AN INVESTIGATION OF THE FACTORS THAT CAN PREDICT PHILANTHROPIC SUPPORT FOR FORMER FEMALE STUDENT-ATHLETES

BY

Jason S. Drummond

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Higher Education
and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

_____
Chairperson

_____

_____

_____

_____

Date Defended: _____

The Dissertation Committee for Jason S. Drummond certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE FACTORS THAT CAN PREDICT PHILANTHROPIC SUPPORT FOR FORMER FEMALE STUDENT-ATHLETES

_____
Chairperson

Date Defended: _____

ABSTRACT

Drummond, Jason S. An Investigation of the Factors That Can Predict Philanthropic Support For Former Female Student-Athletes. Unpublished Doctor of Education dissertation, University of Kansas, 2009.

The purpose of this study was to determine factors that best describe the philanthropic motivations of female student-athletes when considering making financial contributions to their alma mater. A survey instrument was developed and administered to 2,351 alumnae student-athletes which had 347 respondents.

The independent variables chosen were broken into four subscales: Attitude towards the university and athletics; attitude toward the athletic program; willingness to give; and, perceived gender equity. Bivariate correlations were computed using Pearson's correlation coefficient. Multivariate regression analyses were conducted establishing predictors of contributions and amount. Logistic regression was used when examining contributions and linear regression was used when looking at how much they donated.

The findings suggests age, attitudes toward the program and willingness to give are the factors that predicts giving. In predicting amount given, current personal financial situation was a factor. There were no differences explaining contributions comparing team and individual sports participants.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The dissertation process is one that has required many sacrifices. Some of these sacrifices have been ones that I have had to make, but most of the sacrifices are ones that others have had to make on my behalf. I would like to take this opportunity to sincerely thank a few of those who have made inordinate sacrifices.

I would like to thank my personal savior Jesus Christ. The many blessings that He has bestowed on me during this process have been remarkable. I am reminded that through Him all things are possible.

Dad and Mom, thank you for the great example you have set for me and the aspirations you have challenged me to obtain. I love you and recognize while I might get the degree, you are equally as important in this process.

Dr. Susan Twombly for her assistance in helping me get into the program initially and then her guidance throughout the entire program, although it took longer than each of us had anticipated. I would also like to thank Dr. Lisa Wolf-Wendel for her hands-on approach to helping me become a better student and showing me I could finish this process. I would also like to thank Dr. Mary Fry, Dr. Dongbin Kim and Dr. Charles Carlsen for your generous service on my dissertation committee.

The entire staff at the Virginia Athletics Foundation, especially Dirk Katstra and Connie Harrison, have provided both the funding for this project as well as the framework to help me be successful in my profession pursuits. Most of the professional principles I have learned generated from my four years in Charlottesville.

The entire University Advancement staff at MidAmerica Nazarene University has allowed me to continue pursuing this dream while working full-time. You have generously picked me up at times and allowed me to spend time working to complete this project. For that, I am most grateful.

DEDICATION

This project is dedicated to my family. Christy, Aidan, Marin, and Brynn – you have provided me with the time, the energy and the encouragement to fulfill this dream. Even when this became a less achievable goal through some of the circumstances over the past few years, you have continued to remind me how close I am to finishing. Those words, while I didn't like them at the time, kept the fire burning inside to finish what I started.

Christy, you have given me the encouragement to finish this even among the times of trial that we have both experienced personally. There have been many times I have wanted to give up, but your constant and polite pressure has kept me going. You bare the love of my life. This degree is for both of us.

Aidan, Marin and Brynn, thank you for letting Daddy "go to school" at the expense of spending time playing with you. I hope the time spent away from you completing this degree will challenge you in the future to set high aspirations and then achieve them. May God continue to watch over you as each of you dream. I love you.

For this reason, I dedicate this project to all of you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Today, college athletics at the highest level (NCAA Division I-A) is a unique entity that combines the educational value of the American college experience with the multi-million dollar nature of a large corporation. Athletic departments have a responsibility to balance these, at times competing, objectives without losing focus on the distinct characteristics of either one. Nevertheless, athletics budgets at universities that compete for championships each year are growing at a tremendous rate as their teams continue to search for championships. For example, the two universities that competed for both the NCAA Division I-A football and basketball championships in 2006-07 made up two of the four largest budgets in collegiate athletics. Ohio State University spent over $104 million and the University of Florida spent over $82 million on their respective athletic departments (Kerkhoff, 2007).

College athletics has been on a spending spree over the last several years, with major college campuses all across the country constructing new athletic facilities such as stadiums, weight rooms, academic support buildings, and other facilities that help entice new recruits (Kerkhoff, 2007). There is, however, a large disparity developing between athletic departments that generate positive revenue and those departments that do not (Suggs, 2000).

The programs that are fortunate enough to compete at the highest levels and have successful football and/or basketball programs are the beneficiaries of increased and

adequate funding for women's programs in two ways – through revenues derived from ticket sales and television contracts and through large efforts in securing private giving.

With these large athletic department budgets, there becomes a disparity between the very few universities that can compete on this level and the other universities that are fielding teams but are financially unable to perform as well. Most universities do not have profitable athletic departments. In 2002, the average Division I-A deficit was $600,000 (NCAA, 2003). It is equally interesting to note the average student fee contribution of $1,425,000 annually, which is made up of fees collected from the undergraduate population to help support college athletics, is not reflected in the deficit. When summed, these figures represent an average operating deficit of $2,025,000 (NCAA, 2003).

The numbers above show startling revelations. Athletic department budgets are continuing to escalate at rapid paces; however, many athletic departments are operating with deficit spending patterns. Two overwhelming arguments prevail when trying to understand this dichotomy--the need to continue to stay current with facilities and other offerings of peer institutions and the rapid expansion of women's athletic programs.

In the state of Iowa alone, there are $80 million in athletic upgrades for both the University of Iowa and Iowa State University basketball programs. This is indicative of what is driving up the costs of running a self-sufficient athletic program (Dochterman, 2008).

The additional opportunities for women, while extremely important in running a quality athletic department, have grown at a faster rate than budgets can withstand

(Suggs, 2000) so additional resources will be necessary to continue this expansion. The rising cost of college athletics, including the emphasis on capital construction, coaching salaries, and the increase in women's sports has complicated the financial picture. Additionally, athletic departments are increasingly faced with the challenges of operating a transparent program while maintaining fiscal responsibility.

There has been a rapid expansion of women's athletics that financially impacts the future of college athletics in general. Women's sports programs are becoming increasingly popular, and the opportunities for women to compete have increased significantly over the last three decades. Since the passage of Title IX legislation in 1972 and the increased commitment to this legislation in 1987, there has been an explosion in women's athletics. In the last 30 years, female participation in college athletics has increased over 400% while male participation has increased slightly over 20% (Women's Sports Foundation, 2002).

Female participation in higher education is also growing at a more rapid pace than male participation (Fulks, 2000; Fulks, 2002; Suggs, 2003) Between 1971-1972 and 2003-2004, female participation in intercollegiate competition increased from just under 30,000 to almost 151,000 (Bray 2004). The California State University system reported that participation in women's athletics at its 20 NCAA member institutions has increased 114.8 percent in the last 14 years (CSU Report on Equal Opportunity, July 1, 2008).

Cook (2008) reports from 1998-2008 colleges and universities have increased the number of new women's teams by 43%. In terms of the number of women's sports teams at colleges and universities, 2008 was record-setting year. There was an average of 8.65

per school, which continued a nearly consecutive number of yearly increases in average teams per school dating back to 1970. For comparison, in 1970 before Title IX, NCAA member colleges had an average of only 2.5 women's teams per school. That figure shot up to 5.61 in 1978, the first year for Title IX compliance, and has risen to its current levels (Cook, 2008).

Toppo and DeBarros (2007) state that women made up 56% of all undergraduate students in 2006. This also has an impact on women's sports because part of Title IX legislation states that athletic program offerings and participation should reflect the overall undergraduate population of the institution.

Athletic departments have pursued compliance with Title IX by increasing opportunities for women through the addition of new programs. While certainly justified, these increasing opportunities have added significantly to the bottom line of athletic department budgets (Becker, 1991). Unfortunately, many, if not most, women's athletic programs are not able to generate the revenues that will allow these programs to operate as a break-even venture.

Probably the most significant way for universities to increase the athletic departments' budgets would be to place emphasis on uncovering sources of external funding, with the primary effort being on generating significantly more private philanthropy. The growth of private contributions to college athletics has had a positive impact on significant increases in spending by athletic department budgets (Stinson & Howard, 2004; Suggs, 2005).

Although there is measured growth in outside funding, this philanthropic increase has not kept pace with the amount of money universities are spending on their athletic programs.

In NCAA Division I for example, Fulks (2002) reports that contributions from private sources accounted for 18% of the annual budget of these institutions in 2001, up from 15% in 1995. Between 1995 and 2001, universities increased their athletic department budgets at a rate of more than twice the growth rate of the university's general operating budget (Frank, 2004). Stinson and Howard (2004) find that charitable contributions to athletic programs have more than doubled over the past decade as sports have become a larger piece of the overall marketing strategy for colleges and universities.

One subset of alumni that could have dramatic impact on the level of private philanthropy are former student-athletes who represent a relatively untapped revenue resource for universities. There has been a decline in high-profile student-athletes' willingness to make financial contributions to their universities, while the general public seems to remain consistent in their giving patterns (Shulman & Bowen, 2001). Moreover, male student-athletes who have moved on to highly lucrative and successful careers in professional sports have not shown, other than anecdotal evidence, a willingness to give back when compared to male athletes who have a low profile and the general student population at large (Shulman & Bowen, 2001).

Although it is desired that former athletes appreciate the experiences they received while attending college and be able to financially contribute to the athletic fund raising campaigns, the reality is that former student-athlete financial support, both male

and female, is an area that development professionals have been struggling with here is a need for new strategies to encourage contributions by former student-athletes.

As women's sports become increasingly popular, both within the university structure and through a growing fan base, it will become imperative that this segment of the population be cultivated to assist with the funding initiatives necessary for the continued growth of women's athletics.

The current female donor base can be divided into three segments: women who have personally benefited from the advances in women's athletics in the post-Title IX era, women from the pre-Title IX era, and those who never participated in sports at the university but are interested in women's college athletics (Robinson, 1998). Strategies need to be implemented to engage donors to invest in the future of women's athletics, especially women who were participants in those programs. As Robinson (1998) indicates, it is also extremely important that athletic department administrators understand the differences in donor motivations so that cultivation strategies can be more effective.

While the funding gap between men's and women's sports will never be completely equal because of football, the desire to continue to close the relative gap between funding for men's sports and funding for women's sports will necessitate athletic development professionals to understand the process by which women, more specifically former student-athletes, prefer to be cultivated for future support. Athletic departments and development professionals should begin to approach female athletes while they are still attending the university.

Creating a positive environment with opportunities that are equitable to their male counterparts will help the process of securing gifts from this group in the future (Smith, 2003). With the decrease in appropriations made to higher education by state budgets, the increased need for funding in college athletics, and the increased opportunities for women to participate in college athletics, there is relevance for continued research whose goal is to determine characteristics that lead women into becoming a major donor constituent for college athletics.

Purpose of the Study

The overall purpose of this exploratory analysis is to determine whether former female student-athletes give, the amount and factors that best describe the philanthropic motivations of female student-athletes when considering making financial contributions to their alma mater. This study also explores whether the participant's specific athletic program is a factor in deciding whether or not to support the athletics program financially.

While taking into consideration that each institution develops and implements its own strategies for athletic fundraising, the research uncovered in this study adds to the body of literature that fundraising professionals can use to determine strategies and programs that best suit their institutional mission and objectives.

The scope of this study grew out of previous research that was completed regarding fundraising in college athletics; however, there still is limited research on gender factors, institution type and size, as well as participation in particular sports

programs and alumni giving. This study, conducted specifically at the University of Virginia, addresses these gaps in the literature and provides more research for future study to assist fundraising professionals in their continued pursuit of developing strategies to attract female donors.

Research Questions

The following research questions are examined in this study:

1. What are the demographic (age, race, education, income level, scholarship recipient and sport) and attitudinal factors (feelings toward the university and athletic programs, experiences as a student-athletes, and connection to the university and athletic program) that predict whether female student-athletes make financial contributions to support the athletic programs of their alma mater?
2. What are the demographic and attitudinal factors that predict the amount female student-athletes give to the athletic programs of their alma mater?
3. Do significant differences exist in financial contributions made by female student-athletes depending on participation in particular sports?

Significance of the Study

Based on the literature, we know very little regarding financial support for women's college athletic programs by women, especially former student-athletes. College athletic administrators and development staff should be increasing their focus on

understanding women as potential donors, especially women who participated in athletics and received some financial aid for their participation.

As the literature has suggested, women's athletic programs at universities in the United States has grown exponentially (Fulks, 2000; Fulks, 2002; Suggs, 2003; Bray, 2004; Cook, 2008). Opportunities will continue to increase as the next generation of girls who are athletically-inclined aspire to attend college with some subsidy based on their skills. As these opportunities grow, so will the need to fund these programs at increasingly higher levels. Understanding the motivations behind former female student-athletes' giving patterns can help defray the costs encumbered by athletic departments.

We know that universities will continue to provide opportunities for expansion in women's athletic programs and resources because universities that sponsor football are still not in strict compliance with Title IX legislation. The disparity that football causes is specifically due to the number of student-athletes needed to field a football program. This disparity will also continue to promote the growth in women's athletics on college campuses. Again, being able to understand and predict donor behavior will position athletic departments for a better understanding of how to generate streams of income from women who participated in college athletics.

Third, there needs to be an understanding developed that articulates the reasons why females choose to support or decide not to support their athletic teams financially. The nature of athletic competition provides opportunities to learn teamwork and leadership skills. Relationships are formed that, in some cases, last for several decades. Through these relationships, development professionals must capitalize on articulating a

vision that states why female athletes are important to the long-term viability of their own athletic programs. By studying the behavior and characteristics of former female student-athletes, development professionals may be able to glean insight into patterns that enhance the likelihood of philanthropic behavior.

Finally, as the future of college athletics moves towards self-sufficiency because of the financial constraints facing higher education, there needs to be an emphasis placed on understanding where the opportunities rest when creating better strategies to specifically target female philanthropic intent related to college athletics so that development professionals can capitalize on this growing pool of potential donors.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERTAURE AND RELATED RESEARCH

This chapter examines the relevant literature regarding philanthropy within the non-profit sector of higher education, as well as in college athletics. The chapter is separated into six sections: the first reviews women's participation in college athletics; the second section covers public philanthropy in the United States; the third reviews philanthropy in higher education; the fourth section deals with philanthropy in college athletics; the fifth reviews women's philanthropy in higher education; and the sixth section reviews women's philanthropy in college athletics.

Women's Participation in College Athletics

In June,1971, the founding of the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) officially launched their participation in college athletics. Shortly after, a federal mandate called Title IX was passed that essentially granted equal opportunities for both men and women in sports (Durrant, 1989).

During the initial years of the AIAW, women's sport was focused on developing a model that encouraged fair play and broad participation, and provided an educational model that developed cooperation and self-actualization (Durrant, 1989). The AIAW tried to develop a differing model than that of men's intercollegiate sports because of the perception that revenue generation and winning were the main focus of the latter. Instead of succumbing to these characteristics, leaders in women's athletics sought to create a fair but competitive experience for the women (Carpenter & Acosta, 1991).

At the 1980 NCAA Convention, the membership made a decision to promote and schedule NCAA Women's National Championship sports on the exact dates as the AIAW National Championships. The membership also voted to offer incentives to new members specifically aimed at attracting AIAW members. These decisions put the NCAA and AIAW in competition, but the NCAA had more financial resources which enabled it to start controlling women's athletics.

The AIAW filed suit against the NCAA, claiming the monopolistic practices were in violation of federal antitrust laws. The NCAA had forced the AIAW into bankruptcy by dissolving all of their financial resources (Burns, 1987). The AIAW lost the lawsuit and subsequent appeal and was formally dissolved in June, 1982 (Blinde, 1987). At this time, the NCAA assumed responsibility for intercollegiate women's sports as the result of a bitter court battle that changed the face of college athletics. Through this acquisition, women's sports lost much of its earlier appeal for high participation and self-actualization in lieu of the NCAA model that was based on revenue production (Blinde, 1987).

As the shift toward revenue generation for women's athletics began, the dynamics for participants changed as more resources were allocated (albeit not substantial when compared to men's athletics in relative terms), but higher expectations were placed on the athletes and the coaches. As Jones (1991) finds in her study, increased expectations and pressures placed on the female athletes were due, in large part, to the increased financial support they received. She further notes that female athletes were finding themselves in the same position as their male counterparts where every area of their lives was tightly controlled and pressure was placed on them to produce winning records.

Although, women's intercollegiate athletics has undergone a philosophical shift from the AIAW to the NCAA, the growth in terms of participation is staggering. DiBaggio (2001) reports that since 1981-82, the growth in participation by women in college athletics has grown at twice the rate of female student growth in the undergraduate population, while the growth of men's participation has closely matched the growth in undergraduate enrollment. Youngren (2003) reports that according to NCAA statistics, only 16,000 women participated in collegiate athletics in the late 1960s. Today, nearly 10 times that number of female athletes are on the playing fields.

The challenges that lie ahead for women's athletics, as well as for the colleges and universities that sponsor women's athletics, is to maintain and improve funding and to keep working toward an equitable program that provides experiences for women that are similar to those of men's athletic programs. This could be challenging as Curtis (2000) finds that women who participated in college athletics – a population one would expect to contribute – cited that their participation was not a motivating factor to give back to support their program. Furthermore, her research indicates a high likelihood to give to the men's program as opposed to the women's program.

Philanthropy in the United States

Philanthropic efforts in the United States continue to reach billions of dollars annually. In 2003, contributions to charitable organizations in the United States were $248.5 billion, of which $33.8 billion was earmarked for higher education (Blum & Hall, 2005).

Philanthropic support has played a critical role in the funding of American higher education. As federal and state funds decrease and competition increases for private resources among other non-profit entities, seeking resources has become a high priority for American colleges and universities. American higher education has witnessed an unprecedented growth in the professional development activities associated with raising funds (Harris, 1990; Muir & May, 1993; Honeyman & Bruhn, 1996).

Fundraising professionals need to become more aware of the differences among the donor constituencies that they must acknowledge for their respective organizations to thrive in this crowded field of charitable giving (Sargeant, 1999). Strategies must be created to attract, retain and capture the imaginations of donors that are becoming progressively more selective regarding their charitable contributions. Professionals should be able to learn why donors give to certain charitable endeavors and how best to reach those donors.

Philanthropic appeals from organizations must be able to capture the hearts and imaginations of prospective donors whether through a shared experience that is mutual with the organization or a belief that the organization is providing a service that improves the quality of life for groups that are important to the donor. Bennett (2003) finds that personal involvement in or experience with a particular cause will explain the primary intent behind contributions to a specific organization. Donors also become involved because through relationships with, either an organization or its leadership, and those relationships tend to provide for consistent investments.

Brady, Noble, Utter & Smith (2002) find that enduring communal relationships have been found to lead to increased charitable behavior with less concern for personal payback.

Gender Differences in Philanthropy

The literature pertaining to gender differences in donor behavior has the most breadth; however, there continues to be a need for more research regarding the diversity of donor characteristics with regard to men and women (Brunel and Nelson, 2000; Newman, 2000; Sargeant, 1999; Shalala, 1993). Men tend to get much more publicity, and it appears they are more generous when contributing to charitable causes than women; nevertheless, the factual data support that women are indeed slightly more charitably-minded than men (Sargeant, 1999).

Women will end up controlling much of the $41 trillion expected to pass from generation to generation by 2052 (Havens & Schervish, 2003). With the growing number of women earning, inheriting and controlling large amounts of wealth, it is critical to learn more about the ways in which women practice their philanthropic efforts.

Development professionals should have an understanding of what strategies to employ when making appeals to the different genders in order to allow for more coordinated efforts and increased results. It should also decrease donor attrition to organizations by providing a formalized cultivation and stewardship process (Muir & May, 1993).

According to Brunel and Nelson (2000), women prefer fundraising appeals that emphasize helping others, while men broadly are more likely to respond to communications efforts that suggest personal benefits for themselves. Newman (2000) found that women are willing to take greater risks when providing philanthropic dollars, such as helping start new philanthropic enterprises, where men are more concerned with whether the organization is well run and prestigious. Newman (1995) also studies gender differences in philanthropic giving and finds that women are more likely to give to organizations that are in a crisis situation and have a single issue. They are also more concerned with altruism in their philanthropy.

Women tend to give to create something and to make a difference (Shaw & Taylor, 1995). Men's individual giving is often correlated with an individual's membership of a network or social movement (Lohmann, 1992). Developing strategies to incorporate women's values in philanthropic appeals should capitalize on this research, showing that women give from the heart and often want to get emotionally involved before they become charitably involved (Shim, 2001).

Socio-economic Differences in Philanthropy

The research on socio-economic differences in philanthropy is slight, probably because of the belief that most of the contributions are provided by wealthy individuals. Nevertheless, there has been some literature that has studied philanthropic differences among socio-economic backgrounds that helps provide an initial framework for this study because of the varying environments that the respondents represent.

The literature suggests that donors who come from a higher socio-economic status tend to make contributions to organizations that have the ability to shape the policies and agendas that continue to engender the social environments that they espouse (Ostrower, 1997; Bennett, 2003). Ostrower (1997) finds that people with financial means and charitable intent frequently prefer to make contributions to educational and cultural organizations that help create social contexts within those particular communities. Gorov (1999) suggests that most of the philanthropic giving by affluent young entrepreneurs in the United States went to the educational sector, where money was often donated to high-profile schools or higher education institutions that will continue to advocate a social establishment that is familiar and comfortable.

Conversely, donors who come from more modest financial backgrounds tend to support causes that provide an element of compassion through experience, whether directly or indirectly (Radley & Kennedy,1995; Ostrower, 1997; Bennett, 2003). Radley and Kennedy (1995) report that lower socioeconomic groups donated to charities because they were better able to empathize with the predicaments of those in need, whereas higher socioeconomic groups gave not only to assist in the reduction of suffering but also to initiate longer term social change.

Philanthropy in Higher Education

The Council for Aid to Education (2007) reported that private contributions to American higher education in FY 2006 increased 9.4% to $28 billion. On average, individual contributions account for approximately 9% of a university's total operating

budget. The report also indicated that alumni giving – which is the traditional base of philanthropy in higher education – grew by 18.3% during this same time period.

Several trends in private support for higher education have occurred since its origin in the 17th century. The approach has changed from religious-affiliated and individual requests to requests by institutions in a more professional manner (Brittingham & Pezzullo, 1990). In early American higher education, church-affiliated colleges depended on their clergy to raise monies for the institution (Pavlovich, 1993). Today, most, if not all, universities have professional development staff who manage fundraising efforts on behalf of the university.

Alumni fundraising is the financial lifeblood which enables higher education institutions to continue to improve upon their academic offerings and services. Private funding for higher education has never been more important as colleges and universities in the United States continue to undergo a number of economic pressures. One of the most important factors in this financial predicament is the decrease in federal funding and state appropriations. Federal support for higher education was $18 billion in 1990 and inflated to $21 billion in 1993, but this was a 14.3% decrease when measured in constant 1980 dollars (Honeyman & Bruhn, 1996).

This decrease in federal and state funding permeates the struggle to effectively operate higher educational institutions under the scrutiny that exists in today's environment. With student enrollments fluctuating, increased accountability, and growing concern regarding the value proposition of a college degree in today's marketplace, there has been increased emphasis on generating substantial resources from

alternative revenue streams. The primary stream still comes from private philanthropists, both large and small, who understand the importance and the role of higher education in the United States (Alfred, 1996).

This support from private resources will continue to play a major role in American higher education because it provides a relatively stable stream of unrestricted income for the university to utilize with institutional discretion (Leslie & Ramey, 1988; Alfred, 1996; Dionne & Kean, 1996).

These private funds can be distributed generally without the closely monitored scrutiny that governmental monies must adhere to upon distribution. These unrestricted funds are often used to recruit top faculty, offer more substantial financial aid packages, and improve overall academic programs necessary to recruit top students. Leslie and Ramey (1988) continue their argument that private support is a university's only source of discretionary money as many are facing financial difficulties and these monies are playing critical roles in balancing the budgets.

Young and Fischer (1996) report that as federal and state subsidies continue to plateau or trend downward, operating costs continue to move upward generating an increasing larger gap that can only be made up through private philanthropy. The Commission on National Investment in Higher Education (Dionne & Kean, 1996) predicts that "if tuition increases no faster than inflation, then by the year 2015, colleges and universities will fall $38 billion short of the annual budget they need to educate the student population expected in that year" (p. 2). Muir and May (1993) report that as a result of these "changing economic circumstances and the blurring of the fiscal profile of

both private and public institutions, private sector support has become an absolute necessity for almost all institutions" (p. 1).

If colleges and universities can continue to work towards a more philanthropically engaged alumni base, there are also ancillary benefits that appear.
Shadoian (1989) finds that another advantage is that alumni financial support can help generate more gifts from other private sources. Alumni giving is an important factor and is utilized as a measurement of loyalty to the values and perpetuity of the university.

Philanthropy in College Athletics

As Young and Fischer (1996) report, federal and state subsidies continue to plateau or trend downward, while operating costs continue to move upward generating an increasingly larger gap that can only be made up through private philanthropy. With the shortage of institutional monies, increased scrutiny has been pointed toward the role of intercollegiate athletics within the university structure. Some argue that athletics play a major role in the awareness and promotion of the university, thus spawning a fertile ground for development activities (Yang, 1997).

In their study, Stinson and Howard (2004) find that there were significant increases in athletic giving that corresponded with significant decreases in giving to academics at the University of Oregon. The University of Oregon experienced extraordinary athletic success over a 10-year period. During the period, there was a dramatic change in giving patterns that almost completely reversed favoring gifts to support the athletics programs.

Others claim that monies directed toward athletics cannibalize resources that could be dedicated for academic purposes (Moten-Bown, 2001; Frank, 2004; Suggs, 2004). Consider a revelation a few years ago that the University of Minnesota subsidized its intercollegiate athletic program with $10 million per year while making cuts to some of its academic programs (Moten-Brown, 2001).

There have been studies that investigate whether contributions to higher education are more closely related to athletic success or to other academic factors (Coughlin & Erekson, 1984; Grimes& Chressanthis, 1994). It is prudent to separate the research, look at the success of athletic teams and contributions to the university, and then look at the success of athletic teams and contributions to support athletics.

Gaski and Etzel (1984) examinee donor behavior by alumni status and fund type and conclude that there was no evidence of the impact of athletic success on overall giving. Brown (1991) in a study of Ball State University alumni found that the academic reputation of the institution was a primary determinant of donor behavior as opposed to any relative factor dealing with athletic programs. A substantial majority of the alumni donors equated the university's reputation with the quality of its faculty and educational programs and did not attribute those factors as having a positive correlation with athletics at the university.

In more recent studies, Rhoads and Gerking's (2000) 10-year study of 87 NCAA Division IA institutions finds that academic tradition and status has a far greater impact on alumni giving than the performance of athletic teams. Shulman and Bowen (2001) examine giving data from eight private, academically selective colleges and universities

that compete athletically at the NCAA Division IA level and conclude that athletic success was found to be an insignificant factor in alumni giving. The researchers did find that nonathletes at the universities in their study believed that intercollegiate athletics is overemphasized and that possibly better results by the football team could lead to resentment and, therefore, to reduced giving. From this study it can be inferred that there is concern among alumni regarding a heightened emphasis on athletics. This means that the university is allocating more financial resources toward the athletic programs at the expense of the academic programs, or donors are more heavily weighing their contributions to athletics than in the past.

Other research has shown that with greater success comes greater financial reward (Coughlin & Erekson, 1984; Baade & Sundberg, 1996). Baade and Sundberg (1996) find that colleges seem to be rewarded by their alumni for athletic programs that are very successful. Coughlin and Erekson (1984) conducted a cross-sectional study of 56 NCAA Division I schools found that several measures of athletic success including attendance, post-season play, and winning percentage, are significant determinants of monetary contributions to a school's athletics program.

Success on the playing field creates exceptionally good publicity for the college or university. This "advertising effect" might be thought to raise the profile of a college or university relative to other potential candidates for charitable giving, thus increasing the likelihood that alumni read and respond to solicitations from the college or university (Coughlin & Erekson, 1984; McCormick and Tinsley, 1987; Baade & Sundberg, 1996).

Grimes and Chressanthis (1994) conducted a 30-year study of Mississippi State University and found that after controlling for the population of alumni, student enrollment, state appropriations, and per capita income, the results indicate that contributions to athletics as well as academics are positively related to the overall winning percentage of the intercollegiate sports program. The positive relationship between winning and giving in liberal arts colleges suggests that successful athletic programs may well encourage more of the former athletes who attended these schools to contribute (Turner, Meserve & Bowen, 2001).

Women's Philanthropy in Higher Education

Women have played a critical role in the philanthropic efforts of American higher education throughout its history. Highlighting this assertion are the gifts of Sophie Smith, who left a bequest of $400,000 in 1881 to advance the education of women at what is now known as Smith College, and Jane Stanford who helped her husband found Stanford University as a tribute to their son (Whitely & Staples, 1997).

One of the biggest indicators of this growing potential of women in philanthropy can be seen in campaigns for women's colleges. A statistic from the Council for Advancement and Support of Education shows that women's colleges have had enormous successes in their capital campaigns, rivaling male and coeducational institutions (Whitley & Staples, 1997). Tanner (1992) reports that Wellesley College announced the successful completion of a $150 million campaign that actually generated $168 million in current gifts and another $173 million of in-kind gifts. This campaign broke all the

records for liberal arts colleges, but what is also noteworthy is the demographic that Wellesley College caters to women.

The importance of women as potential donors becomes more apparent when one considers the recent advances in the economic position of women in the United States (Shaw & Taylor, 1993). Shalala (1993) suggests that women are beginning to realize financial contributions are expressions of power; and through the passing of their wealth, women can promote the causes about which they are most passionate. Women are developing philanthropic relationships with each other and supporting one another in making contributions for the support of their priorities. By leveraging their dollars, they are able to have a much more significant impact in the community than they could individually (Cohen, 2008). Women also place high priority on accountability for their philanthropic givings. They have always demanded assurances that their donations will transform and have a broader impact on society (Strout, 2007).

Women have always been partners in family philanthropic decision making, but a lot of times it was the men taking a more public role.

Now more women are comfortable taking the lead in advancing their philanthropic interests and exploring how to make change (Cohen, 2008). When women became significant donors, they discovered how much influence on policy and behavior can be asserted and how powerful money really can be (Tanner & Ramset, 1993; Strout, 2007; Caster, 2008; Cohen, 2008).

Understanding the role of women in philanthropy is a major consideration when determining the most appropriate ways to get women involved in campaigns. There is

growing body of research that explains some of the differences between the cultivation strategies used for women that differ from those strategies that are used for men (Critz, 1980; Shaw & Taylor, 1995; Newman, 1996; Bressi, 1999; Strout, 2007; Cohen, 2008).

As women become more aggressive in their philanthropic pursuits, development professionals must understand how to engage this group to maximize their potential as donors. Critz's research (1980) mentions several trends that explain the giving patterns of women. The study found that women are more likely to support programs and people than to support capital improvements and that their ability to make a difference and bring about change ranks as a high motivation for women to provide financial support.

Simari (1995) examines how women alumni approach philanthropic decisions and found a statistical difference between donors and nondonors.

The respondents indicated the importance of encouraging the next generation's loyalty to the university and a sense of obligation as factors why they chose to financially support the university. Similarly, Bressi (1999) finds that women's motivations to provide philanthropy in higher education are primarily based on their desire to make a difference in future generations. She found that scholarships were the most highly supported aspect of giving instead of capital improvements.

Women tend to look for a commitment to the institution and its mission (Kaminski, 1999) and to be able to uniquely align themselves in support of that mission. Whereas men base their philanthropic decisions on whether or not an organization is well-run and efficient, women give based on ability, involvement with the institution, reputation and on being asked (Shaw & Taylor, 1995).

Research has also been completed on the differing cultivation techniques that should be used when soliciting contributions from women. Newman (1996) finds that women were much more likely than men to base donation decisions on several key factors: whether there is an organizational crisis, if an organization has a single purpose; if there is a strong personal connection; if the organization has educated the donor appropriately. Women required more time to be educated when they were asked to make financial contributions and they wanted to be well-connected with the organization (Newman, 1996).

Gutner's (2000) research indicates that women:

> Prefer new projects as opposed to existing ones, prefer funding specific projects instead of offering an unrestricted gift; gravitate to scholarship programs; prefer to be part of a larger campaign rather than making isolated gifts; want to have continual updates on how money is being spent; they are not comfortable with multi-year pledges; and they are not as responsive as men to pressure to match what others have contributed (p. 200).

In order to make a charitable gift, It is important to note that Newman (2000) finds women tend to require a longer cultivation process and more education on specifically how their investment will be utilized. Bressi (1999) finds that women giving more than $100,000 want to be solicited in person and feel the desire to make a difference with their gift. As Bressi (1999) indicates, the need to clearly articulate the case for support strengthens the probability of a gift; however, female donors will also need to have the perception that an organization has a need for their support.

Women's Philanthropy in College Athletics

Throughout the history of college athletics, most of the funding has been received by the men's programs. In 1972, Title IX was passed to provide opportunities for women in education, including college athletics. As reported earlier, there has been a tremendous growth spurt in athletic opportunities for women, but funding continues to lag behind for a multitude of reasons. If the intercollegiate athletics gender equity battle can be reduced to money, supporters of women's college athletics will need to find additional funds to enhance their programs (Verner, 1996).

There is limited research suggesting the reasons why females provide very little support to college athletics. However, the research that does exist supports the notion that women give based on a purely philanthropic model rather than for special considerations (Comstock, 1988; Staurowsky, Parhouse & Sachs, 1996; Dittman, 1997).

Comstock (1988) researched the characteristics that profile male and female donors to athletics programs as well as the rationale for contributing. Her research uncovers four differences: female donors gave smaller amounts of money; female donors had lower personal incomes; female donors were less likely to be married; and female donors were less likely to be the person in the family who made the decision to contribute to athletics. Verner (1996) finds that women are underrepresented among those who make financial contributions to college athletics.

Dittman (1997) comes to the conclusion that women who financially support women's athletics cite the economic benefits of helping others experience something they might not have been able to experience as the main reason behind their contributions.

This would suggest the women were contributing for purely philanthropic reasons and providing perceived economic benefit to others.

Athletic fundraising professionals need to realize the changes in the economic status of women, and the financial contributions they can provide to college athletics should have a considerable influence on how development and cultivation strategies are developed.

Stinson (2005) found that alumni, both male and female, were stronger supporters of the programs than non-alumni. Therefore, the case for support needs to have greater appeal to alumni because of their primary relationship with the beneficiary institution. Dittman (1997) finds that women place a higher priority on improving the quality of the program and moving toward gender equity. Curtis (2000) states that athletic participation did not have a positive correlation on whether women gave to support the athletic program. Based on this body of related literature, alumnae tend to have a higher propensity to give back to their alma mater, but participating in athletics is not a primary factor as a reason for a contribution.

Summary

Educational philanthropy has existed since the early stages of academia. Philanthropy will continue to be a necessary funding mechanism in the future as revenue needs continue to rise. To help offset the continued rise of athletic department budgets, more philanthropic support will be needed from alumni, especially those who participated in college athletics.

The review of the literature supports the need for continued research on donor behavior, especially the philanthropic behavior of student-athletes. While there is supporting research related to donor motivations, the body of research is still relatively small and most of the research is conducted in single campus settings.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODS

As summarized in the previous two chapters, this study sought to determine the factors that best describe the philanthropic motivations of female student-athletes when considering making financial contributions to their alma mater.

Research Design

The study was designed to examine the factors that predict financial contributions made by former female student-athletes. To determine these factors, a survey was designed and distributed to the entire population of female alumnae who participated in varsity athletics at the University of Virginia as student-athletes. The responses were collected and statistical analyses were conducted to answer the primary research questions.

The primary dependent variable in this study was the donor status of respondents: they were either donors or non-donors to the athletic program. Donors were female alumnae athletes who made a financial contribution to the Virginia Athletics Foundation at some point after graduation. For this study, non-donors were female alumnae athletes who did not make a contribution to the Virginia Athletics Foundation during that same period, regardless of whether or not they made a gift to the University of Virginia.

The independent variables for this study include information regarding the respondents' attitudinal, demographic, giving, and participation profiles. Attitudinal profile includes the alumnae athletes' self-reported emotional attachment to the athletic

department and the university. Demographic profile includes age, race, education, graduation year, scholarship recipient, sport participation, and household income. Giving profile reflects current annual giving and lifetime giving to the athletic department. Participation profile is a measure of various levels of contact with the university and athletic department after graduation. This last variable is important because it serves as a proxy for participants' continued engagement with the university athletics department.

Research Questions

1. What are the demographic and attitudinal factors that predict whether or not female student-athletes make financial contributions to support the athletic programs of their alma mater?
2. What are the demographic and attitudinal factors that reflect the amount female student-athletes give to the athletic programs of their alma mater?
3. Do significant differences exist in financial contributions made by female student-athletes depending on participation in particular sports?

Population and Sample

Before discussing the population and sample of this study, a brief historical framework of the University of Virginia and women's athletics at the University of Virginia is useful for understanding the context of this particular population.

The University of Virginia was founded in 1819 by Thomas Jefferson after he served as President of the United States. His vision for the University promoted learning

by developing a place where faculty and students could live together. The University has been ranked either Number 1 or Number 2 in the public university category for each of the last 11 years by *U.S. News and World Report* (www.virginia.edu). The University is selective, admitting only 35% of the applicants who applied in the 2007 entering class, and 88% of these students ranked in the Top 10% of their high school classes. The standardized test scores for the middle half of the entering class ranged from 1280-1490. The University also boasts a strong financial base with an endowment of approximately $5 billion. In 2001, UVA embarked on a $3,000,000,000 campaign to improve the academic quality and the physical plant.

UVA has an interesting history with regard to co-educational experiences, as women were first admitted to the University on an equal basis with men in 1970. During the spring of 1971, it was announced that there would be no further expansion in the men's intercollegiate athletic programs, and guidelines for women's intercollegiate athletic programs were established that included women's teams' obligation to serve at least one year as a club sport before being granted permission for varsity status. To make this move, there needed to be a sufficient base of competition available within both the State of Virginia and the Atlantic Coast Conference, and there had to be adequate facilities available at the University that would allow the team to succeed (http://www.lib.virginia.edu/small/exhibits/hoos/athletics).

The first women's club teams to begin competition in the fall of 1971 were tennis, field hockey and basketball. These teams were accorded varsity status for the 1973-74 season. At this time, it was also decided that all women's intercollegiate teams would be

afforded the same opportunities for travel and scheduling equipment as the men's non-revenue teams, excluding football and men's basketball. It is worth noting that there were no athletic grants-in-aid offered for men's non-revenue sports in 1972 (www.lib.virginia.edu/small/exhibits/hoos/athletics.html).

Today, women's athletics at the University of Virginia has over 260 student-athletes participating in 12 intercollegiate athletic programs. The University has committed to providing the full complement of scholarships allowable by the standards set forth by NCAA Division I regulations for each women's sport that is sponsored. In 2007, the total athletic department budget, to support both men's and women's programs, is slightly greater than $48,000,000.

The participants in this study are comprised of alumnae student-athletes who represent the University of Virginia in intercollegiate athletic competition. The population consists of all participating female student-athletes who graduated from this institution. There are 2,351 individuals in this population for whom contact information is available through University of Virginia records. Consideration for inclusion in the study was granted both to former college athletes who received athletic scholarship assistance and those who did not. In order to be eligible for the study, a respondent must have participated for at least one season and be coded as a former student-athlete by the Virginia Athletic Foundation and the University of Virginia Development Office.

Survey

A 36-item questionnaire was developed to collect data for the study. Questions were included to gauge the respondent's experiences with the University and the athletics programs as well as their current status as a donor. Demographic questions were also included in the instrument to measure any significant outcomes. There was a qualitative component to the study that included four open-ended questions at the end of the survey to determine the influences on givers and non-givers and what the athletic department could do to increase or gain the support of the respondents.

Reliability of the Data

Four topically related subsets of items were treated as subscales and tested for reliability among items using Cronbach's alpha. Below are the four subscales, followed by Cronbach's alpha for each:

1. SS1: Attitude towards university and athletics (Q1-Q4), $\alpha = 0.812$
2. SS2: Attitude towards athletic program (Q5,Q6,Q8-Q10), $\alpha = 0.693$
3. SS3: Willingness to donate (Q18a-Q18f), $\alpha = 0.787$
4. SS4: Perceived gender equity (Q19-21), $\alpha = 0.777$

Each of the subscales had sufficiently large α values to allow for aggregation of individual items within each scale to create subscale scores. To compute subscale scores, the mean value for subscale items was calculated for each respondent in order to reduce the number of variables included in the analyses. For example, Subscale 1 was calculated by summing up items and dividing by the number of items on the scale,

$$Subscale1 = \frac{Q1 + Q2 + Q3 + Q4}{4}$$

For each subscale, a higher score indicated a more positive attitude, or in the case of SS4, greater perceived treatment of female athletes.

Survey Administration

The questions on the survey instrument matched the intended variables. The researcher obtained feedback about the construction of the survey from three athletic fund-raising professionals, and that feedback was also incorporated into the survey. A pilot study was then conducted to examine design, data coding and statistical analysis. The pilot study comprised former female student-athletes at MidAmerica Nazarene University, Olathe, Kansas. These participants were given the survey to complete and once completed the researcher asked the respondents in the pilot study if there were any additional comments and suggestions they might have to improve the validity of the instrument. No changes were made from the pilot study.

The survey instrument was mailed (both via United States Postal Service and e-mail) to the entire population with known addresses. The e-mailed survey was distributed to everyone with a known e-mail address. The message contained a link leading the respondent to the actual survey instrument. A second message was generated exactly 14 days after the initial message as a means to collect surveys. As a secondary method of ensuring as high a response rate as possible, packets were mailed to all participants in the survey population who did not have a known e-mail address. A cover letter was included explaining the nature of the survey and instructions for completing

and returning the questionnaire. A self-addressed stamped envelope for the respondent to use was included in each survey packet. Participants were informed that all data collected would be held in the strictest confidence and that their responses would only be reported as aggregate data rather than identifiable individual responses. Before mailing, the study was filed and approved through the human subjects review committee at the University of Kansas.

Variables

The variables for this study were selected according to a review of the literature related to this subject matter. They were divided into two sections: an explanation of the dependent variable and the independent variables.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables for this study were donor status, at any point in time of female alumnae athletes at the University of Virginia for the annual fundraising campaign sponsored by the Virginia Athletics Foundation and the amount given by female alumnae athletes at the University of Virginia to the annual fundraising campaign.

Independent Variables

The independent variables were selected from the literature combined with the researcher's own experience as a development professional, as well as from communication with other development professionals in higher education.

Attitudes toward the university and athletic program variables

This variable combined four questions that were measured via a Likert scale with five categories. Response categories included: “Strongly agree”, “Agree”, “Neutral”, “Disagree”, and “Strongly disagree”. This variable sought to determine current positive feelings toward the university and the athletics department, as well as positive feelings toward the athletic department as a student experience during time as a student-athlete.

Attitude toward athletic program variables

This variable combined four questions that were measured via a Likert scale with five categories. Response categories included: “Strongly agree”, “Agree”, “Neutral”, “Disagree”, and “Strongly disagree”. This variable sought to determine the financial need of the athletic department, experiences as a student-athlete, current interest in the athletic program and if relationships are still maintained with the program and coach.

Willingness to give variables

This variable combined six questions that were measured via a Likert scale with five categories. Response categories included: “Strongly agree”, “Agree”, “Neutral”, “Disagree”, and “Strongly disagree”. This variable sought to determine the reasons why former female student-athletes would make contributions to the athletic department.

Perceived gender equity variables

This variable combined three questions that were measured via a Likert scale with five categories. Response categories included: “Strongly agree”, “Agree”, “Neutral”, “Disagree”, and “Strongly disagree”. This variable sought to determine if there were any perceived differences in treatment by the athletic department for women’s team compared to men’s teams.

Demographic Variables

The following were included in the survey. "Age" was created as an open variable with no ranges to gain specific ages. After the ages of respondents were gathered, the possibility of creating this as a categorical variable was likely.

"Race" was created as a categorical variable with seven categories. Response categories were as follows: "White", "Black or African-American", "Asian", "Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander", "Hispanic or Latino", "American Indian", and "Other".

"Education" was a dichotomous variable coded 0 for Bachelor's degree and 1 for Graduate degree.

"Graduation Year" was created as an open variable with no ranges to gain specific years. After graduation years of respondents were gathered, the possibility of creating this as a categorical variable was also probable.

"Scholarship Assistance" was a dichotomous variable coded 0 for No and 1 for Yes.

"Sports Participation" was created as a categorical variable with eleven categories. Response categories were as follows: "Basketball", "Field Hockey", "Golf", "Lacrosse", "Rowing", "Soccer", "Softball", "Swimming and Diving", "Tennis", "Track/Cross Country", and "Volleyball".

"Annual household income" was created as a three category variable. Response categories were as follows: "Under $50,000", "$50,001 - $100,000", and "Over $100,000".

Data Analysis

As stated previously, the study's dependent variable was donor status, at any point in time, of female alumnae athletes at the University of Virginia for the annual fundraising campaign sponsored by the Virginia Athletics Foundation. A total of 18 independent variables were chosen for examination in predicting contributions. The independent variables were then grouped into subscales. Subscales were as follows: attitudes toward the university and athletics (Questions 1-4); attitude toward athletic program (Questions 5-6; 8-10); willingness to donate (Question 18a-18f); perceived gender equity (Questions 19-21) and the demographic profile (Questions 27-33).

Upon completion of the data collection, descriptive statistics were calculated using mean and standard deviation for continuous variables and those items on the 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree' Likert scale. Descriptive statistics for categorical variables were measured using frequency and proportion data within each response category.

Among respondents, 91% of the sample was Caucasian, with only 6.1% African American. The remaining 2.9% were distributed among various other racial categories. For analyses, since there were so few respondents fitting into those remaining categories (i.e., not Caucasian or AA), they were collapsed into a single group called 'other'.

In order to narrow data to specific sports in which respondents participated, groups were established according to those participating in exclusively "team" sports (i.e. Basketball, Field Hockey, Lacrosse, Rowing, Soccer, Softball, and Volleyball) and those participating in individual sports. Individual sports represented sports that can be played

as an individual but may also involve participation as a collective (Golf, Swimming/Diving, Tennis, Track/Cross Country). Since there was the possibility of participating in more than one sport, all who participated in at least one 'team' sport were categorized as 'team' sport participants. Those who participated in only 'individual' sports were categorized as 'individual sports only" participants. This binary 'participation' variable was used in the analyses.

In order to improve the ability of interpreting items on a scale that made intuitive sense (i.e., high values equate to 'agreement', low values 'disagreement'), the following survey items were reverse coded: Q1-Q6, Q8-10, Q18a-Q18f, Q19, Q22-Q26.

For the qualitative component, inductive analysis was used to analyze the data collected in this study. This approach allowed for patterns, themes and categories of analysis to emerge from the data. As like data emerged in the analysis, it was categorized and grouped for interpretation.

Statistical Procedures

Data were analyzed using a variety of statistical procedures. Bivariate correlations were computed between key variables using Pearson's correlation coefficient (r). In order to establish which variables were the best predictors of whether a person donated money and how much money she donated, a series of multivariate regression analyses were conducted. Logistic regression was used when examining whether or not people donated, and linear regression was used when looking at how much they donated. Chapter Four reports the results of the survey.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Overview

The primary purpose of the current study was to examine the factors that best describe the philanthropic motivations of former female student-athletes when considering making financial contributions to the athletic program of their alma mater. Additional research in this study explored if the participant's specific athletic program is a factor in deciding whether or not to support the program financially.

This chapter presents the analysis of data collected through the online and mail surveys. The chapter has been divided into two sections: a description of the sample and an analysis of the data related to the study's four major questions.

Descriptive Statistics

Surveys were mailed to 2,351 former female student-athletes at the University of Virginia, which is the entire population. Of the 2,351 surveys, 1,565 were distributed via e-mail and 786 were distributed via postal service. The researcher received notification that 154 subjects did not receive the e-mail survey because of an outdated address and 12 subjects did not receive the postal service survey for the same reason. Therefore, the sample was reduced to 2,201 subjects. A total of 347 completed and useable surveys were received, a response rate of 15.8%.

The sample reflects a broad population with each sport having at least a 10% response rate (number of responses divided by the number of alumnae) with the exception of Rowing, which had a 9% response rate in the survey. (See Table 1)

Table 1.
Percentage of former female student-athletes response rate

Variable	Number of Respondents (Total = 347)	Population (Total = 2,351)	Participation Percentage
Basketball	24	211	11.4
Field Hockey	47	260	18.1
Golf	2	10	20.0
Lacrosse	44	258	17.1
Rowing	48	527	9.1
Soccer	20	190	10.5
Softball	39	153	25.5
Swimming/Diving	41	212	19.3
Tennis	16	149	10.8
Track/Cross Country	46	242	19.0
Volleyball	20	139	14.4

Four subsets of topically related items were treated as subscales from the overall survey. (See Table 2).

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for 4 subscales.

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Median
Subscale 1 (Q1-Q4): Attitude toward university and athletics	344	1.75	5	4.33	0.63	4.5
Subscale 2 (Q5, Q6, Q8-Q10): Attitude toward athletic program	329	1.83	5	3.63	0.67	3.7
Subscale 3 (Q18a-Q18f):Willingness to donate	339	1	5	4.12	0.71	4.2
Subscale 4 (Q19-Q21): Perceived gender equity	342	2	5	3.71	0.82	4.0

Ethnicity

The number of respondents with ethnic backgrounds other than Caucasian were so few so it was determined to collapse it into three groups for the purpose of analysis. (See Table 3)

Table 3. Percentage of former female student-athletes ethnicity

Variable	Number (Total = 343)	Percent (100%)
Caucasian	313	91.0
African-American	21	6.1
Other	10	2.9

Academic credentials

Alumnae who had obtained only a Bachelor's degree made up 50.7% (N=174) of the respondents. Forty-nine percent (N=169) of respondents held a graduate degree. There were 4 subjects who did not respond to this question. (See Table 4)

Table 4. Percentage of former female student-athletes academic credentials

Variable	Number (Total = 343)	Percent (100%)
Bachelor's Degree	174	50.7
Graduate Degree	169	49.3

Scholarship recipient

A majority of the respondents 59.0% (N=203) reported that they had received an athletic scholarship. The remaining 41.0% (N=141) reported that they did not receive any athletic grant-in-aid. There were 3 subjects who did not respond to this question. (See Table 5)

Table 5. Percentage of former female student-athletes receiving athletic scholarship assistance

Variable	Number (Total = 344)	Percent (100%)
Yes	203	59.0
No	141	41.0

Household income

A majority of the respondents, 79.0% (N=264), reported that they had annual household incomes over $50,000. The remaining 21.0% (N=70) reported annual incomes of less than $50,000. There were 13 subjects who did not respond to this question. (See Table 6)

Table 6. Percentage of former female student-athletes annual household income

Variable	Number (Total = 334)	Percent (100%)
Less than $50,000	70	21.0
$50,001 - $100,000	108	32.3
Over $100,000	156	46.7

Contributed to the University of Virginia general fund in 2008

Among respondents, 33.6% (N=116) reported making contributions to the University of Virginia general fund in 2008, while 66.4% (N=229) did not make a contribution to the general fund. There were 2 subjects who did not respond to this question. (See Table 7)

Table 7. Percentage of former female student-athletes who made contributions to the University of Virginia general fund in 2008

Variable	Number (Total = 345)	Percent (100%)
Yes	116	33.6
No	229	66.4

Contributed to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in 2008

There were 35.6% (N=122) former female athletes who made contributions to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in 2008. 64.4% (N=221) did not make a contribution to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in 2008. There were 4 subjects who did not respond to this question. (See Table 8)

Table 8. Percentage of former female student-athletes made contributions to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in 2008

Variable	Number (Total = 343)	Percent (100%)
Yes	122	35.6
No	221	64.4

Amount of the gifts made to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in 2008

Among the respondents who reported dollar amounts for their gifts to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in 2008, a majority (77.7%) donated between $1 and $500. While this is a large percentage of the sample population who responded to the question, it should be noted that only 103 out of 347 (29.7%) of the respondents provided dollar amounts for their financial contributions. (See Table 9)

Table 9. Number and percentage of annual contributions to the Virginia Athletics Foundation made in 2008

Variable	Number (Total = 103)	Percent (100%)
$1 -$500	80	77.7
$501 - $1,000	6	5.8
$1,001 - $10,000	13	12.6
Over $10,000	4	3.9

*the median gift was $100.

Contributions to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in the last five years

Fifty-eight percent of former female athletes made contributions to the Virginia Athletics Foundation at some point during the previous five years, while 41.8% (N=145) did not make a contribution to the Virginia Athletics Foundation. There were 4 subjects who did not respond to this question. (See Table 10)

Table 10. Percentage of former female student-athletes made contributions to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in the last five years

Variable	Number (Total = 343)	Percent (100%)
Yes	202	58.2
No	145	41.8

Supporting the athletic program when making financial contributions

Over thirty-five percent (N=122) of female athletes agreed or strongly agreed that if or when they made financial contributions to the institution, they would support the

Virginia Athletics Foundation with their contributions. There were 40.1% (N=138) of female athletes who reported neutral feelings about making contributions to the Virginia Athletic Foundation if or when they decided to make gifts. Nearly twenty-five percent of respondents indicated, through disagreeing or strongly disagreeing to the question, that they would not support the Virginia Athletics Foundation if or when they decided to make contributions to the University of Virginia. There were 3 subjects who did not respond to this question. (See Table 11)

Table 11. Percentage of former female student-athletes who would support athletics

Variable	Number (Total = 344)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	30	8.7
Agree	92	26.7
Neutral	138	40.1
Disagree	68	19.8
Strongly Disagree	16	4.7

Amount of lifetime gifts made to the Virginia Athletics Foundation

It should be noted that only 138 out of 347 (39.8%) of respondents provided dollar figures for their lifetime donation amounts when asked to fill in a specific amount on Question #15. These figures are very similar to responses regarding amount given to the Virginia Athletic Foundation in 2008. This could possibly mean that contributions are either between $1-$500 for both annual and lifetime gifts or that the respondents had just started to contribute in the recent past. It is also noteworthy that the median age of respondents was 33 years old and nearly 47 percent of the respondents reported annual

household income over $100,000. The data in Table 12 suggest that a high percentage of former athletes are contributing less than $500 per year to the Virginia Athletics Foundation even though, as Table 5 suggests, nearly 47% have annual household incomes are above $100,000. (See Table 12)

Table 12. Amount of lifetime contributions to the Virginia Athletics Foundation by percentage and number of respondents

Variable	Number (Total = 138)	Percent (100%)
$1 -$500	88	63.8
$501 - $1,000	14	10.1
$1,001 - $10,000	27	19.6
Over $10,000	9	6.5

*median gift was $450.

Supporting the University general fund when making financial contributions

Almost 8 percent of former female athletes strongly agreed that if or when they make financial contributions, they will make it to the general fund, while 26.5% (N=91) agreed that that if or when they make financial contributions they will also make it to the general fund. Overall, 34.4% (N=118) of all female athletes agreed or strongly agreed that if or when they make financial contributions they will make them to the general fund. There were 37.6% (N=129) who reported neutral feelings. Female athletes who disagreed that if or when they make financial contributions they will make them to the general

fund accounted for 23.0% (N=79); 5.0% (N=17) strongly disagreed. There were 4 subjects who did not respond to this question. (See Table 13)

Table 13. Percentage of former female student-athletes indicated that if or when they make financial contributions they would support the University general fund.

Variable	Number (Total = 343)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	27	7.9
Agree	91	26.5
Neutral	129	37.6
Disagree	79	23
Strongly Disagree	17	5.0

Supporting the University without preference when making financial contributions

Overall, 7.3% (N=25) of all female athletes agreed or strongly agreed that if or when they make financial contributions they will make them to the University without specifically designating their gift. There were 17.8% (N=61) of female athletes who reported neutral feelings. Female athletes who disagreed that if or when they make contributions to the University without specifically designating their gift accounted for 51.6% (N=177); 23.3% (N=80) strongly disagreed that if or when they make contributions to the University, they would not specifically designate their gift. There were 4 subjects who did not respond to this question. (See Table 14)

Table 14. Percentage of former female student-athletes who would support the University without specifically designating their gift

Variable	Number (Total = 343)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	5	1.5
Agree	20	5.8
Neutral	61	17.8
Disagree	177	51.6
Strongly Disagree	80	23.3

Bivariate Correlation Tables

Prior to analyses designed to answer the major research questions, correlations were examined between each of the potential independent variables and the dependent variables (See Table 15 and Table 16). Of note were the following correlations:

Subscale 1: Attitude towards university and athletics was significantly correlated with Contribution to Virginia Athletics Foundations in 2008 ($r = 0.20$, $p<0.001$) and with Contribution to Virginia Athletics Foundation in the past 5 years ($r = 0.25$, $p<0.001$). If respondents displayed a more positive attitude toward the University, their likelihood of donating to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in the past year and in the past 5 years increased. While significant, the correlations in each of these cases are relatively weak. There are probably other factors that contribute to explaining a person's likelihood of giving.

Subscale 2: Attitude towards the athletic program was significantly correlated with Contribution to Virginia Athletics Foundations in 2008 ($r = 0.26$, $p<0.001$) and with Contribution to Virginia Athletics Foundation in the past 5 years ($r = 0.29$, $p<0.001$). As

respondents displayed a more positive attitude toward the athletic program, their propensity to make a gift to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in the past year and in the past 5 years increased. While significant, the correlations in each of these cases are again relatively weak. There are probably other factors that contribute to explaining a person's likelihood of donating to the Virginia Athletics Foundation.

Subscale 3: Willingness to donate was significantly correlated with Contribution to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in 2008 ($r = 0.13$, $p = .017$), Contribution to the University's general fund in 2008 ($r = 0.21$, $p<0.001$); and with Contribution to Virginia Athletics Foundation in the past 5 years ($r = 0.19$, $p<0.001$). Therefore, people who made contributions to the Virginia Athletic Foundation in 2008 were more likely to have made contributions to the general fund in 2008 and were more likely to have made contributions to the Virginia Athletics Foundation over the past five years.

Subscale 4: Perceived gender equity was not significantly correlated with any of the dependent variables ($p > 0.05$ in each). Being a scholarship recipient was significantly correlated with having contributed to the University's general fund in 2008 ($r = 0.12$, $p = .029$), and with having Contributed to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in the past 5 years ($r = 0.15$, $p = 0.006$). Therefore, people who received a scholarship were more likely to have made contributions to the general fund in 2008 and to the Virginia Athletics Foundation within the past five years.

Household income was significantly correlated with having contributed to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in 2008 ($r = 0.18$, $p = .001$) and having contributed to the University's general fund in 2008 ($r = 0.11$, $p = 0.045$). Household income was only

marginally related to Contribution to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in the past 5 years ($r = 0.11$, $p = 0.054$). This shows that people who have higher household incomes were more likely to have made contributions to both the University's general fund and the Virginia Athletics Foundation in 2008 and within the past five years. Education level was not significantly correlated to any of the outcome variables. Participation in team sports vs. individual sports was not significantly correlated to making financial contributions. (See Tables 15 and 16). Table 16 summarizes the significant correlations between the dependent and independent variables.

Table 15. Bivariate correlations between independent and dependent variables

	Contributed to UVA in 2008	Contributed to VAF in 2008	Contributed to VAF in last 5 years	2008 VAF contribution amount	Lifetime VAF contribution amount
Contributed to VAF in 2008	.257**				
Contributed to VAF in last 5 years	.217**	.628**			
2008 VAF contribution amount	-0.128	0.026	0.016		
Lifetime VAF contribution amount	-0.093	0.082	0.025	.996**	
Subscale 1 (Q1-Q4): Attitude toward university and athletics	0.008	.201**	.249**	-0.021	-0.022
Subscale 2 (Q5-Q10): Attitude toward athletic program	0.003	.264**	.286**	0.131	0.122
Subscale 3 (Q18a-Q18f): Willingness to donate	.130*	.207**	.189**	0.103	0.101
Subscale 4 (Q19-Q21): Perceived gender equity	0.048	0.081	0.044	0.147	0.137
Age	0.057	0.054	0.078	0.103	0.098
Undergraduate vs. graduate degree	-0.095	-0.047	0.005	0.151	0.108
Graduation year	-0.043	-0.051	-0.104	-0.04	-0.041
Received scholarship	-0.059	.118*	.149**	-0.112	-0.106
Team vs. individual sports	0.038	-0.041	-0.06	-0.043	-0.048
Current household income	.176**	.110*	0.105	0.123	0.109

*statistically significant at $p < 0.05$
**statistically significant at $p< 0.01$

Table 16. Summary table of bivariate correlations between independent variables and dependent variables

	Contributed to general fund in 2008	Contributed to VAF in 2008	Contributed to VAF in last 5 years	2008 VAF contribution amount	Lifetime VAF contribution amount
Contributed to VAF in 2008	X		X		
Contributed to VAF in last 5 years	X	X			
2008 VAF contribution amount					X
Lifetime VAF contribution amount				X	
Subscale 1 (Q1-Q4): Attitude toward university and athletics		X	X		
Subscale 2 (Q5-Q10): Attitude toward athletic program		X	X		
Subscale 3 (Q18a-Q18f): Willingness to donate	X	X	X		
Subscale 4 (Q19-Q21): Perceived gender equity					
Age					
Undergraduate vs. graduate degree					
Graduation year					
Received scholarship		X	X		
Team vs. individual sports					
Current household income	X	X			

X = statistically significant at $\alpha \leq 0.05$.

Regression Analyses

In order to determine what variables were predictive of a person's likelihood of donating money towards UVA, a series of backwards logistic regression analyses were conducted; one for each of three yes/no items asking about donations to University of Virginia general fund and the Virginia Athletics Foundation. This procedure sequentially eliminates non-significant (i.e., $p > .05$) predictors from the model until the best fitting model remains. It begins with the "full" model that includes all variables initially selected by the investigator as potential predictors. Non-significant predictors are removed in order from least significant to most significant until only statistically significant predictors remain in a final 'reduced' model. After each variable is removed new p-values are calculated for each remaining predictor in order to determine the next variable to be removed. The "final" model includes only predictors that are statistically significant (i.e., $p < 0.05$) and marginally significant ($p < 0.10$) which will be considered to contribute to determining the dependent variables being measured such as the likelihood of donating to the University of Virginia general fund or the Virginia Athletics Foundation.

For questions pertaining to the dollar amount donated to the Virginia Athletics Foundation (Q14, Q15), backwards linear regression analyses were conducted to determine which variables significantly predicted the amount donated in 2008 (Q14) and in an alumna's lifetime (Q15). For each of the analyses, the following 11 variables were included, and dummy coded as necessary potential predictors for each outcome: Age, Race (Caucasian, African American, Other), Education (Bachelor's Degree, Graduate

Degree), Graduation year, Received athletic scholarship (yes/no) , Type of sport (Team, Individual only), Income (< $50,000, $50,000 to $99,999, ≥ $100,000), Attitude towards university and athletics (SS1), Attitude towards athletic program (SS2), Willingness to donate (SS3), and Perceived gender equity (SS4). Findings of each regression analysis are reported below under headings designating the outcome variable of each.

Contribution to the University of Virginia general fund in 2008

The test of the full model, with contributions to the general fund, included all 11 predictors was statistically significant, $R^2 = 0.13$, $\chi^2(13) = 28.89$, $p = 0.007$. Statistically significant individual predictors included Willingness to donate ($p = 0.025$), Education Level ($p = 0.049$), and Income ($p = 0.026$). Receiving an athletic scholarship was a marginally significant predictor (i.e., $p < 0.10$). Table 17 displays the regression coefficients, p-values, and odds ratios for each predictor in the full model.

The backwards elimination regression procedure was used to identify the most parsimonious model for predicting whether an alumna donated to University of Virginia general fund in 2008. Table 17 displays logistic regression coefficients and p-values for predictors in the full and the reduced models. Intermediate models are excluded. After 8 stages, this procedure resulted in a final model that included four statistically significant predictors: Willingness to donate ($p = 0.019$), Education ($p = 0.042$), Received athletic scholarship ($p = 0.024$), and Income ($p = 0.006$).

This final model indicates that respondents with bachelor's degrees have greater odds of donating than those with graduate degrees (OR = 1.72). The odds of an individual donating to the University of Virginia general fund if they hold a bachelor's

degree is 1.72 times that of an individual donating if they hold a graduate degree. Respondents who did not receive an athletic scholarship are more likely to donate to the University of Virginia general fund than those that did receive one (OR = 1.84), and those with incomes over $100,000 per year were more likely to donate than respondents with incomes less than $50,000 per year (OR = 2.94) and those with mid range incomes between $50,000 and $100,000 per year (OR = 1.85). Thus, the likelihood of donating increases as alumnae express a greater willingness to donate and when they earn a higher income. If they did not receive an athletic scholarship, they were more likely to donate to the University of Virginia general fund than alumnae who had received an athletic scholarship. (See Table 17)

Table 17. Regression coefficients and p-values for models predicting whether or not alumna donated to University of Virginia general fund in 2008; Full and Final models depicted.

Model	Predictor	B	Df	p-value	OR
Full	Age	0.14	1	0.381	1.15
	Race		2	0.700	
	AA v. Cauc.	-0.32	1	0.621	0.73
	Oth. v. Cauc.	-0.61	1	0.484	0.54
	Education	0.54	1	0.049**	1.71
	Yr. Grad.	0.13	1	0.415	1.13
	Ath. Sclrshp.	0.54	1	0.077*	1.71
	Type of Sport	-0.45	1	0.138	0.64
	Income		2	0.026**	
	Low v. High	-1.00	1	0.019**	0.37
	Med. v. High	-0.67	1	0.036**	0.51
	SS1: Attitude toward university and athletics	-0.18	1	0.488	0.84
	SS2: Attitude toward athletic program	0.09	1	0.720	1.10
	SS3: Willingness to donate	0.61	1	0.025**	1.83
	SS4: Gender equity	0.18	1	0.313	1.20
	(Constant)	-259.54	1	0.409	
Final	Education	0.54	1	0.042**	1.72
	Ath. Sclrship.	0.61	1	0.024**	1.84
	Income		2	0.006**	
	Low v. High	-1.07	1	0.003**	0.34
	Med. v. High	-0.62	1	0.041**	0.54
	SS3: Willingness to donate	0.58	1	0.019**	1.79
	(Constant)	-3.24	1	0.002**	

*statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.10$.
**statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

Contribution to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in 2008

Race was excluded from this analysis since there was not enough variation among African Americans or 'other' race categories to produce interpretable coefficients. Thus, the test of the full model included the remaining 10 predictors. The full model accounted for a statistically significant portion of the variation in contribution to the Virginia Athletics Foundation, $R^2 = 0.20$, $\chi^2(11) = 45.18$, $p < 0.001$. Statistically significant individual predictors included Attitude toward athletic program ($p = 0.002$), Willingness to donate ($p = 0.029$). Perceived gender equity ($p = 0.096$) and comparison of low vs. high income groups ($p = 0.084$). Table 18 displays the regression coefficients, p-values, and odds ratios for each predictor in the full model.

A backwards elimination logistic regression procedure was used to identify the most parsimonious model for predicting whether an alumna donated to Virginia Athletics Foundation in 2008. Table 18 displays logistic regression coefficients and p-values for predictors in the full and the reduced models. Intermediate models are excluded. After 7 stages this procedure resulted in a final model that included three statistically significant predictors: Attitude toward athletics program ($p < 0.001$), Willingness to donate ($p = 0.012$), and Graduation Year ($p = 0.001$). Received athletic scholarship ($p = 0.073$) was also a marginally significant predictor that remained in the final model.

This final model indicates that respondents' odds of contributing to the Virginia Athletics Foundation increase as their attitude toward the athletic program increases (OR = 2.32), as their willingness to donate increases (OR = 1.97), and as the number of years since graduation (i.e., 2009 minus graduation year) decreases (OR = 0.95).

As willingness to donate increases and attitude towards the athletic program improve, the likelihood of donating in 2008 was higher, but with increasing years since graduation, the likelihood of donating in 2008 declined. (See Table 18)

Table 18. Regression coefficients and p-values for models predicting whether or not alumna donated to Virginia Athletics Foundation in 2008; Full and Final models depicted.

Model	Predictor	B	df	p-value	OR
Full	Age	-0.05	1	0.749	0.95
	Education	0.21	1	0.446	1.23
	Yr. Grad.	-0.08	1	0.610	0.92
	Ath. Sclrshp.	-0.51	1	0.109	0.60
	Type of Sport	-0.16	1	0.594	0.85
	Income		2	0.214	
	Low v. High	-0.72	1	0.084*	0.49
	Med. v. High	-0.32	1	0.323	0.73
	SS1: Attitude toward university and athletics	0.19	1	0.489	1.21
	SS2: Attitude toward athletic program	0.84	1	0.002**	2.31
	SS3: Willingness to donate	0.62	1	0.029**	1.86
	SS4: Gender equity	0.30	1	0.096*	1.35
	(Constant)	151.21	1	0.630	
Final	Yr. Grad.	-0.05	1	0.001**	0.95
	Ath. Sclrship.	-0.54	1	0.073*	0.59
	SS2: Attitude toward athletic program	0.84	1	0.000**	2.32
	SS3: Willingness to donate	0.68	1	0.012**	1.97
	(Constant)	97.73	1	0.002	

*statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.10$.
**statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

Contribution to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in the past 5 years

The test of the full model which included all 11 predictors was statistically significant, $R^2 = 0.26$, $\chi^2(13) = 63.29$, $p < 0.001$. Statistically significant individual predictors included Race ($p = 0.009$), *SS2:* Attitude toward athletic program ($p = 0.001$), *SS3:* Willingness to donate ($p = 0.048$), and Received athletic scholarship ($p = 0.031$). Table 19 displays the regression coefficients, p-values, and odds ratios for each predictor in the full model.

The backwards elimination regression procedure was used to identify the model that is the best fit for predicting whether an alumna donated to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in the past five years Table 19 displays logistic regression coefficients and p-values for predictors in the full and the reduced models. Intermediate models are excluded. After 7 stages, this procedure resulted in a final model that included five statistically significant predictors: Graduation year ($p < 0.001$), Received athletic scholarship ($p = 0.023$), Race ($p = 0.007$), *SS2:* Attitude toward athletic program ($p < 0.001$), and *SS3:* Willingness to donate ($p = 0.032$).

This final model indicates that the odds of donating to the Virginia Athletics Foundation increased as attitude towards the athletic program (SS2) increased (OR = 2.68), as willingness to donate (SS3) increased (OR = 1.70), and as years since graduation decreased (OR = 1.08). Additionally, those who received athletic scholarships were more likely to donate (OR = 1.95) and Caucasians had higher odds of donating than African Americans (OR = 5.43).

As willingness to donate increases and the attitude towards the athletic program improves, the likelihood of donating is higher, but with increasing years since graduation, the likelihood of donating declines. Alumnae who were Caucasian were more likely to donate than African American alumnae (although the small number of African American respondents may not be representative enough to read too much into this finding) and students who had received athletic scholarships were more likely to donate to the Virginia Athletic Foundation.

Table 19. Regression coefficients and p-values for models predicting whether or not alumni donated to University of Virginia general fund in last 5 years; Full and Final models depicted.

Model	Predictor	β	Df	p-value	OR
Full	Age	-0.08	1	0.622	0.93
	Race		2	0.009**	
	AA v. Cauc.	-1.67	1	0.007**	0.19
	Oth. v. Cauc.	-1.38	1	0.125	0.25
	Education	-0.02	1	0.947	0.98
	Yr. Grad.	-0.14	1	0.379	0.87
	Ath. Sclrshp.	-0.67	1	0.031**	0.51
	Type of Sport	-0.07	1	0.817	0.93
	Income		2	0.498	
	Low v. High	-0.40	1	0.335	0.67
	Med. v. High	-0.33	1	0.303	0.72
	SS1: Attitude toward university and athletics	0.29	1	0.277	1.34
	SS2: Attitude toward athletic program	0.90	1	0.001**	2.45
	SS3: Willingness to donate	0.49	1	0.054*	1.64
	SS4: Gender equity	0.09	1	0.609	1.10
	(Constant)	271.05	1	0.393	
Final	Yr. Grad.	-0.08	1	0.000**	0.93
	Ath. Sclrshp.	-0.67	1	0.023**	0.51
	Race		2	0.007**	
	AA v. Cauc.	-1.69	1	0.005**	0.18
	Oth. v. Cauc.	-1.37	1	0.125	0.26
	SS2: Attitude toward athletic program	0.98	1	0.000**	2.68
	SS3: Willingness to donate	0.53	1	0.032**	1.70
	(Constant)	143.82	1		

*statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.10$.
**statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$

Amount of 2008 contribution to the Virginia Athletics Foundation

The test of the full model which included all 11 predictors did not account for a statistically significant portion of the variability in amount of money donated, $R^2 = 0.11$, $F(11, 74) = 0.81$, $p = 0.626$. None of the individual predictors were statistically significant. A backwards elimination regression procedure was used to identify the most parsimonious model for predicting the amount an alumna donated to Virginia Athletics Foundation in 2008. Table 20 displays regression coefficients and p-values for predictors in the full and the reduced models. Intermediate models are excluded. After 10 stages, this procedure resulted in a final model that did not account for a statistically significant amount of the variability in amount donated, $F(2, 83) = 1.59$, $p = 0.211$, and included only 2 marginally significant predictors: age ($p = 0.084$) and graduation year ($p = 0.092$). Perhaps there are other unmeasured variables that might prove useful in a future study.

Lifetime annual contribution amounts to the Virginia Athletics Foundation

The test of the full model which included all 11 predictors did not account for a statistically significant portion of the variability in amount of money donated, $R^2 = 0.09$, $F (11, 109) = 0.98$, $p = 0.473$. None of the individual predictors were statistically significant, though age ($p = 0.091$) approached significance. A backwards elimination regression procedure was used to identify the most parsimonious model for predicting the amount an alumnus donated to Virginia Athletics Foundation in their lifetime. Table 20 displays regression coefficients and p-values for predictors in the full and the reduced models. The intermediate models are excluded. After 10 stages, this procedure resulted in a final model that did not account for a statistically significant amount of the variability

in amount donated, $F(2, 118) = 1.92$, $p = 0.151$, and included only 2 marginally significant predictors; age ($p = 0.055$) and graduation year ($p = 0.060$). (See Table 20.) Perhaps there are other unmeasured variables that might prove useful in a future study.

Table 20. Regression coefficients and p-values for models predicting amount of money donated to Virginia Athletics Foundation in 2008 and amount of money donated in respondents' lifetimes; Full and Final models depicted.

		2008		Lifetime	
Model	Predictor	B	p-value	B	p-value
Full	Age	-22006.08	0.119	-37454.86	0.091*
	Race	16021.29	0.786	10931.48	0.854
	Education	35839.61	0.172	52231.32	0.153
	Yr. Grad.	-20780.59	0.136	-35775.88	0.105
	Ath. Sclrshp.	20682.92	0.493	36271.75	0.373
	Type of Sport	20438.64	0.444	38719.86	0.308
	Income	12152.09	0.474	16187.26	0.511
	SS1	23134.41	0.139	37073.52	0.294
	SS2	-18085.50	0.478	-28341.42	0.424
	SS3	36051.17	0.208	62464.31	0.109
	SS4	8996.81	0.567	11847.81	0.588
	(Constant)	$4.188x10^7$	0.139	$7.214x10^7$	0.108
Final	Age	-23610.83	0.084*	-41243.16	0.055*
	Yr. Grad.	-22688.21	0.092*	-39838.97	0.060*
	(Constant)	$4.61x10^7$	0.092	$8.096x10^7$	0.060

*statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.10$.

Generally speaking, it appears that alumnae are more likely to donate money to the Virginia Athletics Foundation as they demonstrate a more positive attitude towards it, and they express a greater willingness to donate money to the University of Virginia general fund. Students who received athletic scholarships were more likely to donate to the Virginia Athletics Foundation, but alumnae who did not receive an athletic scholarship were more likely to donate to the University of Virginia general fund.

Overall, in both of the analyses on the amount of money donated, it appears that the older a person is and the longer it has been since she graduated, the less money she tends to donate to both the University of Virginia general fund and the Virginia Athletics Foundation. This is somewhat counterintuitive since income generally increases with age,

but it could be accounted for by the fact that as people age their families also grow and economic priorities tend to reorient towards supporting the family. Another factor may be that when college is more recent and playing a larger role in the memories of younger alumnae, they want to send more money to the institution that so much influenced their recent personal history. A third factor could be the lack of constant communication and messaging between the institution and the subject.

Open-ended comments

For the qualitative component of the study, four open-ended questions were asked of the respondents. The findings presented are the results of those questions. During the analyses of these questions, several common themes emerged concerning the reasons why alumnae either support or do not support the Virginia Athletics Foundation. Thus, the qualitative component uncovered feelings behind the answers to the quantitative questions.

Question #34 asked respondents what influenced their decision to financially support the Virginia Athletics Foundation. There were 181 respondents who answered this question. There were three common themes that could be extracted from their answers. The most common theme identified in this question was that alumnae wanted to help their program succeed. One respondent explained her reasons when she said, "I give because of my past experience as a student-athlete as well as to ensure the success of the future of my program." Another respondent added that she supported the program because of "my love for my sport and my desire to see the program grow and stay as one

of the top programs in the country." Another agreed when she wrote, of her "desire to see my former UVA athletic team grow and succeed." It was clear in this question that nearly half of the respondents indicated the reason they were influenced to give was their notion of wanting to help their former sports programs.

Another theme that emerged was strong feelings towards the University. Alumnae were very appreciative of their experiences, and they indicated a need to make contributions because of their love for the University. One respondent wrote, "I support VAF because of my undying love for the University." Yet another wrote, "I love UVA and had a wonderful experience during my four years." As part of an outgrowth of feelings towards the University, some respondents indicated their relationship with their coach as a motivator for giving. One respondent said that "my relationship with the current players and the coach" is the primary reason she makes gifts.

The last theme that was present was alumnae's ability to make financial contributions. One alumna wrote, "my financial ability to give is the reason why I give back." Another wrote, "I have the opportunity to make contributions because of my financial situation."

Question #34A asked respondents who did not donate what influenced their decision not to financially support the Virginia Athletics Foundation. There were 136 respondents who answered this question. Common themes that came through in this analysis included finances, not being treated well, and supporting other areas either inside or outside the University. The largest response in this question directly dealt with the financial ability to make a contribution. Over half of the respondents indicated the

influential factor in not making a gift was because they were not in a financial position to do so. One respondent wrote, "I cannot give currently because I am not in a financial position to do so, but I plan to give when I am able." Another alumna wrote, "I don't have enough income at this time."

There was another interesting theme that emerged that directly impacted the willingness to contribute. Nearly 15% of the respondents indicated the influencing factors for them not to give had to do with their treatment as student-athletes. An alumna indicated she was mistreated by stating that, "the coaching was very negative and I don't want to support the coach of the program." Yet another had a similar experience by saying, "I will not support a team coached by this coach."

Finally, there were several respondents who indicated their financial priorities were the reason they do not make contributions to the Virginia Athletics Foundation. Among the answers that were given included, "I prefer to donate money to the academic side," and "my son has a terminal illness and I want to support research that finds a cure."

Question #35 asked respondents what the Virginia Athletics Foundation does to increase their financial support? There were 160 respondents who answered this question. The most popular theme showed there would be nothing that could be done to increase the support. Several respondents indicated they already are giving what they can: therefore, the Virginia Athletics Foundation would not be able to increase their giving levels. This theme was supported by one alumna when she wrote, "there is nothing more that can be done; I give what I can financially afford."

Two other themes also emerged that centered around building connections and stronger communications with alumnae. About one-third of the respondents indicated they wanted to feel more connected to the athletic program before they would increase their giving . As one alumna indicated, "have activities for former student-athletes more often," and another echoed this by stating, "organize events that foster a better connection with my former sports team, not necessarily my former teammates."

Finally, issues of communication became important as something that could generate an increase in giving. One respondent wrote, "contact me more often with ways to keep me involved, not just with a hand held out for money." Another responded, "tell me where the funds are going and what is needed." It appears there is a likelihood that alumnae would be open-minded about increasing their giving to the Virginia Athletics Foundation if a concerted effort were developed to strengthen the relationships and provide better communication with former student-athletes.

Question #35A – What could the Virginia Athletics Foundation do to gain your financial support? This question was by far the least answered question of the four with only 88 people responding to this question. Two important themes emerged. One is exactly the same as for the previous question. The most frequently given answer was "stay patient while I get financially stable." To paraphrase a common answer, "there is nothing that can be done right now. I just have to make more money." The interesting thing regarding this finding is the quantitative data that suggests as alumnae are further removed from their experience, the less likely they are to give. However, when

answering the open-ended questions, it appears they are asking for patience while they are able to build their careers and financial base.

The second theme was communication. It appears the Virginia Athletics Foundation needs to continue to work on communicating with alumnae, and that might help generate new and increased giving to support the athletics programs.

One interesting conclusion that could possibly be drawn from these answers when compared to the quantitative data is the possibility of women who are trying to get financially stable before they give might shift their giving priorities by the time they are able. Earlier in the study, the analysis indicated the further away from graduation, the less likely respondents were to make a gift. It might be concluded that by the time women are financially able, their interest will shift to other causes because of the lack of connectedness and communication with the athletic programs.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final chapter presents a summary of the data analyzed in the previous chapter, draws conclusions based on the data collected and its relationship to the literature, and provides recommendations for future research. The chapter is divided into four sections: purpose of the study and procedures; discussion of findings; conclusions; recommendations for future research.

Purpose of the Study and Procedures

The overall purpose of this exploratory analysis was to determine factors that best describe the philanthropic motivations of female student-athletes when considering making financial contributions to their alma mater. In preparation of the study, a comprehensive review of the literature pertaining to fund raising was conducted. Through this literature review, donor characteristics were identified for the study. The donor characteristic variables examined in the study were organized into five groups: attitude towards the athletic department and the institution variables; experience as a student-athlete; continued interest in athletic program variables; attitude toward giving; and, demographics.

Following the identification of variables, a survey was created in order to gather data on each one. Content validity of the survey instrument was assured through its examination by the researcher, as well as three athletic development professionals. A

pilot study was then conducted for reliability purposes and to obtain additional feedback on the survey instrument.

The survey instrument was either e-mailed or mailed to everyone with a known address, which included 2,201 potential respondents. In addition, mail packets containing the survey instrument were mailed to the population who did not have a known e-mail address. Usable responses were obtained from 347 subjects for a response rate of 15.8%.

The study's research questions were analyzed through bivariate correlations that were computed between various variables using Pearson's correlation coefficient (r) as well as backwards logistic regression analysis. Also used to analyze amount donated, backwards linear regression analyses determined which variables were significant predictors of the amount donated.

Discussion of Findings

The respondents for this study had a median age of 33 with 100% of the respondents having a bachelor's degree and 49% of the respondents having a graduate degree. 79% of the respondents reported an annual income of $50,000 or more, with nearly 48% reporting income of $100,000 of more. They reported a median annual gift amount to the Virginia Athletics Foundation of $100 and a lifetime gift to the Virginia Athletics Foundation of $450.

Relative to the first research question, a backwards regression was conducted trying to determine demographic and attitudinal factors that predict whether female

student-athletes make financial contributions to the athletic program. The final model included three statistically significant predictors *Attitude toward athletics program* ($p < 0.001$): willingness to donate ($p = 0.012$); graduation year ($p = 0.001$). There was also a marginally significant predictor - received athletic scholarship ($p = 0.073$).

This final model indicates that respondents' odds of contributing to the Virginia Athletics fund increases as their attitude toward the athletic program increases (OR = 2.32), as their willingness to donate increases (OR = 1.97), and as the number of years since graduation (i.e., 2009 minus graduation year) decreases (OR = 0.95). As attitude towards the athletic program improved and willingness to donate increased, the likelihood of donating in 2008 was higher, but with increasing years since graduation, the likelihood of donating in 2008 declined.

Maintaining an on-going connection with the Virginia Athletics Foundation supports the findings of Bennett (2003) who found that personal involvement or experience with a particular cause will explain the primary intent behind the contributions to a particular organization. While Bennett's study was not specific to athletics, this study found that attitudes toward the program and willingness to donate (which included participation variables) were positively correlated to making a gift to support the program. If alumnae do not maintain their connections with the program, over time their philanthropic focus will shift from previous experiences to current experiences.

Again, the findings in this study, as well as research in previous studies support that women want to make a difference in programs, but the connections are lost over the years and their philanthropic objectives will change over time to reflect their closer

connectedness to other organizations that have achieved a better communication strategy. Therefore, emphasis needs to be placed on constantly messaging the need for support through regularly communicating with former student-athletes.

Respondents in the study agreed that that the reason they chose to financially support their program was the need to continue to support women's athletics because they want to help future generations of women's athletics at Virginia and they understand the need to support women's programs. Again, this study's findings support previous research such as Shaw and Taylor (1995) who reported in their study that women are philanthropically motivated by making a difference in the programs they support.

Dittman (1997) concluded that one of the driving forces behind women who financially support women's athletics was the benefit of helping others experience something they might not have been able to experience themselves. This was supported in this study as respondents who did not receive athletic aid had greater odds of contributing to the Virginia Athletic Foundation than those respondents who did receive some athletic financial aid.

The findings of this study are consistent with what Staurowsky (1994) found as she reported that women contributing to support women's programs tend to be younger. The current study supported this by finding as UVA alumnae athletes get further removed from the university in terms of time; the odds of them making financial contributions to support the athletic program were diminished. While it seems counterintuitive that women who might be in the higher income years of their lives are less likely to

contribute, it may speak to the lack of connection between the alumnae and the Virginia Athletics Foundation.

The findings of this study related to Question #1 suggest the demographic factor that predicts giving to the Virginia Athletic Foundation is age. The more recently graduated have a higher likelihood of contributing. This can be troublesome because the qualitative data suggest a common reason why some respondents were not making or increasing their giving to the Virginia Athletic Foundation was their personal financial situation. However, by not maintaining a strong communication system, as indicated in the qualitative results, as the alumnae's earning power has increased, their interest in the athletic program has diminished compared to other philanthropic priorities.

The quantitative findings also suggest that two attitudinal factors - attitudes toward the program and willingness to give - also predict willingness to support the program. The qualitative findings concur indicating that relationships with the coach and the team are important as well as supporting future generations of women.

In answering the second research question in this study, factors that predict the amount given, a backwards linear regression analysis was conducted to determine which variables significantly predicted the amount donated. For each of the analyses, 11 variables were included as potential predictors for each outcome. The test of the full model did not account for a statistically significant portion of the variability in amount of money donated. Therefore, none of the individual predictors were statistically significant. However, age ($p = 0.055$) and *graduation year* ($p = 0.060$) were marginally significant. Again, this is somewhat counterintuitive since income generally increases with age, but it

could be accounted for by the fact that as people age, their families also grow and economic priorities tend to reorient towards supporting the family and other philanthropic initiatives that are more closely aligned to them at this stage in their lives.

However, Shim (2001) found that women give from the heart and often want to often get emotionally involved before they get charitably involved (Shim, 2001). If a large amount of time lapses between the emotional connections women experienced as players and the appeal for support, then the solicitation process will have to start from the beginning. As Shaw and Taylor (1995) found, women will give to an organization based on involvement and on being asked. However, women require more time to be educated and a longer cultivation process when they are asked to make financial contributions and they want to be well-connected (Newman, 1996).

The findings of this study related to Question #2 suggest that none of the quantitative factors studied predict the amount given to support the Virginia Athletics Foundation. However, the qualitative data suggests that respondents who were currently giving or indicated why they would increase their giving reported that their current personal financial situation was a factor.

The third research question, determining whether differences exist in financial contributions depending on sports participation, was grouped into team sports or individual sports. There were no significant differences found that explained financial contributions being made by members of team sports compared to members of individual sports. Brady, Noble, Utter & Smith (2002) found that communal relationships have been found to increase charitable behavior which would support a greater propensity for

participants of team sports to have a higher likelihood to contribute. However, this study found no significant difference to support the previous research findings. The study does not support a hypothesis, but it is possible that participants in each sport feel that they are part of a team and do not consider themselves participants in individual sports. While this would be institution specific, it is also possible that the long tenures of the coaching staff in many of the programs at the University of Virginia could potentially explain why there is no significant difference. Although there was not significant commentary in the qualitative portion of the study, it was mentioned that relationships with the coach were an important and influential factor to giving back to support the program. Over half of the head coaches in the women's sports have been at Virginia for at least 10 years or more, so relationships with the former student-athletes, if continued to be fostered after graduation, can present an opportunity for giving. However, this could also be a deterrent if student-athletes did not enjoy their experience with the head coach.

The quantitative findings of this study related to Question #3 suggest there are no differences in financial contributions made to the Virginia Athletics Foundation between persons who participated in team or individual sports.

Recommendations for Future Research

The findings of this study suggest a number of recommendations for future research. Research specifically on athletic fund raising in higher education is still sparse. Additional research is needed to continue exploration of the role of gender in athletic development. Athletic development professionals need access to more information

related to gender so best practices can be developed to maximize revenue for the entire program.

Future research should also continue to address the deficiencies in the current research and build upon the framework developed here in an effort to more fully understand the demographic and attitudinal variables that influence contributions to support athletic programs. Demographic research could be completed specifically on differences in sports participation (i.e. team vs. individual) as well as education level and whether or not respondents received a scholarship. Attitudinal research could be more specific on the examination of relationships with the coaching staff as well as current relationships with former teammates.

The current results can hopefully be used to understand donor information from this sample population and then be tested among several institutions, both at the NCAA Division I level and institutions that compete on smaller levels. Also, further research should be designed to better understand the differences in giving by specific sports.

The results of this study suggest that participants at the University of Virginia have the financial capacity to make contributions to support their athletic program but have not take action on a consistent basis to do so. Another future direction of study might be to manipulate the communication strategies directed toward the former female student-athletes. Designing communication and solicitation efforts to build relationships would offer an ideal experiment to see how these former student-athletes would interact with the fundraising organization supporting the institution. Additionally, matching the data on donor motivations with actual giving data would allow for insights on individual

behavior. It would be interesting to research specific appeals to targeted populations of women athletes to determine what types would generate a higher response rate in both giving and participation.

Another potential area for future research would be to gain a better understanding on what programs former female student-athlete would like to financially support. Some preliminary research has suggested (Bressi, 1999; Gutner, 2000) that women tend to support scholarship programs over capital improvement programs. While this is germane to the current state of college athletics since many of the facility enhancements are related to football and basketball. As women's programs continue to flourish, facility enhancement will become necessary. Having gender-based research on what specific programs will be supported (scholarship or capital) will allow for a much better solicitation strategy for development professionals.

Finally, there is an interesting pattern in the current data with respect to reported annual household income. It appears that respondents who reported an annual income of $100,000 or higher were slightly more engaged in giving to support the Virginia Athletics Foundation than giving to support the general fund. This would merit more consideration by investigating the support of giving to intercollegiate athletics as it relates to annual household income. While it is possible that donors to a university's athletic programs are also donors to the university's academic programs, it would be interesting to study annual income levels of donors who support either athletics or academics or donors who support both programs. Specifically, research can be focused on understanding if there is a dollar

threshold in relation to annual income that would predict giving behavior to either academic programs or athletics programs.

There are indications that explaining donor behavior in athletics is far more complex an issue than the research available can support. While this research certainly does not represent the full complexity of the philanthropic environment in college athletics, it is a step forward in understanding some of the variables related to making financial investment in college athletics from former members of the program.

Specifically, recommendations for future research opportunities would include the following questions. Why do younger women seem to give more to support athletics? What are the best communication strategies to employ to keep women engaged in their former athletics programs? What specific programs are women more likely to support in athletics? Does the current success of a team have a relationship with higher financial contributions.

Recommendations for Practice

The findings of this study suggest a few recommendations for athletic development practitioners, specifically at the University of Virginia.

First, a more intense communication and relationship-building strategy needs to be implemented. There were 156 respondents who reported a household income of $100,000 or greater, yet only 36 respondents reported lifetime giving of greater than $1,000. As was reported in the research, women seem to take longer to cultivate for gift giving; however, at least at the study institution, the incomes of the respondents would

make for a very strong prospect pool if communication and strategy were improved to generate more interest in the program.

A second recommendation would be to emphasize the need for future support and the difference it makes on the programs, specifically on women's athletic programs. The responses indicated a feeling of men being treated better than women at the study institution. Being able to reduce or eliminate this stigma, whether perceived or real, will have an impact on how successful the development program will be. Women want to make lasting contributions that will help build upon their personal experiences while participating, not provide contributions just to maintain or possibly reduce their same level of experience.

Another recommendation would be to target the alumnae who have been out for several years and try to bring them back to the University. An educational process needs to be implemented to make these women aware of the needs of the program and the difference that contributions make to the women currently participating in athletics. It appears from the data that women who have been out a number of years would have the financial means, but their philanthropic interests have shifted elsewhere.

Athletic development professionals at the University of Virginia could also increase the likelihood of giving if they tailored strategies that focused on the data from this study. For example, understanding the giving patterns and reasons why alumnae are contributing and subsequently building a profile of a donor based on those characteristics would have an impact on overall philanthropic support.

From a practical perspective, a main reason why alumnae were not giving back to the Virginia Athletics Foundation was tied to financial constraints. It might be a significant step for athletic administrators to implement programs that focus on career placement that might help speed up the development of a stronger financial base for former athletes. While there is no guarantee that a program aimed at placing students after graduation will increase philanthropy, there is evidence that indicates alumnae will give because of their experience, but might not have the resources currently available. If resources became more readily available, then the propensity to give back could possible occur sooner. Getting women to give as soon as they can after graduation, possibly even before they graduate in small increments, could potentially keep them involved as donors for the long-term.

Finally, a highly trained staff can make a difference in increasing the contributions to support the programs. People being able to personally visit the prospect base, educating the constituency on the opportunities that exist and capturing their philanthropic goals related to the Virginia Athletics Foundation will ultimately demonstrate how successful the giving program can become.

Conclusions

This section serves to provide conclusions from the study that may prove to be useful to athletic development staff when organizing programs that are specifically targeted to females who participated in college athletics. The findings from this study should advance the understanding of giving patterns from former female student-athletes and offer some valuable insights to development professionals at educational institutions.

This study was more focused on gender-based giving than previous examinations on athletic giving. It includes several simple components, and variables and their interactions remain to be studied.

Limitations

It should be noted throughout this section that this study was focused on researching a single institution which may limit the generalizations to athletic alumnae from other institutions. Another limitation to drawing generalizations from this study would be that the characteristics of the University of Virginia might be different than those of many other institutions. The data collected was self-reported by the respondents which may also lead to some reporting error. Finally, the researcher was not able to obtain all the addresses needed to include every potential participant for this study.

Summary

Chapter five provided interpretation of the data analysis presented in Chapter Four. This chapter discussed the findings of the study related to the relevant literature as well as the conclusions that were generated based on the results. Recommendations for future research were also presented to keep the literature moving in an appropriate direction to add to the body as a whole.

REFERENCES

Alfred, R. (1996). Competition for limited resources: realities, prospects and strategies. In D.S. Honeyman, J.L. Wattenberger, & K.C. Westbrook (eds.), Struggle to survive: funding higher education in the next century (pp. 109-128). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Baade, R.A., & Sundberg, J.O. (1996). Fourth down and gold to go? Assessing the link between athletics and alumni giving. Social Science Quarterly, pp. 789-803.

Becker, D. (1991). Making the cut. Women's Sports and Fitness, 70.

Bennett, R. (2003). Factors underlying the inclination to donate to particular types of charity. International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 8(1), 12-29.

Blinde, E.M (1987). Contrasting models of sport and the intercollegiate sport experience of female athletes. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois: Champaign, IL.

Blum, D., & Hall, H. (2005, June 24). Americans donated $248.5 billion to charity last year, a 2.3& rise. Chronicle of Higher Education, 51(42), A27.

Brady, M.K., Noble, C.H., Utter, D.J., & Smith, G.E. (2002). How to give and receive: an exploratory study of charitable hybrids. Psychology & Marketing, 19(11), 919-944.

Bray, C. (2004). Summary of sports sponsorship and participation rates data related to the decline in sponsorship of Olympic sports. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association.

Bressi, D. E. (1999). Women and philanthropy: making a difference in higher education Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tennessee: Knoxville, TN.

Brittingham, B. & Pezzullo, T. (1990). The campus green: fund-raising in higher education. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, DC: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.

Brown, I.D.(1991). Targeting university alumni segments that donate for non-athletic reasons. Journal of Professional Service Marketing, 7, 89-97.

Brunel, F. F., & Nelson, M. R. (2000). Explaining gendered responses to "help-self" and "help-others" charity advertising appeals: the mediating role of world-views. Journal of Advertising, 29(3), 15-29.

Burns, K. L. (1987). Reconstructing leadership experiences: Toward a feminist theory of leadership. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Iowa: Iowa City, IA

Carpenter, L.J. & Acosta, R.V. (1991, January-February). Back to the future: reform with a women's voice. Academe, 77(1), 23-27

Caster, J. (2008). A new direction in women's philanthropy. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, *37*(2), 353.

Cohen, D. (2008, June 13). Harnessing the growing wealth of women. The New York Jewish Week (Manhattan Edition), p. 1,16-17.

Comstock, J.B. (1988). A comparison of athletic donors (male and female) to selected big ten conference institutions. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois: Champaign, IL.

Cook, S. G. (2008, February). Study Shows Hope for Equity in Women's College Sports. Women in Higher Education, 17(2), 6.

Coughlin, C.C. & Erekson, O.H. (1984, July). An examination of contributions to support intercollegiate athletics. Southern Economic Journal, 51(1), 180-195.

Council for Aid to Education (2007, Febraury). Contributions to colleges and universities up by 9.4 percent. Washington, DC.

Critz, D. (1980). Women as givers and getters. CASE Currents, 6, 16-19.

CSU Report on Equal Opportunity in Athletics for Women Shows Increase in Participation, Funds and Scholarships. (2008, July 1). *US Fed News Service, Including US State News*. (Document ID: 1506657141).

Curtis, M. (2000). A model of donor behavior: A comparison between female and male donors to men's and women's athletics support organizations at division I NCAA affiliated institutions within the Big Ten. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Iowa: Iowa City, IA.

DiBaggio, J. (2001). Why gender equity in athletics? It's the right thing to do. Women in Higher Education, 10(9), 30.

Dionne, J.L. & Kean, T. (1996). Breaking the social contract: the fiscal crisis in higher education. New York, NY: Council for Aid to Education.

Dochterman, S. (2008, March 4). UI, ISU plan practice facilities: New UI practice facility would cost up to $45 million. McClatchy - Tribune Business News.

Dittman, J.L. (1997). Intercollegiate athletics at the university of Iowa: an analysis of donor motives and characteristics. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Iowa: Iowa City, IA.

Durrant, S. (1989, March). Title IX – its power and its limitations. Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 60(3), 60-64.

Frank. R.H. (2004). Challenging the myth: A review of links among college athletic success, student quality, and donations. New York, NY: Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics.

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.

Fulks, D.L. (2002). Revenues and expenses of division I and II intercollegiate athletics programs: Financial trends and relationships – 2001. Overland Park, KS: The National Collegiate Athletic Association.

Gaski, I. E, and Etzel, M.J. (1984). Collegiate athletic success and alumni generosity: dispelling the myth. Social Behavior and Personality, 12, 29-38.

Gorov, L. (1999, November 28). Spreading the wealth: Rich, young entrepreneurs are turning to social activism instead of the typical charities with their time and money. Boston Globe, p. 1.

Grimes, P. W., & Chressanthis, G.A. (1994). Alumni contributions to academics: the role of intercollegiate sports and NCAA sanctions. American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 53, 27-41.

Gutner, T. (2000, October 30). Philanthropy with a women's touch. Business Week, 13, 8.

Harris, J. (1990). Private support for public, doctorate-granting universities: building a theoretical base. Review of Higher Education, 13, 519-538.

Havens, J.J. & Schervish, P.G. (2003, January). Why the $41 trillion wealth transfer estimate is still valid: a review of the challenges and questions. The Journal of Gift Planning, 7(1), 11-15, 47-50.

Honeyman, D., & Bruhn, M. (1996). The financing of higher education. In D. S. Honeyman, J.L. Wattenbarger, & K.C. Westbrook (Eds.), A Struggle to survive: funding higher education in the next century (pp. 1-27). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Jones, M. (1991). The relationship between autonomy and external controls in the lives of female intercollegiate athletes. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Kent State University: Kent, OH.

Kaminski, A. (1999). The hidden philanthropist: realizing the full potential of women's giving with gender-sensitive cultivation and solicitation strategies. CASE Currents, 25(2), 31-35.

Leslie, L., & Ramey, G. (1988). Donor behavior and voluntary support for higher education institutions. Journal of Higher Education, 59, 115-132.

Lohmann, R. (1992). The Commons: New Perspectives on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action. New York, NY: Jossey-Bass.

Kerkhoff, B. (2007, May 13). Deep pockets for big trophies. Kansas City Star, C4.

McCormick, R. E., & Tinsley, M. (1990). Athletics and academics: A model of university contributions. In B.L. Goff & R.D. Tollison (Eds.), Sportometics (pp. 193-206). College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.

Moten-Bown, T. (2001). Current and future financial challenges in intercollegiate athletics. http://www.unm.edu/urelate/athleticfriday.pdf

Muir, R. & May, J. (1993). Developing an effective major gift program: from managing staff to soliciting gifts. Council for Advancement and Support of Education.

National Collegiate Athletic Association (2003). Gender Equity Report. Indianapolis, IN: Bray, Corey.

National Collegiate Athletic Association (2005). Championship Revenues. Retrieved May 7, 2007 from http:/www.ncaa.org.

Newman, R. (1995). Perceptions of factors relating to gender differences in philanthropy. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of San Francisco: San Francisco, CA.

Newman, R. (2000). Gender differences in philanthropy. Fund Raising Management, 31(1), 28-30.

Ostrower, F. (1997). Why the Wealthy Give. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Pavolvich, M. (1993). Environmental conditions and institutional characteristics which enhance fund-raising potential at private liberal arts colleges. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan: Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Radley, A., & Kennedy, M. (1995). Charitable giving by individuals: a study of attitudes and practice. Human Relations**,** 48(6), 685–709.

Rhoads, T. A., & Gerking, S. (2000). Educational contributions, academic quality and athletic success. Contemporary Economic Policy, 18, 248-259.

Robinson, M.J. (1998, February/March). An untapped market. Athletic Management, 1-5.

Sargeant, A. (1999). Charitable giving: Towards a model of donor behavior. Journal of Marketing Management, 15, 215-238.

Shadoian, H. (1989). A study of predictors of alumni public colleges. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Connecticut: Stoors, CT.

Shalala, D.E. (1993). The changing profile of philanthropy. In A. I. Thompson & A.R. Kaminski (Eds.), Women and philanthropy: A national agenda (pp. 1-5). Madison, WI: Center for Women and Philanthropy, School of Family Resources and Consumer Sciences.

Shaw, S.C. & Taylor, M.A. (1995). Reinventing fundraising: Realizing the potential of women's philanthropy. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shim, J.M. (2001). Relationship of selected alumnae characteristics to alumnae financial support at a women's college. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Florida: Gainesville, FL.

Shulman, J. L., & Bowen, W.G. (2001). The misfortunes of collegiate athletics. Case Currents, (27), 34-41.

Simari, R.M. (1995). Philanthropy and higher education: women as donors. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Hofstra University: Hempstead, NY.

Smith, L. (2003, February/March). Focusing on females. Athletic Management, 49-53.

Staurowsky, E.J. (1994). A comparison of motivations for giving between donors to women's and men's athletic support groups. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Temple University: Philadelphia, PA.

Staurowsky, E.J., Parhouse, B. & Sachs, M. (1996). Developing an instrument to measure athletic donor behavior and motivation. Journal of Sport Management, 10, 262-277.

Stinson, J. (2005). The effects of intercollegiate athletic success on private giving to athletic and academic programs at National Collegiate Athletic Association programs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Oregon: Eugene, OR.

Stinson, J.L., & Howard, D.R. (2004). Scoreboards vs. mortarboards: major donor behavior and intercollegiate athletics. Sports Marketing Quarterly, 13, 129-140.

Strout, E. (2007, July). Courting Female Donors. The Chronicle of Higher Education, *53*(44), A.21-A.22.

Suggs, W. (2000). A Chronicle survey finds gains at big-time football powers, struggles at the 'have-nots'. Chronicle of Higher Education, 46(31), A65

Suggs, W. (2003). Cheers and condemnation greet report on gender equity. Chronicle of Higher Education. A40.

Suggs, W. (2004). Colleges' expenditures on athletics can't be calculated, panelists tell Knight Commission. Chronicle of Higher Education, 51(11).

Suggs, W. (2005). Sports building boom is not proof of 'arms race,' report says. Chronicle of Higher Education 51(36).

Tanner, N. (1992). Single-sex education and fund raising: why have women's colleges been so successful. National Network on Women as Philanthropists Newsletter, 3-4.

Tanner, N.N. & Ramsey, P. (1993). Raising money for women from women: The story of a successful campaign. In A.J. von Schlegell & J.M. Fisher (Eds.), New directions for philanthropic fundraising: women as donors, women as philanthropists (pp. 117-133). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Topp, G. & DeBarros, A. (2007, September 12). Women feed the jump in college enrollment. USA Today. 6D.

Turner, S.E., Meserve, L.A., & Bowen, W.G. (2001). Winning and giving: football results and alumni giving at selective private colleges and Universities. Social Science Quarterly, 82,(4), 812-827.

Verner, M. E. (1996). Developing women as financial donors and philanthropists: a way to enhance intercollegiate athletic opportunities. Women in Sport & Physical Activity Journal, 5(1), 27-36.

Whitley, F.V. & Staples, P. (1997, August). Womenpower: the growing factor in gifts fund raising in the decade ahead. Fund Raising Management, 28(6), 14-19.

Women's Sport Foundation (2002). Briefing Paper No. 4 by Andrew Zimbalist and Robert A. Wood.

Yang, K. (1997). A study of the relationship between winning at athletics and the financial profile of the selected athletic programs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Iowa: Iowa City, IA.

Youngren, J. (2003, Summer). Entitled. Continuum, 13(1).

Young, P. S. & Fischer, N.M. (1996). Identifying undergraduate and post-college characteristics that may affect alumni giving. (ERIC Document Reproductions Services No. ED 397748).

APPENDIX A

Initial Cover Letter

Dear U.Va. Student-Athlete Alumna:

I am a former Assistant Director of the Virginia Athletics Foundation and am in the process of completing my doctoral studies. As part of my dissertation research I am conducting this study to better understand the experiences of female student-athletes at the University of Virginia. I am asking your help by completing a questionnaire, which should take no more than 15 minutes of your time. I am particularly interested in how your experiences as a student-athlete now influence your decisions to financially support the UVA Athletics Department.

The Department of Educational Leadership and Policy at the University of Kansas, where I am completing my doctorate, supports the practice of protection for human subjects participating in research. The following information is provided for you to decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time.

The questionnaire asks questions about your experiences as a student-athlete and you're giving behavior. Although participation may not benefit you directly, we believe that the information obtained from this study will help us gain a better understanding of the experiences of former female student-athletes at the University of Virginia. Your participation is solicited, although strictly voluntary. You may choose to answer some or all of the questions. Your name will not be associated in any way with the research findings. It is possible, however, with internet communications, that through intent or accident someone other than the intended recipient may see your response.

If you would like additional information concerning this study before or after it is completed, please feel free to contact my advisor or me by phone or mail. Completion of the survey indicates your willingness to participate in this project and that you are at least age eighteen. If you have any additional questions about your rights as a research participant, you may call (785) 864-7429 or write the Human Subjects Committee Lawrence Campus (HSCL), University of Kansas, 2385 Irving Hill Road, Lawrence, Kansas 66045-7563, email dhann@ku.edu.

Thank you in advance for your willingness to participate in this study.

Sincerely,

Jason S. Drummond
Principal Investigator

Susan Twombly, Ph.D.
Faculty Supervisor

APPENDIX B

Follow-Up Cover Letter

Dear U.Va. Student-Athlete Alumna:

As a follow up to an initial letter we sent two weeks ago, I am asking your help by completing a questionnaire, which should take no more than 15 minutes of your time. I am particularly interested in how your experiences as a student-athlete now influence your decisions to financially support the UVA Athletics Department.

If you have already completed this survey, please accept my gratitude. If you have not completed the survey, I ask that you complete the survey so your feedback will be included in the study.

Thank you in advance for your willingness to participate in this study.

Sincerely,

Jason S. Drummond
Principal Investigator

APPENDIX C

Survey Instrument

Directions: Please circle the appropriate answer that most closely matches.

1. I have positive feelings toward the University of Virginia athletics department
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

2. I have positive feelings toward the University of Virginia
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

3. I had positive feelings toward the University of Virginia athletics department when I was a student-athlete
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

4. I had a positive experience as a student-athlete at UVA
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

5. The athletics programs at UVA need financial support from former student-athletes
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

6. When I was a student-athlete, the amount of playing time I received met my level of expectation
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

7. When I was a student-athlete, my team:
    a. Won multiple championships
    b. Won a championship
    c. Participated in post season play
    d. Won more games than it lost
    e. Lost more games than it won

8. I maintain some interest in the athletics team I participated on now that I have graduated
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

9. I maintain relationships with my former UVA teammates
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

10. I maintain relationships with my former UVA coach
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

11. I contributed to the University of Virginia general fund in 2008
    a. Yes
    b. No

12. I contributed to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in 2008
    a. Yes
    b. No

13. I have made a contribution to the Virginia Athletics Foundation within the last five years
    a. Yes
    b. No

14. In 2008, I made an annual contribution to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in the amount of: $_____

15. My approximate lifetime contributions to the Virginia Athletics Foundation are $_____

16. If the program you participated in is currently a winning program (in terms of record), are you more likely to give financial support
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

17. If the program you participated is currently a losing program (in terms of record) are you less likely to give financial support
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

18. Indicate the extent to which you agree that the following things would encourage you to make a contribution to the UVA athletics program:

    a. I have a relationship with the coach
        i. Strongly agree
        ii. Agree
        iii. Neutral
        iv. Disagree
        v. Strongly disagree

    b. I was treated well as a student-athlete
        i. Strongly agree
        ii. Agree
        iii. Neutral
        iv. Disagree
        v. Strongly disagree

c. I want to help future generations of women's athletes at Virginia
    i. Strongly agree
    ii. Agree
    iii. Neutral
    iv. Disagree
    v. Strongly disagree

d. The athletics department cared about my well being
    i. Strongly agree
    ii. Agree
    iii. Neutral
    iv. Disagree
    v. Strongly disagree

e. I understand the women's athletics programs at Virginia need assistance
    i. Strongly agree
    ii. Agree
    iii. Neutral
    iv. Disagree
    v. Strongly disagree

f. I care about college athletics
    i. Strongly agree
    ii. Agree
    iii. Neutral
    iv. Disagree
    v. Strongly disagree

19. When I was a student-athlete, UVA treated male athletes better than female athletes
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

20. When I was a student-athlete, UVA treated male and female athletes equally
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

21. When I was a student-athlete, UVA treated female athletes better than male athletes
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

22. If/when I give financially to the UVA, I prefer to support my former UVA athletics team
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

23. If/when I give financially to the UVA, I prefer to support the UVA women's athletics program
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

24. If/when I give financially to the UVA, I prefer to support the UVA athletics program (i.e., both men's & women's sports)
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

25. If/when I give financially to the UVA, I prefer to support the UVA general fund (e.g., academic programs)
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

26. If/when I give financially to the UVA, I will have no preferences where my contributions are given at UVA
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly disagree

27. What is your age_____

28. Race
    a. White
    b. Black or African-American
    c. Asian
    d. Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
    e. Hispanic or Latino
    f. American Indian
    g. Other

29. Education
    a. Bachelor's degree
    b. Graduate degree

30. What year did you graduate from college_____

31. Did you receive an athletics grant-in-aid (scholarship assistance)?
    a. No
    b. Yes

32. I participated in
    a. Basketball
    b. Field Hockey
    c. Golf
    d. Lacrosse
    e. Rowing
    f. Soccer
    g. Softball
    f. Swimming/Diving
    g. Tennis
    h. Track/Cross Country
    i. Volleyball

33. Which best represents your current annual household income
    a. under $50,000
    b. $50,000 - $99,999
    c. Over $100,000

34. What has influenced your decision to financially support the Virginia Athletics Foundation?

34A. What has influenced your decision to NOT financially support the Virginia Athletics Foundation?

35. What could the Virginia Athletics Foundation do to increase your financial support?

35A. What could the Virginia Athletics Foundation do to gain your financial support?

36. What is your occupation_____?

APPENDIX D

Frequency Distribution Tables

Table D1.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who agree or disagree they have positive feelings toward the University of Virginia athletic department

Variable	Number (Total = 346)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	143	41.3
Agree	156	45.1
Neutral	39	11.3
Disagree	39	11.3
Strongly Disagree	8	2.3

Table D2.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who agree or disagree they have positive feelings toward the University of Virginia

Variable	Number (Total = 347)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	254	73.2
Agree	80	23.1
Neutral	12	3.5
Disagree	1	2.3
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0

Table D3.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who agree or disagree they had positive feelings toward the University of Virginia athletic department as a student-athlete

Variable	Number (Total = 346)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	141	40.8
Agree	146	42.4
Neutral	40	11.6
Disagree	16	4.6
Strongly Disagree	3	0.9

Table D4.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who agree or disagree they had a positive experience at the University of Virginia as a student-athlete

Variable	Number (Total = 345)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	160	46.4
Agree	124	35.9
Neutral	39	11.3
Disagree	17	4.9
Strongly Disagree	5	1.4

Table D5.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who agree or disagree the athletics programs need financial support from former student-athletes

Variable	Number (Total = 344)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	94	27.3
Agree	157	45.6
Neutral	84	24.4
Disagree	9	2.6
Strongly Disagree	0	0.0

Table D6.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who believe that the amount of playing time they received met their expectations

Variable	Number (Total = 346)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	141	40.8
Agree	120	34.7
Neutral	61	17.6
Disagree	21	6.1
Strongly Disagree	3	0.9

Table D7.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who reported team performance during participation

Variable	Number (Total = 336)	Percent (100%)
Won Multiple Championships	66	19.6
Won a Championship	53	15.8
Participated in Post Season	125	37.2
Won More Games Than Lost	71	21.1
Lost More Games Than Won	21	6.2

Table D8.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who maintain interest in former team after graduation

Variable	Number (Total = 346)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	94	27.2
Agree	174	50.3
Neutral	51	14.7
Disagree	24	6.9
Strongly Disagree	3	0.9

Table D9.

Percentage of former female student-athletes who maintain relationships with former teammates

Variable	Number (Total = 344)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	115	33.4
Agree	116	33.7
Neutral	46	13.4
Disagree	58	16.9
Strongly Disagree	9	2.6

Table D10.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who maintain relationships with former coach

Variable	Number (Total = 345)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	43	12.5
Agree	72	20.9
Neutral	56	16.2
Disagree	94	27.2
Strongly Disagree	80	23.2

Table D11.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who believe a winning program encourages their support

Variable	Number (Total = 345)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	16	4.6
Agree	40	11.6
Neutral	146	42.3
Disagree	109	31.6
Strongly Disagree	34	9.9

Table D12.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who believe a losing program discourages their support

Variable	Number (Total = 338)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	4	1.2
Agree	21	6.2
Neutral	127	37.6
Disagree	135	39.9
Strongly Disagree	51	15.1

Table D13.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who believe having a relationship with the coach would encourage a financial contribution to the athletic program

Variable	Number (Total = 342)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	87	25.4
Agree	143	41.8
Neutral	62	18.1
Disagree	35	10.2
Strongly Disagree	15	4.4

Table D14.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who believe being treated well as a student-athlete would encourage a financial contribution to the athletic program

Variable	Number (Total = 343)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	150	43.7
Agree	150	43.7
Neutral	25	7.3
Disagree	12	3.5
Strongly Disagree	6	1.7

Table D15.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who believe the desire to help future generations of women athletes encourages a financial contribution to the athletic program

Variable	Number (Total = 343)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	160	46.6
Agree	153	44.6
Neutral	26	7.6
Disagree	3	0.9
Strongly Disagree	1	0.3

Table D16.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who believe that the athletic department cared about their well-being encourages a financial contribution to the athletic program

Variable	Number (Total = 343)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	108	31.5
Agree	145	42.3
Neutral	67	19.5
Disagree	16	4.7
Strongly Disagree	7	2.0

Table D17.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who understand women's athletics needs assistance encourages a financial contribution to the athletic program

Variable	Number (Total = 344)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	118	34.3
Agree	169	49.1
Neutral	48	14.0
Disagree	8	2.3
Strongly Disagree	1	0.3

Table D18.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who believe caring about college athletics encourages a financial contribution to the athletic program

Variable	Number (Total = 344)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	153	44.5
Agree	150	43.6
Neutral	33	9.6
Disagree	6	1.7
Strongly Disagree	2	0.6

Table D19.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who believe that male athletes were treated better than female athletes

Variable	Number (Total = 345)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	85	24.6
Agree	113	32.8
Neutral	80	23.2
Disagree	63	18.3
Strongly Disagree	4	1.2

Table D20.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who believe that male and female athletes were treated equally during the time they participated

Variable	Number (Total = 345)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	2	0.6
Agree	77	22.3
Neutral	84	24.3
Disagree	124	35.9
Strongly Disagree	58	16.8

Table D21.
Percentage of former female student-athletes who believe that female athletes were treated better than male athletes during the time they participated

Variable	Number (Total = 344)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	2	0.6
Agree	4	1.2
Neutral	57	16.6
Disagree	189	54.9
Strongly Disagree	92	26.7

Table D22.
Percentage of former female student-athletes indicated that if or when they make financial contributions they would specifically give them to their team

Variable	Number (Total = 344)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	132	38.4
Agree	121	35.2
Neutral	58	16.9
Disagree	28	8.1
Strongly Disagree	5	1.5

Table D23.
Percentage of former female student-athletes indicated that if or when they make financial contributions they would specifically support women's athletics

Variable	Number (Total = 346)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	69	19.9
Agree	132	38.2
Neutral	95	27.5
Disagree	46	13.3
Strongly Disagree	4	1.2

Table D24.
Percentage of former female student-athletes indicated that if or when they make financial contributions they would support athletics

Variable	Number (Total = 344)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	30	8.7
Agree	92	26.7
Neutral	138	40.1
Disagree	68	19.8
Strongly Disagree	16	4.7

Table D25.
Percentage of former female student-athletes indicated that if or when they make financial contributions they would support the University general fund

Variable	Number (Total = 343)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	27	7.9
Agree	91	26.5
Neutral	129	37.6
Disagree	79	23
Strongly Disagree	17	5.0

Table D26.
Percentage of former female student-athletes indicated that if or when they make financial contributions they would support the University without specifically designating their gift

Variable	Number (Total = 343)	Percent (100%)
Strongly Agree	5	1.5
Agree	20	5.8
Neutral	61	17.8
Disagree	177	51.6
Strongly Disagree	80	23.3

Table D27.
Percentage of former female student-athletes made contributions to the University of Virginia general fund in 2008

Variable	Number (Total = 345)	Percent (100%)
Yes	116	33.6
No	229	66.4

Table D28.
Percentage of former female student-athletes made contributions to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in 2008

Variable	Number (Total = 343)	Percent (100%)
Yes	122	35.6
No	221	64.4

Table D29.
Percentage of former female student-athletes made contributions to the Virginia Athletics Foundation in the last five years

Variable	Number (Total = 343)	Percent (100%)
Yes	202	58.2
No	145	41.8

Table D30.
Percentage of former female student-athletes ethnicity

Variable	Number (Total = 344)	Percent (100%)
White	313	91.0
African American	21	6.1
Asian	4	1.2
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1	0.3
Hispanic/Latino	2	0.6
American Indian	2	0.6
Latino	1	0.3

Table D31.
Percentage of former female student-athletes academic credentials

Variable	Number (Total = 343)	Percent (100%)
Bachelor's Degree	174	50.7
Graduate Degree	169	49.3

Table D32.
Percentage of former female student-athletes receiving athletic scholarship assistance

Variable	Number (Total = 344)	Percent (100%)
Yes	203	59.0
No	141	41.0

Table D33.
Percentage of former female student-athletes and their sports participation

Variable	Number (Total = 347)	Percent (100%)
Basketball	24	6.92
Field Hockey	47	13.54
Golf	2	0.58
Lacrosse	44	12.68
Rowing	48	13.83
Soccer	20	5.76
Softball	39	11.24
Swimming/Diving	41	11.82
Tennis	16	4.61
Track/Cross Country	46	13.26
Volleyball	20	5.76