#### The Social Base of Philanthropic Fundraising in Higher Education: How Frames and Identity Mater

Paper Presented at

2015 European Research Network On Philanthropy

in

Paris, France

Noah D. Drezner, Ph.D. Associate Professor, Higher Education

Teachers College, Columbia University 525 West 120th St, Box 101 New York, NY 10027

> 212-678-3787 drezner@tc.columbia.edu

#### Abstract:

Identity-based philanthropy purports that social identities effect giving, yet there is little quantitative research exploring this notion. Using a population-based experiment (n=1621), I found that respondents who share higher number of social identities with students profiled in solicitations are more likely than others to assign more importance and to give.

This research is funded by the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) John Grenzebach Award for Outstanding Research in Philanthropy for Educational Advancement.

# The Social Base of Philanthropic Fundraising in Higher Education: How Frames and Identity Mater

As a result of the recent economic downturn, institutions, private and public alike, are turning more and more to private giving – such as alumni support – in order to meet budgetary demands. Alumni giving is the largest source of voluntary support and accounts for more than a quarter (26%) of philanthropy to higher education (Kaplan, 2014). The impact of alumni giving is significant; accounting for 7.6% of budgetary expenditures at research universities and nearly 20% at private liberal arts colleges (Kaplan, 2014). Moreover, institutions are exploring the possibility of engaging a broader range of donors from historically disenfranchised and marginalized groups (Drezner, 2013; Gasman & Bowman, 2013).

Empirical research on private giving toward higher education, however, is less developed than expected. Indeed, scholars have argued that fundraising is often "thinly informed by research" (Brittingham & Pezzulo, 1990, p. 1). The failure to ground the research in any theoretical or conceptual framework limits the implications of existing research to the work of practitioners (Drezner, 2011; 2013; Drezner & Huehls, 2014).

An emerging approach, both within the more general philanthropic literature and within the subfield exploring giving towards higher education, is identity-based fundraising (Drezner & Huehls, 2014). The identity-based fundraising literature, often grounded in social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), shows that donors' identities are a factor in their decisions to give and how those gifts are manifested (Drezner, 2013). For example, Small (2011) suggests that "people tend to feel more sympathetic towards and help other people who are closer to them" (p. 150). Scholars who have explored the importance of identity within philanthropy towards higher education have engaged their research along the lines of race and ethnicity (e.g.; Cabrales, 2013; Gasman & Anderson-Thompkins, 2003; Smith, Shue, Vest, & Villarreal, 1999; Tsunoda, 2013), ability (e.g.; Drezner, 2007), religion (e.g.;

Gasman, Drezner, Epstein, Freeman, & Avery, 2011), and sexuality (Drezner & Garvey, 2014; Garvey & Drezner, 2013). Overall, scholars have shown that when institutions engage donors' social identity the likelihood of giving is increased.

The vast majority of the work that has been done on identity-based fundraising is based on qualitative methods, largely providing rich descriptions of motivations among specific groups (e.g., racial and ethnic minorities). While these studies provide a great deal of information on how giving is enacted in minority communities and gives us implications for practice, qualitative work, by its very nature is not meant to be generalizable. Thus, we know little about how donors' identities and the likelihood of giving towards higher education are related among the general population of college graduates. Further, lack of generalizable data hampers our ability to affect fundraising practice. Inspired by the growing literature on identity-base philanthropy, my study views alumni support not only as something that individuals give, but also as something that institutions cultivate. That is, alumni support may be encouraged or discouraged by institutions' engagement with different donors' identities.

#### LITERATURE REVIEW

## Social Identity Theory as a Basis for Identity-Based Philanthropy

Group-identity formation is the basis of a significant literature in the disciplines of psychology and sociology (Drezner & Huehls, 2014). Social Identity Theory is one foundational explanation for intergroup behavior. Tajfel and Turner (1979) posited that individuals create their own identities based on in-groups and out-groups, in other words, they place themselves in relevant groups in which there is another group in which they can be compared. Stemming from Social Identity Theory, Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, and Werherell (1987) developed Self-Categorization Theory that suggests that group identity drives some behaviors, which informs individual identity and further behaviors. In other words, they posit that when an identity category is "activated," a person is likely to treat others in that share that

identity better than those have different identities. Further, Flippen, Hornstein, Siegal, and Weitzman (1996) suggested that shared identity creates a sense of a collective, in which people are more likely to help one another.

#### Social Distance & the Identifiable Victim

Bogardus (1925) described social distance as the distance between different groups in society, where those who are 'socially close' are those we feel most close to, and therefore, those with whom we are have more distance we feel less kinship toward. In other words, "Where there is little sympathetic understanding, social farness exists. Where sympathetic understanding is great, nearness exists" (Bogardus, 1941, p. 106). Karakayali (2009) classifies social distance as an affective distance.

A decrease in social distance can be created by sharing information about others, specifically individuals. Within philanthropic studies researcher, some have found that when a specific person is described, over generalizations or mere statistics, both number of gifts and size of donations increase (Kogut & Ritov, 2011). This has been described as the identifiable victim effect (Schelling, 1968; Jenni & Loewenstein, 1997). Kogut and Ritov (2011) have postulated that there is a singularity effect in the identifiable victim, in which solicitations to support an individual are more likely to receive positive reactions than requests to help a group.

#### Minority – Majority Social Identity Intergroup Interactions

Since a person's sense of self-worth is tied to their social identity group, both affronts and moments of pride to members of that group are often viewed as affronts to or pride for one's self. As such, people often act to help their own group even when such strategies do not directly benefit their objective, or realistic, self-interests (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). The relative size of identity group's size is a moderator of intergroup relations. Experimental studies routinely find that minority groups exhibit greater in-group support than do groups in the majority or with privilege (Leonardelli & Brewer, 2001).

This is partly because minority-group members and those with less privilege, often perceive intergroup boundaries and as a result identify more strongly with their in-group (Jackson, 2002; Mummendey, Klink, Mielke, Wenzel & Blanz, 1999). For example, Croll (2007) and McDermott and Samson (2005), finds that Whites in the United States are less likely than people of color to identify racially, until their Whiteness is made apparent to them through other interactions.

Intergroup relations researchers have also studied the attitudes and behaviors of majority group members, most often Whites, toward minority group members, most often Blacks (Krysan, 2000). There is less research on Whites' attitudes toward other racial minority groups. There is very little research on relations between racial minority groups such as Blacks and Latinos/nas (Telles, Rivera-Salgado, Sawyer, & Zamora, 2011). However, within the limited research on Black-Latino relations in the United States researchers have found that Blacks and Latinos hold negative stereotypes of each other, with Latinos hold more negative stereotypes of Blacks than vice versa (Marrow, 2011; Mindiola, Niemann, & Rodriguez, 2003; Oliver & Wong 2003; Abascal, 2015).

## **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

To begin addressing the aforementioned gaps in the literature, I ask three questions:

- How does different cases for support e.g., need-based and merit based affect the respondent's propensity to give and at what level?
- 2. How does social identity of the recipient e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation affect the respondent's propensity to give and at what level?
- 43. How does the interaction between the recipient and respondent's social identities affect the respondent's propensity to give and at what level?

#### HYPOTHESES

Given previous research in this field, building on the social identity literature and concepts of reduced social distance (Small, Loewenstein, & Slovic, 2007) and the identifiable victim (Kogut & Ritov, 2011), my study has two main hypotheses. First, prospects who were on need-based scholarships themselves will respond more positively to solicitation that describes a need-based scholarship. In other words, I suspect that prospects that see aspects of themselves in the solicitation will respond more favorably, although there may be different responses across diverse sub-populations. Second, that prospects will respond more positively (see a higher importance in a cause and give and at higher amounts) to solicitations that mirror one or more of their social identities (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, sexual minority status, and first-generation status).

#### **DATA AND METHODS**

To address the study objectives, I use data from The National Alumni Giving Experiment I conducted in 2014 (n=1,621). Respondents were recruited and paid via Amazon's Mechanical Turk (MTurk), a popular crowdsourcing site that is increasingly used by behavioral science researchers. Researchers have concluded that although the MTurk sample does not perfectly match the demographic characteristics of the U.S. population, it does not present a distorted view of the U.S. population (Berinsky, Huber, & Lenz, 2012). For this study, only respondents with an academic degree from a four-year institution in the United States were allowed to take the survey. The analytical sample includes only respondents who graduated before 2013, as they were a part of at least one full fiscal year of annual fund solicitation.

Table 1 compares The National Alumni Giving Experiment with the General Social Survey (GSS 2012/2014). GSS conducts basic scientific research on the structure and development of American society. GSS collects their data via phone and in-person interviews. I compared GSS respondents with a bachelor's degree and above to my sample. While not completely comparable, most populations in my

sample do compare to those in GSS. However, of note, the National Alumni Giving Experiment has slightly younger population than the GSS, with the average age being 49.5 in GSS and 40.1 in my sample. The age difference between the samples and the difference in the mode of data collection might explain the higher LGBT identified respondents in my sample. Similarly, when comparing political ideology, I found that GSS has a larger moderate population, while the National Alumni Giving Experiment is slightly more liberal, this too might be explained by the age difference in the two samples.

The National Alumni Giving Experiment evaluates attitudes toward a fictitious solicitation letter sent by the alma mater of the respondent. Standard fundraising solicitations, such as letters asking for scholarship support, often include brief student profiles. These personal stories are considered very effective ways of fundraising, as empathy plays a strong motivation to donate (Davis, et al. 1987; Small, 2011). Respondents were assigned to read two fictitious solicitation letters, where each letter described an individual student exhibiting unique merit or need. Characteristics of the fictional individual and her or his profile were randomly varied across respondents. Questions following the solicitation letter elicited respondents' views toward the cause described in the letter and likelihood of donating money for this cause.

## Solicitation Letter: Experimental Conditions

The fictitious solicitation letter described an individual student profile that represents one of the four different frames used by fundraisers in higher education (see Appendix A for the full text). The first version of the solicitation letter describes an individual student who is academically high achieving and the institution has awarded a merit-based scholarship. The second letter describes an individual student with a general financial need as a result of the recent market downturn. The third version describes an individual student with a financial need related to the student's first-generation status. The fourth letter describes an individual student with a financial need related to a lack of parental support (parents

stopped financial support after son/daughter disclosed their sexual orientation).<sup>1</sup> In addition to the frame/version, the letters also randomly varied the gender, race/ethnicity (White/African American/Latino), and name (John/Juan, Mary/Maria) of the student. I control for each of these different conditions to test how they affect respondents' engagement with philanthropy.

#### Dependent Variables

To measure the perceived importance of the cause described in the letter, respondents were asked "How important is this fundraising priority to you?" with the scale ranging from 1 = "not important at all" to 5 = "very important." To measure the likelihood of donating money for the cause described in the letter, respondents were asked, "Thinking about your last gift to your undergraduate college or university, would a solicitation highlighting this student's story lead you this year to give more, less, or the same as last year?"

#### **Respondents Characteristics**

To assess the effect of the interaction between the student profiled in the solicitation letter and respondent's social identities, I constructed a mirroring index, which is a sum of four indicators for each of the social identities presented in the solicitation letter—i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation status, and first generation status. An indicator is equal to one (1) if the student profiled in the solicitation letter and the respondent shared the same social identity; an indicator is equal to zero (0) if the social identity does not match. For example, if a female respondent read Mary's student profile, the indicator for gender was coded 1. The mirroring index ranges from zero (0), no shared social identities, to four (4), four shared social identities.

In addition, the analysis includes controls for gender, young alumni status, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation status, attainment of a professional or graduate degree, income, first generation status, and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> National nonprofits such as the Point Foundation along with individual institutions (e.g.; the University of Chicago) have established scholarships for LGBT students without financial support.

political ideology. Table 2 presents definitions, metrics, and descriptive statistics for all variables included in this study.

In the survey, I collected race and ethnicity demographics of the respondents as it is collected on most social science surveys and the United States Census, in other words, I collected race separately from ethnicity. The US Census and GSS both treat being Hispanic as an ethnicity. However, I decided to code respondents who identified as Latino/a as though this is their race. This is consistent with how most Latinos/Latinas define themselves. A recent Pew Research Center (2015) report found the two-thirds of those in the United States identify as racially Latino, rather than ethnically Latino. Pew found that this racial identification of Latinos was consistent across gender, age groups, educational levels and language preference. This conversation about race, ethnicity, and identify is not new, Taylor, Lopez, Martinez, and Velasco (2012), found that when it comes to race, on the US Census, half (51%) of Latinos identify their race as "some other race" or volunteer "Hispanic/Latino."

#### RESULTS

To begin, I found that slightly more than one-third (33.5%) of the respondents are donors to their alma mater. Next, I examine the perceived importance of the cause described in the letter. Slightly more than half of the sample (50.7%) view the cause as important (i.e., "very important" and "somewhat important"), whereas about one-third of the sample (30.0%) view the cause as not important (i.e., "somewhat not important" and "not important at all"). The rest, one-fifth of the sample (19.2%) view the cause as neither important nor not important.

When looking at whether the solicitations would motivate the respondents to make a donation to their alma mater, not surprising of those who had given before 94.9% said they would give in response to the letters presented. However, more interesting, is that these solicitations have a relatively high donor acquisition rate, 24.1%. In other words, nearly a quarter of those who had never given to their college or

university said they would now give, in response to solicitations. Further, the solicitations are not only successful acquisition tools, but also successful at renewals at upgrades. When looking at prior donors, only 5.1% would not give and 6.3% would give less than their last gift. However, 28.6% would increase their giving and 60.0% would give at the same level.

Table 3 compares respondents' perceived importance of the solicitation with their willingness to give, and at what level in comparison to prior giving. The association between these variables is significant ( $Chi^2=1.5e+03$ , DF=12, p<.001): As importance increases so does willingness to give increase. Among respondents who think that the cause is "not important at all," less than one percent (.4 percent) indicated they will give more than last year, and vast majority (85.7 percent) indicated they are not willing to give. In contrast, among respondents who think that the cause is "very important," close to two-third (64.9 percent) indicated they will give more than last year, and only small fraction (5.2 percent) indicated they are not willing to give.

Table 4 presents coefficients from four OLS regression models estimating respondents' perception of the importance of the cause described in the solicitation letter. Model 1 includes the randomized conditions of the letter as well as the order of the solicitation letter (first or second). Solicitation letters describing first generation students or LGBT students in need are perceived to be more important than letter profiling meritorious students. Regardless of the scholarship type solicited for, supporting African American students is perceived to be more important than supporting White students. These patterns hold across models, even after we control for respondents' characteristics (Models 2 to 4).

As for respondents' characteristics (Models 2 and 3), I find significant effect for gender, race/ethnicity, sexual minority status, education, and political ideology. On average, women, non-White respondents (i.e., Blacks, American Indians / Native Alaskan / Pacific Islanders, and Asians) except

Latinos/nas, and sexual minority respondents are more likely than others to perceive the causes as important. Similar pattern is observed for respondents with graduate and/or professional degrees. Conservative respondents, however, are less likely than others to assign importance to the causes described in the letters. Model 3 also, found that having been a donor already was linked to perceived importance as well.

Model 4 introduces the mirroring index, which reflects the total number of social identities shared by the respondents and the student profiled in the solicitation letter. The coefficient for the mirroring index is positive and significant (b=.063, p<.05). Respondents who share higher number of social identities with the student profiled in the solicitation letter are more likely than others to assign more importance to the causes described in the letters.

Table 5 presents the coefficients from the multinomial logistic regression (Long, 1997) that estimates respondents' propensity to give to the cause described in the solicitation letter. The models present the probability of choosing one outcome category - give more than last year, the same as last year, or not willing to give - over the probability of choosing the baseline category: giving less than last year. Before looking at the mirroring index, I find that women are more likely to give more than less and that African Americans, American Indians, and Asian Americans are more likely to say they will give less than not willing to give at all. Finally, the mirroring index is significant in all three models. In other words, as the respondents social identities increasingly mirror those of the student profiled in the solicitation letter, respondents are more willing to give more or the same than less. Alternatively, mirroring is more likely to increase the size of a gift in comparison to decreasing the size of the gift.

## DISCUSSION

This study advances the scholarship on the social base of philanthropic giving in at least two ways. First, using a population survey with an experimental design, I assess whether and how social

identity affects alumni giving. Second, research to date on the intersection between social identity and philanthropic giving has largely been qualitative, and therefore, not generalizable. My findings show that alumni giving is affected not only by donor characteristics (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, and political ideology), but also by the framing and presentation of the solicitation. Moreover, I demonstrate the importance of mirroring a donor's social identities with the case for support. In the coming paragraphs I will delve deeper and discusses each of these findings in more detail.

First, Model 1 indicates that need-based solicitations are more compelling than merit-based requests. This might not seem to be a surprising finding, however, to date no empirical work has shown a preference for which type of scholarship aid prospective donors prefer to support through annual giving. The existing literature only looks at the propensity of need-based and merit-based scholarship recipients to give to their alma mater, but not to which type of fund see: Cunningham & Cochi-Ficano, 2002; Marr, Mullin, & Siegried, 2005; McDearmon, & Shirley, 2009).

Also in this model I found that need-based scholarships for first-generation college students and LGBT students who are financially disowned are more compelling than merit, while solicitations for students that have general need is not more compelling than merit. This indicates that not only are more detailed scholarship requests more compelling to potential donors, but those presenting marginalized are more compelling scholarship recipients. This is further evidenced by the fact that support African American students was perceived as more important than supporting a White student.

When I introduced social identities into models 2 and 3 I found that in general women and those people with marginalized identities, except Latinos, give high importance to all vignettes. The specific find that Latinos did not give greater importance to helping other marginalized groups is in line with prior work that has shown tension between Latinos/nas and Blacks (Marrow, 2011; Mindiola, Niemann, & Rodriguez, 2003; Oliver & Wong 2003; Abascal, 2015). However, the fact that others marginalized

groups assign importance to the support of others who are in the minority is supports Leonardelli and Brewer's (2001) work that shows that minority groups exhibit greater in-group support. This intermarginalized group support could be because of those prospective donors who have marginalized identities within American society, have greater empathy for others that are marginalized, even if there is not a direct shared identity. In other words, we seem to see that there might be a marginalized-person shared identity being formed, where in the in-groups and out-groups, as explained in social identity theory, are not direct identities but more collective identities based on larger societal forces.

Additionally, in model 3 I found that those with conservative ideologies are less likely to ascribe importance to any of the different types of solicitations. This combined with the earlier finding that need-based solicitations, in general, were perceived as more important than merit-based gifts, raises interesting questions about the argument for American meritocracy when it comes to philanthropic support of higher education.

Finally, in model 4, I found that mirroring the identity of the student profiled in the solicitation with the different identities of the respondents, after controlling for all other variables, is significant even after controlling for characteristics of student profiled in the solicitation and for respondents characteristics.

The multinomial logistic regression that looked at the propensity to give shows that mirroring a prospective donor's social identities with those of the student's profiled in the solicitation letter is more likely to increase the size of a gift in comparison to decreasing the size of the gift. While this is not the most clear finding that mirroring increases giving and donor acquisition, it does indicate that mirroring does have an effect and should be further explored in both research and practice. One explanation of this less than ideal finding is the original question that was asked. In The National Alumni Giving Experiment, I asked all respondents, prior donors and non-donors, "Thinking about your last gift to your

undergraduate college or university, would a solicitation highlighting this student's story lead you to give more, less, or the same amount as your last gift?" They were able to also say "not willing to donate." This was not a good item for those who had never given a gift to their alma mater before, as "same," "less," and "not willing to donate" could be viewed all as the same response. Additionally, without asking about prior gift size for donors and how much they would be willing to give in response to the solicitation, I was not able to calculate the actual impact that mirroring has on giving. Future research can clarify this.

#### **IMPLICATIONS**

There are a number of implications for both research and practice that emerge from this study. First and foremost is the use of general population experiments within both the fields of education and philanthropic studies. General population experiments are not used all that often in these fields of study. They are growing in popularity in sociology and other social science disciplines. These large scale experiments allow researchers to assign large subject populations to experimental conditions of their choosing. By using Internet technology, such as Amazon Turk, to engage randomly selected respondents with randomly assigned stimuli, we are taking experimentation outside of the laboratory or classroom and therefore we can strengthen the internal validity the research. More researchers should consider these experiments in their research.

With regards to practice, this study has shown the importance of social identities in giving towards higher education. Overall, these findings will have a significant impact on fundraising practice, specifically within the annual fund. Using data to better understand alumni and their social identities will allow fundraisers to develop annual fund solicitation letters that might be more compelling and personal to specific alumni groups based on predictive models that can be developed based on these findings. This will allow for more successful and efficient annual find solicitations.

# CONCLUSION

The vast majority of identity-based philanthropic studies research uses qualitative methods to detail rich descriptive motivations. Building off of my identity-based philanthropy work, The National Alumni Giving Experiment evaluated college graduates' willingness to donate to their alma mater through different solicitation vignettes. These vignettes highlight different possible donor identities and motivations that have emerged in prior scholarship. The experiment allowed us to understand how identity effects one's giving to their alma mater, or the social base of philanthropy in higher education, and how solicitations that mirror donor identity effect philanthropic giving. I found that those who share higher number of social identities with the student profiled in the solicitation letter are more likely than others to assign more importance to the causes described in the letters. I also find that women and those with marginalized identities (race and sexual orientation) showed greater interest in solicitations in supporting other marginalized individuals, even if it was not a direct shared identity. There is room for future research that looks at the mechanisms behind the social distance how mirroring and identify effect philanthropic giving.

15

## REFERENCES

- Abascal, M. (2015). Us and them: Black-White relations in the wake of Hispanic population growth. *American Sociological Review*
- Berinsky, A. J., Huber, G. A., & Lenz, G. S. (2012). Evaluating online labor markets for experimental research: Amazon.com's Mechanical Turk. *Political Analysis*, 20(3), 351-368.

Bogardus, E. S. (1925). Measuring social distances, Journal of Applied Sociology 9, 299–308.

Bogardus, E. S. (1941). Sociology. New York: Macmillan.

- Brittingham, B. E. & Pezzullo, T. R. (1990). The campus green: Fund raising in higher education.
   ASHE-ERIC higher education report no. 1. Washington, DC: The George Washington
   University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Cabrales, J.A. (2013). An approach to engaging Latina/o alumni giving initiatives: Madrinas y padrinos.
   In N.D. Drezner (Ed.) *Expanding the donor base in higher education: Engaging non-traditional donors*. New York: Rutledge.
- Croll, P.R. (2007). Modeling determinants of White racial identity: Results from a new national survey. *Social Forces*, 86(2):613–42.
- Cunningham, B. M., & Cochi-Ficano, C. K. (2002). The determinants of donative revenue flows from alumni of higher education: An empirical inquiry. *Journal of Human Resources*, 540-569.
- Davis, M.H., Bagozzi, R.P., Young, R.D., & Warren, G.G. (1987). Emotional reactions to dramatic film stimuli: The influence of cognitive and emotional empathy. *Journal of Personal and Social Psychology*, 22, 1111-1132.
- Drezner, N. D. (2011). Philanthropy and Fundraising in Higher Education. ASHE Higher Education Reports. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Drezner, N. D. (Ed.) (2013). *Expanding the Donor Base in Higher Education: Engaging Non-Traditional Donors*. New York: Rutledge.
- Drezner, N. D., & Huehls, F. (2014). Fundraising and Institutional Advancement: Theory, Practice, and New Paradigms. New York: Routledge.
- Drezner, N. D., & Garvey, J. (2014). (Un)Conscious queer identity and influence on philanthropy towards higher education. *Nonprofit and Volunteer Sector Quarterly*.
- Flippen, A.R., Hornstein, H.A., Siegal, W.E., and Weitzman, E.A. (1996). A comparison of similarity and interdependence as triggers for in-group formation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 882-93.
- Garvey, J.C. & Drezner, N.D. (2013). Advancement staff and alumni advocates: Cultivating LGBTQ alumni by promoting individual and community uplift. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 6(3).
- Gasman, M., & Anderson-Thompkins, S. (2003). Fund raising from Black college alumni: Successful strategies for supporting alma mater. Washington, DC: CASE.
- Gasman, M., & Bowman III, N. (2013). Engaging Diverse College Alumni: The Essential Guide to Fundraising. Routledge.
- Gasman, M., Drezner, N. D., Epstein, E., Freeman, T., & Avery, V. L. (2011). Race, gender, and leadership in nonprofit organizations. New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Jackson, J.W. (2002). The relationship between group identity and intergroup prejudice is moderated by sociocultural variation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *32*(5):908–933.
- Jenni, K., & Loewenstein, G. (1997). Explaining the identifiable victim effect. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, 14(3), 235-257.

Kaplan, A. (2014). Colleges and universities raise \$33.80 billion in 2013. Retrieved from http://cae.org/images/uploads/pdf/VSE-2013-Press-Release.pdf.

Karakayali, N. (2009), Social distance and affective orientations. Sociological Forum, 24: 538–562.

- Kogut, T. & Ritov, I. (2011). The identifiable victim effect: Causes and boundary conditions. In D. M. Oppenheimer and C. Y. Olivola (Eds). *The science of giving: Experimental approaches to the study of charity* (pp. 133-147). New York: Psychology Press.
- Krysan, M. (2000). Prejudice, politics, and public opinion: Understanding the sources of racial policy attitudes. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26:135–68.
- Leonardelli, G.J. & Brewer, M.B.(2001). Minority and majority discrimination: When and why." Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 37(6):468–85.
- Long, S.J. (1997). Regression models for categorical and limited dependent variables. *Advanced quantitative techniques in the social sciences*, 7. SAGE.
- Marr, K. A., Mullin, C. H., & Siegfried, J. J. (2005). Undergraduate financial aid and subsequent alumni giving behavior. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, *45*(1), 123-143.
- Marrow, H.B. (2011). *New destination dreaming: Immigration, race, and legal status in the rural American south.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- McDermott, M. & Samson, F.L. (2005). White racial and ethnic identity in the United States. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *31*:245–61.
- McDearmon, J. T., & Shirley, K. (2009). Characteristics and institutional factors related to young alumni donors and non-donors. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 9(2), 83-95.
- Mindiola, T., Jr., Flores Niemann, Y. & Rodriguez, N. (2003). *Black-Brown relations and stereotypes*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

- Mummendey, A., Klink, A., Mielke, R., Wenzel, M., & Blanz, M. (1999). Sociostructural characteristics of intergroup relations and identity management strategies: Results from a field study in East Germany. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29(2–3):259–85.
- Oliver, J.E. & Wong, J. (2003). Intergroup prejudice in multiethnic settings. *American Journal of Political Science*, 47(4):567–82
- Pew Research Center. 2015. "Multiracial in America: Proud, Diverse and Growing in Numbers." Washington, D.C.: author.
- Schelling, T. C. (1968). "The life you save may be your own," in Samuel Chase (Ed.), Problems in Public Expenditure Analysis. Washington DC: The Brookings Institute.
- Small, D. A., Loewenstein, G., & Slovic, P. (2007). Sympathy and callousness: The impact of deliberative thought on donations to identifiable and statistical victims. *Organizational Behavior* and Human Decision Processes, 102(2), 143-153.
- Small, D.A. (2011). Sympathy biases and sympathetic appeals: Reducing social distance to boost charitable contributions. In D. M. Oppenheimer and C. Y. Olivola (Eds). *The science of giving: Experimental approaches to the study of charity* (pp. 113-132). New York: Psychology Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G. Austin & S.Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*, (33-47). Monterey, CA:Brooks/Cole.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986) The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W.G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed., pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Taylor, P., Lopez, M.H., Martinez, J., & Velasco, G. (2012). "When Labels Don't Fit: Hispanics and Their Views of Identity." Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center.

- Telles, E., Rivera-Salgado, G., Sawyer, M.Q., & Zamora, S. (2011). "Introduction." Pp. 1–33 in E.
  Telles, M. Sawyer, and G. Rivera-Salgado (Eds.) Just Neighbors? Research on AfricanAmerican and Latino Relations in the United States. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Turner, J.C., Hogg, M.A., Oakes, P.J., Reicher, S.D. and Wetherell, M.S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

ORAFI- DONOT DISTRIBUTE

	General Social Survey		National A	lumni
	2012/2014		Giving Exp	eriment
	Mean /	SD	Mean /	SD
	Percent		Percent	
Female	53.7%		46.0%	
White	80.7%		76.3%	
African American	10.3%		7.8%	
Asian	6.9%		9.2%	
American Indian	4.6%		3.6%	
Other	3.1%			r
Latino	7.5%		5.9%	
LGBT	4.4%		9.5%	
Graduate Degree	37.0%		26.6%	
Political Ideology	3.90	1.54	3.37	1.71
Age	49.55	15.96	40.13	12.36
First Generation College Student –	51.6%		46.8%	
No Parent with Higher Ed Degree				

 Table 1: Demographic Data Comparison: General Social Survey and National Alumni Giving

 Experiment

Variable	Description	Metric	Mean	SD
Dependent variable				
Perceived importance of	"How important is this	1 = "not important at all"	3.20	1.29
fundraising solicitation	fundraising priority to you?"	to		
-		5 = "very important"		
Student profile			$\sim$	
characteristics			$c \setminus \setminus$	
Order (second profile)	Order of profiles	0 = first profile;	.50	
		1 = second profile		
Frame: First generation	Frame of solicitation letter	0 = other frames;	.26	
		1 = first generation		
		student	•	
Frame: Gay/Lesbian	Frame of solicitation letter	0 = other trames;	.24	
student		I = gay/lesbian student	24	
Frame: General need	Frame of solicitation letter	0 = other frames;	.24	
		I = general need	26	
Frame: Merit	Frame of solicitation letter	0 = other frames;	.26	
Women	Conder of student	1 = mentorious student	50	
woman	Gender of student	0 = man;	.50	
White	<b>B</b> ass/athricity of student	1 = woman	24	
w lite	Race/etimicity of student	0 = 0 the $1 = W$ bits	.34	
African Amarican	<b>D</b> aca/athricity of student	1 -  while $0 - $ other:	22	
American	Race/etimetry of student	0 = 0 then, 1 = A frican A merican	.55	
Latino/a	Race/ethnicity of student	0 = other:	34	
Latino, a	Race/cullerty of student	1 = Latino/a	.54	
		1 – Latino/a		
Respondent's				
characteristics				
Women	Gender of respondent	0 = man;	.46	
		1 = woman		
Young alumni	Respondent's graduation year	0 = respondent graduated	.45	
		before 2004;		
		1 = respondent graduated		
$\sim$		in 2004 or later		
White	Race/ethnicity of respondent	0 = other;	.82	
		1 = White		
African American	Race/ethnicity of respondent	0 = other;	.08	
		1 = African American		
American Indian /	Race/ethnicity of respondent	0 = other;	.04	
Native Alaskan / Pacific		1 = American Indian /		
Islander		Native Alaskan / Pacific		
		Islander		

Variable	Description	Metric	Mean	SD
Asian American	Race/ethnicity of respondent	0 = other; 1 = Asian American	.09	
Latino/a	Race/ethnicity of respondent	0 = other; 1 = Latino/a	.08	
Other race	Race/ethnicity of respondent	0 = other; $1 = $ other races	<.01	
Sexual minority	Sexual minority status of	0 = heterosexual	.09	
	respondent	(straight);		
		I = gay, lesbian, bisexual, and other	$\sim$	$\checkmark$
Graduate / Professional	Education of respondent	0 = undergraduate	.27	
degree	1	degree;		
C		1 = graduate or		
		professional degree		
Income	Respondent's income	1 = less than 15K to	4.62	1.96
		9 = more than 150K		
First generation	Parental education	0 = one or more parent(s) graduated from college;	.46	
		1 = no parent having		
		graduated from college		
Political ideology	How would you classify your	1 = "extremely liberal" to	3.37	1.70
	political views?	7 = "extremely		
		conservative"		
Mirroring index	Number of social identities	0 = "no shared social	2.68	.86
	shared between respondent	identities" to		
	and student profile (gender,	4 = "four shared social		
	race/ethnicity, first generation	identities"		
	status, sexual minority status).			

# Table 3: Willingness to give, by perceived importance

	Give More	Give Same	Give Less	Not Willing to Give	Total
Not Important at All	2	51	17	418	488
	(.4)	(10.4)	(3.5)	(85.7)	(100.0)
Somewhat Not	40	159	45	238	482
Important	(8.3)	(33.0)	(9.3)	(49.4)	(100.0)
Neither	60	328	37	197	622
	(9.6)	(52.7)	(5.9)	(31.7)	(100.0)
Somewhat Important	424	574	41	138	1,177
	(36.0)	(48.8)	(3.5)	(11.7)	(100.0)
Very Important	302	126	13	24	465
	(64.9)	(27.1)	(2.8)	(5.2)	(100.0)
Total	828	1,238	153	1,015	3,234
	(25.6)	(38.3)	(4.7)	(31.4)	(100.0)

Panel A: Both Vignettes (n=3,234)

X<sup>2</sup>=1.5e+03, DF=12, p<.001

# Panel B: First Vignette (n=1,617)

	Give	Give	Give	Not	Total
	More	Same	Less	Willing	
				to Give	
Not Important at All	1	27	6	207	241
	(.4)	(11.2)	(2.5)	(85.9)	(100.0)
Somewhat Not	25	78	22	129	254
Important	(9.8)	(30.7)	(8.7)	(50.8)	(100.0)
Neither	34	150	18	101	303
	(11.2)	(49.5)	(5.9)	(33.3)	(100.0)
Somewhat Important	220	269	18	79	586
	(37.5)	(45.9)	(3.1)	(13.5)	(100.0)
Very Important	147	68	6	12	233
	(63.1)	(29.2)	(2.6)	(5.1)	(100.0)
Total	427	592	70	528	1617
	(26.4)	(36.6)	(4.3)	(32.7)	(100.0)

X<sup>2=</sup>1.5e+03, DF=12, p<.001

Panel C: Second Vignette (n=1,617)

	Give More	Give Same	Give Less	Not Willing to Give	Total
Not Important at All	1	24	11	211	247
-	(.4)	(9.7)	(4.4)	(85.4)	(100.0)
Somewhat Not	15	81	23	109	228
Important	(6.6)	(35.5)	(10.1)	(47.8)	(100.0)
Neither	26	178	19	96	319
	(8.1)	(55.8)	(6.0)	(30.1)	(100.0)
Somewhat Important	204	305	23	59	591
_	(34.5)	(51.6)	(3.90)	(10.0)	(100.0)
Very Important	155	58	7	12	232
	(66.8)	(25.0)	(3.0)	(5.2)	(100.0)
Total	401	646	83	487	1617
	(24.8)	(39.9)	(5.1)	(30.1)	(100.0)

X<sup>2</sup>=1.5e+03, DF=12, p<.001

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Student profile characteristics				
Order (second profile)	.012	.012	.012	.010
	(.022)	(.022)	(.022)	(.022)
Frame: First generation	121*	$117^{*}$	$104^{*}$	111*
Tranc. This generation	(.054)	(.052)	(.050)	(.050)
		. ,		
Frame: LGBT student	.124*	.137*	.107*	.155**
	(.058)	(.057)	(.055)	(.057)
Frame: General need	.022	.028	.003	001
	(.054)	(.053)	(.051)	(.051)
Woman	041	045	027	021
	(.063)	(.062)	(.059)	(.059)
African American	.103	.098	$.110^{*}$	.154**
	(.055)	(.054)	(.052)	(.055)
Latino/a	.073	.047	.062	.056
	(.056)	(.055)	(.053)	(.053)
Respondent's characteristics				
Woman		.217***	.224***	.226***
		(.060)	(.057)	(.057)
V 1		111	000	000
Young alumni		111	008	009
		(.000)	(.038)	(.038)
African American		.603***	.468***	.475***
		(.105)	(.103)	(.103)
		770***	CF C***	(22)***
American Indian / Native Alaskan / Pacific Islander		.//2	.656	.633
i active islander		(.101)	(.132)	(.155)
Asian American		.381***	.320**	$.298^{**}$
		(.101)	(.099)	(.099)
Lating/a		220	100	170
Latino/a		.228	.190	.1/0
		(.122)	(.110)	(.110)
Sexual minority		.179*	.154	.186*
-		(.090)	(.085)	(.085)

Table 4: OLS Regression Models of Perceived Importance of Fundraising Solicitation on SelectedVariables ( $N_i = 3,242; N_j = 1,621$ )

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Graduate / Professional degree		.183**	.107	.108
C C		(.068)	(.065)	(.065)
Income		009	024	024
		(.016)	(.016)	(.016)
First generation		.048	.096	.127*
		(.059)	(.057)	(.059)
Political ideology			056***	056***
			(.017)	(.017)
Past Giving			.753***	.752***
C		$\sim$	(.057)	(.057)
Mirroring index		$\sim$		$.062^{*}$
0				(.026)
Intercept	3.103***	2.898***	$2.844^{***}$	$2.692^{***}$
1	(.067)	(.118)	(.127)	(.151)
Adjusted $R^2$	.003	.050	.127	.128
AIC	10809.381	10673.051	10404.479	10401.471
BIC	10870.196	10794.680	10538.271	10541.345

Standard errors (in parentheses) adjusted for clusters p < .05, p < .01, p < .001

This is a DRAFT paper.	Please do not	distribute or cite	without the	permission of	f the author.
------------------------	---------------	--------------------	-------------	---------------	---------------

Selected variables $(N_i = 5,242, N_j = 1,02)$	More	Same	Not willing
	vs. Less	vs. Less	vs. Less
Student profile characteristics			
Order (second profile)	252	093	303*
	(.151)	(.149)	(.144)
Frame: First generation	267	171	007
Frame. First generation	(266)	.171	(267)
	(.200)	(.207)	(.201)
Frame: LGBT student	041	344	395
	(.258)	(.252)	(.252)
	2.52	224	214
Frame: General need	262	234	314
	(.244)	(.235)	(.242)
Woman	.472	.586*	.615*
	(.260)	(.257)	(.263)
African American	.471*	.537*	.287
	(.234)	(.229)	(.235)
Latino/a	- 231	- 078	- 136
Latino, a	(209)	(.200)	(206)
	(.= ., )	()	()
Respondent's characteristics			
Woman	572**	384	174
woman	(.218)	(.215)	(.228)
	()	()	()
Young alumni	403	580**	575**
	(.211)	(.205)	(.218)
A friend A marian	005	511	1 125**
African American	.095	311	-1.135
$\sim \sim$	(.308)	(.313)	(.374)
American Indian / Native Alaskan	252	816*	-1.716***
/ Pacific Islander	(.422)	(.361)	(.503)
			<b>*</b> *
Asian American	096	540	-1.032**
	(.296)	(.294)	(.335)
Latino/a	056	- 028	- 664
	(.481)	(.469)	(.482)
	. ,		

Table 5: Multinomial Logistic Regression of Propensity to Give to Fundraising Solici	tation on
Selected Variables ( $N_i = 3,242; N_i = 1,621$ )	

	More	Same	Not willing
	vs. Less	vs. Less	vs. Less
Sexual minority	448	793**	279
	(.305)	(.296)	(.315)
Graduate / Professional degree	.393	.209	.182
	(.249)	(.246)	(.262)
Income	.016	.017	.023
	(.054)	(.052)	(.057)
First generation	.382	.377	.235
	(.218)	(.210)	(.222)
Political ideology	061	029	029
	(.057)	(.055)	(.058)
Past Giving	349	.277	-2.747***
	(.214)	(.209)	(.274)
Mirroring index	.268*	.264*	.247*
2	(.119)	(.118)	(.119)
Intercept	.907	1.207	2.167**
	(.654)	(.644)	(.660)
pseudo $R^2$	0.114		
AIC	7151.936		
BIC	7571.557		

Standard errors (in parentheses) \* p < 0.05, \*\* p < 0.01, \*\*\* p < 0.001

Ф

# **Appendix A: Sample Solicitation Letters**

# Version 1: Merit Based Scholarship

[John/Joan/Mary/Maria] is a 19-year-old [white/African American/Latino/a] [man/woman] who is a sophomore at the University. [John/Joan/Mary/Maria] has dreamed of attending the University since [he/she] was in elementary school. [He/She] is considered to be one of the best students on campus having earned all A's in his courses and received a national award for undergraduate research.

The need for a college degree is more important than ever. Each year we compete for the best college students throughout the state and country. The University is committed to providing scholarships to the most promising students. In order to provide these scholarships, we need your help.

Please consider a gift to the University Scholarship Fund to help a student like [John/Joan/Mary/Maria].

# Version 2: Need Based Scholarship – First Generation

[John/Joan/Mary/Maria] is a 19-year-old [white/African American/Latino/a] [man/woman] who is a sophomore at the University. [John/Joan/Mary/Maria] has dreamed of attending the University since [he/she] was in elementary school. [He/She] is the first in [his/her] family to attend college. Like many other students who are first in their families to attend college, [he/she] often has a hard time paying tuition.

The need for a college degree is more important than ever. However, the cost of tuition, books, and room and board are out of reach for many. The University is committed to providing scholarships to all admitted students who are in need. In order to provide these scholarships, we need your help.

Please consider a gift to the University Scholarship Fund to help a student like [John/Joan/Mary/Maria].

# Version 3: Need Based Scholarship – LGBT Student

[John/Joan/Mary/Maria] is a 19-year-old [white/African American/Latino/a] [man/woman] who is a sophomore at the University. [John/Joan/Mary/Maria] has dreamed of attending the University since [he/she] was in elementary school. Last year, [he/she] came out to his parents as [gay/lesbian]. [His/Her] parents didn't take the news well and immediately stopped their financial support.

The need for a college degree is more important than ever. However, the cost of tuition, books, and room and board are out of reach for many. The University is committed to providing scholarships to all admitted students who are in need. In order to provide these scholarships, we need your help.

Please consider a gift to the University Scholarship Fund to help a student like [John/Joan/Mary/Maria].

# Version 4: Need Based Scholarship – General Need

[John/Joan/Mary/Maria] is a 19-year-old [white/African American/Latino/a] [man/woman] who is a sophomore at the University. [John/Joan/Mary/Maria] has dreamed of attending the University since [he/she] was in elementary school. [His/Her] parents have saved for [his/her] college education, but after the market downturn they find themselves unable to cover all of the tuition bills.

The need for a college degree is more important than ever. However, the cost of tuition, books, and room and board are out of reach for many. The University is committed to providing scholarships to all admitted students who are in need. In order to provide these scholarships, we need your help.

Please consider a gift to the University Scholarship Fund to help a student like [John/Joan/Mary/Maria].