem is that many of the constraint studies in ICA focused on only former student-athletes from one institution (O'Neil & Schenke, 2006; Shapiro and Giannoulakis, 2006; Shapiro et al., 2010). Cross-validation is needed through examining different institutions, genres, divisions, and regions; however, access issues make this difficult. And, finally, I discuss some general limitations of the ICA giving literature.

ICA Literature Limitations

There is a growing body of literature on philanthropy. In higher education and ICA, the motivation and annual fund research is robust. However, the major gift and planned giving elements have significant gaps. In addition, much of the research is hidden in practitioner-driven dissertations. Unpublished work creates industry repetition. Also, insider research is common; where the researcher is either a student and/or works at the institution where the study was conducted (Proper & Caboni, 2014). Further, in many ways, ICA giving is unique. Yet, in other ways, ICA giving mirrors industry-wide issues.

Limitations of the literature surrounding ICA development include issues related to access (gaining admission to ICA donors is a sensitive and guarded resource for many institutions), self-reported data (bias from self-reporting can inflate or distort findings because respondents often lack the capacity to examine their own behavior accurately and wish to present themselves in a positive light), and reliance on memory (time can blur accurate recollections of past actions and behaviors)(Sun et al., 2007). Measuring motives is difficult for a number of reasons, but none more challenging than motivations may be unconscious and impermanent making them difficult to measure (Tsotsos, 2007). In addition, many studies have been limited to single institutions (Ko et al., 2013; McEvoy, 2002; Meer & Rosen, 2009; O’Neil & Schenke, 2006; Stinson & Howard, 2004; Stinson & Howard, 2010).

In the following sections, I identify the gaps in the literature on ICA development. I begin by discussing the lack of major-gift research. Then, I examine the lifetime value approach. Next, I call attention to the practitioner heavy field and void of research on ICA planned giving. And, finally, I discuss hybrid gifts.

Major Gift Analysis Gap

One of the most difficult things to predict in fundraising is the donation of major gifts; these gifts are rare and often complicated (Hixson, 2012; Sargeant, 2001). Major gifts are both simple and complex (Madden, 2006; Schervish 1997). They are simple in that donors may share common motives; however, they are complex because major-gift donors have the ability to influence programs substantially and hold expectations that their gift will make a difference. Major gifts are complex—uncommonly complicated—because often no single reason exists for major-gift giving (Panas, 1984). Almost every

major gift is “*sui generis*” (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990). In practice, many researchers have avoided studying major-gift donors and large gifts have often been labeled as outliers (Meer & Rosen, 2009). However, these outliers often account for a much larger percentage of the total money raised than the aggregate of ICA smaller donations and are the heart of a successful fundraising program (Meer & Rosen, 2009; Panas, 1984). Furthermore, major gifts are often linked to passion and personal commitment to significant change (Madden, 2006). The absence of research on major gifts is a significant omission in the literature (Hixson, 2012).

Lifetime Value

Examining donors from a lifetime value perspective instead of seeking single donations would require a paradigm shift for many ICA fundraisers. The shift from a transactional approach toward a relational process would be drastic (Sargeant, 2001). Similar to the change that has already occurred in the field of marketing, fundraising would be better served by a systematic move away from the focus on a single transaction to the development of long-term customers (Sargeant, 2001; Tsiotsou, 2007). However, the literature surrounding ICA giving focuses nearly entirely on the transactional approach to fundraising. A longitudinal approach using a relational frame would add value to the field (Oster, 2003; Tsiotsou, 2007). The deep void of longitudinal inquiry is a major lapse in the ICA giving research (Proper & Caboni, 2014).

Practitioner-Heavy Field

The research on institutional advancement and ICA development has grown over the past 20 years; however, generalizable findings remain elusive. One reason is that practitioners dominate the research. Often reflective-scholar practitioners earn a terminal

degree by writing a dissertation or master's thesis as their only form of public inquiry and reenter the field as professionals with deeper knowledge and greater skills set but fail to continue to produce peer-reviewed academic scholarship. Moreover, as the number of dissertations on higher education fundraising continues to grow, the field falls into a cycle of repetition because many dissertations are not published, and few studies are the pursuit of long-term scholars (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990; Brown, 2004). Another important element to recognize is that much of the research design is quantitative in nature and often limited to single institutions. These case studies provide interesting stand-alone findings, but fail to produce generalizable knowledge and restrict the exploration of new elements in higher education giving. As a result, more qualitative research is needed to connect exploratory research with more cross-institutional quantitative approaches (Drezner, 2011).

Planned Giving

The lack of planned-giving research in higher education and ICA is a significant gap. Planned giving is about the future (Johnson, 2010). It is not about reacting or balancing the budget. It is strategic and long-term. Many of the largest gifts in higher education come from planned gifts (Drezner, 2011). Planned giving is often the gateway toward the ultimate gifts (Sapp & Kimball, 2002). Sometimes "legacy gifts" better describe planned gifts; a legacy gift is a final, nonrecurring gift that expresses the alignment of a donor's and institution's commitment and values (Johnson, 2010). These gifts have the impact to change lives and communities. Moreover, planned giving is a path toward sustainability (Johnson, 2010). Planned giving provides comprehensive packages to create significant gifts (Sapp & Kimball, 2002). Therefore, it is critical to

have programs in place to increase this revenue opportunity; planned giving and an endowment focus are elements that can help grow ICA revenues and need further study (Cohen, Whisenant, & Walsh, 2010; Routley et al., 2007).

Hybrid Gifts

Hybrid gifts combine cash—often a major gift—and a planned or deferred gift. These types of gifts are an emerging trend and are becoming crucial as giving and large campaigns attempt to keep up with the rising costs of higher education and ICA (Brown, 2004). The study of hybrid gifts focuses and interweaves a number of limitations that I have identified in this literature review, such as, major gifts, donor lifetime value, practitioner-heavy field, and planned giving. Each of these themes connects to the study of hybrid gifts. Little empirical research exists on hybrid gifts in higher education and ICA. The capacity to help identify hybrid-gift prospects and increase hybrid-gift donations would be a significant addition to the field (Magson & Routley, 2009). As a result, ICA hybrid gifts are a worthy and significant field of study.

Behavioral Economics

A detailed review of the behavioral economics literature is beyond the scope of this literature review; however for those elements that are likely to apply to ICA philanthropy and hybrid-gift development the work of Daniel Kahneman—in particular his groundbreaking book, *Thinking, Fast and Slow* (2011) will serve as a key reference. In addition, multiple works from Tversky and Kahneman (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979; Tversky & Kahneman, 1974; Tversky & Kahneman, 1981; Tversky & Kahneman, 1991) help provide greater depth of understanding. In fact, Tversky and Kahneman are often recognized as two of the founding fathers of behavioral economics, and their

psychological insights have helped explain economic decision-making and cognitive bias. Kahneman's book, *Thinking, Fast and Slow* (2011), excels at using simple language to explain how complex judgments and decision-making works under conditions of uncertainty. In the book, Kahneman describes how the mind works in two different ways: System 1—or, fast thinking—which is automatic and effortless, and System 2—or, slow thinking—which is effortful, reflective, and even often lazy. Moreover, it is important to note that the “Systems” Kahneman uses with the two systems approach are metaphors and do not exist in the mind. The two-system terminology is simply used to provide plain language for complex activities of the mind and help readers to better understand and discuss how the mind works. In the following sections I briefly examine framing, anchoring, what you see is all there is (WYSIATI), and loss aversion as four elements from Kahneman's approach that apply to ICA Philanthropy and hybrid gifts.

Framing

The framing effect describes how decision-making is influenced by the way that choices are presented (Tversky & Kahneman, 1981). Furthermore, some frames are better than others and deciding which one leads to more reasonable decisions is a benefit of understanding and using the framing effect (Kahneman, 2011). For example, on December 5, 2015 the basketball teams for both San Diego State University (SDSU) and the University of San Diego (USD) played a men's basketball game outside at the Major League Baseball home of the San Diego Padres, Petco Park. The next two sentences both describe the outcome of the game but are framed differently: “USD won!” “SDSU lost.” The two sentences are logically equivalent but both evoke markedly different associations (Kahneman, 2011).

Anchoring

The anchoring effect is a concept that uses a starting value or anchor to influence the adjustment of the final answer and is usually biased towards the anchor (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). In short, anchoring works by introducing a higher or lower initial value—the anchor—that then influences the final outcome. Anchoring suggests that a final end value will be closer to the anchor than if an anchor was never introduced (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). For instance, the asking price of a house will often influence how much someone offers to pay for it (Kahneman, 2011). An example of anchoring from charitable giving is the minimum dollar amount that fundraising mailers often suggest, e.g., having a \$25 minimum versus a \$5 minimum box to check off.

What You See Is All There Is (WYSIATI)

Kahneman (2011) uses WYSIATI to explain the notion that the mind forms impressions and makes judgments with only the limited information that is available at that time. Essentially, we use the information we have as the only information. We rarely, if ever, ask what do we not know. Kahneman (2011) provides a hypothetical example where “They made that big decision on the basis of a good report from one consultant. WYSIATI—what you see is all there is. They did not seem to realize how little information they had” (p. 88).

Loss Aversion

Loss aversion describes how losses have a more substantial impact on our decision-making than gains (Tversky & Kahneman, 1991). Quite simply, we are more likely to avoid a loss than take a risk for a gain. In fact, some psychological research suggests losses are twice as powerful as gains (Kahneman & Tversky, 1979). For

example, professional golfers are more accurate when they putt to avoid a bogey than when they putt for a birdie (Ettinger, 2015).

Taken together, these elements of behavioral economics serve as a framework to better understand and enhance the analysis of this study. This brief behavioral economic literature review provides theoretical scaffolding to enhance this practitioner driven study.

Conclusion to the Chapter

The tension between costs and revenue in ICA is inefficient and, most likely, unsustainable (Sanderson & Siegfried, 2015; Sparvero & Warner, 2013). Hybrid gifts are an option for ICA leaders to build a more secure future. Intercollegiate Athletics is an environment ripe for change (Hesel & Perko, 2010). And, hybrid gifts can help ignite and sustain the change.

In sum, philanthropy has been a critical part of American higher education since the founding of ICA. As costs and tuition continue to rise, private gifts increase in importance. Major and planned gifts can provide a blueprint for institutional stability; however, many institutions do not have the donor capacity for outright large cash gifts. Hybrid gifts can bridge the gap.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to examine hybrid-gifts in Division I Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA). Additionally, an overarching goal of the study is to use the data generated to develop a blueprint for ICA leaders to increase ICA revenue through hybrid-gifts. This chapter provides a detailed description of the research design and methodology that was used in the study. I begin with an overview. Next, I describe phase one of study, which involves a quantitative cross-sectional survey. Then, I provide a description of phase two of the study, which entails conducting and comparing two qualitative institutional case studies. Finally, I conclude by detailing the validity, reliability, trustworthiness, and triangulation elements of the study.

Overview of the Research Design and Methodology

The study used an explanatory sequential mixed methods research design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). An explanatory sequential design begins with a quantitative phase and concludes with a connected qualitative phase to explain the results of the quantitative phase in more detail and depth; the focus on the explanation of phase two is explicit in the design name (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

Phase one generated quantitative survey results that take a wide-angle snapshot to answer Research Question 1: What are the characteristics of hybrid-gift development in Division I ICA? Phase two used a qualitative case study comparison approach to answer Research Question 2: What does an in-depth examination of hybrid-gift development reveal about hybrid gift giving Division I ICA programs that the answers to Question 1 suggest are both typical and atypical?

Phase One

As noted, the study's first phase was built around a quantitative cross-sectional survey. The survey was conducted with Division I ICA senior level development directors. The components of phase one included four elements, and the procedures that were employed in each of these components are described in the subsections that follow. First, I discuss the development of the survey instrument. Second, I describe the pilot testing process. Third, I explain the procedures that were used to conduct the survey. And, finally, I describe how the survey data was analyzed.

Development of the Survey Instrument

The survey instrument (See Appendix A) was generated in two parts. First, I adapted questions from surveys and interview guides from McEvoy (2002), Hixson (2012), and Barascout (2012) to create a baseline for the instrument because no survey instruments were found in the literature that specifically targeted hybrid gifts. These initial studies on ICA philanthropy provided a foundation for the survey instrument; however, simply combining the questions did not capture the essence of hybrid-gift development in ICA per se. As a result, the second and more extensive elements of the survey instrument were self-generated to narrow the focus toward hybrid gifts in Division I ICA.

The survey was a confidential self-administrated digital questionnaire (Creswell, 2014). Further, because the study is concerned with both the current fiscal reality of ICA giving and the exploratory nature of hybrid-gift research, the survey instrument was designed to be parsimonious yet contain both open and closed-ended questions. Using open-ended responses is deemed appropriate because of the exploratory nature of the

research, especially, where the study's key term, hybrid gifts, may not be a part of many practitioner's vocabulary. Also, the survey was developed in Qualtrics software.

Qualtrics is a survey-software platform that provides design, distribution, and data collection processes.

Pilot Testing the Survey Instrument

Before implementing the survey, pilot testing of the instrument occurred (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009). Piloting the survey tested for readability, procedures, the time required taking the survey, visual design, navigation problems, and other potential problems with the survey (Dillman et al., 2009). Initially, the piloting process helped obtain feedback on the survey from a number of fundraising professionals with specialized knowledge about hybrid gifts, for example, higher education institutional advancement officers and fundraising consultants (Dillman et al., 2009).

Then, because of the limited number of Division I ICA programs ($N = 346$) and to avoid tainting the actual survey results, the pilot study was conducted with a sample of Division II and III ICA Development Directors ($n = 10$). I contacted potential pilot participants by phone and email. Upon agreeing to be part of the pilot study, pilot participants accessed the instrument digitally, via a link provided in an email message. Next, the pilot participants were asked to first complete the survey and, then, provide written feedback about the survey in the form of notes, questions, and recommendations. Further, two local pilot participants were visited in-person to pilot the instrument and participate in unstructured conversational feedback during and after the survey. In-person pilot participants are considered the gold standard in survey-assessment methodology and

have the potential to provide direct oral face-to-face feedback in real time (F. Galloway, personal communication, March 25, 2016).

The pilot study took place over two weeks. In addition, the pilot test was helpful in minimizing measurement error (Dillman et al., 2009). Moreover, two higher education vice-presidents for institutional advancement also reviewed and provided in-person direct oral face-to-face feedback on the survey. At the conclusion of the pilot test process, suggestions for improvement were considered, and the final adjustments were made to the survey. In addition, the pilot study participants averaged less than ten minutes to complete the survey instrument. The feedback portion of the piloting process took no more than ten additional minutes for digital feedback and 30 minutes (40 total) for the in-person participant feedback.

Conducting the Survey

After the pilot study was completed and the survey instrument was finalized, the survey was sent to the entire population of Division I ICA, one senior level development directors at each institution ($N = 346$). Many institutions had varying titles for the senior ranking ICA development officer. I anticipated using the National Association of Athletic Development Directors (NAADD) as the foundation to build the list of Division I ICA senior level development directors; however, no such list could be located. Therefore, I used ICA websites to build the list.

This was a purposeful population that reduced coverage error by surveying an entire population (Dillman et al., 2009). Next, I describe the Dillman Method that I used to implement the survey.

The Dillman Method of survey implementation focuses on generating an adequate response rate through strategic follow-up notifications (Dillman et al., 2009). Initially, I sent an introductory letter and a link to the survey (See Appendix B). This introduction letter introduced me, provided a brief personal background, and stressed the importance of the survey and critical role the participants would play in generating new knowledge. The survey instrument was also part of the first email to help diffuse any feelings of oppression that may arise from receiving too many emails. Then, after one week, I sent a reminder email to all participants with another link to the survey (See Appendix C). In the email, I thanked those that had completed the survey and encouraged the others to respond. This reminder can help trigger a participant's memory to respond (Dillman et al., 2009). Next, after weeks two and four, I sent further digital reminders and, once again, digital links to the survey. Because the survey is self-administrated, it becomes important to follow-up with different messages over the course of the survey (Dillman et al., 2009). As a result, I used a video message in week three of the survey to remind and ignite more interest in the final few days of the survey (See Appendix D). The 25-second video message was viewed over 15 times. Finally, I enlisted a research assistant to help me call every non-respondent every week for the final three weeks of the month long survey. The Dillman Method generally yields a response rate of 60-75% of the population (Williams, 2014, slide 8). This survey got a 64% response rate.

Analyzing the Survey Data

Responses to the survey questions were entered into an SPSS Statistics version 23 database. The variables were then labeled and cleaned. The statistical software then was used to perform both descriptive and inferential analyses.

The first stage of the analysis calculated descriptive statistics for the following demographic variables collected from the survey: the gender, age, location of the institution; the institutional type (private or public); and the Division I sub-level of the institution (e.g., Autonomy, Non Autonomy, FCS, and Non Football). In addition to these variables, descriptive statistics were also calculated for the number of full-time ICA development employees; the minimum dollar amounts for major, endowment, and deferred gifts; the number of annual fund, major gift, and new bequest donors during the 2015-16 fiscal year; the ICA development budget size in the 2015-16 fiscal year; the ICA financial fundraising goal in the 2015-16 fiscal year; the ICA money raised in the 2015-16 fiscal year; familiarity with the term hybrid gift; the intentional solicitation of hybrid gifts; a multi-item Likert scale on ICA hybrid-gift development; if ICA has a major-gift society or group; the minimum gift and number of donors for the major-gift society or group; when the institution was founded; the size of the institution and athletic endowment; if ICA has an endowment society or group, the number of donors in the endowment society or group; and if endowments count toward donor rewards or point systems. After the means, variances, ranges, and frequencies were calculated for these variables, the requisite information was presented in a number of tables.

Next, the second stage used inferential statistics to explore two characteristics of hybrid-gift development in Division I ICA. One, I used an independent sample t-test to compare the means of an interval dependent variable, *hybrid gift success*, constructed from a multi-item Likert scale on the survey, for two groups, *public* and *private* ICA Division I institutions. A t-test was appropriate for this analysis because *public* and *private* institutions are two groups and *hybrid gift success* is an interval dependent

variable. Also, I used a one-way analysis of variance test (ANOVA) to compare the means of an interval dependent variable, *hybrid gift success*, with more than two groups of Division I football (e.g., *Autonomy*, *Non Autonomy*, *FCS*, and *Non Football*). The ANOVA was appropriate because the categories of Division I football, *Autonomy*, *Non Autonomy*, *FCS*, and *Non Football* are more than two groups and *hybrid gift success* is an interval dependent variable.

Finally, the open-ended responses were coded and analyzed by themes. Next, I will discuss phase two.

Phase Two

The purpose of this phase of the study was to explore and better understand Division I ICA hybrid gift development. This phase employed a qualitative methodology. Phase two attempted to fill the gap in our understanding by digging deeper into the complexity of hybrid gifts in Division I ICA. The research question that guided this phase is: What does an in-depth examination of hybrid-gift development reveal about hybrid gift giving Division I ICA programs that the answers to Research Question 1 suggest are both typical and atypical?

The methodology of phase two was designed to examine the nuanced, interconnected, and comparative aspects of Division I ICA hybrid giving. The qualitative research design is important because it fills a gap identified in the literature review. The literature on ICA giving is overwhelmingly quantitative. Consequently, this phase attempted to fill that gap in the literature by focusing on better understanding and exploring hybrid gifts in Division I ICA from a qualitative lens.

In the following sections, I examine the research design of phase two. I begin by discussing the case study protocol. The following sections examine the sampling and data collection process by providing details about the documents, observations, and interviews that were conducted. Then, I describe the data analysis process of the case studies.

Rationale for a Comparative Case Study Design

The use of a comparative case study design was appropriate in the study because the case studies provide opportunities to study complex systems and examine the unique features of the cases (Bryman, 2012). Put simply, this design allows cases to be examined using relatively identical methods (Bryman, 2012). Further, case studies provide opportunities to use multiple data sources while accounting for contextual conditions (Yin, 2014).

Sampling

The sampling was purposive. Furthermore, the two cases were selected using a combination of criterion, convenience, opportunistic, and snowball approaches (Bryman, 2012). The sampling strategy that was employed can be considered criterion sampling because the case study sites needed to match what the data from research question one revealed as typical and atypical hybrid-gift development. Convenience sampling was also used because of location and potential travel cost implications; in other words, sites that were closest to where I live, Southern California, would be preferred over more distant sites. Finally, opportunistic and snowball sampling was implemented because of the relational elements of fundraising and my initial limited access. For example, once I began interviewing stakeholders, I asked the interviewees if they could think of other potential stakeholders that I should interview. Because I did not know every stakeholder

at a case site, I also relied on an opportunistic and snowball sampling approach to expand my interviewee pool in new directions.

Data Collection Process

The data collection process consisted of three core elements. Once the case study sites were chosen based on the data from phase one, I approached the senior level development officer and asked her or him to participate in the case study research phase. After receiving verbal consent, I sent an email detailing the participation requirements, and I began to reach out for case study participants. For example, I reached out to senior level ICA staff, institutional advancement personnel, institutional leadership, and donors. Furthermore, I spent at least four days at each institution. The following sections detail each phase of the data collection process.

Collection of documents. The document collection process focused on understanding the material culture of Division I ICA hybrid gifts. Documents are important because they can be an especially rich source of explicit information (Patton, 2002). In this study, I examined documents from two Division I ICA departments. The documents collected included fundraising brochures, mission statements, donor mailings, social media, strategic plans, alumni magazines, personal correspondence, ICA websites, and donor reward systems. The documents provided a more robust understanding because of what can be learned directly from the documents and offered insightful tools to create new directions for inquiry (Patton, 2002).

Observations. The methods I used to gather observational data came from direct observation that was recorded in field notes. Direct observation help better understand the activities, people, interactions, and settings of Division I ICA hybrid gifts (Patton, 2002).

The direct observations helped describe and create a more comprehensive picture of the Division I ICA hybrid gifts. Further, the opportunity for observation provided several advantages to understand the context and provide a clearer holistic perspective of Division I ICA hybrid gifts (Patton, 2002). Personal contact and first-hand experience provided an opportunity to see things that normally fall through the cracks and discover new things others may routinely ignore (Patton, 2002).

During observational opportunities, I wrote field notes. The field notes contained brief descriptions of what I observed. I used shorthand for the field notes to try and capture everything I felt was vital to helping answer the research question driving this phase of the study. For example, I noted everything from job notes and location environment to more expansive notes about tone and conversation content. Furthermore, I used the field notes and analytic memos in the data analysis process and findings section of the final dissertation to help recall the details of particular situations.

Interviews. During the site visits, I attempted to schedule in-person interviews with each identified participant. Participants included the following: ICA Development Staff, the ICA Development supervisor, the Athletic Director, the institution's President, members of the Board of Trustees, donors, institutional advancement staff, and, especially, a planned giving expert on the institutional advancement staff. I often conducted the interviews in person, but if an in-person interview could not be scheduled during my visit I conducted the interview over the phone. The one-on-one interviews were semi-structured interviews and averaged less than an hour. Also, the interviewees signed a consent form (See Appendix D).

Interview guides (See Appendix E and F) were used to steer the course of the interviews, but the “way to the goal” was flexible enough for deviation and open enough for new information to emerge (Patton, 2002; Kvale & Brinkman, 2009, Bryman, 2012). Additionally, the questions were brief and simple. The short questions lead to long and rich answers (Kvale & Brinkman, 2009). The interviews were recorded with the app Audio Memos Pro version 4.6.1 on both my iPhone 6s and a digital recording device. After the interviews were completed, each interview was transcribed verbatim. I outsourced the transcription process, but I read and listened to the interviews multiple times to ensure the accuracy of the final transcripts.

Analysis of the Case Studies

For this study, the data analysis was inductive, iterative, and from a constructivist perspective (Charmaz, 2006). Initially, each participant was given the opportunity to receive a transcription of her or his interview to provide an opportunity to confirm the accuracy of the transcriptions through member-checking the data (Saldaña, 2013). Member checking provides “perceived validity” or truthfulness of the transcriptions by having the interviewees verify the accuracy of the transcriptions (Patton, 2002).

First-level coding. Next, I began with a commonsensical process to coding (R. Donmoyer, personal communication, March 29, 2016). Initially, I used a priori set of codes and sub-codes to generate and categorize the interview guide (e.g., culture of philanthropy, hybrid gifts, internal support, and innovation), which made the coding process more efficient (Donmoyer, 2016). Then, I used In-Vivo coding in which I read the transcripts to capture the salient and essence-capturing data in the actual language found in transcription that might have been missed in the priori codes (Saldaña, 2013).

Analytic memos. In addition, throughout the analysis process, I wrote analytic memos. The analytic memos served as a “brain dump” to reflect on the interview and coding process (Saldaña, 2013). Further, Appendix G provides an example of an analytic memo.

Second-level coding. Then, I examined how the initial codes connect to my research question for phase two: What does an in-depth examination of hybrid-gift development reveal about hybrid gift giving Division-I ICA programs that the answers to research question one suggest are both typical and atypical? Over time, the priori and In-Vivo codes were refined through a second-level pattern coding process to develop a more robust sense of the emerging categories, themes, and theory (Saldaña, 2013). After the pattern coding, I examined the final codes by identifying significant quotes and recorded the source/interviewee in an Excel spreadsheet. Further, Appendix H provides an example of a final code in the Excel spreadsheet. From these spreadsheets, I created data tables to compare and contrast the data by code, category, themes, and theory (Kezar, 2013). As a final element of the research design, a cross-case analysis was constructed to explore similar and dissimilar findings.

Validity and Reliability/Trustworthiness and Triangulation

Empirical research requires a rigorous and explicit pursuit of accuracy. This mixed-methods study used a number of tools to help increase the validity and reliability of the study. Furthermore, because of the mixed methodology design of this study, the techniques to maximize validity and reliability will vary between the two phases (Creswell, 2014).

The phase one precautionary steps used to help ensure validity and reliability focused on the survey instrument. It was designed in a two-part process. Initially, I used elements of previously developed instruments from across the field of nonprofit philanthropic research to begin. Then, I generated a number of the questions to narrow the focus of the instrument to ICA hybrid gifts. Moreover, the survey instrument was piloted and reviewed by Division II ICA development professionals. Further, two higher education institutional advancement vice presidents also verified the accuracy of the instrument. It is important to verify the construct and face validity of an instrument by confirming the survey measurements measure what it is supposed to measure (Bryman, 2012). In addition, to measure respondent reliability and increase the study's validity, survey responses on institutional endowments were cross referenced with public information about higher education endowments available through the Chronicle of Higher Education and the 2016 National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) Commonfund Institute study of endowments.

In phase two, additional steps were used to help foster accuracy for the case studies. First, two core interview guides were developed. Depending on the participant, practitioner or donor, each was asked similar core questions with different variations based on position and role in the hybrid-gift process. Second, triangulation was used in multiple levels of analysis in this phase to build support as themes emerged (Bryman, 2012; Creswell, 2014; Patton, 2002). For example, the documents analysis, observations, and interviews combined to overcome any single research design shortcomings or biases (Patton, 2002). Each layer of analysis reveals different empirical realities. Resulting in differences and inconsistencies that can strengthen claims because deeper understanding

emerges (Patton, 2002). Third, I presented each interviewee with a member-checking opportunity. I emailed the interview transcriptions to each participant. Trustworthiness will increase once the interviewees have been given the opportunity to review, comment, and amend the transcriptions. Fourth and perhaps most importantly, I conducted an inter-coder reliability analysis with two other trained Ph.D. researchers. The three of us each coded three interviews, early in the coding process, to ensure the validity of my analysis and help minimize my own biases.

In sum, these processes established triangulation and cross-data consistency checks to increase the reliability and validity of the mixed methods that was used in this study. The mixed methods and source triangulation help overcome the bias that could emerge in any singular method.

Conclusion to the Chapter

This chapter examined the explanatory sequential mixed methods research design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011) that was used in the study. The two-phase methodology provides a number of important elements. Initially, phase one took a quantitative approach to exploring the characteristics of hybrid gifts across Division I ICA. The survey instrument was designed to generate the details of Division I ICA hybrid gift development. This first phase then shaped the case studies chosen for phase two of the study. In phase two, a qualitative case study comparison took a deep dive into better understanding the complexity surrounding Division I ICA hybrid gift development. By studying two different approaches to Division I ICA hybrid gift development I believe that I generated a richer and more meaningful picture of the scope and impact of hybrid gifts in Division I ICA.

CHAPTER FOUR: SURVEY FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the findings and analysis of the data collected in phase one of this mixed-methods study. The explanatory sequential design of the study began with a quantitative survey to the entire population of Division I Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) senior level development directors. The following research question guides this chapter: What are the characteristics of hybrid-gift development in Division I ICA?

The chapter begins by presenting the findings from the ICA Philanthropy Survey. Initially, the population and survey respondent's demographics are presented. Next, the ICA development descriptive statistics are presented as a snapshot of the Division I ICA development landscape. Then, the open-ended survey responses are examined and presented through emerging themes. Subsequently, the findings of the hybrid-gift scale—which attempts to measure hybrid-gift success—are presented. Finally, inferential statistical tests, specifically, independent sample t-tests and Analysis of Variance Test (ANOVA) are used to create a more robust analysis of the characteristics of hybrid-gift development.

ICA Philanthropic Survey

The ICA philanthropic survey was created to better understand the characteristics of hybrid-gift development in Division I ICA. The survey entered the field on August 9, 2016 and concluded on September 7, 2016. The survey captured a wide array of ICA development information, for example, demographics, staff information, financials, planned gifts, and hybrid gift data. In the next few sections I examine the population and response rate associated with the ICA philanthropic survey.

Population Demographics

The population for this survey was all 346 NCAA Division I institutions' senior level development officers. The contact information, both email addresses and office phone numbers, for each ICA senior level development officer was gathered from institutional ICA website staff directory pages.

Descriptive Statistics on Survey Participants

The 33-question online survey captured extensive information about Division I ICA philanthropy. Originally, the survey was open for four weeks; however, it was reopened for a single late respondent who reached out and asked to participate in the survey during late September. The following sections provide a detailed snapshot of the Division I ICA philanthropic landscape from the lens of Division I ICA senior level development officers.

As was mentioned earlier, all Division I ICA senior level development officers were originally contacted by email and surveyed digitally for this study. The survey respondents represent a sample of the entire population of 346 Division I ICA institutions; specifically, 222 surveys were received for a response rate of 64.2 percent. An examination of the responses, however, revealed that one response was a duplicate and therefore removed. Upon further examination, it was determined that a lower level ICA development staff member had submitted the duplicate. Although, one can never be sure, I believe that perhaps as many as 5 percent of respondents were not the Division I ICA senior level development officers. Instead, some Division I ICA senior level development officers appeared to have forwarded the survey participation requests to

other staff members to complete on their behalf. As a result of the one removed duplicate response, the final response rate was 63.9 percent with an $N = 221$.

Institution type. Whether an institution is a private or public institution plays an important role in its operations. To determine the extent to which the sample is representative of the population of Division I ICA institutions, it was important to compare the respondents of the survey with the population of Division I ICA. The private institution respondents made up 33 percent ($n = 73$) of the sample, while public institution respondents made up 67 percent ($n = 148$). These numbers align well with the whole NCAA Division I population breakdown of institution type: private 33 percent (114) and public 67 percent (232). The institution type results suggest a representative sample of Division I ICA.

Football subdivision. Another critical element for categorizing Division I NCAA institutions is by football subdivision. There are a few common ways to stratify Division I ICA. For years, the most common way to classify Division I ICA was into three segments: Division IA, Division IAA, and Non Football playing institutions. In the early 2000s, those categories evolved from Division IA to the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS), Division IAA to the Football Championship Subdivision (FCS), and still the Non Football playing institutions. Then, in 2015, the categories changed again. The FBS became further segmented into Autonomy and Non Autonomy groups, while the FCS and Non Football segments remained the same. To further complicate the categories, the Autonomy and Non Autonomy groups are often classified in the media as the power five conferences (ACC, Big Ten, Big 12, Pac-12, SEC, and Notre Dame as an independent) for the Autonomy group and the group of five (American, Conference-USA, Mid-

American, Mountain West, Sun Belt, and three independents) for the Non Autonomy group of schools. For this study, the football subdivisions are Autonomy, Non Autonomy, FCS, and Non Football.

To determine the extent to which the sample is representative of the population of Division I ICA institutions, Table 1 presents the data of both the population and survey respondents segmented in the football subdivisions. The table shows a consistent and strong percentage of Autonomy, Non Autonomy, and Non Football institutions, all between 75-71 percent. The FCS is skewed slightly lower with a 47 percent response rate.

Table 1

Comparison of ICA Division I Population and Sample, by Subdivisions

	Total	Autonomy	Non Autonomy	FCS	Non Football
Population	346	65	63	124	94
Sample	221	49	47	58	67
Sample Percentage	64%	75%	75%	47%	71%

Conference. Further classification in ICA is often segmented by conference affiliation. In this study respondents were first tethered to their football playing conference. Moreover, if the institution is a non-football institution, then, the institution is classified in their men's basketball conference. *Figure 1* displays the distribution and frequencies of the survey respondents. The conferences are listed in alphabetical order starting with Autonomy, Non Autonomy, FCS, and Non Football conferences. The results highlight the stronger response rate in Autonomy and Non Autonomy conferences.

Figure 1. Distribution of respondents by conference.

Location. Beyond conference affiliation, the location of institutions is important in ICA. The survey data for this study included sufficient data to warrant analysis at the regional level, based on the four regions used by the U.S. Census. The South had the largest number of respondents with 64, which represented 29 percent of the sample, while the Northeast had the smallest number of respondents with 47, which represented 21 percent of sample. A comprehensive table of survey respondent locations can be found in Appendix J.

Gender. An additional factor to examine in the sample was the gender of survey respondents. The gender distribution analysis of the sample revealed an unsurprising predominantly male sample with 86 percent across the whole Division I sample and 13 percent female with 1 percent preferring not to answer. When gender was analyzed within football subdivision, the Autonomy conferences had the highest percentage of female respondents with 19 percent. A comprehensive table of survey respondent gender can be found in Appendix K.

Age. The respondent's age was also captured in the survey, with the average age in the sample being 42 years. Interestingly, when segmented by football subdivision, the Autonomy group had the oldest senior level development directors with an average of 45 years, while the Non Football institutions had the youngest with an average age of 40. Moreover, Non Football institutions had the largest range of ages with 42 years, while the Non Autonomy institutions had the tightest age range with 30 years. A comprehensive table of survey ages can be found in Appendix L.

Alumni. The final descriptive statistics on the survey respondents was alumni size. It is important to state that this question was the final question of the survey and

resulted in only 76 responses. The alumni distribution analysis of the sample revealed an average alumni size of 149,873. Again, when segmented by football subdivision, the Autonomy group had the largest alumni size with 286,595, and the Non Football institutions had the smallest number of alumni with 97,801. Moreover, the FCS institutions had the largest range of alumni size with 990,000, while the Non Autonomy institutions had the smallest alumni range of 230,000.

Taken together, the sample was deemed representative of the population of Division I ICA, although the responses were slightly skewed toward larger ICA departments, both Autonomy and Non Autonomy. This distinction is important, especially when considering ICA development staffing, which I examine next.

Staffing

The staff size for Division I ICA development offices was captured in the survey data. The staff distribution analysis of the sample revealed a Division I average development staff size of 6.7 full-time equivalent (FTE) employees in ICA development offices. Unsurprisingly, when analyzed within football subdivisions the average was highest at Autonomy (13.1) and lowest at Non Football (3.7) ICA development departments. A notable finding when analyzing staff sizes within football subdivisions, was in the comparison between major gift officers and annual fund employees. The autonomy institutions averaged over one FTE more in their annual fund staff. Further, only one subdivision outside of the Autonomy institutions averaged more major gift staff than annual fund staff. The Non Football institutions averaged slightly more major gift officers (1.3) than annual fund staffers (1.2). Additionally, an open-ended question had one Non Football respondent state, “We are staff challenged.” A breakdown of staff size

for the four most identified roles in an ICA development department can be found in Table 2.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics for Total Full-Time Equivalent Staff Size for ICA Development, by Subdivision

Football subdivision	Position	N	Mean	Std. deviation
Autonomy	Total FTE Employees	48	13.1	7.2
	TFE: Major Gifts	48	5.1	1.9
	TFE: Annual Fund	48	4.0	2.7
	TFE: Events and Stewardship	48	2.5	2.9
	TFE: Administrative Assistant	48	2.1	1.7
Non Autonomy	Total FTE Employees	48	6.0	5.0
	TFE: Major Gifts	48	2.3	1.2
	TFE: Annual Fund	48	2.9	2.0
	TFE: Events and Stewardship	48	1.8	1.9
	TFE: Administrative Assistant	48	1.3	1.9
FCS	Total FTE Employees	57	5.4	7.9
	TFE: Major Gifts	57	1.2	0.8
	TFE: Annual Fund	57	1.5	0.9
	TFE: Events and Stewardship	57	1.2	1.2
	TFE: Administrative Assistant	57	0.7	1.0
Non Football	Total FTE Employees	68	3.7	6.0
	TFE: Major Gifts	68	1.3	1.0
	TFE: Annual Fund	68	1.2	1.0
	TFE: Events and Stewardship	67	0.9	0.8
	TFE: Administrative Assistant	66	0.6	0.8
Total	Total FTE Employees	221	6.7	7.5
	TFE: Major Gifts	221	2.3	2.0
	TFE: Annual Fund	221	2.2	2.0
	TFE: Events and Stewardship	220	1.5	1.9
	TFE: Administrative Assistant	219	1.1	1.5

Donors

The survey data captured two segments of donors, annual-fund and major-gift donors, from the last fiscal year for ICA development departments. Importantly, the two donor categories are not mutually exclusive.

Annual-fund donors. The survey data showed a mean of 3,571 annual fund donors across all Division I institutions. When segmented by football subdivision, the data again reveals an expected outcome with Autonomy institution having a larger number of annual fund donors. As the largest group, the Autonomy institutions had a mean of 9,530 donors, and, once again, the Non Football institutions had the smallest with a mean of 1,217 annual fund donors. Table 3 provides a detailed comparison of annual fund donors for the last fiscal year by football subdivision.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for the Number of Annual Fund Donors for the Last Fiscal Year, by Subdivision

Annual fund donors	N	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std. deviation
Autonomy	46	22,500	9,530	8,000	5,166
Non Autonomy	46	17,000	2,877	2,300	2,586
FCS	53	6,000	1,800	1,300	1,523
Non Football	63	8,000	1,217	760	1,282
Totals	208	22,500	3,571	2,000	4,338

Major-gift donors. The survey data showed a mean of 124 major-gift donors across all Division I institutions. When segmented by football subdivision, the data again predictably reveals that Autonomy institutions have the largest number with a median of 250 major-gift donors. Once again, the Non Football institutions had the smallest number

of major gift donors with a median of 25 major-gift donors. Table 4 provides a more detailed comparison of major-gift donors segmented by football subdivision.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for the Number of Major Gift Donors for the Last Fiscal Year, by Subdivision

Major gift donors	N	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std. deviation
Autonomy	42	1,000	307	250	279
Non Autonomy	44	500	101	68	111
FCS	51	867	70	30	133
Non Football	60	500	58	25	88
Totals	197	1,000	124	50	188

Gift Amount Minimums

The survey data helps to better understand what many gift minimums are across Division I ICA development departments. The minimum gifts create a common understanding toward a subjective level of giving, and help provide scaffolding and clarity to ICA development base rate minimum gift amounts.

Major-gift minimums. Major-gift donors are often the most important donors for an ICA department, however, what amount triggers a “major gift” can vary across institutions. Often the anecdotal distinctions in major-gift minimums make the perception of comparison difficult. Interestingly, the survey data reveals that both the median and mode of major-gifts minimums are \$25,000 across all of Division I and every football subdivision. The means across football subdivisions are more challenging to compare because large outliers distort an accurate comparison. Further, I believe some institutions answered the question by inserting the largest major gift they had ever received. A few numbers were so large and exact that, in all probability, it doesn’t serve as a realistic

major-gift minimum. Table 5 provides a detailed comparison of ICA major gift minimum dollar amounts segmented by football subdivision.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for ICA Major Gifts, by Subdivision

Football subdivision	N	Min.	Max. (000)	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. deviation
Autonomy	46	\$2,000	\$15,270	\$371,217	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$2,245,681
Non Autonomy	46	\$2,500	\$5,500	\$166,087	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$810,050
FCS	56	\$10	\$400	\$38,259	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$65,274
Non Football	65	\$500	\$100	\$25,562	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$22,231
Total	213	\$10	\$15,270	\$133,897	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$1,108,812

Endowment minimums. The distributional analysis of endowment minimums of the sample revealed a similar consistency of minimums across all of Division I and within football subdivisions. The aggregate median and mode of endowment minimum gifts for Division I was \$25,000. Furthermore, the median and modes for every football subdivision were also \$25,000, except the median for Autonomy institutions, which was \$50,000. Table 6 provides a detailed comparison of ICA endowment gift minimum dollar amounts segmented by football subdivision.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for ICA Endowment Gifts, by Subdivision

Football subdivision	N	Min.	Max. (000)	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. deviation
Autonomy	44	\$25,000	\$2,000	\$122,159	\$50,000	\$25,000	\$297,529
Non Autonomy	42	\$0	\$1,000	\$80,952	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$182,263
FCS	53	\$0	\$200	\$42,171	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$36,538
Non Football	60	\$5,000	\$500	\$50,917	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$65,861
Total	199	\$0	\$2,000	\$70,679	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$169,393

Development Costs and Revenues

Beyond gift minimums, other revealing elements in ICA development are ICA development operating budget size, fundraising goals, and fundraising outcomes. The next few sections examine the survey results regarding ICA development costs, goals, and revenues.

Operating budget. An ICA operating budget typically reflects its resources and priorities. Within ICA development and segmented by football subdivision, the survey results revealed a mostly predictable allocation of operating budgets. Median dollar amounts provide clearer comparisons because of large outliers within subdivisions. Autonomy institutions led the way with a median ICA development operating budget of \$1,100,000, Non Autonomy was next with a large drop to a median operating budget of \$250,000, the FCS followed with a median of \$85,000, and, finally, Non Football institutions had a median of \$62,500. Median operating budgets were used to measure the differences in ICA development operating budget size because some numbers were so large, specifically, in Non Autonomy schools where it is believed that some respondents may have answered the question with the dollar figure of the whole ICA operating budget. As a result, the median scores help provide a more accurate comparison. Appendix M provides a comprehensive table of the ICA development operating budgets in the last fiscal year for the survey respondents.

Fundraising goal last fiscal year. The Division I ICA institutions fundraising goal data for the last fiscal year was also captured in the survey. Repeating the segmenting of the institutions by football subdivisions reveal an expected gap in the size of goals. Autonomy schools had an average fundraising goal of \$29,837,457. This mean

amount is nearly six times as large as Non Autonomy institutions (\$5,777,273), and ten times the size of both the FCS (\$2,667,843) and Non Football (\$2,120,339) institutions. Appendix N provides a comprehensive table of the ICA development fundraising goals for the last fiscal year for the survey respondents.

Dollars raised last fiscal year. The Division I ICA institutions fundraising goal data for the last fiscal year was also captured in the survey. Again, segmenting the institutions by football subdivisions reveal an expected pattern of Division I ICA. In the last fiscal year, Autonomy institutions raised an average of \$35,734,337. This mean score is nearly five times as large as Non Autonomy institutions (\$6,431,937), seven times the size of the FCS (\$4,760,762), and 11 times the size of Non Football (\$2,284,021) institutions. Moreover, it is important to note that these means could be potentially skewed if some institutions included capital campaigns. To compensate for this potential error, the median ICA money raised in the last fiscal year football subdivisions are also reported: Autonomy (\$32,000,000), Non Autonomy (\$5,000,000), FCS (\$1,719,167), and Non Football (\$1,300,000). The mean and median dollar amounts represent a similar breakdown across football subdivisions and measurements. In addition, Appendix O provides a comprehensive table of the ICA development fundraising dollars raised in the last fiscal year for survey respondents. Next, the survey inquired about a number of planned giving elements.

Planned Gifts

One hundred and seventy-seven (80 percent) of ICA senior level development director survey respondents believe that planned gifts have increased or stayed the same over the last three years. More specifically, 91 (41 percent) survey respondents believe

that planned gifts have increased over the past three years. Planned gifts can come in many different forms; however, endowments are the most common.

Endowments. Measuring and comparing endowments has become a popular exercise across higher education. As costs rise, endowments are often a polarizing metric used to help make sense of the higher education landscape. Furthermore, there is little doubt that endowments are vital to the long-term health of an institution. As a result, endowments are a critical element of philanthropy and potentially the hybrid-gift development; therefore, this study attempted to gather a comprehensive picture and analysis of endowments at both the institutional and ICA level. Further, to help measure respondent reliability and increase the study's validity, survey responses on institutional endowments were cross referenced with public information about higher education endowments available through the Chronicle of Higher Education and the 2016 National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) Commonfund Institute study of endowments.

Institutional. The institutional endowment data for the last fiscal year was captured in the survey. Once again, segmenting the institutions by football subdivisions is helpful to compare like institutions and often shows an expected pattern of resource allocation in ICA. However, the institutional endowment data varies from the normal pattern of ICA resources for two reasons: 1) the institutional endowment is for the entire institution, and 2) the Ivy League is located in the FCS. Obviously, when it comes to endowments, the Ivy League dramatically impacts the mean calculations. For example, the maximum institutional endowment in the FCS is \$38 billion, while the next closest maximum institutional endowment, outside of the FCS, is in the Autonomy group and is

\$10 billion. Regardless, the institutional endowment means are still led by the Autonomy group (\$1,956,622,000); however, now the FCS (\$1,696,526,000) is next, followed by a large drop toward both the Non Autonomy Group (\$451,127,000) and Non Football (378,140,000) institutions. Furthermore, the median institutional endowment numbers provide a good reference because of the strength of a few institutional endowments. The median amounts reveal the same order, yet the dollar amounts are much closer to a normal distribution: Autonomy (\$1,000,000,000), FCS (\$192,000,000), Non Autonomy (\$180,000,000), and Non Football (\$178,000,000). In addition, Appendix P provides a comprehensive table of the institutional endowment total dollar value at the time the survey was completed.

National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO).

The 2016 Commonfund Institute study of endowments lists the current market value of U.S. and Canadian institutions as of fiscal year 2015. This is not a perfect match to the survey question: What is the current total dollar value of your overall institutional endowment? However, it can provide a comparative number to measure the accuracy of the survey responses and, in turn, provide evidence toward the likely accuracy of other responses and the overall validity of the survey. The NACUBO study provided information on over 800 higher education endowments. The survey had 142 responses to the institutional endowment question, and of those responses, 113 institutions were also in the NACUBO study.

Respondent reliability. To determine the respondent reliability, first, the difference between the NACUBO fiscal year 2015 number and the institutional

endowment survey was calculated. Second, the difference was divided back into the original survey response to create the percentage difference.

The respondent reliability analysis revealed that the mean percentage difference across institutions was a positive 7.53 percent. The largest positive difference was 371.07 percent, and the largest negative difference was -66.44 percent. Furthermore, the median calculation was a positive 0.20 percent. Taken together, the mild mean over-estimation is an interesting micro finding and provides evidence toward respondent reliability and trustworthiness for the survey responses. Next, I examine the ICA endowment survey findings.

Athletic. The athletic endowment data for the last fiscal year was also captured in the survey. Again, segmenting the institutions by football subdivisions provides a deeper level of analysis. Once more, the athletic endowment data varies slightly from the normal pattern of ICA resources because the Ivy League dramatically impacts the mean calculations. For example, the maximum institutional endowment in the FCS is \$250 million, and the next closest maximum athletic endowment is in the Autonomy group and is \$240 million. These maximum athletic endowments are much closer than institutional endowments and begin to highlight the importance of athletics at many institutions. Predictably, the athletic endowment means are led by the Autonomy group (\$56,930,000), the FCS (\$19,334,000) is next, followed by a large drop toward and switch in the final two subdivisions Non Football (\$6,404,000), and then Non Autonomy (\$4,000,000) institutions. This finding is surprising. Up until this point, Non Autonomy institutions have not ranked as the low subdivision in any category. One potential explanation may be that Non Autonomy schools do not have the luxury of pursuing

endowment gifts. Non Autonomy schools may be forced, more than other subdivisions, to spend cash now and fundraise for immediate cash projects to keep up with the perceived power conferences. As a result, they might be systematically increasing an already large divide within the upper echelon of Division I ICA.

In contrast, the median athletic endowment dollar amounts provide a different picture. The median results fall back into the normal pattern of football subdivision resources. Moreover, the median amounts reveal closer dollar amounts: Autonomy (\$35,000,000), Non Autonomy (\$4,000,000), FCS (\$ 3,388,000), and Non Football (\$1,750,000). Table 7 provides a more detailed comparison of athletic endowments segmented by football subdivision.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for ICA Current Endowments, by Subdivision

Football subdivision	N	Range (\$000)	Min. (\$000)	Maximum (\$000)	Mean (\$000)	Median (\$000)	Std. deviation (\$000)
Autonomy	39	\$239,381	\$619	\$240,000	\$56,930	\$35,000	\$63,504
Non Autonomy	34	\$42,000	\$12	\$42,000	\$6,014	\$4,000	\$7,805
FCS	30	\$250,000	\$0	\$250,000	\$19,334	\$3,388	\$48,320
Non Football	38	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000	\$6,404	\$1,750	\$11,181

Tangible benefits. Transactional philanthropy or tangible benefits are an important theme in the ICA philanthropic literature. As a result, the survey captured some of the Division I ICA benefits information. Insights from the survey revealed that 131 (60%) respondents offer no type of donor rewards or points for planned gifts. Moreover, it is important to note that some rewards are only small amounts of the normal points or rewards earned. One respondent stated, “We reward irrevocable gifts only for priority

points at \$.20 on the dollar.” Nevertheless, as planned giving continues to be trending up, the age planned gifts are pursued has also risen in prominence.

Age. The age that planned gifts are often pursued is littered with anecdotal evidence from practitioners. Therefore, the ICA philanthropy survey set out to provide evidence to an important strategic decision. The survey data revealed that two-thirds of respondents (148) pursue planned gifts between the ages of 50-69. In addition, 29 (13%) respondents identified a younger age range of either 30-39 (3%) or 40-49 (10%) highlighting a different strategic solution at some ICA development departments to pursue planned gifts at a younger age. Moreover, a potentially troubling finding emerged around the 33 (15%) respondents who “do not know” at what age they begin to pursue planned gifts within their ICA development department. This finding confirms an element of “seat of their pants” decision-making within ICA development. Table 8 presents the frequency and percentage of the distribution of the ages ICA development pursue planned gifts.

Table 8

Distribution of the Age that ICA Pursue Planned Gifts

Age range	Frequency	Percent
Do not know	33	15
20-29	1	0.5
30-39	6	2.7
40-49	23	10.4
50-59	74	33.5
60-69	74	33.5
70-79	8	3.6
80-89	1	0.5
90+	1	0.5
Total	220	100

Planned giving trends. Additionally, survey respondents were asked to share any observations about important trends related to planned gifts. One hundred and twenty respondents answered the open-ended question. The responses were coded, categorized, and the themes and salient examples are presented in Table 9. The major themes that emerged were: opportunity; collaboration; education; age; ask; benefits; legacy; ICA uncertainty; development officer constraints; and short-termism.

Table 9

Select Responses When Asked to Describe Trends in Planned Giving

Response category	Interviewee response
Opportunity	Planned giving is becoming a hot trend in development especially with the surge of baby boomers hitting retirement age This is much more of an emphasis area than it ever has been in the past. Commitments are starting to come.
Collaboration	I see an increased focus on this area when a campaign is in process - collaboration w/ campus advancement Our University Foundation has placed an increased emphasis on planned gifts during the last 5-7 years. I have found that many donors have already included our University or athletic department in their estate plan but have yet to document formally with us.
Education	We see that we have to educate our donors on ways to share their legacy. They don't immediately think about an estate gift and its lasting legacy.
Age	We are having discussions in the late 30's. Used to be late 40's and early 50's. We are being very assertive in raising our overall ask by making proposals blended - cash and future gift.
Ask	Train the major gift officers to always be asking with their prospects. Just ask if the university is in their will! Development Officers can't be afraid to ask for specific amounts when a donor indicates they have the university in their estate plan.
Benefits	Donors want benefits now for their gifts

	Alumni are much more willing to inform us of their intentions when they perceive incentive. We include irrevocable gifts to athletic initiatives in the point system for basketball seat selection, so alumni perceived that as a way to improve their seating location.
Legacy	Many want to leave a "legacy"
	Critical. Our donor base is aging. Need to find ways to secure their legacy
ICA Uncertainty	Donors with interest in making the gifts revocable (contingent on whether a sport is still in existence when they pass; concern for sports being dropped due to funding)
Development Officer Constraints	While we're happy to book planned gifts for all ages, in order to receive Campaign Credit, donors must have reached a certain age, therefore we don't steer those younger than that threshold towards planned giving, in an intentional manner
	At age 60 our development officers begin to get "credit" for booking a planned gift.
Short-termism	They aren't typically a priority in college athletics given the great pressure AD's and Coaches are under to win in the short term.

Hybrid Gift Characteristics

As a reminder, for the purpose of this study a hybrid gift combines both an immediate cash gift and some type of deferred gift. Furthermore, there are many different ways that a hybrid gift in this frame could be constructed.

Hybrid Gifts

In a general sense, 127 (58%) respondents had some familiarity with hybrid gifts. One hundred and forty-two (65%) survey respondents believe that the percentage of hybrid gifts secured have stayed the same or increased over the last three years. Additionally, 163 (75%) survey respondents expect that the percentage of hybrid gifts secured will increase or stay the same next year. These are important findings and suggest that hybrid gifts are trending upward.

Nevertheless and similar to planned gifts, donor rewards or points for hybrid gifts continue to lag. The survey data reveals that 114 (52%) of respondents do not offer any type of rewards for hybrid gifts. This finding showcases a potential misalignment between philanthropic trends and incentives within ICA philanthropy. In the next section, I examine the survey results of the hybrid-gift scale.

Hybrid-gift scale. The hybrid-gift scale is a multi-item Likert scale on ICA hybrid-gift development. The scale ranges were strongly agree (5), somewhat agree (4), neither agree nor disagree (3), somewhat disagree (2), strongly disagree (1), and do not know (0). Both collaboration (2.77) and intentionality (2.77) had the highest component mean scores, while securing irrevocable gifts from the younger donors' (1.9) scored the lowest. Yet, the securing irrevocable gifts from younger donors component had the most consensus with a 1.24 standard deviation score, while the success component had the least consensus with a 1.51 standard deviation. Moreover, the hybrid-gift scale had a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.93 for the seven variables, suggesting that the items have a relatively high internal consistency. In addition, a factor analysis was conducted to see the extent to which the components hung together. All seven of components and the total score made up factor one of the analysis, which explained 19.92 percent of the variance.⁶ Table 10 presents the complete list of individual mean scores and standard

⁶ A factor analysis was used in an effort to inform the construction of the hybrid-gift success scale. To conduct the factor analysis, the responses to the thirty-three questions from the ICA Philanthropy Survey were examined using principal components with a Varimax Kaiser Normalization rotation method to identify the underlying structure of the components. The analysis generated eight factors explaining 66.4 percent of the variance for the set of variables. Factor one was labeled hybrid-gift success indicators because of the high loadings by the following items: hybrid-gift scale total score, hybrid-gift success broadening pool of donors, hybrid-gift training, hybrid-gift success, hybrid-gift priority, hybrid-gift intentionality, hybrid-gifts creating irrevocable younger donors, and hybrid-

deviations; in addition, the hybrid gift total score is included, which is the average of the seven components that make up the hybrid-gift scale.

Table 10

Means and Standard Deviations for the Hybrid Gift (HG) Scale and its Seven Components

Components	Mean	Std. deviation
HG Training	2.74	1.48
HG Success	2.69	1.51
HG Broadening Pool of Impactful Donors	2.40	1.45
HG Securing Irrevocable Gifts from Younger Donors	1.90	1.24
HG Collaboration	2.77	1.46
HG Priority	2.24	1.35
HG Intentionality	2.77	1.49
HG Total Score	2.50	1.21
N = 221		

To continue with the deeper analysis within Division I ICA, Table 11 provides the hybrid gift total scores segmented by football subdivision. Again, unsurprisingly, the autonomy group had the highest average with a 2.93, while the Non Football institutions scored the lowest average with a 2.34. These differences could be expected, however, the max scores across football subdivision reveal unique variations and potential atypical findings. For example, one Non Autonomy institution scored a 4.86 and one Non Football institution scored a 4.71. These high aggregate scores are potential anomalies that are worthy of further investigation because they may reveal unique attributes or best practices that other ICA development departments can learn from.

gift collaboration. Factor one explained 19.9 percent of the variance. Appendix P presents the complete list of factor loadings with Varimax rotation for hybrid-gift development.

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics for the Hybrid Gift Scale, by Subdivision

Football subdivision	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
Autonomy	48	3.43	1.14	4.57	2.93	0.95
Non Autonomy	48	4.86	0	4.86	2.36	1.09
FCS	57	4.14	0	4.14	2.46	1.32
Non Football	68	4.71	0	4.71	2.34	1.29
Total	221	4.86	0	4.86	2.50	1.21

Hybrid-gift strategies. In addition, an open-ended question in this section that asked about the survey respondent's thoughts or additional comments concerning hybrid gift strategies or processes yielded 101 responses. These responses were coded, categorized, and patterns emerged into six major thematic areas: culture of philanthropy, strategic processes, collaboration, vehicle maximization, campaigns, and short-termism. Table 12 displays a representative selection of responses.

Table 12

Select Responses When Asked to Describe Hybrid Gift Strategies

Response category	Interviewee response
Culture of Philanthropy	We have conversations with every major gift prospect. Don't view it as a hybrid trajectory, but major gift trajectory with planned giving as an element when appropriate.
Strategic Processes	Hybrid gifts, as used in this context, are a requirement for our annual metrics as of 2016. So, in that respect they are certainly a priority and part of ongoing conversations. However, it's still new enough that we are feeling it out, especially with the under 50-year old crowd.
Collaboration	We are very integrated with upper campus on all 5+ Million prospects - so hybrid gifts across campus are not unusual

	The last two years we have worked more closely with a revamped planned giving office on campus that has become much more aggressive.
Vehicle Maximization	Hybrid or blended gifts truly help in raising the overall gift ask level.
Campaigns	When building a new basketball arena, hybrid gifts were a large part for any range of donors
Short-termism	The idea of the hybrid gift is somewhat of a new idea, especially since we are relatively young as a university and an athletics department...AD prefers cash now, because of budgetary needs now, so Development staff focuses on current use dollars

Hybrid-gift donor trajectories. Next, an open-ended question about what characteristics help identify a donor that is on a hybrid gift trajectory received 63 responses. The responses were coded and categorized into 12 major themes: loyalty, collaboration, age, capacity, long-termism, impact, creativity, passion, financially astute, liquidity, benefits, and communication. Table 13, displays a representative selection of responses.

Table 13

Select Responses When Asked to Describe Hybrid Gift Donor Trajectories

Response category	Interviewee response
Loyalty	Number of years giving an annual fund gift
	Major gift capability combined with strong annual giving history
Collaboration	Loyal annual donors, pattern of giving to multiple designations
	Working with other schools and combining endowment capital and annual all in one ask
Age	Younger, good career and career trajectory, passionate about athletics; Older with capacity, affinity for former coach or administrator/athletics in general, concerned that they may outlive their "nest egg".
Capacity	Current wealth screen, strong propensity to support athletics with a demonstrated capacity to give at a consistent level.

Long-termism	Ideally, it is someone that is very interested in the long-term sustainability of the ICA department. Our alumni are still very young (school founded in 19XX). If they believe in the long-term vision, speaking to them about giving now and in perpetuity is a dynamic option.
	Philanthropic and committed long-term to the university
	Someone who has an understanding of both the near and long-term cash needs of the organization.
Impact	Age and intent to fund immediately. Instant impact.
Creativity	A good candidate for a hybrid gift is someone who wants to do something big for the program but does not have the funding in hand so they have to be willing to be "creative" to attain their goal of making a major impact on the program.
Passion	Middle income, high passion
	Anyone with a passion for the school
Financially Astute	Business owners and those who are financially astute.
	Younger, more financially astute
Liquidity	A donor who has limited liquid assets but has substantial wealth in real estate or securities.
	Large net worth with a lower cash flow
Benefits	Donors wanting annual benefits and want to help long term yet not in a position to make a current major gift with cash
	Giving to multiple areas within athletics - must be athletics for points but have pulled in non-athletic funds to have one simple pledge for donors
Communication	Willingness to support, but demonstrated interest in multiple projects or unsure of their capability to support
	Their gift intent can generally provide some insight.
	Donors looking to endow something (scholarship, program, coach) seem to make good prospects for a hybrid ask as the designation for both parts of the gift can be the same.

Hybrid-gift trends. The final open-ended question asked respondents to share any observations they have had about important trends related to hybrid gifts. Fifty-two respondents provided data. Again, the responses were coded, categorized, and nine major themes emerged: opportunity, collaboration, communication, impact, creativity, vehicle

maximization, the ask, liquidity, and short-termism. Table 14, displays a representative selection of responses.

Table 14

Select Responses When Asked to Describe Hybrid Gift Donor Trends

Response category	Interviewee response
Opportunity	This is an emerging priority for this office
	In general, my sense is that sophisticated/complicated gifts are only going to increase over the years ahead. We need to be prepared to take advantage of those opportunities.
	It is a valuable tool. It has to be articulated in the right way but can help to maximize the donors giving potential.
Collaboration	Collaborative working towards the goal of the university
	Campus planned giving office was very progressive in outbound solicitations for hybrid gifts or deferred gifts
Communication	Major gift officers need to be trained to consult and educate donors about options, it's all about increasing communication to better educate the donors
	Great stewardship and discussing legacy remain critical and communicating how this approach works is key
	I think that once you have success with one or more of these types of gifts then you can use that experience (and the impact it had) in your discussions with other donors --- sharing success stories is always a good way to get donors to think about new ways of giving
	Donors love them - simplifies the process and brings unity to the University
Impact	People seem to like the idea as they can make a lasting impact both now and in the future
Creative	Need to find creative ways to encourage commitments of alumni, fans and friends. Grow current and future resources simultaneously.
	We have put the most effort into converting our planned givers to hybrid donors by asking them to activate their planned giving plans with a current endowment level gift to make it accessible so they can see their impact in their lifetime.
Vehicle Maximization	Serves as a 'door-opener' to discuss planned giving New gift vehicle for many to contribute but not completely release assets

Ask	They need to be asked for much more often than is currently being done.
	You don't get it if you don't ask.
	Blended gifts as we call them are great in theory, but I've found that they sometimes confuse/overwhelm the donor; we've been more inclined to secure a multi-year commitment and then go back and secure a legacy gift to endow it (or further endow it) as a separate solicitation
Liquidity	Pay attention to a donor's liquid assets and be prepared to have the discussion with donors who may have large assets with low liquidity.
Short-termism	Most institutions want the money now, versus bequests or deferred payments
	This again is important but we are also focused on immediate cash gifts

Inferential Analysis

Next, inferential statistics were used to further analyze the data; in particular, independent samples t-tests and analysis of variance (ANOVA) techniques. Throughout this work the $p \leq .05$ level was used for all hypothesis tests. The discussion now begins with the use of independent sample t-tests to test for differences across different types of institutions.

Independent sample t-tests. Table 15 displays the results of the independent samples t-test conducted to compare means of the *hybrid-gift scale total scores* between *private* and *public* institutions to determine if the two means are statistically the same. In conducting the first part of the analysis, the Levene test was not significant ($p = .599$); therefore, equal variance could be assumed. The second part of the test revealed that there was *not* a significant difference in scores between *public* (2.50) and *private* (2.49); $t(219) = .094$, $p = .925$. Thus, it can be determined that the means for *hybrid-gift scale total scores* across *institution type* are not statistically different. Therefore, the evidence shows

that there is no difference between public and private institutions in the mean of *hybrid-gift scale total scores*. This result helps illustrate a small counter-intuitive finding toward much of the literature and commonly held practitioner assumptions that suggest vast differences between institution type and ICA development. In short, within ICA hybrid-gift development, no significant difference between public and private institutions exist.

Table 15

Independent T-Test Analysis of Hybrid-Gift Total Score Means based on Institution Type

Institution type	N	Mean	Std. deviation	<i>t</i>	df	p
Public	148	2.5087	1.19688	0.094	219	.925
Private	73	2.4924	1.23271			

Note: $p \leq .05$

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Test. With the results of the independent samples t-test showing no significant difference between institution types and indicating a somewhat counter-intuitive result, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to further explore the differences of the hybrid-gift scale total scores by Division I ICA football subdivisions: *Autonomy*, *Non Autonomy*, *FCS*, and *Non Football*. The Levene test homogeneity of variance showed the groups to have equal variances; thus, allowing me to proceed with the analysis. Findings revealed a statistically significant difference of $F(3,217) = 2.785$, $p = .042$ among hybrid gift scale total mean scores based on football subdivision. Given this finding, I then ran a Least Significance Difference (LSD) Post-Hoc Test to determine which group mean hybrid gift scale scores differed from one another. As shown in Table 16, the *Autonomy* mean hybrid gift scale total score (2.93) was significantly higher than the mean hybrid gift scale scores for all the other groups:

Non Autonomy (2.36), *FCS* (2.86), and *Non Football* (2.71). Furthermore, there were no significant differences in mean hybrid gift scale total scores among the remaining groups.

Table 16

Mean Hybrid-Gift Scale Total Score Differences Based on Football Subdivision

Football subdivision	N	Mean	Std. deviation	*Significantly different from
Autonomy	48	2.93	0.95	All Groups
Non Autonomy	48	2.36	1.09	Autonomy
FCS	57	2.86	1.32	Autonomy
Non Football	68	2.71	1.29	Autonomy

* $p \leq .05$

Conclusion to the Chapter

In sum, the survey results produced a comprehensive overview of Division I ICA development. Furthermore, the survey data provides the first empirical evidence to help identify the characteristics of hybrid-gift development within Division I ICA. The patterns that emerged around hybrid gifts are consistent with what one might have expected to find in some respects and surprising in others. The expected themes consist of a culture of philanthropy, strategic processes, education, collaboration, communication, age, passion, and impact. However, the more surprising findings centered on a few individual institutional high hybrid-gift scale scores outside of the Autonomy football subdivision and, also, the tensions that exist between the short- and long-term benefits of ICA philanthropy. Further—and perhaps most importantly—the findings signify an important upward trend and a large opportunity for hybrid gifts to increase in the future across all of Division I ICA. And, finally, the findings and analysis of the survey data clearly identifies a typical (an autonomy or “Power Five” institution) and an atypical (an institution outside of an autonomy or “Power Five” institution)

institutions within ICA hybrid-gift development. This finding will be explored in depth in the next chapter to help better understand and explain the nuance and complexity that the ICA philanthropy survey revealed about Division I ICA hybrid-gift development.

CHAPTER FIVE: CASE STUDIES FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the findings and analysis of the data collected in phase two of this mixed-methods study. The qualitative findings of this chapter and the explanatory sequential design of the study help to better understand the results of the quantitative survey examined in chapter four (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). This chapter, therefore, presents two qualitative comparative case studies that are intended to provide depth and context to the quantitative Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) Philanthropy Survey findings. The following research question guides the chapter: What does an in-depth examination of hybrid-gift development reveal about hybrid gift giving in Division-I ICA programs that the answers to Question 1 suggest are both typical and atypical?

In reality, however, both case studies showed both typical and atypical findings. No one ICA department is exactly the same; rather, all face similar and unique challenges within their ICA development. In that mindset, it makes sense to expect both overlap and variation in the strategies of ICA hybrid-gift development. These two case studies present evidence that both similar and unique strategies exist within successful ICA hybrid-gift development. As a result, determining what is typical and atypical becomes troublesome, if not impossible. Instead, the elements that prove problematic, in the end, create the foundation for richer and more meaningful findings. Together the two case studies provide evidence toward two different, yet successful paths of ICA hybrid-gift development.

The focus for this chapter is the comprehensive presentation of the two comparative case studies. Initially, the chapter begins by describing the selection process used to select the sites for the case studies. Then the organization of the case studies and

the inter-coder reliability are discussed. Following this the Great Lake University (GLU) case study is presented. Subsequently, the Ocean State University (OSU) case study is presented. Finally, the two case studies are compared for both similar and unique attributes.

Selection of the Case Studies

The case study locations were chosen because of a variety of reasons. Although my original intent was to study a typical and atypical institution based on the results of the survey, in practice this proved difficult. However, the survey results determined what institutional type was perceived as typical, a Power Five institution because of their popularity and high levels of resources, and what was perceived as atypical, a Non Football institution and their smaller media exposure and limited resources.

Within this survey framework, the selection process began by examining those institutions that were successful at ICA hybrid gift development. Importantly, the responses to the hybrid-gift scale on the ICA philanthropy survey presented in chapter four were examined. The two case study sites were both in the top six total hybrid-gift scale scores for all Division I institutions. Second, their qualitative open-ended survey responses were coded, analyzed, and deemed to represent the early emerging themes. Third, both institutions responded that they would be willing and available for follow-up questions at the end of the survey. Fourth, the locations were close enough to help ensure a somewhat cost efficient research study. Fifth and finally, insider research⁷ site locations

⁷ Insider research is when the researcher is either a student and/or works at the institution where the study was conducted (Proper & Caboni, 2014).

were eliminated because it was identified as a limitation in the academic literature review surrounding ICA philanthropy.

For the purposes of confidentiality, both institutions that participated in the case studies will be referred to with pseudonyms. As such, the Autonomy institution was Great Lake University (GLU), and the Non Football institution was Ocean State University (OSU).

As a point of clarification, both case study locations used the term blended gift to describe what this study refers to as a hybrid gift. I continue to use the phrase hybrid gift but leave the interviewee's language choices to capture the integrity of their statements. Therefore, in this chapter, hybrid gifts and blended gifts are often used interchangeably.

Organization of Case Studies

The two cases begin with overviews that include descriptive and demographic information, along with a brief history of the ICA department and development. Further, the ICA data was obtained from the U.S. Department of Education, Equity in Athletics Data Analysis (EADA) website, document analysis, the institutional website, and the ICA website.

After the ICA descriptions, the data described in the case studies emerged from interviews. The procedures used to conduct these case studies were provided in detail in Chapter 3 of this dissertation. However, as a reminder, various key stakeholders were interviewed for each case study. For example, the Athletic Director, senior level ICA development director, various ICA development staff, institutional advancement personnel, donors, and one institution's president were all interviewed. The interviews followed semi-structured interview guides where each participant was asked the same

questions depending on whether they were a practitioner or donor. The guides and process were purposively adaptive to allow new information to emerge and be discussed. Every interview but one, with a donor, was done in person. The one donor that was not interviewed in person was done over the phone during the site visit. The case studies themselves are organized around the interview questions, which became the commonsensical codes initially used to identify the categories, patterns, and themes that emerged in the coding process.

Inter-Coder Reliability

Inter-coder reliability attempts to measure if multiple coders code the same data the same way (Campbell, Quincey, Osserman, & Pedersen, 2013). Unfortunately, no agreed upon number of coders or exact threshold exists within semi-structured interviews (Campbell et al., 2013). As a result, I used the simple proportion agreement method because of the number of codes I used (21), the unitization of the text, and the exploratory nature of the study. All of which, Kuraski (2000) determined was practical and appropriate for validating conclusions from open-ended interview data. Moreover, the two additional inter-coders both have a Ph.D., are qualitative researchers, and are not originally from the United States and, therefore, had limited previous knowledge about American ICA.

In this study, the proportion method produced an impressive 86 percent level of agreement. The two other capable coders and I explicitly agreed on the code 93 out of 108 units of text across three separate interviews. According to Campbell et al. (2013), this level of inter-coder reliability is relatively high. Appendix R contains the inter-coder codes and Appendix S is a sample of the interview text unitization.

Case Study 1

Description of Great Lake University (GLU)

Great Lake University (GLU) was established in the mid-nineteenth century and is a Midwest state's flagship, land-grant University. The total enrollment at GLU was approximately 50,000 in the fall of 2016. White students made up 64 percent of enrollment. International students made up 13 percent, Asian students 9 percent, and Black students 5 percent. These percentages have remained relatively unchanged over the past five years. This demographic profile contrasts with the Midwest state that GLU resides in, where 81 percent of the population was White, 6 percent Black, and 5 percent Asian.

Great Lake University overview. Athletically, GLU operates as a Division I ICA Autonomy institution and within what is commonly referred to as a "Power Five" conference. Currently, GLU has over 900 Student-Athletes that compete on 20 plus ICA teams. In the fiscal year 2014-15, the revenue and expenses for the GLU ICA department were nearly identical as both were well over \$100 million with an additional nearly \$7 million of institutional support. According to USA Today, this places GLU in top 20 for ICA financial support. Within ICA development, GLU has 12 full-time equivalent employees: five major-gift officers, two annual fund staff, one director of donor relations, one campaign coordinator, one premium seating and events director, and one administrative assistant. Additionally, three interns support the full-time staff.

The ICA staff operates within a decentralized model at GLU. Essentially, the ICA development staff has a dotted line of reporting to the GLU institutional foundation or what is commonly referred to as the intuitional advancement office. The GLU foundation

provides one holistic philanthropic voice for the institution. Moreover, it is important to note, that GLU ICA is in the middle of a large capital campaign. As a result, one ICA administrator said, “There has been a real shift across the board in athletics, facilities are the big move right now. Everybody wants the best, big new facilities, so we really got in the way of the endowments.”

Many of GLU’s ICA development metrics fall within the middle of the pack for Division I Autonomy programs. Last year, GLU had 12,000 annual fund donors and 78 major-gift donors at or above \$50,000 each. In total, GLU had an ICA development budget of \$10.5 million and raised \$38 million, however, that total was below their goal of the year of \$60 million. Furthermore, the GLU institutional endowment’s market value is at \$700 million and the GLU ICA endowment is \$30 million. And finally, GLU scored a 4.43 on the hybrid gift scale total score on the ICA philanthropic survey. To reiterate, this score was calculated as an aggregate score, with five being the high, for a multi-item Likert scale measuring hybrid gift success. GLU’s score of 4.43 was the second highest score within the Autonomy subdivision and sixth highest in all of Division I ICA.

Great Lake University athletic history. Great Lake University (GLU) has a rich and celebrated ICA history. It has won over 20 national championships and over 200 conference championships. That being said, scandals, allegations, and negative media attention have muddled the GLU regional and national brand. Further, recent changes across a number of key ICA positions have created uncertainty and volatility. To reinforce the importance of ICA leadership, one development professional at GLU put it this way, “Donors give to the institution and the leader. It's both.” Recent changes have complicated elements in the ICA development process. In addition, a few new facilities

and a large ongoing capital project and campaign have narrowed the focus within ICA development. One ICA administrator put it simply, “Money isn’t the most important thing, but it’s right behind oxygen.” Another ICA administrator described the current environment as “Money in the door, money out the door.” Nevertheless, ICA remains a crucial element of philanthropy at the GLU campus. One GLU Foundation administrator said:

Athletics is an extremely important element to our philanthropy because...athletics is a place where [donors] can belong in a whole different way than if they give to scholarships or if they give to research. Athletics is about engagement.

These elements add up to create a complex ICA development ecosystem at GLU. The essence of the GLU ICA philanthropic process emerges from its growing culture of philanthropy.

Culture of Philanthropy

The culture of philanthropy at GLU has a strong tradition of fundraising. It was started relatively late compared to like institutions, but it has ramped up its effectiveness recently. Various interviewees referred to the culture of philanthropy as mission centered and donor-focused. One ICA administrator described the GLU culture of philanthropy as: “Missioned centered is we are a land grant university with a core mission of forming better people and making new discoveries and society and that is how we were formed. At the same time donor-centered or donor-focused.”

The culture is built on the concept that the donor comes first. This donor driven philosophy reveals itself in the everyday actions of many ICA development staff. For

example, one ICA development officer said, “Cultivate (donors) for who they are—not who we are.” This is a subtle but important nuance to the GLU ICA development approach. The relational focus goes beyond simple rhetoric or department slogans. It is ingrained into the GLU ICA development process and has helped engender a culture beyond the common transactional elements often associated with ICA philanthropy. For example in the past, a small donation for better seats at a football game was the norm, however, recent ideological shifts have moved away from quid pro quo giving toward a more relational and longer-term approach.

In addition, the culture of philanthropy surrounding ICA at GLU has created a level of expectation surrounding philanthropy. Both donors and ICA development staff spoke toward a sense of expectation to give back and give at significant amounts. One ICA administrator stated, “I think for most of our high-level donors, those people that have given a lot, there is some expectation that down the line we will be having an estate planning discussion with them.” The expectation to give is a critical element in generating a vibrant culture of philanthropy. One GLU Foundation administrator stated that “philanthropy really now covers how are you going to get from good to great. We call it the margin of excellence.” That same foundation administrator said it simply, “Donations are the life bread for athletics [at GLU].

Strategic Process

A strategic approach to GLU ICA hybrid gift development was on display across the ICA development department. For example, the ICA development department recently surveyed its donors who donated \$500 or more, of which, ICA has approximately 12,000 donors. The survey received a 25% response rate. Moreover, the

strategic approach for GLU ICA development focuses on education, communication, authentic relationships, a long-term view, and incentives. In the next few sections, I examine each focus area in detail.

Education. The education surrounding ICA development was an area of importance for GLU philanthropy and their ICA development. However, for the scope of this study, the focus will be on ICA hybrid-gift education. Here at GLU, the education surrounding ICA hybrid gifts is twofold but rather than being binary, the education is intermixed and overlaps in that: 1) ICA development officers need to be educated about the role, flexibility, incentives, and processes available to construct hybrid gifts, and 2) donors need to be educated about hybrid gifts.

Development-officer education. The ICA development staff has a strong foundation of hybrid-gift education, but some ICA development professionals are more comfortable asking for hybrid gifts than others. One Foundation administrator stated, “I worry a little bit sometimes that some of them (ICA development officers) don't use it (deferred gifts) as much as much as they could.” To improve, one staff member within ICA development has been tasked with the lead for planned and hybrid gifts. That ICA development officer provides the ICA development staff with bimonthly planned giving prospect updates, specific planned giving tips, and receives case study instruction regularly. Also, one ICA administrator stated, “we have opportunities to go to the brown bag lunches from the estate planning office to get the most recent professional development and sharpen the saw.” These activities help educate the ICA development staff and generate a collaborative relationship with the university foundation. One ICA development officer spoke about the development officer education by saying, “I am

probably doing a better job of leading with it in my conversations [with donors], I talk about the blended gift more often I maybe didn't do that initially in my development career.”

However, through the course of the interviews, some contradictory approaches and thought processes emerged around hybrid gifts. For example, one ICA development administrator said, “the blended gift has really been something that has been kind of crafted for development and mainly, in my opinion, for campaigns and the public side of it.” Additionally, the misalignment of incentives in the hybrid-gift process, for both donors and development officers, the illusion of expertise required, and the seemingly ever-present anecdotal evidence of a planned gift resulting in a halt to future giving remain intuitive and high mental hurdles for some ICA development personnel.

Donor education. Donors require a more comprehensive—yet, simplified—educational approach toward hybrid gifts. Currently, GLU provides a number of planned giving educational opportunities and materials, e.g., planned giving bookmarks, advertisements in institutional publications, mailings, and the occasional event. However, no specific hybrid-gift education is available. GLU administrators, both at the institutional and ICA level, believe further education would help enlighten and demystify the process. Simple donor tips and stories help connect the dots and can create more impactful gifts for an ICA development unit that already secures a strong number of hybrid gifts. Nevertheless, it is important to recognize, as one GLU foundation administrator said, “Nobody is ever inspired by a CRT (Charitable Remainder Trust).” Education alone does not work; rather, education needs to be complimented with effective and inspirational communication.

Communication. The GLU ICA development strategic approach for communications is multi-layered. First, it is inspirational. The communication from ICA development attempts to tell stories that connect to donor's passions. And, GLU ICA development believes that investing in Student-Athletes is a great story to tell. Second, the communication is collaborative. Great Lake University ICA works to find the best communication strategies, rather than the easy alternative. For instance, the GLU foundation and ICA development work well together to tell their joint stories. And, third, the communication for hybrid gifts in ICA is intentionally de-siloed and co-marketed. For example, ICA and the foundation for the annual fund and planned giving communicate with donors together rather than separately.

Inspiration. The power of the communication elements surrounding hybrid gifts within GLU ICA emerges from the intentional inspiration that is generated from the relational and donor driven culture of philanthropy. Often, ICA hybrid gifts have the capacity to inspire donors in new and different ways. The communication with hybrid-gift donors reveals how donors can connect passion and legacy through a hybrid gift structure. The inspiration helps motivate donors to make a more powerful impact and connect the donors to a deeper understanding of the purpose underlying their philanthropy. The hybrid gift structure fosters a new and immediate impact. One ICA development officer, for example, said, "I'm trying to set the bar extremely high and to challenge [donors], and make them part of it. We have got to get them inspired." Another ICA administrator stated, "Donors don't give to needs, they give to inspiration, and so the role of our development community is to tell the story...that our donors can understand and get them excited about funding the inspiration and the impact."

Collaboration. The collaboration for the GLU ICA development is woven into the mission, culture, and processes of the department. However, in regard to hybrid gifts, it is perhaps most relevant to the strategic communication of the hybrid-gift process, and although it is currently done well, there are clear areas to improve.

The inter- and intra-office collaboration is an asset at GLU ICA development. Many ICA staffers spoke of the teamwork and strong collaborations within the office. For example, some in ICA development have expertise in planned giving and are often available to help construct hybrid gifts. One ICA administrator stated that “our team...is going to maximize the opportunity and a blended gift and a commitment to a blended gift now is better than working [with a donor] over multiple conversations.” The intra-office teamwork helps generate faster, more efficient, and more meaningful hybrid-gift construction.

Further, the communication with the GLU foundation was also repeatedly referenced in collaboration. One ICA development officer stated, “We work closely with our estate planning office.” Another ICA administrator said, “Overall since I have been here, there has been a good collaboration between us and the foundation.” That being said, some interviewees spoke toward gaps in the collaborative process and areas where the hybrid gift process could even improve.

The major area of improvement within the collaborative hybrid-gift process centers upon early collaboration with the GLU foundation planned giving experts. One GLU Foundation administrator emphasized the importance of early collaboration stating:

I find that blended gift plan gifts are most successful when you bring in the planned giving officer fairly early on in the conversation, so that we

can help [the ICA development officer] think about how the donor might be able to achieve their goals if they can't do it all up front now, and that we can help give ideas or strategize about ways you might want to approach the donor, things you might want to even present to them, so bringing us in early I think helps in the strategizing.

Further, early collaboration is not a new revelation. Instead, GLU recognizes it as a potential philanthropic space to improve and has made corrective action. For example, ICA now has an in-house planned giving lead but even more strides can be taken. For example, a GLU Foundation administrator stated:

We always try to bring the estate plan in as part of the early on meetings to introduce it. And I think it is probably the biggest error in development is that we overlook it and I think we say that we are going to do it and I don't know that we can consistently do it, but for us, we have got to. We can do a better job.

Another GLU Foundation administrator reiterated a similar sentiment saying,

That if we (planned giving officers) were involved more in strategizing it might be helpful for [ICA development officers] in some instances to increase the size of the gift through a blended gift... [ICA development officers] are all really well intentioned, but I would like to work with them more.

In short, the collaboration in communication is a vital piece of GLU's ICA hybrid-gift process, and even though it is working well, GLU recognizes that there are still areas of growth within hybrid gift development.

Co-marketing. Another element of GLU ICA hybrid gift development encompasses an element of communication through marketing, or more specifically, co-marketing. In essence, GLU ICA has a coordinated co-marketing approach to both educate and communicate with hybrid-gift prospective donors through an overlapping and nested approach between the GLU Foundation, ICA, and within ICA; for instance, annual fund and ticket sale marketing often have planned giving information available. This integrated marketing provides an opportunity for one philanthropic voice and also creates a number of new leads for planned and hybrid gifts. One GLU foundation administrator explained that “Half of all future [deferred] gifts come in by marketing alone, it is not a conversation you're having with someone.” The subtle inclusion of planned giving possibilities in annual fund and ticket solicitations is an important detail to highlight the importance of co-marketing. In addition, this helps create opportunities for more hybrid-gifts. Breaking down the silos of donors in the ICA development—e.g., a season ticket holder, a low-level annual fund donor, a mid-level donor, a former Student-Athlete, a planned-gift donor, or a major-gift donor—helps begin to remove some of the mental hurdles for both ICA development officers and potential hybrid gift donors to be able to visualize how a larger hybrid gift can be constructed. In essence, GLU ICA tries to package annual giving opportunities with deferred options through strategic co-marketing to generate more hybrid gifts.

Authentic relationships. Beyond education and communication, GLU ICA also strategically promotes an authentic relationship approach to philanthropy and hybrid-gift development. One senior ICA administrator said,

The key word is authentically, can you develop honest authentic match points...then they start making gifts towards that, right. So, we found their touch points, so everybody has different touch points why they want to be engaged with the department, I think you learn those touch points by developing those authentic relationships and it can't be fake.

For example, one ICA administrator spoke about the importance that ICA development officers, “Go to them.” In essence, ICA development officers need to go see donors on “their home territory.” This helps provide the scaffolding for an authentic relationship to develop. In addition, there are no shortcuts to authentic relationships with donors. An ICA administrator said it requires “breakfast, lunch, and dinner with donors and just developing those relationships.” Another ICA administrator stated,

When I’m at the office I’m doing other people’s work; when I’m out of the office I’m doing my work. So as often as possible I try to stay in that 60 to 70 percent time of visiting a donor, following up on a donor visit, doing the next steps on the prospect that is necessary.

However, it is not simply about getting out of the office and going to see donors. Instead, it is also critical to acknowledge, as one ICA administrator said, “Every prospect, every relationship, every person’s story is unique and different, and you can’t come in with a cookie-cutter.” An ICA hybrid donor put it simply, “it’s all about the relationships and following up and making people feel they’re making a difference.”

It is hardly surprising that relationships are a critical element to hybrid-gift development at GLU ICA, however, it is enlightening to discover that GLU ICA strategically pursues and try to develop relationships at an authentic level through a

sophisticated and practical approach of going to donors while acknowledging the uniqueness of every relationship.

Long-term view. Additionally, GLU ICA development uses a long-term perspective to develop more effective hybrid-gifts. A GLU Foundation administrator stated that “What we hope to do [at GLU] is work with our donors over their lifetime, and graduate and evolve their giving to where they stand with their wealth; we never look at a donor as one and done.” This is an important distinction to the often-transactional nature of some ICA giving. And, within the long-term perspective, the concept of re-cultivation emerged as another critical strategic attribute.

Re-cultivation. Great Lake University strategically re-cultivates or re-asks many donors to increase or activate their gifts. Most often, pledged planned-gift donors are re-approached. For instance, one ICA administrator said:

The other thing we are trying to do is to flip it where based on the good stewardship of the estate planned gift, we can get back to where we can say, well, maybe you can increase or do some more current cash gifts.

This re-cultivation is important insight into the successful pursuit of hybrid-gift development at GLU ICA. One senior ICA administrator stated:

As you develop that relationship they start to see who you are...then they would talk about second and third gifts and in my experience...we started to have those second and third conversations that is when you started to see more blended gifts, because I think everybody understood the importance of cash now to help with facilities or to help with certain needs

but then they also saw the importance of leaving that lasting impact on the department once they were gone.

Re-cultivation creates a continually growing donor pool of potential hybrid-gift prospects. Through re-cultivation, every donor becomes a potential hybrid gift donor for GLU ICA.

Incentives. The incentives surrounding hybrid-gifts within GLU ICA are a window into a complicated system for ICA development officers and donors. Overall, hybrid gifts are both incentivized and disincentivized. For ICA development officers, the total of a hybrid gift counts toward their annual goals or metrics, but hybrid gifts do not count toward the current campaign total for GLU ICA. One ICA administrator said, “They (hybrid gifts) kind of are overshadowed, they kind of took a back seat in the campaign...in terms of our priority.” As a result, ICA development officers can often feel like they have to apologize for securing a large hybrid gift because such a focus is on the cash now element of the ICA campaign. In addition, hybrid-gift donors do receive gift credit within the current ICA point system. One ICA administrator said, “A lot of those point systems don't recognize these type of gifts, they recognize cash in hand.” In that regard, GLU ICA is unique and trendsetting. Beyond the hybrid gift reward system integration, GLU ICA donors will soon have the option to receive customized donor experiences and naming recognition.

Customized experiences. A formal customized experience reward system and engagement initiative is a new element within GLU ICA rewards systems. In fact, it is so new that was only released in the winter of 2017. In the past, these types of customized experiences were ad hoc or, at best, annual. Yet, now a more robust system will allow

donors to customize their own reward experience and ICA will be able to meaningful celebrate their loyalty and investment in GLU ICA. For instance, instead of qualifying for a certain tier of donor perks, a donor can forgo some rewards to pool benefits toward more meaningful experiences and passions. One ICA administrator said,

Let them (hybrid gift donors) customize their experience, their opportunities to create better engagement points, more memorable experiences...they create more of a connection with our product, which, in turn, then will continue to drive them to be involved with us.

One ICA hybrid-gift donor stated,

I think it is really neat these experiential things like a trip...I got to take my grandson down in the tunnel when the team came out, and that was lovely because he is getting bigger now and he is not going to be interested later, and that was a good experience to do that. I love the experiences with my grandkids.

In the past rewards are often a one-size-fits-all approach, but GLU ICA is offering new and exciting strategic opportunities to celebrate donors.

Recognition. The recognition associated with hybrid giving is also a strategic choice at GLU ICA. Although, many of the recognition hybrid gift levels remain in flux as norms are still emerging. One ICA administrator stated,

A trend that is going this way [is] how do you recognize the people who have given you cash but on the back they are going to give you an additional gift once they are gone. You have to somehow figure out a way to recognize what they are doing on the back end too to keep that

engagement process going, because while they are still with you, they can continue to still give you cash, right, but you want to keep them engaged but you want to be respectful of that back end gift too.

Another ICA administrator connected the complicated elements in naming opportunities through hybrid gifts by saying,

The other thing we are looking at a lot more lately is naming opportunities and doing a combination of outright giving now and then a portion of it being able to be deferred, and we are still refining how much of that needs to be up front and how much of that can be deferred, but I think that is also something for folks who are interested in naming rights, where they can have something named after them and not have to pay the full amount up front, but provide some support up front knowing that the balance will come in at the back end. We are seeing more of that in hybrid gift areas as well.

In short, incentives for both ICA development officers and donors combined with customized experiences and donor recognition provide GLU ICA with a fairly robust system of hybrid gift incentives.

Intentionality. Finally, within the strategic framework for hybrid-gift development GLU ICA development intentionally pursues hybrid gifts. Even in the face of a constant overshadowing capital campaign, GLU ICA prioritizes hybrid gifts. One senior ICA administrator said, “We just put a bigger focus on it.” Another ICA administrator said, “We have to be strategic and intentional by going in with a plan and a strategy to ask for...the blended gift.” In fact, some ICA development officers have

started leading with hybrid gift asks. This is a jolting finding and counter-intuitive to many development practitioners who would never start an ask with a hybrid gift. In the past, hybrid gifts were often only thought of as trump cards or fallback plans. One ICA administrator, for example, said:

I will lead with a million dollars proposal, and then they will come back and say, you know often times they will say, ‘I don’t know if we can do that,’ that is when you want to start talking about, well this is how maybe we can be a little bit creative with it, this is how we can approach this gift...Other people go in there with a blended gift proposal because they have got a really good sense that John and Jane Smith just can’t pull off a million in their lifetime.

Furthermore, post campaign GLU ICA expect hybrid gifts to become even more of an emphasis.

In sum, the strategy surrounding hybrid gift development at GLU ICA represents a robust and complex approach. Within that strategy, GLU ICA provides an adaptive and mostly unified outlook toward hybrid gift development.

Hybrid Gifts

Beyond a strategic approach, hybrid gift development within GLU ICA revealed a number of key elements. Many of the attributes were difficult to untangle and often overlapping. However, to better understand hybrid gifts I analyzed the intricacies of the process because as one ICA hybrid gift donor stated they see ICA development with a “significant movement toward blended gifts.”

The next few sections showcase some of the most salient components of the GLU ICA hybrid gift development. First, I describe hybrid gifts as a trend. Next, I discuss hybrid gifts as a specific tool. And, finally, I examine a few GLU ICA opportunities surrounding hybrid gifts.

Trend. The newness of hybrid gifts was a consistent theme for many interviewees. One ICA development officer, for example, said, “I think that these blended gifts are somewhat fairly new. I don’t think a lot of folks put two and two together.” Another ICA administrator alluded to misalignment of some internal incentives, but recognizes the power of hybrid gift construction and said,

So for us we are trying hard to make this a priority, and if you're a development officer, when it comes to just straight metrics, I mean we are not just here to hit our nut and hit our target but...I'm going to use every bullet I can, any option, any opportunity I can.

Further, one ICA hybrid-gift donor stated,

I think that is a brilliant move that the university has moved into that (hybrid gift) space, and I don’t know who came up with the idea or whatever, but basically I just heard the idea within the last year or year and a half and that really works because then you get people tied into the legacy and you get a bigger gift.

Many interviewees expressed similar thoughts, but one ICA senior administrator put it concisely and in a transferable lens by saying, “I think the blended piece is going to be continuing to be a big solution in the future for helping nonprofits.”

The trendiness of hybrid gifts also provides space for skeptical understanding of hybrid gifts. One ICA development officer, for example, said,

Every donor that you have can always do a blended gift...the blended gift has really been something I think that has been kind of crafted for development, and mainly for, in my opinion, for campaigns and the public side of it. Because I think if someone is in a situation to get a blended gift, you have a donor who has a capacity to give a gift and then have the affiliation to do an estate gift. You don't make someone do an estate gift. They have to love the place; they have to want to have a legacy. So, the planned gift is something different all in itself.

This skeptical understanding of hybrid gifts is perhaps warranted in some regards when pledged planned gifts are publically announced and counted in campaigns, which is not the case at GLU. However, this statement also provides evidence that more internal education for ICA development staff needs to take place to better understand the impact and use of hybrid gifts as a philanthropic tool.

Tool. The hybrid gift operates as a unique and flexible tool in gift construction. A hybrid gift provides a donor with a vehicle to see the fruits of the gift while a donor is still alive. One ICA administrator, for example, described hybrid gifts by saying,

I love them. I love them because I think they are such a wonderful story to be able to talk about. Hey, what better way to leave a legacy than to leave an estate gift and so here you can do something now, it might be a little bit less than what you want, but wow, you can really swing the bat in a big way with the estate gift and make that legacy gift in that.

Further, when talking about when to use a hybrid gift ask, one ICA development officer said, “I wanted to kind of hold that as a kind of a trump card if I have to go there.” One GLU Foundation officer stated, “A blended gift for us is a tool in the tool box.” The flexibility and adaptability of the hybrid gift provide a valuable tool for ICA development officers to create more opportunities for bigger and more meaningful gifts.

Opportunity. Hybrid gifts provide a number of opportunities for GLU ICA development. One ICA development officer said,

We really began to recognize this is going to be a very important strategy and very intentional on our part, and even though for the past three years we have been embedded in a really large campaign, it still has to be a part of our conversations, even though it doesn't really count towards the campaign. It does provide us an opportunity.

Hybrid gifts provide a number of opportunities, and, in the following sections, I examine four: a stretch technique, not giving up the airplane, leaving money on the table, and elevated partnerships.

Stretch technique. Hybrid gifts are a way for GLU ICA development to creatively challenge donors to give more. One ICA development officer said, “I use them (hybrid gifts) quite a bit, and in terms of stretching people to make a bigger gift, it is a really valuable tool.” Yet another ICA administrator said, “I think it is a way to create both a gift that can be impactful now and impactful in the future and push people a little bit to do a little more.” Finally, another ICA administrator added, “A blended gift with some deferred elements is just a fantastic way to increase the generosity and be more

donor kind of focused, and leverage out the size of the gift.” Hybrid gifts can push donors to do more.

Here is an example from an ICA development officer describing a cultivation with a donor over a lunch—that, also, includes leadership—and highlights the importance of the stretch capacity of a hybrid gift:

I said I think you're a leader, and I think that you're all about leadership and that we are going to talk to you today about a leadership gift. He says what does leadership look like? I said it looks like a million dollars to me. And he almost choked on his salad, and he started to laugh. So, he says, so that is what leadership is...He ended up doing [it]. He said, here is what we are going to do, we are going to do a half a million in cash, and a half a million in an estate. That is how I can be a leader for you. And that is what he did. So, if not for the blended gift we would have been struggling to get 5 hundred but we got a million. And he, in turn, will probably do more now because I think he has told me once, he has told me 20 times, he said when you hit me with the word leadership he said it was over, he said that was over when you used that word because he said I do take great pride in wanting to be a leader and he said, but you called me on it. And, he said, good for you.

The combination of an immediate and a deferred gift is powerful for both donors and ICA development officers. Another ICA development administrator stated, “It can be kind of a scary thing to think about really, it is a big number to swallow or it seems like a really complicated process, you have to meet with an attorney and all of this, [but] it is

not all that complicated.” In short, hybrid gifts have helped GLU ICA donors increase their generosity while also minimizing some large gift sticker shock.

Don't have to give up the airplane. Some administrators at the GLU Foundation and within ICA development spoke about the initial shock that some donors have when they are asked to donate a large financial gift. Often times, donors want to make a meaningful impact, but, at the same time, not lose their quality of life. One GLU Foundation administrator told the story,

And one of my favorites is, you know I don't want to give so much that I have to give up my airplane, they have other things that they want to do and use the money for and that is clearly just a high net worth person, but everybody has competing interests so if you present it to them whereas something they could start a scholarship fund now, and just pay the annual rate for the donor, but then be able to endow that as permanent, for the scholar, and endow it as a permanent legacy, then it allows the donor to accomplish what it is that they want to accomplish in a way that is more comfortable for them during their lifetime and doesn't feel to them like it is such a scary thing. You know to meet that minimum endowment level, for a lot of people can feel a little bit scary but if instead you say, well you can begin to pay for a scholarship during your lifetime, get to meet the scholar, get to enjoy seeing the benefit of your philanthropy and then provide for an endowment once you pass away. It is a very appealing idea for a lot of people who maybe want to do something, but just feel that they can't afford it yet.

Hybrid gifts ease some of the tensions for donors about giving large gifts. Moreover, hybrid gifts provide the opportunity to operate as a bridge toward making a significant gift while allowing donors to continue their lifestyle.

Leaving money on the table. Leaving money on the table is another way to examine the re-cultivation opportunity hybrid-gift development creates. The deferred gifts or elements of gifts, especially, from donors that gave hybrid gifts at younger ages allow opportunities to re-ask and potentially increase the size of some hybrid gifts. One GLU Foundation administrator, for example, said,

Yeah, I think you know we just had a situation occur last month that was very insightful for me to get back with the team that to your point whether it was done on the first go round or just happen, we were meeting with a high capacity donor who has a number of endowments with us, and so we wanted to take them through transactionally what has happened both in terms of their giving as well as the greater return and all of that. And as we tried to give them the full picture in terms of what they have given to the university, when we gave him the number he was surprised at how large it was, and then when we gave him the report that showed all of the different categories that he gave, he went ah-hah, he said do you have a two and a half million dollar deferred gift here? He said quite honestly I don't even remember doing that because he has been engaged with us for so long. And two, he said gosh I'm just going to be meeting with my estate lawyers in a couple of weeks to re-do that amount, and so it was an *ah-hah* moment for me that you know we had booked an estate gift with him a

number of years ago and enough years ago he didn't remember and we were missing out on this opportunity that he was going to give us more. And so it was one of these key things on this blended gift that are we paying attention enough to the different components of them. Sometimes we pay so much attention to the current piece that we forgot the on the book piece on the deferred gift to go back to the donor and say, wow your wealth has increased since the time that you have done this, is this deferred piece representative of what you intend to do? I said oh my god, we are leaving, sorry in my world, money on the table. Shouldn't we be going back to our high capacity donors or even any of our donor and seeing what we booked as a deferred gift and seeing if that is still representative given people's wealth creation over a decade or two since we have talked to them about it? It sounds kind of basic but that was the insight.

Another ICA development officer said, “And so all of the ones that I have seen that got re-done, typically, we are going to increase our estate gift to you...So, that is a benefit of catching someone early.” One more ICA administrator stated, “As the estate grows there is another opportunity there.”

These tactical opportunities overlap and work together to help create the final opportunity that the evidence from the GLU ICA hybrid-gift development process reveals as an opportunity—an elevated partnership.

Elevated partnership. The concept of an elevated partnership emerged from various stakeholders describing the impact that a hybrid gift had on the donor,

development officer, and the ICA department. Together, the hybrid gift collectively elevated multiple aspects. One donor, for example, described a hybrid gift as a vehicle to “take the relationship to a new level.” Another ICA donor stated, “What it does is it elevates you to a partnership.” This is an important insight because it is counter-intuitive to what many fundraising professionals anecdotally believe, which is that once a deferred gift of any type is secured, a donor no longer continues to give. Instead, the evidence points toward a deeper connection for donors—a new space—to have an opportunity to give potentially larger and more meaningful gifts after a hybrid gift. Moreover, this elevated partnership and potential space for larger gifts are different from a “test gift.” Where a high capacity donor often gives a smaller donation; then, they watch how the gift is used and how they are stewarded. Rather, the elevated partnership expands a philanthropic relationship to otherwise unrealized potential.

The concept of an elevated partnership helps visualize both the construction and outcome of a hybrid gift. Together, through multiple giving streams, a donor and development officer can create more of an impact. In addition, all parties, donor, development officer, and ICA are collectively elevated. The ICA department receives both near and long-term financial support. The development officer moves closer to their individual annual fundraising goals. The donor gets the more meaningful intrinsic joy from making a large philanthropic gift and can also see the impact of their gift during their life. And, finally, the elevated partnership describes the collective experience of how the gift creates a deeper connection and understanding from all parties because of the larger impact and long-term nature that the gift creates a new space for more meaningful partnership and potentially even larger gifts in the future. As one ICA

administrator said, “it opens up a lot of opportunities for more conversations, and eventually bigger gifts down the road.”

Next, I examine the hybrid gift donor trajectory that emerged at GLU ICA.

Hybrid Gift Donor Trajectory

There are many characteristics used within ICA development to identify potential donors or prospects on a hybrid gift trajectory. One ICA development officer used the phrase “critical success indicators” to identify the various characteristics that GLU ICA believes can help identify a potential hybrid gift donor. At GLU ICA, the trajectory of a potential hybrid gift donor often emerges through the following five critical success indicators: capacity, age, family, history, and passion.

Capacity. Capacity or wealth was the often most obvious. But, beyond being an obvious prerequisite to give, there were unique elements about a donor’s capacity that might lead to a hybrid gift trajectory. For example, if a prospect is cash poor but asset rich. One ICA development officer stated,

The reason why you would do a blended gift is that you would have someone that is limited in their amount of resources they give you cash wise because they’re probably on some type of restricted income, but they also have a lot of assets that they have that they can give when they pass.

This type of cash poor but asset rich capacity was a clear identifier for a potential hybrid-gift donor.

Age. Age is also a major indicator to help identify a potential donor on a hybrid gift trajectory. However, age is a complex unit of analysis. Again, similarly to capacity, there are some obvious elements that are often associated anecdotally with age and any

type of deferred giving, i.e., the older the donor the better. And, sometimes, that logic holds. For example, many 70 and half-year-olds are excellent hybrid gift candidates because of IRA rollover restrictions and tax implications. But, a deeper analysis reveals age can often operate as myth toward not pursuing a hybrid gift from donors that would otherwise be excellent candidates. One ICA administrator, for example, said,

One of the other things we found is that we as a team were clearly trapped, trapped in this mythology that you had to be dealing with people at least 60, 65 but preferably 70 to 75, reality is we needed to change that thinking, and that we needed to basically say, everybody, is in the boat here and whether they are 30, 35, 40 or whatever we need to begin to at least introduce the concept and show how this could allow them to participate.

Another ICA administrator stated, “The blended gift opens that up as an opportunity for people probably in the middle stages of their life.” This is an important shift in common fundraising practice because this shift immediately broadens the pool of potential hybrid gift donors. Furthermore, cultivating younger hybrid gift donors bring in additional benefits and potential for gifts. For example, one ICA administrator said,

It is better to get them committed at a young age because then you can stay connected to them throughout their lifetime. There was a big shift, a big move for a while that if you got somebody who was like 45 and committed their estate to you, or a big part of it, people were all nervous that they were never going to make a cash gift to you in their lifetime.

They thought they could just sit back and say we did what we did. We have done what we can do now, but that is not the case. People when they give an estate gift at a young age, typically, make cash gifts throughout their lifetime and significant gifts throughout their lifetime.

Another ICA development officer said,

So the fear is anytime you have a younger donor who makes an estate gift is that they are not going to make a cash gift throughout their lifetime they will just kind of sit back and say I did my thing for you guys, but most of these younger people have also said I want to make an estate gift but I also want to make an annual gift to you too.

These revealing quotes reaffirm the importance of cultivating hybrid gifts at earlier ages and provides further evidence of the earlier mentioned elevated partnership and the potential for more and, perhaps, larger cash gifts after a deferred gift is secured. In essence, the benefits of capturing a hybrid gift early, typically include that as the relationship grows, the connection grows, the estates grows, and, hopefully, the gift grows too.

Family. The family situation of a potential hybrid-gift donor was an often-discussed element in identifying potential hybrid gift donors. Moreover, it is often the lack of a family that was the most relevant identifier. For example, one ICA development officer stated, “The biggest one is that you know, they don’t have kids. That is huge.” Further, once a potential hybrid-gift donor without children is identified, GLU ICA will intentionally try to create a family relationship with the prospect. One ICA administrator, for example, said, “But doing that due diligence and research to find out where the family

lies, and then from a strategic stand point trying to engage them in such a way that we become family; we become the family.” This is a critical insight. Obviously, it is not enough to simply find prospects without children; rather, ICA development officers need to cultivate a family feeling for the donors. In addition, it is important to acknowledge the strategic element of the cultivation in creating a family environment. In essence, when a donor does not have a family, GLU ICA tries to become their family.

History. A donor’s history of giving and engagement is another critical success indicator in identifying a potential hybrid gift donor. One ICA development officer stated that the most important thing to identify donors on a hybrid gift trajectory was the “previous giving. That is probably the biggest thing.” To help analyze the potential hybrid gift donors, GLU ICA conducted a deep dive into their season ticket holder pool. One ICA administrator described the process, saying,

We did this about 3 years ago. We did a real deep dive at our season ticket pool, our database. And we basically said, who are the different segments, who are junior executives, mid-management people who can be future leadership prospects, not just ticket holders and not just annual fund donors, but people who can really move the needle down the road, so we segmented by different groups and one of those was children, one of those was, you know in terms of the family situation where it was just them, or just them and a spouse or partner. So yeah, so that was one of the things that we did, I think that helped identify some people.

A donor’s history clearly provides a window into their potential future giving.

Passion. Intercollegiate Athletics is a passion enterprise. As a result, passion is another key identifier. At the end of the day, as one ICA development officer said donors, “have to have the passion.” Another ICA administrator said,

So you get the mission and the donor’s passion points and ask the passion question, what gives you and your family philanthropic passion, where are your passions, you put them together and that is the commonality that we share, I think we share... [Then,] they are doing true philanthropy in my mind, mission centered and donor focused, and you bring those two together and you’ve got a beautiful thing.

Connecting the passion of a donor with the passion ICA represents a unique opportunity for ICA to generate excitement that many other nonprofits cannot replicate.

In sum, identifying potential hybrid-gift donors is a combination of a number of critical success indicators. Together, all of the indicators help GLU ICA development look forward continuing to improve and secure more hybrid gifts.

Looking Forward

With its culture of philanthropy and strategic process surrounding hybrid gift development in place, GLU ICA has a strong foundation for looking forward and capitalizing on hybrid-gift development. The ICA administrators, GLU foundation administrators, and ICA donors interviewed all spoke about the opportunity hybrid gifts create and how these gifts would continue to grow in importance for ICA development. However, a few agreed that a paradigm shift would need to occur to maximize the utility of hybrid gifts. For example, a more long-term approach needs to emerge to capitalize fully on hybrid gifts. The cash now and cash first approach to ICA fundraising is

potentially hindering the creation of more hybrid gifts. One ICA administrator, for example, said, “This long-term approach to what their needs are...whatever they are, it is just a different feel to it, and so that is the challenge for athletics.”

In addition, moving forward, especially post campaign, many interviewees expressed their beliefs that hybrid gifts will continue to grow in importance. For example, one senior level ICA administrator said,

I think when it is all said and done we will continue to stay on this blended gift approach, but I suspect [post campaign] we will really turn up the heat. And I'm really excited about the blended gift effort and...I think in the future we could see more of this, more and more of a priority.

Case Study 2

Description of Ocean State University (OSU)

Ocean State University (OSU) was established in the mid-twentieth century and is a western state university. The total enrollment at OSU was over 35,000 in 2015. Latino/Latina students were 39 percent of enrollment. Asian students made up 23 percent of enrollment, White students 19 percent, and Black students 4 percent. These percentages have remained relatively stable over the past few years. According to the United States Census Bureau, this demographic profile contrasts with the western state that OSU resides in, where 39 percent of the population are Latino/Latina, 38 percent are White, 15 percent Asian, and 6 percent Black.

Ocean State University overview. Athletically, OSU operates as a Division I ICA Non Football institution. Presently, OSU over 400 Student-Athletes that compete on nearly 20 ICA teams. In the fiscal year 2014-15, the OSU ICA department had total

revenue of just under \$20 million with over \$11 million of institutional support, while expenses were just under \$19 million. The institutional support of ICA was over 60 percent. According to USA Today, this places OSU in top 150 for ICA financial support. Within ICA development, OSU has 4 full-time equivalent employees: one major-gift officer, two annual fund staff, and one development assistant.

Many of OSU's ICA development metrics fall within the middle of the pack for Division I Non Football programs. Last year, OSU had 1,500 annual fund donors and 20 major-gift donors at or above \$25,000 each. In total, OSU had an ICA development budget of \$80,000 and raised \$2.6 million; however, that total was below their goal of the year of \$5 million. Furthermore, the OSU institutional endowment's market value was \$64 million and an OSU ICA endowment of \$2.6 million. And, finally, OSU scored a 4.71 on the hybrid gift scale total score on the ICA philanthropic survey. To reiterate, this score was calculated as an aggregate score, with five being the high, for a multi-item Likert scale measuring hybrid gift success. OSU's score of 4.71 was the second highest score in all of Division I ICA and highest within the Non Football subdivision.

Ocean State University athletic history. Ocean State University has an acclaimed ICA history. OSU has won over ten national championships and numerous conference championships. Further, OSU stopped participating in football during the late twentieth century. As a result, OSU operates within a challenging space with some former football Student-Athletes that no longer have football to support. However, not participating in football also provides opportunities for basketball and other Olympic sports to thrive. OSU, consequently, has built a number of "nonrevenue" sports into

perennial national contenders. One ICA administrator stated the OSU goal is “To be the best mid-major⁸ in the country.”

In addition, OSU ICA is in a leadership transition. Currently, OSU has an interim Athletic Director as the institution conducts a national search for a permanent Athletic Director. This vacancy and potential leadership void add another layer to an already complex and unique ICA development scenario. And, finally, OSU is continuing to fundraise for enhancements for a capital project for their signature “nonrevenue” sport. Together these elements generate a dynamic ICA development environment at OSU.

Culture of Philanthropy

The culture of philanthropy that OSU ICA is trying to build a donor-centric approach, but it is a complicated process. One OSU administrator, for example, said, “Public universities and perhaps in our state system, specifically, have not had great records in philanthropy.” Another institutional advancement administrator said,

I think the biggest difference that I see with OSU is just there is a lack of a culture of philanthropy. And, it doesn’t have to do with our alumni or our donor base. It has to do with, I say, two components. The main one is we’re a very young institution...[two] when you go out and talk to our alumni, they still feel [OSU] is state funded...So, it's really going out [and saying], we're no longer state funded, we're state assisted, and just saying that we need their support today. That's really what I see with the university as a whole is trying to build that culture of philanthropy.

⁸ A mid-major is often referred to in ICA as an institution that does not play in an Autonomy or “Power Five” conference.

Specifically, within ICA, one OSU administrator said, “We had very old fashioned athletic fundraising.” However, the shift toward a donor-centric approach to philanthropy is helping strengthen the budding culture of philanthropy. For example, one ICA administrator said, “Whatever the donor wants to do, we’re going to support as long as it fits within the mission of the university.” This emerging donor-centric approach to ICA development is helping create the foundation of the burgeoning OSU ICA culture of philanthropy foundation.

Strategic Process

Similar to the OSU culture of philanthropy, the strategic process for philanthropy and, specifically, ICA development is an emerging process. In the recent past, OSU philanthropy was a number of newly formed and disjointed units across campus. One OSU administrator, for example, said, “It’s been a mistake to silo out our fundraising...we’re not big enough to have this big separate athletic fundraising.” Therefore, OSU ICA development now operates in a collaborative decentralized model with more intra-campus support and reporting. Another OSU administrator stated, “As a new AD comes in, that’s going to be one of the prerequisites, is somebody just going to have to accept that there’s going to be open communication and shared strategy building.” An institutional advancement administrator stated, “We identify people, we talk, we work together, we strategize.

The strategic process for OSU ICA development centers on education, communication, and collaboration. These three core elements create the strategic platform for the ICA hybrid-gift development.

Education. The importance of donor education at OSU ICA cannot be overstated. Every interviewee mentioned the critical role education played in the ICA development. One institutional advancement administrator, for example, said,

The campus still needs a lot more education as a whole, about what fundraising is, and what it does, and why it's important. There's a lot of internal and external education we still need to do, we became aware of very quickly, during the campaign, that we were battling a huge perception that we were state funded. And so, we had to do a lot of education about the fact that we only get about 25 percent of our entire revenue from the state, and the rest comes from tuition, which is capped. And so, fundraising has to make up the difference. It's particularly critical for sports, you know, for athletics.

Another OSU institutional advancement administrator said, “just to educate the people, no longer state funded; we're state assisted.”

As a result, ICA development created a unique way to educate the ICA donors and prospects. They call it their—three buckets.

Three buckets. The three buckets represent scholarships in bucket one, capital projects in bucket two, and endowments in bucket three. The actual images of the three buckets are available in Appendix T. One ICA administrator described the genesis of the idea, saying,

The bucket idea came about from...some talks about filling buckets when it came to the paradigm of raising philanthropic dollars and corporate sponsorship dollars and ticket sales, like, it's really just one. It's all the

same bucket we're trying to fill. But, when I came to OSU I'd come to a point where educating people on our space in philanthropy and fundraising, there's a clear need in that and being able to communicate.

The three-bucket concept, therefore, emerged and helps educate OSU ICA donors on the different needs of ICA through a simple yet effective metaphor. One ICA administrator said, "Scholarship, capital projects, and then, endowment. And, I think our biggest focus is on bucket one and bucket two." Another ICA administrator development officer said, "Our philosophy is, I think we're really focused on raising annual fund dollars in bucket one and capital projects dollars, bucket two." And, another ICA administrator, when referring to the three buckets, simply stated, "It's just about education."

It is interesting to note here that in the three bucket documentation, both in hard copies and online, hybrid gifts, or specifically blended gifts, were explicitly referred to for the first time in any development material—at any location for any institution—that I have seen. This is insightful because the "blended gift" vehicle example found during the document analysis was connected to toward capital projects: "Provide cash or a blended gift to name and build a facility" (See Appendix T, red arrow). However, ironically, during most of the interviews, the hybrid gift was most often tethered to creating scholarships through endowments. In fact, one ICA administrator stated,

I'm interested in the blended giving. I'm sure we could probably increase our giving if we figure out a better way of presenting that to people.

Because of the buckets analogy is something that I've been crafting. But, there's probably a new, a different version, or maybe just an extension, that we need to develop.

In addition to the buckets, the educational aspects of ICA development at OSU face other challenges.

Challenge. An over-arching sub-category that emerged in the education theme was the repeated references to the challenges of educating donors for OSU ICA. Simple donor education was portrayed as lacking and under-developed. One institutional advancement administrator jokingly stated that all they need to do was put “put bumper stickers on every car” in the region. Joking aside, the educational challenge was a major concern. One ICA administrator, for example, said,

Part of it for me is just educating people on giving. Like, people look at, ‘Oh, it’s college athletics’. You know, [these Power 5 schools]. The people see this and they think the money’s just flowing in. And, the reality is, we only have one donor that’s given over \$1 million in cash.

One ICA administrator said, “That’s one of our biggest challenges, education. And then, tangential to that is communication, and the concept of communication across different stakeholder groups.” An ICA development officer said, “Communication and the education are the two, I think, biggest challenges in my job.”

Communication. Connecting the education and the strategies for communication is a vital part of OSU ICA development. However, it is not easy. One ICA administrator, for example, said, “Sometimes it takes five or six times telling someone what our [Annual Fund] Club is before they really get it. I mean, our staff and coaches don’t all get it...it takes time.” Nonetheless, that time is crucial toward increasing philanthropic revenue.

One of the most effective methods of communication for OSU ICA development was to cut away excess language and industry jargon. One OSU administrator said,

I realized that the most important thing is just to boil down all of the concepts into just plain, simple English. So, if people were talking to us and saying, ‘Well, I’d love to do XYZ, but I don’t think I have the money’, then that’s a really good opportunity to open the door, and just say, ‘Well, have you considered maybe doing a combination of things? Like, maybe doing a little now, maybe some out of your estate?’ People don’t think about that, you know, most people don’t really give much thought to their estate plans until they’re much older.

Furthermore, that simplicity might stretch too far. One ICA development officer, for example, said, “Honestly, I don’t use blended gifts. I don’t ever say ‘blended gifts’ to folks, typically.” This is an important acknowledgment. The ICA development officers do not use the term hybrid or blended gift with its donors. Another ICA development officer, for example, said, “I hadn’t really gotten into selling the blended gift model yet as kind of a sell strategy.” Instead, hybrid gifts usually emerge because a donor wants to try to find a creative way to do more. This communication, and potential lack of communication continues through a number of elements within OSU ICA development. The messaging, marketing, storytelling, and technology each play a role in the ICA hybrid gift development strategic communication.

Messaging. The messaging for OSU ICA development and, specifically, hybrid gift development is crucial. One institutional advancement administrator said,

I think it's all about messaging. Messaging the need, and just saying, 'If you want to do something, we can help you find a way'. I mean it's really that passion. If someone really wants to do something, not having immediate cash should not be an obstacle, and that's the message we want to get out.

Ocean State University ICA was intentional in its messaging toward specific segments of donors, e.g., annual, major, and estate. Specific messaging is hardly a unique revelation because of many, if not all, Division I ICA development offices are concerned with messaging. Rather, the insightful element is how OSU ICA development worked with the institutional advancement office to create unified messaging and institutional themes for solicitations, in essence, co-marketing philanthropy, especially, with deferred giving.

Co-market. The co-marketing is a new element of fundraising at OSU. At OSU, co-marketing blends institutional advancement with ICA development and annual giving with planned giving. For instance, for the first time ever OSU did a joint mailing, i.e., annual fund and estate giving. An institutional advancement administrator said, "For many years there was really very little collaboration between the annual fund [and planned giving]. We were lucky if we had a checkbox asking for information on an annual fund reply card." Another institutional advancement administrator stated,

If we want to increase blended gifts, we have to co-market. It has to be a unified message from, about the benefits of the program to the world, and to students, that can then be reflected in their giving. And, one of the ways that you can do it is through planned giving.

The connection to marketing and planned giving is crucial. One OSU administrator said, “The biggest thing in planned giving is not the technique, it's the marketing. It's how you talk about it.” This shift toward co-marketing is important for hybrid gift development because at OSU many hybrid gifts have started as deferred gifts. This is a counter-intuitive and enlightening insight. Up until this point in the research, most hybrid gift donors were identified as passionate annual fund donors who might lack large cash now capacity; however, OSU has found that many of their hybrid gift donors have been identified by learning about the intent of a donor to leave a planned gift through marketing and, then, a new cultivation—or, technically, a re-cultivation—is made to activate the gift through a hybrid gift. This was the first time in this research that a hybrid gift donor trajectory was identified, essentially, working backward and it emerged through co-marketing. As a result, one institutional advancement officer said, “we've been doing more co-marketing than [ever with ICA]. But, we could probably do a lot better.” Therefore, OSU understands that there is still room for growth with hybrid gifts.

Storytelling. Within the strategic communication, the storytelling that OSU ICA development provides needs to educate and inspire donors to better understand the impact that they can have on an ICA. One OSU administrator, for example, said, “The challenge is presenting the right story to the right donor.” Another institutional advancement administrator stated,

It totally depends on what the story is associated with. If the story is, we love the students. We love, love, love, love, love the students, and we just want to encourage everyone else that loves the students to come out and do things. That's a little different message than I've named the building.

In essence, the stories of the donors and recognition need to match the strategic intent of the ICA development department. Ocean State University ICA does a good job of strategic donor recognition. At the time of the case study, ICA development was holding the announcement of a few large gifts from prominent alumni and professional athletes to help ignite the final push of a sport specific capital campaign.

Technology. The technology used in the communication of ICA development helps separate and distinguish OSU. Here the ICA department tries to maximize impact and innovate through new opportunities. Unsurprisingly, ICA development uses various social media options to help communicate. One ICA administrator spoke about social media, saying, “Within this process, and the creativity process, and all this, social media has a part. Social media’s not the process, social media’s a means by which you can engage. It’s a means of building a relationship.” In addition, ICA development uses video to help create a more robust connection for donors and prospects. Beyond the expected technological steps, ICA development is also experimenting with a newer medium—podcasts. The podcast is more niche and emerging element, but it, also, presents an interesting opportunity to engage donors: first, obviously as listeners, and, second and potentially more importantly with a deeper connection as guests. Further, the podcast might also open doors otherwise closed ICA development. For example, an hour meeting with a wealthy prospect is often difficult for a fundraiser, but a podcast guest request for a technologically savvy and successful businessperson sounds like a better investment of their time than a chat with a fundraiser. One ICA administrator described the podcast by saying,

It's starting in the next couple of weeks – but, our first guest is going to be our chief revenue sport [coach], which is basketball here, and then the next, next up is going to be a CEO of a major company we've never engaged before, and he's giving us 45 minutes of his time. As you know, for a CEO, that's four meetings. It's a big, big deal.

Certain OSU ICA administrators believe the podcast is a gateway towards new and deeper relationships with donors and prospects.

In sum, multiple elements create the OSU ICA strategic communication, which connects with education to provide an opportunity for collaboration toward successful hybrid-gift development.

Collaboration. The collaboration is often complex and with multiple stakeholders. For example, at OSU the collaboration between ICA development and the institutional advancement office is essential. One ICA administrator, for instance, said, “One of the best relationships we can cultivate in this business is with our university advancement team.” Another ICA development officer stated,

The value of the relationship with [institutional advancement] is they provide the infrastructural support behind what development officers go out and do. It's very easy for me to keep an Excel document or a handwritten note on our donors, but if I don't feed the system so that other people can see what's going on, I'm going to be a fraction of the way effective than I should be. So, I'm very passionate about making sure we support them because they support us.

Collaboration also happens between the ICA development officers and the donors for hybrid gifts. Moreover, sometimes other staff within ICA will play a role in a hybrid gift; for example, if a donor has a special affinity for a specific coach that coach might help cultivate a gift. An ICA development officer said, “You have to collaborate, you have to be on the same page.” Essentially, ICA development requires, what one ICA development officer described as “total teamwork.” One institutional advancement administrator said, “We do pitch both planned and cash giving, together, very often.” In addition, collaboration also happens with local financial planners. One OSU administrator said, “One way of accessing people, or identifying people who could be prospects for blended giving is through some of our financial, our alumni and friends for financial planners.” Taken together, the collaborative effort is essential in the ICA development of hybrid gifts.

Hybrid Gifts

Examining the hybrid gift development process within OSU ICA revealed a number of critical features and outcomes. Initially, hybrid gifts were acknowledged from multiple interviewees as new. One ICA administrator spoke about hybrid gifts saying, “I think we’re new at it. It’s not something we’ve done for a long time.” In addition, many of these new elements are nested and difficult to disentangle from each other completely; however, the themes that emerged and separated themselves in hybrid gift development at OSU were vehicle maximization, flexibility, legacy, capital projects, benefits, and misalignment. I examine each theme in the next few sections.

Vehicle maximization. The hybrid gift was used consistently to maximize a gift. In essence, the hybrid gift operated as a tool or vehicle to stretch a donor. One

institutional advancement officer said, “It can almost be used as a way of leveraging that gift, and I guess, adapting it to what the donor’s needs are and what their expectations are, too.” Another ICA administrator said,

You know, it’s the cash [that] helps me today. And, that’s what I need to see come in if I’m [in ICA]. But, the reality is the blended gift, yeah, it helps...we’re not getting as much cash as we’d typically want in a blended gift, but they don’t have the cash to give anyway. So, if they at least give a little cash but then they create this legacy.

Legacy. The legacy or lasting impact of a hybrid gift was also a major theme that emerged. Oftentimes, this is tethered to education, but the impact and potential legacy of a gift is an unrealized opportunity for many prospects or donors. One institutional advancement administrator beautifully captured the process of helping a donor create a legacy by stating that it is like “Dreaming with them.” This institutional advancement officer continued by stating, “They’ll be like, ‘Wow, I didn’t realize I could really have that large of an impact’. And so...I call it dreaming with them.” Essentially, the development officer helps the donor realize the potential impact that the donor can provide, specifically, through a hybrid gift.

Capital projects. Additionally, OSU ICA specifically lists a hybrid or blended gift as a strategy to name and build a facility (Appendix T). This unique and explicit naming is uncommon in a few ways. One, it provides evidence toward some strategic internal misalignment because some development officers stated the ICA does not try to solicit explicitly a gift as a “blended gift.” Two, connecting a hybrid gift to a capital project is oftentimes the most difficult and ad

hoc process for a hybrid gift for because of the cash now element of building and upfront funds required. Most often, hybrid gifts are mentioned in building scholarships and endowments. Therefore, finding the “blended gift” in bucket two or capital projects was a surprise.

Nevertheless, using hybrid gifts in capital projects is a newer and energizing idea in philanthropy. One institutional advancement officer said,

On capital projects, maybe you don't need the full amount, but the naming you want at that price tag, so that way, as long as you're getting your immediate construction/renovation needs completed with the cash component, then we'll take the additional dollars at a later point. So, I think that's one idea with the blended gift, for capital.

Inserting hybrid gifts into more capital campaigns is a rare element that OSU has had success establishing. Multiple Olympic sport capital campaigns have used hybrid gifts to make large contributions and even in naming opportunities.

Furthermore, the donor recognition, and sometimes the naming of a building or space, plays a critical role in the hybrid-gift development process and can amplify the philanthropic message. For example, a naming can play a critical role in multiple aspects of philanthropy at OSU ICA. A naming can help build a culture of philanthropy. Also, a naming can create an expectation to give in the OSU ICA community. However, it is not just about the names over the door. Instead, donor recognition walls are a cost effective trend nowadays. At OSU ICA, stickers have replaced many literal brick and mortar signs and plaques. These stickers allow for faster and cost effective updating and operate as an important showpiece to highlight ICA development momentum and the collective power

of hybrid gifts. One ICA development officer, for example, said, “It’s creating a visual presentation. Up until this year, we’ve only done that in our [basketball arena]. We are probably in the next week, we’re going to have that up at every single facility.” Another ICA administrator said, “When you think of a strategy for education and communication, the visual, the visual strategies are important.” The capital projects and recognition elements provide powerful symbols of hybrid gifts.

Flexibility. The flexibility of hybrid gifts was the next theme that emerged within OSU ICA. The hybrid gift operated like a Swiss army knife in that it was both nimble and adaptive. A hybrid gift represents multiple options for both development officers and donors. Hybrid gifts can be a vehicle used—not only to maximize a gift but also—to create a more thoughtful and meaningful gift. One OSU administrator said, “It gives you, as fundraiser, some flexibility, but also kind of eases the financial burden in a way or gives the donor some flexibility.” Another OSU administrator described OSU ICA development officers saying, “In their approach to thinking, they have to be fairly adaptable. So, it is kind of twofold. You need that technical knowledge but then you need somebody who is a very good empathic listener.” An ICA administrator, for example, said, “You just have to be able to be nimble.” And, finally, another OSU administrator said, “You have to be nimble and you have to be able to look at what are their personal circumstances. And, [how] their wealth is going to change, too. “

Ease tensions. In addition, because of the flexibility of hybrid gifts, many tensions can be eased for hybrid gift donors. One OSU institutional advancement administrator described hybrid gift cultivation and an ask as the following,

If [donors] want to see any part of [their gift] happen now, they may want to set up something now that mirrors what will happen when the big money comes. So, so let's say, you want to set up a scholarship...but, the money isn't here yet. But, just so you can start meeting the students, we may work to set up something now, with cash, and it'll be the exact same criteria that will be in effect when your bequest matures. So, it is a part cash, part estate planned gift.

Further, this type of mirror arrangements with smaller amounts was identified as a generational element from older generations that are perhaps less financially astute or trusting to help ensure that their wishes will be followed correctly as the deferred gift matures.

Shut-up gift answer. The flexibility of the hybrid gift also provides an answer to what some fundraising practitioners refer to as the “shut-up gift.” A shut-up gift is often a donor preemptively telling a development officer what he or she is going to give before an official ask. One ICA administrator, for example, described it as, “the ‘shut up gift,’ if you will. Right? Kind of quiet you down with this gift. ‘I’m going to set the tone of what the gift is, not you as a development officer. Here’s what I’m giving. Deal with it.’” Oftentimes the gift is substantial, but also not as large as the development officer was going to request. In these cases, the hybrid gift operates as a pseudo-bridge. The ICA development officer can acknowledge the graciousness of the shut-up gift, but pauses and pivots by using a hybrid gift construction. The development officer can ask the donor to increase the gift by stretching and politely challenging the donor to do more through a hybrid gift.

Benefits. The current “benefits” for hybrid gifts within OSU ICA are minimal. Ocean State University ICA does not offer additional points or a reward system for hybrid or planned gifts. This is a potential self-defeating element of their current ICA hybrid-gift process. One ICA hybrid-gift donor said, “I did not receive any other tangible gifts that I did not otherwise pay the price as any other individual would.” An ICA administrator, for example, said,

When I think of the blended giving program, what’s our, what’s our next transformation...maybe we do something even more special for people who make a blended gift. And, when I say that, like, parking pass, access to the hospitality suite, that’s one thing. That’s nice, but I think that transformational motivation to give a blended gift is going to come through the relationships they build with coaches and student-athletes.

They want access. That’s the ultimate access that I see people really want. In addition to access, another benefit that emerged was that a hybrid gift creates an immediate impact with the gift. Essentially, allowing the hybrid-gift donor along with the people that the gift impacts to enjoy the gift while the donor is still alive. One OSU institutional advancement administrator, for example, described a potential situation by stating, “How about you gave us a \$100,000 right now, when you’re doing that estate gift, so that way you can see the money, kind of in motion now?” An ICA administrator said,

The people before had not necessarily tackled [hybrid gifts] that way or seen the potential for asking someone for cash now then a deferred gift later to make something larger, like an endowment. Basically, ‘cause then they can see what is starting to happen with the cash they’re already

contributing. So, it's not something that they just leave and never get to experience or enjoy, but they get to see the start of the scholarship, or they get to meet the person who's receiving the—what is currently a small bit coming off of an endowed gift—but will then be significantly more when they pass and will contribute to it. So, I think that's the main benefit of them, that you can present people with the opportunity to enjoy it already.

The idea that donors can see their impact in action was a powerful motivating force for some donors. For instance, one ICA hybrid gift donor said, "If I know now better than they'll know later, and I want to help, again, why wait?"

Misalignment. Finally, within the ICA hybrid-gift development at OSU, some conflicting or misaligning elements emerged. In short, occasionally, hybrid-gift donors and development officers seemed to operate on different pages. For example, one hybrid-gift donor made a request to travel with a specific team and was denied the opportunity. That hybrid-gift donor explained it as "I once called the athletic department to say, 'Hey, can we work out a deal that, you know, so I can get a trip to an out-of-state [Olympic sport]?' 'No, we can't do that.'" This is one of a few disparities that emerged between these donors and their expectations with ICA. Indeed, these relationships are complex and no two are the same; however, that being said, some donors expressed feelings of concern over elements of the development process, specifically, the cultivation and stewardship process. Furthermore, the great recession and rising general costs for higher education have made some donors rethink their contributions to ICA. These concerns, combined with leadership turnover, as OSU hires a new Athletic Director, have caused some hesitation and uncertainty in the ICA hybrid-gift development process.

Interestingly, though, many hybrid-gift donors continue to want to give. As such, the process for identifying potential hybrid-gift donors will be examined in the next few sections.

Donor Trajectory Identification

Identifying the trajectory of hybrid-gift donors at OSU ICA revealed a number of critical attributes. Some identifying elements such as, passion, history of giving, and age were expected. However, there is nuance within the age theme, for instance, generational elements and re-cultivation, along with a theme of community donors were surprising insights within the hybrid-gift development for OSU ICA. In the next few sections, I describe each of the themes that emerged to help better understand hybrid-gift donor trajectory.

Passion. The passion a donor has for OSU ICA was a repeated theme for potential hybrid-gift donors. One ICA hybrid-gift donor, for example, said,

I think one of the differences, I see a lot more passion with people that will give to athletics then I see passion in some of the other people I've talked to that have given to this school. There is a passion that exists over here [with] the givers to athletics.

One OSU administrator said, “donors are saying, ‘I want to make an impactful gift to you, but the only thing I have is my assets...I can’t give you a lot of cash.’” Assets aside, a hybrid gift donor has to have a deep affinity for OSU ICA, which appeared more important than pure wealth in OSU ICA internal metrics. Ocean State University conducts affinity scores, as opposed to wealth screenings. The affinity model attempts to aggregate various data to create a comprehensive score towards the likelihood of hybrid-

gift development. For instance, the affinity score considers age, degree, marital status, spouse's university, spouse's degree, children, student engagement, game attendance, and, of course, giving history.

History. Unsurprisingly, the giving history of a potential hybrid-gift donor is another critical identification metric that emerged. One ICA administrator said, "It's that longstanding donor that's given multiple years." Another ICA administrator said, "It's really just those long-time donors that feel like they can't make that ultimate cash gift today." And one institutional advancement officer said, "The blended gift would be successful for those repeat annual donors, those people that are doing \$5,000 a year, but they said, 'You know, I never can do anymore because I'm on a fixed income.'" One institutional administrator said, "Look at those people who have given 10 out of 10 years, or who's given 20 years... Those are usually your top planned giving donors. In addition, to create a history of giving to ICA, a donor's age also becomes a theme in identifying potential hybrid gift donors.

Age. Age was a major theme in the OSU ICA hybrid gift process. However, rather than simply older or younger donors, OSU reveals a generational analysis and re-cultivation opportunities within the age analysis.

Generational component. The generational component emerged when multiple interviewees described the hybrid gift process as beneficial to different generations in different ways. For example, the greatest generation was characterized by interviewees as very frugal; therefore, hybrid gifts provide a gift structure that allows them to give a little now and start to see the impact and have the clarity and peace of mind that their wishes

will be followed with their estate plan. One institutional advancement officer, for example, said,

It really, I think, takes the pressure off this older generation that's been very frugal, very conservative, and very savvy with their money. And, they think, 'Well, I have \$2 million dollars. I don't think I'm going to go through all of it. Yeah, maybe I could leave \$100,000 in my estate.' So, it takes that pressure off them. That's where I see that blended gift really helping that generation.

Another institutional advancement administrator said,

So sometimes that older generation, those 80-year-olds, they feel a little more secure, if they know that fund is already established at a very low amount compared to their ultimate gift, but they know it will feed directly into there.

Baby boomers, however, offer different opportunities for hybrid gift development.

One ICA administrator said, "It will be interesting to see what happens with these 60-year-olds. I think they'll be more financial savvy, and I think they'll be open to more blended gifts."

Then again, Generation X donors, again, bring a different hybrid-gift opportunity.

Currently, many Generation X donors are starting their estate plans earlier. An institutional advancement administrator, for example, said, "Many people will start their estate planning in their 40s or 50s, but then they'll revise it."

And, finally, some development officers talked about age and the irrelevance of a generational element. Instead, being in the donor's last will was the focus. One

institutional advancement administrator said, “As long as you're in their last will before they die, you'll actually get the money. So, that usually happens when people are in their 70s.” The last will approach leads into another theme that emerged and is connected to age—re-cultivation.

Re-cultivation. For the OSU ICA hybrid-gift development process the theme of re-cultivation was twofold: one, re-engaging older donors, typically widowed, and, two, re-cultivating donors who have made a planned gift as their first gift. Both are interesting findings and will be examined further.

Widows. As the population continues to live longer and, especially, as women continue to live longer than men—which is particularly troublesome for ICA, as men often make up the majority of donors—women will become more crucial to ICA development. As a result, OSU ICA, like many ICA departments, has specific cultivation strategies for women. However, in respect to hybrid gifts, the process is nuanced and delicate as a surviving spouse’s interests may evolve. One OSU administrator, for example, said,

We have a funny thing happening. It used to be that people who got into their 80s were pretty much done with their estate plans, and we sort of just wrote them off and just sort of stewarded them, and, you know, made them feel good about staying involved with the campus. Now what we’re seeing is a trend— this is a national trend— of couples with wealth that the, sorry, the husband dies, and the wealth is transferred to the wife, and the wife is living to 85 and beyond, and this is the time when you have to start that cultivation process over, because often now what their wishes

were have changed. She may have taken a secondary role in determining that when her husband was alive, but now she has new interests. And so, it's almost like you have to start over with somebody who's pretty old. But, I think, you know, ten years ago we would've just thought, you know, it's a stewardship deal at this point: she's made her gift, you know, they've transferred the wealth, but she's going to support what her husband supports. We're finding that you know, really it's a different thing altogether. And, what wealthy, older people are finding is that they have so much wealth they really don't know what to do with it.

Planned gifts first. The fact that some of OSU ICA hybrid gifts came from donors who first indicated their intent to leave a planned gift emerged from an internal study within the institutional advancement planned giving office. This finding is particularly counter-intuitive and important because most fundraising practitioners believe a planned gift is often a donor's last gift. One institutional advancement administrator explained the finding by stating,

We did a study of our own planned giving program, and what we discovered—it was roughly 200 people...we just were reviewing our own program, and what we discovered was that about 25 to 30 percent of our planned giving donors, their first and only gift was a planned gift, maybe even less than that. It was probably about 10 percent where it was their only gift. But, many people made a planned gift, that's why they first called, but then we began, you know, just keeping them involved, sending them information...they learned more about the school, and they began

making annual gifts of one kind or another, or small cash gifts, after their planned gift.

Another OSU institutional advancement administrator said,

Here, for some reason, don't know if it's because of our OSU community, we get a lot of estate gifts first, and then they do a large cash gift. They'll come knocking on our door, or we call them up, and they'll do a million dollar estate gift or even a planned gift of a CRT or gift annuity, and then they get involved with the university, they learn more about the university, and two years later, they decide to set up a \$50,000 student scholarship. And, that's something that we'll encourage.

Community donors. Finally, a theme about community donors emerged in the data. Many interviewees spoke about the local residents that have been born and raised around OSU ICA or made their money in the area. These donors seemed particularly intrigued with making hybrid gifts. One OSU Administrator stated, “It's community-based, pulling in our people from [the area]. We have a lot of die-hard residents.” An ICA development officer said, “Athletics gets a lot of support, primarily from the community.”

Together, the themes of passion, history, generational differences, re-cultivation, and community donors help identify the trajectory of potential hybrid-gift donors for OSU ICA. In addition, in aggregate, the themes work together to provide OSU ICA with new opportunities for hybrid gifts moving forward.

Looking Forward

Within a developing culture of philanthropy and an emerging strategic process focusing on education and communication surrounding the hybrid gift development in place at OSU, ICA can potentially shift toward a more robust system of hybrid-gift development moving forward. In essence, OSU ICA might begin taking further advantage of some of the emerging trends that the case study revealed. Some of the opportunities for further refinement within ICA hybrid gift development include, perhaps, a fourth bucket, specifically, for hybrid gifts. Furthermore, OSU ICA could more intentionally focus on the donor education and communication for various hybrid-gift trends, such as Individual Retirement Account (IRA) rollovers, planned gifts first, and re-cultivation that this case study identified. And, finally, the difficult but critical paradigm shift toward a more long-term mindset might secure more hybrid gifts. Next, I briefly describe each element OSU ICA could implement moving forward.

Fourth Bucket. A fourth bucket might provide ICA development officers a simple and more explicit path and visual toward having a hybrid gift conversation with donors. In fact, at the risk over of oversimplifying the hybrid gift process, a fourth—and perhaps bigger—bucket under the three already existing buckets of scholarships, capital projects, and endowments, might be a strong visual image of the power and flexibility of hybrid gifts.

Trends. Next, a number of trends emerged during the OSU ICA case study. The IRA rollovers, planned gifts first donors, and re-cultivation were the most salient toward hybrid-gift development.

IRA rollovers. A number of interviewees mentioned the important role that IRA rollovers play in many hybrid gifts. One institutional advancement administrator stated,

The other thing I've seen is a lot of blended giving coming through IRA rollovers. Where once people get everything settled, and they figure out their retirement plan, and they realize what they've got, and they've got their world in place, and...Then they get this check. [Laughter.] You know, and, I usually get calls right after the first required minimum distribution, where someone goes, 'Oh my god, I have to pay taxes on this'. [Laughter.] And then we usually work with them to set up a plan. But, it's another point of education.

Another ICA administrator said, "I think with blended you have to be able to look to be creative at all of their assets including real estate, and including stocks, including the IRAs, what they have the possibility of doing." These IRA rollovers are a specific example of the critical role that creativity plays in creating a gift structure that can maximize a gift and stretch a donor while allowing them to continue to live comfortably.

Planned gifts first. The next trend that was recognized is the fact that many hybrid gift donors were also planned gift donors first. This counter-intuitive finding is meaningful for a few reasons. One, it runs counter to the anecdotal evidence many fundraisers tell themselves about the cultivation process. Two, it might open up a new segment of potential hybrid-gift donors. Simple co-marketing of planned giving with annual solicitations might reveal donors who, unbeknownst to ICA development, already plan to leave a planned gift to ICA. Therefore, new hybrid gift prospects might become identifiable through marketing or online questionnaire.

Re-cultivation. The emergence of re-cultivation was another trend in hybrid gift development. At OSU ICA, the re-cultivation focused on widows, usually women, living longer than their deceased husbands. Furthermore, not only were there opportunities to increase the size of hybrid gifts but, also, the widow's interests often evolve too. Therefore, ICA development officers moved beyond stewardship, and, instead, focus on re-cultivating these proven donors for new giving opportunities.

Long-term mindset. Finally, looking forward OSU ICA will continue to benefit from embracing a long-term mindset toward hybrid gifts. That being said, OSU ICA operates like many Division I ICA departments where cash is king; however, the long-term best interest of OSU and OSU ICA requires a committed and relentless focus on the long-term financial wellbeing for the ICA department. Further, the complexity of this new paradigm embrace differs for various stakeholders. Donors worry about their own financial wellbeing, philanthropic legacy, and giving benefits. One ICA administrator said,

It's a long-term mindset. It's, 'I want to leave a lasting legacy.' I think that's something that you'll hear in the vernacular, but it's really true. You want to leave something that goes beyond your life. And, after talking to a lot of people who've been involved in a lot of planned gifts, that's the mindset. It's, 'I want to do something that lasts longer than my physical body ever will.'

In addition, development officers have financial target goals and often career aspirations tethered to performance metrics. And, finally, ICA often need immediate cash for capital

projects, but ICA also want to build a strong and responsible financial foundation to ensure survival and success for many years to come.

These often complex and competing issues work both for and against OSU ICA developing a long-term development mindset. Here, hybrid gifts offer both a model and a path toward a solution to help construct a long-term perspective. The cash now and the benefit of the long-term, often larger, deferred gift embraces the immediate cash need and works toward the long-term best interest of more ICA financial stability.

Summary of Case Studies

The two case studies presented in this chapter were selected to provide a better understanding through rich and thick descriptions of typical and atypical ICA Division I hybrid-gift development. Further, the two case studies help explain the mainly quantitative findings of the previous chapter. To recap, the two case studies were chosen to represent both typical and atypical approaches to hybrid-gift development through the lens of available resources within Division I ICA. Great Lake University (GLU) represented the typical, as a high resource Autonomy institution, although it is important to note that the high revenue Autonomy institutions are not all that typical, yet in the public discourse, they emerge and are thought of as typical. And, Ocean State University (OSU) represents the more atypical selection because of its operating as a lower resource Non Football playing institution. Nevertheless, a careful examination of the data reveals that both case studies contained typical and atypical findings.

Common Findings

Numerous findings emerged as common across the two case studies. First, both ICA departments had cultures of philanthropy that focused on education. The education

was a seemingly continual process at both institutions. At GLU, because of the larger size of the ICA development department, the education was more layered with both development officer and donor education of hybrid gifts. While at OSU, the education focused on donors and the ICA development three-bucket analogy.

Second, the communication within the ICA development and hybrid-gift process was a critical element at both institutions. Furthermore, the communication at both institutions used co-marketing and collaboration to help educate and connect with hybrid gift donors and prospects. For example, annual fund and ticket sale marketing can have planned giving information available integrated in the marketing. This integrated marketing provides an opportunity for a unified philanthropic message and can also create new leads for hybrid gifts. This subtle inclusion of planned giving possibilities is an enlightening detail that co-marketing creates to help generate more hybrid gift opportunities.

Third, both institutions had internal constraints or at best complicated incentives or benefits tethered to hybrid gifts. For example, both institutions incentive development officers by counting hybrid gifts toward their yearly goals; however, hybrid gifts are not counted toward their capital or campaign totals. This misalignment, in addition, with the lack of specific hybrid-gift donor benefits is a bizarre self-defeating system, especially in the ICA environment of tangible expectations associated with giving.

Fourth, both institutions use hybrid gifts as a philanthropic tool to stretch donors and maximize gifts. The capacity of a hybrid gift to stretch donors and offer simple yet often uncommon gift construction for donors thought the cultivation process was one of the most consistent and common attributes between the two case studies. For example,

ICA development officers at both institutions spoke about leveraging the size of a gift with a hybrid gift and challenging donors to do more.

Fifth, the theme of hybrid gifts providing re-cultivation opportunities was another common finding across the case studies. At GLU, the re-cultivation was driven in a more traditional sense of circling back to hybrid gift donors to confirm that their wishes and plans were still consistent with their wealth, i.e., not leaving money on the table for GLU. While at OSU, the re-cultivation experience was oftentimes focused on a surviving spouse that may have evolving interests and donors who were identified as planned donors first. Regardless of the nuances within the two case studies, re-cultivation was a common theme for both.

Sixth, both institutions revealed some expected trajectories for identifying future hybrid-gift donors. For example, passion for ICA, history of giving, and donor age were unsurprising yet consistent indicators that many interviewees at both institutions thought revealed strong hybrid-gift prospects.

Finally, the seventh common finding was a long-term view or mindset that both institutions were able to hold at a certain level in the complex and dynamic world of ICA. Both institutions repeatedly recognized and stated that cash was king; however, both institutions used hybrid gifts as a tool for donors that lacked immediate cash gift capacity. In essence, both ICA development departments recognized and held two competing and in the long run complimenting goals. Initially, they understand the pressing need for immediate cash; however, if large cash gifts are not available, both ICA development departments had the flexibility and technical savvy to pivot toward a hybrid gift structure that allows donors to ease some tensions or not to give up their airplane.

Unique Findings

To reiterate, both case studies possessed typical and atypical findings. Almost assuredly, both GLU and OSU have unique elements associated with hybrid gift development compared with the general Division I ICA population. For example, GLU has a more refined and robust process. Certainly, their larger ICA budget and revenue generating sports provide a foundation for the Autonomy ICA department. But, the institution is also older and more mature. As a result, GLU has more donors that have gone through a lifetime of giving. In addition, because of the larger staff and more sophisticated ICA development, GLU has the luxury of pursuing more authentic and deeper relationships with potential hybrid-gift donors. Also because of the size and scope of the ICA development department, GLU can create a system of customized experiences for hybrid-gift donors. And, finally, because of all of those elements, GLU has the opportunity to promote the elevated partnership that can occur between a hybrid-gift donor and an ICA department. Their resources, staff size, internal systems, established philanthropic institutional foundation, and hybrid gift structure works together to collectively uplift the donor, development officer, and ICA through hybrid gifts.

Ocean State University also had a number of unique features in its hybrid gift development. Furthermore, in comparison to GLU, OSU is a younger state institution, as opposed to a more established land grant flagship institution. As a result, the revenues, resources, and scope of the ICA department are smaller. Consequently, OSU relies on more creative elements of ICA hybrid-gift development. For instance, technology, specifically, podcasting, social media, and video play integral roles in the education and communication process for ICA development. However, the limited resources also

created some misalignment between certain hybrid gift donors and their expectations. This misalignment between donors and expectations was one of the few disparities that emerged in these complex relationships. Nevertheless, the misalignment and donor intensity seemed to cause some unique hesitation and uncertainty toward future ICA hybrid gifts, which, again, was unique in the case study. Finally, identifying the trajectory of potential hybrid-gift donors by first discovering what donors already have plans to leave a planned gift was a notable and unique finding within the OSU ICA development process. Simply co-marketing, inserting a checkbox to indicate a donor's plans on an annual fund solicitation, or asking an established donor face-to-face about planned gifts led to a number of new hybrid gifts.

Conclusion to the Chapter

These case studies help explain hybrid-gift development within Division I ICA institutions. Moreover, it is critical to state that the case studies presented in this chapter may or may not be descriptive of the entire population of Division I ICA. Rather, these two case studies produced deep contextual insights and evidence to help better understand hybrid gift development within Division I ICA.

The typical or atypical selection and criteria of ICA departments mattered less than the culture of philanthropy, strategic processes, and idiosyncratic features of the hybrid-gift development process at each institution. Indeed, the case studies revealed there is no typical hybrid-gift development. Instead, the atypical nature of an ICA hybrid-gift process helps uncover the innovative, unique, and powerful outcomes of hybrid gifts.

CHAPTER SIX: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine hybrid gifts in Division I Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA). More specifically, the study's two overarching goals were to provide a comprehensive snapshot of the current hybrid-gift development across all of Division I ICA, and to provide a blueprint for ICA leaders to increase revenue through hybrid gifts. Presently, the literature on hybrid gifts is limited. This study adds empirical data to the field to create a more nuanced understanding of hybrid giving best practices for the industry.

The study itself was designed to answer the following two research questions. What are the characteristics of hybrid-gift development in Division I ICA? What does an in-depth examination of hybrid-gift development reveal about hybrid-gift giving in Division I ICA programs that the survey responses suggest are both typical and atypical?

To answer these questions, this study used an explanatory sequential mixed-methods research design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). The first phase consisted of a 33-question survey used to capture a comprehensive overview of Division I ICA hybrid-gift development. Findings from this phase described the general characteristics of hybrid-gift development and focused on a culture of philanthropy, strategic processes, education, collaboration, communication, identifying hybrid-gift donor trajectories, and short- and long-term tensions.

The second phase consisted of two qualitative comparative case studies. Findings from this phase helped explain the study's quantitative results by providing an in-depth analysis and thick descriptions of hybrid-gift development at two different Division I ICA departments. In addition to reinforcing the findings from phase one, the findings from

phase two generated a number of new insights and clarified potential new opportunities that include the idea of elevated partnerships and the practice of re-cultivation.

Interestingly, the case studies also helped to show that there is no typical or one size fits all ICA hybrid-gift development process. Rather, the research showed that many unique approaches are used in a variety of conditions and contexts. And, finally, an important finding was the combined evidence from both the ICA philanthropy survey and the two case studies that suggest that the use of hybrid gifts is trending upward.

This chapter begins with a summary and discussion of the primary findings and how they fill gaps in the current ICA philanthropic literature, followed by an application of behavioral economics lens to relevant findings. Next, implications for ICA development are discussed. Taken collectively, these implications consist largely of a list of best practices for ICA leaders and donors. Lastly, the chapter closes with suggestions for further research.

Summary and Discussion of Primary Findings

The primary findings of this study on the characteristics for successful hybrid-gift development within ICA focused on the need for a culture of philanthropy, the importance of strategic processes, identifying the trajectory of hybrid-gift donors, and new opportunities for hybrid gifts. Each of these findings is supported by evidence from the ICA philanthropy survey and the case studies. In addition, the primary findings help to fill gaps in the current literature, specifically, the lack of research on ICA major, planned, and hybrid gifts.

Culture of Philanthropy

A robust culture of philanthropy⁹ was found to be a critical element in establishing the foundation required for strong ICA hybrid-gift development. The behaviors and beliefs or “culture” that an ICA development department exudes and practices provides a baseline for creating a comprehensive development department that, in turn, provides the scaffolding to cultivate and solicit hybrid gifts. Without a thriving culture of philanthropy, hybrid gifts struggle to become a priority. Instead, a strong culture that is mission-centered and relationship-focused can take advantage of the possibilities of what hybrid gifts offer in stretching donors to do more. Without a culture of philanthropy and comprehensive development department, ICA development runs the risk of operating as simply independent fundraising units; for example, separate units that focus on annual fund, major gifts, and planned gifts. These findings are consistent with the literature that suggests that many ICA development departments have a strong understanding of their annual donor motivations and that differences among institutions engender unique elements of ICA development (Gladden et al., 2005; Hixson, 2012; Mahoney, 2003). However, that clarity grew murkier when development officers attempted to describe major gift, planned gift, or hybrid-gift donors. In essence, this study revealed that a robust culture of philanthropy is a prerequisite for hybrid-gift development success. Further, a strong culture of philanthropy begins to create the expectation to give, and hybrid gifts can then operate as an effective vehicle to help

⁹ A culture of philanthropy in this study consists of the behaviors and beliefs of a comprehensive approach to philanthropy (e.g., mission focused development with successful annual giving, major gifts, planned gifts, and the use of campaigns) that results in an expectation for donors to provide meaningful support.

maximize the impact and ease the tensions for donors through a strategic process focused on hybrid gifts.

Strategic Process

The presence of an intentional strategic process was also a consistent finding in successful ICA hybrid-gift development. Simply put, hybrid gifts were successful when they were a priority. Evidence suggests that successful hybrid-gift development in ICA relied upon precise and explicit expectations surrounding potential hybrid-gift donors and the cultivation process. Rarely, if ever, were decisions about gift size or gift construction made from “seat of their pants” development officer decision-making. Instead, each cultivation was pursued as an authentic donor relationship with a hybrid-gift used to maximize the overall gift. Further, both Division I institutions that participated in the case study phase of this research conducted in-depth internal donor analysis. For example, Great Lake University (GLU) did a deep-dive analysis of their season-ticket holders and \$500 and over donors, while Ocean State University (OSU) studied their planned gift donors to examine further philanthropic opportunities within their supporter and donor bases. Both institutions took the proactive initiative to reflect inward and use their internal data to help shape their strategic processes toward hybrid-gift development.

Education. The education—of both ICA development officers and donors—surrounding hybrid gifts was also identified as critical to the success of building hybrid gifts. This theme was consistent across all elements of the study. Practitioners often remarked that most prospects and donors rarely think about philanthropy and financially supporting ICA or higher education. Therefore, ICA leaders and development professionals need to work intentionally to continue to simplify the ICA development

process. In that regard, hybrid gifts work as a simple bridge for what on the surface can appear confusing to donors. Development officers that can simplify the process and clearly explain the benefits of constructing a cash now and deferred gift to both the donor and ICA will likely have a greater success securing more hybrid gifts. The study's findings presented here do not fully explain all of the challenges inherent to educating both donors and development officers about hybrid gifts or, for that matter, all ICA development and philanthropy. However, the study finds that reframing and simplifying the discussion with a concept such as, in the case of OSU "fourth bucket" or following the example of GLU by continuing to lead with personalized hybrid-gift asks contributes to a better understanding of this relatively new phenomena of hybrid gifts in ICA. Regardless, in all likelihood education will remain an ongoing challenge in ICA hybrid-gift development.

Communication. Similar to the importance of education, communication also emerged as a central theme as a necessary process for ICA hybrid-gift development. Often the communication about philanthropy was spread across entities, for example, ICA development staff, institutional advancement, donors, prospects, and community members. In addition, the most effective communication was often described as inspirational in nature. For example, Student-Athletes often have a powerful story to tell that resonates with donors and motivates them to make a gift. The study found that in addition to inspiration, messaging, and specifically unified messaging from institutional advancement and ICA development was critical to cultivating successful hybrid gifts. The unified message often took the form of co-marketing, where an ICA development department worked with institutional advancement to market both annual and planned

giving opportunities, often across generations of donors. For example, co-marketing at both GLU and OSU packaged annual giving opportunities with deferred options to generate more hybrid gifts. Finally, technology played an important role in communication, especially at institutions with fewer resources. For example, an ICA development podcast was found to be an innovative way to begin to cultivate new hybrid-gift prospects at one institution in the study.

Collaboration. Collaboration also proved to be an important element in a successful strategic process for ICA hybrid-gift development. Specifically, early and more frontend collaboration with institutional advancement planned giving experts helped construct more meaningful and larger hybrid gifts. This is an important finding in that it suggests ICA development officers do not need to be planned giving experts to use hybrid gifts; rather, ICA development practitioners need to embrace collaboration with campus experts and utilize their capacities to increase the size of a hybrid gift.

Benefits. The benefits resulting from hybrid gifts were often unnecessarily complicated and misaligned. For example, many ICA departments did not offer reward points or a benefits system to donors for hybrid or any deferred gifts. Moreover, hybrid gifts usually counted toward a development officer's annual financial fundraising goal but were not counted toward department or campus capital campaigns because of the cash now need and focus associated with building facilities. These seemingly misaligned benefits for both donors and development officers clearly work against a successful hybrid-gift development process. Instead, benefit systems and development officer goals and incentives should be recalibrated and realigned to maximize hybrid gifts. The case of

GLU's new customized donor experience reward system provides a good example for parties interested in maximizing or introducing new hybrid gift benefits.

Additional ICA benefits, such as customized donor experiences instead of static donor benefit charts and recognition opportunities through hybrid gifts are other elements that some ICA development departments often fail to embrace. In short, it appears with a little streamlining of internal systems, hybrid-gift benefits can be better optimized for efficiency and ultimately increase the number and size of hybrid gifts.

Hybrid-Gift Donor Trajectory Identification

The evidence from the ICA philanthropy survey and the two case studies suggests that the use of hybrid gifts is trending upward. As a result, the process by which potential hybrid-gift donors are identified becomes increasingly important. This study confirmed both the expected trajectories from literature and provided evidence of some surprise hybrid-gift donor trajectories that can be used to better identify hybrid-gift donors and increase ICA revenue in the future.

Expected trajectories. Consistent with the motivational literature for ICA development (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011; Hixson 2012; Ko et al., 2013; Tsiotsou, 2007), the typical predictors that ICA development officers use for hybrid-gift development are capacity, history of giving, passion, age, and family status. While the realization of any of these is not new, a more nuanced review of the trajectories provided some new and interesting insights.

Consistent with the planned giving and bequest literature (Drezner, 2011; Johnson, 2010; Sapp & Kimball, 2002), age is an expected predictor. Furthermore, age was shown to be not only as a simple number (e.g., a ceiling or floor to pursue hybrid and

planned gifts), although, those emerged too and were discussed in Chapter Four. Instead, age helped to identify generational bookends designed to help ICA development officers better understand how segments of donors approach hybrid gifts. This evidence toward generational segments, in at least some respects, was a surprising finding not previously discussed in the literature.

Another expected trajectory that this study confirmed was family status. Oftentimes family—or lack thereof—was mentioned as one of the most important attributes toward pursuing a hybrid gift with a donor. Yet, surprisingly, it was not enough to find simply a donor without children. Instead, successful hybrid-gift development required purposefully cultivating and authentically building a relationship with donors without children who, in turn, developed ICA as their family. This is an important distinction that adds to the depth of what might otherwise be perceived as a simple checklist to identify hybrid-gift prospects.

Surprise trajectories. Several surprising ICA hybrid-gift donor trajectory factors also emerged. First, a more sophisticated analysis than a common wealth screening found affinity as an important indicator for potential hybrid gifts. Affinity metrics included significantly more variables than a wealth screening. For instance, affinity scores used degree major, spouse's degree and alma mater, age, career arc, game attendance, event attendance, and family dynamics to create a more comprehensive understanding of a hybrid-gift prospect. Second, identifying donors that have intentions or pledges for a planned gift was documented as a new and innovative way to identify hybrid-gift prospects. Often through co-marketing and essentially working backward, ICA development officers identified a number of strong hybrid-gift prospects by discovering

donors that planned to make their first major gift as a planned gift. Third, and finally, a previously undocumented sector of hybrid-gift community donors was identified in this study. Usually, community donors have strong regional allegiance and perhaps made their money close to campus, i.e., die-hard locals. These often rabid and loyal fans might lack a strong liquid cash position, but more often than not they are willing to help try and create a more meaningful and impactful gift to ICA through a hybrid gift because ICA has meant so much to the local community.

New Opportunities

Hybrid gifts provide a number of opportunities for ICA development. Many are fairly intuitive, for example, hybrid gifts are a new philanthropic tool and it is logical to expect that additional education might help create larger and more hybrid gifts. Also, hybrid gifts provide a simple vehicle to stretch, leverage, and challenge a donor to give more. Moreover, hybrid gifts can help ease the tension for donors that giving a large initial sum might cause. And, finally, hybrid gifts are a way for development officers to help ensure that money is not left on the table.

Other opportunities, however, were more difficult to uncover. The ICA philanthropy survey discovered a number of opportunities, but the case studies provided insightful nuance and depth in combination with specific examples to better understand the emergent themes and opportunities. In the next few sections, I discuss three new opportunities supported by evidence of this study: 1) re-cultivation with certain segments of donors, specifically, planned gift first donors, widows, and younger donors; 2) how an elevated partnership can emerge through a deeper understanding of donors and development officers; and 3) how a short-term (cash now) with a long-term (deferred)

combination gift approach creates both multiple and layered benefits beyond just the fiscal outcome of a hybrid gift.

Re-cultivation. The opportunities created from re-cultivation were a consistent finding in this study. Beyond the obvious re-cultivation of strong major gift and annual fund donors, the evidence suggests that new opportunities for hybrid-gift success through re-cultivation center on three segments of donors: planned gift first donors, widows, and younger donors.

Planned gift first donors. This opportunity and segment of donors was discovered through internal research and co-marketing between ICA and institutional advancement. The internal research itself was a deep dive of pledged planned-gift donors. In addition, co-marketing was used to integrate themes that consisted of various units within ICA development targeted across multiple generations of donors. For example, a large extended family sitting around a tailgate talking about how they each give in different ways. Once identified, the planned-gift donors are then often encouraged to become more involved in ICA. Eventually, they are asked to activate their planned gifts, i.e., donate the annual output of what the deferred gift appears likely to yield.

Widows. Another noteworthy re-cultivation opportunity that emerged focused on widows. A widow may have different interests than the deceased spouse. Or perhaps the widow's interests evolve over time. Either way, what used to be thought of as simply a stewardship phase has now shifted to a re-cultivation phase. The process of re-engagement is an opportunity to include new gifts and to generate interest in a potential hybrid gift. In addition, the re-cultivation of widows is another strategic approach to help ensure that all gifts are fully leveraged.

Younger donors. The final re-cultivation opportunity that the study documented was related to younger donors. A number of ICA development professionals mentioned that as younger and younger donors are approached with the idea of hybrid giving, this provides increased opportunities for re-cultivation over the lifespan of those donors. As was reported in this study, the second or third iteration of the gift is often much larger. Therefore, securing hybrid gifts from younger donors creates a continual and broadening pool of hybrid-gift prospects.

Elevated partnership. Consistent with re-cultivation, elevated partnerships are another opportunity associated with hybrid gifts. This insight reflects how a hybrid gift can take relationships between the donor, development officer, and the ICA department to a new level. In essence, a hybrid gift collectively elevates ICA development officers, ICA donors, and all of ICA.

To reiterate, this opportunity is counter-intuitive and flies in the face of what many fundraising practitioners anecdotally believe about deferred gifts. Often fundraisers believe that any deferred or planned gift will be a donor's last gift. The evidence from this study suggests the opposite. Instead, a hybrid gift has the potential to create deeper insight, purpose, and eventually an elevated partnership. Hybrid-gift donors identify having a stronger connection to ICA and, as a result, want to do more. Also, the donor better understands the impact that a significant gift can have immediately with the cash element, and, often times then, the hybrid-gift donor will continue to give and in larger amounts. This is an important and potentially lucrative opportunity for ICA development.

Short- and long-term combination approach. Another opportunity with hybrid gifts is the multiple and layered benefits associated with taking a combined short- and

long-term approach to gift cultivation. In essence, a hybrid-gift construction of a short-term (cash now) and long-term (deferred gift) combination gift mirrors the operation of what the literature (Cohen, Whisenant, & Walsh, 2010; Routley et al., 2007) suggests are best practices toward building a strong and thriving comprehensive fundraising operation. In addition, the combination approach helps move ICA development away from the often-transactional nature of most ICA giving (Sargeant, 2001; Tsiotsou, 2007). Of course, ICA continues to need cash now but not at the expense of the future. Clearly both matter, and a short-term only approach limits the future potential for leverage. With hybrid gifts, the vehicle models the process and vice versa. Excessive short-termism is often associated with ICA development but is mitigated with the combination approach of hybrid gifts. Moreover, there is new evidence—although, from in the corporate sector—that a long-term orientation has shown enormous value and rewards (Barton, Monika, & Williamson, 2017), and it is a reasonable to conclude that similar results might occur in the non-profit sector. Essentially, if ICA leaders and development officers maintain a long-term mindset and resist a short-term only approach, ICA philanthropy would probably increase. This new opportunity is a bit more esoteric than the others mentioned, but I believe it is important because it represents a more complex and nuanced analysis of the ICA hybrid-gift development evidence discovered in this study.

This opportunity is challenging and difficult to untangle because it requires holding multiple and often competing ideas constant. First, ICA development pursues cash gifts. Second, oftentimes the largest gifts are deferred (Drezner, 2011). This creates a tension because ICA development officers are often focused on the cash now gifts at the expense of the larger deferred gifts. Third, ICA leaders and development officers

have consistent turnover in staffing. These consistent staff changes work against many incentives for the cultivation of long-term gifts. Fourth, the hybrid-gift combination approach provides ICA development officers with a vehicle to overcome short-termism while also securing some cash now and operating with a more long-term mindset. Fifth, beyond only impacting the development officer a hybrid-gift combination also provides, as previously mentioned, an elevated partnership for donors. And finally, the short- and long-term combination approach may lead to better performance than any single myopic approach to ICA development; for example, only annual funds or major gifts while also working towards increasing the lifetime value of donors (Sargeant, 2001; Tsiotsou, 2007). In short, the best gifts work on many levels. It is critical to take both a short- and long-term approach to ICA development, and the opportunity to pursue both—simultaneously—through hybrid gifts is a simple and effective way to understand, cultivate, and secure gifts that work on many levels.

Conclusions to Summary of Primary Findings

In sum, the primary findings for ICA hybrid-gift development center on a culture of philanthropy, strategic processes, identifying hybrid gift donor trajectories, and a number of opportunities that hybrid gifts provide. Nevertheless, even within these findings variation exists across successful ICA hybrid-gift development. This is not all that surprising. However, beyond the nuanced differences within ICA hybrid-gift development, a number of best practices and practical implications emerged.

Behavioral Economics and Hybrid Gift Findings

This section uses behavioral economics and specifically, Daniel Kahneman's book, *Thinking, Fast and Slow* (2011), as a framework for better understanding the

findings of this study. Additional works from Kahneman and Tversky—two founding fathers of behavioral economics—are also used to identify further psychological insights and help explain economic decision-making and cognitive bias. The application of behavioral economics in conjunction with the findings of this study was deemed appropriate because of the overlapping concepts of decision-making and uncertainty in ICA development.

As a brief recap, Kahneman describes how the mind works with a two-system process: System 1—or, fast thinking—is automatic and effortless, and System 2—or, slow thinking—is effortful, reflective, and described as lazy. The theory suggests that most of what happens in our minds is automatic or System 1 and usually works well. In short, Kahneman’s use of the two-system terminology provides a frame and language to more easily discuss how the mind works when making decisions. In the following analysis I highlight four elements from Kahneman’s approach as they relate to the findings of this study: framing, anchoring, what you see is all there is (WYSIATI), and loss aversion.

Framing

The framing effect describes how decision-making varies based on how choices are presented (Tversky & Kahneman, 1981). In this study the idea of framing can be used beneficially to help shape the choices an ICA development officer presents a donor. Oftentimes, hybrid-gift solicitations are held back as trump cards in favor of cash now gifts, in essence, too narrowly framing the solicitation. Unfortunately, hybrid gifts are often not presented as an option to many donors, resulting in gifts that are not fully leveraged. Instead, re-framing the approach as a broader and more inclusive one that

includes hybrid gift opportunities may allow donors to make better choices and result in better outcomes for both the donors and ICA department.

Anchoring

The anchoring effect is a concept that uses a starting point or anchor to influence the adjustment of the final plausible or satisfying answer—usually biased toward the anchor (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). In ICA hybrid-gift development, ICA development officers can use a hybrid-gift first ask to introduce a higher initial value—or anchor—to then theoretically strongly influence the size of a larger final gift. Great Lake University, for instance, has used this form of anchoring in hybrid-gift donor solicitations. Anchoring suggests that a final gift in this scenario will be larger than one that results from a lower overall starting number (e.g., a cash only gift) thereby yielding a higher end value (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974).

What You See Is All There Is (WYSIATI)

The acronym WYSIATI was coined by Kahneman (2011) to explain the notion that the mind forms impressions and makes judgments with only the information that is available at that time. In short, our decision-making is bounded by the information that exists and we rarely, if ever, consider what we do not know. In regard to ICA hybrid-gift development, the idea that WYSIATI helps to explain why the internal staff was often focused only on annual and major gifts. Considering this theory, ICA development would be better served to also focus on hybrid or planned gifts. One way this could be accomplished is by designating a hybrid gift lead on ICA developments staffs.

The bias WYSIATI also provides a framework for understanding why some ICA departments pursue hybrid gifts and some do not. Quite simply, the successful cultivation

of hybrid gifts appears to lead to more hybrid gifts. Furthermore, this study found 42 percent of ICA senior level development director survey respondents were not familiar with hybrid-gift development. These non-hybrid gift pursuing ICA development departments may be operating with WYSIATI thinking focusing only on known knowns—usually, annual fund and major gift pursuits—as opposed to realizing the unknown unknowns. The findings from this study should help to mitigate, at least to some extent, the impact of WYSIATI thinking in ICA development.

Loss Aversion

Finally, the concept of loss aversion describes how perceived losses have a larger impact on our decision-making than gains or advantages (Tversky & Kahneman, 1991). In essence, we are more likely to try to avoid a loss than to achieve an equal gain. The idea of loss aversion provides context to illustrate the value of the hybrid-gift model. As the evidence in this study suggests, hybrid-gift models may serve to ease tension associated loss aversion by providing flexibility. Since the hybrid-gift model allows the donor to avoid making an immediate large cash gift and, as one respondent described, “keep their airplane”, their immediate sense of loss may be sufficiently mitigated.

Conclusions to Behavioral Economics and Hybrid Gifts Findings

Taken together, these four elements of behavioral economics have enhanced our understanding of several findings from this study. Perhaps most importantly, the work of Kahneman and Tversky have been supported by the findings of this study, adding a small layer of additional confirmation towards their decade’s long study of decision-making under conditions of uncertainty. As the literature suggests, ICA development departments can combat cognitive biases surrounding ICA philanthropy by focusing on industry

trends rather than anecdotal evidence (Beer & Coffman, 2014) and the evidence from this study suggests that hybrid gifts are a trend.

In the end, a major benefit for overlaying behavioral economics onto the findings of this study is the creation of a hybrid-gift process that is more aligned with System 1 thinking, in essence benefiting both ICA and donors. The effort and reflective process of System 2 is certainly critical and required in nearly every ICA hybrid-gift construction. However, moving forward, ICA development should strive to generate a stronger System 1 type process or fast thinking in regard to hybrid-gift development. Working toward this type of hybrid-gift development would go a long way help optimize ICA philanthropy. For example, both case study locations have begun to create a more robust System 1 type approach to ICA hybrid-gift development by recognizing the hybrid gift trend and opportunities associated with the process. In reality, implementation may prove to be more challenging.

Implications and Recommendations

There are at least two types of implications that can be drawn from this study. These include implications for both ICA leaders and development practitioners, as well as ICA donors and prospects. The two sets of implications are discussed in the next few sections.

ICA Leaders and Development Practitioners

An overarching goal of this study was to provide a practical blueprint for ICA leaders to increase revenue through hybrid gifts. This section discusses the best practices, trends, and new strategies around hybrid gifts that emerged from this study, which can potentially help ICA leaders and development practitioners generate more revenue.

Education. The education provided for hybrid gifts needs to be collectively elevated. Development officers need to evolve their understanding of deferred gifts and the impact of hybrid gifts, recognizing that hybrid-gift prospects require simple and easy to understand guidance through the hybrid-gift process. In addition, education needs to be approached as a continual process, rather, than a one-off meeting or mailer.

Communication. At its best, the communication of ICA hybrid-gift development tells the story of ICA and the impact of ICA hybrid gifts in compelling and inspiring ways. It needs to pull on the heartstrings while at the same time being lean and concise. Further, this sort of communication thrives when it is co-marketed and themed together with not only campus advancement, but also with ICA annual funds, major gifts, and planned gift development. Moreover, cross-generational approaches reveal the impact, capacity, and potential of hybrid gifts.

Assign an internal hybrid-gift lead. In departments that are large enough, assigning a lead for both planned gifts and hybrid gifts within ICA development was another emergent best practice. This provides a number of benefits. First, it signals importance. Second, it carves out the intentional pursuit of hybrid gifts and becomes a priority. Third, it allows other staff members to learn from the lead. Fourth, it creates an in-house expert to help other development officers in earlier collaboration for hybrid gifts. Finally, it creates easier conversations about hybrid gifts with more prospects and donors.

Create a Planned-Giving Council. Creating a planned-giving council is another way to engender more expertise and hybrid-giving opportunities. The council has the opportunity to function as a model for other hybrid-gift donors and prospects. The

evidence from this study suggests hybrid giving begets hybrid giving. Additionally, a successful planned-giving council can help engender a flourishing culture of philanthropy by not only modeling the way but also creating the expectation to give deferred gifts. Moreover, the council can also operate as advocates, experts, and lead generators for ICA development.

Survey donors. Donor surveys emerged as a consistent best practice. Currently, digital surveys provide a cost effective way to gather meaningful information, create new hybrid-gift leads, and operate as another avenue to help educate both development officers and donors. The evidence from this study shows that information gathered from both internal donors and season ticket holder surveys can help identify planned-gift first donors, financially astute younger donors, and community local die-hard residents that have all been shown to be strong hybrid-gift candidates. In short, donor surveys create a more nuanced understanding of a pool of ICA donors.

Earlier collaboration. Initiating an internal culture where early collaboration between ICA development officers and a planned giving expert, usually from institutional advancement, provided evidence of larger gifts and a simpler process for both the donor and ICA development officer. Even in a thriving culture of philanthropy that successfully develops hybrid giving, this concept of earlier collaboration was identified as an area that could improve further to generate additional revenue.

Stretch technique. At its core, the hybrid gift is a simple gift to help donors increase their capacity to give more. It proved an effective philanthropic tool in the toolkit to help ICA development officers challenge donors to help them do more without

imposing an immediate large financial burden. Intercollegiate athletic leaders can politely poke and nudge donors to do more through a hybrid gift.

Lead with a hybrid-gift ask. Leading with a hybrid-gift ask emerged as a best practice in certain situations. This calculated boldness led to a few larger hybrid gifts than otherwise might have been available. Leading with a hybrid ask, as opposed to using it as a trump card or holding the hybrid opportunity back in case a large cash now gift proves not to be option, revealed itself as a philanthropic strategy to create a more personalized ask and expedite the giving process. Furthermore, leading with a hybrid-gift ask helps donors understand that ICA understands their financial situation but also wants to help them find ways to make the largest impact possible.

Align benefits. Another implication from this study was the misalignment between hybrid-gift development, benefits, and incentives for both development officers and donors. Certainly, the benefits will vary from institution to institution, but ICA development departments would be better served by creating benefits that take advantage of the growing number of hybrid gifts. Again, customized donor experiences are an example of a new and unique benefit systems that emerged from one of the case studies.

Re-cultivation. To reiterate, re-cultivation is another benefit of hybrid gifts. Indeed, ICA development needs to embrace hybrid-gift development because of the evidence that points toward increased solicitation opportunities and a proven way to engage younger donors; in essence, avoiding leaving money on the table when a donor's wealth grows.

Naming opportunities. This is a new extension of hybrid gifts, but the philanthropic path toward recognition and naming opportunities is an exciting element in

ICA hybrid-gift trends. Again, although institutions will vary the amount of upfront money required, but the use of hybrid gifts in a strategic and consistent process in capital campaigns is an exciting revelation for ICA and the ICA facilities arms race.

Combination lens. The last implication for ICA development officers focuses on the nested benefits of hybrid gifts through a combination lens. The layered elements to the development officer, ICA as a whole, and the donor for both the short- and long-term provide hybrid gifts with unique amplifying effects of the gift. In essence, the combination of elements helps continue to build a robust culture of philanthropy. Done correctly, hybrid gifts are a strategic calculation both wise and subtle that can help accelerate donors and trigger a cascade toward larger and more impactful gifts.

What the study suggests is that to be most effective, ICA leaders and development officers need to embrace and purposefully pursue hybrid gifts. The study also demonstrated that hybrid gifts can be a powerful tool for ICA donors and prospects.

ICA Donors and Prospects

Another outcome of this study has been the emergence of a set of implications for ICA donors and prospects. This section discusses some of the hybrid-gift trends and implications that could impact ICA donors and prospects.

Done correctly, hybrid gifts can take jargon heavy and unfamiliar philanthropic topics and create an easy to understand vehicle for ICA donors and prospects to increase their impact. The clarity of the gift structure can empower donors to do more.

Larger gifts. Using a combined cash now and deferred gift construction provides a vehicle for donors to give more to ICA. Hybrid gifts provide a tool for donors to give larger and more impactful gifts.

Enjoy the impact. Not only are hybrid gifts a tool to create larger gifts, but they also create immediate impact. In essence, hybrid-gift donors have an opportunity to enjoy the impact that their gift creates while they are still alive.

Ease tensions. In addition, hybrid gifts were shown to ease some of the financial strain that a large cash gift may cause a donor. Hybrid gifts can dilute some of the sticker shock involved in large asks. Because the gifts are often structured with a significant portion of the gift as a deferred element, a hybrid gift allows donors to maintain their current lifestyle and not have to “give up the airplane”.

Elevated partnership. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, there is evidence that ICA hybrid-gift donors undergo a transformation toward an elevated partnership after a hybrid gift is donated. In short, the donor’s relationship with ICA becomes deeper and more meaningful because the donor is now formally connected to the long-term mission of the ICA department and is making an immediate impact; taken together, this represents a powerful combination.

Suggestions for Future Research

The findings of this study provide a springboard to explore ICA philanthropy and hybrid gifts in greater detail. As mentioned earlier, there is a limited amount of published literature that focuses on hybrid or blended gifts in any context, let alone ICA. This study has tried to bridge that gap; however, more knowledge is needed around ICA philanthropy and hybrid gifts. As such, the following recommendations are offered for further research and analysis.

Initially, this study could be replicated across different divisions across college athletics. For example, would an exploration of Division II, III, NAIA, and community

colleges yield varying results? Of course, many similarities would exist across Division I Non Football institutions and lower Division college athletics; nevertheless, insightful differences may emerge.

Another area that is under researched is hybrid-gift donors themselves. Currently, no published research exists that focuses only on hybrid-gift donors. In fact, only one dissertation was found on ICA major-gift donors (Hixson, 2012). Interestingly, of the 24 total interviews that took place during the two case studies, only four were with hybrid-gift donors. Taken together, the information provided by the four hybrid-gift donors reached only limited levels of saturation; although, the theme of an elevated partnership appeared in all four interviews. Beyond that, however, the hybrid-gift donor interviews reaffirmed the case-by-case, unique elements associated with philanthropy, especially large gifts.

In addition, longitudinal research of Division I ICA hybrid-gift development would certainly enhance the literature. Annual or semi-annual surveys could be conducted across Division ICA development departments to better measure growth, changes, and trends across the industry. Further, in-depth follow-up case studies, perhaps as many as ten to twenty years into the future, with the two institutions or similar institutions from this study would help examine the impact of a long-term approach to ICA development and hybrid gifts.

Lastly, conducting hybrid-gift research outside of ICA could be beneficial for the greater nonprofit sector. Research focusing on hybrid-gift development within higher education in general and other nonprofit sectors could significantly contribute to the breadth of understanding of hybrid-gift philanthropy. In fact, one interviewee said, “I

think the blended piece is going to be continuing to be a big solution in the future for helping nonprofits.”

Conclusions to the Chapter

The purpose of this study was to examine hybrid gifts in Division I ICA because of the limited empirical research surrounding hybrid gifts. The 221 usable survey responses and the 24 interviews associated with the case studies provided this study with substantial evidence toward identifying hybrid-gift development characteristics, trends, and best practices across Division I ICA.

Taken as a whole, the findings and implications of this study produced a number of insights. The themes that emerged focused on a culture of philanthropy, a strategic process that includes education, communication, and collaboration, identifying the trajectory of hybrid-gift donors, and new opportunities. The implications focus on an array of industry best practices for ICA leaders and various ramifications for hybrid-gift donors.

Finally, results showed for the first time that hybrid gifts are a growing industry trend and create a number of dynamic new options for ICA development to increase revenue. The long-term mindset, re-cultivation, and elevated partnership attributes make hybrid gifts a substantial, if not dramatic, tool for ICA development officers. Nevertheless, it would be an oversimplification to think of ICA hybrid-gift development as a simple linear process. Instead, hybrid-gift development is a more nuanced process that when prioritized within a thriving culture of philanthropy and strategic process can provide exciting and creative ways to increase ICA revenue.

In the end, I am reminded of a quote from a speech from San Diego State University President Elliot Hirshman. He said, “No matter how long our tenures, we all come and go at the university. But, the things that endure at the university are ideas and endowments” (2016). This study suggests that hybrid gifts are often both.

REFERENCES

- Anctil, E. (2009). Institutional advancement and spectator sports: The importance of television. *New Directions for Higher Education*. 148, 35-44.
- Baade, R. A., & Sundberg, J. O. (1996). Fourth down and gold to go? Assessing the link between athletics and alumni giving. *Social Science Quarterly*. Vol. 77, no. 4, pp. 789-803.
- Barascout, R. (2012). *Gifts on a high note: A case study of major donors to music programs in higher education* (Order No. 3509029). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1019057119). Retrieved from <http://0-search.proquest.com.sally.sandiego.edu/docview/1019057119?accountid=14742>
- Bass, J.R. (2013). The politics of fundraising: An organizational ethnography of boosters. Dissertation. Florida State University.
- Beer, T. & Coffman, J. (2014). How shortcuts cut us short: Cognitive traps in philanthropic decision making. *Center for Evaluation Innovation*.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011). A literature review of empirical studies of philanthropy: Eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Volunteer Sector Quarterly*. Vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 924-973. Sage.
- Billing, J.E., Holt, D., & Smith, J. (1985). *Athletic fund-raising: Exploring the motives behind donations*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Birch, D., & Veroff, J. (1966). *Motivation: A Study of Action*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Brest, P. (2015). Strategic philanthropy and its discontents. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*. Retrieved from https://ssir.org/up_for_debate/article/strategic_philanthropy_and_its_discontents
- Brittingham, B.E., & Pezzullo, T.R. (1990). *The campus green: Raising funds in higher education*. Washington, DC: ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1.
- Brooker, G. & Klastorin, T.D. (1981). To the victors belong the spoils? College athletics and alumni giving. *Social Science Quarterly*. Vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 744-751.
- Brown, D.W. (2003). What research tells us about planned giving? *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*. 9(1), 86-95.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4th ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Budig, J.F. (1976). The relationship among intercollegiate athletics, enrollment, and voluntary support for public higher education. Ph.D. dissertation, Illinois State University.
- Burchette, B.M. (2013). *Examining factors that influence donor motivation among former student-athletes and NCAA DI classification*. Doctoral dissertation, Drexel University. Retrieved from search.proquest.com/docview/1420345503
- Burnsed, B. (2014). Growth in Division I athletics expenses outpaces revenue increases. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/media-center/news/growth-division-i-athletics-expenses-outpaces-revenue-increases> on February 23, 2016.
- Campbell, J.L., Quincey, C., Osserman, J., & Pedersen, O.K. (2013). Coding in-depth semistructured interviews. *Sociological Methods & Research*. Sage.
- Chudacoff, H.P. (2015). *Changing the playbook: How power, profit, and politics transformed college sports*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Chung, D.J. (2013). The dynamic of advertising effect of college athletics. *Marketing Science* 32(5), 679-698.
- Cohen, C., Whisenant, W., & Walsh, P. (2010). The relationship between sustained success and donations for an athletic department with a premier football program. *Public Organiz Rev.* 11, 255-263.
- Coughlin, C. C., & Erickson, O. H. (1984). An examination of contributions to support intercollegiate athletics. *Southern Economic Journal*. Vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 180-195.
- Crawford, D.W., Jackson, E.L., & Godbey, G. (1991). A hierarchical model of leisure constraints. *Leisure Sciences: An Interdisciplinary Journal*. Vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 309-320.
- Creswell, J.W., & Plano Clark, V.L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, C.A.: Sage.
- Creswell, J.W. (2014). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Curti, M. (1957). The history of American philanthropy as a field of research. *The American Historical Review*. 62(2), 352-262.
- Cutlip, S.M. (1990). *Fundraising in the United States: Its role in America's Philanthropy* (2nd ed.). New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction.

- Daly, S. (2013). Philanthropy, the new professionals and higher education; the advent of directors of development and alumni relations. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*. 35(1), 21-33.
- Daughtrey, C. & Stotlar, D. (2000). Donations: are they affected by a football championships? *Sports Marketing Quarterly*. 9(4), 185-193.
- Dillman, D.A., Smyth, J.D., & Christian, L.M. (2009). *Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Donmoyer, R. (2016). *LEAD 608 Virtual Lecture #2*. [Class handout]. Department of Leadership Studies, University of San Diego, San Diego, CA.
- Drezner, N.D. (2011). *Philanthropy and fundraising in American higher education*. *ASHE Higher Education*, 37(2).
- Duderstadt, J.J. (2003). *Intercollegiate athletics and the American university: A university president's perspective*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Ettinger, J.R. (2015). Applications of behavioral economics in philanthropy: Understanding loss aversion and risk tolerance in grantmaking. *Duke Sanford*. Retrieved from <http://cspcs.sanford.duke.edu/learning-resources/publications/applications-behavioral-economics-philanthropy>
- Fisher, B. (2007). Athletics success and institutional rankings. *New Directions for Higher Education*. 148, 45- 53.
- Frank, R. H. (2004). *Challenging the Myth: A Review of the Links Among College Athletic Success, Student Quality, and Donations*. Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics report.
- Fulks, D. (2014). NCAA revenue and expenses of Division I intercollegiate athletics programs report. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Gaski, J.F., & Etzel, M.J. (1984). Collegiate athletic success and alumni generosity: Dispelling the myth. *Social Behavior and Personality*. 12(1), 29-38.
- Getz, M. & Siegfried, J. (2012a). College sports: The mystery of the zero-sum game. *Change*. Pp. 52-59.
- Getz, M. & Siegfried, J. (2012b). What does intercollegiate athletics do to or for colleges and universities? In Getz, M. *The Oxford handbook of sports economics*, pp. 349-372.

- Giving USA. (2015). Annual report on philanthropy for the year 2014. Indiana University.
- Gladden, J.M., Mahony, D.F., & Apostolopulo, A. (2005). Toward a better understanding of college athletic donors: What are the primary motives. *Sports Marketing Quarterly*. Vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 18-30. West Virginia University.
- Goff, B.L., & Tollison, R.D. (Eds.). (1990). *Sportsmetrics*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.
- Gurney, G., Lopiano, D.A., & Zimbalist, A. (2017). *Unwinding madness: What went wrong with college sports and how to fix it*. Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institute.
- Hall, J.S., & Mahony, D.F. (1997). Factors affecting methods used by annual giving programs: A qualitative study of NCAA Division I athletic departments. *Sports Marketing Quarterly*. Vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 21-30.
- Hendrickson, R.M., Lane, J.E., Harris, J.T., & Dorman, R.H. (2013). *Academic leadership and governance of higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Hesel, R., & Perko, A. (2010). A sustainable model? University presidents assess the costs and financing of intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*. 3, 32-50.
- Hirshman, E. (2016, August 30) *Jim Sterk Farewell Reception*. Speech presented at San Diego State University, San Diego, CA.
- Hixson, N.C. (2012). *Multi-million Dollar Donors Within Intercollegiate Athletics: A Qualitative Analysis of Donor Motivations*. Published dissertation, University of Northern Colorado.
- Holmes, J.A., Meditz, J.A., & Somers, P.M. (2008). Athletics and alumni giving: Evidence from a highly selective liberal arts college. *Journal of Sports Economics*. Vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 538-552. Sage. DOI: 10.1177/1527002507313896
- Humphreys, B.R., & Mondello, M. (2007). Intercollegiate athletic success and donations.
- Johnson, K. (2010). *The power of legacy and planned gifts*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Wiley.
- Kahneman D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Kahneman D., & Tversky A. (1979). Prospect theory: Analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*. 47(2): 263-291.

- Kezar, A. (2013). *Non-tenure-track faculty's social construction of a supportive work environment*. Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Ko, Y.J., Rhee, Y.C., Walker, M., & Lee, J.H. (2013). What motivates donors to athletic programs: A new model of donor behavior. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. Sage. DOI:10.1177/0899764012472065
- Kurasaki, K.S. (2000). Intercoder reliability from validating conclusions drawn from open-ended interview data. *Field Methods*. 12, 179-194.
- Kvale, S. & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the Craft of Quantitative Research Interviewing* [2nd. Ed.]. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E.G. (1995). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury, CA: Sage.
- Mahoney, D.F., Gladden, J.M., & Funk, D.C. (2003). Examining Athletic Donors at NCAA Division I Institutions. *International Sports Journal*. Pp. 9-28.
- Madden, K. (2006). Giving and identity: Why affluent Australians give-or don't-to community causes. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*. 41(4), 453-478.
- Magson, N. & Routley, C. (2009). Using data in legacy fundraising: A practical approach. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*. 14(1), 333-340.
- Martinez, J.M., Stinson, J.L., Kang, M., & Jubenville, C.B. (2010). Intercollegiate athletic and institutional fundraising: A meta-analysis. *Sports Marketing quarterly*. 19, 36-47.
- McEvoy, C. (2002). An investigation of Donor characteristics and contributions to an Intercollegiate Athletics Fundraising Program. Unpublished dissertation, Northern Colorado University.
- McEvoy, C.D., Morse, A.L., & Shapiro, S.L. (2013). Factors influencing collegiate athletic department revenues. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*. Vol. 6, pp. 249-267.
- Meer, J., & Rosen, H.S. (2009). The impact of athletic performance on alumni giving: An analysis of microdata. *Economics of Education Review*. Elsevier.
- Meyer, J., & Zimbalist, A. (2017). Reforming college sports: The case for a limited and conditional antitrust exemption. *The Antitrust Bulletin*. 62(1) 31-61.
- Nixon, H.L. (2014). *The athletic trap: How college sports corrupted the academy*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

- Nocera J. & Strauss . (2016). *Indentured: The inside story of the rebellion against the NCAA*. New York, NY: Random House.
- O'Neil, J. & Schenke, M. (2006). An examination of factors impacting athlete alumni donations to their alma mater: a case study of U.S. university. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*. Wiley. DOI: 10.1002/nvsm.274
- Orszag, J.M., & Orszag, P.R. (2005). The empirical effects of collegiate athletics: An update. *NCAA*. Pp. 1-12. Indianapolis, IN: Compass.
- Oster, S.M. (2003). Is there a dark side to endowment growth? *New Directions for Institutional Research*. No. 119. Wiley.
- Panas, J. (1984). *Mega gifts*. Chicago, IL: Bonus Books, Inc.
- Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods*. Third Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Polit, D.F., & Beck, C.T. (2010). Generalization in quantitative and qualitative research: Myths and strategies. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*. 47(11), 1451-1458.
- Proper, E. & Caboni, T.C. (2014). *Institutional advancement: What we know*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rhoads, T. A., & Gerking, S. (2000). Educational contributions, academic quality, and athletic success. *Contemporary Economic Policy*. Vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 248-258.
- Routley, C., Sargeant A., & Scaife, W. (2007). Bequests to educational institutions: Who gives and why? *International journal of educational advancement*. 7(3), 193-203.
- Routley, C. & Sargeant, A. (2014). Leaving a bequest: Living on through charitable gifts. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 44(5), 869-885.
- Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sanderson, A.R., & Siegfried, J.J. (2015). The case for playing college athletes. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 2(1), 115-138.
- Sapp, R.E. & Kimball, P.K. (2002). Planned giving. In Worth, M.J. (2002). *New strategies for educational fund raising*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Sargeant, A. (2001). Using donor lifetime value to inform fundraising strategy. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*. 12(1), 25-38.

- Sargeant, A., Hilton, T., & Wymer, W. (2006). Bequest motives and barriers to giving the case of direct mail donors. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*. Vol. 17, no. 1. Wiley Interscience. DOI: 10.1002/nml.130
- Schervish, P. G. (1997). Inclination, obligation and association: What we know and what we need to know about donor motivation. In D. F. Burlingame (Ed.), *Critical issues in fund raising*, pp. 110-138. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Schwarz, A. & Trahan, K. (2017). The mythology playbook: Procompetitive justifications for “amateurism,” biases and heuristics, and “believing what you know ain’t so.” *The Antitrust Bulletin*. 62(1), 140-183.
- Seymour, H.J. (1999). *Designing for fund-raising* (2nd ed.). Farmington Hills, MI: The Taft Group.
- Shapiro, S. (2008). Donor Loyalty in College Athletics: An Analysis of relationship Fundraising Quality. Unpublished dissertation. University of Northern Colorado.
- Shapiro, S.L., & Giannoulakis, C. (2009). An exploratory investigation of donor constraints for former student-athletes. *International Journal of Sport Management*. Vol. 10, pp. 207-225
- Shapiro, S., Giannoulakis, C., Drayer, J., & Wang, C.H. (2010). An examination of athletic alumni giving behavior: Development of the Former Student-Athlete Donor Constraint Scale. *Sports Management Review*. Pp. 283-295.
- Shapiro, S.L., & Ridinger, L.L. (2011). An analysis of donor involvement, gender, and giving in athletics. *Sports Marketing Quarterly*. Vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 22-32.
- Sigelman, L., & Carter, R. (1979). Win one for the giver? Alumni giving and big-time college sports. *Social Science Quarterly*. 60(2), 284-296.
- Sigelman, L., & Bookheimer, S. (1983). Is it whether you win or lose? Monetary contributions to big-time college athletic programs. *Social Science Quarterly*. Vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 347-359.
- Smith, J.C. (1989). Athletic fund-raising: Exploring the motives behind private donations. Master’s Thesis. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Smith, R.A. (2011). *Pay for play: A history of big-time college athletic reform*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Sparvero, E.S., & Warner, S. (2013). The price of winning and the impact on the NCAA community. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*. (6), p. 120-142.

- Sperber, M. (2000). *How big-time college sports is crippling undergraduate education*. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company.
- Stinson, J.L., & Howard, D.R. (2004). Scoreboards vs. mortarboards: Major donor behavior and intercollegiate athletics. *Sports Marketing Quarterly*. Vol. 13, pp. 129-140. West Virginia University.
- Stinson, J. & Howard, D. (2010). Athletic giving and academic giving: Exploring the value of SPLIT donors. *Journal of Sport Management*. Vol. 24, no. 6, pp. 744-768.
- Strode, J.P. (2006). *Donor motives to giving to intercollegiate athletics*. Dissertation: The Ohio State University.
- Staurowsky, E.J., Parkhouse, B., & Sachs, M. (1996). Developing an instrument to measure athletic donor behavior and motivation. *Journal of Sports Management*. Vol. 10, pp. 262-277. Human Kinetics Publishers, Inc.
- Sun, X., Hoffman, S.C., & Grady, M.L. (2007). A multivariate causal model of alumni giving: Implications for alumni fundraisers. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*. Vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 307-332.
- Tempel, Seiler, & Aldrich. (2011). *Achieving excellence in fundraising*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Thelin, J.R. (2011). *A history of American higher education* (2nd ed.). Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Tsiotsou, R. (2007). An empirically based typology of intercollegiate athletic donors: High and low motivation scenarios. *Journal of Targeting, Measurement, and Analysis for Marketing*. Vol. 15, 2, pp. 79-92.
- Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. *Science*. 185(4157): 1124-1131.
- Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. (1981). The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*. 211: 453-458.
- Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. (1991). Loss aversion in riskless choice: A reference-dependent model. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 106(4): 1039-1061.
- Williams, L. (2014). *Implementing Surveys* [PowerPoint Slides]. Department of Leadership Studies, University of San Diego, San Diego, CA.
- Worth, M.J. (2002). *New strategies for educational fund raising*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Verner, M.E., Hecht, J.B., & Fansler, A.G. (1998). Validating an instrument to assess the motivation of athletic donors. *Journal of Sports Management*. Vol. 12, pp. 123-137. Human Kinetics Publishers, Inc.

Yin, R, (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

APPENDIX A

Division I Intercollegiate Athletics Philanthropy Survey

Division-I Intercollegiate Athletics Philanthropy Survey

Division-I Intercollegiate Athletics Philanthropy Survey. The purpose of this survey is to better understand Division-I Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) philanthropy. You have been asked to participate in this survey because you are a senior level development professional in Division I ICA. Your responses to this survey are very important. Your responses will help create new knowledge by creating a snapshot of the industry and emerging best practices. This survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete. Also, your participation in this survey is entirely voluntary. All of your responses will be kept confidential, and you are giving your informed consent by completing this survey. Should you have any questions, comments, or believe you are not the right person to complete the survey please contact J.T. O'Sullivan at jtosullivan@sandiego.edu or XXX.XXX.XXXX or my dissertation chair Professor Fred Galloway at galloway@sandiego.edu or XXX.XXX.XXXX. I sincerely appreciate your time and thoughtful responses in completing the survey. Thank you!

Q1 How many full-time equivalent (FTE) employees does the Intercollegiate Athletic Development Department have that focus on the following categories:

- Total FTE (1)
 Major gifts (2)
 Annual fund (3)
 Women's Athletics (4)
 Planned gifts (5)
 Prospect Researchers (6)
 Corporate Support (7)
 Communications (12)
 Campaigns (8)
 Events and stewardship (9)
 Administrative assistance (10)
 Other (11)

Q1A Other: Please explain

Q2 Please answer the following Intercollegiate Athletic Development questions:(the categories are not mutually exclusive)

	Number of Donors (1)
Approximately, how many annual fund donors did the Intercollegiate Athletics Department have during the last full Fiscal Year (FY)? (1)	
Approximately, how many major-gift donors did the Intercollegiate Athletics Department have during the last full FY? (2)	

Q3 What are the minimum dollar amounts for the following gift categories at your Intercollegiate Athletics Department?

	Dollar Amounts (1)
Major gift (1)	
Endowment gift (2)	
Deferred gift (4)	

Q4 Please answer the following Intercollegiate Athletics financial questions:

	Dollar Amounts (1)
Approximately, what was the Development Department operating budget for the last full FY? (1)	
Approximately, what was the Development Department fundraising goal for the last full FY? (2)	
Approximately, how much money did the Development Department raise in the last full FY? (3)	

The following section focuses on planned giving and endowments:

Q5 On average, over the last three years, has the percentage of ICA planned gifts secured:

- ☐ Increased (1)
- ☐ Stayed the same (2)
- ☐ Decreased (3)
- ☐ Do not know (4)

Q6 At what donor/prospect age does Intercollegiate Athletics Development begin to intentionally pursue planned gifts?

- ☐ 20-29 (1)
- ☐ 30-39 (2)
- ☐ 40-49 (3)
- ☐ 50-59 (4)
- ☐ 60-69 (5)
- ☐ 70-79 (6)
- ☐ 80-89 (7)
- ☐ 90+ (8)
- ☐ Do not know (9)

Q7 Please share any observations you have about important trends related to planned-gifts.

Q8 What is the current total dollar value of your overall Institutional endowment?

Q9 What is the current total dollar value of the Intercollegiate Athletic endowment?

Q10 Do planned gift amounts count toward any type of donor rewards/point system?

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (2)

Q11 Are you familiar with the term "hybrid gift"?

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (3)
- ☐ Not sure (4)

There are a number of possible definitions for hybrid gifts. For the purpose of this survey, a hybrid gift is a gift that combines both an immediate cash gift and some type of deferred planned gift. Further, there are many ways a hybrid gift in this frame could be structured. For example, a donor could agree to donate the annual endowment payout for an endowment for the rest of their life and pledge the entire endowment in a bequest so that the endowment could live on in perpetuity.

Q12 Please rate the extent that you agree with the following statements about hybrid-gift development for the Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) Department at your institution:

[illegible]

The ICA Development Department has been successful using hybrid-gifts to secure irrevocable gifts earlier from younger donors. (31)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The ICA Development Department has collaborated well with other sectors of the institution (e.g., the College of Letters & Science or Business School) to maximize hybrid gifts. (33)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Hybrid gifts are a high priority for our overall ICA Development strategy. (32)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Q13 Please provide any thoughts or additional comments about hybrid gifts strategies or processes at your institution.

Q14 On average, over the last three years, has the percentage of ICA hybrid gifts secured:

- ☐ Increased (25)
- ☐ Stayed the same (28)
- ☐ Decreased (26)
- ☐ Do not know (27)

Q15 Thinking about next year, do you expect the percentage of ICA hybrid gifts to:

- ☐ Increase (1)
- ☐ Stay the same (2)
- ☐ Decrease (3)
- ☐ Do not know (4)

Q16 Do ICA hybrid gift amounts count toward a type of donor rewards/point system?

- ☐ Yes (28)
- ☐ No (29)

Q17 What characteristics help identify a donor that is on a hybrid-gift trajectory?

Q18 Please share any observations you have about important trends related to hybrid gifts.

The remaining questions are demographic questions:

QD1 Gender

- ☐ Male (1)
- ☐ Female (2)
- ☐ Prefer not to answer (3)

QD2 In what year were you born? yyyy

QD3 What type of institution do you work at?

- ☐ Public (1)
- ☐ Private (2)

QD4 Please share the name of your institution? (The data will be kept confidential. Also, if you answer this question, you will skip a number of remaining demographic questions.)

QD5 What region of the country is your institution located in?

- ☐ Northeast (1)
- ☐ Southeast (2)
- ☐ Midwest (3)
- ☐ Southwest (4)
- ☐ Northwest (5)

QD6 What conference(s) is your institution in? (Multiple answers possible.)

- ☐ American Athletic (1)
- ☐ Atlantic Coast (2)
- ☐ Big Ten (3)
- ☐ Big 12 (4)
- ☐ Conference USA (5)
- ☐ FBS Independent (6)
- ☐ Mid-American (7)
- ☐ Mountain West (8)
- ☐ Pac-12 (9)
- ☐ Southeastern (10)
- ☐ Sun Belt (11)
- ☐ Big Sky (12)
- ☐ Big South (13)
- ☐ Colonial Athletic (14)
- ☐ FCS independent (15)
- ☐ Ivy League (16)
- ☐ Mid-eastern Athletic (17)
- ☐ Missouri Valley (18)
- ☐ Northeast (19)
- ☐ Ohio Valley (20)
- ☐ Patriot (21)
- ☐ Pioneer (22)
- ☐ Southern (23)
- ☐ Southland (24)
- ☐ Southwestern Athletic (25)
- ☐ American East (26)
- ☐ Atlantic Sun (27)
- ☐ Atlantic 10 (28)
- ☐ Big East (29)
- ☐ Big West (30)
- ☐ Coastal Collegiate Sports Association (31)
- ☐ Horizon (32)
- ☐ Metro Atlantic Athletic (33)
- ☐ Missouri Valley (34)
- ☐ Mountain Pacific Sports Federation (35)
- ☐ The Summit (36)
- ☐ West Coast (37)
- ☐ Western Athletic (38)

QD7 Approximately, how many alumni does your institution have?

QD8 Are you willing to be contacted for a follow-up interview?

☐ Yes (1)

☐ No (2)

QD9 Please provide your email:

Thank you for completing the survey. Your responses are very important.
If you have any questions please contact J.T. O'Sullivan at
jtosullivan@sandiego.edu or (###) ###-####. Thank you again
and have a wonderful day.

APPENDIX B

Emailed Survey Introductory Letter

From: J.T. O'Sullivan [sandiego.edu]
 Sent: Day of week, Month Date, Year Time AM/PM
 To: email address
 Subject: Division I Intercollegiate Athletics Development Survey

Month Date, Year

My name is J.T. O'Sullivan. I am a doctoral student at the University of San Diego in the School of Leadership and Education Sciences. In addition, I am a former NFL quarterback that played for 11 different NFL teams, hopefully, your favorite team.

I am writing to ask for your participation in a research study on Division-I Intercollegiate Athletics Development. I would like to invite you to take a survey on Division-I Intercollegiate Athletics Development. The population of survey respondents is one senior level development director at each Division-I Intercollegiate Athletics institution.

Your responses to this survey are very important and will help generate new knowledge in nonprofit philanthropic research. As part of the survey, I am also asking for information about staff size and responsibilities to the nuances of hybrid gifts.

This is a short survey. It should take you no more than 10 minutes to complete. Please click on the link below to go to the survey website (or copy and paste the survey link into your Internet browser).

Survey Link: [hyperlink](#)

Your participation in this survey is entirely voluntary. Your responses will be kept confidential. No personally identifiable information will appear responses in the reports on this data. Should you have any further questions or comments, please feel free to contact me at jtosullivan@sandiego.edu or (###) ###-####. Also, if you would like the final report please email me.

I appreciate your time and consideration in completing the survey. Thank you for participating in the survey!

Many thanks,

J.T. O'Sullivan
 Ph.D. Student, University of San Diego
 School of Leadership and Education Sciences

Dissertation Chair:
 Dr. Fred Galloway
 School of Leadership and Education Sciences

APPENDIX C

Emailed Survey Reminder Message

From: J.T. O'Sullivan [sandiego.edu]
Sent: Day of week, Month Date, Year Time AM/PM
To: email address
Subject: Division I Intercollegiate Athletics Development Survey

Month Date, Year

I recently sent you an email asking you to respond to a brief survey about Intercollegiate Athletic giving. Your responses to this survey are important and will help in developing new best practices in Intercollegiate Athletic development.

The survey is short. It should only take 10 minutes to complete. If you have already completed the survey, I appreciate your participation. If you have not yet responded to the survey, I encourage you to take a few minutes and complete the survey.

Please click on the link below to go to the survey website (or copy and paste the survey link into your Internet browser).

Survey Link: [hyperlink](#)

Your response is important. Getting feedback from Intercollegiate Athletics Senior level Development Directors is crucial for better understanding and improving fundraising. Thank you for your help completing the survey.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J.T. O'Sullivan". The signature is stylized with a large, looped "J" and "O".

J.T. O'Sullivan
Ph.D. Student, University of San Diego
School of Leadership and Education Sciences

APPENDIX D

Emailed Survey Reminder Video Message

YouTube

0:23 / 0:25

Analytics Video Manager

Division I Intercollegiate Athletics Philanthropy Survey Reminder

J.T. O'Sullivan Channel settings 18 views

+ Add to ↪ Share ... More 👍 0 💬 0

Published on Aug 23, 2016

This is my week three survey reminder. Jack (6), Larkin (3), and Baby Davis (1) help me remind my PhD dissertation survey respondents to please complete the Division I Intercollegiate Athletics Philanthropy

Link: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nkKH3uh9Tzw>

APPENDIX E

Case Study Consent Form

**University of San Diego
Institutional Review Board**

Research Participant Consent Form

For the research study entitled:
Examining Hybrid-Gift Philanthropy in Division-I Intercollegiate Athletics:
A Mixed Methods Study

I. Purpose of the research study

J.T. O'Sullivan is a student in the School of Leadership and Education Sciences at the University of San Diego. You are invited to participate in a research study he/she is conducting. The purpose of this research study is: to examine hybrid gifts in Division-I Intercollegiate Athletics.

II. What you will be asked to do

If you decide to be in this study, you will be asked to:

1) Participate in a private audiotaped interview about your experience surrounding hybrid gifts in Division-I Intercollegiate Athletics.

Your participation in this study will take a total of 45-60 minutes.

III. Foreseeable risks or discomforts

This study involves no more risk than the risks you encounter in daily life.

IV. Benefits

While there may be no direct benefit to you from participating in this study, the indirect benefit of participating will be knowing that you helped researchers better understand hybrid gifts in Division-I Intercollegiate Athletics.

V. Confidentiality

Any information provided and/or identifying records will remain confidential and kept in a locked file and/or password-protected computer file in the researcher's office for a minimum of five years. All data collected from you will be coded with a number or pseudonym (fake name). Your real name will not be used. The results of this research project may be made public and information quoted in professional journals and meetings, but information from this study will only be reported as a group, and not individually.

VI. Compensation

You will receive no compensation for your participation in the study.

VII. Voluntary Nature of this Research

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You do not have to do this, and you can refuse to answer any question or quit at any time. Deciding not to participate or not answering any of the questions will have no effect on any benefits you're entitled to, like your health care, or your employment or grades. **You can withdraw from this study at any time without penalty.**

VIII. Contact Information

If you have any questions about this research, you may contact either:

1) J.T. O'Sullivan

Email: jtosullivan@sandiego.edu

Phone: (###) ###-####.

2) Fred Galloway

Email: galloway@sandiego.edu

Phone: (619) 260-7435

I have read and understand this form, and consent to the research it describes to me. I have received a copy of this consent form for my records.

Signature of Participant

Date

APPENDIX F

Interview Guide: Development Practitioner

Interview Guide: Development Practitioner (e.g., AD, Development Officers, and Institutional Advancement Staff)

RQ2: What does an in-depth examination of hybrid-gift development reveal about hybrid gift giving Division-I ICA programs that the answers to Question 1 suggest are both typical and atypical?

Read into the recorder: “This is JT O’Sullivan. The date is Month, Date, 2016. I am interviewing _____, who is a _____.

1. Script:

Hi, my name is JT O’Sullivan. I am a doctoral student at the University of San Diego. The purpose of this interview is to better understand hybrid gift intercollegiate athletic development. This interview will last for about an hour.

2. Walk the interviewee through the consent form.

Make sure to get signature and date.

3. Interview protocol:

0. Tell me a little about yourself.

Probe: Upbringing? Background? Education? Aspirations?

1. Please describe your ICA development office’s philosophy and approach to fundraising?

Probe: Institutional support, “Culture of Philanthropy”

ProbeB: Do you give? To where? Why?

ProbeC: Biggest challenge?

2. Please talk about your role models, mentors, or influences in philanthropy?

Probe: Professional, family/upbringing

3. Please describe your role/duties at _____.

Probe: Why? Timeline? Enjoyment level? Where do you spend your most time?

Probe: What has been your biggest failure in this role?

Probe: What would you want to do more of?

Probe: Are financial bonuses available?

3a. Describe your professional support structure?

Probe: Immediate boss, AD, President.

ProbeB: your roles external expectations?

ProbeC: Describe any training or professional development available

Now, we are going to transition to talking about hybrid-gifts.

4. Please talk about hybrid gifts at _____.

Probe: 1st introduction, donor identification...what makes them a hybrid potential, success, most challenging part, donor education, the ask

ProbeB: donor follow-up, thanks, stewardship

4a. Please describe what a typical, if there is such a thing, cultivation, ask, and stewardship to someone who has been identified as a potential hybrid gift donor?

4b. Does _____ use a strategic approach to HG? If yes, how?

Probe: Intentionality.

5. How does creativity or innovation influence the hybrid gift process?

Probe: Donor or planned giving collaboration,

Probe: Is creativity rewarded/encouraged/recognized at _____? How?

6. How do relationships evolve over the hybrid gift process?

Probe: Stewardship, recognition

ProbeB: Please provide a specific example

6a. What projects, activities, programs, performances, and people at your institution seem to generate the most interest by hybrid gift donors?

7. From you experience, what is the most gratifying aspect of a relationship with a hybrid-gift donor?

Probe: How is it different, if at all, from major gifts or other planned giving?

8. Please describe what you think are hybrid gift development best practices?

Probe: Do they differ from major gift/planned gift? What is unique?

ProbeB: What hasn't worked? Why?

ProbeC: What is next for hybrid gifts?

9. Is there anything else you would like to share about your hybrid gift development strategies?

10. How important is it that the ICA program or _____ sport continually wins?

11. What would you recommend to ICA development office to improve the hybrid gift giving process?

Probe: Thanks, Follow-up, Stewardship, Another ask.

12. What characteristics do you believe a development professional should have to increase the likelihood of a successful hybrid gift cultivation process?

13. It is okay if I contact you if I have any follow-up questions that emerge later?

Do you have anything that you would like to add or that you think are important to the hybrid gift process?

APPENDIX G

Interview Guide: Hybrid-Gift Donor

Interview Guide: Hybrid-Gift Donor

RQ2: What does an in-depth examination of hybrid-gift development reveal about hybrid gift giving Division-I ICA programs that the answers to Question 1 suggest are both typical and atypical?

Read into the recorder: “This is JT O’Sullivan. The date is Month, Date, 2016. I am interviewing _____, who is a _____.

1. Script:

Hi, my name is JT O’Sullivan. I am a doctoral student at the University of San Diego. The purpose of this interview is to better understand hybrid gift intercollegiate athletic development. This interview will last for about an hour.

2. Walk the interviewee through the consent form.

Make sure to get signature and date.

3. Interview protocol:

0. Tell me a little about yourself.

Probe: Upbringing? Background? Education? Aspirations?

ProbeB: Giving history? To ICA?

1. Please describe your general philosophy of philanthropy?

Probe: Do you give? To where? Why?

2. Can you talk about your role models, mentors, or influences in philanthropy?

Probe: Professional, family/upbringing

2a. Please describe your relationship with the institution? Why this institution?

Probe: Former Student-Athlete, Scholar-Athlete? Longtime donor? Fan? Family legacy? Institutional donor?

3. Please tell me about the first time you made a gift to ICAs?

Probe: Motivations? Amount?

Now, we are going to transition to talk about a specific kind of gift.

<Describe a hybrid gift if I have to>

4. Please describe the process you went through in deciding to give a hybrid gift?

Probe: Why hybrid? Why that gift? Why timing wise? Timeline of HG. Were you familiar with the process beforehand?

4a. Were you part of the creative or innovation process of the gift?

4b. Please describe the process of the ask?

Who did it? Immediate feelings? Overall process satisfaction

5. Please describe your strongest relationships within the athletic department?

Probe: How have you benefited from those relationships?

5a. How important is access to the AD or senior level administrators?

5b. Please describe your relationship with _____ Coach?

6. Would you consider making another hybrid gift? Why or why not?
 7. If you were so inclined how much more, percentage wise, could you leave?
Probe: why did you decide on the amount you gave? How much more would you have given?
 8. Do you receive benefits tied to your hybrid gift? If yes, how do you feel about the level and quality of benefits you generate from your donor status? Would you like anything more in terms of benefits/access?
 9. What was/is the most fulfilling part of giving a hybrid-gift?
Probe: How has your family reacted?
 10. How important is it that the ICA program or _____ sport continually wins?
 11. What would you recommend to ICA development office to improve the hybrid gift giving process?
Probe: Thanks, Follow-up, Stewardship, Another ask.
 12. What characteristics do you believe a development professional should have to increase the likelihood of a successful hybrid gift cultivation process?
 13. Is it okay if I contact you if I have any follow-up questions that emerge later?
- Do you have anything that you would like to add or that you think are important to the hybrid gift process?

APPENDIX H

Analytic Memo Example

Analytic Memo: Month. Date.2016

7 AM

Recap from yesterday...wow. All over the place. Complex gift process. Many people don't get it. Culture of Philanthropy, education, communication, technical expertise, collaboration, intention, relational. I was exhausted too. My last interview was not my best, but he gave me some nuggets.

My money, my school.

10 AM

Great...**"Dreaming with them."** DOs and donors. Match maker mentality.

Trajectory identification:

Annual donors. Capital Donors. Sprinklers.

Relationship—long term AF giver, repeat AF donors

Capital—can't give huge amount now, some cash, DG later.

HG: **Generational component:** WW2 = more frugal; Baby boomers = more financially astute. Takes pressure off older generation. Impact now and later. Set up endowment at lower level to then fully fund with PG later...so donor knows exactly where the \$ is going.

Ath. Dept. = more community support

Community based and **"Diehard residents"** born and raised here

More than wealth screening...Affinity screening.

Reeher? (sp?)

Educating Donors

Put bumper sticker on every car..."Not state funded, state assisted."

APPENDIX I

Second-Level Coding Example

Culture of Philanthropy	
Interview 1	XXXXXX just has a great tradition of philanthropy
Interview 2	The development effort is something that is seen as vital to the future of the university
Interview 3	Quid pro quo culture. You give this; you get that.
Interview 3	To me the biggest thing was the philanthropic piece of getting people to give doesn't seem to be always the conversation that you're having, there is a lot of quid pro quo.
Interview 5	Women's sports side, they are more philanthropic
Interview 5	Cash is king in athletics
Interview 5	We try to create that community of giving the same way that you can give now you can give later, you can give little, you can give a lot, you can give over many, many years and it equals a lot.
Interview 5	as you develop that relationship they start to see who you are, the culture you're trying to create for the department, then they would talk about second and third gifts and my experience...we started to have those second and third conversations that is when you started to see more blended gifts, because I think everybody understood the importance of cash now to help with facilities or to help with certain needs but then they also saw the importance of leaving that lasting impact on the department once they were gone.
Interview 6	I think for most of your high level donors, those people that have given a lot, there is some expectation that down the line you will be having an estate planning discussion with them.
Interview 6	Philanthropy really now covers how are you going get from good to great. We call it the margin of excellence
Interview 7	Athletics quite honestly is one of our biggest gateways, engagement opportunities, of not only our alumni but of the community at large. Athletics, when done well, is a brand building element, the image of the university. Donors want to give to winners, whether that is field shaping faculty, inspired students or winning teams. And a winning athletic team helps build the image of a winning university whether that is true or not, but perception of brand is very important and confidence in a brand is very important when you talk to donors,
Interview 8	Athletics is an extremely important element to our philanthropy, because...athletics is a place where they can belong in a whole different way than if they give to scholarships or if they give to research. Athletics is about engagement; it is about getting our alumni back on campus to feel great about not only their time on campus, but what the future holds. And then for folks who are non-alumni, it is a great place of entertainment and a sense of belonging to something.

Interview 9	What we hope to do with XXXXXX is work with our donors over their lifetime, and graduate and evolve their giving to where they stand with their wealth
Interview 9	We never look at a donor as one and done, we stick with them through our stewardship process and if we are doing our stewardship process right we will get them back at the table
Interview 10	But there has been a real shift I think across the board in athletics, facilities are the big move right now. Everybody wants the best, big new facilities, so we really got in the way of kind of the endowments kind of speak to the, kind of pull the heart strings a little bit more, benefiting student athletes, their education, bricks and mortars can do that, but it is more about how we can stay competitive, how we can recruit, how we can retain the best student athletes, how we can get the best coaches to come here, speak some more towards that a little bit, been a little shift in that since I have been here I think
Interview 10 Donor 1	We initially have and they still do have a decentralized model XXXXXXXX got started very late...the university got a late start but they are doing fine, and you have to invest in people and you have to invest in people who are good at development and it is quite an expense but it pays off huge dividends and you also have to have a plan giving department.
Interview 1	Mission centered and donor focused. We have a mission for forming these young men and women to be tomorrow's leaders, members of our community, and that is part of this larger university where you know the whole XXXXXXXX theme, you can see that, we are driven to do all of these things, you can really change the world through science and research, this is an amazing campus. All of these, you know all of these colleges within this university and we are a piece of that. So, missioned centered is we are a land grant university with a core mission of forming better people and making new discoveries and society and that is how we were formed back in 18##, right around there, 18## actually excuse me. At the same time donor centered or donor focused is okay.

APPENDIX J

ICA Philanthropy Survey Respondent Locations

Geographic Distribution of Respondents (based in U.S. Census Regions)

Geographic Region	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Northeast	47	21%
Midwest	53	24%
South	64	29%
West	57	26%

APPENDIX K

ICA Philanthropy Survey Respondent Gender Demographics

Gender Demographics, by Subdivision

Football Subdivision	Male Percentage	Female Percentage	Prefer Not To Answer
Autonomy	81%	19%	0%
Non Autonomy	92%	8%	0%
FCS	86%	12%	2%
Non Football	85%	13%	2%
Total	86%	13%	1%

APPENDIX L

ICA Philanthropy Survey Respondents by Age

Descriptive Statistics for Respondents Date of Birth, by Subdivision

Football Subdivisions	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard. Deviation
Autonomy	47	38	1952	1990	1971	10
Non Autonomy	45	30	1957	1987	1976	8
FCS	53	35	1952	1987	1974	10
Non Football	61	42	1948	1990	1976	9

APPENDIX M

ICA Development Operating Budget in the Last Fiscal Year, by Subdivision

ICA Development Operating Budget In The Last Fiscal Year, by Subdivision

Football Subdivision	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation
Autonomy	41	\$150,000	\$20,800,000	\$2,664,988	\$1,100,000	\$2,000,000	\$4,314,285
Non Autonomy	40	\$67,000	\$45,000,000	\$2,757,031	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$8,893,291
FCS	43	\$0	\$11,000,000	\$689,186	\$85,000	\$0	\$2,320,551
Non Football	54	\$0	\$30,000,000	\$1,405,671	\$62,500	\$20,000	\$5,311,787

APPENDIX N

ICA Fundraising Goal in the Last Fiscal Year, by Subdivision

ICA Fundraising Goal In The Last Fiscal Year, by Subdivision

Football Subdivision	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
Autonomy	46	\$79,977,000	\$23,000	\$80,000,000	\$29,837,457	\$28,000,000	\$15,382,526
Non Autonomy	44	\$29,700,000	\$300,000	\$30,000,000	\$5,777,273	\$4,925,000	\$5,430,667
FCS	51	\$11,900,000	\$100,000	\$12,000,000	\$2,667,843	\$1,500,000	\$2,895,598
Non Football	59	\$12,000,000	\$0	\$12,000,000	\$2,120,339	\$1,350,000	\$2,537,710

APPENDIX O

ICA Fundraising Totals in the Last Fiscal Year, by Subdivision

ICA Fundraising Total In The Last Fiscal Year, by Subdivision

Football Subdivision	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
Autonomy	46	\$131,977,000	\$23,000	\$132,000,000	\$35,734,337	\$32,000,000	\$23,340,367
Non Autonomy	45	\$31,495,000	\$5,000	\$31,500,000	\$6,431,937	\$5,000,000	\$6,447,655
FCS	54	\$58,900,000	\$100,000	\$59,000,000	\$4,760,762	\$1,719,167	\$9,057,508
Non Football	63	\$11,925,000	\$75,000	\$12,000,000	\$2,284,021	\$1,300,000	\$2,757,288

APPENDIX P

Institutional Endowments Totals in the Last Fiscal Year, by Subdivision

Institutional Endowment Current Total Dollar Value, by Subdivision

Football Subdivision	N	Range (\$000)	Minimum (\$000)	Maximum (\$000)	Mean (\$000)	Median (\$000)	Std. Deviation (\$000)
Autonomy	35	\$9,995,500	\$4,500	\$10,000,000	\$1,956,622	\$1,000,000	\$2,217,247
Non Autonomy	31	\$5,475,078	\$24,922	\$5,500,000	\$451,127	\$180,000	\$9,832,651
FCS	39	\$37,998,500	\$1,500	\$38,000,000	\$1,696,526	\$192,000	\$6,214,300
Non Football	37	\$3,850,000	\$0	\$3,850,000	\$378,140	\$178,000	\$687,382

APPENDIX Q

Factor Analysis

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Varimax Rotation for Hybrid-Gift Development and Characteristics

Component	Factor 1: HG success indicators	Factor 2: fundraising staff, donors, & dollars	Factor 3: ICA gift minimu ms	Factor 4: HG and PG past and future	Factor 5: institution and ICA endowment	Factor 6: reward systems	Factor 7: HG familia rity	Factor 8: age and alumni	Commu nality
HG scale total	0.981	0.109	0.008	0.121	0.010	-0.055	-0.047	0.037	0.996
HG broaden pool	0.894	0.157	0.004	0.054	0.092	-0.048	0.034	0.020	0.838
HG training	0.857	0.089	0.012	0.108	-0.037	-0.038	-0.087	0.005	0.765
HG success	0.849	0.141	0.005	0.100	0.082	-0.041	-0.140	0.114	0.792
HG priority	0.842	0.049	-0.064	0.149	-0.055	-0.077	0.033	-0.026	0.748
HG intentionality	0.803	-0.019	0.019	0.197	-0.061	-0.030	-0.031	0.021	0.690
HG irrevocable young donor gifts	0.791	0.153	0.044	-0.023	0.046	-0.049	0.168	-0.046	0.686
HG collaboration	0.771	0.081	0.030	0.110	-0.010	-0.045	-0.217	0.117	0.677
ICA fundraising goals for the LFY	0.135	0.876	0.019	0.112	0.119	-0.033	0.111	-0.022	0.828
ICA fundraising totals for the LFY	0.117	0.817	0.000	0.109	0.148	0.031	0.102	-0.003	0.727
ICA FTE employees: MG	0.072	0.816	0.041	0.047	-0.162	-0.073	-0.028	0.065	0.71 2
AF donors LFY	0.164	0.808	0.001	-0.024	0.017	-0.031	-0.003	0.109	0.693
ICA FTE employees: AF	0.161	0.662	0.007	-0.139	-0.245	-0.067	-0.062	-0.209	0.596
MG donors LFY	-0.047	0.613	0.170	0.148	0.163	-0.062	0.007	-0.091	0.467
ICA FTE emp.	0.090	0.571	0.055	-0.104	-0.238	-0.006	0.079	0.146	0.431

ICA endowment current \$ value	0.047	0.497	0.204	0.206	0.436	0.025	0.069	0.121	0.543
Conference	-0.069	-0.677	-0.043	-0.051	0.290	0.181	0.187	0.081	0.626
ICA MG min. \$ amounts	-0.031	0.111	0.896	-0.080	0.028	-0.057	-0.064	0.045	0.833
ICA endowment min. \$ amounts	0.019	0.151	0.891	-0.075	0.077	-0.070	-0.072	-0.025	0.839
ICA deferred gift min. \$ amounts	0.075	-0.030	0.554	0.160	-0.207	0.042	0.396	0.020	0.541
ICA HG expectations	0.330	-0.034	-0.061	0.709	0.036	-0.120	-0.276	-0.027	0.709
ICA PG L3Y	0.136	0.198	0.011	0.613	-0.029	-0.029	0.064	0.197	0.479
ICA HG L3Y	0.402	0.052	-0.054	0.657	0.093	-0.027	-0.178	-0.071	0.645
Institution region	0.002	-0.030	-0.007	0.461	-0.544	0.054	0.252	-0.188	0.611
Institution type	0.009	-0.204	-0.024	0.059	0.713	0.103	0.084	-0.124	0.587
PG reward system	-0.083	-0.081	-0.083	0.016	0.040	0.867	-0.161	-0.035	0.801
HG reward system	-0.179	-0.165	-0.017	-0.146	0.063	0.810	0.124	-0.040	0.757
Familiarity with HG	-0.190	0.030	-0.018	-0.196	0.027	-0.115	0.715	-0.017	0.602
FB subdivision	-0.115	-0.381	0.061	-0.057	-0.385	-0.264	-0.465	-0.252	0.663
Alumni size	-0.170	0.210	0.072	0.016	-0.294	0.120	0.117	0.597	0.549
Age pursue PG	0.213	0.036	-0.023	0.235	0.018	-0.130	-0.289	0.512	0.465
ICA PG L3Y	-0.136	0.230	0.003	0.075	-0.185	0.091	-0.075	-0.475	0.351
Rotation									
Eigenvalue	6.374	5.097	2.013	1.926	1.645	1.639	1.401	1.151	
% of Total									
Variance	19.92	15.927	6.291	6.019	5.141	5.123	4.379	3.597	
Total Variance	19.92	35.847	42.138	48.157	53.298	58.421	62.8	66.397	

Note: Factor loadings > .400 are in boldface. ICA = Intercollegiate Athletics; HG = Hybrid Gifts; PG = Planned Gifts; FTE = Full-time Equivalent; LFY = Last Fiscal Year; L3Y = Last Three Years; MG = Major Gifts; AF = Annual Gifts

APPENDIX R

Inter-Coder Codes

CoP	Culture of Philanthropy	Giving momentum, giving expectations; Donor-driven; how they approach philanthropy
Stra	Strategic Process	Strategy; (both donor and dev.), Intentionality, Long-Term View, Ask, Tiered ask; Train DO, Proactive, Vision; Re-cultivation;
Edu	Education	Educate Donor, Development Officer, and Practitioner--Help donors understand; demystify
Comm	Communication	Messaging; Stories, interaction (even donor-donor interaction); Integrated Marketing,
Colla	Collaboration	Institutional support; Support planned giving officers; "firm understanding of the technical aspects"; community (expert) support, working with on campus folks; work together,
Rel	Relational	Anything Relationship; Get to know donors (were going to know them); Listening; Empathy; Partnership, Deeper/elevating relationship
Opp	Opportunity	Sophisticated (shops) gifts; Complex; Creativity, Innovation; gift options
Imp	Impact	Impact, Legacy, Big Gifts, Instant
Cap	Capacity	Wealth, Success, wealth screening
Sta	Staff	Anything staff-wise
Camp	Campaign	Any mention of a campaign
Rec	Recognition	Name a building; want their name
Max	Maximize Gift	Vehicle to maximize a gift; a number of different vehicles; Leverage: leverage gifts,
Flex	Flexibility	Nimble; adaptable
Trend	Trend	New, Now; happening now; One of the things we are seeing; seeing now; looking at a lot more lately
Spr	Sprinkler	Donor with multiple interests
Age	Age of donor	Older, Nearing Retirement, older couples, 80s, quite old
Traj	Trajectory	Trajectory, Younger Donors, Fresh, Future, Financial Astute
Pass	Passion	Affinity; Passionate donor, Engagement, engaged
Ben	Benefits	Benefits (Donors and DO), Incentives, Points; Incentives, Point systems, Tickets, tangible gifts/elements: Parking, access etc.; Meet Student-Athletes, meet the scholar
Inn	Innovation	Creative

APPENDIX S

Inter-Coder Example Text

O'SULLIVAN: Can you talk about the campus institution's philosophy toward fundraising and advancement? If you could kind of encapsulate it?

INTERVIEWEE: I think what we're trying to do here on this campus is build a culture of philanthropy. As you know, of course San Diego State is leaps and bounds ahead of most of the XXXX in terms of their fundraising. But, here, philanthropy even in this community is relatively new in terms of supporting higher education. For so long the state has funded it or been the primary source of funding. And so, we're making that shift toward educating, both internally and externally, our audiences on the need and the benefits of private philanthropy. And so, it's a process. We completed our first major comprehensive campaign. We raised \$238 million and our goal was \$225 [million]. And so, we feel good about that. I think one of the biggest benefits of that is, of course, the money, but moreover just the education of the folks in our community and our, I guess, internal community base on the advantages of private giving and what it can bring to the campus.

APPENDIX T

Ocean State Three Buckets

ATHLETIC CLUB

THREE BUCKETS OF NEED

BUCKET #1

Scholarships & Team Enhancement

The cost of an in-state scholarship is \$_____ and provides tuition, room, board and books. We spend _____ million each year. Team enhancement funds provide necessary investment for team travel, food, equipment, and other expenses.

BUCKET #2

Capital Projects

Improving our facilities is essential in our journey to compete against the best programs in the country. We seek donor investment to transform our ability to recruit, enhance the current student-athlete experience, and improve the fan experience.

BUCKET #3

Endowment

The healthiest athletic programs have healthy endowments. Our goal in the next several years is to dramatically grow the Athletics' endowment through commitments of estate and planned gifts.

STRATEGIES FOR FILLING THESE BUCKETS

- Join the _____ Athletic Club
- Join the _____ Membership Challenge
- Attend _____ Night
- Attend _____ Women's Athletics
- Join us for a team reunion

- Name an existing facility (i.e. Coach's Office, team locker room, etc.)
- Provide cash or a blended gift to name and build a facility
- Donate goods and/or services

- Join the _____ Legacy Society
- Leave Athletics in your estate plans
- Transfer a mature IRA if you are 70 ½
- Make _____ a beneficiary on your insurance policy

Institutional Review Board Project Action Summary

Action Date June 30, 2016 *Note: Approval expires one year after this date.*

Type: ☐ New Full Review ☒ New Expedited Review ☐ Continuation Review
☐ Exempt Review
☐ Modification

Action: ☒ Approved ☐ Approved Pending Modification ☐ Not
Approved

Project Number: 2016-06-251

Researcher(s): J. T. O'Sullivan Doc SOLES
Dr. Fred Galloway Fac SOLES

Project Title: Examining Hybrid Gift Philanthropy in Division-1 Intercollegiate
Athletics: A Mixed Methods Study

*Note: We send IRB correspondence regarding student research to the faculty
advisor, who bears the ultimate responsibility for the conduct of the
research. We request that the faculty advisor share this correspondence
with the student researcher.*

Modifications Required or Reasons for Non-Approval

None

The next deadline for submitting project proposals to the Provost's Office for full review
is N/A. You may submit a project proposal for expedited review at any time.

Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost
Hughes Administration Center, Room 214
5998 Alcalá Park, San Diego, CA 92110-2492
Phone (619) 260-4553 • Fax (619) 260-2210 • www.sandiego.edu