

University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

2021-05-15

Does Winning Matter? An Examination of the Impact of Success on Former Student-Athlete Philanthropic Giving

Zach Harris
University of San Diego

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



Part of the [Nonprofit Administration and Management Commons](#), and the [Sports Studies Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Harris, Zach, "Does Winning Matter? An Examination of the Impact of Success on Former Student-Athlete Philanthropic Giving" (2021). *Dissertations*. 912.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/912>

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.

DOES WINNING MATTER?
AN EXAMINATION OF THE IMPACT OF SUCCESS ON FORMER STUDENT-ATHLETE
PHILANTHROPIC GIVING

by

Zachary Harris

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

Doctor of Philosophy

May 2021

Dissertation Committee

Fred J. Galloway, EdD, Chair
Marcus Lam, PhD, Member
Deborah Kelly, DBA, Member

University of San Diego

University of San Diego
School of Leadership and Education Sciences

CANDIDATE'S NAME: Zachary Harris

TITLE OF DISSERTATION: DOES WINNING MATTER? AN EXAMINATION OF THE
IMPACT OF SUCCESS ON FORMER STUDENT-ATHLETE PHILANTHROPIC GIVING

APPROVAL:

_____, Chair
Fred J. Galloway, EdD

_____, Member
Marcus Lam, PhD

_____, Member
Deborah Kelly, DBA

DATE: April 13, 2021

ABSTRACT

Intercollegiate athletic departments (ICAs) rely on philanthropic giving to remain relevant in the “arms race” that is college athletics. Donations provide the necessary resources (scholarships, upgraded facilities, etc.) to compete with rival programs for prospective student-athletes and fans. Previous research in ICA philanthropy has found that team success is one of the key factors driving donations to athletic programs. However, much of the research in this field has centered on athletic giving on a macro-level, focusing on the overall alumni population of an institution. While this research is important for colleges and universities, it misses on measuring the impact that success has on a key alumni subset for ICAs, former student-athletes.

To address the gap in the empirical literature, this cross-sectional study used data from the University of San Diego (USD) to quantitatively examine the athletic careers of all 295 former men’s basketball student-athletes and the impact that team and personal athletic success has had on their giving patterns as alumni. Utilizing logistic and multiple regression analysis, this study looked at whether select success metrics, including team championships and individual achievements, as well as other, non-success related variables (such as wealth and years since graduation) are correlated with philanthropic giving.

Study results revealed the significance of net worth in predicting whether an alum will donate (but not on the total amount of their giving) and that alumni who reside near campus after graduation donate more over their lifetime than their peers who do not. This study also showed that, for each additional year a student-athlete was a part of the program, their probability of donating increases by 6% - 8% and that, when ICAs do not have access to wealth information on donors, individual success on the court does have an impact on one’s likelihood to donate.

Taken together, findings from this study can help ICAs better understand the determinants of philanthropic giving and provide an analytical methodology that can be applied to data from their own institution; in effect, allowing them to more efficiently segment prospective athletic donors, become better stewards of their resources, and increase alumni giving participation.

DEDICATION

To my wife, Katie

Thank you for being my rock. I could not have done this without you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am forever grateful for the many people that have played an integral role in helping me complete this study.

I am indebted to my dissertation committee for their critical advice and leadership. My committee chair, Fred Galloway, was invaluable in helping turn the idea of this study into reality. His direction and encouragement were greatly appreciated throughout this process. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee: Deborah Kelly, for helping pave the way for this study with her own research and her willingness to share ideas on how to strengthen this dissertation, and Marcus Lam, for aiding in the conceptual development of this study and offering sound methodological advice.

A special note of appreciation is extended to some of the great leaders I have had the pleasure of working with at the University of San Diego: Rick Virgin, Vice President for University Advancement, Sandra Ciallella, Associate Vice President for Development and Bill McGillis, Associate Vice President and Executive Director for Athletics. Their guidance and support played a large role in the completion of this study.

I would be remiss if I did not recognize the other members of my cohort in the Leadership Studies program at the University of San Diego. The level of work you consistently put out pushed me to my limits and helped this study take the shape that it did.

Finally, and most importantly, I want to thank my family. I want to thank my parents, Jim and Mary, for the love and support I have always felt and for their constant belief in me. The unwavering encouragement I received from my wife and best friend, Katie, was the driving force behind this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER I: OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose of the Study	5
Significance of the Study	5
Research Questions	6
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	7
History of Athletic Fundraising.....	9
Early Research.....	9
The Motivation of Athletic Donors Scale (MAD-1).....	11
Model of Athletic Donor Motivation (MADOM).....	12
Scale of Athletic Donor Motivation (SADOM).....	12
Mahony’s Four Factors of Success	13
Success I – Tradition	13
Success II – Current Success.....	14
Success III – Future Success	16
Success IV – Community Pride.....	18
Tangible and Psychosocial Benefits	20
Ancillary Benefits.....	20
Social Identity Theory	22
Self Esteem Maintenance Theory.....	23
Existence, Relatedness and Growth (ERG) Theory	24
Testosterone Levels and Biosocial Theory.....	24
Conclusion.....	25
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	29
Research Questions	29
Research Design	30
Data Sources	30

Data Collection Procedures.....	31
Dependent Variables	31
Independent Variables	32
Data Analysis	34
Research Question 1	34
Research Question 2	35
CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	36
Descriptive Statistics.....	36
Success Variable Data	38
Research Question Analysis	40
Research Question 1 Analysis.....	41
Research Question 2 Analysis.....	52
CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	55
Summary of Findings.....	56
Research Question 1 Findings and Discussion.....	56
Research Question 2 Findings and Discussion.....	57
Supporting Research and Findings.....	57
Implications for Policy and Practice	60
Limitations and Delimitations	62
Recommendations for Future Research.....	63
Conclusion.....	64
LIST OF REFERENCES	67

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Independent variables (success).....	33
Table 2. Independent variables (non-success)	33
Table 3. Descriptive statistics on years since leaving USD and years played	37
Table 4. Net worth coding and sample size	38
Table 5. Descriptive statistics on living in San Diego County	38
Table 6. Descriptive statistics on individual success variables.....	39
Table 7. Descriptive statistics on overall winning percentages	39
Table 8. Descriptive statistics on overall winning percentages in best season	40
Table 9. Descriptive statistics on conference championships.....	40
Table 10. Descriptive statistics on how many alumni have made a donation to program.....	41
Table 11. Best predictive giving equation (linear regression) coefficients and model summary ..	42
Table 12. Best predictive giving equation coefficients and model summary (excluding net worth and success variables).....	43
Table 13. Best predictive giving coefficients and model summary for equation with success variable (excluding net worth)	44
Table 14. Coefficients and model summary for best predictive giving equation (logistic regression).....	45
Table 15. Classification table, showing how well the model works in correctly predicting whether or not someone has made a donation (per SPSS).....	46
Table 16. Independent variable sample size, coefficients and means for comparison model between multiple and linear regression results	48
Table 17. Non-wealth independent variables of best predictive model comparison between multiple and logistic regression	48
Table 18. Coefficients and model summary for best predictive giving (logistic regression) model (excluding net worth and success variables).....	49
Table 19. Net worth ranges and the likelihood to donate based on best predictive model.....	50
Table 20. Coefficients and model summary for best predictive giving equation with success variables (excluding net worth)	50
Table 21. Descriptive statistics on cumulative giving	52
Table 22. Coefficients and model summary for total giving equation using the variables in the best predictive giving equation	53
Table 23. Coefficients and model summary for best total giving equation	54

CHAPTER I: OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

In order to remain competitive at the highest levels of NCAA competition, donations directed towards intercollegiate athletic (ICA) departments are required. The cost of facilities, equipment, and travel has risen exponentially over the years. From 1993 to 2002, the average annual expenses incurred by a Division I collegiate athletic program rose from \$13 million to \$27.3 million and, more recently, a study by the Washington Post in 2015 showed that 48 of the schools that comprise the “Power 5” conferences (the five major conferences that compete in Division I, FBS football) had reported average expenditures of over \$91M per school (Fulks, 2002; Hobson & Rich, 2015). Shapiro (2008) found that soliciting donations from those affiliated with athletics is one way that ICA departments attempt to offset these rising costs and remain competitive with their peer institutions, and Ko et. al (2014) state that donations from alumni and athletic boosters account for the most substantial portion of many ICA budgets. In addition, there are documented benefits for those who give: Recent research has shown that many view ICA programs as the main channel that allows donors to have connections with a university (Popp et al., 2016; Stinson & Howard, 2010).

Charitable giving is an important source of necessary revenue for nonprofits (Powell & Bromley, 2020). In 2017, of the \$410 billion contributed to nonprofit organizations, 70% was donated by individual donors. Of all nonprofit sectors, education (14%) was only topped by religious groups (31%) in percentages of overall charitable gifts received (Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, 2018).

Alumni participation rates (the percentage of alumni that make a financial contribution to their alma maters in a given year) at institutions across the country have become a focal point for college administrators. From an institutional perspective, engaging alumni is important because

it helps to create a broad and diverse base of support. Engaging alumni as donors sooner rather than later has become a new focal point for development operations nationwide because studies have shown that alumni who give regularly (even at modest levels) in the years following their graduation are more likely to become major donors (including outright cash gifts and planned/estate gifts) later in life.

It is hardly surprising, therefore, that alumni participation rates have become one of the seven factors considered by the U.S. News & World Report when evaluating and ranking colleges and universities (which can affect reputation and, subsequently, enrollment and tuition revenue). In addition, high alumni participation rates in giving are used by many corporations and foundations when awarding grants (Allenby, 2018). Understanding donor behavior has, therefore, become a necessity for all ICA development operations.

Previous research in the athletic fundraising field, which will be outlined later, focuses on current donors to athletic programs, on a macro level, and the motives that drive their giving (Billing et al., 1985; Gladden et al. 2005; Mahony et al., 2003; Staurowsky et al., 1996; Verner et al. 1998). Of these motivations, success has proven to be one of the more common motivators for ICA gifts (Mahony et al. 2003; Staurowsky et al., 1996; Walker, 2015). Winning, in this context, would be viewed as a measure of success (Gladden et al. 2005; Mahony et al., 2003; Popp et al., 2016; Staurowsky et al., 1996; Verner et al., 1997). Walker's (2015) research showed a statistically significant increase of more than double in the percent increase of overall private contributions for institutions with athletics success compared with all higher education institutions.

Statement of the Problem

As has been already noted, understanding alumni giving patterns and behaviors has become more important than ever for colleges and universities. College enrollment has decreased for eight consecutive years (1.7% from 2018 to 2019), and skepticism about the strength of U.S. colleges and universities is at an all-time high, with only 7% of 10 through 12th graders believing that American higher education institutions are the best in the world and only 8% believing U.S. colleges and universities adequately prepare their students for the working world (Fain, 2019; Busted, 2020). This critical assessment of the higher education system, coupled with economist Grawe's (2018) prediction that the college-going population will drop by 15 percent between 2025 and 2029, has higher education institutions focused on continuing to rise in national rankings to remain relevant and, in some cases, even viable (Marcus et al., 2019).

Colleges and universities have shifted much of their focus, specifically in fundraising, towards alumni giving percentages. This shift in focus over the past 10 to 15 years has been directly correlated with giving percentages being one of the sole determinants of alumni satisfaction scores in the U.S. News & World Report national college rankings (Allenby, 2018). College and university alumni associations and groups have continued to form in order to build affinity and connectedness for alumni, and research has shown that ICA's and college and university athletic teams are one of the main channels for alumni to remain connected to their alma mater (Popp et al., 2016; Stinson & Howard, 2010).

On top of being a major connector between alumni and their alma mater, on a macro-level, success of a college or university's athletic teams have been shown to increase general alumni giving percentages (Mahony et al. 2003; Staurowsky et al., 1996; Walker, 2015). Success on the playing field also has been shown to have a direct impact on the health and well-being of a

college or university, as well. In a study looking at NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) programs, it was shown that if a college or university improves its season by winning 5 more football games than the previous year, it can expect alumni donations to increase by 28%, applications to increase by 5%, in-state enrollment to increase by 3%, and incoming students' 25th percentile SAT scores to increase by nine points (or 1%) (Anderson, 2012).

On top of the rising costs of maintaining success on the playing field, ICA programs, much like their campus counterparts, must also dedicate time and resources towards acquiring their own donors. In 2018, it was shown that 80 percent of donors are acquired after four appeals (the combination of phone, email, direct mail and other outbound solicitation methods), retained after five appeals, and renewed after six appeals (Reeher, 2019). These solicitations are not free of cost to ICAs, so finding effective strategies and techniques are vital to avoid becoming too costly.

Though research has been done on general alumni populations, studies on the giving patterns of one key subset of college or university alumni, former student-athletes, is lacking. Using a google scholar search, only two studies utilizing quantitative methods to examine student-athlete alumni giving were discovered; one looking at a very specific athletic alumni subset (historically black colleges and universities athletic alumni) and the other focusing on barriers to giving of athletic alumni (Jude, 2017; Shapiro, 2008). Despite the fact that alumni participation rates have become more important than ever and athletic success has proven to have an overall positive impact on general alumni giving, there is a lack of research into whether or not former student-athletes view success as a determinant factor towards making a philanthropic donation to their alma mater.

Purpose of the Study

To help offset the rising costs of running a competitive Division I athletic program, ICA's would benefit by determining whether the segmentation of specific donor groups, such as those who had successful playing careers in college, would result in raising more money, increasing alumni giving participation rates, and creating a better return on investment on solicitations. This study will examine whether or not the on-court success of University of San Diego men's basketball alumni affects their likelihood to (1) make a donation or (2) make a larger donation than their peers in support of their alma mater.

Significance of the Study

Recent research has shown that many view ICA programs as the main channel that allows donors to have connections with a university (Popp et al., 2016; Stinson & Howard, 2010). Previous research in the athletic fundraising field has focused on current donors to athletic programs and the motivations that drive their giving. In these studies, success has been identified as one of the more common factors that affect athletic-based philanthropic giving (Mahony et al. 2003; Staurowsky et al., 1996).

The importance of engaging with an alumni base is emphasized by the importance put on alumni participation rates by administrators at NCAA institutions across the country. Some of the reasons that this has become a focal point for development operations nationwide are studies that have shown that alumni who give regularly (even at modest levels) in the years following their graduation are more likely to become major donors (including outright cash gifts and planned/estate gifts) later in life, alumni participation rates have become one of the seven factors considered by the U.S. News & World Report when evaluating and ranking colleges and universities (which can affect reputation and, subsequently, enrollment and tuition revenue), and

high participation rates are used by many corporations and foundations when giving out grants (Allenby, 2018). Understanding donor behavior, therefore, has become more important than ever before for all college and universities, including ICA departments.

This study will aim to gain a better understanding of one of the main motivating factors identified by previous research into athletic fundraising, success, and examine the role that it plays with former student-athletes and their giving habits. By developing a methodology that does not currently exist, we will be able to examine the impact of success on former student-athlete giving at the University of San Diego, helping the athletic department decide whether or not it makes sense to segment their solicitations by any specific success factors while offering broad research to the impact of success on giving for all NCAA institutions. This information could help all ICA departments be better stewards of their resources and, in turn, help each school obtain a better yield on their solicitations to alumni.

Research Questions

The following research questions focused on the role that success has on University of San Diego men's basketball student-athlete alumni giving patterns, specifically in support of the men's basketball program. The following questions will guide the study:

1. What independent variables affect the giving patterns of former men's basketball student-athletes at the University of San Diego, and does success play a role?
 - a. If success does play a role in giving patterns, does personal athletic success affect student-athlete alumni giving more than team success?
2. Of those student-athletes who have donated, does success impact the level of giving more than those who did not experience success?

CHAPTER II: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In order to remain competitive at the highest levels of NCAA competition, the need for donations directed towards intercollegiate athletic (ICA) departments has become vital. The rising cost of facilities, equipment and travel has risen exponentially over the years. From 1993 to 2002, the average expenses incurred by a Division I collegiate athletic program rose from \$13 million to \$27.3 million (Fulks, 2002). Shapiro (2008) found that soliciting donations from those affiliated with athletics is one way that ICA departments attempt to offset these rising costs and remain competitive with their peer institutions, and Ko et. al (2014) state that donations from alumni and athletic boosters account for the most substantial portion of many ICA budgets. Recent research has also shown that many view ICA programs as the main channel that allows donors to have connections with a university (Popp et al., 2016; Stinson & Howard, 2010). Kelly and Vamosiu (2020) found that ICAs who regularly invite donors to events and games receive more donations.

Alumni participation rates (the percentage of alumni that make a financial contribution to their alma mater in a given year) at institutions across the country have become a focal point for college administrators. Generally, the longer a college or university has been involved in institutional advancement activities, the greater success it has at raising private, voluntary support (Harris, 1988). The idea of engaging alumni, from an institutional perspective, is important because it helps to create a broad and diverse base of support as well as a pipeline for future success. Of the many reasons that this has become a new focal point for development operations nationwide are studies that have shown that alumni who give regularly (even at modest levels) in the years following their graduation increases the likelihood that they will become major donors (including outright cash gifts and planned/estate gifts) later in life. In

addition alumni participation rates have become one of the seven factors considered by the U.S. News & World Report when evaluating and ranking colleges and universities (which can affect reputation and, subsequently, enrollment and tuition revenue), and high alumni participation rates are used by many corporations and foundations when giving out grants (Allenby, 2018). Understanding donor behavior has therefore become a necessity for all ICA development operations.

Previous research in the athletic fundraising field, which will be outlined later, focuses on current donors to athletic programs and the motivations that drive their giving (Billing et al., 1985; Gladden et al. 2005; Mahony et al., 2003; Staurowsky et al., 1996; Verner et al. 1998). Of these motivations, *success* proves to be one of the more common motivators for ICA gifts. (Mahony et al. 2003; Staurowsky et al., 1996; Walker, 2015). Winning, in this context, would be viewed as a measure of success (Gladden et al. 2005; Mahony et al., 2003; Popp et al., 2016; Staurowsky et al., 1996; Verner et al., 1998). Importantly, Walker's (2015) research showed a statistically significant increase of more than double in the percent increase of overall private contributions for institutions with athletics success compared with all higher education institutions. As such, this literature review will examine *success* and why it plays a role in athletically centered philanthropic giving by looking at the history of athletic fundraising, breaking down the four factors of *success* described by researcher Daniel Mahony (2003) and will conclude by looking at some of the pivotal theories that could help us understand why *success* is so important to athletic donors.

History of Athletic Fundraising

Early Research

Research into the athletic fundraising field is a relatively new academic undertaking. In 1985, three professors from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill sent out an Athletic Contributions Questionnaire (ACQUIRE) with the goal of figuring out the main motivations behind athletic-centered philanthropy (Billing et al., 1985). In this seminal research study, which would serve as the framework for subsequent research and surveys in the field, the group attempted to break down gift motivations into four categories: philanthropic, social, success and benefits (Billing et al., 1985).

Almost a decade later, Staurowsky, Parkhouse, and Sachs (1996) put out a revised questionnaire, named ACQUIRE-II, that added two new categories; curiosity and power. In their research, Staurowsky et al. (1996) make an effort to explain, in detail, the six categories included between the two sets of questionnaires:

Philanthropic. Philanthropic reasons for donating to ICA departments are described as the desire within individuals to do something to benefit others, such as provide scholarships for student-athletes.

Social. Social reasons for donating to ICA departments focus on the donor's desire for social interaction with friends and family, such as attending games, fundraising events, golf outings, etc.

Success. Success as a motivation for donating to an ICA department center on the donor's desire to help ICA teams become "more successful." By making their donation, the donor hopes their gift would improve the prestige of a school and ultimately impact their status

as an alum or fan. This description of success will, over the years and described later in this literature review, change and add layers and complexity.

Benefits. Donors who support ICA departments because of benefits are transactional givers. The major motivations behind those who donate to receive benefits are centered on the need to make a donation in order to receive something tangible, including season tickets and exclusive access.

Curiosity. This type of motivation suggests that individuals make their donations because they are curious about what it would take, donation wise, to help the team win at the highest level. This motivation, in theory, could be linked with the motivating factor “success.”

Power. Those who donate to ICA departments focus on the desire to make a gift in order to influence and control the decisions made by an ICA department, including coaching hires and facility upgrades.

Following a factor-analysis of the questionnaire responses, Staurowsky, Parkhouse, and Sachs (1996) eliminated the curiosity factor and separated success into two separate factors; success-1 and success-2. Success-1 relates to the donor’s relationship with the school (current and future success), while success-2 is centered on the impact of the athletic program for the economic well-being and reputation of the state (past success). Their survey, sent out to about 7,500 specific donors (out of a pool of over 15,000) from an FBS, Division-1 athletic department, had a decent response rate (12%) and, for being one of the first of its kind, was able to make some strong generalizations of athletic donor motivations. However, many potential flaws to this study make it hard to mimic today. For example, using a delimited sample makes it hard to generalize their findings and make an overarching declaration on athletic donors as a whole and importantly, non-response bias was never addressed.

The Motivation of Athletic Donors Scale (MAD-1)

More recently, research in the field of athletic fundraising has shifted towards refining Staurowsky et al.'s (1996) six factors. Verner, Hecht, and Fansler (1998) developed their own survey, known as the Motivation of Athletic Donors (MAD-1) scale. The thirteen factors these researchers focused included a mixture of Staurowsky et al.'s (1996) factors from the ACQUIRE-II and Shaw and Taylor's (1995) findings from research into women's philanthropy in higher education. A compiled list of options was then given to a panel of athletic administrators to choose factors that they believed would resonate best with an athletic donor base. This study was one of the first in the athletic fundraising field that relied heavily on the experiences of athletic development operations to create the conceptual framework that guided their work. Though novel in its approach, Verner et al.'s (1998) generalizations were made using results from a specific, non-football Division I athletic department (which is a specific niche on the national scale) and chose factors that were heavily biased towards the needs of that specific institution, potentially leading to anchoring or selection bias.

Mahony, Gladden and Funk (2003) attempted to address some of these concerns in the creation of their version of the MAD-1 scale. This survey built upon the previous work of Billing et al. (1985), Staurowsky et al. (1996) and Verner et al. (1998), but chose to split some factors into more specific groupings. Once their survey was created, three Division I institutions were chosen to test the survey and, through a factor analysis, twelve of the fourteen factors tested by Mahony et al. (2003) were significantly correlated with giving habits: philanthropic, social, escape, priority seating for football, priority seating for basketball, business enhancement, success I – tradition, success II – current, success III – future, success IV – community pride,

nostalgia, and psychological commitment. The Mahony et al. (2003) scale serves as a guiding framework for many athletic donor surveys used today.

Model of Athletic Donor Motivation (MADOM) and Scale of Athletic Donor Motivation (SADOM)

One of the more recent research studies that has utilized Mahony's scale is Ko et. al's (2014) MADOM (Model of Athletic Donor Motivation) survey, which combined factors of philanthropic giving with ERG theory and will be outlined later in this review, and SADOM (Scale of Athletic Donor Motivation) scale, that resulted in a psychometrically sound eight-factor measurement scale for athletic donor motivations. The study explored the various motivations of individuals who donate money to athletic programs and attempted to develop a comprehensive framework to better understand motivation. Utilizing a review of academic research, popular press releases and reports, the eight donor motivations that were chosen for these models were philanthropy, vicarious achievement, commitment, affiliation, socialization, public recognition, tangible benefits and power. However, similar to Staurowsky's et al.'s (1996) research, a delimited sample size makes it hard to make firm generalizations to all athletic donors and the scale could have been improved by refining the items in affiliation factor to establish a stronger case for discriminant validity.

For the purposes of breaking down the different motivators involved in *success* as a motivating factor of athletically centered philanthropy, the next portion of this literature review will look into the four success factors described by Mahony et al. (2003), which are tradition, current success, future success, and community pride.

Mahony's Four Factors of Success

Success I – Tradition

Tradition in athletics is the aspect of athletic performance that refers to a school's success level throughout the history of the specific program. The Notre Dame football program, as an example, has a tradition of success, even if the program has suffered through losing seasons in some years (Hall & Mahony, 1997). Similarly, the more frequent participation of a basketball program in the NCAA basketball tournament indicates a strong basketball tradition at an institution, which has been shown to correlate to a stronger relationship between alumni and the athletic program (Baade & Sundberg, 1996).

In the Mahony et al. (2003) study, there were six motivators of tradition that came out as a result of the questionnaire. These factors included the desire to remain a respected athletics program nationally, the rich history of a program, the history of winning, a consistent track record of doing business the right way, a belief that the athletics department is doing its best to field competitive teams, and the product on the field has been enjoyable to watch on a regular basis. These factors have shown to be prevalent in other athletic fundraising studies (Isherwood, 1986; Baade & Sundberg, 1996).

A comparison of total money raised by all athletic fundraising programs indicated that programs, in general, who have been around longer raise more than their counterparts who have not been around as long, suggesting that tradition can be a driver towards success in athletic fundraising numbers (Isherwood, 1986). These institutions have an older, larger, and more well-established alumni pool than their counterparts, and studies have shown that older alumni are more likely to give (and more likely to make a larger contribution), giving them a significant advantage over younger institutions (Baade & Sundberg, 1996). However, a comprehensive

study of eight private, academically elite colleges and universities that compete at the Division I level showed that athletic success, in general, was an insignificant factor in alumni giving, showing that age of an institution (which impacts alumni size and age/capacity), does not always aid in the athletic fundraising efforts of a university (Shulman & Bowen, 2001).

Building and sustaining a fundraising program entirely off a program's tradition of success is not a sustainable model. Tradition can be a powerful tool in creating a "brand" in college athletics, but the millennial sports fan has shown to be more engaged in college sports than Generation X, so finding the balance between a strong tradition and remaining consistently competitive has become more important than ever (Singer, 2017).

Success II – Current Success

Success in major sports (football, basketball and baseball) has been found, in some cases, to significantly increase alumni donations to athletics programs (Brooker & Klastorin, 1981; Gaski & Etzel, 1984; Klages, 1989; Marts, 1934; Sigelman & Brookheimer, 1983). Mahony et al. (2003) identified three factors of current success. In order of contribution, these include the importance of competing for league championships, the importance of having star (high performers on the playing field) student-athletes, and the importance of meeting personal donor's expectations of success.

A study conducted at Mississippi State of alumni from 1962-1991 further found that total contributions were positively related to the overall winning percentage of major teams (basketball, football, and baseball), finding that a one percent increase in overall winning percentage of the three teams correlated to an increase in total giving to the institution (Grimes & Chressanthis, 1994). A separate study, conducted around the same time, showed that contributions from alumni increased by 7.3% per alum when their alma mater made it to the

NCAA tournament in men's basketball and, subsequently, decreased by 13.6% per alumni when an institution's basketball team was placed on NCAA probation (Rhoads & Gerking, 2000). The University of Oregon, who has seen its national profile increase dramatically thanks to contributions from Nike founder Phil Knight, had 69.5% of its alumni donors designate part of their gift to athletics in 2002, following two consecutive Pac-10 Conference football championships. This represented a dramatic 11% increase from 1994, which was the last year that Oregon had won a football conference championship (Stinson & Howard, 2004). The football program had helped raised the profile of the university on a national level, which appeared to have a direct result in the increase in financial contributions.

Not all research supports the idea that the current success of an athletic program leads to an increase in alumni donations (Brooker & Klastorin, 1981; Baade & Sundberg, 1996; Deal, 2017). Schools that emphasize basketball programs (usually Division I schools that do not sponsor a football team) and small, public universities, for example, showed no significant relationship between success and alumni donations (Brooker & Klastorin, 1981; Sigelman & Brookheimer, 1979). Interestingly, Brooker and Klastorin (1981), in their research, found that the makeup of a college or university (size, affiliation, etc.) has a direct correlation as to whether or not winning affects giving. The Ivy League schools that participated in their research, for example, showed football success having a significant relationship to two variables; size of gift per alumnus and percentage of alumni donors. In comparison, large, state schools had a negative regression coefficient on the relationship between football success and the size of per capita gift, suggesting that the marginal giver stimulated by success on the playing field gives less than the other alumni of an institution do.

Baade and Sundberg (1996) described the difference between basketball and football affinity (in regards to current success) by examining the difference between basketball (NCAA tournament) and football (bowl games) postseason experiences. At the Division I level, football bowl selections are announced in mid-November, with the games not being played until the end of December or early January, allowing the fan and alumni base a month to celebrate a bid, purchase souvenirs and plan travel to attend. In men's basketball, the NCAA basketball tournament bids are announced less than one week before the start of the tournament, with 75% of the teams being eliminated by the first Sunday, only one week after the field is announced. The brevity of the experience and the relatively small amount of publicity afforded to the losing programs of the first weekend reduces the impact of a tournament appearance on many alumni (Baade & Sundberg, 1996).

Though the evidence is mixed on current success being a true motivating factor for giving, the idea of "building towards the future" has long been present on campuses across the country, and athletic departments have seized the opportunity to create messaging and strategically plan their future endeavors around their donor base's desires to see a brighter future.

Success III – Future Success

Many donors hope that their donation will help the long-term outlook of an athletic program (Deal, 2017; Mahoney et al., 2003). Mahony et al identified seven motivations of donors that can be classified under the future success factor, including (in order of statistical significance) the desire to improve the quality of the overall athletic program, the desire to provide educational opportunities for student-athletes, the desire to improve the quality of the football program, the desire to promote the image of the university, the desire to improve the quality of women's sports, the desire to improve the quality of men's basketball, and the desire

to improve the quality of men's non-revenue sports. Interestingly enough, the idea of providing educational opportunities for student-athletes showed up in more studies related to success than the philanthropic motivation, revealing a possible connection between athletic donors and their desire to donate towards scholarships as a means of acquiring talented athletes, rather than truly helping with the cost of an education (Mahony et al., 2003). Social identity theory explains that a potential reasoning for this could be an individual's connection with a college and their desire, for their personal pride and feeling of self-worth, to be associated with a winning program (Belk, 1988). Donors have mentioned wanting to "feel like they are a part of something special," and "acquiring talent" can help a donor feel a larger sense of pride for the institution they support (Bass et al., 2015).

Promoting the idea of donating towards the future success of a program can sometimes be a dangerous path for athletic development offices to undertake, as more money committed to a program does not guarantee more success (Baade & Sundberg, 1996). Texas A&M University, as an example, raised \$67 million dollars for athletics in 2015, only to see the football team boast the same record in 2016 as 2015, and win one less game in 2017 (Wolverton & Kambhampati, 2016). However, improving the athletic program continues to be the most often mentioned motivational factor amongst donors (Gladden et al., 2005; Mahony et al., 2003). Guiding these donors towards tangible projects that can ultimately have a lasting effect on the program, such as facility upgrades, is vitally important for athletic donor retention and donor acquisition, as it will help enhance the fan experience and could encourage others to donate in order to be a part of something new (Gladden et al., 2005).

Building momentum towards giving to specific projects of interest for an athletic department is one way that departments can utilize the idea of "building a brighter future" for

their donor base, but it can also get constituents outside of the institution interested in donating. Many individuals and charitable foundations choose to give to an athletic department because they hope they can be a part of something special and benefit directly from the “sense of community” that college athletics can provide.

Success IV – Community Pride

College athletics, especially at the Division I level, can be equally as important for non-alums (especially those who live in the community) as it is for the alumni of the institution. Three factors identified by Mahony et al. (2003) in regards to community pride include donors thinking the athletics program provide a rallying point for the community, the belief that athletics elevate the image of the community, and, specifically, that a strong athletics program helps to promote the image of the city the institution is located in.

The level of support from the local community is important for the overall fundraising operation of an institution as well as the success of an athletic department. Communities that embrace their local institution significantly boost the financial support of the college or university as compared to others where the community does not support the institution (or there are multiple institutions vying for the same support) (Hall & Mahony, 1997). Another consideration regarding community support around an intercollegiate athletics department is the image of the local community. On a broad level, a city’s image competes with other cities’ images for recognition, prestige and status, and large sporting events can help shape that image. Connection with a specific place may become so powerful that the city’s name itself becomes shorthand for the team and/or event that resides there (Schimmel, 2006). An example of this would be Tuscaloosa, Alabama, home of the University of Alabama. Though the University of Alabama has always had a strong reputation, there are few that would dispute that the city of

Tuscaloosa has been put on the map for collegiate sports fans across the country as a result of the success of the Crimson Tide football team, which has won five national championships since 2009.

Public funding for sports stadiums can, often times, be highly contested with differing opinions on whether or not there is an economic benefit to the local community. In response to this, many new stadium supporters have modified their tactics to avoid claiming an economic benefit and have focused on the intangible social benefits (Eckstein & Delaney, 2002). By focusing on a community's self-esteem and the collective conscience, Eckstein and Delaney (2002) argue that this tactic, for better or worse, can pull on a community's desire to be seen in a positive light amongst some of their peers.

Though the financial support of the local community could serve as a great boost to an athletic department, relying on the volatile community donation market is a risky proposition for many institutions. Donors, more than ever, are being pulled in multiple directions by non-profit entities, and the competition for donation dollars is as strong as it has ever been (Clotfelter, 2001). With this in mind, creative thinking and strategic branding are extremely important for athletic departments as they continue to fight for the attention (and dollars) of a local community.

An example of creative thinking and strategic branding can be found in Orlando, Florida, with the University of Central Florida football program. Following an undefeated season in 2017, the UCF athletics department launched a national campaign that stated the team deserved the national championship, as they were the only undefeated team in college football. Though not being recognized by the NCAA as champions, the athletic department has hung a banner recognizing this "achievement" in their stadium, held a parade in downtown Orlando and gave the mayor of Orlando, Buddy Dyer, a ring recognizing the "national champions." (Wolf, 2018).

Taken together, UCF has worked hard to try to capture the attention of the Orlando community and drive interest in the program, which might result in more ticket purchases, merchandise spending and overall higher level of recognition within their local community, where they have to compete with professional sports (the Orlando Magic of the NBA) and one of the largest tourist destinations in the U.S. (Walt Disney World).

Now that we have examined Mahony's (2003) four factors of success in great deal, we will examine why, through psychological studies and psychosocial theories, *success* matters to athletic donors.

Tangible and Psychosocial Benefits

In a 2017 survey, 84% of former student-athletes indicated they would likely give based on their passion to see overall success in college athletics (Deal, 2017). Success is seen as a major motivator in athletic giving (Brooker & Klastorin, 1981; Deal, 2017; Gaski & Etzel, 1984; Klages, 1989; Mahony et al., 2003; Marts, 1934; Sigelman & Brookheimer, 1983; Staurowsky et al., 1986). In American sports culture, winning (otherwise known as "success") is often seen as the only acceptable outcome of a game. But why, for both those who are participating in the game and fans of a specific team, has winning become so vital? The following theories and considerations can help explain the importance of *success* in sports and, in turn, help athletic departments have a better understanding of why the four factors of success have proven to be such motivating factors among athletic donors.

Ancillary Benefits

Collegiate athletics, unlike many other outlets that are partially run on the philanthropic generosity of others, has the ability to offer donors many ancillary benefits. Athletic departments have long utilized these benefits to generate donations, and Mahony et al. (2003) capture these

benefits through three different categories in their revised questionnaire (priority seating for football, priority seating for basketball and business enhancement). Many colleges and universities utilize a required donation associated with the purchase of seats. For example, premium football season tickets at Purdue University cost \$280, but require a \$150 donation to the Legacy Fund on top of the cost of tickets. The Purdue football fan will pay \$430 total for their season tickets, but are now Purdue University Legacy Fund donors and can deduct the \$150 required donation on their tax returns.

Reserved parking, preferred seating and increased access are all drivers for athletic donations, particularly with donors who make their gifts on a more transactional than philanthropic basis. For those who give specifically for the reasons stated, a donor's assets (tickets, parking, etc.) become more valuable as a direct consequence of winning (Turner et al., 2001). Unlike philanthropic giving, if a transactional donor reaches a point where they see the value of their asset decrease (losing season, unpopular coaching change, etc.), they may not renew their access and, subsequently, the college would miss the required donation associated with those assets. In the Purdue University example stated earlier, if football season ticket holders decide not to renew their tickets, the University miss out on \$430 of revenue, \$150 of Legacy Fund donations that they can report, and would no longer be able to count the former season ticket holder as a donor. This type of volatility can be nerve wracking for an athletic fundraising operation and puts a lot of stress on the administration to remain successful on the playing field to ensure that these ancillary benefits remain important to supporters of a specific program.

The idea of ancillary benefits help explain some of the tangible reasons why donors continue to give to athletic departments. Next, we will examine the social identity theory, which may help explain some of the psychological factors in play for donors.

Social Identity Theory

Social identity theory, as described by Abrams and Hogg (1988), holds that people define themselves in part by their memberships and affiliations to various social groups. In this theory, an individual defines a part of their social identity through an association with a specific sports club (in this case, a collegiate sports team) (Belk, 1988; Wann & Branscombe, 1990). The strength of social identity theory on sports fans, in particular, can be seen when examining fans of winning and losing teams (Fink et al., 2009). Highly identified fans, after a win, exhibit biased attribution processing favoring their team in that they associate the victory with positive attributes, such as skill, quality coaching, fan support, etc. (Wann & Dolan, 1994). In losing efforts, highly identified fans also go through a biased attributional process and tend to blame the loss on more external factors, such as fate or poor refereeing as compared to conceding to another team's superiority (Fink et al., 2009).

Frequently, especially at events sponsored by colleges or universities, alumni of a specific sports team will self-identify as a former student-athlete or current supporter of said team, showing that they value their affiliation with the program. Fans of teams that win often comment on how "we" won, even though that person did not play in the game (Cialdini et al., 1976; Cialdini & Richardson, 1980; Snyder et al. 1986).

Social identity theory provides us with the necessary framework to enable college athletic departments to relate to their stakeholders in a consistent and meaningful fashion (Jenkins, 2008). Athletic departments need to be aware of the strong identification fans can have with a

specific team and how that affiliation influences several aspects of supporter behavior. Studies have shown that a strong identification with a team leads to a larger investment in time (attendance at sporting events) and money (Bristow & Sebastian, 2001). In this instance, an investment in money can come via multiple channels, ranging from merchandise sales to donations to the program. Social identity theory would fall under the “social” category described by Staurowsky in her original donor research and could be associated with the social, community pride, nostalgia and psychological commitment factors described by Mahony in his revised version (Mahony et al., 2003; Staurowsky et al., 1996).

Working in coordination with social identity theory, the self-esteem maintenance theory further examines why sports fans choose to affiliate themselves with a specific team.

Self-Esteem Maintenance Theory

The self-esteem maintenance theory, as described by Tesser (1988) predicts that an individual will either like or dislike others, and subsequently either be proud or envious of their success, based on their relevance to the individual’s self-image. In this theory, Tesser stresses three components that can help relate this theory to sports; a psychological closeness, relevance to one’s self-definition, and the performance of others. This theory can also work on a community level, where community members take pride in their city (or, in this case, local college or university) and desire to have “their” entity compete favorably amongst their peers (Eckstein & Delaney, 2002). Working in conjunction with some of the ideas laid out in the social identity theory, it becomes easy to see a potential link between self-esteem and the effects of a game (winning vs. losing).

Existence, Relatedness and Growth (ERG) Theory

Existence, Relatedness and Growth (ERG) theory attempts to categorize human behavior into three core areas; existence, relatedness, and growth. In creating this theory, Aldefer (1969) makes an effort to address the shortcomings of Maslow's (1943) theory of "Hierarchy of Needs" (as lower-level needs are met, higher-level needs become the focus) with empirical research (Robbins, 1998). ERG theory is relevant to athletic donor motivations because donors have multiple needs that need to be simultaneously satisfied, with one of those needs being supporting a "successful" program. If growth is not achieved, donors could regress to relatedness needs and choose to pursue other avenues in order to fulfill unmet needs.

Testosterone Levels and Biosocial Theory

In two separate studies, one examining fans at a University of Georgia basketball game against Georgia Tech University in 1991 and another looking at bar patrons during a 1994 World Cup match between Italy and Brazil, testosterone levels increased among fans of winning teams and decreased among fans of losing teams (Bernhardt et al., 1998). According to Bernhardt (1998), the effect of winning on fans of a winning team was strong enough to reverse the normal pattern of decline in testosterone levels throughout the day. In Oliveira et al.'s (2009) test involving female soccer players participating in the Portuguese Female Soccer League, changes in testosterone levels, moods and anxiety states were found for both winners (increase) and losers (decrease). The measuring of testosterone levels has served as the starting point for the self-esteem maintenance theory and biosocial theory of winning.

Continuing with the examination of testosterone levels, the biosocial theory associated with winning treats testosterone as a physiological aspect of the interaction between competition and status (Mazur, 1985; Mazur et al., 1992). In this theory, success in competition leads to an

increase in status, which could correlate to an increase in testosterone. In Mazur's (1985) research, he found that success in one venture led to a higher rate of success in the next venture. This successful string of events perpetuated a status difference ("winner") and led to an even higher level of testosterone, whereas continuing a losing pattern ("loser") showed a decrease in testosterone levels.

Conclusion

This review started by looking at the early research centered on athletic fundraising. Through surveys and qualitative research, early research in this field showed a multitude of different factors that served as motivating factors for athletic donors (Billings et al., 1985; Staurowsky et al., 1996). In the late 1990s, researchers used these initial survey results to create the MAD (Motivation of Athletic Donors) scale, which looked to more accurately pinpoint and categorize these survey results into specific categories that could be used by athletic departments (Verner et al., 1998). As we moved into the 2000s, and as ICA budgets began to soar into uncharted territory, the MAD scale was revised and tailored to fit the new sports consumer (Fulks, 2002; Mahony et al., 2003; Stinson & Howard, 2010; Popp et al., 2016). Although newer scales and studies have been created and subsequently researched, including Ko et. al's (2014) MADOM and SADOM scales, Mahony (2003) provides the perfect framework for examining success as a motivating factor for philanthropic giving towards ICA departments. This literature review focused on expanding upon Mahony's (2003) four motivating factors of success, which represented 1/3 of the total factors in his revised MAD survey.

The four factors of success (tradition, current success, future success and community pride) are good, over-arching themes of what matters to donors when it relates to ICA donations associated with winning. Tradition, broadly put, represents the history of winning (Notre Dame

football, Duke basketball, etc.) of a specific program (Baade & Sundberg, 1996; Hall & Mahony, 1997). Early research on the subject showed that tradition had a direct relationship with giving, but mainly used variables associated with age, which despite giving a program more opportunities to win, does not always correlate with success (Isherwood et al., 1986). As we move into an era where more millennials are watching college sports than any generation before, it remains unclear just how much a program's "tradition" will correlate with giving (Singer, 2017).

Unlike tradition, which is hard to quantify, a current program's success, particularly in high profile sports, has shown a direct relationship between giving rates and success (Brooker & Klastorin, 1981; Gaski & Etzel, 1984; Klages, 1989; Marts, 1934; Sigelman & Brookheimer, 1983). More recent research at the University of Oregon had shown that the success of their football program had significantly raised alumni participation (Stinson and Howard, 2004). However, some research, specifically looking at schools that emphasize basketball over football and more academically elite institutions, are less willing to say that winning on the playing field has had a positive relationship with an increase in giving (Baade & Sundberg, 1996; Brooker & Klastorin, 1981; Deal, 2017).

The last two motivating factors that were examined, future success and community pride, are largely intangible and, like tradition, hard to quantify. It is widely seen as a negative to promise any type of future success to donors due to the research that has shown no direct relationship between dollars raised and wins (Baade & Sundberg, 1996; Gladden et al., 2005; Mahony et al., 2003; Wolverton & Kambhampati, 2016). However, many institutions have taken donor's desires to influence the future of a program and tied that with facility and endowment projects that, though they do not guarantee future success, have shown an impact on recruiting

top athletes and increasing fan engagement (Bass et al., 2015; Mahony et al., 2003). Along this same line of thought, athletic departments have increased their engagement with their local community to try to engage new donors with the idea of improving the local image and economy of a city (Clotfelter, 2001; Eckstein & Delaney, 2002; Hall & Mahony, 1997).

There are many tangible (physical) and intangible (psychological) benefits behind why success matters in athletic giving. The first were the tangible benefits to making donations, such as upgraded seats and parking permits. These donors, known as “transactional” donors, are not motivated by the philanthropy, but are motivated by the tangible benefit received (Turner et al., 2001). The dangerous thing that ICA departments face when focusing on transactional donors is, because of where their motivation lies, any swing in success that is negative, therefore decreasing the value of their tangible item, could dissuade the donor from continuing to give. Though these donors exist at every school, a majority of an athletic department’s donor base will not fall in this category.

There are multiple theories that can help explain the sociological and biological reasons for success mattering in athletic fundraising. Social identity theory states that many sports fans associate part of their image with an ICA program (Abrams & Hogg, 1988; Belk, 1988; Cialdini et al., 1976; Cialdini & Richardson, 1980; Snyder et al. 1986; Wann & Branscombe, 1990). Self-esteem maintenance theory builds upon the framework of social identity theory and states that the part of an individual that associates their image with a sports team also relies on the success of that team to “compete” amongst their peers (and, subsequently, improve their “self-worth”) (Eckstein & Delaney, 2008; Tesser, 1988). Existence, Relatedness and Growth (ERG) Theory notes that if donors are not feeling a sense of growth or fulfilment, they may choose to look into other avenues that can help fill that void (Alderfer, 1969). On a biological level, the

biosocial theory asserts that the desire to compete amongst peers (at least physiologically) is based on the testosterone level changes of someone's "team" winning or losing (Mazur, 1985; Mazur et al., 1992).

By examining the tangible, sociological and physiological effects that winning can have on collegiate athletic donors, this review has pieced together some of the key factors that continue to make "success" an important factor for athletic giving. Further research, however, could be utilized to make a stronger argument to university administration that a thorough, thoughtful survey of an athletic department's donors could be a fruitful endeavor that could help raise significant dollars (and provide needed budget relief) for departments nationwide.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to examine if there is any correlation between either personal or team success and philanthropic giving. Specifically, this study will examine whether or not “successful” University of San Diego (USD) men’s basketball alumni are more likely to (1) make a donation in support of the program and (2) make a larger donation than their less “successful” peers.

Success is defined as the attainment of a desired or favorable outcome. In team sports, success is most often associated with winning. For this study, in terms of judging team success, we will look at winning percentages, team championships and NCAA tournament appearances. Individual success, a more difficult achievement to quantify, will be determined using personal statistics (scoring, rebounding, etc.) and how they rank amongst their peers.

Research Questions

Aligning with the purpose of this study, the following research questions were developed to help examine the role, if any, that success has on student-athlete alumni giving. The first question will utilize both multiple and logistic regressions to help predict the action of donating, while the second question will use a regression analysis to try to figure out if a total gift amount is affected by success.

1. What independent variables affect the giving patterns of former men’s basketball student-athletes at the University of San Diego, and does success play a role?
 - a. If success does play a role in giving patterns, does personal athletic success affect student-athlete alumni giving more than team success?
2. Of those student-athletes who have donated, does success impact the level of giving more than those who did not experience success?

Research Design

This cross-sectional, quantitative study will examine twenty independent variables (16 independent success variables and four variables highlighting affinity and capacity) and, utilizing multiple and logistic regression models, determine if success as a University of San Diego men's basketball student-athlete is associated with (1) ever donating to the support the basketball program or (2) total amount donated to the basketball program. After gathering all necessary data, the information will be input into SPSS and multiple and logistic regression models will be run to determine the best predictive equations.

Data Sources

The University of San Diego's (USD) men's basketball rosters were obtained using the USD's athletic archives. These archives showed a total of 295 men's basketball student-athletes and alumni have participated on the team through the 2019 basketball season.

This study looked at two dependent variables; (1) whether or not a men's basketball alum has made a donation in support of the basketball program and (2) the total amount donated to the program. The values of both of these variables were found using one of the University of San Diego's alumni database systems, Advance. The first dependent variable, whether or not an alum has donated, was found by looking at each individual alum's Advance record to find whether or not they have donated. If they have ever made a donation, they were scored a "1." If they have not made a donation, they were scored a "0."

Sixteen independent variables indicating some level of success (success variables) were chosen to include in this study, with most of the data being obtained by either using the USD athletic archives or the West Coast Conference's (WCC) online archives. All variables, other than percentages, were coded using binary inputs. The only conference data that was able to be

obtained was that of the WCC, which USD joined beginning in 1980. The USD alumni that played before 1980 were not included in any of the conference calculations, but were still included in team success research with their overall record, and included in all personal success research using their individual statistics.

Four independent variables that do not indicate basketball success (non-success variables) were chosen for inclusion in this study. They included (1) years since graduation, (2) years involved with the basketball program while an undergraduate student, (3) current net worth and (4) whether or not an alum resides in San Diego County.

Data Collection Procedures

Dependent Variables

The two dependent variables chosen for this study were obtained using one of USD's donor databases, Advance. The first dependent variable, (1) ever making a donation in support of the basketball program, is a binary variable. The use of binary scoring is appropriate for this variable as we are looking to determine donor participation for this specific subgroup of alumni. When analyzing this variable, and ultimately trying to find the best fitting equation, we will use the term "Best Predictive Giving Model."

The second dependent variable, (2) total amount donated to the basketball program, is the only non-binary dependent variable that will be used in this study. Though there are many factors that go into the amount of a donation that cannot be determined by this study, the total amount donated does indicate a level of affinity that could show to have some relevance to our study (Mount, 1996; Rosenblatt et. al, 1986). When analyzing this variable, and ultimately trying to find the best fitting equation, we will use the term "Best Total Giving Model."

Independent Variables

Success Variables. Sixteen independent variables indicating some level of basketball success were chosen for this study. Rosters, team, and personal success variables will be obtained either using the University of San Diego (USD) athletic department archives or the West Coast Conference's (WCC) online archives. All variables, other than percentages, will be coded using binary inputs. The use of binary inputs, for the purpose of this research, is beneficial because it will help build a predictive model of whether someone is likely to donate (1) or not (0).

A list of success variables chosen for this study is provided in Table 1.

Other Independent Variables. Wallace (2018), in a study looking at the Nature Conservancy, one of the world's largest nonprofit organizations, found that the average age of a new, direct-mail donor to the organization was 69. Because of this finding, it was determined that including other important, non-success driven independent variables would be important in trying to build a predictive model. For this study, the other, non-success, variables chosen to be included were (1) years since graduation, (2) years involved with the basketball program while an undergraduate student, (3) current net worth and (4) whether or not an alum resides in San Diego County.

Including the years since graduation and current net worth as variables is important because it can help determine, generally, if a prospective donor has the means to be able to make a gift. Having the means to donate has been a proven determinant to making philanthropic donations (Rosenblatt et al., 1986).

Along these same lines, affinity has long been considered a determinant of donating, particularly towards athletic programs, and someone who played four years on a team is likely to

have a stronger affinity towards the program than someone who transferred out of the institution after a year (Baade & Sundberg, 1996). For this reason, years spent on the team was chosen as an additional independent variable.

Another important variable that can be an indicator of affinity is whether or not someone lives within reasonable driving distance to USD, in this study defined as living in San Diego County. Though not a complete indicator of affinity, living within driving distance of USD allows an alum to regularly visit campus for events and/or games.

A list of non-success variables chosen for this study are listed in Table 2.

Table 1 *Independent variables (success)*

Variable	Team or Personal Success Indicator	Binary or Percentage Measurement	Source
Overall winning percentage	Team	Percentage	USD
Overall winning percentage in best season	Team	Percentage	USD
Conference regular season champion?	Team	Binary	USD
Conference tournament champion	Team	Binary	USD
NCAA tournament participant	Team	Binary	USD
1,000 point scorer	Personal	Binary	USD
Led team in scoring in a year	Personal	Binary	USD
Top 10 in scoring all-time at USD	Personal	Binary	USD
Led team in assists in a year	Personal	Binary	USD
Top 10 in assists all-time at USD	Personal	Binary	USD
Led team in rebounds in a year	Personal	Binary	USD
Top 10 in rebounds all-time at USD	Personal	Binary	USD
Led team in a statistical category during a season?	Personal	Binary	USD
Top 10 all-time in a statistical category at USD?	Personal	Binary	USD
All-conference award winner	Personal	Binary	WCC
All-academic team performer (conference)	Personal	Binary	WCC

Table 2 *Independent variables (non-success)*

Variable	Indicator	Numeric or Percentage Measurement	Source
Years on team	Affinity (Baade, 1996)	Numeric	USD
Years since graduation	Means (Rosenblatt, 1986)	Numeric	USD
Net Worth	Means (Rosenblatt, 1986)	Numeric	Reeher
Lives in San Diego County	Affinity (Baade, 1996)	Binary	USD

Data Analysis

To help answer the research questions, each question will be analyzed using specific dependent variables and independent variables, listed in Table 1 and Table 2. Here are the research questions and what variables will be used to help find a conclusion.

RQ1: What independent variables affect the giving patterns of former men's basketball student-athletes at the University of San Diego, and does success play a role?

A. If success does play a role in giving patterns, does personal athletic success affect student-athlete alumni giving more than team success?

This is, by design, an open-ended question allowing the researchers to determine what level and variables of success are to be tested. Through the use of SPSS and logistic regression, all independent success variables (Table 1) and independent non-success variables (Table 2) will go through multiple and logistic regression analysis to determine what variables prove to be significant factors towards making a donation to support the basketball program (Dependent Variable 1).

If success proves to be a significant factor in predicting donation patterns, determining whether personal or team success matters more will require the independent success variables (Table 1) to be sorted into individual success variables and team success variables, which is shown in the second column of Table 1. After sorting, a regression analysis will be run to see if personal success or team success is a better predictor in determining whether or not a basketball alum will make a donation (Dependent Variable 1).

RQ2: Of those student-athletes who have donated, does success impact the level of giving than those who did not experience success?

To help answer this question, the alumni population will be filtered to show only those who have made a donation to support the basketball program (Dependent Variable 1). Through a multiple regression analysis, this research will test all independent success variables (Table 1) and independent non-success variables (Table 2) to see if any variables show to be significant indicators of the total amount given to the program (Dependent Variable 2).

CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the findings and analysis of the research questions for this study. The goal of this study was to answer two main research questions regarding success as a variable in student-athlete alumni giving, specifically with men's basketball alumni at the University of San Diego (USD):

1. What independent variables affect the giving patterns of former men's basketball student-athletes at the University of San Diego, and does success play a role?
 - a. If success does play a role in giving patterns, does personal athletic success affect student-athlete alumni giving more than team success?
2. Of those student-athletes who have donated, does success impact the level of giving than those who did not experience success?

The chapter begins by presenting how some of the data collected for each alumni of the men's basketball program at USD was collected. Then, the descriptive statistics for the chosen success variables will be presented, including the individual and personal success variables described in chapter three. To end the chapter, the findings to each of the research questions will be presented.

Descriptive Statistics

This next section will look at the descriptive statistics of the variables that were chosen and studied in this research. Years since graduation (in this study, "graduation" means the last year they were on campus at USD, not necessarily that the individual left with a degree), was calculated by determining the final year enrolled in class at USD and subtracting from 2019. Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics of this alumni base and how many years (minimum, maximum and average) they have been removed from USD.

Table 3 Descriptive statistics on years since leaving USD and years played

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Years since leaving USD	295	0	61	26.36	18.34
Years played	295	1	5	2.54	1.21

Years with the basketball program utilized the USD athletic archives, which shows which years that each student-athlete participated in. Table 3 also looks at the minimum, maximum and average amount of time (in years) that each member of our alumni group spent on the basketball team.

Utilizing Blackbaud (the parent company of USD's donor database systems Advance and Reeher) Advanced Wealth Analytics, net worth scores were obtained for a majority (76%, 224 of 295) of men's basketball alumni, and were subsequently scored as shown in Table 4. One of the main reasons that Blackbaud would not score someone in the database would be if there was outdated or missing information on file (usually addresses and contact information). The ranges shown are how they are shown in the alumni database, with the exception of choosing a net worth of \$5M+ as the top level (there were 2 alumni who qualified at the \$10M+ net worth level, so it was decided to include them with those at the \$5M+).

Table 4 Net worth coding and sample size

Net Worth	Coding	Frequency	Percentage
Under \$250k	NW1	25	11%
\$250k - \$499k	NW2	25	11%
\$500k - \$999k	NW3	18	8%
\$1M - \$1.9M	NW4	53	24%
\$2M - \$2.9M	NW5	45	20%
\$3M - \$4.9M	NW6	18	8%
Over \$5M	NW7	40	18%

*Net worth is categorized based on set wealth categories presented by Reeher and was not available as a continuous variable

The fourth non-success variable, whether or not the alum lives in San Diego County, was found using the most updated address for the alum in the alumni database system Advance.

Table 5 shows how many of the alumni studied live in San Diego County.

Table 5 Descriptive statistics on living in San Diego County

Lives in San Diego County?	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	46	19%
No	198	81%

*No primary residence information was available for 52 alumni

Success Variable Data

In order to begin to answer the research questions, the first step was collecting and interpreting our success variables that are being analyzed against our dependent variables of 1) ever making a donation and 2) total donation history. The following tables include descriptive statistics on some of the success variables that were collected, and help summarize the varying levels of success that individual student-athletes achieved at USD. Table 6 looks at the descriptive statistics for each individual men's basketball alum and their individual success

(comparative against their peers). The next two tables present the descriptive statistics on winning percentages per student-athlete, Table 7 looking at overall winning percentages and Table 8 looking at the best winning percentage in a single season per student-athlete. Table 9 looks at the conference success, specifically of those student-athletes who played against West Coast Conference teams once the program jumped to Division 1 in 1980, of each individual student-athlete.

Table 6 Descriptive statistics on individual success variables (N=295)

Individual Success Variable	Frequency	Percent of N
1,000 point scorer	24	8.1%
Led team in scoring in a year	39	13.2%
Led team in assists in a year	24	8.1%
Led team in rebounds in a year	35	11.9%
Led team in steals in a year	22	7.5%
Led team in a statistical category in a year	73	24.7%
Top 10 in an all-time statistical category	33	11.2%

*also included as individual success variable is ranking in the Top 10 in each individual category listed above (scoring, assists, rebounds, steals). For each of these, the frequency is 10 and the percent is 3.4%.

**not all members of the population will be represented in one of these categories

Table 7 Descriptive statistics on overall winning percentages per student-athlete (N=295)

Overall Winning %	Frequency	Percent of N
Under 30%	19	6.4%
30% - 39.99%	34	11.4%
40% - 49.99%	78	26.1%
50% - 59.99%	113	37.9%
60% - 69.99%	41	13.7%
Over 70%	10	3.3%

Table 8 Descriptive statistics on overall winning percentages in their best season, per student-athlete (N=295)

Overall Winning %	Frequency	Percentage
Under 30%	11	3.7%
30% - 39.99%	22	7.3%
40% - 49.99%	33	11.0%
50% - 59.99%	89	29.8%
60% - 69.99%	108	36.2%
Over 70%	32	10.7%

Table 9 Descriptive statistics on conference championships per student-athlete (N=295)

Conference Championship Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Conference Regular Season Championship	20	6.7%
Conference Tournament Championship	24	8.1%
Not Applicable	103	34.9%

*Only conference championship information was available for when USD joined the West Coast Conference (1980 – present).

The varying levels of success of the men’s basketball program at USD provided a diverse dataset to interpret. The next section of this chapter will look at the individual research questions and present the findings to each.

Research Question Analysis

RQ1: What independent variables affect the giving patterns of former men’s basketball student-athletes at the University of San Diego, and does success play a role?

Before looking at which independent variables are predictors towards determining whether or not a USD men’s basketball alumni will make a donation, it is important to look at the descriptive statistics on this group making donations to support the program. Table 10 shows

the frequencies of this alumni base making a donation, at any point, in support of the basketball program.

Table 10 Descriptive statistics on how many alumni have made a donation to program

Ever make a gift?	N	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	295	153	52%
No	295	142	48%

As shown in Table 10, there is almost an even 50/50 split of those who have made a donation and those who have not. To get a better understanding if any of our success (or non-success) variables impact the patterns of the 52% of the sample that has made a donation, the next section will look at the multiple and logistic regression results of the study.

Multiple Regression Analysis. Using multiple regression analysis to help find a baseline probability (logistic regression will be analyzed in the next section of this chapter), it was determined that the available wealth indicator, a net worth screening through Reeher, one of University of San Diego’s alumni database tools, was the single strongest indicator in determining whether or not a former men’s basketball student-athlete from the University of San Diego (USD) is likely to make a donation (Hellevik, 2007). Table 11 shows the results of the best predictive model (“Best Predictive Giving Model”), which includes net worth, years played at USD, years since leaving USD and whether or not the alum lives in San Diego County.

Table 11 Best predictive giving equation (linear regression) coefficients and model summary with net worth, years played at USD, years out and currently living in San Diego County

Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	t score	Significance
REF: Net Worth <\$250k				
Net Worth: \$250k - \$500k	.222	.108	2.051	.041
Net Worth: \$500k - \$1M	.253	.119	2.118	.035
Net Worth: \$1M - \$1.99M	.173	.087	2.002	.046
Net Worth: \$2M - \$2.99M	.331	.090	3.675	.000
Net Worth: \$3M – \$4.99M	.337	.121	2.794	.006
Net Worth: Over \$5M	.307	.093	3.314	.001
Years Played at USD	.064	.023	2.811	.005
Years Out	.010	.002	6.266	.000
Live in San Diego County	.126	.071	1.786	.075

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of Estimate
.531	.282	.254	.429

As shown in Table 11, net worth, when compared against men’s basketball alumni who have a net worth under \$250k, is a very important variable when trying to predict the likelihood of someone making a donation. Those alumni who have a net worth over \$250k are 17-34% more likely to donate than those who have a net worth under \$250k (those with a net worth under \$250k were omitted from the equation to avoid perfect collinearity). Other variables that helped create this predictive model, including years played at USD, years since leaving USD and whether or not the alum lives in San Diego County, were all shown to be marginally significant at, at minimum, the $p < .10$ threshold, with two (years played at USD and years out from being at USD) showing to be significant at the $p < .01$ threshold.

Though this model helps explain the greatest amount of variance in determining whether a USD men’s basketball alum is likely to make a gift or not, not all universities or athletic

development operations have access to net worth data. When significant wealth indicators are not readily available, the inclusion of success variables helps create the best predictive model for former USD men's basketball alumni.

Table 12 shows the best predictive model for giving that excludes the net worth variables. As discussed earlier, the best models in this study include net worth, but the fact that not all athletic development operations do not have access to this data, a model was created utilizing data all athletic departments would have access to. The variables that were included in this model were years played, years since leaving USD and whether or not the alum lives in San Diego County.

Table 12 Best predictive giving equation coefficients and model summary for best predictive giving equation (excluding net worth and success variables)

Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	t score	Significance
Years played	.076	.023	3.304	.001
Years out	.011	.002	6.874	.000
Live in San Diego County	.135	.071	1.895	.059

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of Estimate
.475	.225	.216	.440

The model that excludes net worth and all success variables proves to statistically significant at the $p < .1$ level, but fails to equate for about 4% of the variance (adjusted r square) that the model with net worth includes. In order to test the importance of net worth as a variable, an f-test was run comparing the statistical models, resulting in an f statistic of 3.8. This shows the model with the net worth variables to be significant at $p > .01$ (critical f-value of 2.8) and that the difference in r-squares is statistically significant, supporting the finding that net worth indicators are important to include to build the best predictive model when they are available.

Table 13 shows the best predictive model for giving that excludes net worth, which could be beneficial for athletic development operations that do not have access to net worth data. All other independent variables were included, and one success variable was statistically significant. The variables that were included in this model were years played, years since leaving USD, whether or not the alum lives in San Diego County and whether or not the alum ranks in the top 10 in a statistical category all-time for USD basketball.

Table 13 Best predictive giving coefficients and model summary for equation with success variable (excluding net worth)

Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	t score	Significance
Years played	.058	.025	2.326	.021
Years out	.011	.002	7.006	.000
Lives in San Diego County	.132	.071	1.858	.064
Top 10 in a Statistical Category	.172	.096	1.786	.075

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of Estimate
.485	.235	.223	.438

One success variable, being in the top 10 of a statistical category all-time for USD basketball, helped create the strongest predictive model (at the $p < .10$ minimum) when net worth was excluded. Only 11.2% (see Table 6) of the total population ($N=295$) qualified as a top 10 all-time statistical leader, yet that group was over 17% more likely to make a donation than their peers. This model helped explain 1% more of the giving variance than the model that excludes net worth and success variables, meaning that success, however small it may be, does play a factor in the likelihood of a men's basketball alum at the University of San Diego donating.

Logistic Analysis. One can make the argument that the most appropriate analytic techniques to use when answering the first research question is logistic regression, due to the fact that we are trying to make a prediction based on binary outcomes. After running a linear

regression analysis to get a baseline projection on our independent variables and their relation to philanthropic giving, a binary logistical analysis was run on our best model predictive model.

Table 14 shows the results of the best predictive model. Through multiple tests and analysis, the variables included in the best predictive logistic model mirrored that of the best predictive multiple regression model. This model includes net worth, years played at USD, years since leaving USD and whether or not the alum lives in San Diego County. Table 15 shows the classification table for the predictive model.

Table 14 Coefficients and model summary for best predictive giving equation (logistic regression) with net worth, years played at USD, years out and currently living in San Diego County

Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	Exp (B)	Significance
REF: Net Worth < \$250k				
Net Worth: \$250k - \$500k	1.238	.601	2.051	.041
Net Worth: \$500k - \$1M	1.422	.657	2.118	.035
Net Worth: \$1M - \$1.99M	.986	.485	2.002	.046
Net Worth: \$2M - \$2.99M	1.818	.518	3.675	.000
Net Worth: \$3M – \$4.99M	1.927	.721	2.794	.006
Net Worth: Over \$5M	1.664	.526	3.314	.001
Years Played at USD	.344	.125	1.410	.006
Years Out	.054	.010	1.055	.000
Live in San Diego County	.827	.429	2.286	.054

*Nagelkerke R Square = .370

Table 15 Classification table, showing how well the model works in correctly predicting whether or not someone has made a donation (per SPSS)

Model Prediction	Predicted “Yes”	Predicted “No”	Percentage Correct
Has donated.	112	26	81.2%
Has not donated.	38	70	64.8%
		Overall Percentage:	74.0%

Table 15 shows the model summary for our best predictive logistic model. When comparing this model to the multiple regression model shown in Table 11, similar significance levels were shown for every net worth value over \$250k, and living in San Diego County gets closer to the $p < .05$ confidence threshold. This model also explains 37% of the variance in giving, which is roughly 10% higher than the linear model. As shown in Table 16, when running this model (including net worth, years played, years out and living in San Diego County) through descriptive statistics in SPSS, this model was also able to correctly predict the giving patterns (whether or not the alumni made a donation) of 74% of total USD men’s basketball alumni, and was above 80% accuracy in correctly predicting whether an alum has made a donation.

To calculate the likelihood that a USD men’s basketball alum has made a donation in their lifetime, one of the three equivalent forms of the final logistic regression model was used. This form required both the means of the independent variables and their estimated coefficients (shown in Table 16) and, when inserted into the equation below, yields an estimated average giving percentage of 63%.

$$Prob(giving) = \hat{Y}_1 = e^u / (1 + e^u)$$

$$u = -3.27 + (1.238)(.13) + (1.422)(.09) \dots + 26(.054)$$

This same form of the final logistic regression equation was also used to calculate the probabilities associated with each of the three independent variables. To do so, we first make

use of the estimated average giving percentage of 63% and use that as our baseline. From there, we then recalculate the giving percentage with the relevant independent variable increased by one unit from their mean value while the other independent variables are held at their means. The difference between our recalculated giving percentage and the baseline value of 63% is the probability associated with a one-unit change in the independent variable. For example, to calculate the probability associated with our *years played* variable, we first add one to the mean of the *years played* variable ($2.54 + 1$) and then recalculate the giving percentage with the value for *years played* (now at 3.54 rather than 2.54). When doing so, the new estimated giving percentage becomes 72.5%, and since the difference between this and 63% is 9.5%, the probability associated with a one-unit change in *years played* is 9.5%.

This process was similarly repeated with the other two independent variables, with the only distinction involving the *lives in San Diego County* variable. For this binary variable, the estimated giving percentage was calculated twice – once with the value set to zero and then again with the value set to one, with the difference between the two estimates being the probability associated with living in San Diego County. This probability, along with the ones associated with the other two independent variables can be found in Table 17 alongside the probabilities estimated from the multiple regression model.

Table 16 Independent variable sample size, coefficients and means for comparison model between multiple and logistic regression results

Variable	N	Mean	Coefficient
Net Worth: \$250k - \$499k	25	.13	1.238
Net Worth: \$500k - \$999k	18	.09	1.422
Net Worth: \$1M - \$1.9M	53	.27	.986
Net Worth: \$2M - \$2.9M	45	.23	1.818
Net Worth: \$3M - \$4.9M	18	.09	1.927
Net Worth: Over \$5M	40	.20	1.664
Years Played	295	2.5	.344
Years Out	295	26	.054
Lives in San Diego County	295	.19	.827

*CONSTANT: -3.27

Table 17 Non-wealth independent variables of best predictive model comparison between multiple regression and logistic regression results

Variable	Multiple Regression Probability	Logistic Regression Probability
Years Played at USD	.064	.095
Years Out	.010	.007
Live in SD County	.126	.113

As shown in Table 17, the models reveal that, for each year played at USD, you are between 6% and 10% more likely to donate. For each year you are removed from your educational/playing days at USD, you are around 1% more likely to donate, which could coincide with building wealth and having the means to make a donation (Rosenblatt et al., 1986). One of the more valuable takeaways from the model has to do with alumni and their decision to stay in San Diego County following graduation. Those alumni who choose to stay local and live in San Diego County are between 11% and 13% more likely to donate than those who don't live

close to campus. This finding is surely related to the ability to stay connected and build affinity with your alma mater by being close and able to attend events and games on campus (Stinson & Howard, 2010, Popp et al., 2016).

In order to get a broad perspective on the importance of net worth on the giving patterns of men's basketball alumni from the University of San Diego, a logistic model was run using only the variables shown in Table 17. Table 18 shows the logistic regression results for this model.

Table 18 Coefficients and model summary for best predictive giving equation (excluding net worth and success variables)

Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	Exp (B)	Significance
Years played	.371	.120	1.449	.002
Years out	.054	.009	1.056	.000
Live in San Diego County	.762	.396	2.143	.054

*Nagelkerke R Square = .294

This table shows, with an adjusted r square around 29%, that net worth, by itself, increases the explanatory variance in giving by almost 8% and is important, when possible, in predicting whether a men's basketball alum from USD will donate.

To examine this further, the next step was to compare how each of the different net worth ranges affect the likelihood of an alum donating. In doing this, each net worth range was compared against the mean (which produced a likelihood of donating at 63%) to produce the likelihood of that range donating in comparison to their peers. As with the linear model, the net worth range under \$250k had a negative correlation, and were withheld from the model. Unlike the multiple regression model, this model compares the likelihood to give amongst those most likely to give (net worth above \$250k) rather than those who have a net worth below \$250k.

Table 19 shows the net worth ranges and their likelihood, against the mean, to donate. This table

shows results that mirror previous philanthropy studies; having the means to donate is an important determinant in whether someone will or will not donate (Rosenblatt et al., 1986).

Table 19 Net worth ranges and the likelihood to donate based on best predictive logistic model

Variable	Likelihood to Donate	Against the Mean (63%)
Net Worth: \$250k - \$499k	58%	5% less likely
Net Worth: \$500k - \$999k	61%	2% less likely
Net Worth: \$1M - \$1.99M	53%	10% less likely
Net Worth: \$2M - \$2.99M	71%	8% more likely
Net Worth: \$3M - \$4.99M	70%	7% more likely
Net Worth: Over \$5M	66%	3% more likely

Though the importance of including wealth indicators when possible has been supported, the next step of this study was to examine whether the best multiple regression model that excluded wealth indicators (shown in Table 11; which includes a success variable) would be proven, through running a logistic regression, to be a better predictor than the logistic model that excluded both wealth and success variables. Table 20 shows the best predictive logistic model for donating excluding wealth indicators, but including success variables.

Table 20 Coefficients and model summary for best predictive giving equation with success variable (excluding net worth)

Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	Exp (B)	Significance
Years played	.278	.130	1.320	.032
Years out	.056	.009	1.057	.000
Lives in San Diego County	.781	.400	2.183	.051
Top 10 in a Statistical Category	.971	.550	2.641	.077

*Nagelkerke R Square = .308

The logistic regression results, shown in Table 20, mirror the results shown in Table 11 and show that the inclusion of success variables does indeed increase the explanatory variance by somewhere around 1% of philanthropic giving patterns of men's basketball alumni to the best model that excluded both success variables and wealth indicators.

Summary. Multiple tests, including linear and logistic regressions, were run to determine the best predictive model for men's basketball alumni from USD donating in support of the program. From these tests, it was determined that the best predictive model for giving included net worth, years played, years since leaving USD and living in San Diego County. Having access to some sort of wealth indicator, in this case a net worth rating by alumni database Blackbaud, was shown to help explain an additional 8-10% of the variance in giving patterns. However, net worth scores are not always available to athletic development offices.

When net worth was excluded, the best predictive model did include a success variable; being in the top 10 in a statistical category all-time. Utilizing a regression analysis of data that should be available to all athletic development offices (years played, years out, living within a reasonable range of campus and being in the top 10 in a statistical category) explained, at least for USD men's basketball alumni, about 30% of the variance in giving. Considering that this study did not utilize any qualitative interviews or surveys, this is a pretty significant finding and shows that, at least to some extent, success can influence the giving patterns of former men's basketball student-athletes.

Where it was discovered that success can play a small role in giving habits, only one of the success variables, top 10 in a statistical category all-time, was shown to be significant. Although a couple of team success variables (participating in the NCAA tournament and winning a conference regular season championship) were close, neither were marginally

significant at the $p < .10$ confidence threshold. Because the one success variable that proved significant is a personal success variable, it can be stated that personal success, within this specific donor subset, is a better predictor for philanthropic giving than team success.

RQ2: Of those student-athletes who have donated, does success impact the level of giving more than those who did not experience success?

To start this section, Table 21 shows the descriptive statistics outlining the giving of the 153 members of this sample that have given to USD and their cumulative totals.

Table 21 Descriptive statistics on cumulative giving

N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
153	\$1	\$211,835	\$7,961.27	25315.77

Using linear modeling to help create a predictive total giving model for men's basketball alumni at USD, the first model ran mirrored the best model from RQ1, which helped predict the likelihood of one of the sample making a donation. The variables that were included in this model were net worth, years out from USD, years played and living in San Diego County. Table 22 shows the coefficients and model summary for that model when predicting the total amount donated per alum.

Table 22 Coefficients and model summary for total giving equation using the variables in the best predictive giving equation

Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	t score	Significance
REF: Net Worth < \$250k				
Net Worth: \$250k - \$500k	4621.24	9559.71	.483	.630
Net Worth: \$500k - \$1M	678.25	9955.71	.068	.946
Net Worth: \$1M - \$1.99M	11620.54	8165.92	1.423	.157
Net Worth: \$2M - \$2.99M	433.34	8017.15	.054	.957
Net Worth: \$3M – \$4.99M	2190.69	9400.48	.233	.816
Net Worth: Over \$5M	10151.23	8243.41	1.231	.220
Years Played at USD	-1895.44	1676.12	-1.131	.260
Years Out	265.40	130.60	2.032	.044
Live in San Diego County	15615.40	4941.76	3.16	.002

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of Estimate
.398	.158	.099	24250.51

The model in Table 22, which utilized the variables that were included in the best predictive giving model to answer RQ1, explained nearly 10% of the variance, which was not the best model in helping to predict the total amount that an alum will ultimately donate, which is our goal in RQ2. Somewhat surprisingly, net worth was shown to not be a significant factor in total amount given. Also contradictory from the best model for RQ1 was years played at USD, which was shown to not be a significant factor in determining total amount given.

After running a stepwise function to try to determine if any of our success variables were significant in predicting the total giving amount for a men’s basketball alum at USD, nothing was shown to be statistically significant.

The best model for predicting how much, in total, will be donated by an alum at USD involved the two variables shown to be the most significant in the model ran mirroring the best

predictive model from RQ1; years out and living in San Diego County. Table 23 shows the coefficients and model summary for the best total giving model.

Table 23 Coefficients and model summary for best total giving equation

Variable	Estimated Coefficient	Standard Error	t score	Significance
Years out	284.00	128.57	2.209	.029
Live in San Diego County	15843.71	4756.41	3.331	.001

R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of Estimate
.336	.113	.100	24240.40

Though it only explains 10% of the variance, similar to Table 22, in total amount given, both years out from USD and currently living in San Diego County were shown to be significant factors in determining an alum's total giving (years out at the $p < .05$ threshold and living in San Diego County at the $p < .01$ threshold). The model shows that, on average, men's basketball alumni donate \$284 (+/- \$128.57) per year after leaving USD and that living in San Diego County boosts someone's projected giving by almost \$16,000 (+/- \$4,756).

Summary. In answering the question of whether or not success impacts the level of total giving for men's basketball alumni at USD, the answer is no. Success was not shown as a significant factor in predicting total amount given. When attempting to predict how much someone will donate during their lifetime for this sample, living close to campus and how many years removed from being at USD are far more significant factors to consider.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to examine whether or not the on-court success of the University of San Diego men's basketball alumni is a predictor of (1) making a donation to support the program or (2) making a larger donation than their less successful peers. In athletic fundraising research, there is a significant lack of quantitative studies that focus on the giving patterns of former student-athletes. The goal of this research was to see if playing success has any significant impact on their philanthropic giving patterns as alumni and whether or not the segmentation of specific groups of these alumni, such as those who experienced on-court success, makes sense to help garner a better return on investment on targeted solicitations. After focusing on success, a secondary purpose of the study was to determine what quantifiable variables (such as net worth and where they live) impact the giving patterns of this group.

In order to examine success as a variable in student-athlete alumni giving, two research questions were created to guide the study.

1. What independent variables affect the giving patterns of former men's basketball student-athletes at the University of San Diego, and does success play a role?
 - a. If success does play a role in giving patterns, does personal athletic success affect student-athlete alumni giving more than team success?
2. Of those student-athletes who have donated, does success impact the level of giving than those who did not experience success?

Utilizing archives from both the University of San Diego (USD) athletic department and the West Coast Conference, individual and team success statistics were obtained for all 298 current or former men's basketball student-athletes at USD. USD's alumni databases, Advance and Reeher, were used to gather the philanthropic histories of each member of this subset.

Through the use of multiple and binary logistic regression, this study analyzed each of the research questions in an effort to better understand the giving patterns of this group.

In order to better understand the results, summaries of the findings from each research question will be explained in the next portion of this chapter.

Summary of Findings

RQ1: What independent variables affect the giving patterns of former men's basketball student-athletes at the University of San Diego, and does success play a role?

Research Findings. To aid in answering this research question, both multiple and binary logistic regressions were estimated to test the inferential robustness of key findings. Taken together, results revealed that the best predictive model for USD's men's basketball alumni donating in support of the program included four variables: net worth, years played, years since leaving USD and living in San Diego County.

Research has shown that high net-worth donors are more likely to give to higher education than any other nonprofit category (Bank of America, 2014). This finding can be applied to this study, as well, as the inclusion of net worth proved to be important in having the best possible predictive giving model, explaining anywhere from 8%-10% of the variance in giving by itself. The research also showed the importance of longevity with the program, and that likelihood to give increases between 6% and 8% per year on the team. Living in San Diego County was also shown to be an important factor in determining giving likelihood. Those living in San Diego County were shown to be between 11% and 13% more likely to make a donation than those who ultimately move away from San Diego.

It was noted in the study that not all athletic departments have access to net worth data, and when the research excluded this information, one of the fourteen success variables showed to

be significant in the best predictive model: being in the top 10 in a statistical category all-time. Though it only boosted the variance by one percentage point more than the model that did not include a success variable (years played, years out and living in San Diego County), it showed that, for this specific alumni group, personal success can have an impact on predicting the likelihood of making a philanthropic gift to the program.

RQ2: Of those student-athletes who have donated, does success impact the level of giving more than those who did not experience success?

Research Findings. The only two variables that appeared in the best total giving predictive model for USD men's basketball alumni were years since leaving USD and living in San Diego County. Both of these variables were highly significant (years out: .029; living in San Diego County: .001), but only explained 11% of the variance. The model showed that, on average, men's basketball alumni donate \$284 per year removed from USD and living in San Diego County increases an alum's lifetime projected giving by around \$16,000. Though the inclusion of net worth increased the variance explained for total giving (around 16%), no individual net worth was shown to be significant at either the $p < .05$ or $p < .10$ thresholds. The other variable that showed up in the best predictive model for the first research question (years played at USD) also showed to not be a significant factor in total amount given. In relation to the research question, no success variable was shown to significantly impact the total amount donated towards the program.

Supporting Research and Literature

The 2018 U.S. Study of High Net Worth Philanthropy showed that net worth (and, by default, the time needed to accumulate wealth) is an important factor in philanthropic giving (Bank of America, 2018). This study, along with others, also shows that having first-hand

experience with an organization (in this case, institution) matters when making philanthropic decisions (Rosenblatt et al., 1986; Mount, 1996; Stinson & Howard, 2010; Popp et al., 2016). The inclusion of net worth, years played and years since leaving USD in the best predictive model for giving can all, to some extent, be explained by these findings.

Also included in the findings is the importance of living in San Diego County in predicting giving from USD men's basketball alumni. This phenomenon can be partially explained by previous research as well. Much of the previously mentioned research into affinity can help explain the importance of being near campus in general philanthropic giving to colleges and universities, but the importance of being close to campus has also been examined closely in previous research into athletically-centered giving (Rosenblatt et al., 1986; Mount, 1996; Baade & Sundberg, 1996; Stinson & Howard, 2010; Popp et al., 2016). Living within a reasonable distance of campus can increase engagement with a program. This engagement, and subsequent donations, can lead to enhanced ancillary benefits for alumni, such as better seats at home games and exclusive access to the program and could help explain why, on average, a local alum is projected to give around \$16,000 more than their non-local peers (Turner et al., 2001; Mahony et al., 2003). For local alumni, Maslow's (1943) "Hierarchy of Needs" and Alderfer's (1969) Existence, Relatedness and Growth Theory can help explain some desire to give, as the locality of the program could heighten the need to support a hopefully successful program and being seen in a positive light in the local community (Robbins, 1998).

One of the individual success variables appeared in the best predictive model for giving when net worth was excluded; being the top 10 of a statistical category all-time. Though the reasonings behind these specific individuals supporting the program can't be understood without further qualitative research, two theories that have showed prevalent in previous athletically

centered giving research could help explain some of the rationale. Abrams and Hogg (1988) describe how individuals, particularly those who play a significant role on their respective teams, can associate their role on a team with some of their personal identity in their social identity theory (Belk, 1988). Bristow and Sebastian (2001) explain how a strong identification with a program leads to a larger investment in time and money (Staurowsky et al., 1996; Mahony et al., 2003). Similarly, Tesser (1988) identifies three components that relate self-esteem maintenance theory with sports success; a psychological closeness, relevance to one's self-definition and the performance of others. Those who perform at the highest level will likely want to see "their" program have continued success to help boost their overall importance not only to that program, but relevance among national peers (Eckstein & Delaney, 2008).

In regards to total giving, the research from this study contradicts with some of the previous research in philanthropy that equates amount given with net worth and the idea that in order to give more money, one must have accumulated significant wealth (Bank of America, 2018). Although not undertaken in this study, qualitative research could be conducted to help understand an individual's connection to a program, and what this research found relates more closely with the research conducted that highlights first-hand experience as the motivator for giving over wealth (Stinson & Howard, 2010; Popp et al., 2016). It is likely that some of the motivators discussed in either Mahony's (2003) MAD-1 survey or Ko's (2014) MADOM or SADOM scales are more important indicators of the likelihood of athletic donor to give than net worth.

The next portion of this chapter will examine how the findings from this research can be implemented and increase efficiency of targeted solicitations.

Implications for Policy and Practice

When analyzing this study, there are many suggestions for how implementing these findings can help increase the efficiency and efforts of an athletic development operation. One of the major findings in this study is the relationship between making a donation and living locally, with alumni who live in San Diego County being 11% - 13% more likely to donate than their peers who move out of the area following graduation. Two ways that athletic departments can capitalize on this discovery is focusing on limiting hard solicitations (mailed) to alumni who are local and continuing to examine the ancillary benefits of donating to the program. With previous research showing that 80% of donors are acquired after four appeals, retained after five appeals and renewed after six appeals, athletic departments could be better stewards of their resources by focusing their mailed solicitations (which costs money to create and ship) to those who are likely to be most receptive to the ask local alumni (Reeher, 2019). Another reason that local alumni may be more inclined to donate involves the ancillary benefits of giving: premium seating and access to the team being two of them (Turner et al., 2001). These benefits that one receives as part of their donation to the program should continually be reviewed by athletic departments to make sure the offerings will continue to be of interest to the donor base.

Investing in the success of teams can pay dividends for an athletic department both on the field, but also in terms of acquiring new donors (Staurowsky et al., 1996; Mahony et al., 2003; Walker, 2015). Anderson (2012) showed that success on the playing field has shown to lead to an increase in applications, enrollment, average SAT scores and donations. Staying active in the “arms race” of college athletics, by investing in scholarships, facilities, equipment, etc., can help enhance the recruitment and retention of star student-athletes and the image of a program (Mahony et al., 2003).

The findings of this research showed that the retention of student-athletes was also a significant factor in determining philanthropic giving, with each year of participation on the USD's men's basketball team participated on the team equating to a 6% - 8% better likelihood of making a donation. Emphasizing the student experience at colleges and universities, and subsequently implementing changes and enhancements to increase retention, is more important than ever, with the growing concern over the true value of higher education (Busteed, 2020; Fain, 2019; Grawe, 2018). Retention of student-athletes can help build affinity for both the program and the university, and subsequently make them more likely to give as alumni (Allenby, 2018; Popp et al., 2016; Stinson & Howard, 2010).

Net worth also proved to be an important aspect of philanthropic giving within this subset of the USD alumni community, and this finding matches findings in previous research into philanthropic giving (Bank of America, 2018). A recommendation for practice based off of this finding would be to continue to engage younger alumni through events and experiences with the hope that, as they continue to acquire wealth, they will be philanthropic. This research shows that an athletic department would be best served soliciting those with a net worth above \$250k (53% - 71% more likely to make a donation than those who have a net worth below \$250k), with a targeted ask for those above \$2M (3% - 8% more likely than average to donate).

Previous research has shown that athletic success can be a major motivator in athletic giving (Brooker & Klastorin, 1981; Deal, 2017; Gaski & Etzel, 1984; Klages, 1989; Mahony et al., 2003; Marts, 1934; Sigelman & Brookheimer, 1983; Staurowsky et al., 1986;). Though true on a macro (all alumni of a college or university) level, this research has shown that success may not be a major motivating factor. Of the sixteen independent success variables chosen for this study, only one proved to be significant in the best predictive giving model (when excluding net

worth); being in the top 10 all-time of a statistical category. If wanting to focus on teams or individuals who have experienced success on the field, athletic departments would be best served by focusing on top performers in that particular sport to serve as ambassadors for the program and encourage their counterparts to donate, as there are likely to speak passionately about the program due to their psychological closeness to the program (Alderfer, 1969; Eckstein & Delaney, 2008; Maslow, 1943; Robbins, 1998;).

The next section of this chapter will examine some of the limitations of this study.

Limitations and Delimitations

This study looked at some of the quantifiable factors that influence philanthropic giving for USD men's basketball alumni. Though some of the findings are relevant and significant for development operations and processes, there were some limitations that are worth mentioning and considering when conducting future research.

The first limitation of this study is the fact that it is a quantitative study focusing on a limited number of quantifiable variables, mostly focused on success. The structure of this study eliminates social-desirability bias (the assumption that alumni will overstate their philanthropic support, playing success, etc.), but without interviews or surveys, it is hard to say with certainty that success was truly important. The quantitative study also has limitations in the sense that it is focused primarily on the quantifiable experience as a student-athlete and not as a member of the general student population (professors, roommates, classes, clubs and organizations, etc.). There are also multiple economic (job status, current state of economy) and social (interests, philanthropic priorities, religious beliefs) layers to every donation, and this study was not able to account for all of these without a qualitative portion.

A second limitation to this study is the population being studied. Though this study will aim to create a formula that could be transferrable to other ICA programs across the country, men's basketball alumni at USD is a very specific population that could lead our data to be less generalizable; in particular, the demographics at USD are different than many universities, particularly state and larger public universities. Also, with success serving as the main factor being analyzed in this study, it may be beneficial for future research to examine a program with more of a tradition of winning to see how the results differ (Isherwood, 1986; Baade & Sundberg, 1996).

The final section of this chapter will provide suggestions for future research that can be conducted using the framework for this study and to build upon these findings.

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research into the motivations of athletic alumni giving can help build upon the findings of this study. One recommendation would involve utilizing the framework from this study and adding a qualitative component. A true mixed methods study using either interviews, focus groups or surveys could provide meaningful insight into just how important either personal or team success is to them and their memories of their time with the program.

The framework of this study could also be used in analyzing multiple other programs, including more successful men's basketball programs, as well as a different men's and women's athletic programs at another institutions. One could also describe success as a student-athlete as going professional in a sport, so looking at the giving habits of professional athletes (either domestic or abroad) to their alma mater could be another avenue to explore. Examining a more successful program would have an alumni base that have achieved more on the playing field, and examining the giving patterns of these alums would serve as an interesting comparison point

against this study. Qualitative research has shown that a motivating factor of giving is the desire to improve the quality of women's sports, and it would be interesting to see if the quantitative data supports that desire (Mahony et al., 2003).

Conclusion

Intercollegiate athletic departments (ICAs) are constantly competing. Whether it is for the top student-athlete recruits in the country or on the playing field, competition and the subsequent success that comes with victory, is engrained in the ICA experience at every institution in the country.

ICAs are no different than other non-profits in competing for the necessary resources from donors. Now more than ever, individual donors are being pulled in different directions for their philanthropic funds, with evolving needs and passions directing these funds to institutions that are close to the donor's heart. In the education sector, one of the biggest trends in fundraising focuses on alumni giving percentages, which has a direct impact on the U.S. News & World Report national college rankings in terms of alumni satisfaction scores (Allenby, 2018). Though the focus on soliciting alumni is apparent, treating each alumni the same is not appropriate or advantageous for the institution's development goals. Studying the giving patterns of different alumni demographics is more important than ever.

One of these groups, former student-athletes, has been historically under researched in regards to their giving patterns. Past research has focused on qualitative surveys and interviews that focus on the giving motivations, but not their quantitative giving patterns. Of these motivations, success was often shown as a one of the main motivators that sparks gifts towards ICAs (Mahony et al. 2003; Staurowsky et al., 1996; Walker, 2015). In an effort to look at these motivations quantitatively, this study focused on key success variables involving the on-court

success of University of San Diego men's basketball alumni and the effect that it has on their likelihood to (1) donate towards the program or (2) give more to the program than their less "successful" peers.

The first research question of this study focused on the impact of different independent variables affect the giving patterns of these former student-athletes. Utilizing multiple and logistic regression, tests were run to determine the best model in predicting the likelihood of an alum donating. From these tests, it was determined that the best predictive model for giving included net worth, years played, years since leaving USD and living in San Diego County. Having access to a wealth indicator, such as net worth, showed to be important in explaining the variance in giving within this group (6% - 8%).

Additional tests were run to help account for athletic development operations that do not have access to wealth indicators. When running a regression analysis of data that should be available to all athletic departments, individual success, particularly being seen as one of the better athletes in program history (being in the top 10 of a statistical category all-time), showed to be an important factor in predicting the likelihood of an alum making a donation. This model (paired with other independent variables such as years played, years since leaving USD and living in San Diego County) helped explain around 30% of the variance in giving, which can be considered respectable when considering that there were no qualitative interviews or surveys conducted in this study. The analysis also highlighted the importance of remaining on the team (likelihood to donate increases between 6% and 8% per year on team) and staying local to campus after graduation (living in San Diego increases likelihood of donating between 11% and 13%).

The second research question focused on what variables proved to be important in predicting cumulative philanthropic giving. Only two variables (years out and living in San Diego County) proved to be significant at the $p < .05$ threshold and were included in the best total giving model. No success variables or net worth variables proved to be significant. Other important findings included that, on average, USD men's basketball alumni donate (cumulatively) \$284 per year removed from USD and living in San Diego County increases an alum's cumulative projected giving by around \$16,000.

In answering the question of whether or not success matters in athletic fundraising, in regards to former student-athletes, this research showed that success only matters to a top percentage of student-athletes, those likely to be considered among the best in their sport. Otherwise, success on the playing field may not matter as much to student-athlete alumni as it does to the general alumni base (Billing et al., 1985; Gladden et al. 2005; Mahony et al., 2003; Staurowsky et al., 1996; Verner et al. 1998). Variables that appear to matter to this alumni group include living close to campus, being a member of the team for a majority of their time in college and having a net worth above \$250k. The future research recommendations provided in this study, including the study of former student-athlete alumni at other institutions and different programs, can help fundraising professionals better understand an important alumni base and their giving patterns.

References

- Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (1988). Comments on the motivational status of self-esteem in social identity and intergroup discrimination. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 18(4), 317–334. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420180403>
- Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 4, 142-175.
- Allenby, D. (2018). 5 Reasons Alumni Participation is Important. Retrieved from <https://annualgiving.com/2018/02/11/5-reasons-alumni-participation-important/>
- Anderson, M. (2012). The Benefits of College Athletic Success: An Application of the Propensity Score Design with Instrumental Variables. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w18196>
- Baade, R. A., & Sundberg, J. O. (1996). Fourth Down and Gold to Go? Assessing the link between athletics and alumni giving. *Social Science Quarterly*, 77.
- Bank of America & Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. (2014). The 2014 U.S. Trust Study of High Net Worth Philanthropy. https://www.privatebank.bankofamerica.com/publish/content/application/pdf/GWMOL/USTp_ARNTCJF5_2015-11_v1.pdf
- Bank of America & Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. (2018). The 2018 U.S. Trust Study of High Net Worth Philanthropy. <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/17666/high-net-worth2018-summary.pdf>
- Bass, J. R., Gordon, B. S., & Achen, R. M. (2015). Motivations for athletic giving: Examining non-renewed donors. *Applied Research in Coaching and Athletics*, 30(2), 166–186.
- Belk, R.W. (1988). Possessions and the Extended Self. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15.

- Billing, J.E., Holt, D., & Smith, J. (1985). Athletic fund-raising: Exploring the motives behind donations. *Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.*
- Bernhardt, P. C., Dabbs Jr, J. M., Fielden, J. A., & Lutter, C. D. (1998). Testosterone changes during vicarious experiences of winning and losing among fans at sporting events. *Physiology & Behavior*, 65(1), 59–62. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0031-9384\(98\)00147-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0031-9384(98)00147-4)
- Bristow, D.N. and Sebastian, R.J. (2001). "Holy cow! Wait 'til next year! A closer look at the brand loyalty of Chicago Cubs baseball fans", *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 256-275. <https://doi.org/10.1108/07363760110392976>
- Brooker, G. W., & Klastorin, T. D. (1981). To the victors belong the spoils? College athletics and alumni giving. *Social Science Quarterly*, 62.
- Busteed, B. (2020). Just 7% Of U.S. High School Students Confident American Colleges Are World's Best. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/brandonbusteed/2020/01/30/just-7-of-us-high-school-students-confident-american-colleges-are-worlds-best/#34285c525c65>
- Cialdini, R. B., Borden, R. J., Thorne, A., Walker, M. R., Freeman, S., & Sloan, L. R. (1976). Basking in reflected glory: Three (football) field studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34(3), 366–375. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.34.3.366>
- Cialdini, R. B., & Richardson, K. D. (1980). Two indirect tactics of image management: Basking and blasting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39(3), 406–415. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.39.3.406>
- Clotfelter, C. T. (2001). Who are the alumni donors? Giving by two generations of alumni from selective colleges. *Nonprofit management and leadership*, 12.

- Deal, C. T. (2017). Factors influencing the level of financial support provided by former athletes from a NCAA Division I-A Football Championship Series (FCS) university to their alma mater. University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. <https://scholar.utc.edu/theses/504/>
- Eckstein, R., & Delaney, K. (2002). New Sports Stadiums, Community Self-Esteem, and Community Collective Conscience. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 26(3), 235-247. doi:10.1177/0193723502263002
- Fain, P. (2019). College Enrollment Declines Continue. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2019/05/30/college-enrollment-declines-continue>
- Fink, J. S., Parker, H. M., Brett, M., & Higgins, J. (2009). Off-Field Behavior of Athletes and Team Identification: Using Social Identity Theory and Balance Theory to Explain Fan Reactions. *Journal of Sport Management*, 23, 142-155.
- Fulks, D.L. (2000). Revenues and expenses of Division I and II intercollegiate athletics programs; financial trends and relationships – 1999. *Overland Park, KS: The National Collegiate Athletic Association*.
- Gaski, J. F., & Etzel, M. I. (1984). Collegiate success and alumni generosity: Dispelling the myth. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 12.
- Gladden, J. M., Mahony, D. F., & Apostolopoulou, A. (2005). Toward a better understanding of college athletic donors: What are the primary motives? *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 14.
- Grawe, N. D. (2018). Demographics and the Demand for Higher Education. In *Changing Contours of Population and Aggregate Higher Education Demand* (pp. 44–58). Amsterdam University Press. <https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=5SNADwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&>

dq=grawe+2018&ots=I5M53wQI5N&sig=wha93wqDIU9s2eknrBpBIyjY6Ic#v=onepage
&q=grawe%202018&f=false

- Grimes, P. W., & Chressanthis, G. A. (1994). Alumni Contributions to Academics. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 53(1), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1536-7150.1994.tb02669.x>
- Hall, J. S., & Mahony, D. F. (1997). Factors affecting methods used by annual giving programs: A qualitative study of NCAA Division I athletic departments. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 6.
- Harris, J. T. (1988). An Assessment of Factors Related to Successful Fund Raising at Public, Doctorate-Granting Universities. The Pennsylvania State University.
- Hellevik, O. (2007). Linear versus logistic regression when the dependent variable is a dichotomy. *Quality & Quantity*, 43(1), 59–74. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-007-9077-3>
- Hobson, W., & Rich, S. (2015). Playing in the Red. *Washington Post*.
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/sf/sports/wp/2015/11/23/running-up-the-bills/>
- Isherwood, A. C. (1986). A descriptive profile of the fund raising programs in NCAA Division 1-A. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 47.
- Jenkins, R. (2008). Social identity (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Jude, C. (2017). A quantitative survey of motivations behind athletic alumni financial giving in a historically black university. ProQuest.
- Kelly, D. & Vamosiu, A. (2020). Charitable giving to college athletics: the role of brand communities in choosing how much to give. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*.
- Klages, J. W. (1989). Incentives used by intercollegiate athletic booster clubs (NCAA Division I). *Masters Abstracts*, 28, 03.

- Ko, Y. J., Rhee, Y. C., Walker, M., & Lee, J.-H. (2014). What Motivates Donors to Athletic Programs: A New Model of Donor Behavior. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(3), 523–546. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764012472065>
- Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. (2018, June). Giving USA 2018. <https://givingusa.org/giving-usa-2018-americans-gave-410-02-billion-to-charity-in-2017-crossing-the-400-billion-mark-for-the-first-time/>
- Marcus, J., Harris, B., & Mader, J. (2019, April 7). College students predicted to fall by more than 15% after the year 2025. Retrieved from <https://hechingerreport.org/college-students-predicted-to-fall-by-more-than-15-after-the-year-2025/>
- Mahony, D. F., Gladden, J. M., & Funk, D. C. (2003). Examining athletic donors at NCAA Division I institutions. *International Sports Journal*, (Winter).
- Marts, A. C. (1934). College football and college endowment. *School and Society*, 40.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.
- Mazur, A. (1985). A Biosocial Model of Status in Face-to-Face Primate Groups. *Social Forces*, 64(2), 377–402. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/64.2.377>
- Mazur, A., Booth, A., & Jr., J. M. D. (1992). Testosterone and Chess Competition. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 55(1), 70. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2786687>
- Mount, J. (1996). Why donors give. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 7(1), 3–14. doi: 10.1002/nml.4130070103
- Oliveira, T., Gouveia, M., & Oliveira, R. (2009). Testosterone responsiveness to winning and losing experiences in female soccer players. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, 34(7), 1056-1064.

- Popp, N., Barrett, H., & Weight, E. (2016). Examining the relationship between age of fan identification and donor behavior at an NCAA Division I athletics department. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 9, 107–123.
- Powell, W. W., & Bromley, P. (2020). *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, Third Edition (1st ed.). Stanford University Press.
- Reeher, A. (2019). 5 Important Higher Ed Fundraising Truths for FY2020. Retrieved from <https://npengage.com/higher-education/5-important-higher-ed-fundraising-truths-for-fy2020/>
- Rhoads, T., & Gerking, S. (2000). Educational contributions, academic quality, and athletic success. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 18(2), 248–258. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-7287.2000.tb00022.x>
- Robbins, S. P. (1998). *Organizational behavior: Concepts, controversies, applications*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Rosenblatt, J. A., Cusson, A. J., and McGowan, L. (1986). “A Model to Explain Charitable Donations: Health Consumer Behavior.” In R. J. Lutz (ed.), *Advances in Consumer Research*. Vol. 12. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Association for Consumer Research.
- Schimmel, K. S. (2006, August 31). Deep play: Sports mega-events and urban social conditions in the USA. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2006.00659.x>
- Shapiro, S., Giannoulakis, C., Drayer, J., & Wang, C. (2008). An Examination of Athletic Alumni Giving Behavior: Development of the Former Student-Athlete Donor Constraint Scale. *Sport Management Review* 13 (2010) 283–295.

- Shapiro, S. (2008). Donor Loyalty in College Athletics: An Analysis of Relationship Fundraising Quality. Unpublished dissertation. University of Northern Colorado.
- Shaw, S. & Taylor, M. (1995). Reinventing fund-raising: Realizing the potential of women's philanthropy. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Shulman, J. L., & Bowen, W. G. (2001). The misfortunes of collegiate athletics. *Case Currents*, (27).
- Sigelman, L. & Brookheimer, S. (1983). Is it whether you win or lose? Monetary contributions to big-time college athletic programs. *Social Science Quarterly*, 64.
- Singer, D. (2017). We are wrong about millennial sports fans. Retrieved from <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/media-and-entertainment/our-insights/we-are-wrong-about-millennial-sports-fans>
- Snyder, C. R., Lassegard, M., & Ford, C. E. (1986). Distancing after group success and failure: Basking in reflected glory and cutting off reflected failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(2), 382–388. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.2.382>
- Staurowsky, E. J., Parkhouse, B., & Sachs, M. (1996). Developing an instrument to measure athletic donor behavior and motivation. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10.
- Stinson, J. & Howard, D. (2004). Scoreboards vs. mortarboards: Major donor behavior and intercollegiate athletics. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 13, 129-140.
- Stinson, J. L., & Howard, D. R. (2010). Intercollegiate athletics as an institutional fundraising tool: An exploratory donor-based view. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 22(4), 312–335.

- Tesser, A. (1988). Toward a Self-Evaluation Maintenance Model of Social Behavior. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 181–227. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-2601\(08\)60227-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-2601(08)60227-0)
- Turner, S. F., Meserve, L. A., & Bowen, W. G. (2001). Winning and giving: Football results and alumni giving at selective private colleges and universities. *Social Science Quarterly*, S2(4), 812-826.
- Verner, M. E., Hecht, J. B., & Fansler, A. G. (1997). Validating an instrument to assess the motivation of athletic donors. *Journal of Sport Management*, (12).
- Walker, A. G. (2015). Division I Intercollegiate Athletics Success and the Financial Impact on Universities. *SAGE Open*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015611186>
- Wallace, N. (2018). Where are my donors? *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*. Retrieved from https://www.nonprofitjourney.org/uploads/8/4/4/9/8449980/nonprofits_plan_for_an_uncertain_future_as_fewer_americans_give_to_charity_-chronicle_june_2018.pdf
- Wann, D.L., & Branscombe, N.R. (1990). Die-hard and fair-weather fans: Effects of identification on BIRGing and CORFing tendencies. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 14, 103–117.
- Wann, D.L., & Dolan, T.J. (1994). Attributions of highly identified sports spectators. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 134, 783–792.
- Wolf, C. (2018, May 08). Here's Orlando Mayor Buddy Dyer's gigantic UCF "national champions" ring. Retrieved from <https://www.orlandoweekly.com/Blogs/archives/2018/05/04/heres-orlando-mayor-buddy-dyers-gigantic-ucf-national-champions-ring>

Wolverton, B., & Kambhampati, S. (2016). Colleges Raised \$1.2 Billion in Donations for Sports in 2015. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Colleges-Raised-12-Billion/235058>