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The purpose of this study was to determine which variables (alumni characteristics) may influence the giving pattern of alumni to their alma mater. With American colleges facing a continuing need for funds, a clear understanding of factors which may influence alumni giving is vital.

A questionnaire was mailed to all of the alumni of Los Angeles Baptist College. After receiving responses from 54% of the alumni contacted, the data were analyzed to determine whether certain alumni characteristics affected whether an alumnus was a donor or nondonor. The 28 alumni characteristics studied were divided into five categories: (a) academic achievement, (b) financial factors, (c) extracurricular involvement, (d) present circumstances and attitudes, and (e) precollege circumstances.

It was determined that the following areas of alumni characteristics were predictive of alumni support: (a) level of involvement as students or as alumni, (b) family situation of alumni, (c) income level of alumni, (d) age of alumni, and (e) current attitude of alumni toward their alma mater.

The following areas of alumni characteristics were not predictive of alumni support: (a) distance from campus, (b) frequency of
disciplinary action for inappropriate social behavior, (c) precollege circumstances, (d) academic achievements, and (e) method used to finance education.

It was concluded that certain alumni characteristics may influence whether alumni are donors or nondonors. With America's private colleges facing a future complicated by continued cost increases and a potential drop in enrollment, private college administrators must maximize every legitimate source of gift revenue. A proper understanding of alumni characteristics which are predictive of donors will aid college officials in raising funds from their alumni.
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Shortly after its founding in 1636, Harvard University, America's first institution of higher education, received its first gift from an alumnus. With this donation, a precedent for future alumni was established. Since 1636 the number as well as the influence alumni have had in American higher education has increased. This has been true for public as well as private education institutions; however, of special interest for this study are those schools such as Harvard which were formed by various church bodies and have come to be known as private colleges and universities.

No study of higher education in the United States would be complete without giving some attention to the role private colleges and universities have played in fostering higher education in America. Between the time Harvard was established in 1636 and 1780, merely nine colleges were formed in Colonial America, and all but one of the nine schools were initiated by church groups. The names of these centers of higher learning still stand for the best in American education: Harvard, William and Mary, Yale, Princeton, Dartmouth, Brown, Rutgers, and Columbia (Mulhern, 1959).

These early private colleges and universities set a pattern for the growth of similar institutions. The relentless flow of the young
nation westward brought a further spread of colleges. Yale, as an early center of educational and missionary interests of the Congregational Church, assisted and encouraged a total of 16 new colleges. This group included such well known schools as Western Reserve, Beloit, Illinois, and Grinnell Pacific (Snavely, 1955).

During this period of growth for private colleges, few public colleges were begun. By 1800 only three states had sponsored any form of higher education. It was not until the Morrill Act of 1862 that a substantial effort was begun toward taxpayer-supported higher education (Silber, 1975).

The growth of private colleges has never been without travail. The colleges fought a constant battle to secure adequate working funds to exist. At least 80% of private colleges founded before the Civil War ceased to exist by 1932. These colleges passed from existence for a number of reasons; however, financial stringency was the overriding factor. In their search for necessary funds from the private sector, the colleges often entered into ruinous competition with each other. Coupled with this was the impact of a new nation's sputtering economy. When depression struck (as it did again and again, at least locally) the weak institutions succumbed (Wicke, 1964).

The need for outside sources of funds continues to plague private colleges to the present day. Since 1970, 129 private colleges or universities ceased to exist—more than double the number of colleges that opened. Projections for the next 20 years indicate a decline in enrollments due to a drop in the number of college age
individuals. The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education projected a 5% to 15% decline in undergraduate enrollments during the next 20 years (Scully, 1980). "One way or another," said Dartmouth President John G. Kemeny, "if present trends continue, about half of them are going to go out of business" (Private Colleges Cry," 1979, p. 38).

Standing closest to the brink of bankruptcy are the small colleges with endowments yielding revenue insufficient to offset continued budget shortages and few if any government research grants. These colleges typically have a tuition base providing 80% or more of their general fund revenue. The tuition from enrollment of what was termed the great post-war baby boom kept many of them solvent during the 1960s and 1970s. However, the population of 18-year-olds in the United States peaked in 1979-1980 and then began a modest decline which will amount to a loss of potential population of 25% by 1992. Harvard's President Derek Bok noted: "The institutions that closed in the past few years did so without the impact of the decline in enrollment. The decline will provide much more serious pressure on closing in the next generation" (Private Colleges Cry," 1979, p. 38).

In the first half of the 20th century, most colleges grew gradually if at all. It was possible for them to find increased capital support as they needed it from steadily increasing tuition revenues, alumni support, corporate gifts, and foundation grants. By the 1960s, however, large numbers of colleges considerably increased their enrollments. So rapid was growth, and of such magnitude, that
traditional sources of capital for higher education in private colleges were not sufficient to meet the extraordinary need for capital (King, 1975).

As private colleges enter the 1980s, new problems will emerge. Internally they must learn to employ efficient management techniques in order to properly deal with a number of challenging external factors. Although they will be dealt with in more depth in the second chapter, Hughes (1978) summarized some of the key issues facing higher education in the 1980s: (a) general economic conditions, (b) increasing inflation, (c) more demand for accountability, (d) changing national and regional enrollment patterns, (e) energy costs, (f) collective bargaining, (g) government regulations and reporting requirements, and (h) a leveling of financial support. College administrators will need to evaluate carefully the efficiency of their organizations in order to offset the impact of the external factors listed above.

With costs continuing to creep steadily upward, administrators of private colleges and universities will be forced to explore additional sources of financial support. Their options for remaining solvent include cutting back programs, borrowing from endowments or banks, increasing fees, and seeking new sources of support. Increasing tuition can increase income, but it does have a consumer ceiling. Tuition costs considerably higher than those of similar state colleges may discourage students from attending due to the higher cost. Borrowing from endowments, banks, and private sources may ease a current shortage yet lead to long-range instability due to the cost of
debt service. Business and foundations presently provide about 40% of all voluntary support to higher education; however, no indications exist to forecast major increases (Smith, 1980).

One group which could have an increased impact is an institution's alumni. America's private colleges and universities have 6,750,000 alumni. Only 1,250,000 donate money regularly or often. Fewer than one in five alumni are financial supporters of their alma mater (Laukuff, 1971).

The importance of involving the present 5,500,000 noninvolved alumni of private colleges cannot be overemphasized. If each of the 5,500,000 nongivers had given an average of $100 each in 1979, the resulting $550,000,000 would have almost doubled the alumni giving of the previous year; and would have actually increased by one-half the total support received by private colleges from all voluntary sources.

It is imperative that private colleges and universities understand the factors which may or may not encourage their alumni to become financially involved. As long as continuing inflation and declining enrollment exist, colleges will continue to face financial pressures. If college administrators decide to use their alumni to offset the results of these factors, they must know as much as possible about alumni giving habits.
Purpose

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine which variables (alumni characteristics) if any, influence the giving pattern of alumni to their alma mater. If these variables are clearly delineated, a college could consider them when planning for future fund raising. A proper understanding of independent variables (alumni characteristics) could be valuable information for education specialists charged with the task of increasing gift revenue. Armed with such information, they could better understand some of the motives of alumni donors and possibly increase alumni giving. The fundraisers would be better prepared to motivate presently nonsupporting alumni toward financial involvement.

It was determined that a study of certain characteristics as they applied to donor and nondonor alumni could indicate a difference between the characteristics of the two groups. Such information could allow college administrators to understand better what to look for in a prospective donor. It was proposed that the independent variable (alumni characteristics) could influence the dependent variables (donor or nondonor).

Sample

The individuals surveyed were all alumni of Los Angeles Baptist College of Newhall, California. Los Angeles Baptist College was founded in 1927 as an independent Baptist college. The college is
regionally accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges and offers majors in 12 disciplines. Approximately 400 students attended the college when the survey began in 1979.

Hypotheses

Hypotheses 1a-1e. In the area of academic achievement it was hypothesized that there was a difference among the following alumni characteristics and whether a Los Angeles Baptist College alumnus was a donor or nondonor:

1a. Cumulative Los Angeles Baptist College grade point average.
1b. Honor society membership at Los Angeles Baptist College.
1c. Years at Los Angeles Baptist College.
1d. Academic major at Los Angeles Baptist College.
1e. Formal education received after Los Angeles Baptist College attendance.

Hypotheses 2a-2d. In the area of financial factors it was hypothesized that there was a difference between the following alumni characteristics and whether a Los Angeles Baptist College alumnus was a donor or nondonor:

2a. Type of government aid received (grants and scholarships) while at Los Angeles Baptist College.
2b. Source of income while a student at Los Angeles Baptist College.
2c. Amount of loans received while at Los Angeles Baptist College.
2d. Current household income.

**Hypotheses 3a-3d.** In the area of extracurricular involvement it was hypothesized that there was a difference between the following alumni characteristics and whether a Los Angeles Baptist College alumnus was a donor or non donor:

3a. Student government involvement at Los Angeles Baptist College.
3b. Athletic involvement at Los Angeles Baptist College.
3c. Type of housing used at Los Angeles Baptist College.
3d. Amount of discipline received for social irregularities at Los Angeles Baptist College.

**Hypotheses 4a-4l.** In the area of present circumstances and attitudes it was hypothesized that there was a difference between the following alumni characteristics and whether a Los Angeles Baptist College alumnus was a donor or non donor:

4a. Distance of present domicile from Los Angeles Baptist College.
4b. Number of years since last enrolled at Los Angeles Baptist College.
4c. Current job satisfaction.
4d. Marital status.
4e. Enrollment of children at Los Angeles Baptist College.
4f. Present enrollment of children at Los Angeles Baptist College.
4g. Spouse an alumnus of Los Angeles Baptist College.
4h. Number of children.
4i. Involvement with other Los Angeles Baptist College alumni.
4j. Current vocation.
4k. Satisfaction with present general condition of Los Angeles Baptist College.
4l. Satisfaction with vocational preparation from Los Angeles Baptist College.

Hypotheses 5a-5c. In the area of precollege circumstances it was hypothesized that there was a difference between the following alumni characteristics and whether a Los Angeles Baptist College alumnus was a donor or non donor:

5a. Father's occupation the year prior to alumnus' enrollment at Los Angeles Baptist College.
5b. High school grade point average.
5c. Degree of high school extracurricular participation.

Summary

It was believed that at least some of the characteristics listed would have an influence on whether or not alumni financially support their alma mater. This belief was based on the results of studies done during the 1960s and 1970s which dealt with similar characteristics of alumni from several private and public universities. These studies were conducted by Blumenfeld and Sartain (1974), Broms and Davis (1966), Caruthers (1973), Filer (1975), The Institute for Social Research (1975) at the University of Michigan, Markoff (1978),
McKee (1975), McNulty (1976), and Simpson and Hirsch (1968). Their findings will be examined in depth in Chapter II. Generally they found that some alumni characteristics were predictive of financial support or nonsupport. The dissertation by Caruthers (1973) was of special assistance in the preparation of this study. The Caruthers study was used to organize the various chapter headings and subheadings. Also adapted was Caruther's method of categorizing the various alumni characteristics into major groups. Caruthers used the categories of (a) academic experiences, (b) student experiences, (c) alumni support, (d) personal data, and (e) alumni attitudes. The categories utilized in this study are somewhat different. They include: (a) academic achievement, (b) financial factors, (c) extracurricular involvement, (d) present circumstances and attitudes, and (e) precollege circumstances. The Caruthers survey dealt with alumni from a major public university whereas this study investigated characteristics of alumni from a small private college. The researcher sought to discover if some of the eight characteristics which Caruthers determined to be predictive of alumni support at a major public university would be predictive of alumni support at a small private college such as Los Angeles Baptist College. The characteristics are examined further in the following chapters.

Although it was believed that all of the listed variables would have a relationship to the eleemosynary habit of an alumnus, it was recognized that some might show no relationship. The researcher was prepared to accept the fact that a relationship might not exist between any single variable and alumni donating habits. This would
indicate that the alumni characteristics could be discounted if a donor or nondonor profile was constructed.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined to allow a more complete understanding of this research.

1. Senior private college or university—An institution offering at least a baccalaureate degree and receiving its direction from a board of trustees not elected or appointed by the public.

2. Alumnus—An individual who completed a minimum of one semester at Los Angeles Baptist College.

3. Supporting alumnus—An individual who completed a minimum of one semester at Los Angeles Baptist College and who made at least one financial contribution to Los Angeles Baptist College between September 1974 and September 1979.

4. Nonsupporting alumnus—An individual who completed a minimum of one semester at Los Angeles Baptist College and who had not made at least one financial contribution to the college between September 1974 and September 1979.

Limitations of the Study

Research was limited to characteristics of the alumni of Los Angeles Baptist College. Two population groups were considered in this study. The population groups were limited to alumni who had or had not made financial contributions to Los Angeles Baptist College during a 5-year period.
Caution was observed when comparing the results of this study with the results of similar research. The other researchers conducted their studies of the alumni of universities which were much larger and much older than Los Angeles Baptist College. Both of these factors may have been a part of any differences between the results of their research and the results of this study. Although Los Angeles Baptist College was formed in 1927, it did not become an accredited liberal arts college until 1974. At the time the study was conducted, the student body numbered only approximately 400 students. Some of the results of the study could be applicable to the alumni of other private colleges of comparable size and age.

Summary

This chapter has been devoted to providing an introduction to the research problem. After presenting the need for the study, the chapter dealt with a statement of the problem, the definitions of the terms which were of primary use in the study, and a definition of the limitations of the study.

Chapter II is a survey of related literature. It will provide information into background and present status of alumni support of their alma mater. Special attention is given to alumni of private colleges and universities.

Chapter III presents the methodology of the study. After a discussion of the population to be employed in the study, the questionnaire utilized in the study is discussed. The chapter concludes with a treatment of the statistical analysis which will be used to
determine results in the study.

Chapter IV contains the results of the study as outlined in Chapter III.

Chapter V concludes the study by summarizing the results, explaining the conclusions and implications, and recommending areas of future research.
CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

In Chapter I it was stated that people trace the history of higher education in the United States to private colleges and universities such as Harvard, William and Mary, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, the University of Pennsylvania, Brown, Rutgers, and Dartmouth. Of these original nine colleges founded prior to 1780, all but one, the University of Pennsylvania, were founded by religious denominations (Mulhern, 1959). Since the 18th century, observers have witnessed considerable change in the institutions just mentioned. They are no longer governed by the denominations that formed them. They are now known as private institutions with nonsectarian governance. In addition to its distinction as the first American college, Harvard was also the first to witness a loosening of denominational governance. While sectarianism was declining in Harvard, the other early schools held to their denominational heritage for longer periods of time. Dartmouth, Rutgers, and Brown were products of the great religious revivals of the 18th century. Led by evangelists Jonathan Edwards and George Whitfield, the revivals came to be known as the Great Awakening. These colleges, along with Yale, began with the strongest of denominational bonds; however, they soon shifted emphasis toward private education unaccountable to specific religious leadership.
(Mulhern, 1959). The early years of American higher education were marked with questions regarding the governance of the colleges. This was seen clearly in New Hampshire in 1819 as the state attempted to gain control of Dartmouth University. The state court ruled in favor of such a move; however, it was overruled by the U.S. Supreme Court after hearing an articulate and moving presentation by Dartmouth alumnus Daniel Webster (Deitch, 1978b).

As noted in Chapter I, Yale promulgated the interests of the Congregational Church through the founding of 16 new colleges. A review of the history of Princeton University reveals a similar tendency to encourage new schools. Princeton spread the influence of the Presbyterian Church in higher education in its early days in America. One historian claims that 25 colleges were organized through the influence of Princeton alumni (Snavely, 1955).

Recent studies indicate that the earliest private colleges in America witnessed not only a severing of the ties that originally bound them to their founding denominations, but also a corresponding change in the type of vocations for which students were educated. No longer were these early private colleges matriculating individuals destined for service in church-related work. When Harvard University was originally founded by the Congregational Church, it heavily emphasized the training of ministers. During its first 60 years of operation, more than half of its graduates went into the ministry (Mulhern, 1959). This percentage remained constant for other early church-related colleges such as Yale and Princeton.
The other large church groups like the Baptists, Disciples, Methodists, and Roman Catholics had a much later start in the establishment of colleges (Snively, 1955). The Methodists and Baptists were especially zealous in their enthusiasm for the rapid spread of colleges. As "The Great Awakening" of the 18th century helped to spread the influence of the Methodist and Baptist denominations, both groups began to establish colleges. The primary reason for this involvement was to spread their influence and convictions to the young people from their churches. They sought to train them not only in the arts and sciences, but also in the history and doctrine of the Methodist or Baptist church. Along with the Presbyterians and Catholics, these two groups now have the largest number of affiliated institutions.

This study dealt with the alumni of the Baptist college and therefore a brief history of Baptist colleges in America is appropriate. Baptist colleges were not started with much frequency until the Baptist churches of a region began to organize into some form of local, state, or regional association. In 1764 a cooperative effort of the Rhode Island Association of Baptists and the Philadelphia Association of Baptists led to the formation of Rhode Island Baptist College. Following the example set by this group, Baptist associations in Massachusetts, New York, South Carolina, Georgia, and Maine organized state education societies. Their combined efforts led to the formation in 1821 of the Columbian College in the District of Columbia. The institution, since 1904, has been known as George Washington University (Torbet, 1950).
Other Baptist colleges were started during the early 1800s as various Baptist associations which later formed the Northern Baptist Convention (now known as the American Baptist Convention) sought colleges for their young people. Colby College obtained its charter in 1813 under the name "Maine Literary and Theological Institution."

Colgate University (originally known as Madison University) was opened at Hamilton, New York, in 1820. Bucknell University, long known as the University of Lewisburg, was chartered in 1846. The first women's college in America was founded in Poughkeepsie, New York, under the name Vassar College in 1861.

In the early part of the 19th century, Baptist churches in the southern states began to form state associations which shared a concern for educating the youth of their churches. They later united and were called the Southern Baptist Convention. In South Carolina, the churches developed in 1851 what is now known as Furman University. In Georgia, Mercer University was organized in 1837. The Baptist churches of Virginia formed Richmond College in 1840. Southwestern Baptist University was started at Jackson, Tennessee, in 1847. Alabama Baptist churches founded Howard College in 1841. In Texas the churches founded in 1846 what is now known as Baylor University (Pollock, 1901).

During 1817 the first Baptist college was formed in what was then considered the western United States. In 1817 what was later called Shurtleff College was founded in Shawneetown, Illinois, by Elder Peck. The years following (especially the decade of the 1830s) witnessed the founding of such Baptist colleges now known as Denison
University in 1831 at Lancaster, Ohio; Kalamazoo College in 1833 at Kalamazoo, Michigan; and Franklin College in 1837 at Indianapolis, Indiana. The years that followed brought a continued westward spread of Baptist colleges.

The colleges mentioned above are associated with either the American Baptist Convention or the Southern Baptist Convention. They led the Baptist associations in college development. In 1933 a group of churches (now numbering 1,500) left what was then known as the Northern Baptist Convention and formed the General Association of Regular Baptist Churches. Since 1933 the Regular Baptist Churches have developed colleges in Michigan, California, Oregon, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Iowa, Florida, and Colorado. Los Angeles Baptist College was founded by an independent group of California Baptist churches. The college later sought and received recognition as an approved college of the Regular Baptist Churches (Sweazy, 1978).

There were three primary reasons why the early formation of private colleges and universities was undertaken by church groups. In the formative days of our nation, there were no other agencies with sufficient strength to enter the field of education (Wicke, 1964). The second reason concerned the heritage the English Americans brought with them from England. It was part of the British tradition that religion and education were natural partners. With no national or state governance solidly established until the latter part of the 18th century, it was the responsibility of the local municipalities to initiate an institution of higher education. This was simply establishing local social order. Those communities with a more
advanced order were normally operated by a particular denominational group.

The third reason for the initiating of many private colleges by churches was to spread the influence and convictions of a particular denomination by establishing an institution wherein the youth of that denomination could be trained not only in the arts and sciences but also in the history and polity of the founding church. Of the three original reasons for college founding, the third is the one which has prevailed to modern times and appears to be the rationale for the continued founding of new denominational colleges.

During the 17th, 18th, and first half of the 19th centuries, the public sector had not yet been very involved in starting colleges and universities. By 1800 only three states had sponsored any sort of higher education. Passage of the Morrill Act in 1862 was the first substantial movement toward taxpayer-supported higher education. With the Morrill Act, Congress endowed colleges of agriculture and mechanical arts in various states. At that time, of the 182 permanent colleges or universities in the United States, 160 had been formed by religious denominations (Deitch, 1978b).

Although uncelebrated at the time, the Morrill Act was significant for two major reasons. It broke radically with the historic pattern of liberal education. The new curriculum emphasized the practical branches of knowledge (Silber, 1975). The other major reason for significance was the impetus it gave to the establishment of publicly sponsored colleges in the United States. Since 1862 public colleges have proliferated more rapidly than private colleges,
and yet about 1,500 of America's 3,000 colleges and universities remain under private sponsorship.

Financial Problems

There was a proliferation of private colleges and universities as America moved westward during the first half of the 19th century. The majority of them, however, are no longer in operation. The competition for support from the public sector coupled with the problems associated with the young nation's sputtering economy caused the majority of private colleges and universities founded prior to the Civil War to cease functioning by 1932 (Wicke, 1964).

Many people are not aware of the present financial plight of private schools because of the well-publicized success of the more prominent schools. Although Harvard University has an endowment of $1,491 billion and a gift income of $76 million (J. P. Brakeley, 1981), not all private schools are as heavily endowed. Beyond the holdings of the more prestigious private colleges and universities, are the bulk of institutions which have endowments insufficient to provide sustained financial support.

Private colleges continue to face what seems to be a never-ending struggle for financial survival. They continue to dissolve at a rate twice that of the formation of replacements. The 1980s will not offer much relief for them. Whereas 129 have closed their doors in the decade of the 1970s, the Carnegie Foundation predicts the demise of 300 private colleges and universities during the 1980s. S. J. Trachtenberg (1978), president of the University of Hartford,
attributed the primary cause of such financial dilemmas to the constant inflationary reality of the American economy. "Our costs continue to spiral upward, fueled by inflation and the cost of new academic initiatives. Inflation hurts everyone but its impact is greatest on people and institutions such as ours, whose incomes are relatively fixed" (p. 6).

These schools face many problems in the 1980s. As stated in Chapter I, Hughes (1978) listed the following factors: (a) general economic conditions, (b) increasing inflation, (c) more demand for accountability, (d) changing national and regional enrollment patterns, (e) energy costs, (f) collective bargaining, and (g) a leveling of financial support. John Sawhill (1978), of New York University, reported to the American Council of Life Insurance at its 1978 conference at Princeton University that the following issues would be faced by higher education during the decade of the 1980s:

1. Inflation--Sawhill stated that most academic leaders concur that this is the key fiscal issue in higher education today.

2. Salaries--"Academic compensation is slipping behind the general level of wages and salaries each year by perhaps 1.5 to 2.0%" (p. 3).

3. Diminishing enrollments.

4. Cost of energy--"At New York University the budget for electricity and heating has increased more than 280% since 1972" (p. 4).

5. Cost of compliance with government regulations.

6. Cost of research.
The Comptroller General of the United States in his 1978 Report to Congress ("Problems and Outlook," 1978) stressed the fiscal value of small private liberal arts colleges. He noted that if students attending private schools had to be absorbed by public institutions, the additional cost to states (according to estimates) runs as high as $5 billion annually. He explained that during the mid-1970s many small private liberal arts colleges (a) experienced extensive deficit operation, (b) borrowed substantially to cover current operation deficits, and (c) have been delinquent in debt service payment.

The Comptroller General advised that the problems were due to (a) insufficient revenues attributable primarily to declining enrollments, (b) inflation and rising costs, and (c) a lack of prompt and effective administrative controls. He noted that during the period between 1970 and 1975 the following seven factors contributed to the rising costs:

1. Instructional cost (up 27%).
2. Academic and institutional support costs (up 35%).
3. Operations and maintenance (up 100%).
4. Inflation (83% of college administrators responding to the Comptroller General's survey reported inflation had had an extensive impact on their schools).
5. Student aid (up 60%).
6. Lack of prompt and effective administrative control.
7. Inadequate fund-raising efforts (many schools had no formal fund-raising efforts until the mid-1970s).
Laukhuff (1971) also addressed the problems facing higher education. He listed the following four prime factors: (a) inflation, (b) the campus disruptions of the 1960s, (c) the lack of imagination, and (d) the higher number of students requiring financial assistance.

A major component of increased costs, which caused some increases of up to 15% in the 1979-1980 school year, was the acute energy problems faced not only in the United States but in the whole world. Nearly all universities reported rising energy costs as the major reason for higher student fees, and many have implemented strict fuel-saving plans ("Impact of Painful," 1978).

The Comptroller General reported to the Congress of the United States in 1978 that even though private colleges have been realizing an actual increase in enrollments through 1976, they have been receiving an ever decreasing percentage of college students. Whereas in 1950 private colleges matriculated 50.5% of the nation's 2,282,000 college students, in 1976 they matriculated only 23.2% of the nation's 10,105,000 college students ("Problems and Outlook," 1978).

When demographic trends of a 25% decline in 18-year-olds in the United States, between the present record total of 4.3 million in 1979-1980 and the year 1992 are realized, the financial problems of private colleges may be greatly aggravated. Many of the nation's private colleges and universities presently receive 80% or more of their current operating income from student tuition, room, and board. Continuing decline in enrollments will have serious financial repercussions.
King (1975) drew a gloomy picture of higher education by noting that the problems of energy costs and declining enrollments will be serious without other factors. However, when coupled with a general inflation rate of 7% to 9% per year, construction costs increasing at 15% to 20% per year, increased student financial aid requirements, increases in faculty salary scales, and greater compliance with government regulation, it is not difficult to draw a proper picture of the problems being faced by private and public colleges.

To increase financial flexibility private institutions must use every resource to increase potential revenues from both investments and gift income. With more than six million alumni as potential donors, private colleges must attempt to understand not only why people give to their alma mater, but also what factors are likely to predict which alumni might have the greatest potential for fundraising programs.

Sources of Income

Historically, private colleges have drawn their support from endowment funds, tuition payments, government grants, corporate gifts, foundation grants, auxiliary enterprises, and individuals (National Commission on the Financing of Post-Secondary Education, 1973).

Endowment funds can be a stabilizing force in a college's financial future. The income derived from such funds can offer the institution a form of financial security. Some 500 colleges and universities have endowments exceeding $3 million each. Of these
institutions, half have funds in excess of $10 million. The school with the largest endowment is Harvard, with a total of $1.491 billion (J. P. Brakeley, 1981).

Although 500 colleges and universities have endowments of more than $3 million each, the majority of the nation's colleges (approximately 2,500) have endowments below this figure.

The financial position of some of the 500 institutions with endowments in excess of $3 million gives them more latitude in raising increased endowment funds. "An institution like Harvard or Yale doesn't mind waiting a lifetime for its money, or even a spouse's or child's lifetime, depending on how the gift is worded" ("Tax Break!", 1978, p. 84). Many private colleges do not have the resources to hire personnel to solicit such deferred gifts. These colleges must constantly seek funds beyond tuition merely to meet their current obligations.

A second source of income for private colleges is student tuition. Private colleges have sought to keep pace with the cost of operation by steady increases in tuition. Most colleges and universities appear to be attempting to raise tuition as much as they dare without pricing themselves out of what has become a buyer's market. The average yearly private college tuition in 1979 was $2,970 (not including room and board) compared with public college tuition of $600 ("Private Colleges Cry," 1979). At best tuition will help private colleges retain a parity with current costs. At worst it will offer no help with capital expansion or the building of an adequate endowment fund.
Government aid to private colleges has come by several methods. The federal government is aiding the colleges through its allowance of a gift receipt for contributions to the institution. In addition, the federal government has aided private colleges by allowing the favorable deferred giving plans such as charitable remainder unit trusts (Caswell, 1977) and pooled income funds to be used by the private colleges and their donors.

The federal government also aids private colleges by allowing students of such institutions to receive financial aid through the Pell Grant, the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant, the College Work Study Program, the National Direct Student Loan, and the Federally Insured Student Loan. These programs directly aid the students and not the institutions; however, their favorable impact on the institutions is unquestioned.

State and local governments also offer various financial aid and tuition grant programs to students attending private institutions within the state. The state of California offers a tuition scholarship of up to $3,200 (1981) to qualifying students who wish to attend an accredited private institution. This is designed partially to offset the disparity in tuition rates between public and private schools.

Although government money to the students attending private colleges has had a stabilizing effect, it has not eliminated the overall financial pressures faced by the nation's private colleges. The government grants and loans are designed to aid the individual student and not to underwrite the cost of private education in America.
Foundations and corporations have always displayed an interest and concern for the affairs of the nation's private colleges and universities. They currently provide approximately 40% of the voluntary gifts received by colleges. During the 1979-1980 academic year foundations gave 52.4% more (a total of $350,488,000) to the 41 larger colleges and universities involved in the "Brakeley Report" than they did the previous year. A gift of $105,000,000 to Emory from the Emily and Ernest Woodruff Fund, Inc. is responsible for the majority of the increase over the prior year. Corporate contributions to smaller colleges and universities involved in the report decreased 1.2% to a total of $11,760,000 (J. P. Brakeley, 1981).

The Council for Financial Aid to Education's annual survey entitled Corporate Support of Education 1979 reported that of 972 colleges responding to their survey, 97% of private four-year colleges and 92% of public four-year institutions received some corporate support (Smith, 1980). Corporate support of higher education has grown significantly since 1950. In 1950 corporations gave an estimated $43 million to higher education as opposed to $700 million in 1980-1981. This amount ranks corporate gifts to higher education third in size behind the $2 billion from individual donors and the $850 million from private foundations.

In spite of the growth in the amount of corporate gifts between 1950 and 1980, corporate gifts comprised a smaller part of college receipts in 1980 than in 1950. During the 1950s, the $43 million given to higher education comprised nearly 2% of total institutional expenditures. However, by the start of the 1980s contributions
accounted for only 1.1%. This decline occurred in spite of the fact that corporations were giving .4% of 1980 pre-tax profits to higher education as opposed to .1% in 1950 (Smith, 1980).

Most private colleges and universities derive approximately 12% of their income from what is commonly termed "auxiliary enterprises." This category typically includes receipts from food services, dormitories, bookstore, parking fees, etc. Auxiliary enterprises are designed to be self-supporting sources where the income is fed back to the source. It is one of the more stable areas of income and shows little promise for growth or shrinkage as a percentage of the total.

The final fund source from which private colleges ordinarily receive income is individuals. In a typical year approximately 48% of all voluntary support comes from individuals. This amounted to nearly $2 billion in 1980-1981. This figure can be almost equally divided between friends of private colleges and alumni of the same.

Alumni Giving

Alumni giving is vital to colleges and universities in the United States. Keller (1979) stated that:

In the United States more than in any other country, private schools and the colleges and universities depend for their survival and support on their graduates. Alumni and Alumnae—as they are called—are a critical prop for higher education in America. So, to an unusual extent, American colleges have to woo, inform, and engage their graduates, as well as several adjacent publics such as the parents of present students, political legislators and executives, community groups, and businessmen. (p. 1)

Harvard was the first American college to receive support from its alumni. In 1645 John Buckley and Matthew Day donated a garden
for resident fellows. In 1699 Harvard received its first major cash donation. It was given by William Stoughton and amounted to 1,000 pounds (Stover, 1930).

In 1821 the first formal alumni association was formed. It was called the Society of Alumni and was formed at Williams College. The formation was precipitated by a controversy involving the possibility of campus relocation, the resignation of the president, and a decrease in student enrollment. A concerned group of graduates met to evaluate the condition of the college. Subsequent to this meeting they formed the Society of Alumni. They then helped to appoint a new president and raise $25,000 to build a chapel in his honor (Brubacher & Willis, 1968).

Other alumni organizations soon followed at the University of Virginia (1838), Bowdoin College (1840), Harvard (1840), and Amherst College (1842). Societies were formed first in the East, but by the 1870s they were started in many of the western colleges (University of Colorado, 1872, and University of Minnesota, 1877) (Forman, 1979).

This phenomenon of alumni societies was uniquely American. In Europe with its strong public backing of universities, no need had led to the formation of such societies. As American colleges and universities became increasingly aware of the value of alumni participation, efforts to communicate with them intensified. With the increase in correspondence, club activities, and mailing list updates came the need for individuals to direct alumni programs. University of Michigan hired the first recognized full-time alumni secretary (Caruthers, 1973). Similar positions were soon filled at other
colleges and universities in America, and in 1913 the Association of Alumni Secretaries was formed with the intent of sharing ideas regarding alumni with other members of the association (McKee, 1975). In 1927 the American Alumni Council was formed. It brought into one professional organization the Association of Alumni Secretaries, the Alumni Magazine Associated, and the Association of Alumnae Secretaries (Olmstead, 1931).

The purpose of the American Alumni Association is to provide those associated with alumni affairs insight into methods and procedures to foster traditional programs and to initiate new programs supportive of the alma mater (McKee, 1975). Colleges and universities anticipated that the efforts of the alumni secretaries and alumni clubs would help to increase the funds given annually to the institutions by alumni.

H. J. Johnson of the Council for Financial Aid to Education related that support of higher education must not diminish if the institutions are to meet the continuing financial demands (Johnson, 1967). Johnson noted that not all colleges were approaching vigorously enough their most logical source of gift support, their alumni.

With slightly more than 1.25 million of the 6.75 million alumni involved in the support of their college, leaders of private colleges and universities must be concerned with the motivations which either do or do not cause alumni to become financially involved with their alma mater (King, 1975). The Council for Financial Aid to Education reported that during the 1979-1980 academic year 23.4% of private four-year institution alumni made gifts to their alma mater. The
average gift was $111.51. Public four-year institutions received
gifts averaging $72.98 from 12.2% of their alumni. Two-year institu-
tions received gifts from 8.6% of their alumni averaging $55.84 ("How

College administrators must grapple with the reason the majority of
their alumni have not given to their colleges. Each institution
should know both characteristics of its own alumni and characteris-
tics of givers in general. With a more thorough understanding of a
college's alumni, administrators would be better equipped to approach
their alumni for fund support. J. G. Johnson (1979) reflected on the
value of alumni support when he commented that devastation would come
if alumni stopped giving.

Gegoll (1979) suggested that, based on the results of a study of
Texas Christian University, alumni giving should start early. The
study suggested that alumni who gave as early as their senior year
proved to be good supporters years later.

Thompson (1979) contended that innovation be emphasized when
structuring an alumni fund-raising program. A better understanding
of alumni could help administrators develop programs which appeal to
alumni. Meyer (1979) stated that volunteer involvement was the key
to increased individual giving. He suggested (a) clarifying the
volunteers' role and responsibilities, (b) cultivating volunteers,
(c) knowing the volunteers and their interests, (d) scheduling post-
campaign volunteer activities, and (e) using volunteers later (after
the campaign).
A study by Gottlieb (1979) indicated that alumni should be encouraged to make gifts right after graduation. She showed that with little encouragement less than 10% of alumni give by their sixth year after graduation. With her program of early encouragement 45.6% of alumni gave by their sixth year.

Related Research

Studies have been conducted to determine if there are variables (alumni characteristics) which influence whether or not alumni became financial supporters. Ten surveys were examined for their relationship to this study.

In 1966 Broms and Davis conducted a survey of University of Colorado alumni. They attempted to discover whether there were significant characteristic differences between donors and non donors. Questions were asked on the mailed questionnaire regarding 23 alumni characteristics. Donors included alumni who had given for at least 6 or more years consecutively. Nondonors were alumni who had never given. The study used the chi-square test of significance at both the .10 and .05 levels. The working sample of 332 individuals consisted of 131 donors and 201 nondonors. The research indicated that the following characteristics were predictive of donors: (a) higher income, (b) older, (c) more active as an undergraduate, (d) involved in alumni affairs, and (e) a frequent attender of athletic events since graduation.

In 1968 Simpson and Hirsch conducted a survey of 1,000 Stanford University alumni. They also sought to discover characteristics
predictive of alumni donors. The research indicated that donors could be predicted by the following characteristics: (a) a male, (b) holder of a graduate degree, (c) involved in alumni affairs, and (d) self-employed.

Caruthers conducted in 1973 a survey of Oklahoma State University alumni to determine if financially supportive and financially nonsupportive alumni differed in five major categories of characteristics. She examined 28 characteristics related to (a) academic experiences, (b) student experiences, (c) alumni support, (d) personal data, and (e) alumni attitudes. One hundred donors and 125 non donor were randomly selected and mailed questionnaires. Non donors were alumni with no history of giving. Donors were taken from the list of 9,783 individuals that had made some form of gift to the university. The chi-square test of significance was used. A probability level of .05 was employed. Caruthers's (1973) research indicated that the following characteristics were significantly predictive of donors: (a) graduates of business administration, (b) graduates of agriculture, (c) graduates of engineering, (d) involved in alumni affairs, (e) had two or three children, (f) lived 51 to 100 miles, or more than 500 miles from campus, (g) gave because they wanted to help, and (h) had been satisfied with their college experience.

The Caruthers (1973) dissertation proved helpful in developing this study. Both the method of gathering and tabulating data and the structure of the report were helpful.
In 1974 Blumenfeld and Sartain reported the findings of a study which questioned 109 alumni donors and 109 nondonors regarding 22 characteristics. They attempted to isolate predictors of support and nonsupport. They found the following characteristics were significantly predictive of donor alumni: (a) males, (b) business graduates, (c) economics majors, (d) graduates with baccalaureate degrees, and (e) either high or low grade point averages.

McKee completed a study in 1975 which analyzed the characteristics and opinions of Indiana State University alumni. He sought to determine the relationship of characteristics and opinions of selected alumni regarding support of Indiana State University. He mailed questionnaires to 1,415 alumni. Three hundred and thirty-two questionnaires were properly completed and returned. The chi-square test was used to test significance. Test scores were considered to indicate a difference when the significance factor was less than .05. He found the following characteristics were significantly predictive of donor alumni: (a) lived in the same county as the university, (b) had a baccalaureate degree, (c) were involved vocationally in education, and (d) were involved in alumni affairs.

In 1975 the Institute of Social Research completed a report of University of Michigan alumni. The research found that alumni with children were predictively better donors than alumni with no children.

McNulty completed a report in 1976 of Loyola University of Chicago alumni. He sought to determine if there were characteristics which significantly predicted donors or nondonors. He twice mailed
questionnaires to 1,018 alumni. Four hundred and forty-eight properly completed the forced response questionnaire. McNulty (1976) also attempted to determine if later charitable support was influenced by membership in college student personnel service sponsored activities and if either donors or nondonors had made greater use of college student personnel sponsored services while an undergraduate. McNulty used chi-square procedures to test the null hypotheses in the study. The first test of chi-square was on contingency tables with two rows and more than two columns. The second procedure was an adjusted continuity correction to chi-square where the data yielded two rows and two columns. McNulty considered findings significant when the chi-square test result was at or below the .05 level of probability.

McNulty (1976) concluded from his research that alumni who were members of an alumni organization were also alumni who support Loyola financially. In addition to this general statement, McNulty found the following characteristics to be predictive of alumni financial support: (a) graduates of the business college, (b) involved in alumni affairs, (c) demonstrated a "religious" preference, (d) employment arranged through the university placement facility, and (e) family incomes of $30,000 to $50,000 per year.

In 1978 Markoff completed a survey of University of Toledo alumni. His primary purpose was to analyze whether differences existed between alumni who made financial contributions to the University of Toledo and those who did not. A questionnaire was mailed to 640 alumni (320 contributors and 320 noncontributors).
A follow-up questionnaire was mailed 27 days later. Follow-up telephone calls were made to nonrespondents. Two months after the original mailing, 361 or 59.7% of the questionnaires had been returned. Markoff's (1978) study revealed that contributors were more likely to give gifts to voluntary organizations than noncontributors. Other forms of participation in voluntary organizations, such as membership, attendance, member of committees, and office holder, were not predictive of contributors.

In 1978 Blakely concluded a national survey for the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education which tested the axiom "active students tend to become active alumni." The study compared an individual's level of involvement while a student with his or her financial support of the alma mater. Blakely (1978) concluded from the study that an individual's record of student participation should not be relied upon too heavily in predicting alumni participation. Blakely stated that college administrators should look elsewhere for predictive characteristics.

McKinney, Williams, and Goodwin conducted a study in 1979 which examined attitudes of donors to the University of Miami. They sought to identify attitudinal characteristics predictive of the size of a donor's gift. They concluded that donors making what the researchers termed major gifts to the University of Miami considered themselves different from other supporters for two prime reasons: (a) they viewed themselves as more generous than others and (b) they considered themselves less influenced by outside forces (stock market, economy, emergency appeals, awards, plaques, and public recognition).
when deciding to give to the University of Miami.

Each of the researchers studied a private or public university to seek predictive characteristics of alumni donors or nondonors. This report took a similar approach with a small private college. A summary of the results of each of the studies cited appears in Table 30.

Summary

Colleges and universities in America continue to face serious financial pressures. Historically they found support from endowment funds, tuition payments, government grants, corporate gifts, foundation grants, auxiliary enterprises, and individuals. Efforts must be made to increase the revenue from each source if colleges and universities are to maintain programs. This applies to private as well as public colleges and universities.

Private colleges and universities have played an important role in the development of the nation's system of higher education. But today these institutions are in trouble. During the tumultuous 1960s financial problems which had plagued private colleges through more than three centuries intensified. Rapid growth was spurred by a post-Sputnik enthusiasm for higher education, the fruits of the post-World War II "baby boom," and Vietnam era student deferments. Many private as well as public colleges and universities had significantly increased their programs and facilities in response to growing need. Many of them now face the possibility of only partially filled facilities and programs as the decade of the 1980s brings a smaller group
of college age students. When coupled with continuing inflation, a
generally weak national economy, cost of government compliance,
energy cost, and a leveling of financial support, private and public
institutions must seek to fully understand and cultivate all possible
sources of revenue.

With the nation facing the prospect of less enrollment in the
1980s and 1990s, leaders of private colleges and universities must
thoroughly understand and utilize those groups which have historic­
cally supported them. These leaders must know their alumni and how
to motivate the approximately 20% who are donors to increase their
contributions while at the same time motivating the presently in­
active 80% to get financially involved. A thorough understanding is
needed of individual donors and nondonors regarding their present
circumstances and college experiences. The financial need of private
higher education is too pressing to merely speculate regarding rela­
tionships between alumni characteristics and financial support. The
following chapter will outline how this study will attempt to show
that some relationships do exist. It will also summarize the statis­
tical methods used in similar studies of alumni characteristics.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine if any or all of the alumni characteristics listed in Chapter I were related to whether an alumnus of Los Angeles Baptist College is a donor or nondonor (as defined in Chapter I).

Description of the Sample

Los Angeles Baptist College is a private liberal arts college which is fully accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Founded in 1927, Los Angeles Baptist College began as a small unaccredited institution with the primary purpose of preparing men for the pastorate. Until the 1970s the college experienced little if any growth. When the college moved to its present campus in 1961, it was still unaccredited with a student body numbering only 50.

Now located in the Santa Clarita Valley north of Los Angeles, the college began to experience substantial growth in the early 1970s. During the past 6 years, three forces were largely responsible for the growth to its present level of 400: (a) the addition of 11 majors to complement the previous Bible major, (b) the receipt of full accreditation from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.
Colleges, and (c) the rapid growth in population of the greater Los Angeles area.

In spite of its more than 50 years of operation, Los Angeles Baptist College has a relatively small group of alumni numbering 1,397 individuals. This number includes all individuals on record who have completed at least one semester of attendance at the school. The complete list of alumni has been kept and updated by the Office of the Academic Dean. Los Angeles Baptist College received $12,038 from its alumni even though the total 1980-81 budget was $1,817,111.

Of the 1,397 alumni, 236 are presently considered to be supporting alumni inasmuch as they have made at least one financial contribution to the school in the past 5 years, 1974 through 1979. The other alumni made no financial contributions during a similar period. These data were found through a search of the official postings of the school's business office which has records of all donations for the past 5 years. Each donor is designated as either a friend or alumnus of Los Angeles Baptist College on the official giving record. In addition to the 236 alumni are 650 friends of the college who have given gifts during the past 5 years.

This study was designed to be limited to the alumni of Los Angeles Baptist College. Data were gathered by sending a questionnaire to each of the 1,397 alumni. The relatively small number of alumni allowed the researcher to follow this course. It was determined that a sufficient amount of responses would be returned if alumni not responding to the first mailing were sent a second questionnaire.
This study was limited to alumni of Los Angeles Baptist College and thus the findings are a reflection of the college alumni. In light of Los Angeles Baptist College's narrow curriculum offering (primarily Bible until the 1970s) results should not be indiscriminately applied to alumni of other private colleges and universities.

Development of the Instrument

Various researchers have developed questionnaires to gather information regarding alumni characteristics. McKee (1975) developed a 49-item forced answer opinion survey for alumni of Indiana State University. The survey contained instructions for the alumni to circle the response to each statement which most appropriately expressed their feeling. Five responses were listed for each statement. They were: (a) "SA" for strongly agree, (b) "A" for agree, (c) "D" for disagree, (d) "SD" for strongly disagree, and (e) "U" for undecided. Although some of the 49 items were similar to the 28 characteristics the researcher was interested in, the majority were not. All of the questions necessitated one of five answers and did not allow for the open ended answers used in part of this study.

McNulty (1976) developed a questionnaire when he studied alumni of Loyola University of Chicago. The questionnaire had many of the ingredients of the instrument used in this research. It contained questions calling for forced answers as well as open ended answers. It also gathered information relating to present and collegiate alumni characteristics. The questionnaire was not appropriate for this study, however, because it failed to raise questions regarding
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precollege experiences and extracurricular involvement. In addition, it was not sufficiently detailed for this study regarding present circumstances and attitudes.

The questionnaire by Caruthers (1973) was very similar to the final instrument employed in this research. It solicited both objective and subjective answers from alumni. Although some of the questions on the questionnaire were similar to those used in this study, differences also existed. Ten of Caruther's 28 questions dealt with an area of alumni support which was not used in this research. In addition, this research probed areas that were either ignored (precollege circumstances and financial factors) by Caruthers or not explored in as much depth (present circumstances and attitudes) as in this study.

The study by Markoff (1978) differed significantly from this questionnaire in both its purpose and content. It asked alumni to expand on their involvement in various voluntary organizations (i.e., veterans, health, civic, political, etc.). This information was then compared with whether they were donors or nondonors to see if participation in certain types of voluntary organizations was predictive of alumni financial support.

The Filer (1975) Commission used the Survey Research Center of the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan. Personal interviews were conducted by the staff of the institute. Simpson and Hirsch (1968) used a mailed questionnaire. Broms and Davis (1966) also employed this method to gather their data.
It was determined that in order to gather the data necessary for the study, an instrument was needed exclusively for this purpose. Harty (1979) stated the value of designing a questionnaire for a specific research situation:

Each survey situation calling for a questionnaire is unique. The design of a questionnaire must be tailored to fit the individual circumstances of the survey setting. It is nice to have an existing questionnaire fit into a survey but don't force it. (p. 48)

After a rough draft of the questionnaire had been prepared by the researcher, he was approached by the academic dean about the possibility of using the results of the questionnaire to aid the college in preparing an alumni survey. Having received accreditation by the regional accrediting association (viz., Western Association of Schools and Colleges) 5 years prior, Los Angeles Baptist College was to receive its standard 5-year review during the month of October 1979. The preliminary instructions of the accrediting association requested an alumni survey. The academic dean believed that the researcher's questionnaire would provide the information needed if four additional questions were included. Although questions 17 through 20 therefore were added, they were not analyzed by the researcher. They were included to assist the academic dean's office in securing information for the accrediting review.

After examining other questionnaires such as the one by Caruthers (1973), the researcher attempted to emulate what was considered their best aspects. Attention was given to asking questions in a manner which allowed for multiple choice answers or a narrow range of subjective answers. The narrow range allowed for easier
analysis with the chi-square test. Pride (1979) stated that using structured or fixed-choice questions not only saves the respondents' time, but also allows for easier analysis of the results. An effort was made to keep the instrument succinct to avoid discouraging alumni from failing to answer because of questionnaire length. Pride (1979) noted that as a general rule, one should not design questionnaires which are more than two pages in length. His tests indicated that a two-page questionnaire can produce a 15% increase in response over a four-page questionnaire. The questionnaire was given to three administrators at Los Angeles Baptist College. They were asked for their input regarding the ease with which they answered the instrument. Questions were eliminated that caused confusion on the part of the respondent.

The questionnaire was designed to gather data regarding five areas of alumni characteristics. The questions were not listed in categories on the instrument, however. It was determined that categorizing the questions would not provide any benefits for the responding alumni.

The first of these categories was academic achievement. Included in this area were cumulative grade point averages, membership in honor societies, major course of study, years of attendance, and additional training received.

In the second category financial factors were requested. This category included information about the source of funds while in attendance, the amount of money borrowed while at Los Angeles Baptist College, the type of government aid received, and current household
income.

In the third category the student's involvement in extracurricular activities was investigated. These questions asked about membership in student government, athletic involvement, type of housing while a student, and social discipline.

The fourth category was the present circumstances and attitudes of each alumnus sampled. Data were obtained regarding marital situation, location of domicile, number of years since matriculation, present involvement in alumni affairs, occupation, current opinions regarding the school, opinion of training received, children now or ever enrolled, spouse an alumnus, number of children, and vocational satisfaction.

The fifth and final category was the precollege circumstances of the alumni. Information was sought regarding their father's occupation, high school academic performance, and high school involvement in extracurricular activities.

After the final questionnaire was prepared, a cover letter was written. The letter outlined the purpose of the study and attempted to assure respondents that all responses would be treated in a confidential manner. The letter told the alumni that the number on their questionnaires was for follow-up purposes and would in no way infringe on confidentiality. Each alumnus was informed in the letter that once his or her response was received, the number on the upper right corner would be removed from the questionnaire. At that point no method of tracing would be available. The letter was signed by the academic dean as well as by the researcher. Pride (1979) wrote
that the cover letter should (a) clearly state the purpose of the survey and (b) stress how the survey will help their (alumni's) organization better serve them.

Included with each questionnaire was a postage-prepaid return envelope bearing the name and address of the college. The package was mailed on February 8, 1980, in an envelope bearing the official letterhead of the college.

Twenty-one calendar days after the first mailing, a second mailing was sent to those who had not yet responded to the first appeal. The second letter expressed the importance of the study and contained another questionnaire. It asked the recipient to disregard the letter and questionnaire if the initial questionnaire had already been mailed. The 21-day delay period proved to the researcher to be an effective length to wait prior to the mailing of the follow-up letter and questionnaire.

Thirty-eight calendar days after the mailing of the second questionnaire compilation of the data began. This period was needed to accommodate the steady flow of responses. The final deadline for receiving questionnaires was April 7, 1980, 59 days after the first mailing. As of that day 752 alumni (54%) had responded.

Statistical Treatment

Data Analysis

The purpose of the research was to determine if differences existed between individuals who had and those who had not donated to
their alma mater during the previous years. To accomplish this, it was determined to compile data sufficient to indicate that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) depended on one or more alumni characteristics (independent variable). Other studies had analyzed data similar in type to those gathered in this study. The chi-square statistical procedure was generally used in the analysis process.

McNulty (1976) used two chi-square procedures to test the null hypotheses in his study. The first test of chi-square was on contingency tables with two rows and more than two columns. The second procedure was an adjusted continuity correction to chi-square where the data yielded two rows and two columns. McNulty considered findings significant when the chi-square test result was significant at or below the .05 level.

McKee (1975) also used the chi-square test to determine significance. Test scores were considered to indicate a significant difference when the significance factor was less than .05.

Caruthers (1973), like McNulty (1976) and McKee (1975), chose to use the chi-square test to analyze data. A probability level of .05 was used to determine the significance of responses.

Two methods of analysis were used to examine the raw data in this study. The first method was the chi-square test for data yielding a contingency table with two rows and more than two columns. One of the two variables was nominal-dichotomous while the other was nominal and more than dichotomous. An example of such a situation was Question 1 which yielded two variables. The first (dependent)
variable was whether the respondent was a donor or nondonor. The second (independent) variable related to the marital status of the alumnus filling out the questionnaire. The individuals chose one of five possible answers: (a) married, (b) single, (c) divorced, (d) widow, or (e) widower. To facilitate the implementation of the chi-square test a chart similar to the following was used for each question involved in the test. The cells contained the frequency of each of the contingencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Divorced</th>
<th>Widow</th>
<th>Widower</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The formula used to determine the chi-square was:

$$\chi^2 = \Sigma \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}.$$  

The symbols were defined as: $\chi^2 = \text{chi-square}; \Sigma = \text{sum of}; O = \text{observed frequencies};$ and $E = \text{expected frequencies}$. Expected frequencies for each category were determined by the formula of:

$$E = \frac{(\Sigma K_f) (\Sigma R_f)}{N}.$$  

The symbols were defined as: $E = \text{expected frequency}; \Sigma K_f = \text{sum of column frequencies}; \Sigma R_f = \text{sum of row frequencies};$ and $N = \text{total number responding}$. After chi-square and degrees of freedom had been calculated, the results were used to determine if the chi-square was
significant at the .05 level as listed on a standard chi-square table. Degrees of freedom were determined through the formula, 
\[ df = (K - 1) (R - 1), \]
wherein \( K \) represents columns and \( R \) represents rows.

The chi-square test was used with questions 1, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 31, and 32.

A second method used to show relationship between variables was an adjusted chi-square test of significance where both variables are dichotomous. A fourfold contingency table was developed similar to the one used in the previous chi-square test but having two dichotomous variables. A sample table displaying a "yes" or "no" question dealing with whether or not the children of an alumnus have attended Los Angeles Baptist College would look like the following. Once again, cells contained the frequency of each contingency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have children attended Los Angeles Baptist College?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The formula used to determine the chi-square is:

\[
\chi^2 = \frac{Y[(A\cdot D) - (B\cdot C) - (Y \div 2)]^2}{(A + B) (C + D) (A + C) (B + D)}.
\]

The symbols are defined as: \( \chi^2 = \) chi-square; \( Y = \) total number of respondents; \( A = \) upper left square; \( B = \) upper right square; \( C = \) lower left square; and \( D = \) lower right square. After the chi-square
was determined, it was compared to a standard chi-table at 1 degree of freedom to determine if it was significant at the .05 level.

**Review of the Hypotheses**

The Los Angeles Baptist College Alumni Survey was used to gather the data for each of the 28 alumni characteristics being used to test the 28 null hypotheses. The chi-square test was used to determine whether a dependent relationship existed between the characteristics tested and an alumnus' donating habits. Two types of chi-square tests were employed. The first involved the chi-square test of significance for data involving two variables, one of which was nominal-dichotomous and the other of which was nominal and more than dichotomous. The second chi-square test was for data involving two variables, both of which were nominal-dichotomous. In both tests the criterion used to predict significance was the .05 level as recorded in the standard chi-square tables.

Following are the five categories with the appropriate alumni characteristics.

**Academic achievement.** Five of the 28 alumni characteristics addressed academic factors relating to alumni. It was proposed that whether an alumnus does or does not support Los Angeles Baptist College was dependent upon one or all of the following variables: Los Angeles Baptist College grade point average, number of years enrolled at the college, major course of study at the college, additional training received, and membership in an academic honor society.
Financial factors. Four of the 28 alumni characteristics addressed financial factors relating to alumni. It was proposed that whether an alumnus did or did not support Los Angeles Baptist College was dependent upon one or all of the following variables: total household income, source of funds for college, amount of money borrowed for college, and type of government aid received while at Los Angeles Baptist College.

Extracurricular involvement. Four of the 28 alumni characteristics addressed factors relating to the extracurricular involvement of alumni while students at Los Angeles Baptist College. It was proposed that whether an alumnus supported the college was dependent upon one or all of the following variables: involvement in student government, athletic involvement, type of student housing, and frequency of social discipline.

Present circumstances and attitudes. Twelve of the 28 alumni characteristics addressed the alumni's present circumstances and attitudes. It was proposed that whether an alumnus supported Los Angeles Baptist College was dependent upon one or all of the following variables: marital status, whether the alumnus was married to another Los Angeles Baptist College alumnus, number of children, whether children were presently enrolled at the college, whether children had been enrolled at the college, distance of domicile from campus, number of years since last enrolled, current vocation, vocational satisfaction, involvement in alumni association, helpfulness of training for present vocation, and present opinion of the college.
Precollege circumstances. Three of the 28 alumni characteristics addressed precollege circumstances. It was proposed that whether an alumnus supported Los Angeles Baptist College was dependent upon one or all of the following: father's vocation during alumnus' senior year in high school, high school grade point average, and involvement in high school extracurricular activities.

Summary

Chapter III is concerned primarily with the statistical methods used to develop the research. The fourth chapter contains an application of these methods to the data derived from the questionnaire. The final chapter, Chapter V, summarizes the findings and presents conclusions and recommendations based on the findings.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

Chapter IV presents the results of each of the 28 hypotheses presented in the first chapter. The data were collected from the previously described Los Angeles Baptist College Alumni Survey. The chi-square test was used to test each hypothesis to determine whether one of the two variables was indicated as being significantly dependent upon the other. The .05 level of confidence was used.

Review of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine if a difference existed between Los Angeles Baptist College alumni who had supported their alma mater and alumni who had not supported their alma mater. Twenty-eight null hypotheses were presented which stated a dependent relationship would not be indicated between two variables. This type of information could be important for private colleges attempting to raise support from their alumni to help offset the rising costs of higher education.

Other researchers had done similar studies of characteristics of alumni of private and public universities. Their findings are compared in Chapter V with the findings of this study.
Analysis of Collected Data

Academic Achievement

The first of the following five sections presents an analysis of factors pertaining to academic achievement while at Los Angeles Baptist College. It was determined that it was appropriate to delineate which if any of the five affects the dependent variable (donor or nondonor).

1a. Los Angeles Baptist College grade point average. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as their individual grade point averages while a student at the college. Null Hypothesis 1a stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not depend on their Los Angeles Baptist College grade point average (independent variable). Table 1 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 2.05 which fails to indicate significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Although the chi-square results called for nonrejection of the null hypothesis, a minor trend did emerge which showed alumni with higher grade point averages giving in greater percentage than alumni with lower grade point averages. The percentage of donors escalated from 21.5% for "C" to 23.4% for "B" to 27.4% for "A." However, the trend was not strong enough to support the existence of the relationship proposed by the researcher.
Table 1

Los Angeles Baptist College Grade Point Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>2.00-2.64</th>
<th>2.65-3.34</th>
<th>3.35-4.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>21.5% (29)</td>
<td>23.4% (69)</td>
<td>27.4% (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>78.5% (106)</td>
<td>76.6% (226)</td>
<td>72.6% (156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0% (135)</td>
<td>100.0% (295)</td>
<td>100.0% (215)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 2.05; df = 2; p > .05.

1b. Member of academic honor society. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as their membership in an academic honor society while a student at Los Angeles Baptist College. Null Hypothesis 1b stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not depend on whether or not they belonged to one of the school's honor societies (independent variable). Table 2 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 3.00 which failed to indicate significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

The resulting chi-square failed to indicate a dependent relationship. Those alumni who did belong to a Los Angeles Baptist College honor society tended to be less represented as donors than those who did not belong to such an organization.
Table 2
Member of Academic Honor Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>14.7% (15)</td>
<td>25.3% (153)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>85.3% (87)</td>
<td>74.7% (452)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0% (102)</td>
<td>100.0% (605)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 3.00; df = 1; p > .05.

lc. Years enrolled at Los Angeles Baptist College. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as the number of years they were enrolled as students at the college. Null Hypothesis lc stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not depend on the number of years enrolled as a Los Angeles Baptist College student (independent variable). Table 3 indicates the responses of the alumni. The application of the chi-square test yielded a figure of 25.80 which indicates significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Alumni spending 4 or more years at the school appear as donors at a much higher frequency than those spending less than 4 years. The category yielding the greatest percentage of donors (55.2%) included those who had spent at least 5 years in matriculation. The lowest percentage belonged to students spending 2 years at the
Table 3
Years Enrolled at Los Angeles Baptist College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(38)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(148)</td>
<td>(145)</td>
<td>(79)</td>
<td>(145)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(186)</td>
<td>(173)</td>
<td>(101)</td>
<td>(206)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 25.80; df = 4; p < .05.

1d. Major course of study. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as their major course of study while a Los Angeles Baptist College student. Null Hypothesis 1d stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not depend on their major while at Los Angeles Baptist College (independent variable). Table 4 indicates the responses of the alumni. The application of the chi-square test yielded a figure of 26.88 which indicates significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Alumni majoring in history and English were observed to be donors more often (38.5% and 38.2%, respectively) than alumni with other majors. General education, music, and business students...
Table 4

Major Course of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Bible</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Christian Education</th>
<th>General Education</th>
<th>Physical Education</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(161)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
<td>(72)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(217)</td>
<td>(78)</td>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>(84)</td>
<td>(36)</td>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>(29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 26.88; df = 8; p < .05.
appeared as nondonors significantly more than alumni with other majors (85.7%, 85.2%, and 89.7%, respectively).

Ie. Additional training received. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as the type, if any, of training received after leaving Los Angeles Baptist College. Null Hypothesis Ie stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not depend on the nature of post-Los Angeles Baptist College training (independent variable). Table 5 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 7.0 which indicates significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Training Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 7.01; df = 2; p < .05.

Alumni who received additional undergraduate work had a lower percentage of donors (20%) in their ranks than alumni receiving no additional training (26.2%) or alumni receiving graduate training.
(30.8%). Since Los Angeles Baptist College offers no graduate programs, all those alumni indicating such training received it at some other institution.

Financial Factors

This second of five sections presents an analysis of financial factors of Los Angeles Baptist College alumni. It was determined that it was desirable to delineate which if any of the financial factors affected the dependent variable (whether donor or nondonor).

2a. Type of government aid received while at Los Angeles Baptist College. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as the type of government aid they received while enrolled at Los Angeles Baptist College. Null Hypothesis 2a stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not be determined by the type of government aid they received (independent variable). Table 6 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 7.90 which indicates significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The category which indicated the greatest percentage of donors was "loans" (25.5%). The category which demonstrated by far the lowest percentage included alumni who received the California State Scholarship (.0%). Between the two was "grants" (20.5%).

Of the alumni responding to this question 323 (65 donors and 258 nondonors) indicated receiving no government aid while at Los
Angeles Baptist College. This hypothesis dealt only with those who received government aid; therefore the 323 nonrecipients were omitted from the calculations used to determine if the null hypothesis could be rejected.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Government Aid Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 7.90; df = 2; p < .05.

2b. Source of funds for Los Angeles Baptist College education.

It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as their source of funds to finance their education at Los Angeles Baptist College. Null Hypothesis 2b stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not be determined by their source of funds while at the college (independent variable). Table 7 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 6.06 which failed to indicate significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Savings</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Personal Employment</th>
<th>Scholarship</th>
<th>Loans</th>
<th>Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>25.0% (7)</td>
<td>25.3% (44)</td>
<td>28.6% (55)</td>
<td>11.4% (5)</td>
<td>24.4% (19)</td>
<td>21.1% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>75.0% (21)</td>
<td>74.7% (130)</td>
<td>71.4% (137)</td>
<td>88.6% (39)</td>
<td>75.6% (59)</td>
<td>78.9% (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0% (28)</td>
<td>100.0% (174)</td>
<td>100.0% (192)</td>
<td>100.0% (44)</td>
<td>100.0% (78)</td>
<td>100.0% (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes.** Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 6.06; df = 5; p > .05.
It should be noted that 31 alumni (10 donors and 21 nondonors) indicated a wide variety of sources. Due to their diversity they were omitted so as not to invalidate the chi-square test with numerous low expected frequencies. Likewise, it should be noted that although the questionnaire asked for the primary source of funds, 22.7% of the alumni (14.8% of donors and 25.8% of nondonors) indicated more than one. The responses of these alumni were omitted from the calculation of the chi-square score.

Alumni who used personal employment as their principle method of financing were the most supportive (28.6%); however, no strong pattern was demonstrated.

2c. Money borrowed for college. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as the amount of money they borrowed to finance their education at Los Angeles Baptist College. Null Hypothesis 2c stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not be determined by the amount of money they borrowed while students at Los Angeles Baptist College (independent variable). Table 8 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 2.92 which failed to indicate significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Five categories were formed for the alumni responses. The first category represented those who borrowed nothing. The next three categories represented intervals of approximately $1,000 each. The final category represented those who had borrowed anything in excess.
Table 8
Money Borrowed for College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>$1-$1,000</th>
<th>$1,001-$2,000</th>
<th>$2,001-$3,000</th>
<th>$3,001+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(92)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(284)</td>
<td>(91)</td>
<td>(67)</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>(44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(376)</td>
<td>(114)</td>
<td>(89)</td>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>(54)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 2.92; df = 4; p > .05.

No significant trend developed in the five categories. Although the percentage of donors was fairly consistent throughout (24.5%, 20.2%, 24.7%, 28.8%, and 18.5%), the lowest percentage of donors appeared in the category representing the highest amount borrowed ($3,001+ = 18.5%). Sixteen percent of the alumni (18.8% of donors and 15.2% of nondonors) indicated multiple answers to this question. Their responses were omitted in the calculation of the chi-square.

2d. Total household income. It was hypothesized a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as the present household income. Null Hypothesis 2d stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not be determined by
the current amount of household income (independent variable). Table 9 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 24.88 which indicates significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Household Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,501-$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,001-$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Donor 13.6% (12) 15.2% (34) 28.2% (82) 36.1% (30)
Nondonor 86.4% (76) 84.8% (189) 71.8% (209) 63.9% (53)
Total 100.0% (88) 100.0% (223) 100.0% (291) 100.0% (83)

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 24.88; df = 3; p < .05.

Alumni with incomes in the two higher categories were more supportive ($15,001-$30,000 = 28.2% and $30,001+ = 36.1%) than alumni in the two lower categories (0-$7,500 = 13.6% and $7,501-$15,000 = 15.2%). The percentage of donors increased with each category.

Alumni indicating incomes of (a) $30,001-$50,000, (b) $50,001-$100,000, and (c) over $100,000 were combined due to the small number of alumni in the categories.
Extracurricular Involvement

The third of the five sections presents an analysis of factors pertaining to extracurricular involvement while students at Los Angeles Baptist College. It was determined that it was appropriate to delineate which if any of previous extracurricular involvements affects the dependent variable (whether donor or non donor).

3a. Involvement in student government. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and non donor alumni as far as the amount of involvement in student government while students at Los Angeles Baptist College. Null Hypothesis 3a stated that whether alumni were donors or non donors (dependent variable) would not depend on their degree of involvement in student government (independent variable). Table 10 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 12.84 which indicated significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Alumni indicating an active or extremely active involvement in Los Angeles Baptist College student government were more financially supportive of the college (35.1% and 27.5%, respectively) than those indicating only occasional or no involvement (16.5% and 19.4%, respectively).
Table 10
Involvement in Student Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Extremely Active</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Occasionally Active</th>
<th>Not at All Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>27.5% (14)</td>
<td>35.1% (33)</td>
<td>16.5% (27)</td>
<td>19.4% (76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>72.5% (37)</td>
<td>64.9% (61)</td>
<td>83.5% (117)</td>
<td>80.6% (316)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0% (51)</td>
<td>100.0% (94)</td>
<td>100.0% (144)</td>
<td>100.0% (392)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 12.84; df = 3; p < .05.

3b. Athletic involvement. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as their athletic involvement while students at Los Angeles Baptist College. Null Hypothesis 3b stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not be determined by their type of athletic involvement while a student (independent variable). Table 11 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 19.10 which indicates significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Alumni involved in intercollegiate athletics were the most supportive group (36.8%). Alumni who had no Los Angeles Baptist College athletic involvement were the second most supportive group (25.6%). Alumni participating in intramural programs, on the other hand, were represented by only 12.7% of donors—a much lower percentage than the other two categories. Although the researcher asked for the type of
athletic involvement while a student was at the college, 10.6% of the alumni (8.3% of nondonors) indicated multiple responses. Their answers were omitted from the calculation of chi-square.

Table 11
Athletic Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Intramural</th>
<th>Inter-collegiate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>25.6% (103)</td>
<td>12.7% (17)</td>
<td>36.8% (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>74.4% (300)</td>
<td>87.3% (117)</td>
<td>63.2% (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0% (403)</td>
<td>100.0% (134)</td>
<td>100.0% (95)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 19.10, df = 2, p < .05.

3c. Type of housing while a student. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as the type of housing they used while students at Los Angeles Baptist College. Null Hypothesis 3c stated that whether alumni are donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not depend on the primary type of housing they used while students at the college (independent variable). Table 12 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 1.03 which fails to indicate significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Alumni indicating various forms of housing were nearly equal regarding the percentage of donors in each category. The category
recording the lowest percentage of donors was that group which lived in the dormitories. It should be noted that although the questionnaire asked for the type of housing primarily used while a student 6.2% of the alumni (6.7% of donors and 6.0% of nondonors) indicated multiple responses. Their answers were omitted from the calculation of the chi-square.

**Table 12**

Type of Housing While a Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Dormitory</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Off-Campus Apartment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes.** Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 1.03; df = 2; p > .05.

**3d. Frequency of social discipline.** It was determined that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as the frequency of social discipline received while students at Los Angeles Baptist College. Null Hypothesis 3d stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not be determined by the frequency of social discipline they received while students (independent variable). Table 13 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of .18 which failed to
indicate significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 13
Frequency of Social Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Occasionally or Often</th>
<th>Seldom or Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>20.6% (13)</td>
<td>23.9% (156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>79.4% (50)</td>
<td>76.1% (498)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0% (63)</td>
<td>100.0% (654)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = .18; df = 1; p > .05.

Although the alumni had four possible answers to this question, the researcher combined the answers into two categories to aid in the chi-square test by avoiding relatively small numbers of responses. Answers "a" and "b" indicated a frequent degree of discipline.

No dependence emerged between the two variables. When considering the two response categories, alumni with a higher frequency of discipline did prove to be somewhat less supportive (20.6%) than alumni receiving little or no discipline (23.9%); however, the difference was slight.
Present Circumstances and Attitudes

The fourth of the five sections presents an analysis of factors pertaining to present circumstances and attitudes of Los Angeles Baptist College alumni. It was determined that it was desirable to delineate which if any of these characteristics affects the dependent variable (donor or nondonor).

4a. Distance from campus. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as the distance they lived from the Los Angeles Baptist College campus. Null Hypothesis 4a stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not depend on the distance they lived from the campus (independent variable). Table 14 shows the response of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 6.76 which did not indicate significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 14
Distance From Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>0-50</th>
<th>51-500</th>
<th>501-1,000</th>
<th>1,001+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>21.7% (40)</td>
<td>24.7% (54)</td>
<td>19.0% (30)</td>
<td>31.1% (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>78.3% (144)</td>
<td>75.3% (165)</td>
<td>81.0% (128)</td>
<td>68.9% (82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0% (184)</td>
<td>100.0% (219)</td>
<td>100.0% (158)</td>
<td>100.0% (119)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 6.76; df = 3; p > .05.
Although a significant relationship is not indicated by the data, it is interesting to note that the distance category yielding the greatest percentage of donors is "1,001 miles or more" (31.1%). By comparison, of alumni living within a 50-mile radius of the campus, only 21.7% were donors.

4b. **Number of years since last enrolled.** It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as the number of years since last enrolled at Los Angeles Baptist College. Null Hypothesis 4b stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not depend on the number of years that passed since they were last enrolled (independent variable). Table 15 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 44.74 which indicates significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

**Table 15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>1-7</th>
<th>8-14</th>
<th>15+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>15.2% (61)</td>
<td>33.8% (68)</td>
<td>40.4% (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>84.8% (340)</td>
<td>66.2% (133)</td>
<td>59.6% (62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0% (401)</td>
<td>100.0% (201)</td>
<td>100.0% (104)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes.** Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

\[ \text{Chi-square} = 44.74; \ df = 2; p < .05. \]
Although Los Angeles Baptist College has been in existence for 53 years, it was not until the 1970s that substantial growth began to occur. This is shown by the fact that 56.8% of all respondents had been out of the college 7 years or less. Of this group only 15.2% were donors. Of alumni who had been out 8 to 14 years, on the other hand, 33.8% were donors. An even larger percentage, 40.4%, of alumni who had been out of Los Angeles Baptist College more than 15 years were donors.

4c. Vocational satisfaction. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as their satisfaction with their present vocation. Null Hypothesis 4c stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not depend on their present vocational satisfaction (independent variable). Table 16 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 1.52 which failed to indicate significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

In applying the chi-square test the researcher took the liberty of combining the responses to answers "a" and "b" (extremely satisfied and satisfied) as well as combining answers "c" and "d" (unsatisfied and extremely unsatisfied). The former two answers were both positive responses whereas the latter two were both negative responses.

The percentages of satisfied and unsatisfied alumni considered donors were nearly identical and seemed to discredit the assumption
that vocational satisfaction would increase alumni support.

Table 16
Vocational Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>24.8% (166)</td>
<td>23.9% (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>75.2% (503)</td>
<td>76.1% (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0% (669)</td>
<td>100.0% (71)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.
Chi-square = 1.52; df = 1; p > .05.

4d. Marital status. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as their marital status. Null Hypothesis 4d stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not depend on their marital status (independent variable). Table 17 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 25.24 which indicates significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

To avoid working with unusually small numbers, the categories for widow, widower, and divorced were combined and considered under the heading of "other."

Single alumni were the least represented in the donor category (10.3%) whereas "others" were the most highly represented (42.9%). Also highly represented as donors were those who had indicated the
category of "married" (27.7%).

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Married</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>27.7% (152)</td>
<td>10.3% (17)</td>
<td>42.9% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>72.3% (396)</td>
<td>89.7% (148)</td>
<td>57.1% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0% (548)</td>
<td>100.0% (165)</td>
<td>100.0% (21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 25.24; df = 2; p < .05.

4e. Children ever enrolled at Los Angeles Baptist College. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and non-donor alumni as far as whether or not their children had ever attended the college. Null Hypothesis 4e stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not depend on whether or not their child or children had ever attended the college (independent variable). Table 18 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 3.90 which indicates significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Sixty-one donors and 285 nondonors did not have children and therefore were not included in the calculations.

It is interesting to observe the percentage of alumni whose children attended the college who were donors, 52.4%. This compared
to 34.6% of alumni whose children had not attended Los Angeles Baptist College.

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>52.4% (11)</td>
<td>34.6% (127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>47.6% (10)</td>
<td>65.4% (271)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0% (21)</td>
<td>100.0% (398)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 3.90; df = 1; p < .05.

4f. Children presently enrolled at Los Angeles Baptist College.

It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as whether or not a child of theirs was presently enrolled at Los Angeles Baptist College. Null Hypothesis 4f stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not depend on whether or not their child or children were presently enrolled at the college (independent variable). Table 19 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 2.84 which failed to indicate significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

It should be noted that 327 alumni said that this question was not applicable to their situation. Fifty-three of these alumni were donors and 274 were nondonors. This figure corresponded very closely
with the number of alumni indicating on another question that they had no children. Their responses were not included in the chi-square calculations.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>60.0% (6)</td>
<td>30.0% (119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>40.0% (4)</td>
<td>70.0% (278)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0% (10)</td>
<td>100.0% (397)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 2.84; df = 1, p > .05.

Although the chi-square result did not indicate significance, a greater percentage of those with children attending Los Angeles Baptist College (60%) than those with children not attending (30%) were donors.

4g. Married to an alumnus. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni regarding whether or not their spouse was a Los Angeles Baptist College alumnus. Null Hypothesis 4g stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not depend on whether or not they were married to an alumnus of the college (independent variable). Table 20 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a
figure of 4.55 which indicates significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 20

Married to an Alumnus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>32.2% (88)</td>
<td>23.8% (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>67.8% (185)</td>
<td>76.2% (215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0% (273)</td>
<td>100.0% (282)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 4.55; df = 1; p < .05.

In addition to those alumni answering "Yes" or "No," 176 alumni indicated "Not Applicable." Of this total 23 were donors and 156 were nondonors. The individuals comprising the group were unmarried and were thus omitted from the chi-square calculations.

Alumni married to other Los Angeles Baptist College alumni were significantly more supportive (32.2%) than those not married to other alumni of the college (23.8%).

4h. Number of children. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as the number of children they have. Null Hypothesis 4h stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not depend on the number of children they have (independent variable). Table 21 shows
the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 15.50 which indicates significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 21
Number of Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(124)</td>
<td>(82)</td>
<td>(98)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(154)</td>
<td>(105)</td>
<td>(159)</td>
<td>(68)</td>
<td>(60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 15.50; df = 4; p < .05.

It was determined that 89% of all responding alumni had fewer than four children. To facilitate the testing and to avoid unnecessarily small categories, all alumni with four or more children were considered as one category.

Data from another hypothesis indicated that 17 donors and 148 nondonors were single. These individuals were not used in calculating the data for this hypothesis. It was determined to limit this set of data to married alumni.

Alumni with larger families proved to be more supportive than alumni with smaller families. The most frequent donors were alumni...
with two children (38.4%) whereas the most infrequent were alumni with no children (19.5%).

4i. Involvement in alumni association. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as their present involvement in the college's alumni association. Null Hypothesis 4i stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not depend on their involvement in the alumni association (independent variable). Table 22 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 8.07 which indicates significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 22
Involvement in Alumni Association

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Some Involvement</th>
<th>No Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>32.4% (67)</td>
<td>21.9% (111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>67.6% (140)</td>
<td>78.1% (396)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0% (207)</td>
<td>100.0% (507)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 8.07; df = 1; p < .05.

In applying the chi-square test, liberty was taken to combine the responses to answers "a" and "b" (very involved and involved, respectively) as well as answers "c" and "d" (occasionally involved
and never involved, respectively). It sought to dichotomize the alumni into those who were involved and those who were seldom or never involved.

A larger percentage of involved alumni (32.4%) than noninvolved alumni (21.9%) were donors to the college.

4j. Current vocation. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as their current vocation. Null Hypothesis 4j stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not depend on their current vocation (independent variable). Table 23 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square yielded a figure of 21.16 which indicates significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The category "other" contained numerous vocations which had only a half dozen or less responses. They were combined to allow the proper usage of the chi-square test. In addition, 31 individuals indicated that they were presently students. Of this total six were donors and 26 were nondonors. These 31 individuals were not included in the chi-square calculation. It was determined that being a student was not considered a vocation for this study.

Certain vocations emerged as more supportive of Los Angeles Baptist College than other vocations. More supportive were individuals in business (33.8%), skilled (34.2%), and ministerial (34.9%) professions. Two vocations, clerical (6.0%) and unskilled (16.7%), were represented less as donors.
Table 23

Current Vocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Unskilled</th>
<th>Skilled</th>
<th>Minister</th>
<th>Homemaker</th>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Clerical</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 21.16; df = 7; p < .05.
Present opinion of Los Angeles Baptist College. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as their present opinion of Los Angeles Baptist College. Null Hypothesis 4k stated that whether alumni were donors or non-donors (dependent variable) would not depend on their present opinion of the college (independent variable). Table 24 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 34.83 which indicates significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 24
Present Opinion of Los Angeles Baptist College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Some Disagreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>34.8% (146)</td>
<td>12.7% (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>65.2% (273)</td>
<td>87.3% (193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0% (419)</td>
<td>100.0% (221)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 34.83; df = 1; p < .05.

Although the alumni had four possible answers to this question, the researcher combined the answers into two categories to aid in the chi-square test by avoiding categories with abnormally small numbers of alumni responses. Answers "a" and "b" indicated degrees of support for the college whereas answers "c" and "d" indicated degrees of disagreement.
Alumni with an attitude of agreement had a greater percentage of donors (34.8%) than alumni who disagree with the present operation of the college (12.7%).

41. Helpfulness of training. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as their evaluation of the value of training received at Los Angeles Baptist College in their present vocation. Null Hypothesis 41 stated that whether an alumnus was a donor or nondonor (dependent variable) would not depend on that individual's evaluation of the training received at Los Angeles Baptist College (independent variable). Table 25 indicates the responses of the alumni. The application of the chi-square test yielded a figure of 10.22 which indicates significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 25
Helpfulness of Training for Present Vocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Extremely Helpful</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Little Value</th>
<th>No Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>(85)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(117)</td>
<td>(217)</td>
<td>(125)</td>
<td>(72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(143)</td>
<td>(302)</td>
<td>(153)</td>
<td>(86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 10.22; df = 3; p < .05.
The resulting data show that of alumni indicating their training to be of no value in their present occupation only 16.3% were donors whereas of alumni indicating their training to have been helpful 28.1% were donors. Interestingly, the other two categories demonstrated a similar percentage of donors even though the independent variables differ considerably (extremely helpful--18.2%; little value--18.3%).

Precollege Circumstances

The last of the five sections presents an analysis of factors pertaining to precollege circumstances of Los Angeles Baptist College alumni. The researcher attempted to delineate which if any of the characteristics affects the dependent variable (donor or non donor).

5a. Father's occupation. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and non donor alumni as far as their father's occupation the year the alumni enrolled at Los Angeles Baptist College. Null Hypothesis 5a stated that whether alumni were donors or non donors (dependent variable) would not be determined by their father's occupation (independent variable). Table 26 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of 2.78 which failed to indicate significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

The wide variety of occupations listed by the alumni were put into four major categories: skilled, unskilled, professional, and other. For the purposes of this study only the first three
categories were considered. The category of "other," which contained 33 donors and 130 nondonors, was so diverse that it was not useful for the chi-square test.

Table 26
Father's Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Skilled</th>
<th>Unskilled</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>23.9% (21)</td>
<td>31.2% (39)</td>
<td>24.1% (62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>76.1% (67)</td>
<td>68.8% (86)</td>
<td>75.9% (195)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0% (88)</td>
<td>100.0% (125)</td>
<td>100.0% (257)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = 2.78; df = 2; p > .05.

No significance was indicated although alumni whose fathers were unskilled appear to be more supportive (31.2%) than those listed as skilled (23.9%) and professional (24.1%).

5b. High school grade point average. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as their high school grade point average. Null Hypothesis 5b stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would be determined by their high school grade point average (independent variable). Table 27 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of .32 which failed to indicate significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was
not rejected.

Table 27
High School Grade Point Average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>2.0-2.64</th>
<th>2.65-3.34</th>
<th>3.35-4.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>24.2% (32)</td>
<td>24.3% (70)</td>
<td>22.1% (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>75.8% (100)</td>
<td>75.7% (218)</td>
<td>77.9% (197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0% (132)</td>
<td>100.0% (288)</td>
<td>100.0% (253)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual number of responses.

Chi-square = .32; df = 2; p > .05.

To aid in the computation of the chi-square test the answers of the alumni were divided into three categories representing traditional A, B, and C scores. Within these categories there was very little variance. Those with A averages had 22.1% donors, B had 24.3%, and C had 24.2%.

5c. Involvement in high school extracurricular activities. It was hypothesized that a difference would exist between donor and nondonor alumni as far as their involvement in extracurricular activities while in high school. Null Hypothesis 5c stated that whether alumni were donors or nondonors (dependent variable) would not be determined by their level of involvement in high school extracurricular activities (independent variable). Table 28 shows the responses of the alumni. The chi-square test yielded a figure of
2.78 which failed to indicate significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Table 28
Involvement in High School Extracurricular Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Very Active</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Seldom Active</th>
<th>Never Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(44)</td>
<td>(61)</td>
<td>(47)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondonor</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(167)</td>
<td>(174)</td>
<td>(149)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(211)</td>
<td>(235)</td>
<td>(196)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(79)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. Numbers in parentheses represent actual numbers of responses.

Chi-square = 2.78; df = 3; p > .05.

Due to the chi-square test results, dependence could not be accepted and the percentages of donors in each of the four categories showed no major variance. In addition, the category which recorded the greatest percentage of donors (29.1%) was comprised of those alumni who were never active in high school. The category which recorded the lowest percentage (20.9%) included those who were very active.

Summary of Findings

The chi-square test was applied to the data used to test the 28 hypotheses involved in the research. The data were examined to
determine if significant differences existed between donors and non-donors. Commonly accepted measures of significance (Glass & Stanley, 1970) were used to measure the level of significance. In all cases the .05 level was used.

In summarizing the results Table 29 shows the characteristics which produced a chi-square (.05 level) indicative of a significant difference between donor and nondonor alumni.

The final chapter compares results of this study with other similar surveys, suggests conclusions from the results of research, and presents formulations and implications based on the results. Suggestions concerning further investigations also are offered.
Table 29
Summary of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Difference Between Donors and Nondonors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic achievements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Los Angeles Baptist College grade point average</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Membership in honor societies</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Number of years enrolled at Los Angeles Baptist College</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Major course of study</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Additional training received</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Financial factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Type of government aid</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Source of funds while at Los Angeles Baptist College</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Amount of money borrowed for college</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Present household income</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Extracurricular involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Student government involvement</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Athletic involvement</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Type of housing while at Los Angeles Baptist College</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Frequency of social discipline</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Difference Between Donors and Nondonors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Present circumstances and attitudes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Present distance from campus</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Number of years since last enrolled at Los Angeles Baptist College</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Satisfaction with current vocation</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Marital status</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Children have ever been enrolled at Los Angeles Baptist College</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Children presently enrolled at Los Angeles Baptist College</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Married to an alumnus</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Number of children</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Involvement in alumni association</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Current vocation</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Present opinion of Los Angeles Baptist College</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Helpfulness of Los Angeles Baptist College training for present occupation</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Precollege circumstances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Difference Between Donors and Nondonors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Father's occupation</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. High school grade point average</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Involvement in high school extracurricular activities</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of the final chapter is to review the background and intent of this study as well as to summarize the results of the research. After the conclusions and implications of the study have been discussed, recommendations for further research are presented.

Summary of the Study

America's more than 1,500 private colleges and universities face a future complicated by continued cost increases and potential declining enrollments. A primary threat has been and, indications are, will continue to be inadequate funding. Lacking the level of governmental support which has made the fiscal future of the public colleges more secure, private colleges have relied on denominations, corporations, foundations, and individuals to complement revenues from tuition, room, board, fees, endowments, and auxiliary enterprises. As indicated in Chapter II, alumni could have a profound financial impact on their alma mater if their level of support could be increased.

In order for private colleges and universities to procure the maximum financial aid from their alumni, they should approach alumni specifically as donors and nondonors. This study was designed to yield answers to questions regarding whether differences existed between donors and nondonors vis-a-vis various characteristics. The
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characteristics examined related to: (a) academic achievements, 
(b) financial affairs, (c) extracurricular involvement, (d) present 
circumstances and attitudes, and (e) precollege circumstances.

The investigator prepared a questionnaire which was sent to the 
1,397 alumni of Los Angeles Baptist College. Of the 1,397 alumni, 
236 were donors (having made a gift of any sort during the past 5 
years) and 1,161 were nondonors (having made no contribution during 
the same 5-year period). A cover letter was prepared and signed by 
the researcher and by the academic dean of the college. In the cover 
letter, alumni were asked to aid their alma mater by filling out the 
questionnaire. Each of the questionnaires and cover letters was 
accompanied by a preaddressed, postage-paid #9 return envelope.

Four weeks after the first letter was mailed, a follow-up pack­
age was sent to those who had not responded. The package included a 
questionnaire and return envelope as well as a cover letter in which 
they were encouraged to participate. Of the 1,397 alumni contacted, 
752 responded to the letters. Of this total, 168 were donors and 584 
were nondonors. The 752 responses represented 54% of the alumni con­
tacted. The donors responding represented 71% of the donors con­
tacted. The nondonors responding represented 42% of that group con­
tacted.

Five areas of each alumnus' life were examined: (a) academic 
achievement, (b) financial factors, (c) extracurricular involvement, 
(d) present circumstances and attitudes, and (e) precollege circum­
stances. Questions relating to each of the above areas were then 
tested for significance by the use of the chi-square test. In
addition to the test to determine the dependency between a characteristic and the alumnus' giving habits, numerous conclusions could be proposed through an analysis of the resulting data.

As mentioned earlier, other researchers studied the relationship between alumni characteristics and whether or not alumni were donors. The results of their studies and this study are summarized in Table 30. The following section which deals with conclusions will address some of the comparisons shown in the table.

Conclusions

The results of the research for this study indicated that some alumni characteristics were predictive of alumni support and that other characteristics were not predictive of support. The conclusions developed from this study are divided into the categories of "predictive" and "nonpredictive."

Predictive

Five areas emerged as predictive of alumni support. The first area concerned "involvement." It was concluded that involved alumni were more supportive than noninvolved alumni. The level of involvement was tested by the characteristics which dealt with the following: (a) involvement in athletics, (b) involvement in student government, (c) the number of years spent at Los Angeles Baptist College, (d) whether undergraduate work was completed at Los Angeles Baptist College, and (e) the level of involvement with the alumni association. In each of these characteristics, if alumni had spent at least 4 years
Table 30
Comparison of Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Koole</th>
<th>McNulty</th>
<th>McKee</th>
<th>Caruthers</th>
<th>Filer</th>
<th>Broms &amp; Davis</th>
<th>Simpson &amp; Hirsch</th>
<th>Inst. of Social Research</th>
<th>Blumenfeld &amp; Sartain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Grade point average</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Member of honor society</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Years at alma mater</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Academic major</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Advanced degree</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Financial factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Government aid received</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Source of college income</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Amount of loans for college</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Current income</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Koole</th>
<th>McNulty</th>
<th>McKee</th>
<th>Caruthers</th>
<th>Filer</th>
<th>Brome &amp; Davis</th>
<th>Simpson &amp; Hirsch</th>
<th>Inst. of Social Research</th>
<th>Blumenfeld &amp; Sartain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Extracurricular involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Student government involvement</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Athletic involvement</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Type of college housing</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Amount of social discipline</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Present circumstances and attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Present distance from alma mater</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Age/Years since enrollment</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Current job satisfaction</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Marital status</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Children ever enrolled</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Children currently enrolled</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Spouse an alumnus</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Number of children</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Alumni involvement</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Koole</th>
<th>McNulty</th>
<th>Mckee</th>
<th>Caruthers</th>
<th>Filer</th>
<th>Broms &amp; Davis</th>
<th>Simpson &amp; Hirsch</th>
<th>Inst. of Social Research</th>
<th>Blumenfeld &amp; Sartain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Present circumstances and attitudes (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Vocation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Pleased with alma mater</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Job preparation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Precollege circumstances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Father's occupation</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. High school grade point average</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. High school extracurricular involvement</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Y = significant relationship found; N = no significant relationship found; - = characteristic not studied.
at the college or had been involved actively as students or alumni, they were more supportive than alumni who had spent less time at the college and were not involved actively as students or alumni.

Alumni who were involved in intercollegiate athletics or student government were more supportive than alumni who were not involved. The study by Caruthers (1973) was the only other study to address these areas of involvement. She questioned alumni regarding their level of student government involvement and found no relationship between involvement and financial support. It should be noted, however, that her research was done at a large university where a smaller percentage of students were involved in student leadership. At Los Angeles Baptist College, with only 400 students, a much greater percentage of the student body became involved in student leadership positions.

Alumni who had spent at least 4 years at the college were more supportive than alumni who had spent less than 4 years. McKee (1975), Broms and Davis (1966), and Simpson and Hirsch (1968) addressed a similar issue. They found that alumni who completed their undergraduate work at the universities were more supportive than those who had not completed their work.

Alumni who were involved actively in their alumni association were more supportive than alumni who were not involved actively. The same conclusions were derived from the studies by McKee (1975), Broms and Davis (1966), and Simpson and Hirsch (1968).

The second area predictive of alumni support involved the family situation of alumni. It was concluded that factors relating to the
family situation were predictive of whether or not alumni were donors. The family situation was tested by the characteristics which dealt with: (a) marital status, (b) number of children, (c) spouse an alumnus, and (d) whether children have ever attended Los Angeles Baptist College. The study showed that the alumni who were more supportive: (a) were married, (b) had at least two children, (c) were married to another Los Angeles Baptist College alumnus, and (d) had one or more children attend the college.

All but one of these characteristics were addressed by other researchers. The study by Filer (1975) examined the question of marital status and found that married alumni were more supportive than unmarried alumni. The studies by Caruthers (1973) and the Institute of Social Research (1975) both found that the number of children was predictive of alumni support. The study by Broms and Davis (1966) addressed the question of whether the spouse was an alumnus. They found that when this situation existed, alumni were more supportive than alumni who were not married to another alumnus. None of the other studies researched the question of whether or not children of alumni had ever attended their alma mater.

The third area predictive of alumni support involved the income of alumni. It was concluded that alumni with higher incomes were more supportive than alumni with lower incomes. The income level was tested by the characteristics which dealt with: (a) household income, (b) vocation, and (c) academic major. Although the latter two characteristics demonstrated a relationship with whether an alumnus was a donor or nondonor, the relative recency of some subject matter
disciplines at Los Angeles Baptist College eliminated them from consideration while conclusions were drawn. The study did show, however, that alumni with greater incomes were more supportive than alumni with lesser incomes. This also was seen in the studies by McNulty (1976) and Filer (1975).

The fourth area predictive of alumni support was age. It was concluded that older alumni were more supportive than younger alumni. The age of alumni was tested by the characteristic which dealt with the number of years since the alumni were last enrolled at the college. Alumni who had been out of college more than 7 years were more supportive than alumni who had been out of college 7 years or less. Age was also a factor in the studies by McNulty (1976), McKee (1975), Filer (1975), and Simpson and Hirsch (1968). They all determined that older alumni were more supportive than younger alumni.

The fifth, and final, area predictive of alumni support was opinion of the college. It was concluded that alumni who agreed with the current position of the college were more supportive than alumni who disagreed with the current position. The opinions of the alumni were tested by the characteristic which dealt with alumni attitudes concerning Los Angeles Baptist College. None of the other studies addressed this characteristic.

Nonpredictive

Five areas emerged as nonpredictive of alumni support or non-support. It was concluded that the five areas need not be considered as factors when evaluating whether or not alumni will become donors.
The first area involved the distance alumni lived from campus. There was no evidence that whether or not an alumnus was a donor was influenced by distance from campus.

The second area involved the amount of social discipline alumni received as students. Social discipline at Los Angeles Baptist College involved punishment or reprimands for violating rules such as curfew. There was no evidence that alumni who were disciplined occasionally or frequently were less supportive than alumni who had not received occasional or frequent social discipline. None of the other studies addressed this issue.

The third area involved precollege circumstances. There was no evidence that precollege circumstances influenced whether alumni were donors or nondonors. Precollege circumstances were tested by the characteristics which dealt with: (a) high school grade point average, (b) father's occupation, and (c) involvement in high school extracurricular activities. None of the other studies addressed this issue.

The fourth area involved the academic achievements of alumni. There was no evidence that academic achievement in college was a predictor of alumni support or nonsupport. Academic achievement was tested by the characteristics which dealt with Los Angeles Baptist College grade point average and membership in an academic honor society. Neither characteristic produced evidence which indicated a relationship between academic achievement and alumni support. The study by Blumenfeld and Sartain (1974) produced the same conclusion.
The fifth, and final, area involved the methods used by alumni to finance their education at Los Angeles Baptist College. There was no evidence that the method used to finance an education at the college predicted whether or not alumni were financially supportive. The method of financing was tested by the characteristics which dealt with the method of paying for an education and the size of loan used while at the college. The first characteristic was not employed in the drawing of this conclusion due to the newness of the scholarships which recently became available to Los Angeles Baptist College students. The second characteristic revealed that the size of loans procured while at the college did not influence whether or not alumni were supportive. None of the other researchers addressed this characteristic.

Implications

In addition to the conclusions reported in the previous section are the following implications which are proposed from the results of this study.

Student Involvement

From the data it was found that alumni enrolled at the college 4 or more years were more supportive than alumni enrolled less than 4 years. The conclusions also indicated that involved students became involved alumni. This involvement was seen in two of the characteristics studied.
Alumni who either participated in intercollegiate athletics or no athletics at all were more supportive of Los Angeles Baptist College than those who participated in intramural programs. The latter alumni apparently developed either less supportive attitudes concerning the college while in such programs or entered such programs with less supportive attitudes. These individuals may have wanted to be involved in athletics; however, they may not have been sufficiently skilled to participate at the intercollegiate level. This frustration may have negatively influenced their financial support in later years. The individuals who indicated no athletic involvement may have had no concern for athletics and thus avoided any accompanying frustrations. They may have taken the academic goal of a college education more seriously and thus emerged with a greater fulfillment. The most supportive alumni were those who participated in intercollegiate athletics. It might be assumed that this group became intimately involved with a many-sided approach to college life. They probably became involved with the promotion of college spirit during their athletic involvement. The loyalty to Los Angeles Baptist College apparently persisted substantially enough to create a more supportive attitude in later years.

Alumni who were actively involved in student government were more supportive than those who were not active. Apparently the first group either developed a greater appreciation of the college while working in student government or went into student government because a greater appreciation already existed. This involvement could have allowed them to know their colleagues better and also to know the
faculty, staff, and administration on a more personal level. This may have had a positive effect on their supportiveness in later years.

Students staying at Los Angeles Baptist College 4 or more years were more supportive than those staying less than 4 years. The latter group could have become dissatisfied with the college and dropped out of college or transferred prior to graduation. Whatever dissatisfaction they may have had may have discouraged them in later years from responding to an appeal for support. This was also seen in the data which dealt with additional training received by alumni. Alumni who finished their undergraduate work at another college or university were less supportive than alumni who did not transfer. Their dissatisfaction may have been due to a displeasure with the curriculum, or any variety of reasons. If they continued their studies elsewhere, their loyalty may have been transferred to the other college. Students staying at least 4 years may have started with or developed an attitude of support for the college during their stay. Either they stayed because of a satisfaction with the college or they became satisfied because they stayed.

Age

It was determined that as the level of income escalated, so did the percentage of supportive alumni at that level. It could be speculated that alumni in the higher income categories were older than alumni in the lower categories. Higher income alumni may have been out of college longer and thus made more vocational advancement than lower income alumni. It was shown earlier in this report that the
number of years out of college does influence level of support—the more years, the greater the percentage of supportive alumni. Simpson and Hirsch (1968) not only found this to be true but they found that the size of the gift tends to increase with age.

Age may have been a factor in the results of the characteristic which dealt with current vocations. The study indicated that ministers were the most supportive alumni. During its early years Los Angeles Baptist College was involved primarily with the preparation of ministers, whereas in recent years an increased number of students matriculated with majors that did not exist 15 years ago. Thus, alumni who are ministers may be older on the average than the liberal arts graduates.

The data also indicated that certain academic majors produced alumni more supportive than alumni from other majors. Not surprisingly, alumni from the older majors were typically more supportive than alumni from the newer majors. Again, the age of the alumni must be considered a factor.

The data from the characteristic which dealt with the type of government aid received may have been related to age. The data indicated that alumni who received funds through College Work Study and GI Bill were more supportive than those who received funds through the California State Scholarship plan. The high incidence of donors among GI Bill recipients may be representative of more mature students who entered college at an older age and who were more motivated to receive all they could from their education at Los Angeles Baptist College. They may have been more appreciative than others of the
college from which they received their education. The researcher drew no conclusions from the high donor incidence among College Work Study recipients because of the relatively small number (11) in this category.

The low percentage of donor alumni who received California State Scholarships could be age related. Los Angeles Baptist College students were not eligible for this program until the college’s regional accreditation by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges in 1974. None of the alumni recipients had been out of Los Angeles Baptist College more than 6 years whereas alumni in the other categories could have been out much longer. Again it is recalled from previous data that alumni who had been out of the college 7 years or less were the least supportive group.

Family Situation

Several characteristics were used to gather information regarding the family situation of alumni. The following implications have been developed concerning family oriented characteristics.

The research indicated that married alumni were more supportive than single alumni. This relationship could have existed for any number of reasons. It might be that married alumni had been out of college longer than single alumni and thus fell into a more supportive category for that reason (it has been seen that years out of college was usually indicative of increased supportiveness). In addition, married alumni may have become more secure in their professions due to a diminished amount of mobility. It would seem, however, that
once again age could have been the most important factor.

The research also indicated that marriages composed of two alumni generated more support than marriages which involved only one alumnus. It could be that the former relationship allowed both partners to be supportive of the same institution whereas the latter found each partner with a loyalty to a different college. It is likely that there was a greater understanding of the needs of the college when both partners shared experiences at the college.

Alumni with two or more children were more supportive of the college than alumni with one or less. It would appear that several factors might have caused this to happen. The first might have been that couples with larger families generally had been married longer than couples with smaller families. This could indicate an older alumnus, and from previous statements it is clear that this had a positive impact on support. An additional factor could have been that couples with greater financial strength can afford the higher cost of a larger family as well as be able to financially support their alma mater. There is also the possibility that alumni with larger families either have had, do have, or will have one of their children enrolled at the college and were thus better informed of the current needs of the college.

Alumni Involvement

Alumni that were involved with the alumni association were more supportive than alumni that were not involved in the alumni association. Two possibilities developed as explanations for this trend:
(a) Alumni became involved because they were already supportive of the college, or (b) alumni became supportive of the college because of experiences within the alumni association. One or both of these factors may have been involved in the relationship. In the second case, alumni were constantly appraised of the various needs of the college while working with the association. They also may have become better acquainted with the people who initiated the requests for aid and thus been more apt to participate.

Recommendations

The decade of the 1980s threatens to be a period of challenge for America's private colleges. Escalating costs coupled with declining numbers of potential students cause such colleges to fear whether they will survive the decade of the 1980s. In most instances private colleges must acknowledge the circumstances and attempt to work with the situation. They cannot change factors such as the nation's continuing inflation or changing demography. They must strive for excellence as they constantly combat the realities of the present decade.

One area in which private colleges can control their own destiny deals with the funding of their programs. As reviewed in Chapter II, private colleges have historically drawn their support from endowment funds, tuition payments, government grants, corporate gifts, auxiliary enterprises, and individuals. It is this last category in general and one of its components, the college's alumni, with which this study was specifically concerned. With only about 20% of alumni
presently supporting their alma mater, it is imperative that colleges
learn as much as they can about their alumni and what characteristics
tend to influence why they are or are not supportive of their alma
mater. The importance of such knowledge is unquestionable. If the
5,500,000 nonsupportive alumni of America's private colleges would
join, through annual gifts, the 1,250,000 supportive alumni, the
financial plight of private colleges would be greatly eased.

The preceding sections of this chapter developed conclusions and
implications regarding the findings of the study. The following rec­
ommendations are presented in two sections. Internal recommendations
are suggestions for increasing involvement in Los Angeles Baptist
College while individuals are still students. External recomenda­
tions are suggestions for increasing alumni involvement in the alumni
association.

Internal

The results of this study indicated that alumni who spent at
least 4 years at Los Angeles Baptist College and were involved in
activities such as student government and intercollegiate athletics
became more supportive alumni than their counterparts who spent less
than 4 years at the college and did not get involved in the campus
activities. The following recommendations are suggestions to encour­
age students to spend all 4 years at the same college and to become
involved more integrally in campus activities.
Encourage students to become involved in campus clubs, programs, and activities. College administrators should evaluate current campus programs to assertain the level of student involvement. If participation is sparse, the programs should be studied to determine why. If there is a shortage of programs in which students can become involved, administrators should examine the idea of initiating new ones. Some programs which could help students become more involved are: (a) student fund-raising projects, (b) social activities sponsored by various campus groups, (c) fraternities and sororities, (d) honor societies, (e) special interest clubs (backpacking, skiing, foreign language, etc.), (f) student government, (g) intercollegiate athletics, (h) intramural athletics, (i) musical groups, (j) glee club, and (k) cheerleaders.

Provide and promote career counseling. Assist students to prioritize their goals in life through the use of career counselors. Counselors can help students understand that their studies will lead them to a worthwhile vocation if their goals are properly defined. The counselors may prevent the attrition of talented students in search of career guidance.

Communicate the mission of the college. Let students know about the purpose and uniqueness of their college. Treat students as partners in the college and not as mere customers.

Upgrade deficient facilities. Evaluate campus facilities to see if some may be causing dissatisfied students to leave the college.
prematurely. Make certain that student housing and dining areas are as well maintained and developed as the administrative offices.

**Ask your students why they are leaving.** Either through interviews or questionnaires, ask nonreturning students to explain why they are not returning.

**Correct curriculum deficiencies.** Make certain that the college curriculum is providing the ingredients to prepare students for a competitive job market. Be alert for inadequacies which may be causing students to finish their undergraduate studies at other colleges.

**Promote the availability of financial aid.** Do not lose students because they were not made aware of the numerous financial aid programs available through the federal government, the state government, private scholarships, and institutional grants and scholarships. Many students may think about transferring to a public college or university in order to benefit from the lower tuition rates. The financial aid office must work with both new and continuing students to inform them of the programs which could help them pay the additional cost of a private education. If they do not already have them, college officials should consider the implementation of institutional scholarships and grants based on both need and performance.

**Develop communication between students and administrators.** The college presidents should establish times when they and other key college administrators are available for interaction with the students. These sessions should encourage students to get to know the
administrators as individuals and not just campus officials. If students sense that the administrators care about student ideas and needs and not just the functional aspects of the campus, more concerned students may result.

External

The results of this study indicated that alumni who held favorable opinions of Los Angeles Baptist College and were involved in alumni activities were more supportive than alumni who held unfavorable opinions of the college and were not involved in alumni activities. The following are recommendations to help get alumni involved in alumni activities and to create more positive opinions of the college through various means of communication.

Develop and promote activities for alumni. Either through the alumni association, the alumni secretary, or the administration identify and develop activities which will encourage alumni participation. This may include: (a) reunions, (b) alumni travel excursions, (c) alumni workshops and seminars on campus, (d) central and regional dinners, and (e) homecoming. Efforts should be taken to make these quality events which will be attended gladly by alumni. A poor or mediocre program will discourage further involvement on the part of the alumni.

Use innovation to provide programs which will target specific segments of the alumni pool. Reunions, for example, could target classes which are celebrating the 5th, 10th, or 25th graduation
anniversaries. Cooke (1980) stated about reunions, "The advent of a major class reunion is a natural time for an individual to refocus attention and interest on his or her alma mater. This provides the positive climate in which requests can be made for significant increases in contributions" (p. 76).

Travel excursions can feature faculty members who were teaching at the time alumni were students. Regional dinners can be times to recognize prominent local alumni. Homecoming could feature athletic contests between alumni teams of different eras. Alumni workshops and seminars could cater to alumni who are interested in more than parties and dinners by providing academically oriented sessions.

Develop a quality regularly distributed alumni publication. Alumni publications are a must if alumni are to be kept abreast with what is happening both with their former classmates and the college. Reichley (1979) stated:

The keystone of the communications process with alumni is the regular issuance of publications from schools, colleges, and universities. Costly though they are and sometimes controversial as well—alumni magazines, newspapers, and newsletters inform most of our graduates more of the time than do all the club and class activities, and the speeches of presidents, professors and football coaches put together. (p. 89)

Develop or strengthen the alumni association. The alumni association should be involving a broad base of alumni continually. Existing associations should be examined to insure that they are involving more than a tiny circle of alumni. It should organize activities which appeal to both the young and the old, the rich and the
poor. Association leadership likewise should include alumni from various eras and areas. The alumni association must be confident that it has the full support of the college's administration. If properly conceived and effectively functioning, the alumni association can be a vital force in involving alumni and promoting positive attitudes.

**Use phonathons.** Phonathons can be profitable in encouraging alumni who have never contributed, to send a gift. As many as 40% of the donors will be alumni who did not contribute the previous year. Stephany (1980a, p. 53) gave three reasons for this: (a) phone calls are personal, (b) volunteers are involved, and (c) the appeal can be targeted toward different groups.

**Use alumni as volunteers.** Volunteers can be effective in raising funds, recruiting students, and promoting the image of the college. In so doing they are becoming integrally involved in their alma mater. Nichols (1980a) stated that the following points regarding volunteers should be etched in the minds of annual giving officers:

1. Volunteers are effective only if their services are actually needed.

2. Identifying, recruiting, and training volunteers are the critical priorities for staff.

3. Regular communications offering support and guidance determine whether and how well the job will be done.

4. A volunteer must have a clear job description, a sense of importance, a schedule for completion, and an understood term of office.
5. Doing the thoughtful and courteous is the essence of cultivating gifts and volunteers.

6. It is impossible to acknowledge or thank volunteers too much. (p. 31)

**Involve the spouse.** Methods should be devised through which the spouses of alumni will be made to feel more a part of the college. One manner in which this could be done is by awarding honorary alumni certificates to the spouses. Socials at which spouses get to meet other alumni or college officials may also help to develop a bond of loyalty toward the college.

**Actively recruit the children of alumni.** Show alumni that you are interested in having their children attend the college. Alumni with children at their alma mater are more supportive than alumni with no children at the college. Special days can be planned for alumni and their children to visit the campus.

**Get alumni involved with the annual fund.** Attempt to get the alumni association to obligate itself to raise a portion of the annual fund. Individual classes may take on specific goals. The more small groups that get involved, the greater the probability of success. Younger alumni should be encouraged to start the giving habit by contributing a small gift. The college will benefit not only from the positive impact of involved alumni but also from the funds generated. Welch (1980) stated:

What do annual funds mean in terms of percentage of a total educational budget? For some colleges they mean a critical 6 to 12 percent, while for others it may be only 1 or 2 percent. Whatever the percentage, it often
means the difference between being able to maintain vital programs and services, or making compromises which will severely affect the quality of academic programs and facilities. (p. 2)

Summary

As America's private colleges grapple with increasing costs and declining enrollments, it is imperative that they utilize every possible source of support at their disposal. One group of individuals which has yet to be as supportive as it could be is comprised of the 6,750,000 alumni of America's private colleges and universities. Necessity will mandate a greater participation from this group during the decade of the 1980s if America is to retain its tradition of quality private education. This study has shown that one of the best ways that colleges can receive increased financial participation from their alumni is to: (a) encourage their students to become actively involved in campus activities and (b) encourage their alumni to become involved in alumni activities. Involved alumni are supportive in attitude, and involved alumni are financially supportive.
Appendix A

Los Angeles Baptist College Alumni Survey
Los Angeles Baptist College Alumni Survey

The following questions are designed to provide Los Angeles Baptist College with information which will allow for a better understanding of its alumni. Your participation is vital for the success of the survey. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential. Please return your completed survey in the enclosed envelope.

1. What is your marital status?
   a. Married
   b. Single
   c. Divorced
   d. Widow
   e. Widower

2. If married, is your spouse an alumnus of LABC?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Not applicable

3. How many children do you have?

4. Do any of your children presently attend LABC?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Not applicable

5. Have any of your children ever attended LABC?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Not applicable

6. How far do you live from LABC?

7. How many years is it since you were last enrolled at LABC?

8. State your current occupation.

9. How satisfied are you with your current occupation?
   a. Extremely satisfied
   b. Satisfied
   c. Unsatisfied
   d. Extremely unsatisfied

10. What is your current total household income (approximate)?
   a. Under $7,500
   b. $7,501 - 15,000
   c. $15,001 - 30,000
   d. $30,001 - 50,000
   e. $50,001 - 100,000
   f. Over $100,000

11. How involved are you in the LABC Alumni Association?
   a. Very involved
   b. Involved
   c. Occasionally involved
   d. Never involved

12. What was your approximate LABC grade point average?

13. To what degree did your training at LABC benefit you in pursuing a vocation after departure?
   a. Extremely helpful
   b. Helpful
   c. Little value
   d. No value

14. How many years did you attend LABC?

15. What was your major course of study at LABC?

16. What further training was received after leaving LABC?
   a. None
   b. Additional undergraduate
   c. Graduate school
   d. Seminary
   e. Other (Specify)
17. Where was the additional training received?  

18. What honors or awards have you received since leaving LABC?  

19. What kinds of involvement have you had in church and community affairs?  

20. What positions have you held other than those associated with your employment?  

21. What was your single most important source of funds while at LABC?  
   a. Savings  
   b. Parents  
   c. Personal employment  
   d. Scholarship  
   e. Loans  
   f. Grants  
   g. Other (Specify)  

22. How much money did you borrow to finance your education at LABC?  

23. What (if any) types of government aid did you receive while a student at LABC?  
   a. Very active  
   b. Active  
   c. Seldom active  
   d. Never active  

24. How involved were you in either intercollegiate or intramural athletics while at LABC?  
   a. Not at all  
   b. Intramural programs  
   c. Intercollegiate programs  

25. How active were you in any form of student government?  
   a. Extremely active  
   b. Active  
   c. Occasionally active  
   d. Not at all active  

26. What type of housing did you use primarily while a student at LABC?  
   a. Dorm  
   b. Parents' home  
   c. Off-campus apartment  

27. How often did you undergo formal social discipline while a student at LABC?  
   a. Often  
   b. Occasionally  
   c. Seldom  
   d. Never  

28. Were you involved in any academic honor societies while a student at LABC?  
   a. Yes  
   b. No  

29. What was your father's primary occupation prior to your attending LABC?  

30. What was your approximate high school grade point average?  

31. How involved were you in high school extracurricular activities?  
   a. Very active  
   b. Active  
   c. Occasionally active  
   d. Not at all active  

32. What is your present opinion of LABC?  
   a. Very supportive  
   b. Support  
   c. Some disagreement  
   d. Disagree  

Thank you for your cooperation!  
Please use the enclosed return envelope to return the completed questionnaire.
Appendix B

Cover Letter
Dear Alumnus of LABC:

As any college looks toward its future it must have a good grasp of its past performance. It is vital that schools such as Los Angeles Baptist College have a proper understanding of what their alumni are presently doing in light of the experiences received while a student.

Enclosed is a confidential survey designed to provide information which will help us understand the present status of our alumni. This information will remain totally anonymous. When the survey has been returned to the college, the number in the upper left hand corner will be removed immediately, and no one, including the researcher, will have any knowledge of who has responded. The detached number will allow us to know you have responded, yet we will not know which of the hundreds of surveys is yours. The detached number will also allow us to send you a summary of the survey results.

It will take you approximately 3 minutes to complete both sides of the survey. Check as many answers as are applicable. Use the pre-addressed postage-paid envelope to return your survey.

We sincerely request your help in this important project. The greater the number that respond, the more meaningful the conclusions will be. As an alumnus, you are a very vital part of the LABC family and as such we trust you will help us in this study. By understanding our alumni better we hope to achieve our goal of communicating with and serving you more knowledgeably in the future.

Please use the next 3 minutes to complete the survey and drop it in the mail.

In His service,

John Stead
Academic Dean

Richard Koole
Director of Development

1927-1977

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Appendix C

Follow-Up Letter
Dear Alumnus,

We hate to be pests, but....

We need your help!!!

Enclosed is a copy of the confidential survey which was sent to all LABC alumni. If you have not yet returned the first questionnaire, please spend three minutes completing this copy.

Your assistance is urgently needed in making the survey meaningful. The greater the response the more valid the conclusions. By understanding our alumni better we hope to achieve our goal of communicating with and serving you more knowledgeably in the future.

Let me once again assure you of the confidentiality with which the responses will be treated. When the survey has been returned to the college, the number in the upper left corner will be removed immediately, and no one, including the researcher, will have knowledge of who has answered which survey.

Thank you for your help!

In His service,

John Stead
Academic Dean

Richard Koole
Director of Development

P.S.: If you've already mailed in your finished questionnaire, please disregard this letter.
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