2020

The Shifting Scheme of Athletic Fundraising: Investigating Private Giving Under the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act

Kirsten Nicole Brown

West Virginia University, kbrown30@mix.wvu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd>

Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), [Sports Studies Commons](#), [Taxation Commons](#), and the [Tax Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Brown, Kirsten Nicole, "The Shifting Scheme of Athletic Fundraising: Investigating Private Giving Under the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act" (2020). *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 7797.
<https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/7797>

This Dissertation is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by the The Research Repository @ WVU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Dissertation in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This Dissertation has been accepted for inclusion in WVU Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports collection by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu.

**The Shifting Scheme of Athletic Fundraising:
Investigating Private Giving Under the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act**

Kirsten N. Brown

Dissertation submitted
to the College of Education and Human Services
at West Virginia University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in
Higher Education Administration

Rodney Hughes, Ph.D., Chair
Nathan Sorber, Ph.D.
Erin McHenry-Sorber, Ph.D.
Phil Blackman, Ph.D, J.D., L.L.M

Department of Curriculum and Instruction/ Literacy Studies

Morgantown, West Virginia
2020

Keywords: Higher Education, Fundraising, Philanthropy, Private Giving, Athletics, Tax Cuts and
Jobs Act, Tax Reform

Copyright 2020 Kirsten N. Brown

ABSTRACT

The Shifting Scheme of Athletic Fundraising: Investigating Private Giving Under the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act

Kirsten N. Brown

With a consistent decline in state funding to public higher education, institutions have become more reliant on private funding to institutional support. The shift in government policy through the introduction of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (TCJA) (2017) created financial uncertainty within athletic departments and university foundations. The TCJA eliminated the 80 percent tax deduction on season ticket donations and increased the standard deduction. With these policy changes, athletic development officers speculated a decline in donations in 2018 and beyond. Using quantitative methodology and a longitudinal approach, this study examined athletic donations from January 1, 2013 to July 31, 2019 using multiple regression analyses to better understand the impacts of the TCJA on athletic giving patterns. The study concluded an overall reduction in the number of season ticket donors post-TCJA, an overall reduction in the number of split donors post-TCJA, and an overall reduction in the total number of donations post-TCJA. This study provides recommendations to athletic departments, development officers, university foundations, and donors to inform higher education fundraising activity under the current government policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables.....	iv
List of Figures.....	v
Acknowledgments.....	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	16
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	55
Chapter 4: Results.....	66
Chapter 5: Discussion.....	90
Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	112
References.....	116

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: MADOM Variables Paired With Donor Descriptive Variables.....	57
Table 2: Summary of Descriptive Statistics.....	65
Table 3: Regression of the Number of Season Ticket Corporate Donors, 2013 – 2018.....	74
Table 4: Regression of the Number of Season Ticket Donors Yearly, 2013-2019.....	75
Table 5: Regression of the Total Amount of Gifts Yearly, 2013-2019.....	77
Table 6: Regression of the Total Number of Gifts Yearly, 2013-2019	78
Table 7: Regression of the Average Gift Size Yearly, 2013-2019	79
Table 8: Regression of the Number of Split Donors Yearly, 2013-2019	81
Table 9: Regression of the Number Season Ticket Donors by Past Giving, 2013-2019	85
Table 10: Regression of the Total Amount of Gifts by Past Giving, 2013-2019	86
Table 11: Regression of the Number of Gifts by Past Giving, 2013-2019.....	87
Table 12: Regression of the Average Gift Size by Past Giving, 2013-2019.....	88
Table 13: Regression of the Number of Split Donors by Past Giving, 2013-2019.....	89

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: A Model of Donor Athletic Motivation.....	11
Figure 2: Number of Season Ticket Donors, 2013-2019.....	75
Figure 3: Total Amount of Gifts, 2013-2019.....	76
Figure 4: Number of Donations, 2013-2019.....	78
Figure 5: Number of Split Donors, 2013-2019.....	80

Acknowledgments

This study would not be possible without the leadership of Dr. Rodney Hughes. Thank you for your time, patience, and mentorship throughout the dissertation process. To my committee members, Dr. Nathan Sorber, Dr. Erin McHenry-Sorber, and Dr. Phil Blackman, for their critical questions and suggestions which have helped shape this study.

I am deeply indebted to my parents, Jeff and Laura, for their encouragement and support throughout my academic career. Dad, I appreciate your sense of humor and encouraging texts through tough and challenging times. Mom, as a fundraising guru yourself, thank you for providing invaluable knowledge and insight to this study.

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my husband, Dr. Scott Barnicle, for his guidance, patience, and support throughout this process. You have been my greatest support-system and biggest cheerleader. Most of all, thank you for believing in me even when I didn't believe in myself. I also want to thank, Cindy and Jack Barnicle, for your overwhelming support.

Thank you to Dr. Paula Jo Meyer-Stout, who has been a wonderful friend, mentor and role model for over nine years. Your guidance through personal and professional challenges has molded me into the person I am today. Thank you for always supporting me and believing in me.

I would like to thank Chuck Kerzak, Senior Associate Vice President of the WVU Foundation, and Ben Murray, Senior Associate Athletic Director/ Executive Director of the Mountaineer Athletic Club, for their approval and support of this study. To Drew Parrish, BI Analyst of the WVU Foundation, for your patience and assistance in the retrieving donor data.

Chapter 1: Introduction

The federal and state government continue to modify policies creating financial challenges to public institutions who were once reliant on state revenue for institutional funding. Of twenty-six states, 20 percent of funding per student was cut from 2007 to 2016 (Mitchell, Leachman, & Masterson, 2016). These funding cuts make it difficult for institutions to afford yearly operational costs, facility maintenance, and academic support (Mitchell et al., 2016). Along with funding cuts, student tuition had significantly increased placing a financial burden on college students and families (Mitchell et al., 2016). From 2015 to 2016, the average tuition increased \$245 or 2.8 percent per student (Mitchell et al., 2016). This gradual shift in state funding and federal policy change, forced public universities to take a closer look at their expenses and spending habits in search for supplemental funding (Speck, 2010). A large majority of supplemental funding originates from tuition, student fees, grants, and charitable donations (Speck, 2010). Public institutions have relied heavily on state funding, but the decrease in state appropriations has led to an increase in tuition revenue causing a rise in student debt. With the rise in student debt, it is uncertain how much more institutions can increase their tuition. Instead, universities are seeking alternative revenue and support from private donations and grants.

Due to these changes, universities have turned towards fundraising offices and foundations for additional support. With over 4,000 institutions competing for resources, universities fundraise to compensate for institutional expenses and a lack of state funding (Caulkins, Cole, & Hardoby, 2002). In fact, American universities solicited over \$43 billion from private support in 2017 (Seltzer, 2018a). Among the institutions with the highest amount fundraised, the University of Washington raised over \$567 million in 2017 for their public institution (Seltzer, 2018a). In general, 26 percent of private giving is donated by alumni, 18 percent by non-alumni, 30 percent by foundations, 15 percent by corporations, and 10 percent by

other external entities (Seltzer, 2018a). Not only has charitable giving assisted in financing operational costs, private support has also enhanced the college experience by providing funds for new dormitories, facility upgrades, and scholarships (Speck, 2010).

Past research concerning state appropriations and giving has suggested that donors are more likely to donate altruistically when they are more knowledgeable about the relationship between higher education and state funding because they can better understand the financial need of the institution (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008). From 1994 to 2004, higher education witnessed an increase in private giving by 30 percent while state appropriations fell nearly 15 percent per student (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008). From 2011 to 2018, private giving to higher education increased six out of eight years (Voluntary Support of Education, 2018). From 2009 to 2018 private support increased 67.8 percent, where in 2018, private giving exceeded \$46.73 billion (Voluntary Support of Education, 2018).

The Benefits of College Athletics

Athletic departments provide many benefits from supporting private giving, increasing alumni involvement, and helping to produce split donors. Goff (2000) stated that athletic program success provides direct financial benefits by increasing alumni giving and external giving (as cited in Humphreys & Mondello, 2007). Meer and Rosen (2018) discovered a positive correlation between athletic team success and alumni giving. When an athletic team wins a conference championship, there is a higher likelihood that the alumni, who attended school during this time period, would donate to back to their institution and athletic program (Meer and Rosen, 2018). The institution's visibility and positive image can build a stronger connection between the alumni and the school, which may increase their probability to donate (Cheslock & Knight, 2015).

Stinson and Howard (2010) discovered an initial athletic contribution motivates people to cross-cultivate, where they eventually consider making a donation to an academic program at the same institution. Many athletic-only giving donors eventually donate to academic programs becoming split donors, which increases donations to the university as well as their bond and connectedness to the institution (Stinson & Howard, 2010). One third of alumni donors are categorized as split donors, and these individuals are willing to donate larger quantities to the university (Stinson & Howard, 2010). Additionally, when examining consecutive years of giving, split donors often give equal or additional years compared to athletic-only or academic-only donors (Stinson & Howard, 2010).

Athletic success and visibility can also increase interest in student enrollment which can increase revenue through tuition dollars. For example, a movement called the “Flutie effect” emerged at Boston College in 1984 when the quarterback, Doug Flutie, threw the winning touchdown against the University of Miami (Chung, 2013, p. 3). This incredible win on national television, boosted visibility and interest to the University of Miami, thus increasing the number of applicants by 45 percent from 1983 to 1986 (Chung, 2013). Not only did the sheer number of applicants increase, but athletic success is also known to attract high-quality applicants (Chung, 2013).

While each university is unique, colleges and universities count on athletic programs to assist in boosting revenue through student enrollment, media outlets, national visibility, and most importantly, private donations. It is apparent that private donations assist in the financial success of present-day institutions, however ever-shifting government policies might play a role in a donor’s motivations and interests. Changes in the number of private donations could result from an economic recession or policy change. According to Voluntary Support of Education (2018),

increases in the stock market or Gross Domestic Product (GDP), increases charitable giving. The same relationship occurs when these economic factors decrease (Voluntary Support of Education, 2018). These statements lead into the next section which focuses on giving patterns under shifting government policy.

Fundraising Under Shifting Government Policy

Until the current Senate Bill 2254 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (TCJA), effective January 1, 2018, Americans had not witnessed an immense change in the U.S. tax policy since Ronald Reagan's Tax Reform Act of 1986 (Enzi, Tester, Grassley, Shaheen, Fischer, Van Hollen, & McConnell, 2018). Across Democratic and Republican lines, the TCJA has created skeptics and believers. The modifications of the TCJA are as follows: lower (most) individual tax rates, lower business income tax rates to 21 percent, increase the standard deduction¹ for single and joint tax filers, and increase exemption on alternative minimum tax (Tax Foundation, 2017). While the direct effects of this tax reform are still unknown, there has been some speculation on how this law could change fundraising to intercollegiate athletics.

Regarding America's economy, Honorable Mike Enzi, the United States Senator, suspects the bill will "jump-start economic growth" by growing small businesses, helping local businesses succeed in the international marketplace, and providing opportunity for citizens to save, keep, and invest their money (Enzi et al., 2018, p. 10). The Tax Foundation (2017) estimates that the TCJA will boost the economy by producing \$600 billion in permanent revenue, and the reform will provide 1.5 percent higher income and establish an additional 339,000 full-time employment opportunities in the United States. The American Council on Education (ACE) indicated that the TCJA is a double-edged sword for higher education institutions (Wyman-Blackburn, 2018). As an advantage, the TCJA recognizes and assists the

financial challenges faced by many low-class and middle-class families (Wyman-Blackburn, 2018). However, the reform could make colleges financially weak due to a potential decrease in giving which will escalate the cost of tuition making higher education less accessible to families (Wyman-Blackburn, 2018). With limited research on the economic trajectory of the TCJA, the effects of the reform on universities and athletic departments are still unknown.

According to the Council on Foundations, with the introduction of the new tax reform, there will be a deficit of \$16 billion to \$24 billion annually throughout America's fundraising market (Cross, 2018). Specifically affecting donors, the TCJA will increase the standard deduction, eliminate deductions for state and local taxes, and put a limit on mortgage interest² deductions (Seltzer, 2018a). Under the new policy, charitable donations will continue to count as a qualifying expense, however fewer taxpayers will have the incentive to itemize their deduction. These individuals will discover that the new standard deduction exceeds the total amount that they can itemize (or their itemized deduction³). Due to this increase in the standard deduction, two scenarios could occur. First, some donors who are already giving above the old standard deduction and the new standard deduction, might choose to continue to donate to higher education and itemize their taxes to earn benefits. Secondly, among other donors whose qualifying expenses might be in-between the old standard deduction and the new standard deduction, these donors might choose to donate less or not at all. By claiming the standard deduction instead of itemizing, these donors would no longer find that a donation to higher education would reduce the taxable income⁴. This change in tax law could cause a disinterest in giving and an overall decrease in donations from a certain group of donors depending on their philanthropic motivations.

The Tax Policy Center has speculated that the number of American households claiming an itemized deduction on philanthropic donations will plummet from roughly 37 million in 2017 to 16 million in 2018 (Cross, 2018). In fact, the Tax Policy Center (2016) predicted that roughly 30 percent of individuals itemized their taxes in 2017, and in 2018 after the tax policy change, roughly 10 percent itemized their taxes. With these changes, the TCJA may generate negative consequences to the funding sources of many intercollegiate athletic programs by preventing donor tax benefits through deductions on their charitable donations.

Prior to the reform, charitable gifts to athletic season tickets were tax deductible giving donors a larger incentive to give. Athletic donors will no longer have the option to deduct 80 percent of the total contribution in order to receive preferential order to purchase season tickets, potentially diminishing their interest in giving all together (Seltzer, 2018a). However, tax services believe that donors will be paying 30 to 40 percent more for their season tickets (Gutierrez, 2018). Unfortunately, fewer individuals will have an incentive to itemize their deduction, and instead, will have to claim the standard deduction which could deter donors from giving or making a larger donation (Gutierrez, 2018). Due to the change in tax law, donors might lose interest in giving an annual season ticket donation which could lead to a loss of vital support to athletic departments and universities.

While individual donations are likely to decrease due to the increase in standard deduction, corporate donations should remain unaffected. Individual donors have the option to itemize their deduction or to take the standard deduction while corporate donors do not have the choice to itemize their deduction or not to itemize. Corporate donations will not be affected by the increase in standard deduction. However, prior to the TCJA, both corporations and individuals benefited from the 80/20 rule where 80 percent of the season ticket donation was tax

deductible. With the elimination of this rule, both corporations and individuals will be affected which could cause changes in giving patterns.

Most institutions are anticipating changes to athletic donations as a consequence of the new reform. Seltzer (2018a) explained that these changes in giving will continue to occur throughout 2018 and beyond. To help soften the negative effects of the TCJA, Syracuse University advised donors to pay their season ticket donation by December 2017, so they were still eligible to receive an 80 percent tax deductible (Gutierrez, 2018). Shane Lyons, the Director of Athletics at West Virginia University, explained that their athletic fundraising arm contributes about \$2 million a year in athletic scholarships for student-athletes, but under the reform, the Athletic Department is estimating a \$1.3 million loss (Jenkins, 2017). If these negative consequences are proven true, college athletic departments could find themselves fighting to sustain their athletic programs.

The TCJA should allow lower-income and middle-income families to save extra money by providing the resources necessary to invest wisely in fundraising enterprises such as higher education or athletic programs (Wyman-Blackburn, 2018). With more money in their pocket, donations could increase, however the additional money could also steer individuals away from athletics towards external charities or healthcare industries. Otherwise, if their primary reason for giving is altruistic, tax-related incentives might have a minimal effect on their giving habits. At this moment we can only predict and estimate the impact that the TCJA will have on college athletics but overtime we will better understand the direct effect of the TCJA on athletic giving patterns.

The topic of giving patterns under the new reform impacts many stakeholders such as athletic donors, development offices, and higher education administrators. Athletic development

is directly influenced by this shift in government policy, and development officers are eager to understand how this policy will influence donor giving patterns. Discovering more about donor motivations can help university development officers understand how the tax law impacts athletic giving and funding. Significant changes in fundraising tactics and giving patterns could have a drastic impact on the university, forcing administrators to find alternative funding sources. While this topic is relevant, current, and controversial, little is known about the impact of the TCJA on donor giving patterns and attitudes towards giving charitable donations in 2018 and beyond.

Theoretical Framework

Prince and File (1994) developed seven donor categories based on giving motivations (Stinson & Howard, 2010). These seven groups include: communitarians, who give to their community; devouts, or individuals giving out of religious obligation; altruists, who give to benefit from a selfless and noble act; dynasts, who give because their family members have given in the past; socialites, who donate for access and benefits; and investors, who give for economic and tax-related benefits (Prince & File, 1994 in Stinson & Howard, 2010).

Specifically, regarding college athletics, Ko, Rhee, Walker, and Lee (2014), developed the Model of Athletic Donor Motivation (MADOM) to discover reasons behind athletic donor motivations. The MADOM will guide this study on TCJA implications on intercollegiate athletic giving because it is the most accurate and current model to explain donor motives behind giving to college athletic programs. While this research is guided by the MADOM, the exchange theory plays a small role in explaining athletic donor motives. The following paragraphs extensively explain the MADOM and the incentives behind athletic-giving.

Model of Athletic Donor Motivation (MADOM). The MADOM, established by Ko et al. (2014) includes eight factors which explained athletic-donor motivations and giving patterns. There is limited research on athletic donor motivations, and the MADOM is the first formal model which includes key motivations of athletic donors (Ko et al., 2014). By investigating previous literature, Ko et al. (2014) delivered the following athletic donor motivations (see Figure 1): philanthropic and altruistic approaches; vicarious achievement; commitment or connectedness with the athletic program; affiliation or continuing relationships with coaches, former teammates, and current players; socialization with peers and donors; public recognition or a self-esteem boost; tangible benefits such as football and basketball season tickets; and power (Ko et al., 2014).

Ko et al.'s (2014) research was guided by Alderfer's (1969) Existence, Relatedness, and Growth (ERG) Theory, which defined individuals' basic needs to coexist (Ko et al., 2014). The MADOM incentives of "philanthropy," "vicarious achievement," and "commitment" are categorized under "growth needs" of the ERG Theory which explains the donor's altruistic and humane need to give back to their community and help create a positive outcome with the generous donation (Alderfer, 1969 in Ko et al., 2014). "Relatedness needs" includes the MADOM incentives of "affiliation" and "social interaction," where these motivations are generated through relationship building (Ko et al., 2014). Team affiliation and interaction is essential in college sports and can encourage giving to the program (Ko et al., 2014). "Existence needs" includes incentives of "power," "public recognition," and "tangible benefits" (Ko et al., 2014). "Existence needs" provide more information on the tangible profits and physiological features of charitable donations (Ko et al., 2014). Regarding tangible benefits, such as season

tickets and tax benefits, the economic philosophies of exchange theory and cost-benefit analysis is highly present to deliver the meaning behind giving to receive (Ko et al., 2014).

After the development of MADOM, Ko et al. (2014) development the Scale of Athletic Donor Motivation (SADOM) through a three-step process to be used when further researching athletic donor motivations (Ko et al., 2014). SADOM was created by surveying an NCAA Division I-A institution using a survey and a 7-point Likert scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) (Ko et al., 2014). As the first tool of its kind, SADOM provides a systematic understanding of this understudied topic, and was proven an effective measuring tool of athletic donor motivations which will assist in retaining and recruiting additional athletic donors (Ko et al., 2014). Furthermore, Ko et al.'s (2014) research on MADOM will provide a framework to better understand and predict additional information about athletic donor motivations and the implications of the TCJA.

Figure 1. A model of donor athletic motivations (Ko et al., 2014).

MADOM & TCJA. According to Clotfelter and Salamon (1982), changes in law and policy, new government administration, and social environment are correlated with income, tax rates, and giving. Due to the TCJA, reducing the room for some donors to receive tax benefits, it is conceivable that donors may be inclined to donate less or not at all. Keeping in mind MADOM, this philanthropic decision will vary among donors and the decision to donate will dependent on various factors whether tangible or intangible, philanthropic, altruistic, commitment, socialization, public recognition, or power (Ko et al., 2014). On the other hand, when differentiating between tangible and intangible factors, Venable, Rose, Bush, and Gilbert (2005) confirmed that social incentives from intangible benefits are higher valued in comparison to financial, economic, or tax-related benefits (Stinson & Howard, 2010). It is likely that without tax benefits, donors might continue to give altruistically to gain self-happiness and a sense of connectedness to their former team or university. If a donor is unable to claim a tax deduction on their charitable donation, they could still be motivated to donate to purchase season tickets and other tangible benefits. This dilemma will be revealed after researching further on athletic donor giving patterns and the impact of the TCJA.

Purpose Statement and Research Questions

The purpose of this longitudinal quantitative study is to identify the ramifications of the TCJA on athletic giving patterns, a vital contributor of student financial support and institutional funding, by researching one Division I public higher education institution. Specifically, this study investigated one overarching question and four sub-questions.

- 1) To what extent is the TCJA associated with athletic donor giving patterns at a selected Division I, power five, public institution?
- 2) To what extent is the TCJA associated with change in monetary size of charitable donations to intercollegiate athletics?

- 3) To what extent is the TCJA associated with a change in total quantity of charitable donations to intercollegiate athletics?
- 4) To what extent is the TCJA associated with the charitable gift patterns of split donors who give to athletic gifts and academic gifts?
- 5) To what extent is the TCJA associated with the donor's financial wealth to impact donations towards intercollegiate athletics?

There were a few limitations to note in this study. Firstly, only a single Division I institution was researched instead of examining multiple institutions. Each institution is unique, and the results from this study are not directly applicable to other institutions, such as Division II, Division III, private university, or community colleges. However, the study's results will be most relevant to peer institutions. Secondly, while the study examined from January 1, 2013 to July 31, 2019, where the TCJA was enacted on January 1, 2018, the study only captured one and-a-half years of giving under the TCJA. Thirdly, the Raiser's Edge database, used to store donor information, could hold mistakes due to human error, inaccurate data, and lack of obtaining all necessary information.

Lastly, the Model of Athletic Donor Motivation (MADOM) (Ko et. al, 2014) is used to guide this research and better understand athletic donor motives. This study examines qualitative motives through a quantitative lens. Through a quantitative approach it is difficult to truly estimate what motivates an individual to donate without directly interviewing them, however this approach provides unique insight on monetary values, tax incentives, tangible benefits, intangible benefits, and demographics. Comparing the quantitative results to MADOM variables provides a qualitative perspective to this study. Not only will the study provide yearly monetary values and a trajectory of giving post-TCJA, but this framework also provides an understanding of donor motivations and "why" these donors choose to donate.

The remaining sections outline the literature review, methods, results, discussion and conclusion. Firstly, the literature review examines higher education finance to understand more about university expenses, revenue, and other funding sources such as fundraising and private donations. Past literature on higher education giving is analyzed to discover more about alumni, young alumni and students, faculty and staff, gender differences, leadership roles, social media, and geographic locations. Secondly, the literature review looks at studies related to giving and intercollegiate athletics among the topics of gender differences, athletic programs success, and split donors. Next, the literature review discusses the impact of government policy change on general giving patterns and examines the previous tax policy under President Reagan and the current tax policy under President Trump. The final section of the literature review further analyzes this study's theoretical framework, and donor motivations and incentives.

The methods section will follow the literature review, highlighting the quantitative approach of researching athletic giving patterns of an anonymous Division I public institution. This section will also describe how the theoretical framework under the MADOM (Ko et al., 2014) guides the variables used in this study. The methods sections will include data sampling and analysis techniques, types of data, and validity. The results and discussion sections will describe the findings and broader themes of the research study. Finally, the conclusion will connect the findings to practical implications in the intercollegiate athletic fundraising sector.

Definition of Terms

The following section includes a list of major terms used throughout the study. This section provides definitions which gives the reader a better understanding of the terms used within this document.

¹ Standard Deduction: A taxable write-off that diminishes taxable income where the taxable write-off fluctuates depending on the individual's filing status (Intuit TurboTax, 2019).

² Mortgage Interest: A deductible interest on debt that meet the requirements as a home equity debt (Intuit TurboTax, 2019).

³ Itemized Deduction: Taxable write-offs that individuals subtract from gross income (Intuit TurboTax, 2019).

⁴ Taxable Income: An individual's income after eliminating adjustments, exemptions, and deductions (Intuit TurboTax, 2019).

⁵ Taxation of Estates: The exemption amount for estates is \$10,180,000 and a 40% maximum estate tax in 2018 (Intuit TurboTax, 2019).

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The purpose of the literature review is to better understand previous research on America's tax policies and intercollegiate athletic giving motivations to determine the potential relationship between the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (TCJA) and future athletic giving patterns. Prior topics have been researched regarding university fundraising to discover giving patterns of alumni, young alumni, and faculty and staff donations. Unfortunately, there is less research specifically pointing to intercollegiate athletic giving patterns, and no research on the new TCJA on athletic donation patterns. It is not surprising that there is a lack of research on the TCJA, however previous findings, although limited, on former tax policy can help forecast philosophies. This research will fill the gap in the literature to predict the TCJA's effect on athletic giving which could assist in solicitation contingency plan for development offices leading to an increase in funding and revenue to the university.

The following sections outline previous research on higher education finance, intercollegiate athletics, giving under changing government policies, and a theoretical framework. The section on higher education finance describes a broad picture of expenses, revenue, and fundraising initiatives in higher education. The second section, on intercollegiate athletic fundraising, dives deeper to better understand how gender, athletic success, and split donors play a role in giving. The third section on changing government policies discusses the history of policy change from the Reaganomic to Trumponomic Eras to better comprehend the influence of the TCJA on the U.S. economy and the emerging literature of the TCJA on giving. The fourth section on theoretical framework, examines even more specific literature on donor motivations and incentives which will be used to help shape the findings of this study.

Higher Education Finance

This section examines the relationship between higher education expenses, revenue, and funding sources to showcase the importance of university fundraising initiatives. Previous research in higher education fundraising has focused on giving among alumni, young alumni, faculty and staff, leadership, social media, and geographic location.

Higher Education Expenses, Revenue, & Funding Sources. In 2013, the average spending for a public university per full-time equivalent (FTE) student was \$10,783 on instruction, \$6,213 on research, \$1,590 on student services, \$2,062 on public service, \$3,150 on academic support, \$2,695 on institutional support, and 1,932 on operation and maintenance (Desrochers & Hurlburt, 2016). Over a ten-year span, from 2003 to 2013, each of these spending areas increased between 2.0% to 25.5%, except for operation and maintenance (Desrochers & Hurlburt, 2016). Higher education expenses are consistently on the rise and need to discover alternative sources of revenue to stay competitive among their peer institutions.

Since the Great Recession of 2008, public institutions continue to rely on tuition to help defer costs from higher education spending habits and other expenses (Seltzer, 2018b). The cost of tuition continues to rise from 35.8 percent to 46.4 percent from 2008-2017 (Seltzer, 2018b). By 2017, the average undergraduate paid \$19,488 for their education at a four-year public institution (National Science Board, 2018). According to State Higher Education Executive Officers, state appropriations are slowly on the rise but regarding 28 states, 50 percent of total revenue was generated by student tuition (Seltzer, 2018b). Tuition and state appropriations are linked, as state appropriations decrease, tuition and student fees increase (Speck, 2010).

Cheslock and Gianneschi (2008) studied the relationship between higher education giving and state appropriations. Cheslock and Gianneschi (2008) researched public 4-year institutions which had undergraduate degrees and a 2000 Carnegie Classification, then accessed private

donation data throughout the years of 1994-2004 using the Voluntary Support to Education (VSE) survey which was provided by the Council for Advancement of Education (CAE). Information on student enrollment, state appropriations and Carnegie institution classification were discovered through the National Center for Education Statistics Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and employment rates were discovered through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and state personal income was provided through the Bureau of Economic Analysis (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008). Cheslock and Gianneschi (2008) along with Okten and Weisbrod (2000) and Payne (2001), contradicted past research by Steignberg (1993) who confirmed that increased government funding crowds-out charitable gifts, and instead suggested that increased government appropriations lead to increased private donations to the institution. This positive relationship suggests that when institutions receive more state appropriations and funding, private donations increase (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008). However, Cheslock and Gianneschi (2008) confirmed that as state appropriations decrease, private donations could still increase due to aggressive fundraising efforts or the donor's perception of need (Cheslock & Gianneschi, 2008). In Steignberg's (1993) examination of previous research related to crowding-out, he concluded that for every rise in government expenditures corresponded with a reduction in donations.

Fundraising in Higher Education. General giving patterns in higher education are more widely studied to include the following areas: differences between alumni and non-alumni giving; faculty and staff giving; young alumni and student giving; leadership influences on contributions; and the role of geographic residency on donation size. These areas are studied to further uncover the underlying reasons people donate to higher education institutions. Previous research gives administrators fundraising insight on the "who," "what," and "why" to

adapt and alter development strategies leading to increased donations. Previous research on higher education fundraising is beneficial to the current research by providing background information on higher education donors, which could answer more questions relating to athletic donor's approaches towards the current TCJA.

Alumni giving patterns. According to Sturtevant (2002), under the 90/10 rule of fundraising, 10 percent of donors give 90 percent of the total donations (as cited in Weerts & Ronca, 2009). There is much more to learn regarding who gives and how much to higher education institutions, and Meer and Rosen (2018) realized that there is a close relationship between the university, alumni, and development offices in comparison to other businesses and nonprofit groups. The relationship between the alumni and the institution is cultivated while the student is in school then continues throughout their life (Meer & Rosen, 2018). Students develop throughout their college career on an academic and social capacity, creating a strong bond between the student and the university. Examining this bond between alumni donors and institutions can provide a deeper understanding of the true reasons behind donor motivations.

Weerts and Ronca (2009) researched alumni and non-alumni giving patterns by investigating differences in characteristics between the two groups, then explored their giving level in conjunction with these characteristics. This research used similar analytic framework to the Classification and Regression Trees (CART) (Breiman, Friedman, Olshen, & Stone, 1984) to gather information on alumni giving behaviors (as cited in Weerts & Ronca, 2009). A total sample of 1,441 individuals were gathered from an Alumni Connections Survey retrieved from the Wisconsin Center for the Advancement of Postsecondary Education (WISCAPE) and included living alumni (ages 30-70) who attended the University of Wisconsin-Madison (UW) (Weerts & Ronca, 2009). The CART survey inquired information on the following topics about

the donor or alumni: their awareness of university need; their connectedness and relationship to the university; their family income; their highest degree earned; their prior relationships and interactions with faculty-staff members; their student experience; their the level of student volunteer involvement or recreational sport programs; their overall experience; and their career opportunities (Weerts & Ronca, 2009). As the participants were answering questions on the survey, for each answer given, the participant would move down to the next question which helped predict the potential giving amount of each alumni (Weerts & Ronca, 2009). The structure of this questionnaire is mimicking a tree shape, hence the name Classification and Regression Trees (CART) (Weerts & Ronca, 2009).

Weerts and Ronca's (2009) results suggested that alumni giving depends on attitudes, income, relationships, connectedness, and number of degrees from competing institutions, but the most influential characteristic is whether the individual believes that the institution has a financial need for the donation (Weerts & Ronca, 2009). For example, individuals whose attitudes indicated that they did not see a financial need at their institution, were unlikely to donate; but on the other hand, individuals who saw this need were more apt to connect with the university through athletic news (Weerts & Ronca, 2009). When examining donors who saw the need, CART observed income and found that individuals with a combined household income under \$90,000 were unlikely to donate or they would donate a smaller gift amount (Weerts & Ronca, 2009). Individuals with a household income over \$90,000 who earned an advanced degree from the university and had positive attitudes towards the university and the city were likely to donate \$500-\$1,000 (Weerts & Ronca, 2009).

Alumni who only had a somewhat positive attitude towards the university would donate \$50, while alumni with a more positive attitude towards their institution would donate \$500

(Weerts & Ronca, 2009). Lastly, alumni who donated \$101-\$250 had positive attitude and a strong connection to the university due to their previous participation in intermural sports and extra-circular activities (Weerts & Ronca, 2009). This research differentiated the unique factors between alumni and non-alumni giving by considering the donor's lifestyle including their past and present choices and actions. This data is beneficial to development officers when searching for potential prospects and interested alumni. Regarding collegiate athletics, this research established the important role sporting programs play in attracting and connecting alumni back to their institution.

Meer and Rosen (2012) studied alumni at an anonymous research institution to better understand how donation patterns are impacted by undergraduate financial aid packages, scholarships, loans, and on campus jobs. The dataset included 14,382 alumni who graduated between 1995-2005, where 61.3 percent of individuals donate to the institution (Meer and Rosen, 2012). Meer and Rosen (2012) discovered that individuals who received a scholarship donated a smaller gift amount, and their earning of a scholarship had little impact on whether they chose to donate. On the other hand, alumni with student loans are described experiencing the “annoyance effect” where they do not feel the need to donate to their institution due to the accumulation of student loan debt, and therefore are less likely to donate back to the college (Meer & Rosen, 2012, p. 2). This research assisted in discovering the financial factors relating to loan and scholarship packages which play a role in an alumni's attitude towards donating back to their institution. This research can help us understand how financial challenges can play a role in giving patterns.

To further expand on alumni giving, Meer and Rosen (2018) studied alumni at an anonymous university and under covered donor motives, whether philanthropic or egocentric.

Cases of philanthropic and egocentric giving are presented in many forms. An example of egocentric or self-serving giving behavior can be described through the child-cycle of alumni giving which illustrates that parents will donate more to their alumni institution years prior to their child applying to the university with the expectation that the child has a higher chance of acceptance (Meer & Rosen, 2018). The child-cycle of alumni giving demonstrates a mutually beneficial relationship between the alumni donor and the university. Meer and Rosen's (2018) results suggested that alumni with children 14 years of age and applying to the university, will give more than in previous years with the expectation that their donation will increase their child's likelihood to be accepted into the university. Alumni with children 18 years of age, who applied to the institution and were rejected, indicated a dramatic decline in giving to the institution (Meer & Rosen, 2018). Furthermore, by the time the child has graduated college, around 21 to 25 years of age, the probability of giving from the alumni parent drops back down to the average (Meer & Rosen, 2018). The outcomes between accepted and unaccepted students demonstrated a "give" and "take" relationship between alumni and the institution.

Stephenson and Bell (2014) identified the reasons behind donor motivations and their connectedness to the institution by exploring theories on social identity and self-congruity to identify donors and non-donors. A state institution in the Mid-Atlantic Region, studied approximately 15,000 students through a quantitative approach (Stephenson & Bell, 2014). Surveys were emailed to 45,015 alumni and a total of 2,763 surveys were utilized in the study (Stephenson & Bell, 2014). Of the 2,763 participants, 68 percent of donors chose to donate because of their alumni status and 43 percent of donors chose not to donate because did not have the financial capacity to partake in charitable spending habits (Stephenson & Bell, 2014). The survey gave donors the option to choose their motivations for donating due to tax purposes,

however, no further information was indicated on this choice thus concluded that tax purposes was not a pressing reason as to why individuals choose to give (Stephenson & Bell, 2014). Instead, donors chose to give for the philanthropic purposes, such as donating to increase student success (Stephenson & Bell, 2014).

Lara and Johnson (2014) expanded the model of philanthropic giving which discovered new donors, whether annual giving donors or planned giving donors, followed by a proposed “ask” amount. The “ask” amount was gathered from the donor’s background, financial information, and giving patterns (Lara & Johnson, 2014). Lara and Johnson (2014) utilized a descriptive academic model and an economy theory to uncover their findings. From the years of 2004-2007, a total of 27,632 Colorado College alumni were identified by the university foundation for this study (Lara & Johnson, 2014). Numerous variables were collected to include age, gender, graduation date, major, student group associations, and enrollment in collegiate sports programs (Lara & Johnson, 2014). Lara and Johnson (2014) found that education and increased giving are positively correlated. In addition, single alumni are 9 percent less likely to give compared to their married peers (Lara & Johnson, 2014). Additionally, alumni whose family members were also alums are 1 percent more likely to give per family member (Lara & Johnson, 2014).

Regarding former student-athletes, these donors give smaller amounts and less often compared to average donors (Lara & Johnson, 2014). This may relate closely to the finding that students who received financial awards are 5 percent less likely to donate compared to the average student. Lara and Johnson’s (2014) conclusion differed from Meer and Rosen (2018) who found that alumni who received financial aid through scholarship, have a higher chance of donation post-college and beyond; furthermore, the larger the scholarship, the larger the

donation. Alumni who did not receive scholarship and instead had student loan debt felt a sense of resentment towards the university which may deter them from giving back to their alma mater. This discovery corresponds with the “annoyance effect” discovered by Meer and Rosen (2012, p. 2). Discovering more about young alumni can help development offices determine the motives behind soliciting donations.

While there are distinctions between alumni and non-alumni donors, research has noted differences among alumni donors depending on institution type. A study conducted by Skari (2014) confirmed that four-year institutions are successfully utilizing their alumni groups for donations, however, community colleges have yet to understand how these donors might play a role in their fundraising efforts. Information on demographics, wealth status, age, and interest in donating were examined using an alumni predictive scale, guided by the social exchange theory (Skari, 2014). For the purposes of Skari’s (2014) research, the social exchange theory is used to describe the relationship and social interactions between the donors and the institution. Through the lens of social exchange, development officers use strategies to connect, engage, and cultivate donors to create positive relationships and build optimistic feelings towards their alma mater (Piliavin & Charng, 1990 in Skari, 2014). These feelings provoke the alumni to donate back to their former institution (Piliavin & Charng, 1990 in Skari, 2014).

When referencing the social exchange theory, Skari (2014) suggested that alumni students are more likely to donate because they have a stronger connection and relationship to the university compared to an individual who did not attend the community college (Skari, 2014). The sample included a state-wide population of 7,330 community college alumni and each were given a survey to determine their interest in giving (Skari, 2014). Skari (2014) found that community college alumni whom furthered their education and donated to their four-year

institution, were four times more likely to donate to their primary two-year institution (Skari, 2014). While this research focused on boosting giving to community colleges, some findings can be compared to public four-year institutions.

Young alumni & student giving. Student and young alumni giving patterns can indicate motivations and behaviors behind charitable contributions. While college students may not be able to donate in large quantities and donations are often few and far between, it's important to cultivate young alumni for continued and growing university support. Olberding (2012) studied student philanthropy and the long-term effects on giving to determine student awareness, engagement and involvement. This study used data retrieved from Northern Kentucky University and the Mayerson Student Philanthropy Project from 2000-2009, which educated students through various projects about the importance of philanthropy (Olberding, 2012). A sample of 430 individuals were contacted via email with an online survey where 127 responded by answering questions on their awareness, beliefs, learning, and intentions of philanthropy at their institution (Olberding, 2012). Olberding (2012) confirmed that student philanthropy had a positive impact on 95.2 percent of alumni's perceptions and awareness of nonprofit organizations. Furthermore, 89.6 percent of alumni, agreed that their experience with student philanthropy increased their understanding of needs within the community (Olberding, 2012).

Despite much research in the field of young alumni giving, Freeland, Spenner, and McCalmon (2015) examined two cohorts from 2001 to 2002, including 1,062 eligible participants to determine the likelihood of giving post-graduation which indicated that sociodemographic, financial support, and college encounters played a role in student giving. Information on donation amount was gathered by the development office (Freeland et al., 2015). Freeland et al. (2015) concluded that incentives through scholarship monies and parental reliance

during college, increased the chance a student gave. Furthermore, it is extremely likely that students who gave during their senior gift campaign would continue their giving post-graduation and beyond (Freeland et al, 2015).

Regarding student and alumni giving, Meer and Rosen (2018) researched the impact of peer pressure on giving. At an anonymous university, freshman students were studied where a subset of students were solicitors for the university and others were labeled as non-solicitors (Meer & Rosen, 2018). When soliciting peers asked their roommate to donate to their university, the roommate felt a sense of pressure and obligation to donate; whereas students who had non-soliciting roommates did not feel the pressure to donate (Meer & Rosen, 2018). Students with solicitor roommates increased overall giving by 10 percent (Meer & Rosen, 2018). While young alumni may elect to donate soon after graduating when they feel a stronger connection to the university built on memories and experiences, development officers must transmit this excitement and passion to foster donations for decades further (Meer & Rosen, 2018). To keep young alumni engaged and knowledgeable about their university's financial need, students should be exposed to the "habit-formation effect," or the continuous pattern of giving post-graduation (Meer & Rosen, 2018, p. 1).

Faculty & staff giving. Building on alumni giving at public institutions, Borden, Shaker, and Kienker (2014) examined giving for faculty and staff, alumni and non-alumni. While there is evidence from past studies indicating that academic employees of alumni status are more likely to give compared to non-alumni, the gap in the literature provided further analysis of donation amount (Borden, et al., 2014). Staurowsky (1996) confirmed that when surveying donors to determine differences in demographics and motivations, 66 percent of the donors identified as alumni of the university. Borden et al. (2014) studied 17,038 staff and faculty members sampled

from the years of 2009-2011 where age, gender, ethnicity, and salary were recorded, then investigated using a binary logit model, which is a model used to predict the relationship between an independent and dependent variable, and a hurdle analysis. The term hurdle analysis was coined to identify the characteristics or certain “hurdles” which assist in estimating the donor’s capacity of giving (Borden et al., 2014).

This study determined that factors such as commitment and identification play a key role in giving patterns of employees (Borden et al., 2014). In fact, the “ceiling effect” indicates that alumni in tenured faculty positions, who spend many years teaching, publishing, and serving the institution, are most likely to donate (Borden et al., 2014, p. 213). There is also a stronger indication that alumni who are academic employees are more likely to give compared to non-academic employee (Borden et al., 2014). This study concluded that connectedness to the university is a primary driver which draws more employees towards the fundraising process. The idea of connectedness can be used in current research to examine the true philanthropic giving methods of donors when receiving zero tax benefits.

Gender differences. Simmons and Emanuele (2007) used empirical analysis to study the differences between males and females using the Giving and Volunteering (1999) U.S. dataset to examine observed and unobserved characteristics. Simmons and Emanuele (2007) compared variables between the groups: donors with children, donors whose parents donated, donor age, donor experiences, and donor salary. The results concluded that females donate more money and volunteer time compared to men (Simmons & Emanuele, 2007). To confirm this theory further, Wiepking, Bekkers, Mesch, Brown, Moore, and Hayat (2011) used framework by Bekkers and Wiepking (2011) which delivered eight mechanisms for giving through principles to determine the differences in male and female giving and concluded that women have higher levels of

empathy for giving. This empathetic behavior in women increased their likelihood to donate and giving back (Wiepking et al., 2011). Through a practical and current lens, women continue to climb the ladder in the workplace, and because of this, fundraising offices can expect to see increased donations from women to nonprofit organizations (Simmons & Emanuele, 2007).

On the other hand, Einolf (2011) stated that differences in gender and giving are minimal. Data was retrieved from the 1995 Midlife in the United States (MIDUS) survey with a sample of individuals ages 25-74 (Einolf, 2011). To determine the differences in male and female giving patterns, three dependent variables were studied to include volunteering, religious donations, and charitable giving (Einolf, 2011). When comparing males and females, Einolf (2011) found that males have increased resources, higher social capital, and larger income which increased their likelihood to donate. However, women have a natural nurturing approach and better understand the value of volunteering and giving back which motivates them to donate (Einolf, 2011).

The impact of leadership. Undoubtedly, college presidents have a large impact on the financial and performance-based success of an institution (Bastedo, Samuels, & Kleinman, 2014). Bastedo et al. (2014) researched the personality characteristics and financial impact higher education leaders have on private institution donations. With a sample of 240 medium to large private four-year institutions, 104 college presidents were studied by 11 college students to rate the charismatic nature of the president after viewing a video of their commencement speech or a similar speech (Bastedo et al., 2014). For each video, 12 questions from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) were answered regarding the president's speech (Bastedo et al., 2014). Additionally, the institution's performance was also examined with data pulled from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) to include the compensation of the president while donation quantities were retrieved from the Council of Aid to Education

(Bastedo et al., 2014). Research suggested that a heightened enthusiasm of a college president indicated higher levels of support from the community, local businesses, and stakeholders (Bastedo et al., 2014). However, the research was vague and failed to deliver conclusions on charismatic leaders as a direct impression on increased charitable giving levels (Bastedo et al., 2014). For this study, understanding how leadership has an influence on donations can help us recognize other factors which might play a role in the donor's decision to give.

The impact of social media. Farrow and Yuan (2011) studied the importance of social media to university connectedness and giving patterns. Farrow and Yuan (2011) predicted that alumni who are active on Facebook alumni groups have an increased frequency of communication with other alumni. Additionally, these alumni involved in social media have increased emotional closeness to the university compared to alumni who do not use social media (Farrow & Yuan, 2011). To test this theory, the methodology was comprised of interviews, participant observation, and a large-scale survey with data obtained by the Office of Alumni Affairs and Development (Farrow & Yuan, 2011). Variables such as volunteer behaviors, attitudes toward giving, and communication and emotional closeness with the university were assessed using various behavioral tools (Farrow & Yuan, 2011). This research confirmed that alumni can be persuaded to donate through social media efforts and peer interactions (Farrow & Yuan, 2011). More importantly, Farrow and Yuan (2011) suggested that social media donors are influenced by intangible factors, and do not only donate for tangible factors such as tax benefits or season tickets. For the purposes of this study, it is important to understand how external factors, like social media or advertising, influence alumni donation patterns.

The impact of geographic location. Nesbit, Christensen, Tschirhart, Clerkin, and Paarlberg (2015) researched nonprofit charitable organizations and the impact of donor

relocation on the number of incoming gifts. Nesbit et al. (2015) chose to study Wilmington, NC due to its retirement nature where surveys were electronically released asking for information on philanthropic nature, residential history, and organizational interest (Nesbit et al., 2015). Of 343 surveys, results indicated a positive relationship between residency status, sense of belonging, and interest in giving (Nesbit et al., 2015). Additionally, giving increased as residency duration increased (Nesbit et al., 2015). The results from this research are beneficial to the current study for examining the relationship between residency near and far from the institution. While there is insignificant research on residential location and giving, this is an important factor to consider especially when researching athletic donors giving to receive season tickets and expected to attend local sporting games.

Intercollegiate Athletics

There has been some research conducted to better understand patterns of athletic giving. Previous literature studied the correlation between athletic success and giving patterns as well as the cross-cultivation process between athletics and academic giving. Each of these studies dives deeper into the unique beliefs, diverse motivations and various scenarios compelling athletic donors to contribute. This section examines gender differences, athletic program success, and split donor giving habits.

Gender differences. Using the Athletic Contribution Questionnaire Revised Edition (ACQUIRE-II), Staurowsky (1996) examined gender and giving to better understand donor demographics and donation type. Using a self-reported survey, 201 donors at two institutions were examined to determine their motivational capacity to include areas of social benefits, power, institutional success, philanthropic values, and other tax or business-related benefits (Staurowsky, 1996). The study determined that regarding educational status between male and

female donors, more males possessed a degree in law or medicine compared to women, however, female donors were more likely to possess a doctorate compared to male donors (Staurowsky, 1996). Staurowsky (1996) determined that women are more likely to donate at a younger age than their male counterparts, and females are more likely to give to female athletic programs. Not only are women likely to donate at a younger age, but Borden et al. (2014) suggested that females had moderately stronger tendency to donate. Lara and Johnson (2014) also discovered that women tend to donate more often and found that, in general, men give smaller amounts and less often compared to women.

Mahony, Gladden, and Funk (2003), built their research from previous literature of Staurowsky (1996) and Billing, Holt, and Smith (1985), both of whom researched athletic success factors, giving patterns, and donor motivations. Mahony, et al. (2003), created an athletic Donor Motivation Scale to determine giving difference between higher education institutions. Donors, including 1,751 individuals at three Division I-A institutions, were given a survey to determine their giving amount, their number of consecutive years holding men's basketball and/or football season tickets, and motivations behind donating (Mahony et al., 2003). The results suggested that motivational purposes varied depending on institutional type, nevertheless, donors are more motivated by the option to purchase season tickets and priority seating on an annual basis (Mahony et al., 2003). Staurowsky (1996) explained that motivational differences are contingent on gender and found that men are more often motivated by social and tangible benefits such as season tickets. Additionally, these social benefits are highly valued among donors giving larger quantities (Ko, Kim, & Saga, 2016).

Ko, Rhee, Walker, and Lee (2014) conducted a study at a single Division I-A institution where donors were contacted through online questionnaire. The study expanded on the research

of Mahony et al. (2003) and used the Existence Relatedness Growth (ERG) Theory and the Model of Athletic Donor Motivations (MADOM) to determine factors which played a role in athletic-giving donors (Ko et al., 2014). These 8 factors, described in the Scale of Athletic Donor Motivation (SADOM), include: vicarious achievement, philanthropy, commitment, affiliation, socialization, power, and tangible benefits (Ko et al., 2014). Prior to the establishment of SADOM, Mahony et al. (2003) researched a variety of these factors, but also expanded on psychological and mental health benefits from the idea of using sports as an escape from real life issues. The SADOM was utilized further to determine the differences in motivations of high-giving and low-giving donors and found that low-giving donors are often more motivated to give when tangible benefits are involved (Ko, et al., 2016).

Athletic program success. Humphreys and Mondello (2007) hypothesized that athletic success of Division I men's basketball and football programs were positively correlated with donation size. From 1976-1996, researchers collected financial data, revenue and expenses, and student enrollment through IPEDS and the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Educational Statistics from public and private institutions. The results suggested that successful football and basketball programs aid in increased donations to the university, yet within private institutions, this is only true for successful basketball schools (Humphreys & Mondello, 2007). This research provided insight to donor motivations and differences between institution types.

While Humphreys and Mondello (2007) discovered that athletic success and donation size are positively correlated, Meer and Rosen (2009) realized that there is still controversy over the topic and dove deeper into the micro-data. The micro-data researched a singular school but included data on specific donors and gifts (Meer & Rosen, 2008). When looking at athletic success and donations, instead of examining only the top sport team's (e.g. football) success on

donations, Meer and Rosen (2009) researched other major sports or key players, which might have been well-liked by countless donors. Analyzing micro-data allowed Meer and Rosen (2009) to research data outside of the norm, which might still play a role in donations sizes and athletic success.

From 1983 to 2006, at an anonymous research institution, donor data was collected to include information on general giving versus athletic giving, donation size, consecutive years giving, alumni status, major, activities, occupation, residency, high school, ethnicity, academic honors, and marital status (Meer & Rosen, 2008). In their findings, Meer and Rosen (2009) found that with reference to the average donor, football and men's basketball success have little effect on donation. Meer and Rosen (2009) concluded that the success of a basketball season can occasionally lead to a decrease in donations. However, Meer and Rosen (2009) noted that this finding might be different for institutions with larger and more visible athletic programs. According to Turner, Meserve and Bowen (2001), this decrease in donation occurs because alumni donors believe the heightened success is due to excessive and reckless spending habits of the athletic department on these sporting programs. Additionally, the motivational factor causing former male athletes to donate to athletics wasn't the current success of the program, but the success of the program while the athlete was in college (Meer & Rosen, 2008). These positive experiences and memories that the former athlete experiences while on the team is carried into their present-day attitudes about the program and their attitudes towards donating.

Furthermore, there is a difference between female and male giving regarding athletic success (Meer & Rosen, 2008). For women, there is less of a correlation between athletic success and donation size, but regarding men, if the team won a conference championship the donation increased by seven percent (Meer & Rosen, 2008). Male athletes who were once successful

during their college career have a higher likelihood of contributing a larger donation than those who were unsuccessful, or even female athletes in general (Meer & Rosen, 2008). This statement is confirmed again by Meer and Rosen's (2018) study on giving patterns and success of low-profile men's basketball and football school, where successful student-athletes have a higher probability to donate. The research process and results of Meer and Rosen's (2018) study will be examined further in the following section on alumni giving patterns.

Cohen, Whisenant, and Walsh (2011) utilized the findings from Humphreys and Mondello (2007) but examined one high ranking Division I football program to discover how athletic success plays a role in athletic donations over a ten-year period from 1998 to 2008. Donor information was collected, to include donation size, donation amount, and team winning percentages, then investigated using the Pearson Correlation Analysis (Cohen et al., 2011). Cohen et al. (2011) determined that athletic success and increased donations are unrelated, but alternative factors such as increased season ticket costs could increase revenue. While each study stated a different hypothesis and findings, the true outcome could depend on institutional type and unique donor motivations.

Split donors. As a result of Weerts and Ronca's (2009) research on alumni-giving characteristics using the Classification and Regression Trees (CART) method, included a survey in the structure of a tree, answered by participants using a series of related questions to determine more about their giving patterns and predicted donation amount. Weerts and Ronca's (2009) discovered that alumni who stayed engaged with the university by athletic newsletters and other media outlets were more likely to donate to the university. This conclusion demonstrated that there is a mutually beneficial relationship between athletics and university donations.

Stinson and Howard (2010) found a gap in the literature to examine the value of “split donors,” or individuals giving to both athletic and academic programs, by examining the significance of cross-cultivation in fundraising. Using the exchange theory to demonstrate the “give” and “take” relationship between donors and departments, Stinson and Howard (2010) identified donors in several categories: communitarian (donate for community improvement), devout (donate for religious reasons), investors (donate for economic and tax reasons), socialites (donate for social interest), repayer (donate to consume services provided by the business), altruist (donate for others in a selfless manner), and dynast (donate for family tradition). Over 15,000 donors, contributing greater than \$1,000 in annual gifts, were surveyed across three institutions then assessed using a multimethod procedure (Stinson & Howard, 2010). The study found that split donors delivered more benefits to institutions because they often donated larger quantities in comparison to individuals giving to a singular department, and often gave over consecutive years (Stinson & Howard, 2010). However, Stinson and Howard (2010) found that while donors were giving larger quantities in general, but the overall athletic contribution drops when they become a split donor, and this conclusion was irrefutable at all three institutions. As a result, the following provides data on the average gift change to the athletic gift as the donor becomes a split donor: Institution I had an average change of -\$58.02; Institution II had an average gift change of -\$4.51; and Institution III had an average gift change of -\$144.88 (Stinson & Howard, 2010). These results are significant and suggested that donor motivations could change over-time, becoming more altruistic in nature, leading to cross-cultivation.

Giving Under Changing Government Policy

Federal tax policies continue to shift between Democratic and Republican agendas, however, there are parallels between the two Republican policies of President Ronald Reagan’s

Economic Recovery Act (ERA) (1981) and President Donald Trump's Tax Cuts in Jobs Act (TCJA) (2017). In the past and present, nonprofit organizations and educational institutions are learning how to deal with the policy changes which may disrupt donation patterns and vital support. Previous research on tax policy change and the impact on charitable gifts is minimal, and even less research has been completed on the topic of tax policy and giving to college athletics. Predictions from the Reaganomic Era which concluded findings of the model of economic giving (Clotfelter & Salamon, 1982) along with research on donor incentives can help administrators predict the impact of the TCJA on giving in the Trumponomic (Hawkins & Versace, 2017) Era. This section delivers similarities and differences of Reaganomics and Trumponomics Eras while highlighting and predicting how these tax reforms influence nonprofit fundraising. This section also highlights the initial predictions and emerging literature of the TCJA on giving patterns.

Reaganomics. A Republican and firm believer in the trickle-down effect, President Ronald Reagan delivered two tax reforms, the Economic Recovery Act (ERA) of 1981 and the Tax Reform Act (TRA) of 1986. ERA introduced an "above-the-line" nonprofit deduction for non-itemizing taxpayers, a marginal tax rate reduction of 25 percent, and a cutback from 70 percent to 50 percent in the maximum tax rate on individual income (Clotfelter & Salamon, 1982). Along with these tax reforms, President Reagan shaped the four pillars of Reaganomics which would thrust America's economy in an upward direction (Kengor, 2014). These four pillars included: tax cuts and the simplification of the tax code; deregulation to create heightened competition among companies; diminishment of government spending; and increased money management tactics (Kengor, 2014).

Clotfelter and Salamon (1982) studied the impact of the ERA on charitable giving from 1981-1984 to determine that the ERA would have a colossal effect on many industries, nonprofits, and resources resulting in a reduction of charitable giving, placing budget-conscious industries in jeopardy. The ERA would alter three key elements of giving: elimination of taxation of estates⁵ which diminished the tax incentives for these types of gifts; establishment of new depreciation rules which lessened taxable corporate profits and tax liabilities leading to a decrease in corporate giving; and alleviated pay-out requirements enforced on foundations (Clotfelter & Salamon, 1982). Additionally, economic sustainability and inflation impacted charitable giving by shifting taxpayers into higher tax brackets then decreasing the cost of giving (Clotfelter & Salamon, 1982). Due to these elements and the economic shift, Clotfelter and Salamon (1982) hypothesized that giving would increase over the years but at a relaxed pace compared to previous years where these elements were not impacted.

An economic model of giving was produced to determine changes in income, tax rate, itemization, and total deduction to predict data on overall individual giving level, income group differences, and recipient types (Clotfelter & Salamon, 1982). Clotfelter and Salamon's (1982) results suggested that the burden of giving would shift between income groups from 1981-1984 where taxpayers in the lower class (30 percent) would increase their giving rate by 3.3 percent; the middle class (55 percent) would increase giving their giving rate by 9.6 percent; and the upper class (15 percent) would decrease giving by 10.4 percent (Clotfelter & Salamon, 1982). While individuals are still willing to donate to nonprofits, the reform has altered who will give and to what organizations. There is a direct correlation between lower-income individuals and donations to churches; and while Clotfelter and Salamon (1982) predicted lower-income individuals will increase their donations, religious organizations should see an increase in

donations. Clotfelter and Salamon (1982) predicted a decrease in donations from upper class individuals and these types of donors are more likely to give to educational institutions. As a result, giving would decrease 5 percent towards colleges, universities, and hospitals (Clotfelter & Salamon, 1982). These findings on higher education and religious giving are similar to the findings presented by Feldstein (1975). The number of donations under the ERA escalated slowly, however Clotfelter and Salamon (1982) believed that without the enactment of the reform there would have been an even greater increase in giving. The introduction of Reagan's TRA decreased tax incentives and reduced charitable giving by \$11 billion to nonprofit sectors (Grant, 1991). However, many of these concerns and uncertainties were quickly laid to rest when nonprofit organizations realized that they were still capable of fundraising at a viable rate (Grant, 1991).

Trumponomics. Similarly to Reagan's Tax Reform Act of 1986, Trump's Tax Cuts and Jobs (TCJA) of 2017 exposed many concerns and unanswered questions from taxpayers and nonprofits. The TCJA provided three key elements to boost the U.S. economy: deliver a straightforward and comprehensible tax code; build a competitive and ambitious business market; and lower taxes (Powell, 2018). These elements, also termed "Trumponomics" by Hawkins and Versace (2017), are very similar to Reaganomics' four pillars to improve America, thus it might be assumed that these strategies reach similar outcomes. While Reagan was successful in his strategy, the economic development, population demographics and growth rates were divergent compared to today's concerns (Hawkins & Versace, 2017). For example, during Reagan's presidency the average saving was 10 percent with today's average only 5.4 percent (Hawkins & Versace, 2017).

According to Gleckman (2018) and the Tax Policy Center, under the Trump Administration, it is estimated that the number of donors itemizing deductions will drop from 39 percent to 15 percent for those individuals who earn a salary of \$86,000 to \$150,000. While this is only a theory, this drop in itemized tax deductions could decrease the number of essential supporters to nonprofit organizations. Prior to the TCJA, single individuals could claim the standard deductions to \$6,450, and if their deductible expenses exceeded this amount, they would have more of an incentive to itemize their deduction; however under the new reform, single individuals need to exceed \$12,000 in deductions in order to itemize (Dickler & Epperson, 2018). For taxpayers filing married, the standard deduction increased from \$12,700 to \$24,000 which could also leave these individuals with less of an incentive to itemize their deduction (Dickler & Epperson, 2018).

Some research has been completed on the TCJA's impact on charitable giving. Nickerson (2018) speculated its effects by understanding past literature and research on giving. According to Nickerson (2018), increased giving is associated with three factors, disposable personal income, consumption, and the Standard and Poor's 500 Index, all of which have been increasing since 2016 according to the Federal Reserve Economic Data (FRED) trends. In conjunction with the 2013 Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy study, Nickerson (2018) explored a variety of personal donation incentives and discovered that tax-related benefits were ranked seventh on the list of incentives where 18 percent of individuals claimed they donate specifically for tax benefits. The 2013 Philanthropic Panel Study also indicated that 50.4 percent of donors with a high net worth would decrease their donation if there was no tax deduction (Nickerson, 2018). Nickerson (2018) stated that negative impacts, such as declines in giving, won't only influence nonprofits, but will impact the economy. Nickerson (2018) speculated that

different factors could cause increases or decreases in giving. Not receiving tax benefits and low tax rates from the TCJA will decrease individual giving, however, there would be an increase of 1.7 percent in gross domestic product (GDP), as well as an increase in take-home pay and disposable income, which will lead to an increase in private giving (Nickerson, 2018).

Prior to the TCJA, Rooney, Osili, Kou, Zarins, and Bergdoll (2018) used the 2014 Tax Reform Act to estimate the reform's impact on charitable giving. Rooney et al. (2018) researched donor income levels and itemizers versus non-itemizers under the Tax Reform Act. Data of 9,000 households was gathered to include wealth standing, marital status, and number of dependents (Rooney et al., 2018). Data was gathered from multiple sources to include the University of Michigan Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID), the Philanthropy Panel Study (PPS) produced by the Lilly Family School of Philanthropy (LFSOP), and the 2009 IRS Statistics of Income Public Use File (SOI PUF) (Rooney et al., 2018). Equations were utilized to predict the cost of giving and price of tax elasticity (Rooney et al., 2018). The tax-price elasticity determines the degree to which a donation changes due to changes in a tax policy (Rooney et al., 2018). The price of giving, also known as the after-tax price, is determined by $\$1.00 \text{ equals } 1 \text{ minus the MTR (marginal tax rate)}$ (Rooney et al., 2018). To measure elasticity, you must take the percent change in donations divided by the percent change in price of giving (Rooney et al., 2018). Different scenarios are used to predict different types of situations which then determined how charitable giving would change (Rooney et al., 2018). These scenarios include increase standard deduction, decrease top marginal tax rate to 35 percent, a university charitable deduction, and so on (Rooney et al., 2018).

The results indicated that individuals with lower income experienced a greater reaction to tax price of giving (Rooney et al., 2018). This finding was confirmed because these donors

usually have less spendable income, while donors of higher wealth can further anticipate the tax change and are more easily capable of shifting their giving habits and spendable income (Rooney et al., 2018). While this study was helpful to determine the possible effects of the TCJA, it does not provide information on how this reform will specifically impact higher education donations to athletics, but rather the differences in giving habits between income groups and itemizers versus non-itemizers (Rooney et al., 2018).

Emerging literature on the TCJA. Statistics continue to develop on the impact of the TCJA on the U.S. economy. One year after the enactment of the TCJA, the reform has widened the inequality gap in the U.S. by increasing the after-tax income to the upper class by 2.9 percent and increasing the after-tax income to the lower class by merely 0.4 percent (Gale, 2018). An increase in the standard deduction may find tax payers with less incentive to itemize their deductions (Tax Policy Center, 2016). In fact, prior to the TCJA, roughly 30 percent of individuals could reduce their taxable income more by itemizing their deduction, however under the current reform, the percentage of itemizers will drop to roughly 10 percent in 2018 (Tax Policy Center, 2016). Due to this, charitable donations are estimated to decrease from \$57 billion to \$54.3 billion dollars (Tax Policy Center, 2016).

Relationship with nonprofit donations. A study conducted by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE) researched nonprofit giving under the TCJA, used the Open Source Policy Center's Tax-Calculator which measures 163,790 anonymous tax records (Brill & Choe, 2018). Based on the Tax Calculator, for individuals earning over \$200,000, 3.3 percent itemized, and 1.4 percent took the standard deduction (Brill & Choe, 2018). Of the individuals with an AGI of \$100,000-\$200,000, 3.1 percent itemized, and 1.3 percent took the standard deduction (Brill & Choe, 2018). Of the individuals with an AGI of

\$50,000-\$100,000, 4.0 percent itemized, and 1.7 percent took the standard deduction (Brill & Choe, 2018). Lastly, of the individuals with an AGI of \$0-\$50,000, 4.7 percent itemizer and 2.0 percent took the standard deduction (Brill & Choe, 2018). Brill and Choe (2018) confirm that the majority of charitable giving is donated by the top five percent, and that these high-level donors are most likely to itemize their taxes.

An increase in nonprofit donations. According to the Association of Fundraising Professionals and the Urban Institute who created the Fundraising Effectiveness Project (FEP) to help increase nonprofit donations, the program analyzes giving patterns of over 4,500 charities post-TCJA (Holmes & Rafferty, 2019). In 2018, while overall donations increased 1.6 percent, there were differences between small and large gifts (Holmes & Rafferty, 2019). The FEP reports a 2.6 percent increase in donations over \$1,000, and a 15 percent decrease in donation \$250 or less (Holmes & Rafferty, 2019). Additionally, in 2018, those donors giving \$250 or less had dropped 4.4 percent (Holmes & Rafferty, 2019). According to Holmes and Rafferty (2019), small and mid-size charities will feel the effects of the TCJA on donations.

More specifically to higher education giving, according to the Voluntary Support to Education (VSE), in 2017 gifts to colleges and universities reached \$43.60 billion (Seltzer, 2018). In 2018, after the introduction of the TCJA, gifts to higher education increased to \$46.73 billion with increases by all stakeholders to include alumni, non-alumni, foundations, corporations, and other organizations (Giving to the U.S., 2018). Research has indicated that this is a 7.2 percent increase giving for the 2017 to 2018 fiscal year (Jaschik, 2019). Giving to higher education has been allocated to the following top three sectors: research at 33 percent; academic divisions at 21.4 percent; and other restricted purposes at 18.1 percent (Giving to the U.S., 2018).

Athletic departments trail behind with only 8.2 percent allocation of private giving (Giving to the U.S., 2018).

The Voluntary Support to Education (VSE) survey has concluded that donations to higher education have reach their top record in 2018, however there are differences between income groups (Hazelrigg, 2019). This tax change has caused individual donations to decrease, but capital campaign donations to increase (Hazelrigg, 2019). High income donors or donations by corporations have not been affected by itemizing, however, there has been a decrease in giving from middle class donors or individual givers some of these donors may have less incentive to itemize (Hazelrigg, 2019). Foundations and athletic departments are promoting capital campaigns and multiyear campaigns which are thriving due to this new tax reform (Hazelrigg, 2019). While many of the smaller donations are decreasing, larger donations are becoming ever-popular. Unfortunately, with a decrease in smaller donations from individual giving, arises a decrease in alumni giving (Hazelrigg, 2019). Many young alumni donors lack a robust income and have relied on tax deduction as an incentive to donate, but without this incentive, fewer alumni will donate and will become disconnected to the institution (Hazelrigg, 2019).

Accepting the new rules. Donors and development officers are faced with navigating through the potential benefits and challenges of the Trump tax reform, however with this new reform, there are a handful of ways to sustain nonprofit giving. To reach the itemized deduction, donors are encouraged to partake in a model of bunching donations where they plan to give every other year in order to save money and exceed the standard deduction (Dickler & Epperson, 2018). For example, instead of giving \$6,000 in 2017, the donor will delay their giving, save money, then donate \$12,000 in 2019 so they can have a deductible expense in a sign tax year that is large enough to exceed the standard deduction (Dickler & Epperson, 2018). This technique is

mutually beneficial to the donor as well as the organization, however, the gift isn't donated on a yearly basis and the nonprofit must become more patient with their donors and their financial alterations.

Donors can also partake in a donor-advised fund. Voluntary Support of Education (2018) reported a 65.8 percent increase to donor-advised funds from 2017 to 2018. The donor-advised fund eliminates stress to the donor by offering them a one-time tax deduction instead of donating on a yearly basis without a tax break (Dickler & Epperson, 2018). With this fund, donors can build up a larger donation for the charity of choice (Dickler & Epperson, 2018). An example of giving under a donor-advised fund includes donating a larger lump sum, such as \$15,000, to gain a one-time tax deduction, but then dividing the sum between charitable organizations (Dickler & Epperson, 2018). Finally, instead of giving a monetary gift, donors can earn unique benefits through donating stock or other tangible assets (Dickler & Epperson, 2018).

Theoretical Framework

This section elaborates on the theoretical framework of this study. The section first discusses how the social exchange theory plays a role in giving and donor incentives, which can be identified as tangible or intangible. The final section discusses other studies and their findings on donor motivations. Specifically, the section examines the theoretical framework used in this study, the Model of Donor Athletic Motivations (MADOM) developed by Ko et al. (2014).

Exchange of incentives. Within philanthropy, the exchange theory suggests the following philosophies of donors: to minimize costs by increasing benefits or rewards; and to continue relationships where benefits outweigh costs (Blau, 1964 in Mathur, 1996). Belk (1979) proposed that there must be an exchange relationship, or a give and take relationship between the

donor and the organization (Mathur, 1996). University development officers use the social exchange theory to engage alumni, build relationships, and cultivate a gift (Skar, 2014).

However, the capacity to donate does not depend on a single factor; in fact, Brady, Noble, Utter, and Smith (2002) justified that it takes both, tangible and intangible benefits, for the donor to reach gratification in the giving process (Stinson & Howard, 2010).

Intangible factors. Through a positive lens, the social exchange theory suggests that people give good to get good in return (Piliavin & Charng, 1990 in Skari, 2014). Scott and Seglow (2007) firmly believed that all charitable donors have some form of altruistic view on giving (Monroe, 2009). Intangible social and psychological benefits such as positive feeling from helping others or social incentives are exchanged for the cost of giving (Harbaugh, 1998 in Stinson & Howard, 2010). Alumni and donors recognize the positive impact that the university has on the community which in turn, boosts the donor's self-esteem and self-happiness when they donate back to an institution of great value (Skar, 2014).

Family traditions play a role in fundraising where the donor might consider donating to a specific sports program or make a donation to retain season tickets that have been in the family for decades (Stinson & Howard, 2010). However, family members and peer groups could place social pressures on the donor to continue purchasing expensive tickets and donating to an athletic team. Additionally, athletic donors may also donate in pursuit of attention, power, or personal gain. Staurowsky, Parkhouse, and Sachs (1996) confirmed that athletic donors are often motivated by power and control, where their decision to donate is dependent on whether their opinion will be valued within athletic department strategic plans, facility upgrades, or program improvements (Ko, et al., 2014).

Tangible factors. Schervish (1997) coined the term “consumption philanthropy” which implies that some donors prefer tangible gifts in exchange for their donations, where athletic program funding is viewed as commercially driven because individuals are only interested in purchasing season tickets instead of supporting the university or the student-athletes (Stinson & Howard, 2010, p.748). According to Stinson and Howard (2010), tangible benefits are vital to college athletic program where fundraising offices often require individuals to donate a gift in exchange for season tickets. Depending on the gift size, athletic donors can receive expensive box seats or field passes for football games, priceless benefits such as one-on-one time with coaches and players, exclusive apparel items, or invitations to special events. These required gifts help increase revenue for the athletic department (Stinson & Howard, 2010). Nevertheless, this strategy assists in the “ceiling effect,” capping donors at giving levels and limiting their potential to give larger quantities (Stinson & Howard, 2010, p.748).

Aside from the tangible benefits of purchasing season tickets, Bendapudi, Singh, and Bendapudi (1996) confirmed that tangible benefits are often associated with egotistical intention to boost the donor’s self-perception while patting themselves on the back for donating (Ko et al., 2014). Stinson and Howard (2010) found that eventually these donors’ transition to giving to other areas in athletics and throughout the institution, confirming that these athletic tangible benefits can offer increased giving for university foundations (Ko et al., 2014).

In addition, tangible benefits are often connected with the economic value of a gift where donors appreciate that they can receive tax benefits from their charitable gift (Stinson & Howard, 2010). These donors who give particularly for tax benefits are partaking in an economic exchange of goods and services. There is a direct relationship with taxes and giving, and when the price of giving decreases, taxpayers are more likely to donate (Clotfelter & Salamon, 1982).

Factors such as tax incentives, play a role in a donor's tangible motivation to donate to an athletic program.

Tax incentives. Historically, charitable tax incentives were established for two reasons: firstly, to level out the taxable income base between higher income individuals and lower income individuals; and secondly, to entice individuals to donate to charities and nonprofits (Rosenberg, Steuerle, Ovalle, & Stallworth, 2016). Introducing tax incentives to increase giving provided better goods and services through medical research, technology, and education (McGregor-Loendes, Newton, & Marsden, 2006). While tax incentives are beneficial to donors, not all individuals have enough in deductible expenses to reduce their taxable income. Individuals categorized as high income may be more likely to receive tax benefits from itemizing their deductions, while the standard deduction might cover a larger number of middle-income and lower-income taxpayers (Rosenberg et al., 2016). Low-class and middle-class individuals may not be able to reach the current standard deduction of \$12,000 individually, but these individuals may benefit from a larger standard deduction (Dickler & Epperson, 2018). While this may seem unjust to the lower class, it has the potential to create a win-win situation for upper class individuals and nonprofit organizations by giving the upper class a bigger incentive to donate larger amounts, and nonprofits the opportunity to cultivate high-level donors. With these charitable tax incentives, nonprofits must deliver their own incentive-based fundraising models to attract donors and bring in additional funds to sustain their organization (Grant, 1991).

Using the 2001 Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) data from the Center of Philanthropy at Indiana University, Brooks (2007) examined the impact of tax incentives throughout six nonprofit industries and determined ways which tax deductions play a role in giving patterns. Compared to previous literature, the research conducted by Brooks (2007) is

unique because it focused on differences among multiple sectors rather than a singular nonprofit. Respondents from 7,400 families were surveyed to discover each individual's marginal tax rate, determined by the National Bureau of Economic Research TAXSIM tax calculator, and other variables to include marital status, labor income, and number of dependents, demographics, residency, property income, expenses, and itemized deductions on taxes (Brooks, 2007). The results suggested that some donations to similar charities such as the United Way or religious entities, reacted strongly to tax incentives, while other nonprofits such as health industries and higher education have a lesser reaction to tax deductibility (Brooks, 2007). A sense of duty to donate may correlate with less sensitivity to tax changes because individuals feeling obligated to donate (Brooks, 2007). This sense of duty may be apparent regarding religious and educational donors (Brooks, 2007). This research helps to form a hypothesis that the present-day tax reform may have little impact on charitable donations to college athletics.

Duquette (2016) explored tax incentive differences between charitable organizations. Duquette (2016) retrieved data from the Federal Form 990 of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) filings which provided insight on donations for various organizations according to company size and revenue produced and further included information on the organization's tax-sensitivity and heterogeneity (Duquette, 2016). Data was retrieved through the IRS Statistics of Income Division (SOI) to include all organizations above \$1 million in assets from 1982-1983 and 1985-2016. In conjunction with Brooks (2007) and Duquette (2016) discovered that higher education institutions are less tax sensitive compared to other organizations. Duquette (2016) concluded that art organizations are less sensitive to tax incentives; but on the other hand, nursing homes and homeless shelters are highly tax sensitive. Duquette (2016) compared the less tax-sensitive groups, such as higher education institutions, to the more tax-sensitive groups, such as healthcare

and K-12 education, and discovered that donors giving to high tax-sensitive nonprofits understand that their contribution benefits individuals who are completely dependent on their donation. Examples of individuals dependent on donation include children, people with illness, or elderly (Duquette, 2016). Furthermore, donors giving to these sectors do not directly benefit from these institutions, so they rely on tax benefits as an incentive (Duquette, 2016). Whereas less tax incentive organizations such as higher education and the arts, carry a donor-base that are direct consumers of their donation by having the ability to attend a university sporting event or use their local YMCA gym (Duquette, 2016). As a direct consumer, higher education donors rely less on tax benefits.

Model of Athletic Donor Motivation (MADOM). There has been broad research on previous tax reforms and charitable giving, for example, Clotfelter and Salamon (1982) on the Economic Recovery Act (ERA) 1981 and discovered findings similar to Feldstein (1975) that upper class individuals are more likely to give to educational institutions, however, less of an interest in giving will lead to a 5 percent decrease in funding towards colleges, universities, and hospitals (Clotfelter & Salamon, 1982). Unfortunately, Clotfelter and Salamon's (1982) research is not specific to the current tax reform or collegiate athletics. More current studies have suggested that that higher education institutions are less tax sensitive compared to other organizations (Brooks, 2007; Duquette, 2016). Nickerson (2018) predicted that the new reform will have little influence on giving and that donors are motivated by other, more philanthropic benefits. However, Nickerson (2018) noted that donations from higher income donors will drop if there is no tax deduction option. It is possible that altruistic giving habits may overshadow the lack of tax benefits now in place from the TCJA. With knowledge from past research, this study acknowledges that there could be a drop in athletic donations due to the impact of the TCJA,

however there is uncertainty at the extensiveness of the decline in donations. However recent studies by the VSE have indicated increases in higher education giving by 7.2 percent under the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (Jaschik, 2019). Less is known about the specifics of this tax reform on athletic giving. In 2018, academic programs raised 21.4 percent of private giving whereas athletic departments raised only 8.2 percent of higher education donations (Giving to the U.S., 2018).

There has been some research conducted on giving patterns in higher education and collegiate athletics, however, little is known about the current tax reform and its influence on athletic donations and donor motivation. Most recently and most valuable to this study, Ko et al. (2014) delivered a Model of Athletic Donor Motivations (MADOM) to include eight athletic-specific motivational factors which could influence giving habits through vicarious achievement, philanthropic, commitment, affiliation, public recognition, socialization, power, and tangible benefits (Ko et al., 2014).

The following paragraphs demonstrate the MADOM (Ko et al., 2014) in further detail to include identification factors and participant statements associated with each of the motivations. “Growth needs” motivations include philanthropy, vicarious achievement, and demonstration of commitment (Ko et al. 2014). The motivational factors of “philanthropy” comprise innate motivations which is only advantageous to the recipient, not the giver (Ko et al., 2014). The statements under this factor are as follows: “I donate because it is the right thing to do” and “I donate to provide educational opportunities to students” (Ko et al., 2014, p.537). The motivation of “philanthropy” could be further assessed by identifying donor’s alumni status. The motivational factors of “vicarious achievement” includes the need to feel successful through the victories and achievements of the university (Ko et al., 2014). These statements under “vicarious

achievement” include: “I feel a sense of achievement when the AAA team I support does well” and “I feel pride in the success of the program I support” (Ko et al., 2014, p.537). The motivational factors under the “demonstration of commitment” illustrates the psychological relationship connecting the donor to the university (Ko et al., 2014). “Demonstration of commitment” suggest statements such as: “I donate to show my allegiance to the AAA” and “I donate to show my dedication of the AAA” (Ko et al., 2016, p.537).

The second category, “relatedness needs,” includes the motivations of affiliation and socialization (Ko et al., 2014). “Affiliation” occurs when a donation is given and membership into a group is expected in return (Ko et al., 2014). Affiliated donors often relate to the following statements: “I feel connected to members of AAA Boosters” and “I donate to gain a sense of belonging” (Ko et al., 2016, p.537). “Affiliation” can be further assessed by examining variables of the donor’s graduation year or residential location. “Socialization” is defined as donor communication and interaction among the group (Ko et al., 2014). The statements under “socialization” include: “I enjoy associating with the members of AAA Boosters” and “I appreciate the opportunity to meet people in the athletic department” (Ko et al., 2016, p. 537).

The third, and final category is “existence needs” which motivations include power, public recognition, and tangible benefits (Ko et al., 2014). “Power” is defined as the innate motivation and need to engage in the decision-making process of athletic programs (Ko et al., 2014). Statements under “power” include: “It is important for me to be able to voice my opinion on department decisions” and “It is important for me to have the opportunities to shape the direction of the department” (Ko et al., 2014, p. 537). “Public recognition” is defined as an individual who donates for acknowledgment and attention (Ko et al., 2014). The statements under “public recognition” includes: “It is important for me to receive recognition for my

contribution” and I feel good about being publicly recognized for my gift” (Ko et al., 2014, p. 537). Lastly, donors who wish to receive tangible benefits are defined as those individuals who want to gain profit in exchange for giving (Ko et al., 2014). Donors wishing for tangible benefits can be described as stating: “The access to priority seating is important to me” and “Receiving tax deduction is important benefit for me” (Ko et al., 2014, p. 537). Tangible motivational factors can be assessed through variables such as the type of fund the donor is giving to, whether towards season tickets or for a more philanthropic fund. Understanding the definitions and donor statements under these eight motivations will provide a framework for this study.

Ko et al.’s (2014) research produced the Scale of Athletic Donor Motivation (SADOM) which confirmed that low-level giving donors are more motivated to donate when there are tangible benefits involved such as season tickets or tax incentives (Ko et al., 2014). Ko et al.’s (2014) research provides a framework for the athletic giving and TCJA study, and additionally, can assist in determining which factors may be most significant to athletic donors. Furthermore, Ko et al.’s (2014) research studied a single Division I-A institution which is transferrable to this study which examines a single Division I public institution.

Interpretation of Literature

While previous studies on giving have highlighted important topics, there is still a lot to discover about athletic fundraising and donor motivations. This section discusses the limitations of previous studies and highlights the numerous contributions of this current study on athletic giving under the TCJA.

Limitations

From the literature review, a lot is still unknown about the influence of the TCJA on giving, especially regarding athletic season ticket donations. Within the area of higher education, there has been much concern and speculation around this topic and its impact revenue. Additionally, there is no concrete evidence through quantitative statistics, qualitative interviews and surveys, or tax returns on the importance of a tax incentive on season ticket donations. Finally, most studies examine the changes in giving patterns of numerous institutions, not just the comprehensive data of a single institution longitudinally.

Contributions

This study delivers many contributions to the fundraising and higher education field. The study analyzes data from all season ticket donors at a single public institution over a six-and-a-half-year period and investigates donor characteristics and fund types for athletic, academic, and healthcare programs. While there is limited research on giving post-TCJA, this study examines one-and-a-half years of data after the tax policy change. This data is used to better understand the initial implications of the TCJA on athletic giving. In addition to these findings, this data also provides results for prior giving levels and donations patterns before the TCJA which can help predict whether donors choose to itemize prior to the TCJA. Finally, this study looks specifically at season ticket donations as an outcome to determine changes in their giving patterns and the influence of the TCJA on giving.

Chapter 3: Methodology

For the purposes of this study, athletic donor giving patterns will be examined to identify the influence of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (TCJA) on giving. The donor pool included a single public university which will be examined on a longitudinal scale to determine the differences in giving patterns. This study examined data through a quantitative lens to gain more insight on athletic giving patterns, motivations, monetary changes overtime, and implications of the TCJA.

Sample

This study researched athletic donor data, identified as “individuals,” at a single anonymous public research university from 2013 to 2019. The data was assessed using two different methods. First, the data was assessed over 12 months of data from January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2018. Second, the data was assessed over seven months in each calendar year from January to August in the years of 2013 through 2019. The public university which was studied included a Division I Power 5 institution.

Public Division I institutions rely on private support to support operational expenses and support students. In 2017, roughly 59 percent of funds raised to higher education were allocated to operational expenses, while 41 percent of funds were allocated to capital purposes (Seltzer, 2018a). The status and ranking of this institution show that athletic programs are a large driver of the institution’s revenue, interest, and visibility. According to Chung (2015), intercollegiate athletics is a multibillion-dollar industry which positively impacts revenue, campus diversity, school pride, and alumni connection. Athletic fundraising offices provide large amounts of support and funding to student-athletes and the university. The lack of pro sport teams where this anonymous university is located has heightened fan interest in college sports. Due to this, individuals are prideful of their college athletic teams and often exceed expectation when financially supporting their Alma Mater. The conclusions from this study provide the first in-

depth analysis of athletic giving under the TCJA, where the final conclusions and recommendations can be used to increase funding for schools of similar classifications.

Variables

Ko et al.'s (2014) introduction of the MADOM and the eight motivational factors of athletic donors guided this research. For the purposes of this study, most of these motivational factors were used to guide this research which include: philanthropy, vicarious achievement, demonstration of commitment, affiliation, socialization, power, public recognition and tangible benefits (Ko et al., 2014). Alongside MADOM variables, the following donor descriptive variables were used to assess each motivational factor of athletic giving. (See Table 1.)

Table 1

MADOM Variables Paired with Donor Descriptive Variables

MADOM	Donor Descriptive Variables
Philanthropy	Gender Academic Major Occupation Giving Outside of Athletics
Vicarious Achievement	Alumni Status Former Student-Athlete Athletic Performance
Demonstration of Commitment	Alumni Status Faculty/Staff Status Athletic Performance Consecutive Giving Years
Affiliation	Alumni Status Faculty/Staff Status Number Years Attending the University Zip Code/ Residency
Socialization	Season Tickets Special Events
Power	Amount of Giving Stock Market
Public Recognition	Amount of Giving
Tangible Benefits	Season Tickets Sports-Specific Giving

Philanthropy. For the motivation of “philanthropy,” data was collected on the donor’s gender. The variable of gender can also determine more about philanthropic giving and their motives. Information on the donor’s giving history was also examined to better understand their giving patterns overtime. While this study did not examine, in-depth, the donor’s academic and athletic giving, however these variables could be studied in the future to better understand philanthropic motives. Additionally, academic majors and occupations could also provide more insight on the donor’s interests. For example, if they graduated in a major under social work, the donor may be a more philanthropic person, and they might be more willing to donate without incentives. Donor occupation and major were not explored in this study, but these variables would be beneficial to examine in future research.

Vicarious achievement. The motive of “vicarious achievement” was further examined through the donor’s student-athlete status. Some former student-athletes stay connected to their college, sports team, and coaches by donating back to their program. Former athletes, coaches and athletic trainers who chose to donate back to athletics are members of a Varsity Club where they receive recognition at special events, attendance at sporting games, and athletic department updates. The variable of alumni status can also demonstrate that a donor is living vicariously through their alumni sports team.

Demonstration of commitment. The motivation of “commitment” was examined through donor alumni status. Alumni have committed many years to the institution and will continue to show commitment by donating back to their favorite programs. In addition to alumni status, the number of consecutive years of giving to athletics and the number of consecutive years giving to the university. Individuals who choose to donate over years or decades are loyal to the university’s vision and plan. Lastly, athletic performance of the football team was

measured to better understand if a donor's likelihood of giving is related to athletic success. If the football team has a successful season, this could increase the chances that some donors will give to the program. However, if the team has a bad season, this could decrease donations to the program.

Affiliation. For the motivation of "affiliation," the variable of alumni status was examined. The donor's residential status or zip code can help explain more about the individual's connection with the institution and the community. For this study, the donor's residential city and state were analyzed to determine if the donor lived in the same state as the location of the institution. If the donor lives in-state, or even in the city of the university, they are most likely more affiliated with the school. If the donor lives in the community, they most likely support other businesses, attend local events, or even work at the institution. Therefore, the affiliation of a local donor is likely much higher than an individual living across the country.

Socialization. The variable of "socialization" includes the donor's attendance at special events. All donors have the opportunity to attend local events, which offers them the opportunity to mingle with other fans and meets coaches and student-athletes. The variable of special events was not measured for this study; however, it is an interesting factor to consider for future research which can shine light on the motive of socialization in a donor's potential to give. Donors who purchase season tickets for men's basketball and football, may also be motivated to give for socialization purposes. Donors attending sporting events often enjoy the overall culture and atmosphere of the game where they have the opportunity to spend time with friends and family in a positive environment.

Power. For the motivation of "power," data was collected on the total amount giving. This information can provide a better understanding of the donor's wealth and income. If

individuals are donating more per year, they most likely, have disposable income to spend on charitable organizations. Data was collected on Standard and Poor's 500 Index to measure the performance of the stock market, which will help to determine if high-level donor might have financial gains when investing. Additionally, donors' occupations and positions within their company can determine if "power" is a desirable motive for donating. Donors who hold executive positions in their company by be more interested in the idea of being involved in the decision-making process within the athletic department. Donor occupation and position within the company was not available for all donors of this study. This information on occupation was not collected for this study, however occupation could be examined in future research.

Public recognition. In order to gauge the variable of "public recognition," the specific donor will be assessed, whether they are donating under a company or individual donation. Often times, companies enjoy receiving recognition, sponsorships, and partnerships with the university through their donation. For this study, specific donors were not able to be analyzed. However, monetary totals of giving per year were assessed to determine the high-level donors.

Tangible benefits. For the motive of "tangible benefits," data was collected on individuals donating to obtain season ticket. In return for a season ticket donation, the donor receives season ticket seats as a tangible benefit. Prior to the TCJA, individuals received tax benefits from season tickets. Collecting data on season tickets, pre and post-TCJA, also provided insight on tangible and tax benefits. Another tangible benefit to examine in future research is sport-specific giving. When donating to sport-specific programs, often times the donor becomes a member of a club and gains benefits from apparel items and newsletters.

Procedure

Through a quantitative approach, athletic giving was assessed from 2013 to 2019 to better understand how the TCJA plays a role in athletic donor giving patterns. Individual athletic donor giving patterns were pulled from an anonymous foundation where their donations to athletic funds, academic funds, and healthcare programs were researched from 2013 to 2019. The main athletics funds utilized for this research include: the general athletic fund for season tickets, the fund for stadium suite holders, the fund for stadium field box holders, and the fund that includes donations to the athletic scholarship fund. Once donors from these funds were pulled, their giving to academics, healthcare, and other athletic donations were analyzed. Donor profiles and monetary data was retrieved from the Raiser's Edge software, a fundraising tool used to store donor information.

To determine the relationship between the TCJA and the anonymous university, individual donor motivations were examined. Pre-TCJA and post-TCJA, donors' data was analyzed to include information on consecutive years of giving, donation amount, number of donations, and fund type. Donor variables were analyzed to include alumni status, student-athlete status, and prior giving level. To better understand the relationship between the TCJA and split donor behavior, number of split donors were examined pre-TCJA and post-TCJA.

Data Sources

Donor data was obtained from Raiser's Edge software, a fundraising management tool, from the anonymous university's foundation. Raiser's Edge software is an instrument which stored donor data and includes information such as gender, donor status, amount donated yearly, fund types, consecutive years giving, and lifetime giving. Data from Raiser's Edge was exported to an Excel spreadsheet for research and reviewing purposes then saved in a secured location. To obtain data on athletic performance, past football wins of the anonymous university was

collected from Entertainment and Sports Programming Network (ESPN). Yearly stock market data was retrieved from the Standard and Poor's 500 Index to better understand the health of the U.S. economy.

Data Analysis

In order to analyze these variables, a regression model was used for each research question. The following equation was used to better understand how each variable plays a role in the results.

$$Y_i = b_0 + b_1 * D_i + b_2 * A_i + b_3 * F_i + b_4 * G_i + e_i \quad (1)$$

Y_i is described as an outcome for donors, and D_i was a category for individual donor characteristics which includes gender and donor type. A_i was a vector of the donor's affiliation with the college, and was an indicator for alumni status, former student-athlete status, and prior-year wins for the university's football team. F_i was a vector of financial data including an indicator for post-TCJA reform, stock market viability, and state median income. G_i was a vector of yearly monetary totals of athletic giving and academic giving. Finally, e_i was an error term and the b 's were the regression coefficients to be estimated. STATA software was used to produce five outcomes. To deliver different outcomes, the regression was run multiple times. The outcomes included number of season ticket holders, total amount giving, total number of gifts, average gift size, and number of split donors.

Each outcome delivered main results and results by past giving. Each table created contained two types of information. Columns 1 and 2 contained 12-month data, January to December, from 2013 to 2018. Columns 3 and 4 included data from January 1 to July 31 from 2013 to 2019. Data for the full year of 2019 was unable to be retrieved as the analysis process of this study began in July 2019. In addition to examining the five main outcomes using regression

analysis, within the results by past year, three separate giving levels were analyzed to better understand how the TCJA impacted giving levels. This information revealed which donor groups are likely to remain the same, decrease, or increase post-TCJA and beyond.

Limitations

As a limitation to this study, only a single Division I institution was researched. While the results can be applied to other peer institutions, it does not uncover the differences and similarities between multiple institutions. Longitudinally, the study researched athletic giving over a six-in-a-half-year period, from 2013 to 2019; because the TCJA was established on January 1, 2018, the study only captured one year and seven months of giving under the new reform. Due to this, the study only determined the initial implications of the tax reform.

Because this study was conducted soon after the enactment of the TCJA, development offices may or may not have shifted their fundraising tactics, and the same theory applies to donors as they might not have changed their giving habits to align with the current tax reform. Down the road, donors may decide to alter their finances in their favor to fit the current tax reform. Additionally, development officers might decide to alter their incentives or change their season ticket donation charts to offer more financial-friendly options to donors. While there is financial uncertainty under the current TCJA, this study delivered swift predictions on athletic giving patterns under a new reform.

Regarding limitations for Raiser's Edges software, these databases might hold mistakes due to human error when inputting data. Donor information may not be updated and accurate, where some data could be missing. The following information might be inaccurate on Raiser's Edge software: gender, major, occupation, graduation date, residential location, phone numbers, or deceased donors. Due to human error and accidents, donors might have multiple accounts

which might not accurately reflect their consecutive years of giving or lifetime giving amount. However, data regarding donation amount and number of donations are accurate. As I acknowledge these limitations, the study still accurately predicted a pattern in athletic giving over time and described more about athletic donor motivations under the TCJA. This data provided new and unique insight on how tax reforms and incentives play a role in athletic giving and provided an alternative plan to boost giving under future tax reforms.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 illustrates a summary of descriptive statistics for the years of 2013 to 2018 which includes 53,088 donors. This donor pool included donors identified as individual donors, not corporations and businesses. Of the 53,088 individual donors, 25 percent of donors were female, and 75 percent were male donors. When examining donor residency, 62 percent of donors lived in-state, and 38 percent lived out-of-state. The data concluded that 49 percent of donors were alumni at the institution, and 51 percent were not labeled as alumni of the researched institution. The Varsity Club is a fundraising program for former student-athletes, coaches and trainers. Analyzing membership to the Varsity Club is the best way to determine whether or not a donor was a former student-athlete. However, not all former student-athletes donate to the Varsity Club so some individuals may not be identified. The findings for former student-athletes status concluded that two percent of the donor population were members of the Varsity Club and former student-athletes, former coaches, or athletic trainers.

Of the 53,088 individual donors, from 2013 to 2018, 50 percent were season ticket donors. The average number of gifts per years was 1.32 gifts. The average total amount of giving was \$3,242.22 and the average mean gift size per year was \$1,957.00. The average number of

split donors (individuals giving to academic and athletic programs) per year was 12 percent of donors.

Table 2

Summary of Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean
Donor had Season Tickets	0.50 (0.50)
Number of Gifts	1.32 (3.23)
Total Amount of Gifts	3242.22 (94493.58)
Average Gift Size	1957.00 (24842.92)
Donor is Split Donor	0.12 (0.33)
Donor is Female	0.25 (0.43)
Donor is Alumnus	0.49 (0.50)
Donor Lives In-State	0.62 (0.49)
Donor Gave to the Varsity Club	0.02 (0.15)
Football Wins (Last Year)	7.17 (1.77)
S&P 500 (Last Year)	16.21 (9.47)
State Median Household Income	42.07 (1.00)
Middle Group	0.07 (0.26)
High Group	0.03 (0.18)
	N 53,088

Standard deviation in parentheses

Chapter 4: Results

The following paragraphs discuss the results of the regression analyses. The regressions explore the following outcomes of the study's research questions: number of season ticket donors, total amount giving, total number of gifts, average gift size, and number of split donors. The main results include giving patterns yearly and post-2018. The past giving results include prior giving of each donor and groups them in low, middle or high, depending on their giving history. The results of this study concluded an overall reduction of season ticket donors for the middle group (post-TCJA), an overall reduction of number of gifts for the high group (post-TCJA), inconsistent evidence for total amount of giving and average gift size (post-TCJA), and an overall reduction of split donors (post-TCJA).

Main Results

Table 3 illustrates a regression analysis of the season ticket giving patterns of corporate donors. Corporate donations are not included in the main results and past giving regression analysis of each outcome due to the changes made by the TCJA where corporation cannot make the decision to itemize or not itemize, especially for season ticket purposes. While corporate donors are not included in the regression analysis of each outcome, it is still relevant to briefly examine these donors because their incentives and benefits have been altered by the TCJA and the elimination of the 80/20 rule. Tables 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 illustrate the giving patterns individual donors and the number of season ticket donors, the total amount of giving, the number of gifts, the average gift size, and the number of split donors. In each table, columns 1 and 2 analyzed data over 12 months (January to December) from 2013 to 2018. Columns 3 and 4 analyzed data over seven months (January 1st to July 31st) from 2013 to 2019. In columns 1 and 2, data was made available for a full year (12 months) from 2013 to 2018, however columns 3 and 4 illustrate seven months of data from 2013 to 2019 as only seven months of data were made

available in 2019. The data within columns 1 and 2 are critical to explore because this illustrates yearly patterns over 12 months of data, likewise, the data within columns 3 and 4 are also critical to understand because these columns include the initial giving patterns for the year of 2019 compared to the initial giving patterns of previous years. Columns 1 and 3 compared the number of season ticket donors yearly, while columns 2 and 4 defined potential variables that could influence number of season ticket donors which include Standard and Poor's 500 Index (S&P 500), the median household income of the state where the anonymous university is located, and previous football wins of the anonymous university.

Season ticket donors. Prior to the TJCA, corporations followed the 80/20 rule where 80% of their season ticket donation could be deducted from their taxes. Post- TCJA where this rule is no longer made available, corporations do not make the decision to itemize or not to itemize. Unlike individual donors, corporations do not choose between itemizing and taking the standard deduction. Post-TCJA, the standard deduction is only available for individual donors. For these reasons, corporate donors have been dropped from the main results and past giving results of this research. Table 3 illustrates a regression of corporate donors from 2014 to 2018 to better understand how season ticket giving patterns have changed for corporate donors, pre-TCJA and post-TCJA.

Table 3 illustrates that a total of 6,036 corporations were studied from 2013 to 2018. The number of corporate donors living in-state were 15 percentage points higher compared to individual donors. The number of corporate donors giving to the Varsity Club were five percentage points lower compared to individual donors. When comparing corporate donors to the year of 2017, in 2013 corporate donors increased ten percentage points. In 2014, corporate donors increased 13 percentage points; in 2015 corporate donors increased nine percentage

points; and in 2016 corporate donors increased six percentage points. When comparing corporate donors to the year of 2017, in 2018 post-TCJA, corporate donors decreased three percentage points. For the following regression analysis and the remainder of the study, corporate donors will be removed to better understand the TCJA implication on individual donors.

Figure 2 illustrates the number of season ticket donors, both individual donors and corporate donors, per year. In 2013 there were 4,990 donors who were purchased season tickets, where in 2014, the number of season ticket donors decreased slightly to 4,721 donations. In 2015, there were 4,364 season ticket donors, and in 2016, there were 4,387 season ticket donors. In 2017, there were 4,234 donors purchasing season tickets. In 2018, the number of season ticket donors decreased considerably to 3,619. While this study only analyzed seven months of data in 2019, the number of season ticket donors consisted of 2,854 donations. Each year, the soft deadline to donate a season ticket donation is in July. Although the year of 2019 only consists of 7 months of data, this data includes the month of July where donors, most likely, already gave their athletic donation. Due to this deadline in July, the data received over 7 months in 2019 provides an accurate trajectory of the number of individuals who purchased season tickets in 2019.

Table 4 illustrates regression results of the number of season ticket holders. When examining data post-2018, there was a lower likelihood to purchase season tickets, between nine and ten percentage points. In 2019, there was an even lower probability of purchasing season tickets at 18 percentage points compared to the year of 2017, pre-TCJA. Females had a lower likelihood, between seven and eight percentage points, of purchasing season tickets compared to males. When examining alumni status, on average, alumni donors had a higher likelihood at nine percentage points of purchasing season tickets compared to non-alumni. On average, donors who

lived in-state had a higher likelihood, between three and five percentage points, of purchasing season tickets compared to donors who lived out-of-state. Donors who were former student-athletes had a lower likelihood of purchasing season tickets, between zero to two percentage points, and this data was statistically significant. The impact of state median income decreased the number of season ticket donations between nine and ten percentage points.

Total amount of giving. Figure 3 illustrates the total amount donated to the university which includes donations to academic, athletics, and healthcare programs from 2013 to 2019. This data included gifts donated by athletic donors who identified as both individuals and corporations. The lowest amount of donations was in 2019 with \$26,000,000, however this amount only includes seven months of data in 2019. In 2013, there were \$43,000,000 in donations which increased to \$52,000,000 in 2014 and 2015. In 2016, the amount increased to \$66,000,000. The largest amount of donations was in 2017, pre-TCJA, at \$97,000,000. The largest donation in 2017 was a planned gift at \$7,000,000 for the College of Business. In addition to this, the second largest donation in 2017 was also a planned gift to the Athletic Department for \$5,500,000. The third largest donation in 2017 was a planned gift to the Engineering Department for \$3,000,000. Post-TCJA, the amount of donations decreased to \$49,000,000, which was lower than the years of 2016, 2015 and 2014. The 2019 data does not include critical charitable giving days such as the annual Day of Giving in November and end-of-year giving in December, so this amount of donations is likely to increase substantially from August to December.

Table 5 illustrates a regression of the total amount of giving from 2013 to 2019. When examining the total amount of giving relative to 2017, within Table 5 column 1 and 3, in 2018 there was a decline in donations between \$1,561.66 and \$3,392.93. Relative to data in 2017, Table 5 column 3 showed a decline in donations by \$651.12 in 2019. Table 5 column 1 and 3

illustrated post-2018 giving data which was insignificant where there was a \$1,492.20 to \$3,586.38 decrease per donor in the total amount of gifts.

When examining total amount of giving and gender, females gave \$973.50 to \$2,317.17 less than their male counterparts, however, this data was not statistically significant. Of the alumni population, alumni gave \$1,690.59 to \$1,953.03 more than non-alumni donors. When observing 12 months of data from 2013 to 2018, donors who lived in-state gave more by \$465.26 per donor compared to donors living out-of-state, however, this data is insignificant. When examining seven months of data from 2013 to 2019, the total amount of giving for in-state donors was \$174.30 less per donor compared to individuals who lived out-of-state. Donors who were former student-athletes and gave to the Varsity Club donated \$7,560.82 to \$7,966.69 more per donor compared to individuals who weren't former student-athletes or associated with the athletic department.

Number of gifts. Figure 4 illustrates the total number of donations yearly including individual donors and corporate donors. These donations include all donations to academic, athletic, and healthcare funds. From January 1, 2013 to July 31, 2019, there was a total of 84,525 donations. In 2013, the total number of gifts was 11,886, which increased in 2014 to 12,884 total gifts. In 2015, the amount totaled 12,785, which increased to 13,454 gifts in 2016. The year with the largest number of gifts was in 2017 with 14,536 donations. In 2018, the amount declined to 12,446 donations, and thus far in 2019, there was a total of 6,574 donations.

Table 6 illustrates regression of the number of gifts per year for individual donors. Table 6 demonstrates an overall reduction of the number of gifts by a small amount, post-TCJA, where the data was statistically significant. When examining the number of gifts in Table 6 column 1 and 3, in 2018 there were .20 to .23 fewer total number of donations compared to the year of

2017. Within Table 6 column 3, in 2019 there were fewer total number of donations at .45 compared to the year of 2017. Within Table 6 column 2 and 4, post-2018 data was statistically significant where there were .25 to .29 fewer total amount of donations.

When examining the number of gifts and gender, females donated between .05 and .07 more gifts compared to their male counterparts. Alumni donors also gave a larger number of donations, between .62 to .84 more donations. Donors who lived in-state gave .20 to .29 more compared to individuals living out-of-state, and former student-athletes gave .79 to 1.27 more compared to individuals who were not student-athletes. All of these findings above were statistically significant.

Average gift size. Table 7 illustrates a regression of the average gift size of individual donors. When observing the average gift, within Table 7 column 1 and 3, the average gift size of donations decreased \$764.39 to \$1,124.17 per donor in 2018 compared to the year of 2017. Within Table 7 column 3, in 2019 the average gift size of a donor increased \$325.30 per donor compared to the year of 2017. Regarding 12-month data from 2013 to 2018 within Table 6 column 2, there was a decline in the average donation size by \$1,223.80 to \$1,597.09 per donor post-2018, however this number was not statistically significant. When examining seven months of data from 2013 to 2019 within Table 7 column 4, there was a greater decline in the average donation size by \$1,587.82 per donor post-2018, where this data was statistically significant. Throughout the data described in Table 7, there is weak evidence for change post-TCJA, where the data was not consistently statistically significant.

When examining average gift size over 12 months, 2013 to 2018, females gave \$807.57 to \$808.17 less per donor than male donors, where this data was statistically significant. Over seven months of data from 2013 to 2019, on average, females gave \$9.97 to \$11.52 more than

male donors, however this data was not statistically significant. When examining data from 2013 to 2018 and 2013 to 2019, alumni gave an average gift size of \$130 to 132 less per donor than non-alumni. When examining the 12-month data 2013 to 2018, donors who lived in-state had a lower average gift size by \$71 per donor. Regarding seven months of data from 2013 to 2019, in-state donors gave an average gift size of \$385.08 to \$387.89 less per donor compared to out-of-state individuals. The average gift size of a former student-athlete increased by \$2,720.27 to \$6,092.25 per donor. The data analyzing Varsity Club status was statistically significant. Of Table 6 columns 2 and 4, the state's median household income was statically significant and increased \$752.10 to \$907.77.

Split donors. Figure 5 describes total amount of individual and corporate donors by giving type of athletic-only, academic-only, and split donors. Academic-only donors include individuals giving to academic colleges and university healthcare. Split donors are individuals giving to athletics and academic programs. From 2013 to 2017, there is a slight increase, yearly, of donors within all categories. From 2013 to 2019, the highest number of donors gave to athletics. The year of 2017 had the highest number of split donors at 2,646 donors. In 2018, the number of split donors decreased to 1,972 individuals. The increased number of donors to athletics could be attributed to season ticket sales and individuals seeking to purchase football tickets at a stadium which holds over 60,000 fans and donors. Filling a stadium boosts the number of donors to athletics.

Table 8 illustrates a regression of the number of split donors, yearly, from 2013 to 2019. Regarding Table 8 column 1 and 3, in 2018 donors were three to four percentage points less likely to become a split donor compared to the year of 2017. Regarding Table 8 column 3, in 2019 donors were six percentage points less likely to become a split donor compared to 2017. Of

Table 8 column 2 and 4, donors were four and five percentage points less likely to become a split donor post-2018, compared to donors in 2017.

Alumni were 12 to 13 percentage points more likely to be a split donor compared to non-alumni. Former student-athletes were 11 to 13 percentage points more likely to be a split donor compared to non-athletes. In-state donors were one percentage point more likely to become a split donor compared to out-of-state donors. All of these findings on split donor demographics (alumni status, in-state residency, and Varsity Club status) were statistically significant.

Table 3

Regression of the Number of Season Ticket Corporate Donors, 2013 – 2018

Variables	
Donor Lives In-State	0.15*** (0.01)
Donor Gave to the Varsity Club	-0.05 (0.09)
2013	0.10*** (0.02)
2014	0.13*** (0.02)
2015	0.09*** (0.02)
2016	0.06** (0.02)
2018	-0.03 (0.02)
Constant	0.28*** (0.02)
Observations	6,036
R-squared	0.03

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Figure 2. Number of Season Ticket Donors, 2013-2019

Table 4

Regression of the Number of Season Ticket Donors Yearly, 2013-2019

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Donor is Female	-0.08*** (0.00)	-0.08*** (0.00)	-0.07*** (0.00)	-0.07*** (0.00)
Donor is Alumnus	0.09*** (0.00)	0.09*** (0.00)	0.09*** (0.00)	0.09*** (0.00)
Donor lives In-State	0.05*** (0.00)	0.05*** (0.00)	0.03*** (0.00)	0.03*** (0.00)
Donor Gave to the Varsity Club	-0.00 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.01)	-0.02 (0.01)	-0.02 (0.01)
2013	0.04*** (0.01)		0.07*** (0.01)	
2014	0.04*** (0.01)		0.04*** (0.01)	
2015	0.00 (0.01)		-0.00 (0.01)	
2016	0.00		0.01	

	(0.01)		(0.01)	
2018	-0.08***		-0.07***	
	(0.01)		(0.01)	
2019			-0.18***	
			(0.01)	
Football Wins (Last Year)		-0.00		0.01***
		(0.00)		(0.00)
S&P 500 (Last Year)		0.00*		0.00***
		(0.00)		(0.00)
State Median Household Income		-0.01		-0.03***
		(0.01)		(0.01)
Post- 2018		-0.10***		-0.09***
		(0.01)		(0.01)
Constant	0.44***	0.74***	0.46***	1.44***
	(0.01)	(0.20)	(0.01)	(0.20)
Observations	53,088	53,088	60,249	60,249
R-squared	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.03

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Figure 3. Total Amount of Giving, 2013-2019

Table 5

Regression of the Total Amount of Giving Yearly, 2013-2019

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Donor is Female	-2,317.17* (951.72)	-2,317.17* (951.71)	-973.25 (596.66)	-972.50 (596.67)
Donor is Alumnus	1,690.59* (825.75)	1,690.59* (825.74)	1,953.03*** (514.43)	1,951.01*** (514.44)
Donor lives In-State	465.26 (848.72)	465.26 (848.71)	-174.30 (534.34)	-172.72 (534.35)
Donor Gave to the Varsity Club	7,560.82** (2,780.13)	7,560.82** (2,780.12)	7,966.69*** (1,761.06)	7,969.57*** (1,761.09)
2013	-3,323.56* (1,420.43)		-1,127.20 (952.42)	
2014	-2,681.79 (1,420.43)		201.07 (951.89)	
2015	-2,623.32 (1,420.43)		173.50 (953.56)	
2016	-1,782.28 (1,420.43)		-910.22 (950.27)	
2018	-3,392.93* (1,420.43)		-1,561.66 (954.57)	
2019			-651.12 (958.18)	
Football Wins (Last Year)		-63.54 (673.79)		-243.44 (383.94)
S&P 500 (Last Year)		-5.86 (86.53)		-13.45 (38.00)
State Median Household Income		1,374.44 (1,045.17)		420.34 (664.29)
Post- 2018		-3,586.38 (1,931.25)		-1,492.20 (1,286.86)
Constant	4,827.76*** (1,230.09)	-54,151.48 (39,027.06)	2,449.73** (814.88)	-13,496.25 (25,233.26)
Observations	53,088	53,088	60,249	60,249
R-squared	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, *

p<0.05

Figure 4. Number of Donations, 2013-2019

Table 6

Regression of the Total Number of Gifts Yearly, 2013-2019

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Donor is Female	0.07*	0.07*	0.05*	0.05*
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Donor is Alumnus	0.84***	0.84***	0.62***	0.62***
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Donor lives In-State	0.29***	0.29***	0.20***	0.20***
	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Donor Gave to the Varsity Club	1.27***	1.27***	0.79***	0.79***
	(0.09)	(0.09)	(0.07)	(0.07)
2013	-0.31***		-0.23***	
	(0.05)		(0.04)	
2014	-0.21***		-0.20***	
	(0.05)		(0.04)	
2015	-0.21***		-0.15***	
	(0.05)		(0.04)	
2016	-0.12**		-0.07	
	(0.05)		(0.04)	

2018	-0.23***		-0.20***	
	(0.05)		(0.04)	
2019			-0.45***	
			(0.04)	
Football Wins (Last Year)		-0.03		0.04**
		(0.02)		(0.01)
S&P 500 (Last Year)		-0.00		0.01***
		(0.00)		(0.00)
State Median Household Income		0.14***		0.05
		(0.04)		(0.03)
Post- 2018		-0.29***		-0.25***
		(0.07)		(0.05)
Constant	0.86***	-5.06***	0.83***	-1.59
	(0.04)	(1.32)	(0.03)	(0.97)
Observations	53,088	53,088	60,249	60,249
R-squared	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Table 7

Regression of the Average Gift Size Yearly, 2013-2019

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Donor is Female	-808.17*	-807.57*	11.52	9.97
	(339.40)	(339.39)	(464.05)	(464.03)
Donor is Alumnus	-130.75	-130.28	132.44	132.12
	(288.13)	(288.12)	(392.03)	(392.00)
Donor lives In-State	-71.14	-71.83	-387.89	-385.08
	(296.43)	(296.42)	(404.39)	(404.37)
Donor Gave to the Varsity Club	2,720.27**	2,720.52**	6,091.20***	6,092.25***
	(827.59)	(827.57)	(1,168.25)	(1,168.21)
2013	-1,116.51*		-1,184.24	
	(482.50)		(682.95)	
2014	-817.08		-534.09	
	(485.22)		(693.68)	
2015	-1,093.43*		-1,205.17	
	(491.23)		(704.72)	
2016	-336.44		-757.67	
	(492.51)		(700.97)	
2018	-764.39		-1,124.17	
	(508.21)		(730.69)	
2019			-325.30	

			(790.93)	
Football Wins (Last Year)		-217.43		-319.88
		(231.22)		(284.50)
S&P 500 (Last Year)		-25.27		-23.45
		(29.98)		(29.98)
State Median Household Income		752.10*		907.77
		(357.65)		(484.67)
Post- 2018		-1,223.80		-1,597.09
		(675.42)		(955.18)
Constant		-		
	2,869.43***	27,290.42*	3,011.27***	-33,008.63
	(436.51)	(13,352.31)	(617.48)	(18,379.54)
Observations	30,604	30,604	33,165	33,165
R-squared	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Figure 5. Number of Split Donors, 2013 – 2019

Table 8

Regression of the Number of Split Donors Yearly, 2013-2019

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Donor is Female	-0.01** (0.00)	-0.01** (0.00)	-0.01** (0.00)	-0.01** (0.00)
Donor is Alumnus	0.13*** (0.00)	0.13*** (0.00)	0.12*** (0.00)	0.12*** (0.00)
Donor lives In-State	0.01** (0.00)	0.01** (0.00)	0.01*** (0.00)	0.01*** (0.00)
Donor Gave to the Varsity Club	0.13*** (0.01)	0.13*** (0.01)	0.11*** (0.01)	0.11*** (0.01)
2013	-0.01** (0.00)		-0.02*** (0.00)	
2014	-0.02*** (0.00)		-0.01** (0.00)	
2015	-0.02*** (0.00)		-0.03*** (0.00)	
2016	-0.01* (0.00)		0.00 (0.00)	
2018	-0.04*** (0.00)		-0.03*** (0.00)	
2019			-0.06*** (0.00)	
Football Wins (Last Year)		0.00 (0.00)		-0.00 (0.00)
S&P 500 (Last Year)		0.00 (0.00)		0.00 (0.00)
State Median Household Income		0.01 (0.00)		0.01*** (0.00)
Post- 2018		-0.04*** (0.01)		-0.05*** (0.01)
Constant	0.07*** (0.00)	-0.21 (0.13)	0.06*** (0.00)	-0.47*** (0.12)
Observations	53,088	53,088	60,249	60,249
R-squared	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.04

Standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Results by Prior Giving

Tables 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 group individual donors by their prior giving level under the following outcomes: number of season ticket donors, total amount of giving, number of gifts, average gift size, and number of split donors. Columns 1 and 2 analyzed data of 12 months (January to December) over the years of 2013 to 2018. Columns 3 and 4 analyzed data from January 1st to July 31st from 2013 to 2019. Columns 1 and 3 displays the same data as the first regression to include information on the donor's gender and alumni status, corporate donations, the donor's residency, and the donor's Varsity Club status. These columns also include variables that might affect donation patterns such as Standard and Poor 500 Index (S&P 500), the median household income of the state where the anonymous university is located, and previous football wins of the anonymous university.

Columns 2 and 4 categorize donors into two groups based on their prior giving level patterns. The middle group of donors gave an average annual gift of \$3,000 to \$10,000. The high group of donors contributed an average annual gift of \$10,000 or more prior to the years each outcome was measured. The low group was not noted on the regression table, but this includes a group of donors who gave \$3,000 average annual or less. Both, middle and high groups on the regression table were compared to these lower level donors. These giving groups were defined around the standard tax deduction to better understand how tax incentives play a role in giving patterns. With the TCJA, an individual filer's tax deduction increased from \$6,000 in 2017 to \$12,000 in 2018 (Dickler & Epperson, 2018). When analyzing these groups, pre-TCJA and post-TCJA, shifts in giving patterns should illuminate if tax deductions or policy change have a role in charitable giving. The low group is least likely to be affected by the tax policy change because they haven't given enough in the past or present to receive a tax deduction. The middle group's

giving patterns are situated on the edge of the standard deduction cutoff, so their giving patterns might change post-2018. Prior to 2018, the high group should have been above the upper limit and is still likely above the upper limit in 2018 and 2019.

Season ticket donors. Regarding Table 9, columns 2 and 4 illustrates statistically significant differences between two groups, high and low. The middle group of donors which had an average annual donation of \$3,000 to \$10,000 and had a higher likelihood of donating of 26 to 29 percentage points relative to the low group of donors. Regarding Table 9 columns 2 and 4, the middle group declined six to twelve percentage points more post-2018, compared to the low group. This evidence suggests that the middle group had a higher association with the changes from the TCJA. Due to this, the strongest evidence suggests that the middle group also had a higher reduction in the likelihood of purchasing season tickets, post-TCJA. However, with these findings, it's still unknown the exact number of individuals in this group who itemized pre-TCJA and post-TCJA. The high-level group had a higher likelihood of donating 21 to 23 percentage points more compared to the lower level donors. Within Table 9 column 2 and 4, the high group had a lower likelihood to donate between ten to twelve percentage points post-2018 compared to the lower-level donors.

When examining the number of season ticket donors, factors which could play a larger role on the impact of these donations include alumni status, the donor's residency, and the previous year's football wins. According to Table 9, alumni status was statistically significant where there is a higher likelihood of purchasing season tickets if the donor is an alumnus, between eight and nine percentage points, and there is a higher likelihood if the donor lives in-state, between two and five percentage points. The number of football wins, in previous years, did not have a large relationship with the number of season ticket donors.

Total amount of giving. Table 10 illustrates a regression of the total amount of giving by prior giving level. When comparing all of the data on Table 10, there is inconsistent evidence for change post-TCJA. The total amount of giving for individuals in the middle group is \$5,646.92 to \$12,475.04 higher than the low group, on average. The total amount of giving for individuals in the high group is \$30,713.90 to \$72,427.17 more per donor compared to the low group. According to Table 10 column 2 which included full year data from 2013 to 2018, middle group donors increased donations by \$648.54 donor post-2018 compared to the low group. Table 10 column 4 which includes half-year data from 2013 to 2019, middle group donors decreased their donation by \$9,291.74, and this result was statistically significant. Regarding Table 10, column 2 and 4, high group donors decreased their donation from \$14,339.52 to \$45,411.11 per donor. Results for high level donors were statistically significant.

Number of gifts. Table 11 illustrates the number of gifts by prior giving levels. The overall findings of Table 11 describes a reduction of donations by the high group, post-TCJA. Individuals in the middle group gave 1.07 to 1.32 more gifts on average compared to the low group. Of the middle group, Table 11 column 2 illustrates that middle donors gave .01 to .07 less post-TCJA compared to donors in the lower level. The number of gifts for individuals in the high group give between 1.92 to 2.96 more, on average, compared to the low group. According to Table 11 column 2 and 4, the high group donors was .56 to .66 less per donor post-TJCA.

Average gift size. Table 12 illustrates the average gift size by prior giving levels. The middle group gave an average gift size of \$2,560.76 to \$2,984.91 per donor, and the high group gave an average gift size of \$8,790.25 to \$15,343.44 per donor. According to Table 12 column 2 which examined full-year data from 2013 to 2018, the middle group gave on average \$294.65 more per donor compared to the low group. According to Table 12 column 4 which examined

half-year data from 2013 to 2019, the middle group gave on average \$1,328.59 less than the low group of donors. In Table 12 column 2 and 4, high group donors gave on average \$3,405.92 to \$3,166.60 less than the low group, post-TCJA.

Split donors. Table 13 illustrates a regression of split donors by prior giving levels from 2013 to 2019. Split donors in the middle group, were 13 to 17 percentage points more likely to be split donors, annually, compared to the low group. Donors in the middle group were four to six percentage points less likely to be split donors compared to the low group after TCJA. Donors in the high group, were 24 to 25 percentage points more likely to be split donors, than the low group. According to Table 13 column 2 and 4, high group donors were zero to six percentage points less likely to donate post-TCJA.

Table 9

Regression of the Number Season Ticket Donors by Past Giving, 2013-2019

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Donor is Female	-0.08*** (0.00)	-0.05*** (0.01)	-0.07*** (0.00)	-0.04*** (0.01)
Donor is Alumnus	0.09*** (0.00)	0.08*** (0.00)	0.09*** (0.00)	0.09*** (0.01)
Donor Lives In-State	0.05*** (0.00)	0.03*** (0.00)	0.03*** (0.00)	0.02* (0.01)
Donor Gave to the Varsity Club	-0.00 (0.01)	-0.02 (0.02)	-0.02 (0.01)	-0.05* (0.03)
Football Wins	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.01** (0.00)	0.01*** (0.00)	-0.01 (0.01)
S&P 500	0.00* (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	0.00*** (0.00)	0.00*** (0.00)
State's Median Household Income	-0.01 (0.01)	0.01* (0.01)	-0.03*** (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
Post-2018	-0.10*** (0.01)	-0.11*** (0.01)	-0.09*** (0.01)	-0.15*** (0.02)
\$3,000 to \$10,000 (Average Annual)		0.29***		0.26***

		(0.01)		(0.02)
\$10,000 or more (Average Annual)		0.21***		0.23***
		(0.02)		(0.03)
Middle (Post-2018)		-0.12***		-0.06*
		(0.02)		(0.03)
High (Post-2018)		-0.12***		-0.10*
		(0.03)		(0.05)
Constant	0.74***	-0.03	1.44***	-0.07
	(0.20)	(0.24)	(0.20)	(0.48)
Observations	53,088	44,213	60,249	15,200
R-squared	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.06

Standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Table 10

Regression of the Total Amount of Giving by Past Giving, 2013-2019

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Donor is Female	-2,317.17*	-863.15	-972.50	-1,412.50
	(951.71)	(1,126.57)	(596.67)	(1,235.28)
Donor is Alumnus	1,690.59*	188.02	1,951.01***	1,358.38
	(825.74)	(979.33)	(514.44)	(1,076.50)
Donor Lives In-State	465.26	-418.68	-172.72	1,011.79
	(848.71)	(1,002.79)	(534.35)	(1,114.99)
Donor Gave to the Varsity Club	7,560.82**	4,120.16	7,969.57***	-2,467.22
	(2,780.12)	(3,279.73)	(1,761.09)	(3,575.37)
Football Wins	-63.54	40.12	-243.44	1,405.59
	(673.79)	(825.02)	(383.94)	(967.10)
S&P 500	-5.86	14.67	-13.45	90.34
	(86.53)	(99.97)	(38.00)	(73.88)
State's Median Household Income	1,374.44	964.69	420.34	-2,499.15
	(1,045.17)	(1,351.32)	(664.29)	(1,707.82)
Post-2018	-3,586.38	-2,044.30	-1,492.20	3,981.30
	(1,931.25)	(2,265.99)	(1,286.86)	(2,992.38)
\$3,000 to \$10,000 (Average Annual)		5,646.92**		12,475.04***
		(2,085.46)		(2,533.51)

\$10,000 or more (Average Annual)		72,427.17*** (3,162.70)		30,713.90*** (4,192.86)
Middle (Post-2018)		648.54 (4,616.55)		-9,291.74* (3,849.50)
High (Post-2018)		-45,411.11*** (6,528.67)		-14,339.52* (6,282.77)
Constant	-54,151.48 (39,027.06)	-39,525.27 (50,595.31)	-13,496.25 (25,233.26)	93,484.14 (64,678.12)
Observations	53,088	44,213	60,249	15,200
R-squared	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01

Standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Table 11

Regression of the Number of Gifts by Past Giving, 2013-2019

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Donor is Female	0.07* (0.03)	0.19*** (0.04)	0.05* (0.02)	0.14** (0.04)
Donor is Alumnus	0.84*** (0.03)	0.74*** (0.03)	0.62*** (0.02)	0.58*** (0.04)
Donor Lives In-State	0.29*** (0.03)	0.20*** (0.03)	0.20*** (0.02)	0.17*** (0.04)
Donor Gave to the Varsity Club	1.27*** (0.09)	1.13*** (0.10)	0.79*** (0.07)	0.52*** (0.13)
Football Wins	-0.03 (0.02)	0.00 (0.03)	0.04** (0.01)	-0.00 (0.03)
S&P 500	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	0.01*** (0.00)	0.01* (0.00)
State's Median Household Income	0.14*** (0.04)	0.08 (0.04)	0.05 (0.03)	0.03 (0.06)
Post-2018	-0.29*** (0.07)	-0.22** (0.07)	-0.25*** (0.05)	-0.32** (0.11)
\$3,000 to \$10,000 (Average Annual)		1.32*** (0.07)		1.07*** (0.09)
\$10,000 or more (Average Annual)		2.69*** (0.10)		1.92*** (0.15)
Middle (Post-2018)		-0.01 (0.15)		-0.07 (0.14)
High (Post-2018)		-0.56**		-0.66**

Constant	-5.06*** (1.32)	(0.21) -2.91 (1.61)	-1.59 (0.97)	(0.22) -0.71 (2.31)
Observations	53,088	44,213	60,249	15,200
R-squared	0.02	0.05	0.02	0.05

Standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05

Table 12

Regression of the Average Gift Size by Past Giving, 2013-2019

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Donor is Female	-807.57* (339.39)	-232.39 (408.69)	9.97 (464.03)	-723.50 (430.90)
Donor is Alumnus	-130.28 (288.12)	-672.52 (348.91)	132.12 (392.00)	-417.88 (370.87)
Donor Lives In-State	-71.83 (296.42)	-438.98 (356.96)	-385.08 (404.37)	328.66 (380.17)
Donor Gave to the Varsity Club	2,720.52** (827.57)	2,553.30* (995.77)	6,092.25*** (1,168.21)	-1,346.64 (1,065.21)
Football Wins	-217.43 (231.22)	-218.80 (288.92)	-319.88 (284.50)	111.16 (311.73)
S&P 500	-25.27 (29.98)	-19.51 (35.18)	-23.45 (29.98)	13.74 (25.64)
State's Median Household Income	752.10* (357.65)	715.80 (473.42)	907.77 (484.67)	-115.38 (552.86)
Post-2018	-1,223.80 (675.42)	-1,274.71 (814.33)	-1,597.09 (955.18)	712.40 (973.90)
\$3,000 to \$10,000 (Average Annual)		2,560.76*** (610.68)		2,984.91*** (693.24)
\$10,000 or more (Average Annual)		15,343.44*** (903.28)		8,790.25*** (1,093.98)
Middle (Post-2018)		294.65 (1,441.28)		-1,328.59 (1,134.39)
High (Post-2018)		-3,166.60 (1,925.84)		-3,405.92 (1,742.21)
Constant	- 27,290.42* (13,352.31)	-26,419.42 (17,725.53)	-33,008.63 (18,379.54)	5,203.28 (20,946.00)
Observations	30,604	25,091	33,165	7,845

R-squared	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
Standard errors in parentheses				
*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05				

Table 13

Regression of the Number of Split Donors by Past Giving, 2013-2019

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Donor is Female	-0.01** (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	-0.01** (0.00)	-0.00 (0.01)
Donor is Alumnus	0.13*** (0.00)	0.12*** (0.00)	0.12*** (0.00)	0.11*** (0.00)
Donor Lives In-State	0.01** (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	0.01*** (0.00)	0.00 (0.01)
Donor Gave to the Varsity Club	0.13*** (0.01)	0.10*** (0.01)	0.11*** (0.01)	0.10*** (0.02)
Football Wins	0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.01 (0.00)
S&P 500	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)
State's Median Household Income	0.01 (0.00)	0.01 (0.00)	0.01*** (0.00)	0.02** (0.01)
Post-2018	-0.04*** (0.01)	-0.04*** (0.01)	-0.05*** (0.01)	-0.07*** (0.01)
\$3,000 to \$10,000 (Average Annual)		0.17*** (0.01)		0.13*** (0.01)
\$10,000 or more (Average Annual)		0.25*** (0.01)		0.24*** (0.02)
Middle (Post-2018)		-0.06*** (0.01)		-0.04* (0.02)
High (Post-2018)		-0.00 (0.02)		-0.06* (0.03)
Constant	-0.21 (0.13)	-0.29 (0.16)	-0.47*** (0.12)	-0.84** (0.29)
Observations	53,088	44,213	60,249	15,200
R-squared	0.05	0.08	0.04	0.07
Standard errors in parentheses				
*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05				

Chapter 5: Discussion

The discussion will elaborate on the central research questions of the study to discover more about athletic giving patterns under the TCJA at an anonymous, public, Division I institution. The four research questions within the overarching question examine conclusions on monetary size of donations, quantity of donations, split donors, and financial wealth of athletic donors. The discussion will elaborate on the five outcomes defined by the regression model which includes the number of season ticket donors, the total amount of giving, the number of gifts, the average gift size, and the number of split donors. The following paragraphs will discuss the key findings of the outcomes while assessing the conclusions of the central research questions. The Model of Athletic Donor Motivations (MADOM) (Ko et al., 2014) of philanthropy, vicarious achievement, commitment, affiliation, socialization, power, public recognition, or tangible benefits, will guide the discussion. The framework of MADOM variables will help understand the relationship between donor motives and the outcomes of the study.

The key findings of the study include an overall decline in season ticket donations and split donors after the TCJA. Regarding season ticket donors, there was an overall reduction of the middle group, post-TCJA. This decline was expected as the middle group was most likely to itemize before the TCJA, but not after the TCJA. High level donors had a consistent decrease in donations for all five outcomes where there was a decrease in full year data from 2013 to 2018 and a decrease in half-year data from 2013 to 2019. However, for middle group donors, there were inconsistencies in the data for total amount giving and average gift size where middle group donation amounts slightly increased when using full year data from 2013 to 2018 was analyzed, but middle group donors donation amounts decreased drastically when using half-year data but including 2019 data. Overall, data declined post-2018 for all groups of donors.

Season Ticket Donors

This study concluded an overall reduction of the number of season ticket donors after the tax policy change. The decline of season ticket donors in 2018 could be due to the elimination of the tax incentives. Donors could be cutting back on philanthropic giving and donating amounts they are more comfortable giving, instead of donating large amounts with plan to itemize by exceeding the standard deduction. Additionally, the decline in the number of season ticket donors could also be due to the new spending and saving habits. Season ticket holders might have given their 2018 season ticket donation in December 2017 to receive the tax benefit.

When examining prior giving levels post-2018, there was strong evidence which suggested a reduction in the number of season ticket donors of the middle group, who gave \$3,000 to \$10,000 annually. Prior to the reform, the middle group of donors had a higher likelihood of itemizing their season ticket donation as these individuals could itemize their donations at 80 percent. Additionally, it was easier for the middle group to itemize taxes, as the standard deduction was \$6,000 in 2017, instead of \$12,000 in 2018 to file as a single individual. The reason for the reduction in the number of season ticket donors might be due to the elimination of tax incentives, post TCJA, causing a decline in the number of season ticket donors by the middle group. Under the new reform, the middle group can no longer receive tax benefits on season ticket donations, and it could be challenging for a middle group donor to have enough deductions to exceed the new, higher level of the standard deduction. The middle group could have decreased their season ticket donations for other reasons unrelated to the tax law such as a loss of interest in the athletic programs, a lack of interest in attending games, a loss of connectedness to the University, an increased interest to donate to outside programs, or reduction

in an individual's income. The low group was not similarly influenced by the TCJA compared to the middle and high group as it is likely that these individuals didn't itemize their donations prior to 2017 and still do not after the tax policy change.

Gender differences, residential location, alumni status, former student-athletes status, and football wins are variables that might influence a season ticket holder's likelihood to donate. These factors also predict the types of MADOM motivations behind athletic donor giving patterns. Some of these MADOM motivations could include commitment, affiliation, socialization, or vicarious achievement. The paragraphs below describe donor variables that might impact the donor's decision to purchase season tickets.

Gender differences. A philanthropic, or altruistic donor, can be identified through gender differences and traditional roles. Female donors are often viewed as more selfless and self-sacrificing and have higher levels of empathy for giving and philanthropic behavior (Wiepking et al., 2011). This study confirmed that females gave less season ticket donations and less amount on-average compared to males; however, females gave a higher number of donations. While the majority of donors were males, this donor-base could be viewed as less philanthropic and selfless. When donors are less philanthropic, this is putting a larger emphasis on the importance of giving for tangible incentives or tax purposes. However, overall these finding regarding giving and gender differences were minimal, which concluded similar findings to Einolf (2011), who discovered minimal differences between the giving patterns of men and women.

Residential location. Residential location can determine the donor's level of commitment and affiliation to the institution. Donors who live in-state might work for the

university or have a strong connection with the community. Including athletic and academic donations, there were more in-state donors at 62 percent. Donors who lived in-state had a higher likelihood to purchase season tickets, up to five percentage points more compared to individuals who live out-of-state. Donors living in-state might be more likely to purchase season tickets due to travel convenience.

Alumni donors. Alumni donors had a higher likelihood between eight and nine percentage points of purchasing season tickets compared to other individuals. Alumni donors also gave a larger number of donations, between .58 and .84 more, compared to non-alumni donors. Both of these measures were statistically significant. These findings suggest that alumni purchase season tickets in order to feel feeling connected and affiliated to their alma mater. Alumni might also enjoy purchasing season tickets and attending games because they see this as an opportunity to socialize with old friends and colleagues.

Former student-athletes. Similar to alumni, former-athletes might also purchase season ticket donations for the reasons of affiliation with the institution and socialization with former team members. Former student-athletes might also attend football games due to vicarious achievement where they want to see their team win and relive the exciting experiences. While former athletes have a zero to five percentage point lower likelihood of purchasing season tickets. The reason for the decline in donations could be due to the benefits that former-athletes received when returning to the institution for a football game such as free field passes. With these benefits, there may not be a need for former athletes to purchase season tickets.

Of the Varsity Club donations, there were .52 to 1.27 more number of gifts compared to other donors. This increase in overall donations could be influenced by the former athletes'

affiliation to the institution. Division I student-athletes are extremely invested in their institution through endless team practice and competition among peer institution. These students are often marketed as the “brand” of the university, and because of these factors, they often feel more connected to their alma mater.

Football wins. A winning season makes donors and fans more excited about the upcoming season. Yet, these results suggested that past football wins played an insignificant role in donations to season tickets. Due to these conclusions, no matter if the football teams win, donors still plan to purchase season tickets and attend football games. Since football wins do not play a significant role in purchasing season tickets, these donors could be viewed as committed to the University.

Total Amount of Giving

Post-TCJA, this study concluded weak evidence for change of total amount of giving which was not consistently statistically significant. These findings were consistent for both outcomes of total amount of giving and average gift size. Post-2018 giving data for total amount of year was insignificant where there was a decrease of \$2,044.30 to \$3,586.38 per donor in the total amount of gifts with the full year data from 2013 to 2018. With the data involving half-year and the year of 2019, there was an increase of \$3,981.30. There were inconsistencies in the overall data post-2018. Additionally, there were inconsistencies in the middle group data post-2018. With full year data from 2013 to 2018, middle group donations to the University increased by a total amount of \$648.54 per donor, however when including 2019 data, the total amount giving for the middle group decreased -\$9,291.74. These inconsistencies could be caused by middle group donors still giving a larger donation to academic programs, but then altering their

giving patterns once the TCJA went into further effect. Additionally, this inconsistency could be due to individual donors not understanding exactly how the TCJA could impact their giving habits and decision to itemize or take the new standard deduction. Among many variables, one variable that could influence the total amount of giving include stock market health measured through the Standard and Poor's 500 Index.

S&P 500 index. Throughout the study, the results regarding the Standard and Poor's 500 Index (S&P 500) to measure stock market information were inconsistent and statistically insignificant. When examining S&P 500 and season ticket donations, the data was statistically significant however, the stock market had minimal impact on a donor's motivations to give. While the data on S&P 500 Index was not statistically significant, the stock market had a negative impact on donations where they would decrease \$5.86 to \$13.45 per donor or increase \$14.67 to \$90.34 per donor. Overall, this data is insignificant, and the study concludes that the stock market has a nominal influence on giving in general. Since this data is inconsistent and insignificant, it is difficult to predict whether individuals are motivated to donate for power and public recognition. These variables could be measured qualitatively by examining the giving patterns of the high group of donors to determine if the stock market plays a role in giving patterns. Additionally, in future research, high level donors could also describe how public recognition might play a role in the motivation to give additional money.

Number of Gifts

The findings for number of gifts concluded similar results to season ticket donations. In 2018, data showed that the number of donations declined. The number of donations for the middle group declined by a small amount, where this amount was not statistically significant.

However, the number of donations for the high group declined more from .56 to .66 number gifts, where this data was statistically significant. High level donors could have chosen to drop their 2018 donation and changed their giving habits. Due to this decline in donations, high level donors might not be as committed to their institution compared to low or middle group donors. The slight decline in the number of donations could be due to a shift in spending habits. In 2018, since there are fewer number of donations, it could be likely that donors are giving a one-time donation instead of setting up a payment plan. Donors could be saving their money in 2017 and 2018, in order to donate a bigger donation in 2019 and 2020 to itemize their taxes.

Average Gift Size

Regarding average gift size, this study concluded weak evidence for change post-TCJA, which is not consistently statistically significant. Post-TCJA, average gift size illustrated inconsistent evidence for change in the middle group. For average gift size, the high group decline consistently. However, data for middle group and high group were both statistically inconsistent. Both, total amount of giving and average gift size, weren't affected significantly by the TCJA. To better understand average amount of giving or total amount of giving, donors are most likely motivated by their income level. The average household income was calculated for the state where the institution is located.

Median household income. Measuring the median household income of the state which the university is located can help determine the economic viability of the state and the amount of expendable income for individuals in the state. Median household income was statistically significant and plays a role in the average gift size of a donation. The median household income had a positive impact on donations by increasing the average gift size by \$715.80 to \$907.77 per

donor. This study predicted that median household income can influence a donor's motivations to give. Wyman-Blackburn (2018) explained that the new reform would put more money back in the pockets of tax payers. With this extra expendable income, donors could be more motivated to increase their average gift size.

Number of Split Donors

The findings for the number of split donors suggested an overall reduction of the number of split donors by a small amount post-TCJA. The high group of donors is less likely to be split donors in 2018, but this group rebounded across 2018 and 2019. According to Stinson and Howard (2010), cross-cultivation begins with athletic-only donors who eventually donate to academic programs and become split donors. The number of split donors increased in 2017, similarly to the findings of the number of season ticket donors. In 2018, the number of split donors decreased drastically. This data does not draw conclusions of athletic-only donors becoming split donors, overtime, however when comparing the number of gifts in both split donors and season ticket donors post-TCJA, these trends are similar. These findings might suggest that many of these season ticket donors are split donors who dropped their donations to athletics and academics after the tax policy change.

Comparison to Past Research

Previous research conducted by Brooks (2007) and Duquette (2016) discovered that higher education institutions are less tax-sensitive compared to other organizations. Specifically, Brooks (2007) examined the impact of tax incentives throughout six nonprofit industries and determined ways which tax deductions play a role in giving patterns. The results suggested that

donations to groups such as religious entities or the United Way reacted strongly to tax incentives, while other nonprofits such as health industries and higher education have a lesser reaction to tax deductibility (Brooks, 2007). Duquette (2016) also stated that higher education institutions are less tax sensitive compared to other non-profits related healthcare, children, elderly or illness. Unlike higher education where a certain percentage of revenue is funded by the government, these non-profits are strictly dependent on donations making them more sensitive to tax law changes (Duquette, 2016)

However, the results of this study are inconsistent with Brooks' (2007) and Duquette's (2016) findings about higher education and giving. The results from these studies suggested that there is a consistent decline in giving post-2018 throughout the five outcomes of number of season ticket donors, total amount giving, number of gifts, average gifts size, and split donors. Additionally, in these conclusions recorded in Figure 3 and Figure 4, there was a consistent increase in the total amount of donations and number of donations from 2013 to 2017. Once the TCJA was established, there were changes in giving patterns and a decrease in overall donations. While other factors, such as changes in economic health and football losses could play a role in the decrease of donations, the TCJA appears to have played a role in the changes of giving patterns. Unlike Brooks (2007), results of this study suggested that individual donations to higher education are tax sensitive. Additionally, Brooks (2007) stated that individuals give to education because they often feel obligated to donate back to their alma mater which makes them less sensitive to these tax changes. While this assumption may be true as these individuals often feel a connection to their institution, tax changes and disposable income still influence alumni's decision to donation back to their alma mater. Unlike Brooks (2007) who examined higher education national data, this study only examined athletic data which could be more tax-sensitive

compared to other academic units in higher education. Last, this study examined a single institution, and depending on the income levels of these donors (as suggested by Rooney et al. (2018)) to this anonymous institution, these donors could be more or less tax-sensitive than the national average.

Implications for Practice

Implications for practice include developing strategic plans to increase fundraising initiatives to a select public institution after the introduction of the TCJA which may generate fundraising challenges. Due to the findings of this study, development officers and foundations can learn more about donor motivations and incentives to develop plans which cultivate and retain donors for many years. This study provides implications for athletic departments, development officers, university foundations, and donors.

Athletic departments. One key practice implication for athletic departments is to reduce the decline in season ticket donations in order to sustain or increase fundraising efforts. Along with realizing this decline in season ticket donations, college football attendance continues to decline where it has reached the lowest average in 22 years (Dodd, 2019). From 2017 to 2018, of the top 30 institutions in college football, 20 of these schools' football game attendance rates remained stagnant or declined in 2018 (Dodd, 2019). Football attendance is on the decline due a culture of convenience where fans can stay at home for free and watch their favorite teams (Dodd, 2019). Attending football games are often inconvenient and expensive (Dodd, 2019). For example, there is a financial strain of purchasing season tickets and traveling to the game, and the inconvenience of waiting in lines at the concession stands or the bathroom (Dodd, 2019). The decline in student attendance at football games can also be attributed to the various activities that

students can participate in on-campus which compete against their interest in attending a football game (Dodd, 2019).

While there has been a consistent decline in football game attendance, the TCJA adds an additional roadblock with the elimination of tax benefits. To increase these numbers, athletic departments should promote the college game day experience, which includes meeting old friends and visiting their alma mater (Dodd, 2019). This is an experience you can only gain by visiting campus, and department should continue to host alumni reunions and fan tailgates to encourage donors to visit campus and attend football games. In addition to these marketing techniques, athletic departments should upgrade Wi-Fi networks, increase bathroom capacities, add additional food and beverage options, and create more convenient parking and shuttle areas for fans. These upgrades will make attending the game more convenient to fans and donors.

Finally, athletic departments should build a culture of philanthropy. It is easy for athletic departments to incentive giving through season tickets, special event invites, signed basketballs, and other tangible gifts. The athletic department should focus on changing the mindset of athletic-giving donors to think more philanthropically about the reasons they donate. These reasons could be to help supply scholarships to athletes or help support a new athletic-academic facility. Athletic departments should encourage cross-cultivation of donors into academic areas because this will enhance the institution as a whole, boost rankings, and help with donor retention.

Priority Points & Season Ticket Donations. Donors can be offered priority points which assist in their seat selection time. In regard to the anonymous institution being studied, priority points are calculated by your current giving to athletics, consecutive years giving to the

university, consecutive years giving to athletic tickets, lifetime giving to athletics, Varsity Club status, Alumni membership, societal memberships, faculty and staff status, and giving at the university. With all of these factors to consider, assessing priority points can be complex. Even if the donor is an alumnus, former athlete, or faculty or staff member, and gave over 10 years to athletics, if the donor can't give above and beyond high giving donors or corporations, these priority points don't hold much meaning.

Once you are a member of the athletic club, basic priority points will be calculated based on donor affiliation, where these points will determine the date and time the donor will select season ticket seats. These priority points include alumni status (1 point), current faculty/staff status (1 point), former student-athlete status (1 point), consecutive years giving to season tickets (1 point every 5 years) and consecutive years giving to academic or health sciences (1 point every five years). While these factors do not incentivize donors to give more to the annual athletic donation, this equation values donors who are affiliated and committed to the institution, and when individuals feel valued, they continue to invest in the institution. With the results of this study finding a reduction of season ticket donations by the middle group, donors giving \$3,000 to \$10,000 annually, this new model will incentivize that middle group to join the athletic club, have the opportunity to select football seats they deserve, and possibly donate more to get those tickets. This process is fairer for the middle group donors because it focuses more on affiliation instead of large donations. For institutional ranking purposes, it is critical to continue increasing season ticket donations for ranking purposes, however there should be less of a push for donors to increase their donation and more of an emphasis on donor appreciation and commitment. This may seem contradictory when looking to increase dollars raised, but it will have long-term benefits in the retention of donors.

As an alternative plan, the athletic donation should be disconnected from the season ticket process. The athletic donation can still range from \$100 to \$6,500 and above, however, the amount is disconnected from the location of your season tickets or the date and time of your seat selection process. The donation is simply to become a member of the athletic club and to have the capability to purchase season tickets. While still requiring season ticket holders to contribute a donation is beneficial to the athletic department in terms of revenue raised, this tactic doesn't present incentives for donating large amounts. Now that this donation is disconnected from the seat selection process, it is critical to find a way to get donors excited and interested in donating larger amounts. Instead of the athletic donation going straight to the general athletic fund, the donation could be set aside for football scholarships or other student-athlete scholarships. The donation could also benefit a new football facility or new stadium seats. While donors can no longer collect tax incentives through this donation, with these new incentives, they will be more willing to donate larger amounts because the money is going directly to the athletic program's success or the student-athletes success.

With the new season ticket model where the athletic donations are disconnected from the season ticket cost, donors will select their football seats based on the cost of that particular seat. This new model could give low group and middle group donors the opportunity to purchase better seats without competing with large companies and feeling pressured to donate exponential amounts towards the athletic donations. However, in order for the athletic departments to continue making money, the cost of each football seat will increase compared to prior years. While the cost of each seat is increasing, this model still offers valued donors a better chance to purchase the exact seat they want without competing with big-money donors.

In addition to providing a different season ticket process, athletic departments should focus on different tactics to yield income through football mini plans. Now that there is less of an incentive to purchase season tickets, mini plans allow fans to pick a package of three to five football games per season without an athletic donation. The middle group of donors might be more interested in these mini packs because they cost less, and it is less of a financial commitment.

Development officers. Development officers can benefit from this research because the study provides results through numerical and monetary values. This study shows trends over time and examines a large dataset for accurate result. The information on donor's demographics such as gender, alumni status, and prior giving can help development officers target prospective donors. Development officers can learn more about donor motivations to guide a successful solicitation process.

Development officers should better understand donor groups by giving amount and household income to gain a better understanding of groups who are declining in donations in order to set new initiatives in place to increase and retain donations. This information is critical for development officers to understand which groups of donors are dropping their donations and which group of donors are donating the same amounts after the TCJA. If development officers are aware that the middle group of donors are decreasing donations, post-TCJA, development officers could put new incentives in place for these donors. Development officers can learn to work with donors who might need to adjust their giving patterns to make donating to the intuition more convenient.

To increase donations, development officers need to nurture internal university relationships. These individuals can work with other internal departments to grow fan interest and increase funding. The decline in football attendance isn't going to be solved by one department. Firstly, athletic development officers should partner with the Alumni Association to invest in their alumni. To get more alumni involved, development officers must work in conjunction with the Alumni Association to develop a plan to get more alumni involved through exclusive tailgate tents, access to exclusive rooms at the stadium, free food during the game, low-cost game day packages.

In addition to building alumni connections, development officers should increase the number of young alumni donors. Today, attracting young alumni is difficult due to trends in the job market and student loan debt (Seltzer, 2016). There are several ways to get young alumni more involved in fundraising, however the first and most important strategy is helping them finding a job to they have a good foundation to build expendable income in the future (Seltzer, 2016). Development officers can also attract young alumni through social media efforts, texting, and crowdfunding campaigns (Seltzer, 2016). These online campaigns require smaller donation amounts where groups of people compete to raise funds for a specific goal (Seltzer, 2016). With these tactics, development officers can stay connected to young alumni and work with them overtime to increase their funding efforts.

In addition to alumni, development officers must invest in the game day experience by supporting the groups who help to create the experience – the marching band, dance team, and cheerleaders. These groups provide free marketing for the football team and university, and also attract a different type of fan-base, donor-base, and parent groups. By putting strategies in place

to attract this potentially new donor-base willing to support these groups, athletic departments could increase their funding. Some of these strategies includes priority points, game day recognition days, tailgate packages, section-specific seating arrangements, or lower priced game day packages. In addition to these game day recognition days, universities can promote other groups on campus such as student veterans, young alumni, college seniors, and incoming freshman. Through these initiatives, athletic departments can build connections across campus while increasing revenue.

University foundations. University foundations can benefit immensely from this study by learning more about the changes that are occurring in giving patterns over time. If donations are dwindling, foundations may need to rethink their fundraising plans, gift agreements, policies, and deadlines to accommodate their donor-base. By altering these fundraising plans to accommodate donors, foundations are more likely to retain and attract donors, which will increase the amount of donations over time.

Donors. This research can teach current donors more about the implications of the TCJA on their charitable gift. While there is not much research on this topic, this study shows the beginnings of how donors will be affected by the policy change. Through this study, donors can learn more about their own motivations, tangible incentives, and potential for tax benefits. With the enactment of the TCJA, donors might be interested in exploring alternative financial giving plans through donor-advised funds, payment plans or bunching gifts to reach their maximum donation amount.

Implications for Future Research

There are several implications for future research which could help higher education professionals discover more about charitable giving under the new tax reform. Firstly, while this study examined one public, Division I, Power 5 institution, it would be beneficial to examine other institutions of similar status to compare the results. Institutions of different background such as Division II and III schools, community colleges, and private institutions should be investigated to determine more about donor motivations which will help increase donations. In addition to studying various nonprofits, the study should investigate upcoming years beyond 2019. This information would predict a more accurate trajectory charitable giving patterns and revenue patterns, post-TCJA.

Qualitative methodology. Through the current study, with quantitate methodology, researchers could examine a large quantity of data with over 53,088 donations over six-in-a-half years. A quantitative approach also provides a unique perspective on a large scale by investigating charitable giving patterns through monetary values and numeric values. However, this study could benefit from investigating data through a qualitative approach. With this new approach, researchers could survey and interview donors to discover more about their motivations behind itemizing and incentives. Some questions that could be asked include: why do you donate or what motivates you to donate; do you itemize your taxes or do tax benefits play a role your giving patterns; do you give altruistically; if you are a split donor, did you first give to athletics or academics; and do you give to any nonprofits outside of higher education? Additionally, through surveys or interviews, researchers could receive more accurate and current information on age, birth date, marital status, occupation, and alumni status.

Grouping donors by giving habits. In addition to this study, future research should reconsider grouping donors to better reflect how individuals can be impacted by the policy change. The current study groups donors as low (\$3,000 or below, average annual), middle (\$3,000 to \$10,000 average annual) and high (\$10,000 and above, average annual). Reorganizing and regrouping donors differently by average donations could allow researchers to see the difference among donor groups or income levels.

Furthermore, if the middle group expresses the most change in giving overtime researchers could further analyze this group of donors to discover the causes behind changes in giving patterns. While the current study estimated groups of donors (itemizers versus non-itemizers), new donor groups could be analyzed more accurately using tax data retrieved from surveys or tax returns. Examining tax returns or surveyed answers would help researchers better understand the giving patterns between income groups and tax incentives. The select group could be analyzed further using a prospect software, iWave, to discover more about the donor's giving history in higher education and among other nonprofits, prospect of wealth, political leanings, and other interests. This research can provide a better understanding of the specific group of donors affected by the TCJA.

Monthly giving patterns. Through this research, 2017 had the highest number of donations. This increase in giving and change in giving pattern could have been caused by the unforeseeable modifications of the TCJA on charitable tax incentives. Prior to January 2018, donors were knowledgeable about the elimination to deduct season ticket donations and the increase in the standard deduction. Some donors, especially those donors in the high group according to the results, might have given their 2018 donations in December 2017 to receive tax

benefits prior to the policy change. In order to discover more about whether donors gave at the end of 2017, future research should examine donations from August 1 to December 31st from 2013 to 2018. By viewing this data monthly and yearly, researchers could determine if the majority of these donations were given when donors learned about the policy change, or if there are other factors that might have caused this increase such as large campaigns.

Academic vs. athletic donations. Further examination should focus on the past giving history of academic and athletic donations, separately, to better understand how these donations are changes overtime and post-TCJA. Academic donations, monetary size and number of gifts, should be studied from 2013 to 2019. Similar studies should be conducted on athletic donations and split donations. These three categories will then be examined to determine if there were significant changes in one donation type compared to the other type. For example, if athletic donations decreased in 2018 and 2019, but there is a slight increase in academic donations in 2018 and 2019, this consequence could be triggered by donor's decreasing their season ticket donations due to the tax policy change. Instead of donating to athletics in 2018, the donor may have given their donations to an academic program instead. Split donors could also be observed to learn more about the increases or decreases in this group post-TCJA. This study will help researchers recognize the relationship between athletic and academic donation patterns.

Donor characteristics. Donor characteristics of alumni status or gender could be studied further by running a separate regression to examine how these variables changes post-TCJA. The current regression to this study examines the average annual giving patterns of each donor overtime when considering the years of 2013 to 2019. However, this study doesn't specifically note the changes in groups of alumni and gender post-TCJA. For example, a study could

examine if the number of donations of alumni decline or incline post-TCJA. Instead, this current study examines the average change in giving patterns of alumni over time but does not specifically examine these individuals post-2018.

In addition to alumni status and gender, future research could examine faculty staff status majors, and occupation or position. For the donors who are alumni at the institution, the profiles of these individuals could hold information on their occupation, position, or major. The occupations will illustrate whether the donor is a faculty or staff member at the institution. Discovering more about the donor's occupation or position will provide insight to MADOM variables of commitment, affiliation, and philanthropic giving.

Special events and sport-specific funds. Additional research could be completed on donors attending athletic special events in order to understand more about donor motives and incentives. Individuals who donated to receive tickets to an event may be more willing to donate elsewhere if tax incentives or other tangible incentives are made available. In addition to this special event research, sport-specific giving should be analyzed to understand why donors give to a specific team. When individuals donate to sport-specific funds, they often receive tangible benefits through invites to special events, limited addition clothing items, team newsletters, and calendars. Donors who give to these funds are often committed and affiliated to the organization. If development officers learn more about these donors, they can encourage them to become committed in a different area or cross-cultivate to another program. These donors are often already interested in the university, they just need introduced to more opportunities. Cross-cultivation of these donors can help increase donations to the university.

Median U.S. household income. As an alternative to investigating the state median household income, the median U.S household income could be used as a variable in future studies. Sixty-three percent of the current donor pool lived in the same state as the anonymous university. Due to such a high percentage, state median household income was used throughout the study as a regression variable. However, future studies might benefit from using the median U.S. household income as 37 percent of the donor pool lived out-of-state. Using median U.S. income could provide a more comprehensive analysis by considering the income of all U.S. citizens, not just individuals living in a single state.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

This study contributed conclusions on a topic that is relevant, controversial, with minimal research. Many athletic fundraising offices had only speculated the impact of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (TCJA) (2017) on athletic giving patterns. With the elimination of the tax deduction of athletic season tickets and an increase in the standard deduction, many athletic foundations were speculating a decline in donations and donor interest. Not only is this study relevant, it provided quantitative conclusions by examining monetary and nominal giving patterns from 2013 to 2019 of a single Division I, Power 5, public institution.

The study highlighted an overall reduction of the number of season ticket donors, a reduction of the number of split donors, and a reduction of the number of gifts post-TCJA. Additionally, the findings highlighted a reduction of the number of gifts for donors in the high group. The reason for this decline could be due to the elimination of tax benefits on season tickets or refinancing spendable income to accommodate the tax policy change. This study also highlighted an overall reduction of season ticket donations of the middle group, who had a higher likelihood of being affected by the increase of the standard deduction and the elimination of tax benefits.

The practical implications of this study for athletic departments and athletic development officers is vital to the success of athletic fundraising moving forward. By learning more about the overall reduction of season ticket donations and the reduction of middle group donors, athletic foundations can develop a new plan to accommodate the financial challenges facing athletic donors. Some of these plans could include creating new incentives to season ticket donations, developing a revised model for season tickets, or creating bundle packages to help donors reach the standard deduction through split-giving. This study can provide athletic development officers with more information on donor demographics, interests and motivations that will be beneficial

during the solicitation process. Through the theoretical framework of MADOM, and learning more about motivations specific to athletic donors, development officers can discover reasons why athletic donors choose to donate and how they can use these motivations to incentivize donors to further invest in the university. Specific to this study, development officers can better understand philanthropic donors and how these individuals are impacted by the TCJA by analyzing trends and donor groups to determine which group might give more philanthropically. This study also analyzes the MADOM variable of demonstration of commitment by examining consecutive years giving overtime of each group - low, middle and high-level donors. Commitment and affiliation were better understood by examining alumni status, non-alumni donors and donor residential proximity to the University. Finally, the MADOM variable of tangible benefits provides development officers information on the donor motivations in regard to tax incentives or football season ticket benefits. Examining split donors can also help development officers understand if individuals continue to give to athletics and/or academics post-TCJA and with or without benefits.

This research analyzed giving patterns under the TCJA, which assists athletic development officers to predict future trends and monetary estimates under the new tax policy. With these data trends, development officers can create a contingency plan to increase donations for athletic programs, which in turn, could increase donations to academic programs. With 20 percent of funding per student cut to higher education (Mitchell, Leachman, & Masterson, 2016), this study is critical to explore. The success of an athletic department can provide priceless benefits to an institution through marketing efforts, student recruitment, and alumni connections. Many researchers such as Goff (2000), Humphreys and Mondello (2007) and Meer and Rosen (2018) have proven that athletic programs have impacted higher education in a positive light.

This research of athletic donations is essential because the financial prosperity of the athletic department is directly linked to the institutional success in a competitive higher education marketplace.

References

- Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 4, 142-175.
- Bastedo, M., Samuels, E., & Kleinman, M. (2014). Do charismatic presidents influence college applications and alumni donations? Organizational identity and performance in US higher education. *Higher Education*, 68(3), 397-415. doi:10.1007/s10734-014-9719-z
- Bekkers, R. & Wiepking P. (2011). A literature review of empirical studies of philanthropy: Eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 40(5), 924–973. doi:10.1177/ 0899764010380927
- Belk, R. W. (1979). Gift-giving behavior. In J. N. Sheth (Ed.), *Research in Marketing* (Vol. 2 pp. 95-126). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press Inc.
- Bendapudi, N., Singh, S. N., & Bendapudi, V. (1996). Enhancing helping behavior: An integrative framework for promotion planning. *Journal of Marketing*, 60, 33-49.
- Billing, J. E., Holt, D., & Smith, J. (1985). *Athletic fund-raising: Exploring the motives behind donations*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.
- Borden, V., Shaker, G., & Kienker, B. (2014). The impact of alumni status on institutional giving by faculty and staff. *Research in Higher Education*, 55(2), 196-217. doi:10.1007/s11162-013-9318-3
- Brady, M. K., Noble, C. H., Utter, D. J., & Smith, G. E. (2002). How to give and receive: An exploratory study of charitable hybrids. *Psychology and Marketing*, 19, 919-944.

- Breiman, L., Friedman, J. H., Olshen, R. A., & Stone, C. J. (1984). *Classification and regression trees*. New York, NY: Chapman & Hall.
- Brill, A. & Choe, D. (2018). *Charitable giving and the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act*. Economic Perspectives. Retrieved from <https://www.case.org/system/files/media/file/Charitable-Giving-and-the-Tax-Cuts-and-Jobs-Act.pdf>
- Brooks, A. (2007). Income tax policy and charitable giving. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 26(3), 599-599. doi:10.1002/pam.20267
- Caulkins, J. P., Cole, J., & Hardoby, M. (2002). *Intelligent giving: Insights and strategies for higher education donors*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Cheslock, J. & Gianneschi, M. (2008). Replacing state appropriations with alternative revenue sources: The case of voluntary support. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 79(2), 208-229. doi:10.1080/00221546.2008.11772092
- Cheslock, J. & Knight, D. (2015). Diverging revenues, cascading expenditures, and ensuing subsidies: The unbalanced and growing financial strain of intercollegiate athletics on universities and their students. *Journal of Higher Education*, 86(3), 417-447.
- Chung, D.J. (2015). How much is a win worth? An application to intercollegiate athletics. *Management Science*, 63(2). doi:10.1287/mnsc.2015.2337
- Clotfelter, C. T. & Salamon, L. M. (1982). The impact of the 1981 tax act on individual charitable giving. *National Tax Journal*, 35(2), 171-187.

- Cohen, C., Whisenant, W., & Walsh, P. (2011). The relationship between sustained success and donations for an athletic department with a premier football program. *Public Organization Review*, 11(3), 255-263. doi:10.1007/s11115-010-0122-7
- Cross, M. (2018). The new rules of philanthropy. *Kiplinger's Personal Finance*, 72(4), 66-70.
- Delaney, E. N. (1981). The Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981. *American Bar Association Journal*, 67(10), 1266.
- Desrochers, D. M. & Hurlburt, S. (2016). *Trends in college spending: 2003-2013*. Retrieved from <https://www.deltacostproject.org>
- Dickler, J. & Epperson, S. (2018, May 13). What the new tax law means for your charitable giving. *Customer News and Business Channel*. Retrieved from <https://www.cnbc.com/>
- Dodd, D. (2019, March 25). College football can look to KISS to win fans back after lowest average attendance in 22 years. *CBS Sports*. Retrieved from cbssports.com
- Duquette, N. (2016). Do tax incentives affect charitable contributions? Evidence from public charities' reported revenues. *Journal of Public Economics*, 137, 51-69.
doi:10.1016/j.jpubeco.2016.02.002
- Einolf, C. (2011). Gender differences in the correlates of volunteering and charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40(6), 1092-1112.
doi:10.1177/0899764010385949
- Enzi, M., Tester, J., Grassley, C., Shaheen, J., Fischer, D., Van Hollen, C., & McConnell, M. (2018). The pros and cons of the republican tax reform legislation. *Congressional Digest*, 97(1), 10-29.

Farrow, H. & Yuan, Y. (2011). Building stronger ties with alumni through Facebook to increase volunteerism and charitable giving. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 16(3), 445-464. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2011.01550.x

Feldstein, M. (1975). The income tax and charitable contributions: Part II—the impact on religious, educational and other organizations. *National Tax Journal*, 28(2), 209–226.

Freeland, R. E., Spenner, K. I., & McCalmon, G. (2015). I gave at the campus. *Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 44(4), 755-774. doi:10.1177/0899764014529625

Gale, W. G. (2018). (Not so) happy birthday to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. *Tax Policy Center*. Retrieved from <https://www.taxpolicycenter.org/taxvox/not-so-happy-birthday-tax-cuts-and-jobs-act>

Giving to the U.S. higher education: A snapshot. (2018). *Council of Advancement and Support of Education*. Retrieved from https://www.case.org/system/files/media/file/GivingToUS_Higher%20Ed_2018_0.pdf

Gleckman, H. (2018, January 8). 21 Million taxpayers will stop taking the charitable deduction under the TCJA. *Tax Policy Center: Urban Institute and Brookings Institution*. Retrieved from <https://www.taxpolicycenter.org/>

Goff, B. (2000). Effects of university athletics on the university: A review and extension of empirical assessment. *Journal of Sport Management*, 14, 85-104.

Grant, D. (1991). Tax codes changed, giving. *The Christian Science Monitoring*.

Harbaugh, W. T. (1998). What do donations buy? A model of philanthropy based on prestige and warm glow. *Journal of Public Economics*, 67, 269-285.

- Hawkins, L. & Versace, C. (2017, March 21). There's a big difference between Reaganomics and Trumponomics. *Business Insider*. Retrieved from <https://www.businessinsider.com/>
- Hazelrigg, N. (2019, June 20). Larger donations, fewer donors. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/>
- Holmes, A. & Rafferty, A. (2019). Trump's tax law threatens charities. The poor will pay. *The Center for Public Integrity*. Retrieved from <https://publicintegrity.org/business/trumps-tax-law-threatens-charities-the-poor-will-pay/>
- Humphreys, B. R. & Mondello, M. (2007). Intercollegiate athletic success and donations at NCAA Division I institutions. *Journal of Sport Management*, 21(2), 265-280.
- Intuit TurboTax. (2019). *Tax terms glossary*. Retrieved from <https://turbotax.intuit.com/tax-tips/general/tax-terms-glossary/L2M1PfoYy#S>
- Jaschik, S. (2019, February 11). Giving to colleges is up 7.2%. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/>
- Jenkins, J. (2017, December 21). Tax reform to impact WVU athletics, donors. *MetroNews*. Retrieved from <http://wvmetronews.com/>
- Ko, Y. J., Kim, H. Y., & Sagas, M., (2016). Donor motivation in college sport: Does contribution level matter? *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 44(6), 1015-1032. doi:10.2224/sbp.2016.44.6.1015
- Ko, Y. J., Rhee, Y. C., Walker, M., & Lee, J. (2014). What motivates donors to athletic programs: A new model of donor behavior. *Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(3), 523-546. doi:10.1177/0899764012472065

- Lara, C. & Johnson, D. (2014). The anatomy of a likely donor: Econometric evidence on philanthropy to higher education. *Education Economics*, 22(3), 293-304.
doi:10.1080/09645292.2013.766672
- Mahony, D. F., Gladden, J. M., & Funk, D. C. (2003). Examining athletic donors at NCAA Division I institutions. *International Sports Journal*, 7(1), 9.
- Mathur, A. (1996). Older adults' motivations for gift giving to charitable organizations: An exchange theory perspective. *Psychology & Marketing*, 13(1), 107-107.
- McGregor-Loendes, M., Newton, C., & Marsden, S. (2006). Did tax incentives play any part in increased giving? *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 41(4), 495-509.
- Meer, J. & Rosen, H. (2009). The impact of athletic performance on alumni giving: An analysis of microdata. *Economics of Education Review*, 28(3), 287-294.
doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2008.06.003
- Meer, J. & Rosen, H (2012). *Does generosity beget generosity? Alumni giving and undergraduate financial aid*. Retrieved from <https://www.nber.org/papers/w17861>
- Meer, J. & Rosen, H. S. (2018). *Measuring motives for charitable giving*. Retrieved from <http://www.nber.org/reporter/2018number1/rosen.html>
- Mitchell, M., Leachman, M., & Masterson, K. (2016). Funding down, tuition up. *Center on Budget and Policy Priorities*. Retrieved from <https://www.cbpp.org/research/state-budget-and-tax/funding-down-tuition-up>
- Monroe, K. R. (2009). Altruism: By Niall Scott and Jonathan Seglow. *Political Psychology*, 30(3), 502-504. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2009.00710.x

- National Science Board. (2018). *Higher education: State and student resources for higher education*. Retrieved from <https://nsf.gov/statistics/state-indicators/compare/state-and-student-resources-for-higher-education/years>
- Nesbit, R., Christensen, R., Tschirhart, M., Clerkin, R., & Paarlberg, L. (2015). Philanthropic mobility and the influence of duration of donor residency on donation choices. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary & Nonprofit Organizations*, 26(1), 267-287.
doi:10.1007/s11266-013-9433-y
- Nickerson, M. A. (2018, April). First look at the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act: Impact on individual charitable giving. *The CPA Journal*. Retrieved from <https://www.cpajournal.com/>
- Okten, C. & Weisbrod, B. A. (2000). Determinants of donations in private nonprofit markets. *Journal of Public Economics*, 75(2), 255–272.
- Olberding, J. (2012). Does student philanthropy work? A study of long-term effects of the “learning by giving” approach. *Innovative Higher Education*, 37(2), 71-87.
doi:10.1007/s10755-011-9189-5
- Patton, S. (2012, June 27). Federal-loan changes may curb graduate study. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/>
- Payne, A. A. (2001). Measuring the effect of federal research funding on private donations at research universities: Is federal research funding more than a substitute for private donations? *International Tax and Public Finance*, 8(5), 731–751.
- Piliavin, J. A. & Charng, H. W. (1990). Altruism: A review of recent theory and research. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16, 27-65.

- Powell, S. S. (2018, Jan 10). The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 is already delivering. *Investor's Business Daily*. Retrieved from <https://search-proquest-com.www.libproxy.wvu.edu/docview/2017513368?accountid=2837>
- Tax Foundation. (2017). *Preliminary details and analysis of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act*. Retrieved from <https://taxfoundation.org/final-tax-cuts-and-jobs-act-details-analysis/>
- Tax Policy Center. (2016). *Tax policy center briefing book: Key elements of the U.S. tax system*. Retrieved from <https://www.taxpolicycenter.org/briefing-book/what-are-itemized-deductions-and-who-claims-them>
- Rosenberg, J., Steuerle, C. E., Ovalle, J., & Stallworth, J. (2016). The new debate over a charitable deduction for nonitemizers. *Urban Institute*, 1-11.
- Rooney, P., Osili, U., Kou, X., Zarins, S., & Bergdoll, J. (2018). *Tax policy and giving results*. Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/12599/tax-policy170518.pdf>
- Schervish, P.J. (1997). Inclination, obligation and association: What we know and what we need to know about donor motivation. In D.F. Burlingame (Ed.), *Critical issues in fund raising*, 110-138. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Seltzer, R. (2016, June 30). The elusive young donor. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/>
- Seltzer, R. (2018a, February 6). Giving to colleges rises by 6.3%. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/>
- Seltzer, R. (2018b, March 29). Tuition grows in importance. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/>

- Simmons, W. & Emanuele, R. (2007). Male-female giving differentials: Are women more altruistic? *Journal of Economic Studies*, 34(6), 534-550.
doi:10.1108/01443580710830989
- Speck, B. W. (2010). The growing role of private giving in financing the modern university. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2010 (149), 7–16. <https://doi-org.www.libproxy.wvu.edu/10.1002/he.376>
- Skari, L. A. (2014). Community college alumni: Predicting who gives. *Community College Review*, 42(1), 23-40. doi:10.1177/0091552113510172
- Staurowsky, E. J. (1996). Women and athletic fund raising: Exploring the connection between gender and giving. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10(4), 401-416.
- Staurowsky, E. J., Parkhouse, B., & Sachs, M. (1996). Developing an instrument to measure athletic donor behavior and motivation. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10, 262-277.
- Stephenson, A. & Bell, N. (2014). Motivation for alumni donations: A social identity perspective on the role of branding in higher education. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 19(3), 176-186. doi:10.1002/nvsm.1495
- Stinson, J. & Howard, D. (2010). Athletic giving and academic giving: Exploring the value of SPLIT donors. *Journal of Sport Management*, 24(6), 744-768.
- Sturtevant, W. (2002). *Major gifts fundraising: The mission and promise*. Keynote address at the annual Association for Arts and Sciences Advancement Professionals meeting, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Turner, S., Meserve, L. A., & Bowen, W. G. (2001). Winning and giving: Football results and alumni giving at selective private colleges and universities. *Social Science Quarterly*, 812-826.

- Venable, B. T., Rose, G. M., Bush, V. D., & Gilbert, F. W. (2005). The role of brand personality in charitable giving: An assessment and validation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 33, 295-312.
- Voluntary Support of Education. (2018). *Key findings from data collected for the 2017-18 academic fiscal year for U.S. higher education*. Retrieved from <https://www.case.org/system/files/media/file/2018%20VSE%20Research%20Brief.pdf>
- Weerts, D. J. & Ronca, J. M. (2009). Using classification trees to predict alumni giving for higher education. *Education Economics*, 17(1), 95-122.
doi:10.1080/09645290801976985
- Wiepking, P., Bekkers, R., Mesch, D., Brown, M., Moore, Z., & Hayat, A. (2011). Gender differences in charitable giving: Gender differences in charitable giving. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 16(4), 342-355.
doi:10.1002/nvsm.432
- Wyman-Blackburn, S. (2018). Higher ed responds to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. *University Business*, 21(3), 20.