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The purpose of this study was to investigate relationships between alumni donor characteristics and self-esteem and altruism with the assumption that donor self-esteem and altruism are related to alumni giving behavior. Eight donor characteristics perceived to represent a cross-section of donor characteristics having a direct or indirect relationship to either self-esteem, altruism, or both, in regard to philanthropy, were selected for study. Self-esteem and altruism were selected because they are perceived to represent factors that are paramount in motivation for giving.

A survey instrument consisting of two sections was developed. Section one provided information regarding donor characteristics which included gender, age, household income, amount of contribution, level of degree, career preparation, rank, and tax-incentive. Section two measured self-esteem and altruism. Thirty-six questions that comprise the altruism subscale of the Omnibus Personality Inventory and 24 questions that constitute the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory were randomly selected and combined to provide a single set of questions that became section two of the instrument. This instrument, named the Donor Motivation Inventory, subsequently consisted of 68 items,
eight questions regarding donor characteristics and 60 questions used to measure donor self-esteem and altruism. The population investigated consisted of Western Michigan University alumni who made a financial contribution to the Western Michigan University Alumni Fund between January 1, 1979 and December 31, 1979. A sample of 400 alumni was obtained through a systematic random sample process. Donor names used for this study were made public through the WMU Foundation 1979 Annual Report To Donors published in the February 1980 issue of University Magazine, a Western Michigan University publication. All participants were mailed the questionnaire (Donor Motivation Inventory) with 254 (63%) returned in usable form.

Sixteen research hypotheses were investigated through the testing of the relationships between donor characteristic variables and the two perceived motivational factors of self-esteem and altruism. Eight hypotheses investigated relationships between selected donor characteristics and self-esteem and eight hypotheses investigated relationships between selected donor characteristics and altruism. The one-way analysis of variance was used to test these hypotheses at the .05 level of significance.

Results of the hypothesis testing indicated the following relationships between self-esteem and donor characteristics as well as altruism and donor characteristics: (1) self-esteem for male donors is greater than self-esteem for female donors; (2) altruism for female donors is greater than altruism for male donors; (3) donors who perceive their career preparation at Western Michigan University
to be above average have greater self-esteem than donors who perceive their career preparation to be average; (4) donors who perceive their career preparation at Western Michigan University to be above average have greater altruism than donors who perceive their career preparation to be average.

Possible implications and recommendations for future study were reported.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Background to the Problem

Higher education is becoming a victim of a national economic crisis, increasing in momentum, and predicted to become more critical during the early 1980's. Combined with problems of declining enrollment that confronts most institutions of higher education, the outlook becomes one of grave concern for educational leaders as they enter a new decade. A report published by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education states that higher education is in the grip of a new academic revolution. Unlike the trend of the 1960's, when many institutions tried to become research universities, the trend of the 1980's and 1990's, according to this report, is likely to follow the long-time examples of the community colleges in adjusting to the market (Scully, January 28, 1980, pp. 1; 11; 13).

Several factors contribute to this situation. Salaries and other residual considerations for faculty and non-faculty have increased steadily as the cost of living has risen. Another cost factor associated closely with instruction is the necessity for modifying programs, equipment and facilities to meet changing educational requirements. Such changes often necessitate the need for sophisticated and costly equipment and instructional materials. A third factor is the tendency for students to stay longer in college. Since the institutional per
student expenditures vary directly with the level of education attained, student aspirations for more advanced education increase the average per student costs for each institution and contribute to bigger annual operating budgets. The rapid upward spiral of inflation is another factor that has had severe impact on overall operational costs of colleges and universities. Inflation as well as the tendency for state and federal funding agencies to decrease support to all levels of education have combined to increase the financial difficulties of institutional operation.

An unstable economy and achievement of greater productivity in a service industry where people are the major input to the process present higher education with a situation that is threatening, difficult, and challenging for the 1980's (Trends In Post Secondary Education, 1970).

As state and federal agencies reduce spending for public colleges and universities, the financial picture will become increasingly critical. The struggle to maintain academic standards, and in some instances even to survive, will test the abilities of academic leaders.

The projected rapid deceleration of growth for institutions of higher education through the 1990's has no historical precedent. Shrinking enrollment and expenditure pressures that are projected to curtail the growth of institutional revenues are characteristics that will make the 1980's difficult and memorable (Magarrell, January 7, 1980, p. 6).
David W. Breneman, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institute, says it is "entirely possible that 200 to 300 small colleges may close their doors during the 1980's" (Magarrell, January 7, 1980, p. 6). Writing in the bulletin of the American Association for Higher Education, Breneman says that as colleges and universities face the problems of the 1980's "the most troubled group will be the former teachers' colleges that began to develop into comprehensive state universities in the 1960's and that find themselves stranded in a state of semi-development and uncertain mission. These institutions will not develop into major research universities within our lifetimes, and are likely to bear much of the enrollment loss within the public sector" (Magarrell, January 7, 1980, p. 6). Breneman's description of "the most troubled group" fits the historical profile of Western Michigan University.

Western Michigan University began in 1903 as Michigan Normal College. In 1927 the name was changed to Western State Teachers College of Education, in 1955 to Western Michigan College, and, in 1957, to Western Michigan University. In 1938 a master's degree program was initiated under the auspices of the University of Michigan. In 1951, Western began granting its own master's degrees. Specialist programs were started in 1960, and in 1966, the first doctoral programs were initiated.

In 1957, the year Western Michigan College became Western Michigan University, enrollment was 6,875. In 1971, enrollment reached an all-time high of 21,846 students. Current enrollment, 1979-80,
stands at 20,698 (Registrar, Western Michigan University, 1980).

Although Western Michigan University has not yet had to deal with a rapid decline in enrollment, other descriptors of Breneman's assessment of "the most troubled group" bears strong similarities to the situation in which Western finds itself. This is not to say that Western will necessarily suffer the most deliterious effects of the dilemma in which higher education finds itself, but it is certainly practical to anticipate that economic difficulties of the 1980's will threaten the institution, causing intense concern for all who have an interest in its welfare.

Roger W. Heyns, President, American Council on Education, stated

To the institutions, individual donor gifts may well mean the difference between high-quality education, research, and services or mediocrity (in some cases, even survival).

Higher education in this nation owes its beginnings to the generosity of private benefactors. Even though the succeeding decades have seen increasing governmental support and funding, the contributions of private donors remain essential to the financial health of all colleges and universities, both public and private. (Levi and Steinbeck, 1974, p. 30)

Giving to higher education is increasing, but the increase has not been sufficient to keep abreast of rising operational costs. State and federal funding is also providing inadequate financial assistance to help institutions cope with the current inflationary spiral, and from all indications, funding resources will become more scarce, at least for the next several years.

The American Association of Fund-Raising Counsel, Inc., reported that $5.99 billion in contributions were made during 1979 to
make education the second-largest recipient of philanthropic dollars in the United States. The Council for Financial Aid to Education reported a 6.3% increase in giving to higher education, which represented a $.19 billion gain from the 1978 total of $3.04 billion (Giving USA, 1980). Even with a gain greater than 6%, an inflation rate of 13.3% would indicate that higher education lost measurable ground.

Obviously, institutional operating expenses are increasing at a rate greater than the rate of increase in voluntary giving. Correspondingly, as government funding declines, alternatives must be found to counter the effects of inflation and to reduce the impact of declining state and federal financial support. The most practical approach, possibly the only one, is increased private financial support. Radock (1976) has expressed concerns regarding the relationship between higher education and private financial sources. Radock foresees that institutions of higher education that will continue to thrive and excel are those that develop their potential for private funding.

The implication of Radock's observation is that institutions of higher education, failing to develop their sources of private funding, will maintain the status quo or digress into what can be described at best as a state of mediocrity. This may not mean the death knell for public institutions that fail to develop private sources of funding, but it does mean the emergence of institutions that fall short of their obligation to protect the academic principals of higher
A major component of fund raising programs for institutions of higher education is alumni. Most institutions raise money from alumni on a yearly basis, usually through an annual fund organization. The annual fund also provides an avenue of communication between the school and its former students, often resulting in substantial gifts to the institution.

Increased financial support by alumni to their alma mater is a concern of all institutional development organizations, but few attempts have been made to understand motivational factors for alumni giving. The domain of donor motivation is an area that requires more attention, and if given more attention, may reveal ways for annual fund programs to increase the financial support of alumni. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate relationships between selected characteristics of Western Michigan University (WMU) alumni who gave financial support to the WMU Annual Fund between January 1, 1979 and December 31, 1979, and the personality factors of self-esteem and altruism perceived to be motivational factors for WMU alumni financial support.

Rationale for the Study

The future of institutions of higher education in the decade of the 1980's is threatened by declining student enrollment, high levels
of inflation, and declining state and federal financial support, all of which have a profound effect upon institutional operations. Programs must be developed to counteract the negative repercussions of these factors on the operational stability of colleges and universities. One such program already in existence in nearly every institution of higher education is the solicitation of financial support from alumni.

Private financial support has played an important role in the development of most American colleges and universities since the inception of higher education in this country. In order that it may assume the increasing demand of providing greater financial support, new and improved solicitation approached to alumni must be devised.

It is clearly evident, based on a review of literature relevant to alumni giving, that more empirical research regarding motivational factors of alumni givers, as well as alumni non-givers, is needed so that an in-depth understanding of reasons for individual financial support or non-support to a multitude of institutions and organizations will be forthcoming.

Variables that were selected for investigation by this study are perceived to represent a cross-section of donor characteristics that have appeared in literature, surveys, and in-depth studies concerned with philanthropy. It was not the intent of this study to investigate all possible donor characteristics, for such an investigation would not have been possible due to the constraints of time and financial resources. It was perceived, however, that those donor
characteristics that were selected constitute a cross-section of characteristics that represent factors possessing a high degree of concern for those interested in motivations for giving to institutions of higher education.

Consideration to include non-donors in the study was given, but the researcher felt that those alumni who were donors would be the more appropriate population to study. It was felt that for an initial study of this kind, donors would be more likely to participate, consequently increasing the chance of a successful study. It was also felt that the design for any future studies investigating relationships between donors and non-donors and variables similar to those used for this study, would benefit from findings presented in this study.

The eight selected donor variables are: (1) gender, (2) age, (3) annual household income, (4) amount of 1979 contribution to the WMU Annual Fund, (5) degree received from WMU, (6) rank of WMU when compared to other Michigan institutions of higher education, (7) satisfaction of career preparation provided by WMU, and (8) perceived value of tax-incentives for giving to WMU.

Sixteen hypotheses were investigated through the testing of the relationships between the donor characteristic variables and each of the two motivational factors of self-esteem and altruism. Self-esteem and altruism were selected because they are perceived to represent factors that play an important role in the motivation for giving.

This study was designed to investigate relationships between
selected donor variables and donor self-esteem and altruism, with the assumption that donor self-esteem and altruism are related to the giving behavior of WMU Annual Fund donors.

It is anticipated that data emanating from this study will provide useful input to the Western Michigan University Development Office for such purposes as analysis of current and long range giving, and the development of donor profiles that could be used to study various giving characteristics of alumni donors for application to both the development and alumni affairs offices. It is also anticipated that this study will contribute to the body of research literature dealing with self-esteem and altruism as motivational factors for giving by alumni of institutions of higher education.

Hypotheses to be Investigated

In this study the hypotheses stated below were investigated:

1. The perceived level of self-esteem is greater for the male donor than for the female donor.

2. The age of the donor is related to the level of perceived self-esteem.

3. The annual household income of the donor is related to the level of perceived self-esteem.

4. Amount of the 1979 contribution to the WMU Annual Fund made by the donor is related to the level of perceived self-esteem.

5. The type of degree received from WMU by the donor is related to the level of perceived self-esteem.

6. Donor ranking of WMU when compared to other Michigan four-year institutions of higher education is related to the level of perceived self-esteem.
7. Donor satisfaction of career preparation provided by WMU is related to the level of perceived self-esteem.

8. Donor perception of tax-incentives as a factor for giving to WMU is related to the level of perceived self-esteem.

9. The perceived level of altruism is greater for the female donor than for the male donor.

10. The age of the donor is related to the level of perceived altruism.

11. The annual household income of the donor is related to the level of perceived altruism.

12. Amount of the 1979 contribution to the WMU Annual Fund made by the donor is related to the level of perceived altruism.

13. The type of degree received from WMU by the donor is related to the level of perceived altruism.

14. Donor ranking of WMU when compared to other Michigan four-year institutions of higher education is related to the level of perceived altruism.

15. Donor satisfaction of career preparation provided by WMU is related to the level of perceived altruism.

16. Donor perception of tax-incentives as a factor for giving to WMU is related to the level of perceived altruism.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I provides a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, rationale for the study, and a description of relationships to be investigated.

Chapter II provides a discussion relevant to self-esteem and altruism as motivators for giving and their relationship to each of the donor characteristics.
Chapter III provides the design and methodology to be employed by the study. Specific topics discussed in this chapter are a review of the problem, population and selected sample, instrumentation, methodology, and analysis of data.

Chapter IV presents the method of analysis presented in Chapter III that was used to analyze the raw data resulting from responses of the selected population.

Chapter V presents a conclusion of the study by summarizing the results of the statistical analysis. After discussion of the conclusions and implications of the study, recommendations are presented suggesting further research of the problem presented by the study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

Introduction

Private financial support for institutions of higher education has a long and successful history. From the first organized alumni fund at Yale University in 1890, private financial support has been a factor in the operation and growth of private colleges and universities, and since that time has become a major factor in the growth and development of many public institutions (Smith, 1957).

Corporations, foundations, and alumni are the three primary sources of private financial support for both private and public institutions of higher education. A less frequent, though substantial contributitional source, is from the individual who is not an alumnus but who is induced to give to a college or university by what are generally described as altruistic motives.

Though 28 years elapsed before a publicly supported educational institution ventured into the fund raising arena, the highly successful efforts of the private colleges and universities did not go unnoticed. In 1918, Miami University of Ohio organized the first alumni fund raising effort in an American publicly supported educational institution (Smith, 1957). The success of Miami of Ohio encouraged other publicly supported colleges and universities to solicit private financial support, and started a trend in public
higher education that has contributed immeasurably to the growth and quality of American public higher education.

Western Michigan University, a public institution since 1903, has a brief history of organized fund raising. Though alumni financial support has been received through the alumni office for many years, it was not until 1970 that WMU established its development office for the purpose of creating a professionally organized and directed effort to solicit financial support from alumni as well as from other private sources. The organizational structure of the WMU development office includes a department for solicitation of financial support from corporations and foundations, a department for deferred giving, a department for solicitation of financial support for Western’s intercollegiate athletic program, and a department for the solicitation of financial support from alumni through the WMU Annual Fund. The WMU Annual Fund is a yearly appeal to individuals and organizations that attempts to gain private financial support for Western Michigan University. A primary goal of the annual fund is to achieve a high percentage of alumni participation and to increase the amount of alumni financial support each year.

Though financial support received from corporations and foundations, or such sources as bequests, charitable gift annuities, and life insurance policies (all methods of deferred giving) may surpass annual alumni giving, the importance of the annual alumni fund raising effort remains as the catalyst for all private financial support to private and public colleges and universities. Brakely (1980) observed
that "The role of alumni giving in inflationary times is particularly vital. For many colleges and universities, annual giving provides a major portion of the income needed to bridge the widening gap between cost and income" (p. 120).

Since inception of the first organized fund raising effort by the Western Michigan University Alumni Foundation in 1964-65, total private gift support has increased from $11,129 in 1965 (Western Michigan University Magazine, 1965) to $2,690,518 in 1979 (University Magazine, 1980). It is evident that formal professional fund raising methods have been successful for Western Michigan University. It is also evident that, based on discussions in Chapter I regarding problems of declining federal and state funding and inflationary trends in the American economy, continued increases in alumni giving must be forthcoming just to counteract the deliterious effects of inflation.

Motivation

Broce (1979) presented several characteristics of a successful fund raiser, one of which is to understand people and to know how to organize, direct, and motivate them. Brakeley (1980), a nationally recognized fund raiser with more than forty years experience, has identified nine donor motivating factors that he perceives to influence practically every fund raising campaign. Brakeley's donor motivating factors are:

1. Individuals, corporations, and foundations have money to give.
2. The right person or persons ask them, at the right time, and in the right circumstances.

3. People have a sincere desire to help other people.

4. People wish to belong to or be identified with a group or organization they admire.

5. Recognition of how vital their gifts can be satisfies a need for a sense of personal power in many people.

6. People have received benefits—often, personal enjoyment, as from a symphony orchestra—from the services of the organization and wish, in turn, to support it.

7. People give because they "get something" out of giving.

8. People receive income and estate tax benefits from giving.

9. People may "need" to give; that is, altruism may not be an option but a "love or perish" necessity for many people. (p. 26)

Brakeley points out that the nine motivational factors he has identified sometimes correspond to various psychological, social, and economic theories of human behavior and that "altruism is one of the many possible motives—but usually the chief one" (p. 25). Brakeley also makes the point that "most positive human behavior is motivated to some degree by enlightened self-interest, and the human need to 'get something out of giving'" (p. 26). Symour (1966) observed that people give when someone "at their own or a higher level asks them to give—usually more thoughtfully when asked with good reason, more proportionately when the giving requirements are explained and the worker himself has helped set the standards, and more regularly and dependably when the contact is personal and influential" (p. 29). Dichter (1971) presented several factors that he perceives
as motivators for giving. The "disease of poverty," defined by Dichter as "The act of giving (making oneself a little bit poorer) [which] reminds one that, with a little bad luck, he might be as badly off as those to whom the contribution is made" (p. 120), is perceived by Dichter as an inducement for giving. "'Fear of embarrassment' and 'Competitive giving'—'promoted as a way of competing and earning prestige'" (p. 121), are also viewed by Dichter as viable motivators for giving.

The motivational factors identified by Brakeley (1980), Symore (1966), Dichter (1971), as well as other professional fund raisers, appear logical and can probably be substantiated by formal scientific investigation. But the somewhat casual reference to these factors fails to deal directly with the multitude of variables such as gender, age, social and economic status, and attitudes that influence human behavior. This is not to say the importance of such variables is not recognized by professional fund raisers; it is, however, to say that the value of having identified donor motivational factors a priori is somewhat diminished due to the lack of in-depth empirical evidence to support them.

The literature of philanthropy abounds with references to motivation for giving. A survey of literature concerning motivation for giving to institutions of higher education generally deals with characteristic differences between donors and non-donors, as in studies by McKee (1975), McNulty (1976), and Markoff (1978), for example. Little, if any, empirical research has been directed toward an inves-
tigation of specific subjective psychological motivational factors and their relationships to financial support for institutions of higher education.

Traditionally, motivational research in the field of psychology has been directed toward three theoretical approaches. One approach has been taken from the biological, physicalistic tradition of 19th century physiologists and the Darwinian revolution in scientific thought. Psychologists such as Hull, Watson, and Spence used terms like drive and instincts to describe their motivational theories. A second approach has been the study of motivation from the perspective of cultural influences with learned experiences and the nature of the psychological environment as central influences in explaining motivation. Terms such as wishes, feelings, desires, demands, needs, and motives emerged from this approach. The third approach to motivational research is that of philosophy and theology, an approach that dominated the field prior to the 20th century (Korman, 1974). Though motivational research in the field of psychology has been extensive in all three approaches, and research findings have made important contributions for providing insight to the comprehension of many aspects of human behavior, a single concept of motivation that could provide a theoretical basis for all behavior has eluded development. According to Bayton (1977), however, the general consensus of psychologists is that motivational needs fall into two categories: (1) tension-systems physiological in nature, and (2) tension-systems existing in the individual's subjective psychological state and in his
relations with others (psychogenic needs).

Philanthropy, and in particular the giving of money, appears logically to be a function of psychological motives that are more subjective in nature than they are physiological. The gesture to help another individual or group by giving them money may be viewed as a way to reduce psychological tension for the giver, but is unlikely to be perceived as a satisfier for basic physiological needs. The giving of money might be more readily viewed from the motivational perspective of satisfying a higher level need, such as self-esteem, a need proposed by Maslow (1970), or from the perspective that such giving is motivated by altruism, a motivational factor proposed by Nagel (1970) to be a "rational requirement on human conduct" (p. 80).

McClanahan (1977) observed that "in the purest definitional form, altruism does not exist, for the individual seeks some 'personal gain' in his activity. Even the ultimate 'gift of martyrdom' is accompanied by a profound sense of fulfillment. It is not so much the cause that motivates, but the achievement of the highest personal satisfaction" (p. 2). One might question the degree of finality in McClanahan's statement that "it is not so much the cause that motivates but the achievement of the highest personal satisfaction" in terms of whether such satisfaction is in fact a consequence of the behavior rather than the incentive for it. McClanahan's viewpoint may be true, but it cannot negate the fact that altruism is perceived to exist by most professional fund raisers and numerous professionals in fields such as psychology, philosophy, and particularly theology.
Self-Esteem

Allport (1937) observed that self-esteem and self-love have been so prominently discussed in Western cultures that they have been declared man's supreme traits. The principal aim of all our actions, according to many psychologists, is to keep the "ego-level" as high as possible. Ralph Waldo Emerson succinctly described this school of thought in regard to a motivation for giving when he said, "Take egotism out, and you would castrate the benefactor" (Culyer, 1973, p. 48).

The literature of motivation is liberally sprinkled with terminology such as ego and combinations of terms referring to some form of self-affection causing one to question the definition of each term in relationship to similarly defined terms. Wells and Marwell (1976) listed terms such as self-love, self-confidence, self-respect, self-acceptance (or rejection), self-satisfaction, self-evaluation, self-appraisal, self-worth, sense of adequacy or personal efficacy, sense of competence, self-ideal congruence, and ego or ego-strength to illustrate this pot pourri of different terms used to describe the same personality trait. Wells and Marwell noted that, according to Allport, the ideas of ego and self were interchangeable in early literature dealing with motivation and personality development.

Maslow (1970) describes needs of ego-enhancement as esteem needs manifested by all people in our society, as a "need or desire for a stable, firmly based, usually high evaluation of themselves, for self-respect, or self-esteem, and for the esteem of others" (p. 45).
These needs have been classified by Maslow into two subsidiary sets. The first set includes "the desire for strength, for achievement, for adequacy, for mastery and competence, for confidence in the face of the world, and for independence and freedom" (p. 45). Included in the second set is the desire for reputation or prestige, status, fame and glory, dominance, recognition, attention, importance, dignity, and for appreciation.

Bayton (1977) provides an analogous but somewhat less elaborate description of ego-enhancement needs than Maslow, by defining "the needs to enhance or promote the personality, to gain prestige and recognition, to satisfy the ego through domination of others" as ego-bolstering needs (p. 133). Bakal (1979) sees status, the desire for self-esteem, and social prestige as common reasons people become involved in fund raising activities; he views various fund raising functions such as charity balls, fashion shows, golf outings, and a variety of concerts as ways to provide and satisfy needs of status and social prestige. According to Bakal, this kind of activity not only motivates giving but directs that giving to particular organizations. The practice of naming buildings after generous donors has been common in the United States since the inception of fund raising activities in this country. The enhancement of the individual through the custom of memorialization is extensive throughout the United States and includes the naming of hospitals, museums, and various cultural centers after generous benefactors. Institutions of higher education are readily amenable to memorialization of the big giver: (Elighy)
Yale; (Nicholas) Brown; (James Buchanan) Duke; Johns Hopkins; 
(Mathew) Vassar; and (Leland) Stanford, just to name a few that bear 
the benefactor's name (Bakal, 1979).

Studies by Hovland, Janis, and Field (1959) revealed a negative 
relationship between self-esteem and persuasibility. The lower your 
self-esteem the higher your persuasibility. Their research dealt 
with resistance to persuasive communication. As part of their re­
search, an attempt was made to find personality features conducive to 
persuasibility. Self-esteem emerged as one of the most important 
factors contributing to persuasibility.

Altruism

The concept of altruism is the antithesis of Emerson's cynical 
view of egotism as a prime motivator for giving; it proposes that an 
unselfish interest in the welfare of others is a principal factor 
for the motivation of giving.

Altruistic motives emerge in part from the influences of religion. 
Religious institutions provide social stimuli that enable individuals 
to think and act altruistically (Jenkins, 1950). Christianity, 
Buddhism, Islam, and Judaism all stress compassion for suffering and 
an obligation of the wealthy toward the unfortunate (Nightingale, 1973).

Religion certainly plays an important role in the development 
of altruistic behavior, but it is just one part in the formulation of 
such moral character. A survey made by the United Jewish Appeal re­
vealed that two thirds of the respondents agreed that cultural and
and family traditions are important factors in giving (Bakal, 1979). Lawrence Rockefeller, explaining influences that helped form his philanthropic behavior, stated that "We were all brought up to give. My grandfather started it, my father continued it, and we did it too. As children, we all gave a certain percentage of our allowance to what we called 'Benevolence' which was one of the headings in the account books we kept" (Bakal, 1979, p. 41).

Nagel (1970) proposes that there is such a thing as pure altruism, noting that it may never occur in isolation from all other motives. Nagel's thesis presents an argument for the existence of altruism as a legitimate motivational factor but does not deny that sympathy, love, redirected self-interest, and other influences may be factors that motivate people when "they pursue the interest of others" (p. 80). Nagel contends that there is a motivation available when others are not and also when others are "which has genuinely the status of a rational requirement on human conduct" (p. 80). Aronfreed (1961), contends that anytime a person's behavior is controlled by empathetic processes, his behavior should be labeled altruistic. Some scientists interpret altruism in cost-benefit terms, assuming that individuals, altruists included, learn to perform those acts that are rewarded and to avoid those acts that are not. Either self-congratulation or external reward, then, must support apparent altruistic behavior, according to Hatfield et al. (1975).

On one hand, the concept of altruism is supported from an epistemological approach that argues altruism does in fact exist in a
"pure" form, while on the other hand, the scientific approach takes the position that antecedent conditions exist which direct certain behaviors perceived to be altruistic.

In a survey probing reasons for giving, people said they gave because of an obligation to help the needy. However, when asked why others gave, they said the main motivating factors were the desire for social status, prestige, respect, and acclaim. Examples such as these lead one to believe the "obligation to give" (altruism) is little understood, is a concept that includes motivational factors for which the individual does not want to admit ownership, and is also used as a convenient category to classify motivational factors of helping behavior that are perceived to fit nowhere else.

Like much of the subjective realm of psychological research, the positive identification of variables that could relate altruistic behavior to particular stimuli has not been forthcoming. Consequently, the theories of altruism that grow from a deductive philosophical base are just as valid as those that have been developed from motivational research carried out by scientific methodology.

Altruism has been described by the theologians as the unselfish interest in the welfare of others; by the psychologists as a motive of self-interest; by the economists as a transaction involving some kind of exchange, a quid pro quo; by the philosophers, such as Herbert Spencer, as "nine parts self-interest gilt over with one part philanthropy" (Bakal, 1979, p. 43), and by Nagel (1970), who provides a dialectic proposition that altruism is a pure unselfish act.
In a recent national survey of philanthropic activities, a summation statement included a recognition of altruism as a motivational factor for giving:

Once we get beyond the tax incentives and the other economic and demographic forces, we find some background influences and some current environmental factors with marginal effects on giving. But there remains an altruistic syndrome, differences in the level of which we cannot explain. (Morgan et al., 1979, p. 244)

Donor Variables

Several donor variables have been discussed in Chapter I which represent a nucleus of donor characteristics that are perceived to possess a high degree of importance as factors instrumental in alumni giving behavior. Demographic variables such as sex, age, income, and education level are routinely included in studies of philanthropic behavior by McKee (1975), McNulty (1976), Markoff (1978), and Morgan, Dye, and Hybels (1979), while professional fundraisers Brakeley (1980), Symore (1966), and Dichter (1971) repeatedly refer to previous gifts, influence of prestige, and tax-incentives as factors having influence on individual giving behavior. All of these donor variables are alluded to as having a direct or indirect relationship to either self-esteem, altruism, or both.

Gender

Research on women has generally revealed two things: they are more persuasible than men, and their persuasibility seems much less
related to particular personality characteristics (Elms, 1972).

In the late 1930's, Allport (1937) observed that the dual standards of employment (with the exception of domestically related work) imposed on women by men was being modified to include women, and as this change slowly occurred, the ratio of inferiority between men and women would be equalized. Allport's observation was insightful, and we have witnessed the entrance of many more women into occupations that were exclusively the territory of the male. One might question how much change has actually occurred in terms of equalizing feelings of inferiority between men and women. Mulford (1964), 27 years after Allport's observation, found that women with children were more likely to define themselves spontaneously as mothers and wives than were men to define themselves as fathers and husbands.

F. Rosenberg and Simmons (1975), Bush, Simmons, Hutchinson, and Blyth (1977-78), and Seidner (1978) found lower self-esteem among girls than among boys. M. Rosenberg (1965) and Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) found little difference between the self-esteem of boys and that of girls. F. Rosenberg and Simmons (1975) and Simmons and F. Rosenberg (1975) found that the self-esteem of boys and girls differed only modestly, but at adolescence, girls show considerably higher instability of self-concept: their ideas about themselves tended to change more quickly, to vary more from day to day. Similar differences between males and females in regard to helping behavior have been found to exist. Fox (1979) noted that in medicine, as in academia, women earn less than men. At the same time, medical women
profess less interest in money, and more interest in patients. In other fields, according to Fox, women similarly express less interest in money. Hoffman (1977) claimed that empathy, a basic underlying characteristic of altruism, is more prevalent in females than in males. Hoffman proposed two types of empathy: (1) cognitive awareness of the feelings of others and (2) the vicarious affective response to another's feelings, concluding that females are more likely than males to exhibit the vicarious affective type of empathy.

Age

The Report of the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs (Giving in America, 1975) reported that the average annual giving for someone in the 18- to 24-year-old range was $60, compared to $742 for someone 75 or older. Results from a national survey of philanthropic activity (Morgan et al., 1979) published by the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center states:

Giving also increases with age for many reasons. The pessimistic interpretation would be that each new 'younger' generation is less altruistic than the previous one, or that proximity of eternal judgement motivates the aged. But people may have economic responsibilities and uncertainties as they get older and more assets and accumulated rights. (p. 164)

Coles and McCall (1979) studied adult males and females, married and single, ranging in age from 30 to 45. Their findings suggested continued personality development through the adult period. Seventeen percent of the subjects in the 30-year-old age group said that altruism was important or very important to their quality of life. Forty-one
percent perceived altruism to be important to quality of life in the 35-year-old age group. There appears to be a significant increase in altruism from the 30 to 35 age groups, suggesting that people tend to be more concerned for the welfare of others as age increases. In the 40 to 45 age groups, there was a slight tendency for the perception of altruism as being important to the quality of life to decline, but it remained well above the response level of the 30-year-old age group. This study also showed that components of self-esteem (personal development and self-knowledge) were rated most important for the 35-year-old age group, declining slightly for the 45-year-old age group. Lowe and Ritchey (1973) found a strong relationship between age and helping behavior and between social class and helping behavior. Results of their study revealed that upper middle class subjects exhibited helping behavior more frequently than middle and lower middle class subjects. When presented with the opportunity to provide help, 45.5% of subjects with a mean age of 24 years responded favorably, while 59% of subjects with a mean age of 39 years exhibited helping behavior. Such studies support the suggestion that age tends to influence self-esteem and altruism of adult males and females.

Household Income

Fund raising professionals like Michael Radock know from experience that people with higher incomes give proportionately more money (Radock, 1976). A recent study undertaken by the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center showed that, from the population
surveyed, more than half the total giving came from households with incomes between $10,000 and $30,000, which represent nearly half of all households in the country. Results of the survey showed that 48% of households have incomes below $10,000 and represent only 16% of the giving, while less than 4% of households have incomes above $30,000 and represent 29% of the giving (Morgan, Dye, & Hybels, 1979).

If those who have more tend to give more, one’s first reaction is to perceive this as an altruistic gesture. But here the "hedonistic paradox" presents itself and gives question to the existence of altruism as the only motive for giving more. The "hedonistic paradox" states that "even the most unselfish act may produce a psychological reward for the actor" (Cohen, 1978, p. 82-83). Cohen's experience with the Kanuri (Nigerian) culture exemplifies this paradox. The Kanuri explanation for the logic of giving states basically that "either I am going to receive esteem and influence or, if I have acted generously to someone, I want something in particular and will state it as soon as it is diplomatic to do so" (Cohen, 1978, p. 86). Cohen sees this as generally a universal motive in everyday behavior.

Amount of Gift to WMU

If it can be said that people give as a response to "pure altruism" or as a way to contribute to self-enhancement, then it can be reasoned that giving begets giving. Symour (1966) stated that "the best prospects are those who have already given and that the more a person gives, the more likely he is to give more" (p. 28). Bar-Tel
(1976) observed that the individual who perceives himself as generous damages his self-perception when not helping after he or she has provided previous help. Schaeffer (1975) found that subjects who reciprocated the help given them previously were more willing to help again than those subjects who did not reciprocate. Freedman and Fraser (1966) found that compliance with an initial request results in greater likelihood that a larger request will be met with a positive response. In their study, women who agreed to answer questions about household products they used were found to be more favorably responsive when they were asked to comply with a larger request to allow a survey team to perform an inventory of all their household products. Harris (1972) conducted a study that supports the hypothesis that doing one good deed makes a person more likely to do another. Harris asked subjects for money (a dime) using three different approaches. Subjects were asked to give money only; asked the time followed by a request for money; and asked for directions to a particular street followed by a request for money. Results of the study showed that 11.11% of those asked for money only, gave; 44.4% of those asked the time followed by a request for money gave both the time and money; and 38.9% of those asked for directions followed by a request for money gave both directions and money.

Type of Degree

According to Giving in America (1975), a college graduate gives six times as much as a high school graduate. This estimate corresponds
to results reported by Morgan, Dye, and Hybels (1979). Average giving per year was found to range from $162 for a husband or single head of household with less than seven years of formal education to $924 per year for those holding a B.A. or B.S. degree, and increased to $1,248 for those with an advanced degree. Morgan et al. (1979) speculated that giving may depend on a variety of reasons, ranging from greater income security and stability of the well educated to their greater feeling of social responsibility. Denmark and Guttening (1967) found that women of high self-esteem who want to go to college are more likely to achieve that goal than women who want to go to college who have low self-esteem. Research by Shaw (1969) showed that academic achievers have a more positive self-concept than under-achievers. Results of these studies could conceivably be generalized to predict that individuals with high self-esteem are motivated to pursue an advanced degree.

Satisfaction of Career Preparation Provided by WMU

Donor characteristics based on perception of prestige associated with Western Michigan University, and on satisfaction of career preparation while attending WMU, deal with attitudes of alumni toward their alma mater. Reichley (1977) noted that "not all alumni leave their institutions with a strong attachment" (p. 324-325). Studies by Moore, Underwood, and Rosenhan (1973) and Rosenhan, Underwood, and Moore (1974) have shown that reflection on past experiences that have been perceived as positive, has a facilitative effect on generosity.
Generosity was shown to be just as readily withheld when experiences have been perceived as negative (Rosenhan, 1978). According to Bar-Tel (1976), the quality and quantity of the reward provided by the donor are two of the most important determinants of reciprocative behavior. A study conducted by Wilke and Lanzetta (1970) clearly demonstrated the linear relationship between the amount of help received and the amount of reciprocation. Results of their study produced a correlation of .71 between the help received and the help reciprocated. Results also showed that reciprocity was proportional to the amount of prior help received from the donor, thereby supporting the hypothesis that the more rewarded the recipients, the more they are willing to reciprocate.

**Ranking of Western Michigan University**

Thibaut and Riecken (1955) found that the status of the donor is instrumental in the recipient's perception of the donor's motive. Status was also seen as having an effect upon the willingness of the recipient to reciprocate. Spaeth and Greeley (1971), doing research commissioned by the National Opinion Research Center for the Carnegie Commission on the future of Higher Education, found that 80% of alumni surveyed in 1967-68 indicated that they liked their alma mater, yet only 37% made a financial contribution to their college.

**Tax-Incentives for Giving**

The value of tax-incentives on the giving of money to organizations and institutions has long been a question among fund raisers.
Morgan et al. (1979) found that few people, with the exception of those at the highest income levels, would give substantially less without deductibility. Hyden W. Smith, an official of the Council for Financial Aid to Education, remarked that he knew of no one who has made a gift just to get a tax deduction (Bakal, 1979). Bakal surmised that if tax deductions have an impact upon giving, it is in regard to the amount to give rather than the decision to give or not to give.

Summary

Self-esteem and altruism and their roles as motivational factors of human behavior are discussed in numerous forms of publication. It is, however, a difficult task to find literature regarding this subject that deals with philanthropy, and more precisely with alumni giving to institutions of higher education.

Self-esteem appears to be generally accepted by a diverse cross-section of psychological thought as a motivational force in almost every facet of human behavior. Research conducted by Hovland, Janis, and Field (1959) lends corroboration to the evidence that self-esteem is in fact one of the most important factors contributing to persuasibility. Snagg and Combs (1949) postulate that the protection and enhancement of the self are themselves prime motives, not reducible to more basic drives. M. Rosenberg (1979) perceives the protection and enhancement of self-esteem as a major determinant of human thought and behavior. Altruism is also viewed by many motivational theorists
as a salient motivating factor that influences individual behavior, particularly behavior directed toward the helping of others.

The scarcity of empirical research directly related to alumni giving underscores the need for studies of this nature, but does not exclude findings of previous research from application to alumni giving behavior. Alumni giving is a manifestation of human behavior; therefore, previous studies of human behavior, particularly studies of self-esteem and altruism as motivational forces, should have some general applicability to variables of alumni giving behavior.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The design of the study and the methods used in conducting this research are described in this chapter. The specific topics discussed include: (a) review of the problem, (b) population and selected sample, (c) instrumentation, (d) methodology (data collection, computerization), and (e) analysis of data.

Review of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to analyze relationships that exist between donor self-esteem and altruism and selected characteristics of Western Michigan University Annual Fund donors. Donor characteristics include (a) gender, (b) age, (c) annual household income, (d) amount of 1979 contribution to the WMU Annual Fund, (e) degree received from WMU, (f) ranking of WMU, (g) satisfaction of career preparation while attending WMU, and (h) perceived value of tax-incentives for giving to WMU.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument (Appendix B) is composed of two parts. The first part, consisting of items 1 through 8, was designed to provide information regarding selected donor characteristics of WMU alumni who made a financial contribution to the WMU Annual Fund during 1979. The second part was designed to measure the factors of self-
esteem and altruism and consists of items 1 through 60.

Items 1 through 8 are concerned with selected donor characteristics. Twenty-five donor characteristics were selected after an extensive review of literature and related research was conducted. The final selection of eight donor characteristics, identified within the Review of the Problem section of this chapter, was made on the basis of their pertinence to the purpose of the study.

The second section of the instrument was designed to measure the personality traits of self-esteem and altruism perceived as motivational factors for alumni giving. The scores obtained for levels of self-esteem and altruism were independently subjected to statistical analysis so that relationships between each of the eight donor characteristics and the levels of self-esteem and altruism could be investigated.

The instrument was developed to collect data used to answer two major questions: (1) Is there a relationship between self-esteem and each of the eight selected donor characteristics? (2) Is there a relationship between altruism and each of the eight selected donor characteristics?

Kerlinger (1964) described personality measurement as the most complex of the fields of psychological measurement. An examination of various instruments commonly used to measure an extensive variety of personality traits not only reveals the complexity of personality measurement, but also makes one aware of the vast array of methodology used in measurement of personality characteristics.
The subjective psychological aspect of personality measurement is a primary factor that creates difficulty in construction of instruments used for personality measurement. Cronbach (1960) observed that "Personality structure, even if perfectly measured, represents only a predisposition rather than an absolutely determining force" (p. 493). It is imperative that instruments used for measurement of personality actually measure what they are intended to measure (validity) and possess characteristics of stability and consistency (reliability) so that they may reflect personality factors being measured as accurately as possible.

After assessing the technical difficulties encountered in test construction, particularly in construction of personality tests, the decision was made to use an existing instrument designed for measurement of self-esteem and altruism respectively. The administration of recognized instruments used for measuring both variables was the most desirable choice, but an acceptable test that measures altruism could not be found. The extraction of a subscale from an existing personality test was selected to meet the descriptive criteria of altruism as well as to provide acceptable coefficients for reliability and validity. Such a scale was found in the Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI). The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) was selected as the method for measurement of self-esteem. Selection of this instrument was based on existing reliability and validity data, length, and format compatibility with the OPI altruism subscale. The subscale extracted from the OPI and the entire Self-Esteem Inventory...
were used to construct a single instrument that was used to measure self-esteem and altruism for this study.

The 36 questions comprising the altruism subscale of the Omnibus Personality Inventory and the 24 questions that constitute the entire Self-Esteem Inventory were combined so that a random selection of test items could be made. The resulting 60 items were selected and used to construct the second part of the instrument (items 1 through 60). All 60 items comprising the second section of the questionnaire required a response of true or false. Only responses marked true were counted. A raw score of 36 was obtainable for the Omnibus Personality Inventory portion of the questionnaire. The SEI raw score was used as the actual score for measurement of self-esteem. The altruism raw score, measured by the OPI altruism subscale, was converted to a standard score using Table 1, Norms for the OPI Scales (Heist & Yonge, 1968, p. 11).

Personality Scale Development

Both the Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1967) and the Omnibus Personality Inventory (Heist & Yonge, 1968) were constructed to assess characteristics of personality possessing normal aspects of human behavior.

The Omnibus Personality Inventory scales were developed from a large collection of items comprising a variety of scales in an original version of the OPI and from selected scales in the VC Attitude Inventory. Scale development and refinement produced the present Form F
version (Heist & Yonge, 1968).

The Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI)

Measurement of self-esteem required for this study was obtained through application of the Self-Esteem Inventory. The 25-item inventory was designed to measure the self-attitudes of an individual in the areas of peers, parents, school, and personal interests and to provide a subjective appraisal of personal worth—factors that fulfilled the descriptive criteria of self-esteem for the purpose of this study. Items for the SEI were extracted from a scale developed by Rogers and Dymond. All the items from the Rogers and Dymond scale were reworded so that the SEI could be used for adults as well as for children. The SEI was reduced from 50 to 25 items by a panel of five psychologists and was designed so that respondents are required to select "Like Me" or "Unlike Me" for each of the 25 items. Each item is keyed for the high esteem response which represented a single score. A maximum score of 25 is indicative of high self-esteem (Coopersmith, 1967).

Two modifications were made to the Self-Esteem Inventory. The terms "Like Me" and "Unlike Me," used as response choices, were changed to true and false respectively. This change was made so that all items on the questionnaire constructed for this study could be answered either true or false. The second change consisted of the elimination of item 25, considered to be weak "since less than 10% answer in the low esteem direction" (Coopersmith, 1967, p. 87). Table
1 provides identification of the 24 items used to measure self-esteem for this study.

Table 1
Dependent Variables of Self-Esteem and Altruism and Corresponding Questionnaire Items for Section II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Questionnaire Items Section--II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>2, 3, 7, 8, 12, 17, 21, 22, 26, 30, 33, 34, 36, 38, 40, 41, 43, 46, 47, 49, 51, 52, 57, 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 35, 37, 39, 42, 44, 45, 48, 50, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Omnibus Personality Inventory Form F Altruism Subscale (OPI)

Measurement of the altruism factors were obtained through application of the altruism subscale, extracted from the OPI. The 36 item altruism subscale was designed to be "in line with the interpretation that the altruistic person is not oriented toward personal gains but maintains a concern for the welfare of his fellow man" (Heist & Yonge, 1968, p. 30).

High scorers on the altruism subscale tend to be affiliative, trusting, and ethical in relations with others, and are concerned about the feelings and welfare of other people. Low scorers tend not to
consider the feelings and welfare of others and often view people from an impersonal distant perspective. A score of 60 or above is interpreted to be representative of the subscale definition.

Raw scores obtained by application of the altruism subscale were converted to standard scores with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. Table 1 provides identification of the 36 items used to measure altruism for this study.

Reliability

Reliability is described by Kerlinger (1964) as "stability, predictability, dependability, and consistency" (p. 132). Wood (1961) defines reliability as the "lack of dependence upon chance variation" (p. 11). Both definitions allude to the same end, which in test theory is referred to as "reliability."

Taylor and Reitz found a .90 split-half reliability for the Self-Esteem Inventory long form. Coopersmith reported a test-retest reliability coefficient for the original 50-item scale of .88 over a five week period, and .70 over three years. Reliability data for the shorter 25-item SEI are not available, but it is suggested that reliability coefficients may be less stable due to shorter length (Coopersmith, 1967).

The Kuder-Richardson Formula 21 (KR 21) and the corrected split-half method (using the Spearman-Brown formula) were used to obtain estimates of internal consistency for the Omnibus Personality Inventory. The test-retest method, reflecting the tendency of individuals
to maintain their relative positions when tested a second time, was also used. The coefficient obtained by the Kuder-Richardson Formula for the altruism subscale was .74. The split-half correlation corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula obtained .83 for this subscale. Two groups, \( n = 67 \), and \( n = 71 \), were used for the test-retest method with respective coefficients of .81 and .90 obtained for the altruism subscale (Heist & Yonge, 1968).

Reliability coefficients obtained by the Kuder-Richardson Formula, the corrected split-half method, and the test-retest method for the Self-Esteem Inventory and the Omnibus Personality Inventory altruism subscale appeared to possess the necessary criteria for test reliability. Consequently, both the Self-Esteem Inventory and the Omnibus Personality Inventory altruism subscale were considered satisfactory for application to this study.

Validity

It is generally assumed that an instrument is valid if it measures what it is supposed to measure. Data contained in both the Omnibus Personality Inventory and the Self-Esteem Inventory test manuals indicate that what they actually measure is related closely to what their names suggest they measure.

Taylor and Reitz reported a correlation of .45 between the California Personality Inventory self-acceptance scale and the longer Coopersmith scale, and found correlations of .75 and .44 with the Edwards and the Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scales. Coopersmith
found correlations of .59 and .60 between the short form of the SEI and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale using two samples of college student subjects (Coopersmith, 1967).

Correlations between the OPI altruism subscale and the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values (Revised Edition) (social service worker = .42), and the Strong Vocational Interest Blank for Men (minister = .47) are in line with the interpretation that the altruistic person is concerned more for the welfare of his fellow man than for his personal gain (Heist & Yonge, 1968).

Validity coefficients tend to be much lower than reliability coefficients, tending to fall within a band of .40 to .60 (Downie & Heath, 1970). Cronbach (1960) noted that it is unusual to obtain a validity coefficient above .60. The judgment of whether or not a validity coefficient is high enough to warrant use of a test as a predictor is dependent upon "such practical considerations as the urgency of improved prediction, the cost of testing, and the cost and validity of the selection methods already in use" (p. 115-116). Cronbach remarked that "If a criterion can be predicted only with .20, the test may still make an appreciable practical contribution" (p. 116).

Content and criterion validity coefficients for the Self-Esteem Inventory and the Omnibus Personality Inventory altruism subscale were considered to possess acceptable levels of validity for use as personality measurement scales for the purposes of this study.
Population and Sample

A random selection of 400 donor names was made from a list of more than 6,000 names of alumni who made a financial contribution to the WMU Annual Fund between January 1, 1979 and December 31, 1979. Names and addresses were obtained from the records of the WMU Alumni Affairs Office. Donor names used for this study were made public through the WMU Foundation 1979 Annual Report To Donors (University Magazine, 1980). Only names of Western Michigan University alumni were selected from the 1979 donors; names of donors who desired to remain anonymous were excluded. Donor names were also selected on the basis of a known current address.

The procedure reported by Krejcie (1970, p. 607-610), was used to determine the sample size, \( n \), necessary for 95% confidence with no more than 5% error. The sample size needed to meet the specified conditions was 267. To minimize error and insure an adequate rate of response, the sample size was increased to 400.

A systematic random sample of donors was assembled using the computerized list of donor names. A code (numbers 1 to 400) was assigned to each of the selected names.

Each donor's name, address, and code number were recorded on individual 3 x 5 cards which were used as a master file.

All data from the usable questionnaires were transferred to coding form sheets, key punched on tape, and stored.
Data Collection

A pilot study was undertaken to determine whether questionnaire directions and items were sufficiently clear and to verify that an adequate response rate could be achieved when using sensitive personality questions that might elicit reluctance on the part of the subject to respond. The returned questionnaires did not reveal problems with responding to directions or items, and a 65% rate of return for the pilot study dispelled apprehension that subjects might not respond at a rate acceptable for the purpose of the study. No changes were made in the questionnaire or accompanying cover letter as a result of the pilot study.

Two weeks after the initial mailing, each of the remaining 350 subjects was mailed a questionnaire with an individually numbered code affixed in the upper right corner. A cover letter (Appendix A) and pre-addressed, pre-stamped envelope accompanied the questionnaire. The cover letter established the need for the study and expressed the researcher's concern for confidentiality of all information. As the questionnaires were returned, their code numbers permitted accounting of responses.

It was decided not to undertake a follow-up mailing because of the sensitive nature of the instrument used in this study and in consideration of alumni who had already provided help to Western Michigan University. The achieved response rate of 63% was considered acceptable for the purpose of this study.
Analysis of Data

Leedy (1974) has described two principal functions for inferential statistics: (1) to predict or estimate a population parameter from a random, or representative sample, and (2) to test statistically based hypotheses (p. 138). The prediction or estimation of a population parameter from a random, or representative sample, is determined through use of the independent variables under investigation. The second function of inferential statistics, to test statistically based hypotheses, uses both the independent variables (donor characteristics in this study) and the dependent variables (self-esteem and altruism) to draw conclusions from the hypotheses testing.

Independent Variables

The independent variables for this study were derived from selected donor characteristics and consisted of two or more groups of interval data. The independent variables are:

1. Gender. The independent variable of gender was divided into two groups: Female and Male.

2. Age. The independent variable of age was divided into four age groups: 20 to 30, 31 to 40, 41 to 50, and over 50.

3. Amount of 1969 contribution to the WMU Annual Fund. The independent variable of amount of contribution was divided into three groups: $1 to $100, $101 to $250, over $250.

4. Type of Degree. The independent variable of degree was divided into four groups: Certificate, Baccalaureate, Graduate Degree, Baccalaureate and Graduate Degree.
5. Ranking of WMU. The independent variable of rank was divided into three groups: Above Average, Average, Below Average.

6. Annual household income. The independent variable of household income was divided into four groups: Less than $15,000, $15,000 to $35,000, $36,000 to $45,000, over $45,000.

7. Career preparation at WMU. The independent variable of career preparation while attending WMU was divided into three groups: Above Average, Average, Below Average.

8. Tax-incentive. The independent variable of influence of tax-incentives on giving was divided into three groups: Was a primary factor for giving, Had some influence, Had no influence.

**Dependent Variables**

The dependent variables for this study are self-esteem and altruism. The two personality factors were measured by responses recorded on section two of the instrument constructed for use by this study.

**Procedures for Testing**

The One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to test each of the hypotheses.

Downie and Heath (1970) recommended that three assumptions underlying the use of analysis of variance should be met: (1) individuals in the various subgroups should be selected randomly from normally distributed populations, (2) variance of the subgroups should be homogeneous, and (3) the groups should be independent (equal intervals) so that the ratio of between and within variances will have the F-distribution. Assumption number one is satisfied through normal distribution obtained from a random selection process and a large
sample size. Assumption number three is satisfied through use of interval data applied to the independent variables. Kerlinger (1964) suggests that "the importance of normality and homogeneity is overrated" (p. 258). Unless variances are obviously heterogeneous, the effect on the F-test will probably be negligible. It is assumed that variances within the groups will be statistically the same. Consequently, assumption number two, suggested by Downie and Heath, is satisfied.

For the purpose of this study, .05 was used as the probability for committing a Type I error in rejecting the null hypothesis for the One-Way Analysis of Variance.

Summary

Chapter III presented a review of the problem and described the population and selected sample, instrumentation design, data collection procedures, and statistical treatment of the data.

The study was designed to analyze relationships between donor self-esteem perceived to be a motivator for giving and selected characteristics of WMU Annual Fund donors, as well as relationships between donor altruism perceived to be a motivator for giving and selected characteristics of WMU Annual Fund donors. The Questionnaire was composed of two parts. Part I, items 1 through 8, provided information regarding donor characteristics. The second part of the questionnaire was used to measure self-esteem and altruism, and contained items 1 through 60.

Alumni were selected by a systematic sampling of those who pro-
vided financial support to the 1979 WMU Annual Fund drive. Questionnaires were mailed, with an addressed and postage paid envelope, to 400 Western Michigan University alumni.

The hypotheses were tested using a One-Way Analysis of Variance.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

This study was designed to provide information concerning relationships between the personality variables of self-esteem and altruism, assumed to be motivational factors for giving, and each selected characteristic of Western Michigan University Annual Fund donors.

Results of the study are described in several sections of this chapter. The first section describes the response rate of the population studied. The second and third sections present the findings related to the 16 research hypotheses. The second section presents the findings of hypotheses one through eight, which were constructed to investigate the relationships between donor self-esteem and each of the eight donor characteristics. Section three presents findings of hypotheses nine through sixteen that were constructed to investigate the relationships between donor altruism and each of the eight donor characteristics. The final section presents a summary of Chapter IV.

Response Rate

The "Donor Motivation Inventory" instrument was used to collect the data needed for the study. The instrument was administered to a systematic random sample of 400 Western Michigan University alumni who gave financial support to the 1979 WMU Annual Fund drive. A total of 254 alumni (63%) participated and completed usable question-
naires. A summary of frequency distribution, mean, and standard deviation of donor self-esteem and altruism scores are presented in Appendix C (self-esteem) and Appendix D (altruism).

Description of Respondents

Distribution of Western Michigan University alumni who responded to the questionnaires, with respect to the variables under investigation, are reported in Table 2.

The gender variable grouped the respondents by whether they were female or male. Sixty-four percent of the respondents were males while 36% of the respondents were females.

The age variable had four categories: those between the ages of 21 and 30, 31 and 40, 41 and 50, and those over 50. The 31 to 40 age group had the largest response rate, with 35%.

The annual household income variable was divided into four groups: those with annual household incomes of less than $15,000, those with incomes between $15,000 and $35,000, between $36,000 and $45,000, and those with annual household incomes of over $45,000. The majority of respondents, 50%, reported annual household incomes of $15,000 to $35,000. The under $15,000 income category was not included as a group choice on the questionnaire, but was included as a category when several respondents indicated that they had incomes of less than $15,000 annually.

The ranking variable consisted of three categories for ranking WMU in respect to other Michigan four-year public institutions of higher education: those who perceived WMU to be above average, those
who perceived WMU to be average, and those who perceived WMU to be below average. The group perceiving WMU as average was the largest, with 60% of the respondents in that group.

The contribution variable consisted of three groups: those who contributed between $1 and $100, those who gave between $101 and $250, and those who donated more than $250. An overwhelming majority of 93% reported contributions ranging from $1 to $100.

The degree variable divided the respondents into four categories: those who earned a certificate at WMU, those who received a baccalaureate degree, those who earned a graduate degree, and those who obtained a combination of baccalaureate and graduate degrees from Western Michigan University. Sixty-seven percent of the respondents were awarded a baccalaureate degree by WMU. The certificate category was not included as a category on the questionnaire, but was included when several respondents indicated they had been awarded a "certificate" by Western Michigan University.

The career preparation variable consisted of three groups: those who perceived their career preparation at WMU to be above average, those who rated their career preparation as average, and those who perceived their career preparation to be below average. Career preparation provided by Western Michigan University was perceived to be average by a majority of respondents, with 57% rating career preparation in the average category.

The tax-incentive variable was divided into three categories: those who perceived tax-incentives to be a primary influence on their decision to make a contribution, those who felt tax-incentives had
some influence on their decision, and those who felt tax-incentives were not a factor in their decision to make a contribution. The categories of "some influence" and "no influence" had a combined response rate of 96%, with 56% of the respondents indicating that tax-incentives had no influence upon their decision to contribute to the 1979 WMU Annual Fund drive.

The distribution of respondent donors and corresponding distribution of self-esteem and altruism mean scores, with respect to donor characteristics, is presented in Appendix E.

Table 2

Distribution of Respondent Donors with Respect to Donor Characteristic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Variable</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $15,000</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $35,000</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Variable</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$36,000 to $45,000</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over $45,000</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 to $100</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$101 to $250</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over $250</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate/Graduate</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender Variable

The first hypothesis stated that self-esteem would be greater for the male donor than for the female donor.

A One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to test the null hypothesis of no difference between the mean self-esteem score of the female donor and the mean self-esteem score of the male donor. Since the probability of obtaining an F-ratio of 4.66 or greater was less than the predetermined probability of .05 for committing a Type I error, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The results of the One-Way Analysis of Variance, shown in Table 3, showed the difference in group means between the self-esteem of male and female donors to be in the expected direction. Male donors obtained a higher self-esteem mean score than did female donors.

Age Variable

The second hypothesis stated that there would be a relationship...
between self-esteem and age of the donor.

A One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to test the second null hypothesis for the following age groups: 21 to 30, 31 to 40, 41 to 50, and over 50. Since the probability of obtaining an $F$-ratio of 2.14 or greater was larger than the predetermined probability of .05 for committing a Type I error, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, as shown in Table 4, no support was found for the hypothesis that there is a relationship between self-esteem and donor age.

Table 3

ANOVA Investigating Relationships Between Self-Esteem and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>57.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.032*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$.

Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income Variable

The third hypothesis stated that there would be a relationship between self-esteem and annual household income of the donor.

A One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to test the third null hypothesis.
hypothesis for the following groups of donor annual household income: less than $15,000, $15,000 to $35,000, $36,000 to $45,000, and over $45,000. Since the probability of obtaining an F-ratio of 1.76 or greater was larger than the predetermined probability of .05 for committing a Type I error, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, as shown in Table 5, no support was found for the hypothesis that there is a relationship between self-esteem and annual household income.

Table 4

ANOVA Investigating Relationships Between Self-Esteem and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>26.46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.19</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>19.85</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19.84</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

ANOVA Investigating Relationships Between Self-Esteem and Annual Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>0.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than $15,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.83</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $35,000</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$36,000 to $45,000</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over $45,000</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contribution Variable

The fourth hypothesis stated that there would be a relationship between self-esteem and amount of donor contribution to the 1979 Western Michigan University Annual Fund.

A One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to test the fourth null hypothesis for the following groups of donor contribution: $1 to $100, $101 to $250, and over $250. Since the probability of obtaining an F-ratio of 0.192 or greater was larger than the predetermined probability of .05 for committing a Type I error, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, as shown in Table 6, no support was found for the hypothesis that there is a relationship between self-esteem
and amount of donor contribution.

Table 6
ANOVA Investigating Relationships Between Self-Esteem and Donor Contribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1 to $100</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$101 to $250</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.31</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over $250</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree Variable

The fifth hypothesis stated that there would be a relationship between self-esteem and the type of degree granted by Western Michigan University to the donor.

A One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to test the fifth null hypothesis for the following groups of degrees: Certificate, Baccalaureate Degree, Graduate Degree, Baccalaureate and Graduate Degree.

Since the probability of obtaining an F-ratio of 0.94 or greater was larger than the predetermined probability of .05 for committing a Type I error, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, as
shown in Table 7. no support was found for the hypothesis that there is a relationship between self-esteem and the type of degree received.

Table 7

ANOVA Investigating Relationships Between Self-Esteem and Type of Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>19.24</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19.70</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate/Graduate</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranking Variable

The sixth hypothesis stated that there would be a relationship between self-esteem and donor ranking of Western Michigan University when compared to other Michigan public institutions of higher education.

A One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to test the sixth null hypothesis for the following ranking groups: Above Average, Average, Below Average. Since the probability of obtaining an F-ratio of 0.31
or greater was larger than the predetermined probability of .05 for committing a Type I error, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, as shown in Table 8, no support was found for the hypothesis that there is a relationship between self-esteem and the donor ranking of Western Michigan University.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>19.46</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>19.37</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Career Preparation Variable

The seventh hypothesis stated that there would be a relationship between self-esteem and donor perception of career preparation provided by Western Michigan University.

A One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to test the seventh null hypothesis for the following groups of perceived career preparation:
Above Average, Average, Below Average. Since the probability of obtaining an F-ratio of 9.53 or greater was less than the predetermined probability of .05 for committing a Type I error, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The results of the One-Way Analysis of Variance, shown in Table 9, showed a relationship in group means between self-esteem and perception of career preparation.

The Mean Squares Error testing procedure was used to determine which differences between the pairs of means contributed to the overall significance of the One-Way Analysis of Variance. The greatest difference was found to be between donors who perceived their career preparation to be above average and donors who perceived their career preparation to be average. Donors with an above average perception of their career preparation obtained a higher self-esteem mean score than donors who perceived their career preparation to be average or below average.

**Tax-Incentive Variable**

The eighth hypothesis stated that there would be a relationship between self-esteem and the level of tax-incentive influence on donor giving behavior.

A One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to test the eighth null hypothesis for the following tax-incentive groups: was a primary factor, had some influence, had no influence. Since the probability of obtaining an F-ratio of 0.97 or greater was larger than the predetermined probability of .05 for committing a Type I error, the null
hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, as shown in Table 10, no support was found for the hypothesis that there is a relationship between self-esteem and the influence of tax-incentives on donor giving behavior.

Table 9
ANOVA Investigating Relationships Between Self-Esteem and Career Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>112.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Preparation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>20.61</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender Variable

The ninth hypothesis stated that altruism would be greater for the female donor than for the male donor.

A One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to test the null hypothesis of no difference between the mean altruism score of the female donor and the mean altruism score of the male donor. Since the probability of obtaining an F-ratio of 5.32 or greater was less than the
predetermined probability of .05 for committing a Type I error, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The results of the One-Way Analysis of Variance, shown in Table 11, showed the difference in group means between the altruism of female and male donors to be in the expected direction. Female donors obtained a higher altruism mean score than did male donors.

Table 10

ANOVA Investigating Relationships Between Self-Esteem and Tax-Incentives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax-Incentive</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary factor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some influence</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>19.12</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No influence</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>19.70</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age Variable

The tenth hypothesis stated that there would be a relationship between altruism and age of the donor.

A One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to test the tenth null hypothesis for the following groups: 21 to 30, 31 to 40, 41 to 50,
and over 50. Since the probability of obtaining an F-ratio of 2.22 or greater was larger than the predetermined probability of .05 for committing a Type I error, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, as shown in Table 12, no support was found for the hypothesis that there is a relationship between altruism and age of the donor.

While the One-Way Analysis of Variance indicates no relationship between age and altruism, the determined probability of .086 is in the direction of the .05 level of significance used in this study and suggests that differences between age groups and their mean altruism scores should be noted. As shown in Table 12, the mean altruism scores show a steady increase from 21 to 50 years of age and appear to stabilize at their highest level for donors over 50 years old.

Table 11

ANOVA Investigating Relationships Between Altruism and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>443.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>83.42</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>56.91</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>54.14</td>
<td>9.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

ANOVA Investigating Relationships Between Altruism and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>185.98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>83.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age | N | Mean | Standard Deviation
---|---|------|-------------------|
21 to 30 | 31 | 52.42 | 10.44 |
31 to 40 | 88 | 54.15 | 8.90 |
41 to 50 | 57 | 56.72 | 9.86 |
over 50 | 75 | 56.29 | 8.30 |

**Income Variable**

The eleventh hypothesis stated that there would be a relationship between altruism and annual household income of the donor.

A One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to test the eleventh null hypothesis for the following groups of donor annual household income: less than $15,000, $15,000 to $35,000, $36,000 to $45,000, and over $45,000. Since the probability of obtaining an F-ratio of 0.65 or greater was larger than the predetermined probability of .05 for committing a Type I error, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, as shown in Table 13, no support was found for the hypothesis that there is a relationship between altruism and annual household...
income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>57.29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>87.22</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13
ANOVA Investigating Relationships Between Altruism and Annual Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than $15,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52.50</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $35,000</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>54.60</td>
<td>9.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$36,000 to $45,000</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56.21</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over $45,000</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55.94</td>
<td>7.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contribution Variable

The twelfth hypothesis stated that there would be a relationship between altruism and the amount of donor contribution to the 1979 WMU Annual Fund.

A One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to test the twelfth null hypothesis for the following groups of donor contribution: $1 to $100, $101 to $250, over $250. Since the probability of obtaining an F-ratio of 1.08 or greater was larger than the predetermined probability of .05 for committing a Type I error, the null hypothesis was not rejected.
Therefore, as shown in Table 14, no support was found for the hypothesis that there is a relationship between altruism and the amount of donor contribution.

Table 14

ANOVA Investigating Relationships Between Altruism and Donor Contribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>91.94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>84.80</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1 to $100</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>55.31</td>
<td>9.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$101 to $250</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over $250</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57.66</td>
<td>9.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree Variable

The thirteenth hypothesis stated that there would be a relationship between altruism and the type of degree granted by Western Michigan University to the donor.

A One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to test the thirteenth null hypothesis for the following groups of degrees: Certificate, Baccalaureate Degree, Graduate Degree, Baccalaureate and Graduate Degree. Since the probability of obtaining an F-ratio of 1.07 or greater was...
larger than the predetermined probability of .05 for committing a Type I error, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, as shown in Table 15, no support was found for the hypothesis that there is a relationship between altruism and the type of degree.

Table 15

ANOVA Investigating Relationships Between Altruism and Type of Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>90.51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>84.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52.86</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaurate</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>54.68</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55.49</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaurate/Graduate</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57.72</td>
<td>8.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ranking Variable

The fourteenth hypothesis stated that there would be a relationship between altruism and donor ranking of Western Michigan University when compared to other Michigan public institutions of higher education.

A One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to test the fourteenth
null hypothesis for the following ranking groups: Above Average, Average, Below Average. Since the probability of obtaining an F-ratio of 0.46 or greater was larger than the predetermined probability of .05 for committing a Type I error, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, as shown in Table 16, no support was found for the hypothesis that there is a relationship between donor ranking of WMU and altruism.

Table 16

ANOVA Investigating Relationships Between Altruism and Ranking of WMU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>39.70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>86.00</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>55.88</td>
<td>9.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>54.72</td>
<td>9.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>10.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Career Preparation Variable

The fifteenth hypothesis stated that there would be a relationship between altruism and donor perception of career preparation provided by Western Michigan University.
A One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to test the fifteenth null hypothesis for the following career preparation groups: Above Average, Average, and Below Average. Since the probability of obtaining an F-ratio of 12.60 or greater was smaller than the predetermined probability of .05 for committing a Type I error, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The results of the One-Way Analysis of Variance, shown in Table 17, showed a relationship in group means between altruism and perception of career preparation.

The Mean Squares Error testing procedure was used to determine which differences between the pairs of means contributed to the overall significance of the One-Way Analysis of Variance. The greatest difference was found to be between donors who perceived their career preparation to be above average and donors who perceived their career preparation to be average. Donors with an above average perception of their career preparation at WMU obtained a higher altruism mean score than donors who perceived their career preparation to be average or below average.

**Tax-Incentive Variable**

The sixteenth hypothesis stated that there would be a relationship between altruism and the level of tax-incentive influence on donor giving behavior.

A One-Way Analysis of Variance was used to test the sixteenth null hypothesis for the following tax-incentive groups: was a primary influence, had some influence, had no influence. Since the probabil-
ity of obtaining an F-ratio of .098 or greater was larger than the
predetermined probability of .05 for committing a Type I error, the
null hypothesis was not rejected. Therefore, as shown in Table 18,
no support was found for the hypothesis that there is a relationship
between altruism and the influence of tax-incentives on donor giving
behavior.

Table 17

ANOVA Investigating Relationships Between
Altruism and Career Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>989.44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>78.51</td>
<td>245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

Career Preparation | N  | Mean | Standard Deviation |
-------------------|----|------|--------------------|
Above Average      | 99 | 58.56| 9.17               |
Average            | 144| 52.78| 8.66               |
Below Average      | 5  | 56.80| 8.04               |
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Table 18

ANOVA Investigating Relationships Between Altruism and Influence of Tax-Incentive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>83.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax-Incentive</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary factor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51.71</td>
<td>9.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some influence</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>54.79</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No influence</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>55.65</td>
<td>9.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Chapter IV presented data pertaining to the research hypotheses as well as a description of respondents relative to the eight donor characteristics. Relationships were found to exist between self-esteem of male donors and between self-esteem of female donors. Relationships were also found between donor perception of career preparation and self-esteem and between donor perception of career preparation and altruism.

Chapter V presents the conclusions, recommendations, and summary based on the data collected.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND SUMMARY

Conclusions

In this study it was hypothesized that various donor characteristics have a direct relationship to self-esteem and altruism which in turn, have an influence upon the giving behavior of Western Michigan University alumni who gave financial support to the WMU 1979 Annual Fund drive.

The hypothesis that self-esteem is greater for the male donor than for the female donor was accepted by this study. The results indicated that male donors obtained a higher self-esteem mean score than did female donors. The results of the study supported research by F. Rosenberg and Simmons (1975), Bush, Simmions, Hutchinson, and Blyth (1977-78), and Seidner (1978) that found self-esteem to be predominately higher in the male subject.

Differences in self-esteem between males and females, as investigated by this study, were not expected to vary from results reported in other studies that found self-esteem to be greater for males than for females. Results confirmed this expectation. It was assumed that the population of this study is subjected to the same social and psychological pressures that influence individual behavior to conform to the mores of the normal American population of which it is a part.

If this assumption is true, then it would be expected that male donors
would exceed female donors in formal education and individual income, and would be acting in the role of head-of-household, all of which are variables recognized as factors that contribute to self-enhancement, which in turn is positively related to self-esteem. The disparity between male and female roles in our society has been undergoing a drastic evolution. Such change could, and most likely will, lead to a decline in significant differences in self-esteem between males and females, but such change has not occurred in the population of this study. This fact leads one to the conclusion that self-esteem, as studied here, is a motivational factor that exerts a greater influence upon the giving behavior of the male donor than on the female donor.

The hypothesis that altruism is greater for female donors than for male donors was accepted in the study. The results indicated that female donors obtained a higher altruism mean score than did male donors. These findings support research by Fox (1979) and Hoffman (1977) that found the influence of altruism to be more predominant in females than in males. As with the relationship between self-esteem and donor gender, differences in altruism between male and female donors were expected to correspond to previous research that found altruism to be greater for females than for male subjects.

The American social system has historically been one in which females have assumed the role of helper. The teaching profession (with the exception of higher education), the nursing profession, and the predominance of women involved in a profusion of voluntary roles in the field of philanthropy are prominent examples of areas dominated
by women and which are generally perceived as helping professions or activities. Some would argue that the helping role played by women in our society is an inherent one, but evidence suggests that it is a role that has been forced upon women by a male dominated society. Over the past several decades we have witnessed the struggle of women for equal rights with significant gains being made. Perhaps such gain will eventually result in a narrowing of differences in self-esteem between males and females; but a gain in self-esteem for women does not necessarily mean a decline in altruism. The results of this study indicate that altruism is significantly higher for female donors than for male donors leading one to conclude that altruism, in regard to this study, is a motivational factor yielding a greater influence upon the giving behavior of the female donor than on the male donor.

The hypothesis that there is a relationship between self-esteem and perception of career preparation provided by Western Michigan University was accepted in this study. The results indicated that there is a relationship between self-esteem and donor perception of career preparation. Donors with an above average perception of their career preparation were found to have higher self-esteem than donors who perceived their career preparation to be average. Such results might be expected considering what we know of self-esteem. The results followed usual patterns of behavior that work to enhance the self-image however, two possible conclusions emerge. The high self-esteem score for donors who perceived their career preparation to be above average could be a result of donors possessing a high level of self-esteem, rating career preparation as above average so that they
might maintain or improve their own self-concept. On the other hand, career preparation perceived to be above average could boost the self-esteem of the recipient of such perceived help. Regardless of which is cause and which is effect, it may be concluded from the results of the study that donors who perceive their career preparation at WMU to be above average possess a higher level of self-esteem than donors who perceive their career preparation to be average.

The hypothesis that there is a relationship between altruism and donor perception of career preparation provided by Western Michigan University was accepted by the study. The results indicated that there is a relationship between altruism and perception of career preparation. Altruism was found to be greater for donors who perceived their career preparation to be above average than for donors who perceived their career preparation to be average. Like the relationship discussed previously between self-esteem and career preparation, the relationship between altruism and career preparation could conceivably be a result of one of two obvious causes. The greater inclination toward altruism of donors rating their career preparation to be above average could be a result of a need for reciprocity in the form of above average rating of career preparation. Wilke and Lanzetta (1970) found that the more rewarded the recipients are, the more they are willing to reciprocate. It is also possible that donors with high altruism rated career preparation as above average as a result of what Aronfreed (1970) refers to as behavior controlled by empathetic processes. Whatever the cause, it can be concluded from the results of the study that donors who perceive their career preparation pro-
vided by Western Michigan University to be above average achieved a
greater level of altruism than donors who perceived their career prep-
eration to be average.

The relationships found by this study between self-esteem and
gender and between altruism and gender focus on the existence of dif-
fferences between the sexes other than those physiological in nature.
As with other research focusing on relationships between males and
females and self-esteem and between males and females and altruism,
this study suggests that the formation of subjective psychological
concepts are different for males than for females. In terms of
applying these differences to fund raising strategies, the possibil-
ity of a different approach to males than to females for the solicici-
tation of financial support could conceivably have a more personal
effect and, hopefully, a positive influence upon alumni giving.

Relationships were found between career preparation and self-
esteeem and between career preparation and altruism. Donors who rated
their career preparation as above average obtained the highest altru-
ism mean score as well as the highest self-esteem mean score. With
self-esteem and altruism perceived as motivators for giving, one
might speculate that those donors who ranked their career preparation
as above average, and who also had the greatest mean self-esteem and
altruism scores, would be donors with the potential for greater
financial support to their alma mater.

With the exceptions of those variables previously discussed, no
relationships were found between the remaining donor characteristics
and self-esteem and altruism. However, mean self-esteem and altruism
scores tended to be in the direction one would predict based on a review of literature regarding self-esteem and altruism. Self-esteem mean scores tended to increase as age, income, level of degree, rank of WMU, and perception of career preparation increased. Self-esteem mean scores tended to increase as the influence of tax-incentives decreased. Altruism mean scores tended to increase as age, income, level of degree, rank of WMU, and perception of career preparation increased. The greatest altruism mean score for the tax-incentive variable was found for those who perceived tax-incentives to have no influence on the decision to give.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this investigation, recommendations for further research are as follows:

1. Expansion of this study should be undertaken to investigate relationships between self-esteem and altruism, and selected donor characteristics of other college and university alumni.

2. An expanded selection of donor characteristics should be developed so that variables not included in this study may be investigated regarding relationships to self-esteem and altruism.

3. A study to determine the existence of differences between donors and non-donors in regard to relationships between self-esteem and altruism and various donor characteristics should be implemented.

4. Further studies based on factors perceived to influence alumni giving behavior should be conducted so that a greater in-depth
knowledge of subjective psychological forces that have an impact on giving behaviors will be forthcoming.

5. An attempt should be made to develop a single instrument that has measurement of self-esteem and altruism of the adult population as its purpose.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships between selected donor characteristics of Western Michigan University alumni who gave financial support to the WMU Annual Fund between January 1 and December 31, 1979, and donor self-esteem and altruism perceived to be motivational factors for WMU alumni financial support. The results provide insight to how various donor characteristics influence self-esteem and altruism of WMU Annual Fund donors. The eight donor characteristic variables selected for this study were those perceived to represent a cross-section of donor characteristics that have appeared in literature, surveys, and in-depth studies concerned with philanthropy and which are alluded to as having a direct or indirect relationship to either self-esteem, altruism, or both. Self-esteem and altruism were selected because they are perceived to represent factors that play an important role in the motivation for giving. Hypotheses were developed concerning relationships between the donor characteristics and donor self-esteem as well as donor characteristics and donor altruism.

A review of related literature and research relevant to fund
raising in institutions of higher education and to philanthropy in
general, supported the assumption that self-esteem and altruism are
perceived to be motivational factors for giving. The selection of donor
characteristics was also supported by the literature review which indi­
cated that those donor characteristics selected for investigation
appeared most often as characteristics of interest and concern.

The subjects in the study were male and female alumni of Western
Michigan University who gave financial support to the 1979 WMU Annual
Fund, and were selected for the study by the systematic random sample
method.

A Questionnaire consisting of eight items regarding donor charac­
teristics and 60 items (24 items—self-esteem and 36 items—altruism)
for measuring self-esteem and altruism was developed and mailed with
a stamped, return addressed envelope enclosed. The mailing procedure
produced a 63% usable response rate.

Relationships were found to exist between self-esteem of male
donors and self-esteem of female donors as well as altruism of male
donors and altruism of female donors. Relationships were also found
to exist between donor perception of career preparation and self-esteem
and between donor perception of career preparation and altruism.
Appendix A

Cover Letter
You are being asked to help me complete research for a doctoral dissertation undertaken as partial fulfillment for the degree of Doctor of Education. The study has been designed to investigate motivational characteristics of Western Michigan University alumni who provided financial support to the 1979 WMU Annual Fund drive.

Completion of the enclosed questionnaire, which takes approximately 15 minutes, will be an invaluable contribution to the success of the study.

Collected information will be processed with a maximum concern for confidentiality and in no instance will you be referred to by name. The number in the upper right corner of the questionnaire is for follow-up purposes only. Upon conclusion of the response period, the master list containing names and identifying numbers will be destroyed.

Sincerely,

Gerald L. Anderson
Graduate Associate

Uldis Smidchens, Ph.D.
Professor
Educational Leadership Dept.
Appendix B

Questionnaire

Donor Motivation Inventory
**Donor Motivation Inventory**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Please mark the box under each item that best describes you or your opinion.

1. **Sex:**
   - [ ] Female
   - [ ] Male

2. **Age:**
   - [ ] 20 - 30
   - [ ] 31 - 40
   - [ ] 41 - 50
   - [ ] over 50

3. **Annual Household Income:**
   - [ ] $15,000 - 35,000
   - [ ] $36,000 - 45,000
   - [ ] over $45,000

4. **Amount of Contribution to the 1979 WMU Annual Fund:**
   - [ ] $1 - 100
   - [ ] $101 - 250
   - [ ] over $250

5. **Upon completion of my studies at WMU, I was granted a:**
   - [ ] Baccalaureate Degree
   - [ ] Graduate Degree
   - [ ] Baccalaureate & Graduate Degree

6. **Compared to other Michigan public institutions of higher education, WMU ranks:**
   - [ ] Above Average
   - [ ] Average
   - [ ] Below Average

7. **My career preparation provided by WMU was:**
   - [ ] Above Average
   - [ ] Average
   - [ ] Below Average

8. **The influence of tax-incentives on the amount of my gift to WMU:**
   - [ ] was a primary factor for giving
   - [ ] had some influence
   - [ ] had no influence
INSTRUCTIONS: Items 1 through 60 contain a series of statements. Please read each one, decide how you feel about it, and then mark your choice in the appropriate box. If you agree with a statement or feel it is true about you, place an X in the box under TRUE. If you disagree with a statement, or feel that it is not true about you, place an X in the box under FALSE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRUE</th>
<th>FALSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. I like to serve as a member of a committee in carrying out some activity or project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Other people usually follow my ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. My family understands me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. I am more realistic than idealistic, that is, more occupied with things as they should be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. I would enjoy showing foreigners around my town or state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. I become so enthusiastic that my enthusiasm spreads to those around me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. It takes me a long time to get used to anything new.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. I can make up my mind without too much trouble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. I would rather not have responsibility for other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. We cannot know for sure whether or not there is a God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. When traveling I am more interested in seeing the scenic or historical spots than in making new acquaintances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. I find it very hard to talk in front of a group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. I discuss the causes and possible solutions of social, political, economic or international problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. I am aroused by a speaker's description of unfortunate conditions in a locality or country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. I would rather remain free from commitments to others than risk serious disappointment or failure later.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. I tend to ignore the feelings of others when accomplishing some end that is very important to me.
17. I get upset easily at home.
18. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it.
19. The best way to handle people is to tell them what they want to hear.
20. I am active on the committees of school organizations.
21. Most people are better liked than I am.
22. I usually feel as if my family is pushing me.
23. Assuming that I had sufficient leisure time, I would prefer to use it to develop a favorite skill rather than do volunteer social work or public social work.
24. What is lost in life seems more vivid than what is gained.
25. People pretend to care more about one another than they really do.
26. Things usually don't bother me.
27. It is better never to expect much; then you are rarely disappointed.
28. A strong person doesn't show his emotions and feelings.
29. Most people inwardly dislike putting themselves out to help other people.
30. I often wish I were someone else.
31. I am curious about people but I don't feel close to them.
32. It is all right to get around the law if you don't actually break it.
33. I'm a lot of fun to be with.
34. I'm popular with people my own age.
35. When prices are high you can't blame a person for getting all he can while the getting is good.

36. My family expects too much of me.

37. I often wonder what hidden reason another person may have for doing something nice for me.

38. I give in very easily.

39. I don't blame anyone for trying to grab all he can get in this world.

40. My family usually considers my feelings.

41. There are lots of things about myself I'd change if I could.

42. I would enjoy studying the causes of an important national or international event and writing a paper on these causes.

43. I often get discouraged at what I am doing.

44. It makes me impatient to have people ask my advice or otherwise interrupt me when I am working on something important.

45. I enjoy listening to debates and discussions on social, economic, or political problems.

46. There are many times when I'd like to leave home.

47. If I have something to say, I usually say it.

48. I expect that ultimately mathematics will prove more important for mankind than will theology.

49. I'm not as nice looking as most people.

50. It is difficult for me to take people seriously.

51. It's pretty tough to be me.

52. I often feel upset about the work that I do.

53. I enjoy chatting and playing with children.

54. I hesitate to ask the assistance of others.
55. There are certain people I dislike so much that I am inwardly pleased when they are catching it for something they have done.

56. I easily become impatient with people.

57. I have a low opinion of myself.

58. Things are all mixed up in my life.

59. Husbands, rather than wives, should have the final voice in family matters.

60. I am interested in conversations about people whether or not I am acquainted with them.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>8.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>13.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>16.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>25.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>35.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>44.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>56.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>69.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>76.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.48</td>
<td>90.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible range of scores = 16

Mean = 19.43

Standard Deviation = 3.53
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Frequency Distribution, Mean, and Standard Deviation of Donor Altruism Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>6.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>10.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>12.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>15.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>19.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>25.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>30.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>36.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>44.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>51.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>60.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>67.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>74.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>80.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Appendix D (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>88.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>93.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>96.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>98.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>98.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>99.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible range of scores = 49

Mean = 55.13

Standard Deviation = 9.21
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Distribution of Respondent Donors and Corresponding Self-Esteem and Altruism Mean Scores with Respect to Donor Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Altruism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>56.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>54.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.19</td>
<td>52.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19.85</td>
<td>54.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.84</td>
<td>56.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>56.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $15,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.83</td>
<td>52.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 - $35,000</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>54.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$36,000 - $45,000</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>56.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $45,000</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>55.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 - $100</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>55.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$101 - $250</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.31</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $250</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>57.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Donor Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Altruism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>52.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaurate</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19.24</td>
<td>54.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.70</td>
<td>55.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaurate &amp; Graduate</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>57.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Altruism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.46</td>
<td>55.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>19.37</td>
<td>54.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Preparation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Altruism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.61</td>
<td>58.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>52.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>56.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax-Incentive</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Altruism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Influence</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>51.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Influence</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19.12</td>
<td>54.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Influence</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19.70</td>
<td>55.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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