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ABSTRACT

This study examined the profile of the potential online donor to a small, private, liberal arts institution. Attitudes towards online giving were studied between participants who donated online and those who did not. Additionally respondents of differing class years were compared to determine which age groups were more likely to donate over the Internet. A total of 576 surveys were returned for an effective response rate of 38%.

Collected data were entered into an SPSS database. The data revealed most respondents had been using the Internet for over 5 years, and accessed the Internet almost everyday. Data also revealed that most respondents accessed the Internet from their homes or offices and own two e-mail addresses.

Through data analysis, it was discovered that a small percentage of respondents currently donated to other non-profits over the Internet. However, the majority of respondents were unsure about online giving and its role in the philanthropic process. Additionally, respondents' attitudes towards online giving did not differ between class years. Respondents' preferred method of communication was
through the mail, however, the majority of respondents reported they would be willing to receive monthly e-mail communications from the institution.

Conclusions and recommendations included that credit card security and information privacy were viewed as very important to donors if they were to donate over the Internet. In addition, it was concluded that donors who made financial transactions over the Internet were more likely to make a charitable contribution over the Internet.

Recommendations included the institution should begin the process of educating their alumni as to the benefits of online giving, and integrate online giving into their comprehensive fundraising process.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Colleges and Universities are increasingly utilizing technology. Online technology has begun to enter the classroom with many classes taught online each year. In addition, most colleges and universities have established a presence in cyberspace by maintaining a website to convey information to their alumni and to assist them in recruiting perspective students. "Online technologies provide educational institutions with new ways to serve, engage and interact with alumni. They also offer new opportunities to communicate with more alumni more consistently and in a more timely fashion than ever before" (Pearson, 2001, ¶ 1). Although very slowly, online technology is making its way toward impacting the way that fundraisers solicit gifts in support of their organization.

The start of the new millennium was coupled with the beginning of the "Philanthropic Internet Age. Just as we were saying goodbye to the most amazing period in human history, we gave birth to the promise of a bright philanthropic future" (Hart, 2001, p. 22). The phrase to describe the Philanthropic Internet Age is e-philanthropy.
"In the midst of the frenzied buying and selling of goods and services on the Internet, a new kind of money exchange is taking root. Call it e-philanthropy" (Henry, 1999, ¶ 1).

While some colleges and universities have begun to participate in online giving, many have been hesitant to fully embrace it as part of their fund-raising efforts. According to Lajoie (2002):

Many development officers say they are hesitant to jump to conclusions regarding their current returns, or in some cases, invest further in the venture until more data are available and their constituents provide more feedback on their experiences. Other campuses have soldiered on, instituting some features common to Web sites outside higher education and incorporating elements that take advantage of the Webs benefits. (¶ 2)

Many of the campuses that are taking advantage of online giving are producing positive results. While, “many development officers report that they have yet to analyze whether donors who make gifts with checks will shift to making gifts online” (Lajoie, ¶ 6).

Stetson University

Stetson University was founded in 1887, and is Florida’s first private university. The current mission of the institution is to “Provide an excellent education in a creative community where learning and values meet, and to foster in students the qualities of mind and heart that will prepare them to reach their full potential as informed
citizens of local communities and the world" (Stetson University, 2003).

The university was charted as an independent and comprehensive university. In the past, there had been a historical relationship with the Baptist Church, however today the university is independent of all religious ties. Stetson is comprised of faculty, staff, and students from diverse religious, cultural, and academic backgrounds.

The university consists of four colleges and several campuses throughout the state of Florida. There are approximately 2,500 students on all campuses. The main campus is located in DeLand, Florida and is the location of the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Business, and the School of Music. The Stetson University Center at Celebration, Florida offers professional programs and a limited number of graduate programs. The fourth college, the College of Law, is located in St. Petersburg, Florida. In addition, a branch campus of the College of Law is being constructed in Tampa, Florida.

Academic programs at the university include over 60 undergraduate majors and minors across all disciplines in each of the three colleges. Graduate programs include the Masters of Business, Masters of Accountancy, Masters of Science in Counseling, Masters of Arts in English, and a Masters of Education. The university also offers a joint MBA/JD degree at the College of Law. The university is
fully accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The College of Law is accredited by the American Bar Association. The National Association of Schools of Music accredits the School of Music. The American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business is the accrediting body for the school of business administration. In addition, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education accredits the teacher education programs. The University was ranked fourth among schools in the southeast in the 2001 US News and World Report guide of America’s best colleges. In addition, the College of Law ranked second in the nation for its trial advocacy program and in the top half of the fourth tier of all law schools nationally.

The Stetson Development Fiscal Year 2002

Recap and Fiscal Year 2003 Goals

Each year, Development and University Relations staff aims to achieve and exceed the University’s alumni gift participation, capital project, Annual Fund, Challenger, and Restricted Scholarship goals. In addition, the office is responsible for College and School Board management, volunteer identification and management, gift posting, donor acknowledgement and stewardship, and database and record management. The fiscal year 2002 alumni participation rate
was aggressively set at 40%. The participation rate suffered a 1% total loss in fiscal year 2002 compared to fiscal year 2001 and was 32%. Targeted mail and phone appeals were made to non-donor DeLand young alumni (less than 10 years out of school), non-donor DeLand alumni, and non-donor DeLand reunion alumni in an effort to recruit new alumni donors. The strategy for these contacts were: (a) a $15 ask in support of scholarships, or (b) permission from the alumni for an anonymous donor to contribute $1 on their behalf to their record. These contacts collectively yielded less than a 2% return, securing 114 new donors. Also, all Stetson senior class members were contacted and encouraged to make a gift after graduation but before May 31. This effort yielded a 4% return with 19 new donors. Finally, Development staff actively targeted and contacted the 60 faculty and staff who were Stetson alumni non-donors yielding 7 responses.

The department merged efforts with the Alumni Office in running the reunion giving campaign in fiscal year 2002. Four staff members were each assigned two classes to work with through the fall semester in an effort to achieve class fund-raising and participation goals. Two mailings were sent out to each class to encourage giving and reunion participation and each staff member assigned to a class made significant phone contacts to class members. Overall, the
class gift goals were met, but gift participation was low, especially among recent graduation classes.

Fiscal year 2002 provided a change of focus for the development programs. The renovation of the Business School's Lynn Business Center placed additional requirements on staff time. Monthly volunteer contact was made and over 500 pieces of mail were sent in connection with raising money for this campaign. The year began with a $950,000 Annual Fund goal and $1,419,000 Challenger/Restricted (gifts over $25,000) Scholarship goal. The $2,369,000 total was $274,000 less than the $2,643,000 that was actually raised in fiscal year 2001. However, midway through the fiscal year, an additional $115,000 was added to the $2,369,000 Annual Fund goal, which made the revised goal $2,484,000.

There were three general annual fund appeals made to current donors, LYBUNTS (last year but not this year), PYBUNTS (previous year but not this year), friends, parents, corporations, and volunteers. The total number of pieces mailed was 26,400 and yielded less than a 1% response rate. Additionally, special and separate appeals, totaling 11,600 were made with 2 mailings to young non-donors and non-donors who graduated more than 13 years ago and also yielded less than a 1% response rate. In all, approximately $87,000 was raised through direct mail efforts in fiscal year 2002. Two phone-a-thons were held in fiscal year 2002, 14,550 alumni were contacted, and $145,400 was generated in support. The
combined goal for direct mail and phone-a-thon was $300,000 in fiscal year 2002 however, in total $232,400 was achieved. The fiscal year total for unrestricted annual support was $579,973.

In fiscal year 2003, the Annual Fund program for scholarships had a budget goal of $2,633,190 broken down between the goals for Annual Fund gifts under $25,000 of $1,050,000 and the Challenger Scholarship program’s goal of $1,583,190. The alumni participation goal was fixed at 40%. There were four general direct mailings this year. Two mailings were sent to current donors, LYBUNTS, and PYBUNTS. One mailing was sent to Non-donors and one mailing to current seniors. Additionally, end-of-the-year (calendar and fiscal) appeals were made. The goal for the direct mail program for fiscal year 2003 will be $100,000. In addition, there were two phone-a-thons during the year, and the goal for the combined efforts was $200,000.

Problem Statement

The problem of this study was to develop a profile of alumni donors at a small private institution. Of primary interest was the determination of: (a) the willingness of alumni to embrace online giving, and (b) the extent to which attitudes toward online giving differ based on selected variables including years since graduation, and personal technological use.
Research Questions
This study identified and explored alumni of Stetson University and their perceptions regarding making donations over the Internet. This study was guided by the following questions.

1. What is the profile of the potential online donor for a small, private, liberal arts institution?
2. What is the profile of those donors who might donate online compared to those donors who might not?
3. Is there a difference in attitudes toward online giving between those alumni donors from a private university who graduated less than 5 years out of school, 5-10 years out of school, 10-15 years out of school, more than 15 years out of school?
4. Do donors who give to Stetson University through traditional means give to other organizations over the Internet?
5. Would donors be interested in receiving Stetson University information and program updates via e-mail?
6. What concerns do alumni have when making a donation through the Internet?

Definition of Terms
For the purpose of the reader's clarification, the following terminology are defined:
Alumni--Only Stetson University alumni who graduated between 1981-2002, and who donated less than $1,000 to the institution.

Annual Fund--"A program that consistently (annually) solicits gifts from all elements of a consistency" (Grasty & Sheinkopf, 1982, p. 19).

Annual Gift--Gifts contributed on an annual basis by the institution using direct mail, solicitation of new parents, matching gifts, and phone-a-thons.

E-commerce--The direct exchange of funds in sales transactions occurring through cyberspace (Johnston, 1999).

E-mail--Electronic mail sent between computers via the Internet, to specific E-mail addresses.

E-Philanthropy--The building and enhancing of relationships with supporters of nonprofit organizations using an Internet based platform, and the online contribution of cash or real property or the purchase of products or services to benefit a nonprofit organization (Clohesy & Reis, 2001).

LYBUNTS--Donors who gave the previous year, but had not given yet this year.

Online Donation--A financial gift contribution to the annual fund using the Internet. The gift was either a pledge or paid in full using a credit card.

PYBUNTS--Donors who gave in previous years, but had yet to donate this year.
University Development- Fundraising specifically for institutions of higher learning sometimes referred to as University Advancement.

**Assumptions**

1. It was assumed the universities were interested in expanding their methods of interacting with graduates to the extent that alumni indicated such interest.

2. It was assumed that online giving was an appropriate part of the university development process.

3. It was assumed that the survey used for the study would elicit information regarding alumni's responsiveness to online giving.

4. It was assumed that individuals would respond honestly and accurately to the survey instrument designed for the study.

5. It was assumed that alumni, based on selected variables, would have varying attitudes toward online giving.

**Instrumentation and Other Sources of Data**

A self-administrated questionnaire was sent to the eligible population of 1,418. Additional data were received from the records of Stetson University. Additional data included respondents' graduation years, degrees, and ages.
The questionnaire (see Appendix A) is an original instrument designed by the researcher and the Stetson University Office of Development staff to collect data on alumni views regarding online giving. The questionnaire contains 32 questions and covers topics such as alumni attitudes about online giving and computer and E-mail usage.

Population

The population for this study consisted of 1,418 alumni who gave less than $1,000, through regular mass appeal solicitations, and per industry standard, in any of the last 5 years (fiscal year 1998-2002). Only donors who gave less than $1,000 were selected due to the fact that the institution treats donors at the $1,000 level and above as a Presidential Councilor and, as a result, those donors usually receive a personal visit from a development staff member, rather than a mass appeal solicitation. They were alumni of Stetson University and included all active alumni donors who graduated between the years of 1981 and 2001 from the DeLand campus. The entire response rate achieved was used to comprise the population for this study.

The population of this study consisted of 1,418 alumni who gave less than $1,000, through regular mass appeal solicitations, in any of the last 5 years (fiscal years 1998-2002). They were alumni of Stetson University and included all active alumni donors who graduated between the
years of 1981 and 2001 from the DeLand campus. The entire response rate achieved was used to comprise the population for this study.

Data Collection

The prospect pool of 1,418 Stetson alumni who met the established criteria was utilized. A survey was conducted using the questionnaire found in Appendix A. Each survey recipient received the instrument, a cover letter (see Appendix B), and a postage-paid self-addressed envelope. The instrument, cover letter, and postage-paid envelope were mailed to recipients on June 4, 2003. The cover letter explained the purpose of the instrument, as well as presented specific instructions and timelines for responding. A self-addressed postage-paid envelope was included to ensure the delivery of the completed surveys. The return envelope was coded for verification purposes to identify which of the respondents returned the completed surveys. To encourage participants to respond, a follow-up letter (see Appendix A) and a second copy of the instrument was mailed on July 6, 2003 to those who did not respond.

Data Analysis

Data analysis for this study was conducted using the statistical analysis software Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 11.0 for Windows. The
majority of responses to questions on the survey resulted in
categorical data, and responses were analyzed with the
Descriptive Statistics and Nonparametric Tests procedures.

**Delimitations**

1. The archival data were delimited to data that could be accessed using the Stetson University database.
2. The study population was delimited to include only the alumni who contributed up to $1,000, through regular mass mail solicitations, to the institution's annual fund for the 2002 fiscal year.

**Limitations**

This study was limited to the specific population of donors who gave less than $1,000 per year, through regular mass mail solicitations, to the Stetson University annual fund and inferences should be drawn only after consideration of the characteristics of the subjects used and the conditions under which the study was carried out.

**Significance of the Study**

Institutions of higher education have become increasingly dependant on the gifts of alumni to improve the quality of the institution's services that are provided to students. This is extremely true for private institutions that have consistently relied upon private benefactors to
enhance their budgets. As private institutions are faced with the reality that less money will be available from governmental sources, they must lean more heavily on the support of their alumni, parents, and friends. Utter, Noble, and Brady (1999) reiterated "the stakes are high in the business of raising alumni contributions, both public and private higher educational institutions face increasing pressures to generate non-tuition sources of revenue (2). Also, education, as with any business, must be able to show a positive return on their investment used to reach these donors. The traditional methods of fundraising, while effective, can be cost prohibitive at times. During this period of financial uncertainty for colleges, the information age has begun to hold a significant place in today's society. The combination of these two elements leads many development officers to wonder if the Internet can be used effectively to solicit much needed funds from their constituents.

Unfortunately, there were limited studies as to a person's attitudes and willingness to participate in online giving, and none focused specifically on alumni of a small, private liberal arts institution and their attitudes towards this new form of donating. University advancement is an integral part of any university operation, and even more so at a private university where there may be limited funds available to support the institution's mission and goals.
College development offices are often under staffed and over worked; however, with the emergence of online technologies, the ability to contact alumni to solicit funds with little or no difficulty could ease the pressures that many small development offices encounter.

This study was used to gather data on alumni donors with a particular emphasis on the potential profile of an online donor. This profile will be of assistance in the determination of future marketing strategies. Analyzed data also served to: (a) determine the difference in attitudes between respondents less than 5 years out of school, 5-10 years out of school, 10-15 years out of school and more than 15 years out of school; (b) determine if it would be possible to convert donors who gave through traditional methods to use online technologies; and (c) identify concerns alumni had when they donated through online technologies. This study may also be beneficial to other small private institutions similar to Stetson University.
Fund raising, gift giving, and receiving is so much a part of our national experience that we in the United States tend to accept the practice as home grown, a totally American phenomenon, and in its modern day form it may well be. (Russo, 1996, p. 103)

However, traces of fundraising and the notion of philanthropy was "derived from the lessons of past centuries, from the practices observed in ancient Greek and Roman cultures and from the practices found among the Puritan settlers during this nation's colonial period" (Russo, 1996, p. 108). In addition, the word philanthropy, which means, "love of mankind" was passed down from the early Grecian culture. Russo reported that in the American colonies, philanthropy was linked to the idea of "brotherly love", and occurred more in the basic neighbor-to-neighbor form; as a result, very little money was exchanged and philanthropy took the form of sharing services. However, as the nation grew and the needs for buildings and services increased, the hired fundraiser began to seek gifts to build such things as colleges, schools, and hospitals. Benjamin
Franklin was one of the first fundraisers, and contributed the notions of the matching gift, pledge payments, and the challenge grant to our present day fundraising strategies. While attempting to build a hospital in Philadelphia, Franklin realized that the government did not support the project. He requested that the government donate one half of the necessary funds, and he would be responsible for the other half of the funds, which he would raise from supporters of the plan. Franklin and his associates targeted prospects and approached them for a gift, and allowed them to donate the money over a period of time. The strategy was successful and the Pennsylvania Hospital was built and is still in operation today (Russo, 1996).

Russo (1996) maintained that fund-raising was pioneered during the 18th Century and, progress was made in the definition of fundraising as a discipline during the 19th Century. It was during this time that the “era skilled entrepreneurs and financial advisors represented the needs of organizations and before donors” (p. 107). During the 20th Century, many of the concepts previously developed were put to the test, specifically due to World War I.

Broce (1986) reported that in the 1920s, institutions of higher education began the practice of philanthropy, with the earliest campaigns focusing on buildings, football stadiums, and endowment funds. However, this “first golden age of philanthropy” (p. 12) was short lived as the stock
market crash and the resulting great depression placed a damper on American's notion to give. It was not until the 1950s that new heights were achieved in fund-raising. "Beginning in the early 1950s, public giving to religious, health, welfare, and educational institutions reached new proportions exceeding the $15 billion mark annually for the first time" (p. 12). It was also during this time that private foundations set patterns of giving, by providing colleges and universities significant challenge grants, which raised donor sights to new levels. The 1950s gave way to the 1960s and multi-million dollar campaigns. Harvard University's successful $82 million campaign encouraged other major private universities, such as Duke and Stanford to launch campaigns. Broce stated that at first, many thought these campaigns would fail, however, when they succeeded other organizations realized they could achieve success in fundraising and established campaigns.

The philanthropic process is comprised of many workings (Greenfield, 1994). These ingredients included: (a) the vision and mission of the organization; (b) rights of assembly, association and community; (c) charitable purposes and public benefits, and (d) legal form. The vision and mission of the organization is an important component because it explains why the organization was formed, what it has accomplished in the past, and what its goals are for the future. Rights of assembly, association, and community are
a guaranteed part of America’s Bill of Rights, and government has supported philanthropy through legitimizing its existence. The charitable purpose of the organization is necessary because giving a gift implies that a certain level of confidence and trust in the organization. Finally, the legal component of philanthropy is necessary so that each organization abides by the same rules and correctly operated as a non-profit.

The Annual Fund

Greenfield (1997) reported “annual campaigns as designed to provide funds for basic program operations and normal growth. They address relativity short-term needs and focus on individual giving, corporations, foundations and civic groups” (p. 236). These campaigns are designed to be repeated and each campaign becomes a foundation for the next years campaign. The annual fund is comprised of any or all of the following components: Phone-a-thons, direct mail, personal solicitations, and special events.

Direct mail is a letter asking for financial support and can consist of large volumes of preprinted commercial letters, or almost any mailing of 10 or more pieces (Greenfield, 1997). While “solicitation by mail may be less effective than a personal solicitation, it is by far the most popular method of annual giving practiced in America” (Greenfield, 1999, p. 113), and is effective for reaching
the masses. Greenfield (1999) reported that a drawback to direct mail was that it could sometimes be costly, and as a result very difficult to generate a profit.

Personal contact can be achieved in the annual fund campaign using telemarketing. Phone-a-thons, are "fund raising-efforts in which gifts or pledges are solicited by telephone" (Greenfield, 1997, p. 318). These types of fundraising provide for personal contact with a large number of people over a short period. It has proven to be successful and can outperform direct mail sometimes as much as 100:1 (Greenfield, 1997). Greenfield stated that phone-a-thons were particularly well suited for educational settings where there is a warm affection and association with the institution. However, one disadvantage of phone-a-thons, according to Greenfield (1999), was that it is not suitable for members of special clubs such as a booster program due to the fact that it may be neither efficient nor effective.

The Capital Campaign, Major Gifts, and Planned Giving

The other important components of development are capital campaigns, major gifts, and planned giving. The capital campaign is "a concentrated effort by an organization to raise a specified sum of money to meet a specified goal within a specified period of time" (Broce, 1986, p. 44). Greenfield (1997) asserted that the capital
campaign increases the level of the gift a donor may give, and these are often referred to as major gifts. The major gift serves to accomplish several things for the organization. First, it serves to provide a quick start to a program or a campaign; second, it seeks to influence the giving levels for all those in the organization; third a major gift provides the opportunity for the organization to make public its goals, and tell the organization's story.

Flanagan (2000) reported that planned gifts were gifts donated at a later time, or bequests. The benefit of a planned gift is that the donor's financial situation can be strengthened through the reduction of taxes. The organization benefits from the future security the bequest provides.

E-Philanthropy

The Internet in it simplest terms is not a thing, a place, or even a corporation, it is simply a cooperative networking effort that spans the globe (Johnston, 1999). However, in a physical sense, the Internet is comprised of millions of computers located around the world that are in constant communication with each other using telephones lines and airwaves. In human terms, "the Internet can be seen as a loosely structured global community that meets in cyberspace - an artificial community that exists only within the bounds of the Internet" (p. 2). Nonprofits are usually
far behind the adoption of new technologies. However, where the use of cyberspace is concerned, nonprofits have recognized the technological benefits to society and have become leaders in adopting and embracing a presence in cyberspace (Conhaim, 1996). Andruss (2001) disagrees and feels that while many nonprofits have been slow to adapt, funds raised by non profits using this type of technology is on the rise. The increased use of the Internet and a presence in cyberspace provided new opportunities for nonprofits in every area from volunteer recruitment to the solicitation of donations. As a result, it was no surprise that online technology instantly conveys information between two people, or allowed for transactions of any type was beginning to impact civic responsibility and especially philanthropy (Hair, 1999). The growth of e-commerce over the past years has also brought to light new fundraising opportunities for schools (Gressel, 2000). The dawn of the millennium combined with the beginning of this new "Philanthropic Internet Age" gave birth to a bright new philanthropic future (Hart, 2001).

Henry (1999) reported the new Philanthropic Internet Age could be labeled e-philanthropy. E-philanthropy was a new kind of money exchange that was taking place in the midst of the exchange of goods and services over the Internet (Henry, 1999). Caldera (2001) defined the term simply as "any activity related to philanthropy that is carried out
using the web" (p. 24). The term e-philanthropy was given substance by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation in a report on the subject.

The word e-philanthropy is now widely accepted as an umbrella term for nonprofit and philanthropy activity online. It is accepted as a kind of universal word that can be used to describe the general buzz on Internet activity that relates to and affects the many dimensions of nonprofit and social change work. (Clohesy & Reis, 2001, p. 4)

Kanter (2002) maintained that while the potential for e-philanthropy to explode onto the scene was great, the concept was still new, and that the use of the Internet for charitable purposes was still in its infancy. However, as technological systems became stronger and more people became accustomed to using the Internet in their daily lives, the potential for a new revolution was great.

Davis (2001) called this potential revolution "as pervasive and significant as the Industrial Revolution of the 19th century" (p. 19). Hart (2001) stated that millions of dollars have been spent by both for-profit and not-for-profit organizations in the construction of an infrastructure and the implementation of policies to support online giving capabilities for both the organization and their constituents. While the construction and implementation of this infrastructure was taking place, a variety of Internet-based methods were used to collect millions of dollars for non-profits both large and small. The convergence of the philanthropic notion to give and the
technological capabilities has created the opportunity to expand and strengthen American philanthropy. In addition, increased use of electronic methods of communications and the new opportunities the Internet provided for both non-profits and their supporters provided more efficient and widespread giving. This dramatically affected the way charitable gifts were made and the way money was raised. This notion was elaborated upon by Glasrud (1999) "the early twenty first century will witness the ability of fundraisers to harness even higher levels of technology in their search for the philanthropic dollar" (p. 40).

Clark (1995) asserted that online technology was starting to impact the non-profit sector in a dramatic fashion, simply by impacting the way information was conveyed. Austin (2001) elaborated that the "e-philanthropy revolution was here to stay" and the revolution would reinvent charitable giving in a similar way that technology reinvented the business world. Simply put, according to Austin, if charities did not embrace e-philanthropy they ran the risk of losing touch with their donors and impeding the mission and goals of their organization. Everyone from foundations to individuals was on the information super-highway and as a result a new mode of philanthropy was being defined. As more Americans used the Internet, non-profits had much to gain through increased opportunities and
exposure to those constituents who the organization felt were demographically desirable.

**Why Nonprofits Should be Online?**

Those who are in leadership positions in philanthropy have little time to act. The web has taken only four years to reach critical mass: 50 million users. Radio took thirty-eight years to reach critical mass, personal computers took sixteen years, television took thirteen years, and the World Wide Web took fourteen years. (Smith, 1999, p. 82)

Nonprofits need to take full advantage of the growing marketing opportunities the Internet provides. Carter (2000) stated that "charities can create their own websites for prospective donors and volunteers or for potential users of their services. The exposure is world wide and the potential is unlimited" (p. 42). Sandborn (2000) collaborated that "non profits are interested in the Internet because of its donation potential" (¶ 7).

Baker (2001) reported that the growth of the Internet has forced organizations to rethink their approach to marketing and the way they communicated with their donors. The emergence of millions of websites has forced organizations to development strategies to reach their target audience, while bypassing much of the junk that is also associated with the Internet. Due to the fact that many of these marketing messages are unsolicited, the question becomes, Is your marketing strategy actually reaching the intended audience? Most of the web's effective
organizations actively recruit their web users in meaningful conversation. This recruitment leads to the development of lasting relationships. As a result, it can be said, an effective marketing strategy for the web occurs when the organization creates dynamic and personal programs that promise a high level of user involvement and an open dialogue. The outcome of this approach is that loyalty and trust can be developed and strengthened in the relationship between the organization and the donor. Baker continued by stating that this type of marketing strategy takes time, but is designed to build lasting relationships. The return on the organization's investment is not suddenly realized. The constituent must be moved through the phases of this process: (a) attracting visitors, (b) turning visitors into friends, (c) converting friends into donors, and (d) growing donors into loyal donors.

However, even with the addition of an online strategy, the more traditional fund-raising methods will continue to play an active role in the fund-raising process. Freeman (2001) took this fact one step further by stating "Development staff will need cross training in outright and deferred gifts, private and public foundations annual and capital gifts" (p. 48). Hart (2001) reported that the Internet would not be the sole means of philanthropic contributions. Martin (2001) agreed by stating that online fundraising will become an important part of the fundraising
"mix." Traditional methods of fundraising such as direct mail, phone-a-thons, and planned giving will continue to be necessary components of development. The key to success with online giving was to utilize the efficiency and effectiveness of the web and integrate e-philanthropy with the traditional models. There is not a large number of potential donors searching the Internet searching for a place to donate. If organizations want donors to give online, they must invite them to do so. Just as it is unlikely for a nonprofit to receive a large, unsolicited gift without cultivating that donor, so too it is unlikely that gifts through the Internet will be attracted without an invitation by the charity to make such a gift.

However, while traditional fundraising efforts may not be replaced by e-philanthropy, the popular methods of raising money may be losing the impact due to factors such as not reaching the right audience, lack of personalized contact, high costs associated with such methods, and other barriers to success.

**Untapped Audiences**

Today's society is busier than ever. People are constantly presented with more and more information than ever, and this leads to "information overload." Information overload is the main cause of our distaste of dinnertime sales calls or unsolicited junk mail (Greer, 1999).
Austin confirmed that the “true power of the Internet is connectivity” (Austin, 2002, p. 43). As such, the Internet can be used to reach an audience that might not be inclined to contribute through the more traditional modes of giving, most notably direct mailings and phone-a-thons. “The demographics of Internet audiences are highly desirable for fundraisers. Users are typically highly educated, with undergraduate or graduate degrees, and have household incomes of over $80,000” (Clark, 1995, p. 30). Greer (1999) elaborated that many of today’s young professionals were comfortable with most of today’s technology. It is this same group that often have the ability and the notion to give. It is also this group that regularly uses the Internet as a means of communication, for a source of news and information, and as a method of shopping. These professionals relish the ability to control the information they receive and when they receive it. These donors, who are well educated, desire to know more about the organization they contribute to and often times look to the web as the source of that information. Younger generations, who have yet to establish giving practices, were also more comfortable on the Internet and are less likely to respond to the traditional phone call solicitation or direct mail requests. According to the BBB Wise Giving Alliance Donor Expectations Survey (2001):

Forty seven percent of young adults aged 18-29 say that young people aged 18-29 say they are very likely to use
a web site to research the organization. The percent very likely to use these web sites steadily declines as age increases. (p. 23)

This younger audience should also be a prime target for the non-profit organization, but the non-profit must be able to communicate with them in their chosen language - technology.

Sargeant (2001) stated:

Almost 41% of adults in the United States are estimated to utilize the Internet. In just a few years the profile of the typical user has shifted from a white, middle class, educated male, aged 29-34 to becoming gradually more representative of society as a whole. A widespread of ages is now represented with more recent growth accounted for by both younger and older individuals. (p. 2)

In addition, the profile of the present day online community is a younger age group than those who gave through more traditional fund-raising sources, and the Internet should be the tool that inspires the younger generation to give. Austin, (2001) reported that the initial evidence suggested that technology would make donating easier, pull in more new supporters, and lead to above average donations. However, to reach this generation and these goals, nonprofit organizations have to ask for money where younger people are trying to make a difference and that place is online (Johnston, 1999). The BBB Wise Survey (2001) elaborated further on this theory "the age group between (18-29) who have grown up with access to computers and new technologies, are most open to the idea of online giving. More than one third (37%) reported they would consider making an online contribution" (p. 18).
Lack of Personalized Contact

Traditional methods of direct mail and phone-a-thons do little to establish and maintain a relationship with a donor, and it is a major reason that those methods may be failing in attracting new donors. Greer (1999) explained that traditional means of solicitation hinder the nonprofits' ability to establish a relationship with their donors. When donors contribute through traditional methods, the non-profit provided updates and solicited more gifts by mail. The problem with this method was that it is largely one-way. The donor is grouped together with other donors on a mass mailing or phone list. People want to be treated as individuals and receive information on how the gift is being used through personalized contact with the organization. Online fundraising allows a dialogue to be established between the contributor and the non-profit. Because of this personalized contact, the donor can be made to feel part of the organization and will be further motivated to support the organization's efforts.

High Cost of Traditional Methods

The cost of producing and mailing a direct mail solicitation increases every year. "The cost of sending direct mail or hiring a telemarketer firm is 25-40¢ per every dollar received" (Greer, 1999, p. 27). This built-in overhead can be prohibitive to donors who may hesitate to
donate knowing that a large part of their donations are being eaten up by production and administrative costs, rather than supporting the organization's mission. Conversely, fund-raising via the Internet may only cost 10-15 cents per dollar donated and can save staff time and save money, which allowed for more of the donor's contribution to go directly to the organization's mission.

**Past Barriers to Success**

While the concept of e-philanthropy is relatively new, the concept of people giving through the Internet is not. "The debate on whether the Internet would be a successful medium for raising money has been going on for years. Some organizations may have already tried and failed in this area" (Greer, 2001, p. 27).

There is a necessity for a nonprofit to establish a presence online. In order for a non-profit to be prepared for tomorrow, the Internet and the web must be taken advantage of today. "Once considered a dream, then a fad, then a chancy bet, the Web is now widely accepted among business leaders, academics, and ordinary individuals as the next great technological change in human communication" (Landesman, 1995, ¶ 1). Smith (1999) emphasized, "If philanthropic organizations are going to influence this fast-moving train, they must reinvent themselves and find
their own roles as catalysts for enhancing the social impact of the Internet” (p. 82)

Society certainly has embraced technology, general economic data about computer owners and those who used the web paints a picture of wealthy, smart, caring adults who were ready and willing to trust themselves and their money to e-philanthropy (Clohesy & Reis, 2001). However, from a fundraiser’s standpoint, perhaps the most significant reason to establish a presence in cyberspace is because as the American population matures over the next 50 years, it is estimated that between $10 and $25 trillion will pass between generations. A significant portion of that wealth could flow into philanthropy (Hart, 2001).

As to potential wealth flowing into philanthropic channels, Austin (2001) reported that in 1999 only 4% of people who donated to a charity did so over the Internet. This small percentage accounted for roughly $10 million in gifts that were given over the web. However, Austin continued, that in 2000, an estimated $250 million was donated via the web, and that by the year 2010, one third of all money that was donated to charities could be given through the web.

Davis (2001) explained that the Internet has altered the face of communication and business transactions, and will play a significant role in the aid of this new type of donor. Hart (2001) reported that the Internet would provide
opportunities which have not been presented in the past, and would be relied upon by donors as a method of support of their favorite charities. The Internet will enhance opportunities to learn about the charity's mission and successes and will provide the venue for the donor to stay informed and communicate with the charity. Hart continued by maintaining that donors in the past, had to rely on the organization to provide information, in most cases this was done only when convenient to the organization. The Internet will allow charities to provide information that the donor may access at their convenience. In addition, Austin (2002) reported, "The new e-philanthropy enterprise gives non-profits and donors greater access to each other and allows them to work together more effectively and efficiently than any previous channel has" (p. 43).

According to Greer (1999), society is ready for online fund-raising because the elements necessary for online fund-raising to succeed have finally matured. Greer elaborated that while many of the technological advances have been available for years, the advancement of technology is overwhelming. The ability to make purchases online with a credit card is better, quicker, and some may say, even safer than the older more established methods. In addition, donor tracking is made easier through database technologies. The fact that people are just beginning to realize how the Internet can help them be more informed and make their
decisions about donating easier proved that people are becoming ready to donate online.

While it is important to recognize the fact that donors may be willing to share their wealth through an online source, it is also important to recognize that the basic fund-raising principles still apply to e-philanthropy. As the Online Networking for the Environment (One Northwest), a nonprofit based in Seattle, Washington conveyed to their constituents that interest in the organization must still be cultivated via appeal letters, special events and other types of campaigns. A quick and convenient way of accepting gifts through the Internet was an important piece of the puzzle, but until both offline and online strategies were implemented, much money will never be raised online.

Another factor is trust. As the two streams of philanthropy and technology flow, the degree of their convergence will be determined, in part, by trust (Hart, 2001). Trust is an important issue that all fundraisers must deal with. Hart explained that approximately 60% of American households donated to philanthropic causes every year. The majority of those households had a sense of commitment and familiarity to the organization they supported. These households contributed to organizations whose mission they believed in and whose programs they recognized. This giving was often a result of relationships that had been forged over time and built upon commonly-held
values. Philanthropy has been based upon relationships that are rooted in trust, and every fundraiser knows that trust is the most basic element in building that relationship. It is the Internet, Olsen, Keevers, Paul and Covington (2001) reported that serves as a tool that can help build a solid relationship, by helping fund raisers meet the goal of establishing a successful relationship by knowing their constituents well enough to connect their interests with opportunities to give in support of the organizations mission, The donor must trust the organizations mission and integrity; they must trust the organizations people and they must trust that they will be treated fairly by the organization.

Types of E-Philanthropy

Once those questions were answered by the development staff, they decide to pursue fund-raising on the Internet; the manner in which those funds were to be collected must be settled upon. There are three basic types of e-philanthropy, or options, that a non-profit can use to generate funds through the Internet. Two options, Charity Malls and Donation portals, could be considered the electronic version of outsourcing and may not be of much use to Higher Education. The third option, owning and maintaining your own system, is of great interest to fund raisers in higher education.
Charity Malls

Kanter (2002) identified the charity mall as:

an individual merchant or mall that places an ad on your Web site. When donors click on the link they are taken to an e-commerce site where they can purchase a variety of items, designate their favorite cause or charity, and the merchant or mall donates a percentage of the sales back to the organization. (¶ 14)

Frenza and Hoffman (1999) reported that by establishing a relationship with one of these types of sites can be a great initial step for charities that want to establish a presence on the World Wide Web.

The Kellogg Foundation (2001) identified the advantages of charity malls to both the charity and the consumer. The report stated, "for some people a fun and carefree way to give is to go shopping with the knowledge that some portion of the profit on the purchased items will be transferred to charity" (p. 13). For the non-profit, this form of online giving "requires no investment in staff, time or technology. Your organization simply collects a check" (Kanter, 2002, ¶ 13).

While this may be a simple way to raise online money, there were disadvantages to such a system. The main one was that in most cases the Charity Mall must collect a minimum number of contributions before they send you a check. Kanter (2002) reported that it may take a very long time for the charity mall to collect enough contributions before your organization was issued a payment. Another drawback of the Charity Mall, according to Kanter was that
according to IRS guidelines shoppers are not eligible for tax donations on the money being donated to non-profit organizations. The IRS limits tax deductibility for charitable contributions to the amount paid over and above the fair market price for an item. Since the prices at most Charity Malls are the same as purchased directly from the merchant, no tax-deductible event occurs. (¶ 18)

Kanter (2002), asserted that there were several issues that non-profits must address when deciding if a charity mall was a good match for their organization: These issues included the following:

1. How many merchants, non-profits, and consumers participate?
2. How does the Charity Mall promote its site?
3. What is the monthly traffic?
4. Are there any up front or hidden costs?
5. Does the mall restrict the recipients to 501-C organizations?
6. What is the retail mix? Are these products of interest to your donors?
7. What is the percentage of each sale that is contributed to your organization?
8. What are the rules in terms of banner/ad link placement on your Web site and other requirements for promoting the Charity Mall on your Web site or to your audiences? (¶ 21)
9. What is the minimum amount that needs to accrue before the Mall issues a check?
10. How is the check issued?
11. Can you enter into relationships with more than one Charity Mall?
12. What is the privacy policy of the site and how is it enforced?
Donation Portals

Another type of online fundraising method is the donation portal. Kanter (2002) identified this type of fundraising method as a site that lists many different types of non-profits and provides information about each. Donors can then visit the site and view information about their favorite charity, and if they choose to make a contribution to that organization. The main feature of the donation portal is that the portal "processes the transaction, acknowledges the gift and forwards the money along with a report including donor information to the nonprofit" (Kanter, 2002, p. 24). According to the Kellogg Foundation (2001), the portal "helps the donor by vetting the charities according to criteria for mission and consistency [as a result] the portals offer great advantage to the non-profit" (p. 13). Kanter (2002) took this concept further by stating that "The main advantage is that it requires a minimal investment in time, staff or technology to experiment" (p. 26).

Because the portal hosts many non-profits, each non-profit must realize that they are not the only organization benefiting from this service. One Northwest (2002) reported that there were some drawbacks to this service:

It's important to note that donors who use this service are often not making a direct donation directly to your organization, rather to the non-profit pass through affiliated with the donation processing service. While this generally is not a problem in terms of image, there can be bookkeeping and administrative issues. It is
also important to keep in mind that the donors who give to you through a portal can elect to remain anonymous to you. (¶ 15)

The key issues to determine if a donation portal would be a good fit for your organization, according to Kanter (2002), they included:

1. What and how many other non-profits are included on the site?
2. What is the cost of registering?
3. Are there any restrictions in terms of participating or working with other online fundraising vendors?
4. Can’t non-profit organizations provide a direct link to organizations information page on the charity engine site?
5. What is the fee? Is it a flat fee, based on transactions, or a combination?
6. Does the donation portal make its revenue from other services than fees? Is it in the business to sell services to non-profits?
7. How does the donation portal promote its site?
8. What is the traffic?
9. What are the legal risks?
10. Is the site registered as a professional solicitor in all 39 states that require it? (¶ 20)

Dolbert (2000) identified four areas a portal must excel. They included high visibility, technical ability, customer service, and good awareness. Finally, Kanter (2002) reported "any US nonprofit that decides to do fundraising over the Internet is required to register as a professional solicitation in 39 of the 50 states [Florida is one of the 39 states that require non-profits to register]" (¶ 22).
Internal Systems

Internal systems enable "your organization to have complete control of the transaction process" (Kanter, 2002, p. 31). According to One Northwest (2002), there were two necessary components for this system to be productive: (a) the capacity to receive credit card information via a secure Web Page and; (b) the capacity to authorize the credit card transaction and deposit it to your bank account based on that information. Dessoff (1992) noted that this type of system be very beneficial to many development efforts in higher education since "many institutions already accept credit cards and electronic fund transfers 'conveniences' to their supporters" (¶ 6). Kanter (2002) stated that independent vendors could be an alternative if the ability to accept credit cards was not an option for the institution. These vendors, Kanter (2002) continued, provided services by managing the entire process required in processing donations and payments received. This was commonly accomplished by the vendor’s ability to accept credit card transactions through a link provided on the organization’s Web site to a pledge or donation page that resides on the vendor’s.

If considering setting up your own internal system, Kanter (2002) provided some questions to consider:

1. Are secure transactions offered?
2. Is there adequate technical support?
3. Is the service reliable?
4. How much does the service cost? Are there any costs associated with the transaction?
5. Is there a contract length?
6. What does the organization need to provide or do for the set up?
7. How much control/customization is available on the solicitation page?
8. Can the confirmation e-mail/screen be customized?
9. What type of support is provided to the donor if there is a problem?
10. What type of reporting is available to the organization online or via e-mail?
11. Can the organization’s database be integrated with the software? (¶ 32)

How to Establish a Presence Online

According to Stanionis’ (n.d.), there were several features that must be included on any charity’s website. These included:

1. Information update: Provide a form where donors can change their mailing and e-mail addresses online.

2. Must be Personal: A column where the executive director (or president) talks with supporters. This should be candid, up-to-date, personal and informal. Ask your donors to talk back and provide an e-mail address where they can send their comments directly to the boss. Have the e-mail forwarded to a staff member to respond.

3. Show Success: Pick a few successes on how donations have helped the organization, and tell about them. This will avoid the common question most donors ask: Did my contribution make a difference?

4. Ask their opinion: A quick survey to ask your donors about everything from communication
preferences to issues of concern that the organization may be dealing with. This allows them to feel involvement in the organization.

5. Upgrade your supporters: Online is the right place to promote a new giving opportunity, or campaign. Be sure to tie the appeal into your latest Direct Mail campaign, and attempt to upgrade your supporters to a new giving level.

6. Say Thank You: It goes without saying this is the place to say thank you. Be sure to check each page and make sure that your gratitude shows.

Stanionis (n.d.) reported that once the key elements of the website were in place, it was important to begin to move the organization’s constituents towards the website. Stanionis cited several ways that the organization can promote its new Internet presence:

1. Publicize your Web and e-mail addresses on your direct mail: Be sure to include your web address as part of your web address.

2. Collect e-mail address on your response cards: Add a line for e-mail along with their name and address. Then send them a welcome e-mail and a monthly newsletter. Give the recipients the option to unsubscribe in every message.

3. Offer an online giving option on your response card: Encourage your donors to give online.

4. Create a unique giving page: This page should allow donors to make their gifts not only in real time, but also allowing them to track their gifts.

5. Make it optional: all of the information that the donor is asked to complete on response cards is optional--but stating it explicitly can lessen the feeling that you may be asking too many questions.

Reis (2000) pointed out that in order to be effective at fundraising on the web a site must be more than just a place where people can go and determine where they want to make a
donation. Olsen et al. (2001) elaborated on this idea further through the development of an online donor relationship methodology. This methodology provided for a comprehensive method of online donor cultivation and fundraising. The initial element in this methodology was to connect. "The first and most obvious step in an effective E-mail communication strategy is to begin acquiring e-mail addresses" (p. 366). It is important, according to Olsen et al. to allow the e-mail address owners an option to choose whether to participate in this type of communication. However, once the organization received this permission, it had a potent tool for communication.

The second component is Dialogue. Olsen et al. (2001) reported that e-mail differed from other types of direct mail communications due to the fact that it allowed for a dialogue to occur between the donor and the organization. However, this dialogue was not conducted in a traditional sense "instead, an e-mail dialogue occurred not only when a user replied to a message, but when they clicked anywhere on the page" (p. 367). Olsen et al. reported that the knowledge of what constituents' interests were could be very valuable because it allowed for the organization to personalize communications based upon the preferences of the donor, and that this would be more meaningful to the donor than a simple mass mailing.
Regular communication with the donors was extremely important. Olsen et al. (2001) suggested that nonprofit organizations utilize monthly e-mails to stimulate donor behavior much like what many corporations do to stimulate buyer behavior. "When communications are based on a schedule, donors anticipate them" (p. 367). It is through this type of communication that donors become more and more engaged with the organization and will want to communicate further. Timely follow-ups to any response must be used, and this increased communication could lead to extraordinary response rates.

The fourth element, Appeal, was also important when sending e-mail communications. Olsen et al. (2001) stated "e-mail appeals that are based on donor specific preferences are more likely to solicit a gift. The art of fundraising is key when determining what appeal will best fit a specific donor" (p. 367).

Finally, it is important to recognize the donors appropriately. "Thanking donors for their online gifts was the key to building successful e-mail relationships" (Olsen et al., 2001, p. 367). Olsen et al. reported that when thanking donors for their gifts via e-mail, there were several do's and don'ts. The do's included:

1. Respond promptly.
2. Respond using the same medium that the donor used.
3. In the body of the message express how the gift will help specific people.
4. Recognize the donor’s generosity appropriately.
5. Have the appropriate person sign the letter.

Through the effective use of these standards, the relationship will be strengthened. However, the relationship can be weakened if when acknowledging the donors’ gifts any of the don’ts were employed. The Don’ts included:

1. Avoid sending a message that can be perceived as complicated or too technical.
2. It is unnecessary to attach long confirmation numbers to the e-mail.
3. Have someone outside the office write the letter; it should come from someone who is close to the issue.
4. Avoid confusing the donors with third-party e-mail addresses.
5. Avoid the use of the credit card information on the e-mail response; however, do make sure what the donor’s statement will say.
6. Do not automatically add the donor to the direct mail list, but do allow them the opportunity to join if they so choose.

E-Philanthropy and Ethics

"Ethical guidelines focused on the collection and use of information in support of fundraising have been firmly in place for years. However, the recent explosion of access to information, capping a gradual increase in the ease of accessibility due to technological advances, has brought with it questions as to whether those guidelines are still applicable or whether they are now dated" (Pulawski, 1999, pg 69)

There are several organizations that have worked to set standards for those users of e-philanthropy to follow. In addition to the Kellogg Foundation’s report mentioned
earlier in this review, there are several other organizations that advocate e-philanthropy. The most notable include the e-PhilanthropyFoundation.Org (www.epiphilanthropyfoundation.org), The National Association of State Charity Officials (www.nasconet.org), and The Pew Partnership.

E-Philanthropy Foundation

The e-philanthropy foundation was "founded in 2002 by a group of non-profit and for-profit organizations to learn how to find success utilizing the Internet based on an established set of principles" (Hart, 2001, p. 22). The principles, according to the organization's Web site, strove to "foster the effective and safe use of the Internet for philanthropic purposes" (p. 25). The principles are available online at www.epiphilanthropyfoundation.org. Excerpts of the principles included:

Section A Philanthropic Experience

1. Clearly and specifically display and describe the organization's identity on the organization's Web site;

2. Employ practices on the Web site that exhibit integrity, honesty, and truthfulness and seeks to safeguard the public trust;

Section B Privacy and Security

1. Seek to inspire trust in every online transaction;

2. Prominently display the opportunity for supporters to have their names removed from lists that are sold to, rented to, or exchanged with other organizations;
3. Conduct online transactions through a system that employs high-level, security technology, to protect the donor's personal information; for both internal and external authorized use.

4. Provide either an 'opt in' and 'opt out' mechanism to prevent unsolicited communications or solicitations by organizations that obtain E-mail addresses directly from the donor. Should lists be rented or exchanged only those verified, as having been obtained through donors or prospects opting in will be used by a charity.

5. Protect the interests and privacy of individuals interacting with their website.

6. Provide a clear, prominent and easily accessible privacy policy on its website telling visitors, at a minimum, what information is being collected, how this information will be used and who has access to the data.

Section C Disclosures

1. Disclose the identity of the organization or provider processing an online transaction;

2. Guarantee that the name, logo and likeness of all parties to an online transaction belong to the party and will not be used without express permission;

3. Maintain all appropriate governmental and regulatory designations or certifications.

Section D Complaints

1. Provide protection to hold the donor harmless of any problem arising from a transaction conducted through the organization's website;

2. Promptly respond to all customer complaints and to employ best efforts to fairly resolve all legitimate complaints in a timely fashion.

Section E Transactions

1. Ensure contributions are used to support the activities of the organization to which they were donated.

2. Ensure that legal control of contributions or proceeds from online transactions are transferred
directly to the charity or expedited in the fastest possible way.

3. Companies providing online services to charities will provide clear and full communication with the charity on all aspects of donor transactions including the accurate and timely transmission of data related to online transactions.

4. Stay informed regarding the best methods to insure the ethical, secure and private nature of online ePhilanthropy transactions;

5. Adhere to the spirit as well as the letter of all applicable laws and regulations, including but not limited to charity solicitation and tax laws;

6. Ensure that all services, recognition and other transactions promised on a Web site, in consideration of gift or transaction, will be fulfilled on a timely basis.

7. Disclose to the donor the nature of the relationship between the organization processing the gift or transaction and the charity intended to benefit from the gift.

The National Association of State Charity Officials and the Pew Partnership

The purpose of The National Association of State Charity Officials (2001) is to "act as a forum for the exchange of views and experiences relating to charitable trust and charitable solicitation issues" (¶ 3). The Charleston Principles: On Charitable Solicitations using the Internet was developed in October 1999 in Charleston, South Carolina. Simply referred to as The Charleston Principles, they act as "a non-binding, suggested set of regulatory guidelines to determine when non profit in one state must register in another state in order to raise funds on the Internet" (The
National Association of State Charity Officials 2001). The Pew Partnership, is supported by the Pew Charitable Trust, and is a civic research organization. In 1999, the partnership, in “an effort to learn about how non profit organizations access information to better serve their communities” (Dugery & Hamner, 2000, ¶ 2), began focus group research. The research group consisted of not only of representatives from non-profit groups, but “organizational leaders that represented a cross section of issue areas related to the Pew Partnership’s work” (¶ 3). The key findings of this research were as follows:

1. Most nonprofits have not integrated a systematic learning or knowledge-management process into their organizational culture. Instead, most nonprofits described their organizations as places where periodic learning takes place—a hybrid of continuous and just-in-time learning.

2. In the nonprofit world, learning is often exclusively equated with program-evaluation activities or organizational-development issues.

3. Effective data collection and outcome measurement are significant challenges for many nonprofits. In addition, there is disconnect between founder and nonprofits in terms of the purpose of data collection and what data are useful.

4. In terms of information, nonprofits are hungry for the “real story.” They want to hear about the struggles, failures, obstacles, and barriers others faced, not just the seamless success story.

5. Nonprofits see a role for a knowledge broker—someone who can routinely sift and sort through all the available information and give them the most relevant and valuable nuggets.

6. Most nonprofit leaders view the new technologies as invaluable tools for their organizations, though
with regard to the Internet most of them do not use it very often, except for e-mail.

7. For most nonprofit leaders, direct one-on-one contact with someone they trust is the most preferred way of accessing the information they need.

8. Direct service providers allocate learning time to improving existing programs, dealing with organizational-development issues, and searching for new funding opportunities. (¶ 5)

Online Giving and the University Development Process

Since, e-philanthropy is still in its infancy, there are several issues that the traditional fundraiser must deal with. Johnston (1999) stated: "It [Cyber-fund-raising] is still in its infant, experimental stage. Its limits and true potential live in people's imagination and entrepreneurial spirit" (p. 99). To succeed with online fundraising, the fundraiser must mold fund-raising principles and techniques into this new media.

Higher education has just begun to utilize e-philanthropy. Lajoie (2002) reported that development officers might be hesitant to determine if online fundraising could bolster their returns and may prefer to wait until more data were available about their constituents' experiences. Conversely, many campuses have forged ahead and incorporated elements of the web's potential into their giving programs.

Campuses that are taking advantage of online giving are producing positive results. While, "many development
officers report that they have yet to analyze whether donors who make gifts with checks will shift to making gifts online" (Lajoie, 2002, ¶ 6), several institutions are reporting substantial results. "Harvard's online giving page has been operational for nearly a year and a half; in fiscal year 2001, the university raised more than $260,000 through that medium" (¶ 3).

Stanford University has implemented a very effective electronic marketing campaign, and has seen alumni participation increase as a result. Stanford has an e-mail newsletter that is mailed monthly to alumni and friends and contains campus news and research (Pearson, 2001). After sending the newsletter, the development database was analyzed as to participation rates for fiscal year 2000. The results were impressive "among all undergraduates and dual degree holders, 49% of the recipients (of the newsletter) made a gift, compared to 34% of the non-recipients" (¶ 27). Stanford's renewal rate for donors was also affected. Pearson explained:

Among those who had a gift in fiscal year 1999, a slightly greater percentage of recipients (78), than non-recipients (73) renewed their support in fiscal year 2000. Among lapsed donors (those who made a gift in prior years, but not in fiscal year 1999) 32% of recipients made a gift in fiscal year 2000, compared to 22% of non-recipients. Among those who have never made a gift prior to fiscal year 2000, 13% of recipients gave for the first time, compared to just 5% of the non-recipients. (¶ 27)

Wake Forrest has also found success with e-mail solicitations. Allen (2001) reported:
Development officers sent e-mail appeals to annual fund donors, letting them know that anyone who responded with a gift by the end of the month would be spared a telephone solicitation. Within a few weeks, the university received more than $173,000 from nearly 350 donors— an increase from about $36,600 from 122 donors raised by telephone and mail during the same period the previous year. (¶ 4)

Wallace, Larose and Voelz (2002) compiled a list of colleges that have participated in online giving and how much money they raised during the fiscal year 2001. While e-philanthropy is a new concept, fundraisers and non-profits have adapted to new forms of technology in the past— radio, television, telephone, and direct mail have all had methods developed for them to help raise money (Hart, 2001, p. 27). Fuisz (1999) reiterated:

The world of fund-raising has included many different approaches over the years. While finding the dollars necessary to support an organization’s mission remains the consistent goal, the avenues pursued to raise funds are now dramatically changing because of the Internet. (p. 22)

There is certainly the possibility that the next great method for non-profits to utilize in fund-raising is the Internet. Institutions will always continue to communicate with individual donors in many ways. Some institutions have avoided mass E-mail solicitations while a few institutions, have successfully launched E-mail solicitation campaigns and viewed them as a natural part of their fund-raising efforts (Allen, 2001).
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the procedures and methods used in: (a) determining the profile of a potential online donor for a small private institution; (b) defining the difference in that profile of those donors who may donate over the Internet compared to those donors who do not give over the Internet; (c) determining the difference in attitudes toward online giving between those alumni donors of varying class years; (d) determining if donors who gave through traditional methods to Stetson University donated to other organizations through the Internet; (e) determining alumni interest in receiving university information and updates via e-mail; (f) identify the concerns of alumni while making a donation over the Internet.

This study was initiated in the summer of 2003 at Stetson University. The final analysis of data, conclusions and recommendations were presented in the Fall of 2003.

The chapter is divided into six sections. The first section is a statement of the problem. The second section describes the population. The instrument is addressed in
the third section. Data collection is described in the fourth section. The fifth section describes the data analysis. The final section describes the procedures for analysis. A summary of the sections concludes Chapter 3.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to develop a profile of alumni donors at a small private institution. Of primary interest was the determination of: (a) the willingness of alumni to embrace online giving, and (b) the extent to which attitudes toward online giving differ based on selected variables including years since graduation, and personal technological use.

Population

The population of this study consisted of 1,418 alumni who donated less than $1,000 through regular mass mail solicitations in any of the last 5 years (fiscal years 1998-2002). They were alumni of Stetson University and included all active alumni donors who graduated between the years of 1981 and 2001 from the DeLand campus. The selected group of potential participants resided throughout the United States. All responses generated from the population were used to analyze the data.
Instrumentation

The researcher and representatives of the institution developed the instrumentation for this study with the assistance of the institution between January 2003 and April 2003. The instrument was piloted during April of 2003 using alumni from institutions other than Stetson University. The survey instrument consisted of 32 questions. Questions 1-8, 12, 15, and 25 were categorical questions; Questions 9, 18-24 consisted of a 5-point Likert scale. Questions 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 17 were answered with a yes/no categorical answer. Questions 26-31 were attitude scales with answers ranging from (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree. Question 32 was an independent question that was used for institutional purposes only and not part of the analysis.

Data Collection

Data were collected through the use of The Online Giving Survey developed by the researcher and the institution. A description of the data collection process follows.

The survey see Appendix A), along with a personalized cover letter (see Appendix B) to 1,418 potential participants was sent from the Executive Director of Development at Stetson University explaining the purpose of the study, and a postage paid return envelope were mailed out to 1,418 alumni on June 2, 2003. An identifying code number was printed on the outside of each of the return
envelopes in order for the institution to identify and sort the returned surveys. The institution then provided the researcher with the processed surveys. The initial mailing yielded a 27% (N=388) response rate as of June 21, 2003.

On July 7, 2003 a second instrument, and individualized follow-up letter (see Appendix C) and another postage paid return envelope was mailed to the remaining 1,030 non-respondents to encourage participation. This mailing yielded an 18% (N=188) response rate as of July 27, 2003. As of August 12, 2003, a response rate of 38% (N=576) had been reached.

The responses were then broken down into four subsections. Each subsection represented a group of alumni graduation years. Group 1 consisted of alumni who graduated between the years 1981-1985; 390 participants were initially classified in this group. The first mailing yielded a 25% response rate (N=98). The second mailing to the remaining 292 non-respondents yielded a 17% response rate (N=50). The total response rate for this group was 38% (N=148).

Group 2 was comprised of alumni who graduated between 1986-1990; 451 participants were originally classified in this group. The first mailing yielded a 28% response rate (N=130); the second mailing to the remaining 321 non-respondents generated an 18% response rate (N=59). The total response rate for this group was 42% (N=189).
The third group of respondents were alumni from the class years 1991-1995. At the outset, 377 participants were classified in this category. The first mailing yielded a response rate of 30% (N=116). The second mailing to the remaining 261 generated a response rate of 21% (N=56). The total group yielded a response rate of 45% (N=172).

The final group of respondents represented those alumni whom graduated between 1996-2000. At first, 200 participants were classified in this category. The initial mailing generated a response rate of 22% (N=44). The remaining 156 alumni were contacted again and a 14% (N=23) response rate was achieved. The total group yielded a 33% response rate (N=67).

Data Analysis

The researcher completed all analysis on the collected data. All statistical computations were performed using the statistical analysis software Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 11.0 for Windows (2002). The majority of responses to questions on the survey resulted in categorical data, and responses were analyzed with the Descriptive Statistics and Nonparametric Tests procedures.

Procedures for Analysis

Upon the return of each survey, the respondent's answers were coded for entry into SPSS. Alumni class year
information was provided to the researcher by the institution. The identification number and the respondent's class year were imputed into SPSS. Responses to the survey questions were then imputed into SPSS using the following method.

Question 1: "How long have you been using the Internet?" was given the title "usenet." "No, I do not use the Internet" was coded 1, less than a year was coded 2; 2-3 years was coded 3; 4-5 years was coded 4; and More than 5 years was coded 5.

Question 2: "How often do you access the Internet?" was given the title "howoftn." Never was coded 1; almost every day was coded 2; about once a week was coded 3; and About once a month was coded 4.

Question 3: "Were do you access the Internet from the most?" was titled "where." Home was coded 2; Library was coded 3; Office was coded 4 other was coded 5 and do not access the Internet was coded 1.

Question 4: "How many e-mail addresses do you currently have?" was titled "emails." 0 was coded 1; 1 was coded 2; 2 was coded 3; 3 was coded 4; and 4 or more was coded 5.

Question 5: "How often do you change your e-mail address?" was titled "change." Never was coded 1; every 6 months was coded 2; every 2-3 years was coded 3; every year was coded 4.
Question 6: "Would you consider using a permanent e-mail address provided by Stetson University?" was titled "permanent." Yes was coded 1; No was coded 2 and 3 was assigned to maybe.

Question 7: "How often do you visit the Stetson website" was coded "visitit." Never was coded 1; once a day was coded 2; weekly was coded 3; monthly was coded 4; and yearly was coded 5.

Question 8: "Why do you visit the Stetson website" was titled "why." To find out what is happening on campus was coded 1; To keep updated on Stetson Sports was coded 2; To look for friends from my college years was coded 3; Other was coded 4; not answered was coded 5; if all responses was selected 6 was assigned; if choices 1 and 2 were selected 6 was assigned; if selections 1 and 3 were chosen 8 was assigned; if choices 2 and 3 were selected 9 was assigned; if choices 1 or 2 or 3 and 4 were selected 0 was assigned.

Question 9: Selections for the question "Rank in order of preference the ways that you prefer to donate to Stetson" was divided into five sections "mail" was labeled "mail"; "Personal Visit" was labeled "personal"; "Phone" was labeled "phone"; "website" was labeled "website" and "E-mail" was labeled "email." The responses were labeled as follows: lowest preference was coded 1; Unsure was coded 3 and highest preference was coded 5.
Question 10: "Have you donated to other non-profit organizations" was coded "dontooth." Yes was coded 1 and No, I only donate to Stetson was coded 2.

Question 11: "Have you donated a minimum of $10 to other non-profit organizations through the Internet" was coded "min10." The responses Yes were coded with a 1 and No was coded with 2.

Question 12: "If you give online, is the amount of your contribution generally more?" was coded "online." I do not give online was coded 1; Smaller than the more traditional means was coded 2; The same as the more traditional means was coded 3; and larger than the more traditional means was coded 4.

Question 13: "If Stetson supplied a safe and secure method of making on-line donations, would you consider making a donation to Stetson through the Internet" was labeled "safe." Yes was coded 1; No was coded 2; and maybe was coded 3.

Question 14: "Would you be interested in receiving a monthly newsletter via e-mail from Stetson?" was coded "receive." Yes was coded 1; Yes, provided I can be removed when I desire was coded 2; and No was coded 3.

Question 15: "Do you feel that online giving has replaced the other forms of giving you have used in the past?" was labeled "replaced." I do not know was coded 1; has replaced traditional forms of giving was coded 2; Used
in addition to other forms of giving was coded 3; No was coded 4.

Question 16: "Do you participate in online giving in addition to other forms of giving" was labeled "particip."
Yes was coded 1 and No was coded 2.

Question 17: "Do you make any type of financial transactions (e.g., online banking, bill payment, etc) through the Internet" was labeled "trans." Yes was coded 1 and No was coded 2.

Questions 18-24: "The following is a list of potential concerns a donor may have while making a gift through the Internet to the University" was divided into 7 separate issues.

Question 18: "Credit Card Security" was labeled "Security."

Question 19 "Information Privacy" was coded "privacy."

Questions 20 "Confirmation that money goes to a specific department" was coded "confirm."

Question 21 "Knowledge of the University Mission" was labeled "mission."

Question 22 "being able to be kept updated on the University was labeled "updated."

Question 23 "Being able to e-mail the University" was labeled "able."

Question 24 "Donation goes to the Support of Scholarships" was labeled "scholar." The responses were
labeled as follows, not important was coded 1; Unsure was coded 3; very important was coded 5.

Question 25: "What is the main reason you would not consider making a gift through the Internet" was labeled "main." I do not go online was coded 1; I do not make financial transactions online was coded 2; I prefer traditions methods (e.g. phone-a-thons or direct mail) of giving was coded 3 and other was coded 4.

Question 26: "Online giving is an effective means of donating to a non-profit organization" was labeled "effective." Strongly Disagree was coded 1; Disagree was coded 2; Unsure was coded 3; Agree, was coded 4; Strongly Agree, was coded 5.

Question 27: "Stetson should use online technology to solicit funds from alumni" was coded "shouldus." Strongly Disagree was coded 1; Disagree was coded 2; Unsure was coded 3; Agree was coded 4; Strongly Agree, was coded 5.

Question 28: "Alumni donate more freely when donating through traditional methods of giving" was labeled "Freely." Strongly Disagree was coded 1; Disagree was coded 2; Unsure was coded 3; Agree was coded 4; Strongly Agree, was coded 5.

Question 29: "The use of online giving increases alumni motivation to donate" was labeled "increase." Strongly Disagree was coded 1; Disagree was coded 2; Unsure was coded 3; Agree was coded 4; Strongly Agree, was coded 5.
Question 30: "I prefer donating through the Internet to the traditional means of contribution" was labeled "prefer." Strongly Disagree was coded 1; Disagree was coded 2; Unsure was coded 3; Agree was coded 4; Strongly Agree, was coded 5.

Question 31: "My donation to Stetson University would be greater if I contributed through the Internet" was labeled greater. Strongly Disagree was coded 1, Disagree was coded 2, Unsure was coded 3, Agree was coded 4, Strongly Agree was coded 5.

Summary

The chapter has described the procedures and instrumentation used to identify the profile of a potential online donor for a small private institution; the difference in that profile of those donors who may donate over the Internet compared to those donors who do not give over the Internet; determine the difference in attitudes toward online giving between those alumni donors of varying class years; the possibility of converting donors who presently donate through traditional methods to donors that give over the Internet; determining alumni interest in receiving university information and updates via e-mail; identify the concerns of alumni while making a donation over the Internet.

The potential population for this study consisted of 1,418 Alumni of Stetson University that had donated to the
institution of less than $1,000 through regular mass mail requests, between the years of 1998-2002. Five hundred eighty six participants represented a usable response rate of 38%. Conclusions from the analyzed data were used to answer six research questions.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine a profile of alumni donors of a small private liberal arts institution, who may be willing to participate in online giving as an alternate form of donating. A survey was sent to 1,418 alumni of Stetson University who had donated less than $1,000 through regular mass mail and phone solicitations of the University. Six research questions guided this study. Research Question 1 determined what the profile of the potential online donor for a small private, liberal arts institution would resemble. Research Question 2 compared the profile of those donors who might donate online with the profile of those donors who would not donate online. Research Question 3 centered on the difference in attitudes towards online giving of alumni between selected class groups. Research Question 4 investigated whether or not donors who give to Stetson gave to other non-profits via the Internet. Research Question 5 asked donors what their preferred method of communication with the university was.
Research Question 6 focused on the concerns alumni may have when making a gift through the Internet. Descriptive statistics were used in the analysis of the majority of the data. The information provided by the respondents should be useful in determining then effectiveness of establishing an online giving program at a small institution. The program SPSS was used to tabulate and analyze the data.

This chapter contains the analysis of data gathered during the study. The chapter is divided into eight sections: Introduction, Description of Respondents, and Research Questions. A summary is provided at the end of the chapter.

Description of Respondents

Data collection for this survey was conducted during the summer of 2003. A total of 576 usable surveys were returned from a population of 1,418 alumni of Stetson University who donated less than $1,000 through regular mass mail appeals to the university during the fiscal years 1998-2002. Frequencies and percentages were used in the analysis of these data. Table 1 presents information regarding respondents' class years and the group percentage of the population.
### Table 1

Respondents' Class Years (N=576)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Class Year</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 2 consisted of 31.8% of the population, which represented alumni, who graduated between the class years of 1986-1990. Group 3 represented the second most populated group. This group represented alumni who graduated between the class years of 1991-1995. However, the frequencies of each class group were relatively evenly distributed throughout the 20-year span of potential class years. The notable exceptions to this were the years 1999, and 2000. A potential reason for this occurrence is the fact that many
of these respondents, having just graduated, may not have made a gift to the institution.

Two hundred forty respondents (41.7%) visited the Stetson website on a yearly basis. Two hundred twenty three (38.7%) respondents maintained they had never visited the Stetson Website. Of those visiting, the reasons given for visiting the Stetson Website included: (a) to find out what is happening on campus (16%; n=92), to keep updated on Stetson Sports (3.6%; n=21), and to look for friends from college (8.5%; n=49). Table 2 provides data used in the analysis of how often alumni visit the Stetson site. Table 3 displays the reasons why alumni visit the site.

Table 2
How Often Respondents Visit the Stetson Website

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once a Day</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Reasons Why Respondents Visit the Stetson Website

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons to Visit</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To find out what is happening on campus</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To look for friends from College</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To keep updated on Stetson sports</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the above</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Research Question Data

This section is arranged according to the six main research questions. Each question is stated, followed by a discussion of the data.

Research Question 1
What is the profile of the potential online donor for a small private liberal arts institution?

Five survey questions addressed this research question. Survey Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 focused on the respondent’s computer and e-mail usage. Questions were asked as to how often respondents have been using the Internet, how often they access the Internet, where they access the Internet most from, how many e-mail addresses the
respondents have, and how often they change their e-mail addresses.

Survey Question 1 asked respondents how long had they been using the Internet. The data analysis revealed that 388 of the respondents had been using the Internet more than 5 years. One hundred eight respondents stated they had been using the Internet between 4-5 years. A complete presentation of the data analysis is presented in Table 4.

Table 4
How Long Respondent Had Been Using the Internet? \(N=576\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How long using the Internet</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, I do not use the Internet</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 years</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 years</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 5 years</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Question 2 focused upon how often respondents accessed the Internet. Four hundred ninety two respondents stated they accessed the Internet almost everyday. Table 5 presents the frequency of respondents' answers.
Table 5
How often do you access the Internet?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost Everyday</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a week</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a month</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Question 3 asked respondents to identify where they accessed the Internet most often. Frequency was used to analyze the data. The majority of respondents stated they accessed the Internet from their homes (n=330). The second most popular location for Internet access was the respondents' offices (n=237). Table 6 displays the data used in the analysis.

Table 6
Where Respondents Accessed the Internet from the Most

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not access the Internet</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Question 4 addressed how many e-mail addresses the respondents accessed. Two hundred eighty respondents owned more than one e-mail address. One hundred sixty three respondents owned a single e-mail address. Forty two respondents owned four or more e-mail addresses; 7 respondents did not own an e-mail address. Table 7 presents the data collected.

Table 7
Numbers of E-mail Addresses Respondents Had

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Addresses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Question 5 focused on whether or not respondents changed their e-mail addresses, and if so how often did they make that change. The majority of respondents (n=403) never changed their e-mail addresses. One hundred fifty six respondents changed their e-mail addresses every 2-3 years, 10 respondents change their e-mail address every year, while 7 respondents changed their e-mail address every 6 months. Table 8 presents the data.
Table 8
How Often Respondents Changed E-Mail Addresses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Times Changed</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six months</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every year</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every 2-3 years</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, Research Question 1 centered upon the profile of the potential online donor. To determine the profile, questions were asked regarding Internet usage, how many e-mail addresses respondents had, and how often they changed their e-mail addresses. Survey Question 1 explored how long respondents had been using the Internet. Three hundred eighty eight respondents responded they had been using the Internet more than 5 years. Survey Question 2 asked how often respondents accessed the Internet. Four hundred ninety two respondents maintained they accessed the Internet everyday. Survey Question 3 asked respondents to identify from where they access the Internet the most often. Three hundred thirty respondents stated they accessed the Internet from their homes, while 237 respondents stated they accessed the net from their offices the most. Survey Question 4 addressed how many e-mail addresses each alumni owned. Two hundred eight respondents owned two addresses,
while 163 only owned one e-mail address. The final survey question pertaining to this research question, Survey Question 5, queried respondents whether or not they changed their e-mail addresses, and if so how often. Four hundred three respondents stated they never changed their e-mail addresses.

Research Question 2

What is the profile of those donors who might donate online compared to those who might not?

Three survey questions addressed this research question, Survey Questions 14, 15, and 25 focused upon respondents' participation in online giving. Survey Question 16 asked if the respondents participated in online giving in addition to other forms of giving. All 576 respondents completed the item. Data analysis was conducted by using frequencies for this item. Results showed that the highest percentage of the respondents did not participate in online giving, (n=484; 84.4%). Conversely, a much smaller percentage participated in online giving in addition to the more traditional means of giving, (n=90; 15.6%). The analysis showed that the majority of people questioned did not make any donations over the Internet.

Survey Question 15 focused on whether respondents felt that online giving had replaced other forms of giving. Respondents were to select from the following choices: I do not know, Has replaced traditional forms of giving, used in
addition to other forms of giving, and no. Respondents who answered yes to Survey Question 16 did not know if online giving had replaced the more traditional means of donating (n=11, 12.2%). Two respondents (2.2%) answered No to the question; 12 respondents (13.3%) felt that online giving has replaced the traditional means of giving. However, the greatest majority of the respondents (n=65; 72.2%) answered that online giving was used in addition to other forms of giving.

Those respondents who answered No to Survey Question 16 had a much different view than their counterparts. Of those who answered No to the question about their participation in online giving, 293 (60.5%) did not know if online giving had replaced the more traditional means of donation. Five respondents (1%) felt that online giving had replaced the traditional forms of giving, 128 respondents (26.4%) reported that online giving was used in addition to other forms of giving. Fifty eight respondents (12%) answered they did not participate in online giving.

Survey Question 25 asked respondents to select the main reason they would not make a gift over the Internet. Respondents were asked to select from the following: I do not go online, I do not make financial transactions online, I prefer traditional methods of giving, or other. Of alumni who responded Yes to Survey Question 16, 55 (61.1%) selected "other" as the answer to this question; 34, (37.8%)
preferred the traditional methods of giving; 1 respondent (1.1%) did not make financial transactions online. No respondent answered that he/she did not go online. Relativity the same percentages held true for those who answered No to Survey Questions 16. Eight respondents (1.7%) reported they did not go online. One hundred three (21.3%) respondents did not make financial transactions online; 272 (56.2%) respondents preferred the traditional methods of donating. One hundred one (20.9%) respondents answered "other" to this question. Table 9 reports the complete data analysis.

In summary, Research Question 2 compared the profile of alumni that donated online to those alumni who did not. Survey Question 16 asked respondents to identify if they had participated in online giving in addition to making a gift through the traditional methods of giving. Four hundred eighty four (84.4%) of respondents stated they did not participate in online giving; 15.6% (n=90) of respondents stated they did participate in online giving. Survey Question 15 asked respondents whether they felt that online giving had replaced the traditional forms of giving and was segregated into two groups. Sixty five (72.2%) respondents who had previously stated they had donated online felt that online giving was used in addition to the other, more traditional means of donating. Of the respondents that answered they had not donated online, 26.4% (n=128) stated
that online giving was used in addition to other forms of giving.

Survey Question 25 asked participants to select the main reason they would not make a gift online. Three choices were provided: I do not make financial transactions online; I prefer traditional methods of donating; and I do not go online. Of the respondents who answered yes they did make a donation over the Internet, 37.8% (n=34) preferred traditional methods of donating. Of the respondents who stated they did not make a donation online, 56.2% (n=272) also stated they preferred the more traditional means of donating.
Table 9
Do You Participate in Online Giving?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>YES Freq.</th>
<th>YES %</th>
<th>NO Freq.</th>
<th>NO %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Would you be interested in receiving a monthly newsletter vis e-mail from Stetson?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, provided I can be removed when I desire</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Do you feel that online giving has replaced the other forms of giving you have used in the past?</td>
<td>I do not know</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has replaced traditional forms of giving</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Used in addition other forms of giving</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. What is the main reason you would not consider making a gift through the Internet?</td>
<td>I do not go online</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I do not make financial transactions online</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I prefer traditional</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 3
Is there a difference in attitudes towards online giving between those alumni from a private university who graduated less than 5 years out of school, who graduated 5-10 years out of school, who graduated 10-15 years out of school, and who graduated more than 15 years out of school?

Research Question 3 determined if there was a difference in attitude toward online giving between class groups. Survey Questions 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31 were used in the analysis of this research question. A Likert scale with the ranges of 1-5 was utilized to determine alumni’s agreement or disagreement on topics such as online giving as an effective means of making a donation and whether or not Stetson should use online giving to solicit funds. Frequencies and analysis of variance were used to analyze the statistics. Table 10 provides the complete data, prior to calculating the mean score, used in this analysis.

Survey Question 26 asked respondents if they strongly disagreed, disagreed, were unsure about, agreed, or strongly agreed with the following statement: "Online giving is an effective means of donating to a non-profit organization?" Fifteen respondents strongly disagreed with the statement, 38 disagreed, 165 were unsure about the statement, 246 respondents agreed with the statement, and 112 respondents strongly agreed with the statement.

Survey Question 27 asked the respondents if they strongly disagreed, disagreed, were unsure about, agreed, or strongly agreed with the following statement: "Stetson
Table 10
Individual Attitudes Toward Online Giving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online giving is an effective means of donating to a non-profit organization.</td>
<td>15 2.6</td>
<td>38 6.6</td>
<td>165 28.6</td>
<td>246 42.7</td>
<td>112 19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stetson should use online technology to solicit funds from Alumni.</td>
<td>25 4.3</td>
<td>54 9.4</td>
<td>172 29.9</td>
<td>239 41.5</td>
<td>86 14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni donate more freely when donating through traditional methods of giving.</td>
<td>2 .3</td>
<td>55 9.5</td>
<td>311 54.0</td>
<td>153 26.6</td>
<td>55 9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of online giving increases alumni motivation to donate.</td>
<td>14 2.4</td>
<td>112 19.4</td>
<td>322 55.9</td>
<td>110 19.1</td>
<td>18 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer donating through the Internet to the traditional methods of making a contribution.</td>
<td>148 25.7</td>
<td>179 31.1</td>
<td>124 21.5</td>
<td>92 16.0</td>
<td>33 5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My donation to Stetson University would be greater if I contributed through the Internet.</td>
<td>196 34.0</td>
<td>218 37.8</td>
<td>131 22.7</td>
<td>22 3.8</td>
<td>9 1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F=Frequency
P=Percentage
should use online technology to solicit funds from alumni?" Twenty five respondents strongly disagreed with the statement, 54 disagreed, 172 were unsure about the statement, 239 respondents agreed with the statement, and 86 respondents strongly agreed with the statement.

Survey Question 28 asked the respondents if they strongly disagreed, disagreed, were unsure about, agreed, or strongly agreed with the following statement: "Alumni donate more freely when donating through traditional methods of giving?" Two respondents strongly disagreed with the statement, 54 disagreed, 172 were unsure about the statement, 239 respondents agreed with the statement, and 86 respondents strongly agreed with the statement.

Survey Question 29 asked respondents if they strongly disagreed, disagreed, were unsure about, agreed, or strongly agreed with the following statement: "The use of online giving increases alumni motivation to donate?" Two respondents strongly disagreed with the statement, 55 disagreed, 311 were unsure about the statement, 153 respondents agreed with the statement, and 55 respondents strongly agreed with the statement.

Survey Question 30 asked respondents if they strongly disagreed, disagreed, were unsure about, agreed, or strongly agreed with the following statement: "I prefer donating through the Internet to the traditional methods of making a contribution?" One hundred forty eight respondents strongly
disagreed with the statement, 179 disagreed, 124 were unsure about the statement, 92 respondents agreed with the statement, and 33 respondents strongly agreed with the statement.

Survey Question 31 asked respondents if they strongly disagreed, disagreed, were unsure about, agreed, or strongly agreed with the following statement: "My donation to Stetson University would be greater if I contributed through the Internet." One hundred ninety six respondents strongly disagreed with the statement, 218 disagreed, 131 were unsure about the statement, 22 respondents agreed with the statement, and 9 respondents strongly agreed with the statement.

Respondents' answers were then tabulated and an analysis of variance was performed to determine the factors between the class year groupings. The tests of between-subject effects were statistically significant (F=8.53, df 3, 572, p<.05). However, class groups only explained 4.3% of the variance. Individually, the tests were significant (.05 level) between the following class groups: Group 1 (1981-1985) and 3 (1991-1995), Group 2 (1986-1989) and Group 4 (1996-2000). However, Groups 3 and 4 differed from Group 2. The results of attitude are as follows: Group 1 (n=149, Mean 2.82, SD=.5316); Group 2 (n=183, Mean 2.99, SD=.5991); Group 3 (n=170, mean 3.13, SD=.5992); group 4 (n=74, mean 3.12, SD=.5985). Group 2 did not differ Group 1.
In summary Research Question 3 focused upon alumni attitudes towards online giving between class years. A Likert scale was provided to gauge respondent's attitudes. Selections for the scale were strongly disagree; disagree; unsure; agree, strongly agree. Survey Question 26 asked respondents if they felt that online giving was an effective means of donating to the institution. Fifteen respondents strongly disagreed with the statement, while 112 respondents strongly agreed with the statement. Survey Question 27 asked respondents if Stetson should use online giving as a means to solicit funds from alumni. Twenty five respondents strongly disagreed with the statement, 86 respondents strongly agreed with the statement. Survey Question 28 asked if respondents felt that alumni donated more freely through traditional methods of giving. Two respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 86 respondents strongly agreed with the statement.

Survey Question 30 asked respondents if they preferred donating through the Internet compared to traditional means of donating. One hundred forty eight respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 33 respondents strongly agreed with the statement. Survey Question 31 asked if respondents felt that their gifts to Stetson would be greater if they made the contribution through the Internet. One hundred ninety six respondents strongly disagreed with the statement; 9 respondents strongly agreed with the statement.
Respondents' answers were then tabulated to calculate a mean attitude score. This score was then analyzed using analysis of variance to test the factors between class groups. The tests of between subject effects were statistically significant (F=8.53, df=3,572). However, class groups only explained .043 of the variance. Group 2 (1986-1990) shared both subsets.

Research Question 4

Do donors who give to Stetson University through traditional means give to other organizations over the Internet?

Research Question 4 investigated if donors who gave to Stetson through traditional means gave to other non-profit organization over the Internet. Survey Questions 10, 11, 12, 13, and 17 were the guiding questions for this research question. Frequencies and percentages were used in the analysis of this research question.

Participants were asked in Survey Question 10 if they donated to other non-profit institutions. Of the 576 respondents, 96.9% (n=558) responded they did donate to other non-profit institutions. Conversely, only 3.1% (n=18) reported Stetson University was the only non-profit they donated to.

Survey Question 11 asked if respondents had donated a minimum of $10.00 to other nonprofits organizations through the Internet. Eighty nine (15.5%) responded they had
donated a minimum of $10.00 to other nonprofits organizations; 84.5% of the respondents (n=487) stated they have not given a minimum of $10.00 to other nonprofits over the Internet.

Survey Question 13, If Stetson supplied a safe and secure method of making on-line donations, would you consider making a gift to Stetson through the Internet? 55.2% of the respondents (n=318) reported they would consider making a gift through the Internet to Stetson, while 43.4% (n=250) stated they would not consider donating over the Internet to Stetson. Eight respondents, 1.4% of the population stated they might consider making a gift to the institution.

The issue of whether or not many of the alumni made financial transactions such as bill payments online was addressed in Survey Question 17. Three hundred eighty seven (67.2%) of the population reported they made financial transactions online, while 32.6% of respondents (n=188) reported they did not make financial transactions online.

The final survey question asked participants, if they gave online, to select from one of the following four choices: Smaller than the more traditional means; the same as the more traditional means, larger than the more traditional means; or did not give online. One hundred three (17.9%) reported they gave the same amount as they did through traditional methods of donating; 78.1% (n=449) of
the respondents stated they did not make donations over the Internet. Table 11 provides the complete data analysis for this survey question.

### Table 11
If You Give Online, Is the Amount of Your Contribution Generally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not give online</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller than the more traditional methods</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same as the more traditional methods</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger than the more traditional methods</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, Research Question 4 centered on the question, Do donors who give to Stetson University through traditional methods give to other organizations over the Internet? 96.9% of respondents (n=558) stated they did give to other nonprofit organizations. Survey Question 13 then asked if the alumni had made a minimum gift of $10.00 to other nonprofit organizations over the Internet. Four hundred eighty seven (84.5%) respondents stated they had not given the minimum amount to other nonprofits over the Internet. Survey Question 17 asked if alumni made any types of financial transaction online. Three hundred eight seven
(67.2%) reported they made other types of financial transactions over the Internet; 32.6% of respondents (n=188) reported they did not make financial transactions online. Survey Question 13 asked if alumni would be willing to donate online if Stetson provided a safe and secure method of doing so. Three hundred eighteen (55.2%) respondents stated they would consider making a gift through the Internet to Stetson, while 43.4% (n=250) stated they would not consider donating over the Internet to Stetson.

Finally, Survey Question 12 asked respondents if they gave online was the amount of their gift generally smaller, the same as, or larger than if they were to give through more traditional means of donating. Four hundred forty nine (78.1%) respondents stated they did not make a donation online, while 103 (17.9%) respondents stated they would give the same amount to the institution whether it was through the more traditional means or though the Internet.

Research Question 5

Would donors be interested in receiving Stetson University Information and program updates via e-mail?

Participants were asked what their preference was when they communicate or donate with Stetson. Survey Question 9 asked the respondents stated their preference on five different ways to communicate with the institution. Respondents were asked to choose between the following choices: Lowest preference (1); low preference (2); unsure
(3); high preference (4); and highest preference (5). The first selection was if the respondents preferred communication through the mail. Three hundred fifty two (61.1%) respondents stated that communicating through the mail was their highest preference.

The next selection was communicating through a personal visit. Three hundred forty six (60.1%) respondents stated that this was their lowest preference, while 3.3% (n=19) stated they preferred communicating with the institution in the manner. Communicating by means of the telephone was the next choice provided to the respondents. Two hundred sixty six (46.2%) respondents felt that this was their lowest preference, while 17.9% (n=103) felt they were unsure about communicating by the telephone.

Online technologies were the focus of the final two selections. When asked if the respondents preferred communicating through the website, 34.9% (n=201) stated that this was their lowest preference; 28.5% (n=164) stated they were unsure about communicating through the website. The final selection was communicating via e-mail. Two hundred five (35.6%) respondents stated that this was their lowest preference, compared to 8.7% (n=50) of the respondents who felt that this was their highest preference. Table 12 provides the complete data analysis for Survey Question 9.
Table 12
Preference of Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>lowest preference</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low preference</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High preference</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest Preference</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Visit</td>
<td>lowest preference</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low preference</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High preference</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest Preference</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>lowest preference</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low preference</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High preference</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest Preference</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>lowest preference</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low preference</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High preference</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest Preference</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>lowest preference</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low preference</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High preference</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest Preference</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Question 14 pertained to receiving monthly communications from the university. These communications would be in newsletter format and would serve as a means to maintain the dialogue between the institution and the alum. Respondents were to select from the following: Yes, Yes, provided I can be removed when I desire and No.
Frequencies, percentages and respondents' answers from Survey Question 16 were used for data analysis. The majority of the respondents who answered, "YES" to Survey Question 16 were willing to receive a monthly newsletter from the institution provided they could be removed from the list when they desired (n=59; 65.6%). Twenty three respondents, (25.6%) answered "Yes" to the question, while 8 (8.9%) did not wish to receive the newsletter. Of those respondents who answered No to Survey Question 16, 53.7% (n=260) stated they would be willing to receive a monthly newsletter provided they could be removed from the list when they desired. One hundred respondents (20.7%), stated they would be willing to receive a newsletter, while 124 respondents (25.6%) stated they did not want to receive any type of newsletter from the institution. Table 13 provides the data used in this analysis.
Table 13

Would You Be Willing to Receive a Monthly Newsletter from Stetson?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, provided I can be removed when I desire</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, provided I can be removed when I desire</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Question 6 asked respondents if they would consider using a permanent e-mail address provided by the University. Three hundred four (52.8%) respondents stated they would not consider using a permanent e-mail address, while 41.5% (n=239) stated they would be willing to use a permanent e-mail address from the institution. Thirty three respondents (5.7%) stated they might consider using a permanent e-mail address if provided by the University.

In summary, Research Question 5 investigated donors' preferences in communications with the university. Survey Question 9 provided respondents the opportunity to select their preference of communication with the university. A Likert scale was provided with the following ranges: Lowest
preference, low preference, unsure, high preference, and highest preference. This scale was applied to five categories of communication that the university routinely had with its constituents. These were through the mail; through personal contact; by means of the telephone; through the website; and through e-mail. Three hundred fifty two (60.1%) respondents ranked communication through the mail as their highest preference. A personal visit was chosen by 60.1% of the respondents as their lowest preference; 46.2% (n=266) respondents selected that a telephone call from their alma mater was their lowest preference. Online technologies were the focus of the final two subsections of this question. One hundred sixty four (28.5%) respondents stated they were unsure about using the website as a method of communication with the university. E-mail communication was the lowest preference for 35.6% (n=205) of the respondents.

Survey Question 14 asked respondents if they would be willing to receive a monthly newsletter from the institution. Respondents were given three categories to select from: Yes, Yes, provided I could be removed when I desired, and no. The respondents were segregated into two groups: those who had given online, and those who had not given online. Fifty nine (65.6%) respondents who gave online stated they would be willing to receive a monthly newsletter from the institution. Two hundred sixty (53.7%)
respondents who stated they did not donate online maintained they would be willing to receive a newsletter from the institution.

Survey Question 6 investigated whether or not alumni would be willing to use a permanent e-mail address provided by the university. Three hundred four (52.8%) respondents stated they would not consider using a permanent e-mail address, while 41.5% (n=239) stated they would be willing to use a permanent e-mail address from the institution.

Research Question 6

What concerns do alumni have when making a donation through the Internet?

Research Question 6 investigated the concerns that alumni may have when making a donation over the Internet. Survey Questions, 18, 19, 20, 21, 21, and 23 were the guiding survey questions for this question. Descriptive statistics were used in the analysis of the research question. Respondents were asked to select from one of the following choices: Not important (1); less important (2); unsure (3); important (4); and very important (5). Data provided from the respondents are presented in Table 14.
Table 14
Respondents' Concerns about Making a Gift Through the Internet (Frequencies and Percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Less Important</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit Card Security</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Privacy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation that money goes to a specific dept.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the university mission</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being kept updated about the university.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to e-mail the University</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F=Frequency
%=Percent
The majority of respondents felt that the two most important concerns when making a gift to the university online were Security (n=466; 80.9%) and Privacy (n=441; 76.6%). Conversely, alumni did not seem to place that much importance on being able to have communication with the university through e-mail (n=129; 22.4%), or the mission of the university (n=116; 20.1%). However, there were several respondents who were unsure about issues such as making sure that their money went to a specific department (n=101; 17.5%), the knowledge of the university mission (n=127; 22%), being updated on the university (n=126; 21.9%), or being able to e-mail the university (n=143; 24.8%).

In summary, Research Question 6 focused on donor concerns when they made a gift online. Respondents were presented with six concerns that may be present when dealing with online technologies. These six areas of concern included: Credit card security, information privacy, confirmation that the money goes to a specific department; being able to be kept updated on the university's mission, and being about to e-mail the university. For each of the areas of concern, respondents were provided with five choices: Not important; less important; unsure; important; and very important. Credit card security was very important to 80.9% (n=466) of the respondents. Privacy was very important to 76.6% (n=441) of the respondents. Being able to e-mail the institution was not important to 22.4% (n=129)
of the respondents. Knowledge of the university mission also ranked low on the level of importance for the respondents. One hundred sixteen (20.1%) respondents reported that this concern was not important to them.

Summary

Chapter 4 reported on the data analysis gathered from this study. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies were used in the analysis of the data for Research Questions 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6. Analysis of variance was used to respond to Research Question 3. Chapter 5 will summarize the research and discuss the conclusions of this study. Recommendations for further study will also be presented in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study examined alumni of a small private, liberal arts institution and their willingness to participate in online giving. Specifically, the study focused on alumni of Stetson University who had donated less than $1,000 through traditional methods of giving during any of the previous 5 fiscal years (1998-2002). Questions about computer usage, attitudes toward online giving, and the preferred way of communication were asked to approximately 1,418 alumni that fit the desired qualifications. Chapter 5 is presented in five sections, and provides a review of the research, summary of the findings for each of the guiding research questions, conclusions and recommendations for further research.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to develop a profile of alumni donors at a small private institution. Of primary interest was the determination of: (a) the willingness of alumni to embrace online giving, and (b) the extent to which attitudes toward online giving differ based on selected
variables including years since graduation, and personal technological use. The study was guided by six research questions. The research questions were:

1. What is the profile of the potential online donor for a small private institution?
2. What is the profile of those donors who might donate online compared to those who do not?
3. Is there a difference in attitudes towards online giving between those alumni from a private university who graduated less than 5 years out of school, who graduated 5-10 years out of school, who graduated 10-15 years out of school, and who graduated more than 15 years out of school?
4. Do donors who give to Stetson University through traditional means give to other organizations over the Internet?
5. Would donors be interested in receiving Stetson University information and program updates via-e-mail?
6. What concerns do alumni have when making a donation through the Internet?
Methodology

Population

The population of this study consisted of 1,418 alumni who gave less than $1,000, through regular mass appeal solicitations, in any of the last 5 years (fiscal years 1998-2002). They were alumni of Stetson University and included all active alumni donors who graduated between the years of 1981 and 2001 from the DeLand campus. The entire response rate achieved was used in the analysis for this study.

Data Collection and Instrumentation

The prospect pool of 1,418 Stetson alumni who met the established criteria was utilized. A survey was conducted using the questionnaire found in Appendix A. Each survey recipient received the instrument, a cover letter, and a postage-paid self-addressed envelope. The instrument, cover letter, and postage-paid envelope were mailed to recipients on June 4, 2003. The cover letter (see Appendix B) explained the purpose of the instrument, as well as presented specific instructions and timelines for responding. A self-addressed business reply envelope was included to ensure the delivery of the completed surveys. The return envelope was coded for verification purposes to identify which respondents returned the completed surveys.
To encourage participants to respond, a follow-up letter (see Appendix C) and a second copy of the instrument was mailed on July 6, 2003 to those who do not respond to the initial mailing.

The initial mailing yielded a 27% (n=388) response rate as of June 21, 2003. The follow-up mailing yielded a response rate of 18% (n=188) response rate as of July 27, 2003. As of August 12, 2003 a cumulative response rate of 38% (N=576) had been reached.

The results were then subdivided into four classifications that represented four class groups. Group 1 represented those alumni that graduated between the years of 1981-1985. The second classification represented those groups that graduated between 1986-1990. The third group represented alumni from the class years of 1991-1995. The 4th and final group represented alumni from the class years 1996-2000.

Data Analysis

Data analysis for this study was conducted using the statistical analysis software Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 11.0 for Windows. The majority of responses to questions on the survey resulted in categorical data, and responses were analyzed with the Descriptive Statistics and Nonparametric Tests procedures.
Summary of the Findings

Six research questions were used to guide this study. Results of the data analysis for each of the guiding research questions are discussed in the following sections.

Research Question 1

What is the profile of the potential online donor for a small private institution?

The data showed that a vast majority of respondents had been using the Internet for more than 5 years, and that 86.5% of them accessed the Internet almost every day. This percentage was much higher than the 61% of adults reported to access the web at least once a month by the BBB Wise giving alliance Donor Expectations Survey. The most popular place to access the Internet was respondents’ homes; the second most popular place for Internet access was the respondents’ offices.

The majority of respondents owned more than one e-mail address, presumably a personal e-mail address and one e-mail address through their place of employment. Data also revealed that the majority of respondents rarely changed their e-mail address, while a small minority of the respondents changed their e-mail at least every year.

Analysis of the data determined that the characteristics of the potential online donor to a small private institution would include a person that was on the Internet every day either from their home or office; would have one, possibly
showed that 72.2% of the population felt that online giving was used in addition to other forms of donating. Conversely, of those donors who stated that they did not participate in online giving, 26.4% felt that online was used in addition to the other forms of making a gift. This is important to note because it showed that once a respondent participated in making a gift online they had a positive response, and felt that it was a beneficial portion of the fundraising process.

When asked why they would not consider making a donation, 37.8% of the respondents stated they did participate in online giving also stated that they preferred the traditional methods of giving. The percentage of respondents who reported they did not participate in online giving preferred traditional methods was much higher (56.2%). This was important to note because the percentage of those who preferred the traditional methods was much lower within the group that stated they made donations online. It was also valid to point out that within the group that did not make donations online, 21.3% stated that they did not make any financial transactions online, compared to 1.1% within the group that stated they made a gift online.
Research Question 3
Is there a difference in attitudes towards online giving between those alumni from a private university who graduated less than 5 years out of school, who graduated 5-10 years out of school, who graduated 10-15 years out of school, and who graduated more than 15 years out of school?

Survey Questions 26-31 asked respondents to indicate their attitude towards certain subjects that focused on online giving. The majority of the respondents either agreed (n=246) or strongly agreed (n=112) that online giving was an effective means of donating to a non-profit organization. This revealed the fact that alumni of Stetson felt that online giving was an important part of the fundraising process.

The majority of respondents, when asked if Stetson should use online giving as a way to solicit funds, felt that the institution should do so. In addition, there was a large amount of respondents who felt that they were unsure about whether Stetson should use online technology to solicit funds for the institution. This showed that if implemented at Stetson, online giving could be extremely successful due to the large number of people who were still undecided about making a gift online.

There was also a large number of the population (n=331) who had yet to make up their minds as to if alumni would donate more freely over the Internet. This was valid due to the fact that if those alums were converted into online donors they may be willing to donate without being solicited.
through the traditions methods to the institution. The same can be said for the issue of alumni motivation to donate. Most respondents (n=322) were simply unsure as to if the presence of online giving would increase their motivation to donate.

When asked if alumni preferred donating online to the more traditional methods of donating, the majority or respondents strongly disagreed (n=148) or disagreed (n=179) with the statement. The same held true with the statement "my donation to Stetson University would be greater if I contributed through the Internet." The majority of respondents to this question either strongly disagreed (n=196) or disagreed (n=218) with this statement. This should be noted because while in much of the previous data discussed in this section, respondents felt that online giving was an important part of the fundraising process, most were unwilling to state they would be agreeable to participate in online giving.

Results of this portion of the data collection determined that the decision to donate online was still unclear for most alumni. Much like the results of the BBB Wise survey on Donor Expectations (2001), the notion of online giving has failed to catch on with the majority of the alumni of Stetson.

Once results were tabulated and compared between class years, there was no difference between Group 1 (1981-1986),
Group 3 (1990-1995) and Group 4 (1996-2000). The main difference occurred with the group of alumni in the class years 1986-1990, which was not statistically significant and therefore could be the most likely to donate online than those alumni in the other class years. This is important to note due to the fact that this group could be used to test the cost effectiveness of an online giving program.

Research Question 4

Do donors who give to Stetson University through traditional means give to other organizations over the Internet?

Due to the fact that the majority of respondents made contributions to other nonprofit organizations, it can be inferred that the alumni surveyed understood the necessity for, as well as, the process of philanthropic contributions. However, when they donated to other nonprofit organizations, they did so through the traditional methods of donating. Of those surveyed, 84.5% stated they had not given a minimum of $10.00 to other nonprofits over the Internet. Conversely, 15.5% reported they had given the minimum amount to another nonprofit. However, when compared to the BBB Wise giving alliance survey, which reported that 6% of adults made a charitable contribution of $10.00 or more, that percentage was much greater. It can be determined that while the majority of Stetson alumni donated to other nonprofit organizations, the majority did so through more traditional
methods, and did not donate to other organizations over the Internet.

Research Question 5

Would donors be interested in receiving Stetson University Information and program updates via-e-mail?

Alumni were given five methods of communication that could occur between them and the institution. The choices ranged from communication through the mail, a personal visit from an officer of the institution, a telephone call, communication through the website and e-mail communications. Communication through the mail was the highest preference with 61.1% of respondents declaring this was their highest preference.

The alumni also stated they would be willing to receive a monthly e-mail communication from the institution. Combined, 76.9% of respondents maintained they would be willing to receive provided they could be removed when they desired, such as an e-mail communication. The factors of receiving communications through the mail as being the alums preferred method of communication and their willingness to receive e-mail communications led to the determination that alumni would be interested in receiving Stetson University information and program updates via e-mail.
Research Question 6

What concerns do alumni have when making a donation through the Internet?

The greatest concern alumni had when making a gift through the Internet was credit card security. Of alumni surveyed, 80.9% asserted that this was very important to them. Also, 76.6% of alumni declared that information privacy was also very important to them. These concerns were valid, and could be considered obstacles to getting donors to give online. It was important that alums felt their privacy was protected, not only when they donated online, but when they donated to the institution in general. Issues such as the alumni’s knowledge that their donation went to a specific department or the alumni being able to e-mail the university were far less of a concern to donors than the fact that if they donated, their personal information would be kept confidential. This fact can be attributed to the issue of trust that was discussed by Hart (2001) and Olsen et. al (2001). Donors must feel that they had a relationship (whether it was a relationship established online or a personal relationship) with the organization in order to feel comfortable donating to an institution.

Conclusions

This study investigated the differences in attitudes towards online giving between four class groups. This study
also determined alumni interest in receiving e-mail communication from the institution, and determined the possibility of converting donors who presently donated through traditional methods to donors who would make donations over the Internet. The review of literature explained the history of fundraising, and the benefits for nonprofits to be online. It also focused on the different types of Internet fundraising, and how various educational non-profits implemented and utilized online technology into the fundraising process.

The following conclusions were made:

1. The majority of alumni have been using the Internet for over 5 years, and mainly accessed the Internet from either their homes or offices. It can also be concluded that alumni rarely changed their e-mail address, and as a result once that e-mail address was obtained, there could be a high level of confidence that the e-mail address was valid.

2. While online giving was viewed as a integral part of the fundraising process, many alumni were reluctant to participate in online giving at this time.

3. There was minimal difference in the views of online giving between those who had participated in online giving and those who had not participated in online giving.
4. There was no difference in attitudes toward online giving between class years.

5. Alumni preferred communication with the institution by more traditional methods of communications, i.e., mail and telephone.

6. While donors to Stetson held a philanthropic notion to donate, they did so through the more traditional methods.

7. Alumni would be willing to receive e-mail newsletters from the institution provided they could be removed from doing so when they desired.

8. Credit card security and information privacy were viewed as very important to alumni when they donated over the Internet.

9. Donors who made financial transactions over the Internet were more likely to make a charitable gift over the Internet.

Recommendations

1. Universities should begin to educate their alumni as to the benefits of donating over the Internet. These benefits may include:
   a. increased personalized contact between the university and its alumni;
   b. cost effective solicitation appeals;
   c. the ability to reach far away alumni.
2. Universities should set up safe and secure methods for receiving online donations.

3. Universities should establish a monthly e-mail newsletter to be delivered to alums.

4. This newsletter should be followed up be a monthly e-mail fund raising solicitation.

5. Universities should integrate online giving into their comprehensive fundraising process.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

1. A study could be duplicated with a focus on alumni who do not presently donate to the institution.

2. This study could be duplicated with alumni of a large public institution.

3. A study could be conducted concerning alumni of different colleges and schools such as the School of Business and the College of Arts and Sciences within the institution to determine if there was a difference in attitude between alumni of those schools within the University.

4. A study could be conducted with alumni who donate over $1,000 to determine what their preference of communication is with the institution, and their attitudes towards online giving.
5. This study could be duplicated after the initiation of the e-mail newsletter, and after further educating the alumni about online giving.

6. A study could be conducted comparing the respondents who reported they made a donation online to a sample of the respondents who reported they did not donate online in order to determine any differences in attitudes, computer usage, etc.
APPENDIXES
APPENDIX A
SURVEY INSTRUMENT
STETSON UNIVERSITY

Your alma mater is exploring ways to improve communication with you and other constituents. Please answer the following questions about Stetson University and your use of the Internet.

START HERE:

1. How long have you been using the Internet?
   - [ ] No, I don't use the Internet
   - [ ] Less than a year
   - [ ] 2-3 years
   - [ ] 4-5 years
   - [ ] More than 5 years

2. How often do you access the Internet?
   - [ ] Never
   - [ ] Almost everyday
   - [ ] About once a week
   - [ ] About once a month

3. Where do you access the Internet from the most?
   - [ ] Home
   - [ ] Library
   - [ ] Office
   - [ ] Other
   - [ ] do not access the Internet

4. How many e-mail addresses do you currently have?
   - [ ] 0
   - [ ] 1
   - [ ] 2
   - [ ] 3
   - [ ] 4 or more

5. How often do you change your e-mail address?
   - [ ] Never
   - [ ] Every 6 Months
   - [ ] Every 2-3 years
   - [ ] Every year

6. Would you consider using a permanent e-mail address provided by Stetson University?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

7. How often do you visit the Stetson website?
   - [ ] Never
   - [ ] Once a day
   - [ ] Weekly
   - [ ] Monthly
   - [ ] Yearly

8. Why do you visit the Stetson Web Site? (check all that apply)
   - [ ] To find out about what is happening on campus.
   - [ ] To keep updated on Stetson Sports.
   - [ ] To look for friends from my college years.
   - [ ] Other (please specify) ____________________________

Go on to Next Page→
9. Rank in order of preference the ways that you prefer to donate to Stetson. (please circle the appropriate response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lowest Preference</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Highest Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Visit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Have you donated to other non-profit organizations?

- [ ] YES
- [ ] NO, I only donate to Stetson

11. Have you donated a minimum of $10 to other non-profit organizations through the Internet?

- [ ] YES
- [ ] NO

12. If you give online, is the amount, of your contribution generally:

- [ ] Smaller than the more traditional means
- [ ] The same as the more traditional means
- [ ] Larger than the more traditional means
- [ ] I do not give online

13. If Stetson supplied a safe and secure method of making on-line donations, would you consider making a donation to Stetson through the Internet?

- [ ] YES
- [ ] NO

14. Would you be interested in receiving a monthly newsletter via e-mail from Stetson?

- [ ] YES
- [ ] NO
- [ ] YES, provided I can be removed when I desire.

Go on to Next Page →
15. Do you feel that online giving has replaced the other forms of giving you have used in the past?

☐ Has replaced traditional forms of giving.
☐ Used in addition to other forms of giving.
☐ I do not know.

16. Do you participate in online giving in addition to other forms of giving?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

17. Do you make any type of financial transaction (e.g. online banking, bill payment, etc) through the Internet?

☐ YES  ☐ NO

The following is a list of potential concerns a donor may have while making a gift through the Internet to the University. Some concerns may be more important to you than others. Please mark the importance of each issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18. Credit Card Security</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19. Information Privacy</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20. Confirmation that money goes to a specific department</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21. Knowledge of University Mission</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22. Being able to be kept updated on the University</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23. Being able to e-mail the University</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24. Donation goes to the Support of Scholarships</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other

25. What is the main reason you would not consider making a gift through the Internet?

☐ I do not go online.

☐ I do not make financial transactions online.

☐ I prefer traditional methods (e.g. phone-a-thons or direct mail) of giving.

☐ Other (please specify) ________________________________

Go on to Next Page →
Please circle the appropriate number to indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

1 - Strongly Disagree  2 - Disagree  3 - Unsure  4 - Agree  5 - Strongly Agree

26. Online giving is an effective means of donating to a non-profit organization.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Unsure  Agree  Strongly Agree
1  2  3  4  5

27. Stetson should use online technology to solicit funds from Alumni.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Unsure  Agree  Strongly Agree
1  2  3  4  5

28. Alumni donate more freely when donating through traditional methods of giving.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Unsure  Agree  Strongly Agree
1  2  3  4  5

29. The use of online giving increases alumni motivation to donate.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Unsure  Agree  Strongly Agree
1  2  3  4  5

30. I prefer donating through the Internet to the traditional methods of making a contribution.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Unsure  Agree  Strongly Agree
1  2  3  4  5

31. My donation to Stetson University would be greater if I contributed through the Internet.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Unsure  Agree  Strongly Agree
1  2  3  4  5

32. Please rate the importance of the following types of gift recognition that the Office of Development can provide. (1 being the lowest, 5 being the highest)

Thank you letter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Little Importance</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Invitation to a Stetson event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Little Importance</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special previews to concerts or gallery openings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Little Importance</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special lecture series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Little Importance</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stetson merchandise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Little Importance</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END HERE

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. The information will be extremely beneficial to Stetson University and its mission.

If you have any questions please contact Stetson University’s Office of Development at 421 North Woodland Blvd., Unit 8286 Deland, Florida 32723 (386) 822-7455
Dear Name:

I am writing to request your assistance in a study of Stetson University alumni donors. This study is part of an effort to learn about the willingness of alumni to participate in online giving programs. The results of this endeavor will determine Stetson's actions in providing expanded, effective and efficient giving options to our current and future donors.

We are surveying a sample of alumni donors to ask if they would consider making a donation to the university online and what benefits they might expect from this option. You have been a generous supporter of the university; its programs, and its students. This is why you have been selected to participate in this study.

Your answers are confidential and this survey is voluntary. If for some reason you prefer not to respond, please let us know by returning the blank questionnaire in the enclosed postage paid envelope.

If you have any questions about this study we would be happy to talk with you. I can be reached at 386-822-7738 or jrabin@stetson.edu.

Thank you very much for helping your alma mater with this important study.

Sincerely,

Jenine S. Rabin
Executive Director of Development

Enclosure
APPENDIX C
SECOND COVER LETTER
Dear Name:

Stetson University needs your help!

Recently, your University mailed a questionnaire requesting your involvement in a study on the willingness of Stetson alumni to participate in online giving programs. As this is an important analysis of our programs and services, I am writing you again to request your participation in this survey to ensure we capture the most accurate data. Although we have heard from many alumni, your response makes a difference.

Your answers are confidential and this survey is voluntary. If for some reason you prefer not to respond, please let us know by returning the blank questionnaire in the enclosed postage paid envelope. Protecting the confidentiality of our alumni is a matter we take very seriously. For tracking purposes a random identification number is printed on the outside of the return envelope. Once a survey is returned, that number is taken off the mailing list.

I hope that you will complete the survey and return it soon. For your convenience, I have enclosed another survey and response envelope. In case you have already returned your survey, please disregard this request. If you have any questions about this study I would be happy to talk with you. I can be reached at 386-822-7738 or jrabin@stetson.edu.

Thank you again for assisting your alma mater with this important study.

Sincerely,

Jennie S. Rabin
Executive Director of Development
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IRB APPROVAL LETTER
May 13, 2003

Peter A. Trakas II
130 Heron Bay Circle
Lake Mary, FL 32746

Dear Mr. Trakas:

With reference to your protocol entitled, "Online giving and University Deployment," I am enclosing for your records the approved, executed document of the UCFIRB Form you had submitted to our office.

Please be advised that this approval is given for one year. Should there be any addendums or administrative changes to the already approved protocol, they must also be submitted to the Board. Changes should not be initiated until written IRB approval is received. Adverse events should be reported to the IRB as they occur. Further, should there be a need to extend this protocol, a renewal form must be submitted for approval at least one month prior to the anniversary date of the most recent approval and is the responsibility of the investigator (UCF).

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 823-2901.

Please accept our best wishes for the success of your endeavors.

Cordially,

Chris Grayson
Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Copies: Dr. Levester Tubbs
IRB File


