

# ***How Do Young Professionals Approach Hospital Philanthropy?***

Brad Canfield

Capstone Project

Strategic Communication Masters Program

School of Journalism and Communication

University of Oregon

June 2008

Committee Chair: Kim Sheehan, PhD

Committee Reader: Julie Manning, APR, CFRE

## Introduction

In many ways, the future of hospital philanthropy in the U.S. looks grim. As nonprofit hospitals wage on an ongoing battle against dwindling public support and increased government scrutiny, charitable donations to hospital foundations continue to decline.<sup>1 2</sup>

At the same time, the donor pool is changing. One of the largest generations of young professionals in the history of the nation is beginning to dominate the workplace, and this massive new group of potential donors, according to the demographic study *American Generations*, “will have their parents’ political and economic clout to pave the way as they make their own demands on society.”<sup>3</sup> Backed by one of the greatest transfers of generational wealth in history, young professionals today constitute a powerful and cohesive social force.<sup>4</sup>

All of this is occurring against a cultural and political backdrop marked by alarmingly low public confidence in the nonprofit sector and nationwide discussion about health care reform.<sup>5</sup> If the current generation of young professionals chooses to reject the case for support presented by nonprofit hospitals, the result for hospital philanthropy could be deeply damaging.

Yet amidst these concerning circumstances, tremendous opportunities may also exist. For example, some researchers are finding that today’s young adults demonstrate characteristics indicating a potential deep interest in philanthropy as they age and build wealth. As Howe and Strauss write in *Millennials Rising*, “a new Millennial service ethic is emerging, built around notions of collegial (rather than individual) action, support for (rather than resistance against) civic institutions, and the tangible doing of good deeds.”<sup>6</sup> Nonprofit hospitals with the right strategy, messaging and tactics may find that they are able to take advantage of this new “service ethic” in cultivating young financial supporters. At least one hospital foundation has demonstrated that a well-constructed campaign can successfully raise funds from young adults. Carolinas Healthcare Foundation recently reported its success with a program designed to attract 100 young families over a two year period, each contributing \$5,000 over a five-year period. In early

2009, the foundation reported that the program had recruited more than 200 families and raised \$1.25 million.<sup>7</sup>

Many development professionals seem to agree that finding ways to engage young professionals now, even before they have significant financial resources, is important to the long-term health of philanthropy.<sup>8 9 10</sup> As one self-described “under 30 professional working in not-for-profit philanthropy” wrote in response to a blog post on *The Chronicle of Philanthropy’s* Website, “When I turn 50, I will remember those organizations that took the time, and continue to take the time, to tell me about their work and success. When I am able to give at higher levels, those organizations will be top on my list.”<sup>11</sup>

As noted above, the challenges for nonprofit hospitals in engaging young professionals as donors are significant. This research report recognizes that nonprofit hospital development professionals can do little on a wide scale to craft strategy for engaging young professionals without first obtaining a basic understanding of the target audience and how that audience thinks, feels and acts in regards to hospital philanthropy. Thus, the report seeks to begin exploring how young professionals approach hospital philanthropy. It is hoped that the report will help encourage further research on the topic and that it may also aid fundraisers in evaluating and planning their own efforts to reach young professionals.

### **Literature review**

In preparing this report, a search for relevant published academic studies was conducted with the aid of a professional university research librarian. Very little published academic literature on young professionals and philanthropy was found, and none was found specific to young professionals and hospital philanthropy.

Perhaps the most relevant study found was a survey of 217 young professionals in Britain by Kottasz (although it should be noted that the study’s focus on British young professionals limits its overall relevancy).<sup>12</sup> The study employed a questionnaire designed “to explore the charity donor attitudes and behavior of young affluent males and females.”<sup>13</sup> Published as two separate papers, one focusing on the preferences and attitudes of the males surveyed and one focusing on the differences between males and females, the survey resulted in several findings:

- Young affluent professionals in the London area “represent a distinct segment possessing unique characteristics.”<sup>14</sup>
- Differences in attitude and behavior toward charities exist between different types of young professionals surveyed. For example, “lawyers tended to donate larger amounts of money to charity and on a more regular basis than individuals working in financial services.”<sup>15</sup>
- Those surveyed had a preference for arts and cultural nonprofits and for nonprofits with well-developed reputations and brands.<sup>16</sup>
- The large majority of those surveyed “wanted detailed information on how their donations would be used.”<sup>17</sup>
- “Generic attitudes” toward philanthropy among the men and women surveyed were “relatively similar,” meaning that the following suppositions did not hold true: “(a) women are more empathetic and altruistic than men; (b) women are more interested in getting a precise explanation of how their money is spent and used by the supported charity; (c) women are more likely to respond to an emotional charity advertisement than one that simply presents large amounts of factual information; and, (d) women spend more of their disposable income on philanthropic giving.”<sup>18</sup>

Of particular interest is Kottasz’s finding that young professionals expect detailed evidence of how their donations are spent, as this emerged as a major theme in the findings of the present study and also echoes the opinion of many development professionals.<sup>19</sup>

A second study of some relevancy consisted of two focus groups with young African Americans conducted by Jackson in 2001 (in this case the study’s relevancy is limited by its focus on a specific ethnicity).<sup>20</sup> “The purpose of the focus groups,” Jackson writes, “was to identify motives for philanthropy among younger African Americans and in particular whether these might differ from those reported in the historical extant literature.”<sup>21</sup> Participants in the focus groups ranged in age from 26 to 32.

The focus groups yielded two findings that are particularly useful to the present study. First, Jackson notes that, “while many respondents did not participate in organized religion, their giving did appear to be influenced by the giving patterns created in the

church.”<sup>22</sup> She goes on to note that while religious attendance may not be as high among young African Americans as it is in older generations, it still appears to play a major role in shaping their approach to philanthropy. This finding is important because religious attendance and affiliation have proven to be strong indicators of philanthropic activity, and because religion emerged as a significant theme in the findings of the present study.<sup>23</sup>

Second, the focus group findings indicate “that the notion of family is looked to more than any other factor as a motivation for giving” and that “motives for giving among the young African American community have remained relatively consistent over time.”<sup>24</sup> This implies that young donors may exhibit many philanthropic characteristics of older generations, and that some of those characteristics may be learned from family role models. While many development professionals place great emphasis on what makes young donors different from older generations, Jackson’s study points out that they may be similar in some ways.

In addition to these two published academic studies, valuable indicators of how young adults approach philanthropy can also be drawn from a number of demographic studies. For example, some studies indicate that today’s young professionals may have a very strong orientation toward volunteerism, which is a key predictor of philanthropic behavior.<sup>25</sup> Howe and Strauss have noted that many members of Generation Y (or the Millennial Generation) attended school during a time when compulsory service learning was rapidly spreading through the national education system. Using other indicators such as attitudes about responsibility to take civic action toward improving the environment, they predict the “new Millennial service ethic” mentioned in the introduction to this study.<sup>26</sup> Indeed, AmeriCorps recently announced that the number of young adults applying to its “City Year” program has tripled over the last year.<sup>27</sup> (The article did not specifically mention it, but the poor job market may be another factor for this increase). Although these indicators may offer promise for the future of volunteerism and philanthropic engagement with young adults, it should also be noted that the Corporation for National & Community Service reports that the overall number of volunteers in the U.S. has been declining since 2006.<sup>28</sup> While “new Millennial serviced ethic” has yet to come to full fruition, volunteerism and its connection to philanthropy did emerge as a strong theme in the present study.

In agreement with Jackson's findings on the importance of religion in establishing attitudes about philanthropy in young African American adults, Howe and Strauss point to several indicators that members of Generation Y may be strongly influenced by religious activity and views. For example, they note that in 1990, when many current young professionals were in the early stages of their educational journeys, there were no prayer circles in public schools. In 2000, however, 10,000 had been established.<sup>29</sup> They also point to a 1999 Gallup poll showing that 55 percent of teens in that year (many of today's young professionals) attended church, compared to the national average of 45 percent, and to a 1998 *USA Weekend* report noting that "teens cited religion as the second strongest influence in their lives, just behind parents but just ahead of teachers, boy/girlfriends, peers and the media."<sup>30</sup> As mentioned, religion and its influence on attitudes of young professionals toward philanthropy emerged as a significant theme in the findings of the present study.

Light's research on public trust in charities also yields some valuable insights into how young adults perceive the nonprofit sector as a whole. It is clear from Light's most recent Report on Charitable Confidence that today's young adults are approaching philanthropy from an environment soaked in mistrust. "Driven downward significantly by the controversies surrounding the sluggish disbursement of the American Red Cross Liberty Fund, confidence has yet to recover," he writes. "The percentage of Americans who said they had 'a lot' of confidence in charitable organizations dropped from 25 percent in July 2001 to 18 percent in May 2002. The percentage that reported having 'none at all' rose from 8 percent in 2001 to 17 percent in 2002."<sup>31</sup> Light goes on to note that, "70 percent of Americans said that charitable organizations waste 'a great deal' or 'fair amount' of money. This figure has risen 10 percent since October 2003."<sup>32</sup>

The study showed very few differences between older and younger Americans.<sup>33</sup> Thus it can be inferred that many younger adults tend to approach nonprofits with an almost automatic sense of caution. This finding is particularly germane to hospital philanthropy as the health care industry continues to fight a losing public relations battle that is only likely get worse in the next few years. For example, the authors of *American Generations* note that, "the proportion of people aged 18 to 24 who did not have health insurance climbed from 23 to 30 percent between 1987 and 2003. Among people aged 25

to 34, the share without health insurance rose from 17 to 26 percent.”<sup>34</sup> As this trend continues, young professionals will find themselves in the very center of the nation’s health care debate, likely to be deeply concerned about escalating health care costs as they give birth, raise families and start their own businesses. According to *American Generations*, “the debate over the future of the nation’s health care delivery and payment systems is just beginning. As aging boomers face more health problems, costs will soar. So will demand for changes in the health care system.”<sup>35</sup> If young adults appear to place little confidence in the health care industry now, it does not seem likely that their confidence will increase in the near future. A deep lack of trust in hospitals and health care networks was also one of the most significant findings to emerge from the present study.

Two demographic studies focused on differences in giving between generations, one by Steinberg and Willhelm and one by the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University, also shed some light on the philanthropic approach of young adults.<sup>36 37</sup> Steinberg and Willhelm use the Center on Philanthropy Panel Study (COPPS), which contains data on giving and volunteering in 7,400 American households, to examine generosity levels among the prewar generation, baby boomers, and Generation X (it should be noted that Generation X composes only a portion of today’s young professionals, which makes Steinberg and Willhelm’s paper of limited value to the present study). While giving to secular causes varies little across the three generations according to COPPS data, it varies significantly in religious giving. When taking religious giving into account, “gen-Xers are both less likely to give and less generous when they do give.”<sup>38</sup>

The COPPS data may paint a somewhat unfair picture of Generation X, however. While the Center on Philanthropy study does agree that Generation X gives less to religious charities, it also notes that “giving differs mostly by factors other than generation – educational attainment, frequency of religious attendance and income. After controls, generation alone did not make a difference in the amount donors contributed to religion or to secular causes.”<sup>39</sup> This is an important point that extends to Generation Y (the rest of today’s young professionals) as well. While young adults do appear to give less often and in smaller amounts, this is most likely because they have lower incomes

and different financial burdens than older generations, such as young children, large mortgages and school debt. The Center on Philanthropy Study indicates that young adults give at levels consistent with their income and education levels. *American Generations* supports this finding, noting that “most households headed by people 25 to 34 include children. That is why they are spending nearly twice as much as the average household on personal services, which includes daycare expenses.”<sup>40</sup> If demographic evidence is an indicator, young adults may turn out to be just as generous as older generations as they build wealth and decrease debt.

In addition to the academic and demographic studies already mentioned, a large and growing amount of writing on young adults and philanthropy continues to appear in popular media and professional journals and on Websites and blogs. Many of these articles are based either on opinion or undisclosed research. A few are based on research conducted by marketing and communication firms, such as a 2008 study by Grizzard Communications Group during the summer of 2008 showing that donors ages 25 to 34 were the age group most likely to say they planned to increase their giving during the last quarter of 2008.<sup>41</sup>

Of particular relevance to the present study is the intense focus given in professional publications and on blogs to the role of the Internet and social media in cultivating young adults as donors. Many of these articles present the online world, and social media in particular, as a kind of “magic key” that will unlock the door to young donors. For example, Iragui and Botti write about a “hidden gate” in the traditional fundraising pyramid, “an entire new level that admits nonfinancial, digital supporters who arrive via new media – websites, email and the increasingly popular SMS (Short Message Service, or text messaging) or through other wireless access points.”<sup>42</sup> Cramer, referring to the effectiveness of online forums, writes, “The ability to become part of an online community’s discussion in this manner is truly transformative, helping to engage supporters and take them from passive to active participation.”<sup>43</sup> In a blog post, Hughes writes, “there is a growing number of savvy, early-adopters in nonprofit development and communication departments across the country who are taking advantage of Twitter as a ‘friend-raising’ tool. Once they have built up their social capital, they are turning it into a fundraising machine.”<sup>44</sup> Other authors present a more balanced view of online and social

media fundraising, such as Floyd, who notes that, “smaller groups that have the greatest use for small donations seem to see the most fundraising benefit from social media.”<sup>45</sup> A recent *Chronicle of Philanthropy* study also found that while 75 percent of 980 nonprofit organizations have a presence on Facebook, less than two percent have raised \$10,000 or more on the social media site.<sup>46</sup>

The question regarding the Internet and social media appears to be whether it is a transformational medium that will change the very nature of fundraising or simply another fundraising and communication tool that may be effective with some audience members, as is the case with direct mail. The current study seeks to probe this question.

Taken as a whole, the gamut of existing literature on young adults and philanthropy presents a picture of a target audience that demonstrates many qualities positively associated with charitable giving, such as volunteerism and religious affiliation, while at the same time being in a life stage that brings with it lower incomes and a myriad of financial obligations that may limit philanthropic activity. Young adults also appear to be steeped in an environment of mistrust for nonprofit organizations and have unprecedented access to information and tools, such as the Internet and social media, with which to investigate charities that interest them. Appearing to be influenced by the charitable behaviors and attitudes of older generations while at the same time existing in a world transformed by new technology, the current generation of young professionals may very well turn out to be generous and responsive to nonprofits in the coming years. Yet engaging young adults as donors may be particularly challenging for nonprofit hospitals, given the negative public perception created by rising health care costs and the growing debate on health care reform. This picture should serve as a useful backdrop as the findings of the current study are examined.

### **Sample and data collection method**

A convenience sample of 17 young professionals, ages 25 to 40, from Benton, Linn, Lane and Lincoln counties in Oregon was selected for the study. The participants represent a wide variety of professions including finance, engineering, design and photography, health care, technology, insurance, nonprofit management, media and marketing. The participants represent a well-spread mix of corporate executives, business owners and mid-level professionals. The sample consisted of 13 males and 4 females.

Two participants are current supporters of the hospital in their community. For a more detailed overview of research participants, see the Appendix.

Each participant was interviewed for an average of 45 minutes, using an informal discussion guide created by the researcher in consultation with Professor Kim Sheehan of the School of Journalism and Communication at the University of Oregon. The interview guide was designed to facilitate discussion regarding each participant's views on philanthropy in general and hospital philanthropy specifically. The list of questions used in the discussion guide is included in the Appendix of this report. Notes were taken by the researcher during each interview and then transcribed.

### **Data analysis method**

The interview findings were evaluated for common themes and are presented in the following three broad categories that emerged: *approach to philanthropy in general*; *approach to nonprofit giving and communication methods*; and *approach to hospital philanthropy*. The purpose of this analysis method is to make the findings as clear and applicable as possible for discussion and application by development professionals and others.

### **Analysis of findings**

#### **Approach to philanthropy in general**

The majority of participants expressed a very strong belief in philanthropy and a long-term commitment to supporting nonprofit organizations through giving. All of those interviewed said they support at least one nonprofit on an annual basis, and almost all said that they support numerous organizations. Several felt that philanthropy is a vital social obligation and that young professionals who aren't making charitable gifts are shirking a responsibility. "I think it's something that people should be doing," said one participant. "If a businessperson isn't giving, I would kind of question why that person is in business." Another participant said, "I view it as my public duty. I've been the beneficiary of nonprofit programs and I feel like I need to give back." A third participant went so far as to say, "I feel like it's wrong not to give if you are able to give."

A very small portion of the participants indicated that while philanthropy does play a role in their lives, they don't consider it extremely important at this point. All of those who expressed this view said that other current financial obligations had more

priority than philanthropy at this stage in their lives. “When I think of where my money’s going, like to bills and that kind of thing, it’s not a huge priority right now,” one participant said. “I think about giving if there’s money left over and something presents itself and it’s easy to give to it.”

Most participants felt that philanthropy will play a strong, even central, role in their lives and that they will continue to give increasingly more money as they age and build wealth. Several said that they plan to increase not just the amount that they give but also the percentage of their income. “I see myself doing and giving more and more,” one participant said. “I would love to devote myself to it full time someday.” Another participant who owns a business with his wife said, “We’ll definitely give more, probably even increase the percentage we give. That’s true for our business and for us personally.”

A few expressed more caution, saying that their future giving will be largely determined by other life factors such as financial success. “We’ll probably give way more in a few years when our income hopefully goes way up. We’re happy with our lifestyle right now and we want to do more good with the excess money,” one participant said. “It will become much more important but first I have to establish myself,” another said. “I may not donate anything for a while and then donate a massive amount in the future.”

The strong commitment to philanthropy expressed by most participants is consistent with the predictions made by Howe and Strauss regarding the civic attitudes of today’s young adults.<sup>47</sup> While most participants shared that they don’t yet have the financial resources to be major givers, there was a very strong sense that philanthropy is a significant priority that shapes their approach to life.

In addition to a very strong overall commitment to philanthropy, there was also a strong undertone of religious values, and their positive effect on giving, throughout many of the interviews. While the majority of participants did not openly identify with a religious group and many did not mention an affiliation with religion at all, several drew a clear and strong connection between their faith and their giving. Here is how one participant described why he donates to nonprofit organizations:

A big part of it is my religious background. I was raised to give a portion of my salary, but I’ve expanded the idea of what it means to tithe so that my tithe doesn’t just mean giving to church but giving to other organizations as well. I think it’s a spiritual discipline. It’s also really satisfying – I love the feeling of giving.

Another participant said, “My selfish reason is that it feels good. My unselfish reason is that we’re called to do it. I was raised and taught to do things that way, in school and in church.” A third participant said, “Giving is one form of worship to God; and it’s better for me – it gives me joy.” While not specifically drawing a connection to religion, a fourth participant said, “I was raised in an environment that taught me to give.” This final quote is mentioned because it bridges a gap between two findings from Jackson’s research. The young African American adults in her study drew a connection between their giving and their religious environment as well the example set for them by older family members. The same appears to hold true in these findings. Many participants who did not specifically talk about religion indicated that they were raised in an environment in which they were taught to give. In analyzing the interview notes it became clear that most participants’ philanthropic views were shaped to some degree by religious and/or familial values. As mentioned in the literature review, while development professionals often place great emphasis on what makes today’s young adults different from older generations, this finding emphasizes a strong philanthropic characteristic that many young adults may hold in common with their seniors.

Another striking finding that is consistent with existing research and opinion is the way in which many participants first became involved with the nonprofits that they support. Each participant was asked to select one nonprofit and explain how he or she first became a supporter of the organization. Following is one participant’s response, explaining how he first became involved with the Corvallis Montessori School:

I went there for a couple of years when I was really young. But when I moved back to Corvallis to join [current employer] my girlfriend at the time was friends with some of the board members, so they approached me and said they were looking for a board member who didn’t have kids there. Once I got involved a little bit, I just got really passionate about their mission.

Most participants told stories with similar elements: they knew or met someone already connected to the organization who invited them to become involved, usually through volunteer service or by attending an event. Another participant reported, “I became a volunteer and then it just seemed natural to give.” A third participant said, “I met Chris [the nonprofit’s executive director] and then met some of the staff and really

liked all of them. We went to their big dinner and met some of the kids they help and then we felt compelled to give.”

In addition to echoing research that shows a strong connection between volunteerism and giving, this finding also supports the opinion of some development professionals that volunteering, especially board and committee service, is an effective way to cultivate young professionals as donors because it provides them with a way to build their resumes.<sup>48</sup> Indeed, while no participants blatantly said that they joined a nonprofit committee or board in order to help bolster their career, many implied that this was an element of their motivation to volunteer. Several talked about being asked to join a board or committee by a prominent community member or colleague, while others mentioned that community involvement is an important part of their job description or helps market their business in the community.

Both participants who are current hospital donors first became involved with the hospital through volunteering and are now foundation board members. One was asked by a prominent community member to join a foundation event committee, and one was invited by a business associate to volunteer at and donate materials to a foundation event. Further findings regarding the importance of personal connection will be explored in the next section: *approach to nonprofit giving and communication methods*.

As mentioned, all of the participants said that they support at least one nonprofit through charitable giving and almost all support several. While most said that they plan to remain loyal to these organizations long-term, they also indicated that they plan to support additional nonprofits in the future as they develop the financial means to do so. Many of the participants appear to take a strategic, planned approach when it comes to deciding which organizations to support – almost as if they are managing “giving portfolios,” which is how one participant described how she and her husband plan their charitable giving before the start of each year. “We try to have a balance of different types of organizations that we give to,” she said. Another participant said, “My wife and I proactively develop a plan each year of who we’re going to give to and how much.” “I do a budget for my giving every year,” a third participant said. “I move the amount I give around a little among the organizations I support.” While not all participants described

putting this level of detail into planning their giving, almost all indicated that they do put forethought and strategy into allocating their charitable gifts to different organizations.

This finding echoes Kottasz's conclusion that many young professionals tend to take an "investment approach" to giving – carefully measuring and tracking the impact of their charitable gifts. Two participants described "testing and tracking" nonprofit organizations that they were interested in supporting long-term. This process involves making a small donation and then carefully monitoring what the organization does with the money and how one is treated as a donor before making a further commitment. One participant described testing and tracking as follows:

I heard about [organization] through friends and I decided to try an experiment with them: I sent them a letter with a check, asking them not to include me on any mailing lists – that I would make another donation when I decided. They actually did it, so I was impressed.

Describing an organization that she was interested in supporting, another participant explained, "I heard about them from a friend, but I've been tracking them for a while. I made a small donation and watched what happened, then made a bigger donation."

Three of the strongest findings, with the most resonance among participants and the deepest implications for hospital philanthropy, to emerge from this study regard three characteristics that participants identified as being very important for nonprofit organizations to have: *local focus*; *financial transparency*; and *demonstration of impact*. Because of their prominence, each of these characteristics will be presented under its own subheading.

*Local focus*: During the interview, each participant was asked to name the first several nonprofits that came to mind. Later, the participant was also asked to list the specific nonprofits that he or she supports through charitable giving. Local nonprofits (defined as those serving a specific city or region of a state) dominated the responses to both questions. While this is not a quantitative report, it is valuable to show percentages in this case: 54 percent of the nonprofits that first came to mind for participants are local; compared to national at 31 percent; international at 9 percent; and state at 6 percent. Of the nonprofits that participants support through charitable giving, 60 percent are local; 20

percent are national; 14 percent are international; and 6 percent are state. (For a complete listing of the organizations named in response to both questions, see the Appendix).

Furthermore, a preference for organizations that specifically benefit the local community emerged among a very significant portion of the interviews. For example, when talking about organizations that they are interested in supporting in the future, several participants focused exclusively on local organizations. “We want to give to local entities that support the local community,” one participant said. “I want to give to things that benefit my kids and that will give them a great community to grow up in.” Another participant said, “We want to give to stuff that’s focused on helping underprivileged people in our area.” A third participant said, “We want to give to Love Inc. and Southside Community Outreach – things that support this local community.”

*Financial transparency:* Deeply connected to the preference for local nonprofits was an overarching demand among participants for financial transparency. Participants made it very clear that prominent financial transparency is not just a good quality that lends an advantage to those organizations that demonstrate it. Instead, it is something that most participants automatically expect, and they have a tendency to quickly reject organizations that aren’t financially transparent.

For example, when asked to name the qualities that they think are important for nonprofits to have, the significant majority included some form of fiscal responsibility and/or financial transparency in their responses. “Transparency is the most important thing,” one participant said. “Everything about you should be very clear, upfront and spelled out.” Another participant said, “Having their own fiscal responsibility is really important. Are they like Goodwill, with a CEO who makes \$2 million? That’s why I give to local charities – so I can see what they’re doing with the money.” A third participant said that, “some sort of measurable demonstration that the money they get will go to helping the people they serve” is the most important characteristic for her.

The following quote from a fourth participant helps draw the connection between *financial transparency* and *local focus*:

They should spend money wisely. I always look at overhead before I give. I don’t give to United Way for that reason – I want to physically see what they’re doing. That’s why I give to Cornerstone. Being locally based is the most important aspect for me.

Even though this participant mentioned “being locally based” as the most important characteristic, he made a very clear connection between local focus and financial transparency. One of the central reasons that he appears to value local organizations like Cornerstone is because he can see what they’re accomplishing with donations. Their close proximity to him forces them to be financially transparent.

Participants were also asked to talk about what kind of information is most important for them to know when it comes to nonprofits that they support and that they are interested in supporting. Financial information again dominated the responses. “Transparency,” one participant responded. “Don’t do it unless you’re doing it for the right reasons. I want to know that the organization is really doing some good and is using the money with the right motivation.” Another participant responded with a series of questions: “How efficient are they with donations? What are they doing with the money? Is my donation having the effect they say it’s going to have?” A third participant responded, “What are they accomplishing with the money? I want to see specific projects they’re accomplishing.” Echoing these responses, a fourth participant described an organization that she feels does an effective job of communication fiscal responsibility:

I like to know where the money is going. I think the perfect example is when I donated to Life for Sudan and got personal information about the students I was sponsoring. It wasn’t generic newsletter stuff – I was actually seeing the individual things that I was buying for my students.

Despite the fact that her example focuses on an international nonprofit, this participant may be emphasizing one reason why so many participants prefer local nonprofits. Because their desire for financial transparency is so strong, giving to local organizations allows them to stay more closely tuned to how their donations are actually being spent.

It may also be that participant’s heavy emphasis on financial transparency is tied to Light’s findings regarding general public distrust of the nonprofit sector. If it is true that young adults approach charitable giving from a perspective that requires a nonprofit to prove its trustworthiness before being considered deserving of their support, then it logically follows that financial transparency would be forefront in their minds.

*Demonstration of impact:* While financial transparency dominated responses regarding important nonprofit characteristics and important information about nonprofits,

most participants made it clear that, for them, the concept is inseparable from demonstration of impact. In other words, effective nonprofits prove their financial transparency by demonstrating impact through clear, concrete examples. This is evident in several of the quotes used above, such as “Is my donation really having the effect they say it’s going to have?” and, “some sort of measurable demonstration that the money they get will go to helping the people they serve;” and, “What are they accomplishing with the money? I want to see specific projects they’re accomplishing.”

A few participants actually emphasized demonstration of impact over financial transparency. For example, one participant said,

I’m looking for info about what kind of impact they’re having on the people they’re helping. I want to hear from the people they’re helping, not just the organization’s CEO. I really don’t care about specific financial information.

For most participants however, financial transparency, which is of the utmost importance, appears to be validated by concrete demonstration of how donations are used.

#### Approach to nonprofit giving and communication methods

When asked what they expect to receive back after donating to a nonprofit, the majority of participants said they want regular communication. “Communication is really important,” one participant said. “For our wedding we gave a donation to a small nonprofit and then we didn’t hear anything back from them for six months. It actually really ticked me off because I wanted them to communicate with me.” Another participant said, “Regular communication is important – I appreciate quarterly updates.” A third participant said, “Communication – I don’t want an overload, but I do want good, regular communication.”

Similar to the finding regarding financial transparency, there was a strong sense that high-quality, regular communication does not give a nonprofit a special advantage or distinction with participants, but simply that it helps establish the organization as credible and professional. It is something that participants have come to automatically expect, and nonprofits that don’t do it instantly lose credibility while those that do are simply bolstering their positions as normal, healthy organizations.

As mentioned, participants strongly indicated that financial and impact information is highly important to them when it comes to nonprofits that they support or

that they are interested in supporting. A somewhat surprising finding is the way in which they get this information. The heavy focus given to the Internet and social media in professional literature, mentioned in the literature review, might lead one to believe that young professionals strongly prefer online methods of communication. Yet this did not prove to be the case for most participants.

In fact, the majority of participants said that they rely on personal interaction to get information about the nonprofits that interest them. One participant, a business owner, responded, “We’re doing windshields all day long, so I just hear from people I’m working with. It’s mostly word of mouth and just community involvement.” Another participant responded, “Personal relationships. I know the executive directors of the Boys and Girls Club and United Way. They also send me newsletters but I don’t really pay attention to them because I get the info I want by talking to the people I know there.” A third participant responded:

Mostly through personal interaction, like going to board meetings and events.

Young Professionals [a local social organization] also invites a different nonprofit to come and speak each month so I hear things that way. I think press and print is good to a certain extent, for name awareness, but I think people talking to people is what makes the difference.

This finding makes sense when linked with the findings from the previous section showing that participants prefer local organizations and that they largely become engaged with nonprofits through personal interaction, service and attending events. It is clear that most participants want a fairly high level of engagement with the organizations they support, and supporting local nonprofits makes this much easier to do because proximity naturally facilitates personal interaction.

While the Internet was mentioned by many participants as a means of getting information, it received almost the same amount of preference as mailed newsletters. Neither channel approached the popularity of personal interaction and most participants who mentioned either also mentioned personal interaction. Of those who mentioned online communication, two said they prefer e-newsletters while the rest said they prefer visiting the organization’s Website.

“I go to their Websites,” one participant said, “but I don’t like to get e-newsletters or anything else. I’m sure those are good communication tools, but they just don’t work

for me. I want to go find information when I want it and not have it fed to me.” Another participant who made a first-time donation to Options Pregnancy Center and received mailed communication said, “The first time we donated we got a packet of information that I didn’t really find relevant. About two months later we got a newsletter that I found much more interesting and relevant because it was about who they’re helping right now and not just about the organization. It read like a magazine and not a user’s manual.” In contrast to these two statements, a participant who relies almost exclusively on personal communication said, “I’m honestly kind of sick of getting mail and email from nonprofits. It’s just overkill.”

Participants were also asked a specific question regarding the nonprofit sector’s use of social media platforms such as Facebook Cause, and most responded with casual interest, indifference or annoyance. To summarize briefly, Facebook Cause and similar social media platforms allow a nonprofit to establish its own social media profile and thus solicit members, or “friends,” host online discussions, post information, solicit donations, and send out email updates to members.

“I think it’s being abused,” one participant said. “I don’t need to get an email update every day from an organization. People go too crazy with it.” Another participant said, “I just don’t see it. I don’t see it as a legitimate way of doing things.” A third participant said, “I haven’t heard of Facebook Cause. I’m not a big fan of online stuff. I like personal interaction.” The majority of participants, however, echoed the following statement from a fourth participant: “I don’t pay very much attention to Facebook Cause. I think it’s probably a viable way of doing it, but I just haven’t really paid attention to it.”

Two participants said that they have made small, one-time donations to nonprofits through a social media platform, and both seemed somewhat more positive about the concept than the rest of the participants. “I really liked it,” said one. “I would definitely do it again. It’s good for small token gifts but not for big gifts.” The other participant said, “It worked because it [the donation] was \$5.”

Participants were also asked about the various methods they currently use to make donations to nonprofits and about the donation methods they most prefer. Here an interesting, and at first paradoxical, finding emerges. Not surprisingly, the majority of participants said that they most frequently make their gifts in person - donating at events,

bringing checks to meetings, putting money in the offering plate at church, etc. Online giving emerged as the second most popular method, with direct mail following a very close third.

When asked the method they most prefer to use, however, the majority of participants said they prefer to give online, citing security, convenience, and immediate receipt of the gift as their main reasons. “The only checks we write are to charities that don’t have good online giving capabilities,” one participant said. “We would gladly get rid of our checkbook.” “I don’t write checks anymore,” another participant said. “If an organization can’t accept donations online, then something’s wrong.” A smaller group of participants said they prefer to give in-person, saying that they like the relational aspects of this method. “The impact is there more,” one participant said. “For example, every year they do a tour at the Old Mill Center and that’s when I make my donation, even though I’ve been on it a million times. I just feel like it keeps me in the loop and that means so much.”

Why is it that participants so strongly prefer to get information in-person and yet prefer to donate online? The answer may be that they consider these two acts, receiving information and making a donation, to be very different and separate and thus better suited to different channels. Participants clearly prefer online giving for practical reasons – convenience and safety. They prefer in-person communication for less tangible reasons – it makes them feel more involved and like they have a better understanding of what the organization is doing with donations.

It may be that some of the focus on online, and especially social media, philanthropy is a result of practitioners confusing these two very separate acts. Development professionals see online donations continuing to rise, often coming from younger donors, and they assume that these donors also prefer to communicate online. Yet the results of this research indicate that young professionals may see the Internet primarily as a practical giving tool with some information-gathering advantages (such as viewing IRS form 990s), while they prefer to talk and develop relationships with actual people in order to get the majority of their information about the nonprofits that interest them.

It is also possible that participants' preference for online giving is affected by the fact that most give at relatively low levels, as previously indicated, consistent with their ages and income levels. Most development professionals appear to agree that the Internet is primarily used for smaller gifts, and the average online gift in 2008 was \$71 (a decrease from \$86 in 2007).<sup>49</sup> Thus, it may be that as young professionals begin to make larger gifts, they also begin to prefer giving in person.

There is no doubt that the Internet is a valid communication tool for nonprofits, but it may be that it is no more than that – another communication tool that works effectively with some audience members – as opposed to a transformational medium that will overshadow all others.

#### Approach to hospital philanthropy

The majority of participants do not believe that it is important to support their local hospital through charitable giving. The following response from one participant, a business owner, helps summarize what many expressed:

I've actually talked about this with friends. Why does the hospital need donations? When we go to the hospital we get a huge bill and that should cover everything. The bill for our daughter's birth was huge, by far the biggest expense we had last year. How could they possibly need a donation? In the back of my mind I can understand a little. I can understand how you would want to help low-income patients and things like that. But giving to the hospital just seems like giving to a big corporation.

Several aspects of this quote were echoed by many other participants. First, there is a lack of understanding of the hospital's nonprofit status and structure (all of the communities represented by participants are served by nonprofit hospitals). "It seems like they should be self supporting," another participant said. "They should have enough money already. My wife works at Good Sam [the Corvallis hospital] and I've never thought of them as nonprofit." Another participant said, "Good Sam doesn't seem like a nonprofit. I didn't even realize it was a nonprofit. It seems much more like a business."

Second, there is a belief that medical bills should be more than enough to support the hospital. Interestingly, this view was expressed most strongly by participants who own businesses, as in this remark from one participant:

I pay a lot of insurance because I own my own business. When Jolleen [an employee at the hospital] told me that SHS [Samaritan Health Services] is nonprofit, I think I said something like, "Why the hell would anyone ever give money to the hospital?" I could

see if the hospital saved your life or something like that, but I assumed all hospitals were for-profit.

This finding makes sense, as self-employed business owners would be more likely to be saddled with large insurance premiums or have no insurance, and thus large medical bills, when they do need to use the hospital. As predicted in *American Generations*, rising numbers of young professionals with no health insurance may continue adding to the negative perception that hospitals are already struggling with.<sup>50</sup>

Third, there is a sense that the hospital is a large, wealthy corporation with no personal face. “The hospital is a huge, behemoth organization with huge, beautiful buildings,” one participant said. “I understand that they might need big donations for big stuff, but that stuff doesn’t directly benefit me and they don’t need my donation.” Another participant said, “I think I put Samaritan in a special category because I know people there and I have learned about the organization, but even given that, SHS comes across as kind of a huge, faceless, cold organization.”

A smaller group of participants said that they were not actively opposed to supporting the hospital but they don’t understand how the hospital operates, why it would need philanthropic support, or what it would do with donations. “Honestly, I don’t know if I can answer,” one participant said, “because I don’t understand the way the hospital works. I’m aware that they’re nonprofit, but they don’t look or act like a nonprofit. Most of that is based on [my wife] working there for two years and it seemed to be run like a for-profit corporation.” Another participant said, “On a fundamental basis I would say yes, it’s important, but I don’t really know how hospitals operate. The hospital just seems like a big administrative entity.”

Another small group of participants said that, while they don’t currently support their local hospital through giving, they are open to the idea. Interestingly, everyone who expressed this view had some form of personal experience at the hospital or a significant encounter with representatives of the hospital who explained the hospital’s nonprofit structure and how philanthropy makes an impact. One participant described his experience as follows:

My wife and my mom both work there [the hospital], so I have heard bad things. But then I met Jeff Larson [Good Samaritan Hospital Foundation director] through Leadership

Corvallis and I connected a lot better. Jeff communicated the need really well and I understood more how giving to the hospital would actually help.

Another participant responded, “Yes, I think it’s important because it has a direct benefit to the community. I interact with the hospitals through the business community so I know their mission and I know what they need.”

Similarly, both participants who are current hospital donors described going through educational experiences involving personal connection and interaction before they understood the importance of hospital philanthropy. “Before I met David Bigelow [Newport hospital CEO] I had no idea my hospital was barely profitable and that donations are one of the things that really helps it survive,” one participant said. “Until I had that talk in his office, I just didn’t have any idea. And most people haven’t been there.”

The other participant who is currently a hospital donor explained the personal experience she had in high school that changed her perception of nonprofit hospitals:

Before my friend went to Doernbecher, I think I had a different perception of what hospitals are and how they operate. I ended up serving on the teen executive board at Doernbecher and after that I really understood what a nonprofit hospital is. I think the main problem in our community is that most people haven’t had that same exposure, so they don’t have that same understanding. I don’t think the community is fully aware of what the hospital can do for them. It’s investing in our community and in people’s lives. The hospital is a cornerstone of our local economy. People don’t realize the amount of patients who walk into the emergency room and don’t end up paying their bills and that gets absorbed as charity care.

There appears to be a basic set of differences between participants who believe that supporting the hospital is important and those who don’t. First, those who believe it is important have an understanding that their local hospital is nonprofit and what that nonprofit status means, while those who don’t believe it is important are generally unaware of the hospital’s nonprofit status and think of it more as a for-profit business.

Second, those who believe it is important have an understanding of the hospital’s overall impact on the community, the charity care it provides, and its role in the local economy while those who don’t tend to view the hospital as a large, faceless entity that

takes money out of the community via medical bills but doesn't necessarily benefit the community outside of patient care.

Third, those who believe it is important have had some kind of significant encounter, often with a representative of the hospital, that helped them understand the hospital's nonprofit status and the important role it plays in the community.

Participants were also asked if they think they will ever become financial supporters of their local hospital. While many said that do not plan to ever become supporters, a significant number said they are open to the idea, and almost all of these indicated that understanding how their gift would be used and the impact it would have would be the biggest factors in their decision. Most also said that they would want to give to a specific cause or project at the hospital.

"If there was a specific cause where I felt I could actually make a difference and not just be throwing a penny in a bucket, or if it directly benefits someone I know," one participant said. "But I wouldn't ever give to a general thing." Using similar wording, another participant said, "I would if it were a specific cause that I could actually have an impact on – not just a drop in the bucket. I could definitely see myself giving to a specific cancer-related cause." A third participant said, "I'm not closed off to the idea, but I guess I would wonder where my money would ultimately be going. I think it would need to be a specific cancer-related cause."

There is a direct connection between this finding and the finding regarding participants' desire for financial transparency and evidence of impact. Clearly the level of expectation in these two areas that participants have for other nonprofits also holds true for hospitals. Before they commit to making a charitable gift, they want to clearly understand the measurable impact it will have.

### **Implications and conclusion**

Five central and deeply connected conclusions, with significant implications for hospital philanthropy, emerge from the findings analysis:

1. Most participants have a strong belief in and commitment to philanthropy, and it is likely that their giving will increase in the future.
2. Most participants take a strategic, investment-like approach to philanthropy, researching their choices and measuring the impact of their giving.

3. Most participants prefer nonprofits that are locally focused, financially transparent, and that demonstrate clear evidence of impact.
4. Personal relationships and interaction are very important to most participants, both in terms of how they become engaged as supporters of nonprofits and how they get information about nonprofits. For most participants, personal communication is more important than online or written communication.
5. Most participants do not believe that it is important to support their local hospital through charitable giving. This appears to be affected at least in part by a fundamental lack of understanding about nonprofit hospital structure, the benefit of the hospital to the local community, and the impact of hospital philanthropy.

What do these five conclusions mean for hospital foundations who wish to reach out to young professionals? First, it appears that there is a solid foundation of philanthropic interest to work from. Young professionals seem to already be strongly engaged in charitable giving, even if their giving has not yet extended to hospitals.

Second, despite a strong orientation toward philanthropy, it will not likely be easy for nonprofit hospitals to engage young professionals as donors, at least in the short term. A great deal of work needs to be done first. If young professionals are strategic givers who research their options and who are looking for very specific qualities such as local focus, financial transparency and strong demonstration of impact, they are likely to evaluate hospital appeals for support based on these criteria. While many community-based hospitals may have an advantage in their local focus, most hospitals will find themselves sorely lacking in the areas of financial transparency and evidence of impact.

Certainly, the complicated structure of most hospital foundations, with multiple funds and areas of focus, can make financial transparency and demonstration of impact very difficult. If young professionals don't find these qualities, however, their strategic approach and multitude of choices may lead them to reject hospital appeals for support. Actions such as posting IRS form 990s to a hospital foundation's Websites and providing information about overhead costs versus money spent directly on services and projects are certainly strong steps in the right direction, yet they may not be enough. Young professionals appear to find validation of financial transparency in concrete

demonstration of impact – they want to see clear examples of people helped by philanthropy.

In other words, it may no longer be enough for a hospital foundation to say, “We helped hundreds of local women this year obtain free mammograms at our hospital;” or even, “We spent \$50,000 this year to help hundreds of local women obtain free mammograms at our hospital.” Instead, the findings of this research indicate that a message with greater validity to young professionals would be, “This year donors gave \$50,000 to help us provide free mammograms to local women. At \$416 a mammogram, we were able to screen 120 women. Thankfully, most of the women screened learned that they do not have cancer. Three, however, were referred for biopsies, diagnosed with breast cancer and are now undergoing treatment. Without donor support, these women may not have learned about their breast cancer until it was too late.”

Third, before nonprofit hospitals can ever truly hope to engage young professionals as donors, significant communication efforts must first take place. Since young professionals appear to prefer locally focused nonprofits, this would be an appropriate place to start. Young professionals must understand the role that the hospital plays in the local community: its impact on the economy, the preventative health efforts it undertakes in the community, and the amount of charity care it provides to local low-income patients. If young professionals begin to understand the way in which a nonprofit hospital is structured, that by its very design it is required to operate on a razor thin margin while providing the best service possible to its patients and actively seeking to build the health of the local community, they may begin to see the positive impact that hospital philanthropy can have.

Clearly, young professionals cannot be expected to support the idea of hospital philanthropy if they don’t understand that their local hospital is nonprofit and what that nonprofit status means. This must be the central driving idea behind initial efforts to communicate with them. Appeals for support from young professionals will be largely meaningless until a fundamental shift in their understanding of nonprofit hospitals has taken place.

Fourth, the findings present clear implications for the way in which this shift in understanding must take place. While messaging on Websites and in marketing materials

must certainly be adjusted, particularly in the areas of financial transparency and demonstration of impact, it is personal relationships and interaction that will be the deciding factor. Young professionals will begin to think differently about hospital philanthropy only as they interact with credible hospital representatives on a meaningful level. This can happen in a variety of ways: through presentations by hospital leaders at community events and forums where young professionals are present; through hospital events that appeal to young professionals; through service and volunteer programs that offer young professionals the chance to build their resumes while interacting with and learning more about their local hospital; and through peer-to-peer interaction with young professionals who are already engaged as hospital supporters. Additionally, hospital development staff and leadership must be equipped with an understanding of how young professionals approach hospital philanthropy and thus prepared to address their concerns and assumptions as they interact with them on an ongoing basis.

Essentially, these five conclusions help clarify the core message and the medium that nonprofit hospitals must use to effectively begin communicating with young professionals. The (simplified) message is, “Your local hospital is nonprofit, and philanthropy makes a tremendous difference in our ability to effectively serve the local community.” The medium for this message is primarily personal communication.

Further research regarding how young professionals approach philanthropy, and specifically how they approach hospital philanthropy, is clearly needed. In addition to further qualitative studies regarding attitudes, beliefs and perceptions about philanthropy in general and hospital philanthropy in particular, quantitative studies focused on giving and communication methods and overall generosity may prove very beneficial to the field.

As noted in the introduction to this paper, young professionals are the future of hospital philanthropy. As they assume greater dominance in the workplace and build wealth, they will gradually become a larger and larger portion of the donor pool. The findings in this research should be cause for great concern but should also be cause for optimism. If appropriate and well-executed efforts to shift young professionals’ understanding of hospital philanthropy are undertaken, future appeals for support may be very effective.

## **Limitations**

Two factors limit the overall applicability of this research. First, the study is qualitative, which automatically limits generalization from the findings. Second, the ratio of males to females is imbalanced, with only four female participants. As noted by Kottasz, however, it is possible that young professional males and females do not differ significantly in their approaches to philanthropy.<sup>51</sup>

## **Appendix**

### *Exhibit 1 – Overview of research participants*

1. Male, single, vice president of a financial services company
2. Male, married with children, owns an auto glass company and glass art studio
3. Female, married, employed as an independent marketing consultant
4. Male, married with children, owns a photography, Web design, and email communication firm with his wife
5. Female, married with children, buyer for a clothing store chain
6. Male, married with children, pastor
7. Male, married, insurance agent
8. Male, married with children, owner and principal of a graphic design firm
9. Male, single, president of a graphic design firm
10. Female, married, certified nursing assistant
11. Male, single, president of a technology upstart company
12. Male, married with children, owns a photography studio
13. Male, married with children, insurance agent
14. Female, single, mechanical engineer
15. Male, single, president and CEO of a media firm
16. Male, married, bank manager
17. Male, married, executive director of a local nonprofit

### *Exhibit 2 – Discussion guide used for interviews*

#### Section 1 – General Questions

1. When I say the words “non profit” what comes to mind?
2. Can you name some non-profits?

3. What qualities do you think are important for a non-profit to have?
4. How do you feel about supporting non-profit organizations through charitable giving?
5. What are the specific non-profits that you personally support?
6. Why do you give to these organizations?
7. Do you anticipate giving to the same non-profits or to different ones as you get older?
8. How did you first become involved with organization X?
9. How do you get information about non-profits that interest you?
10. What kind of information is important to you?
11. What motivates you to give?
12. What role do you feel that charitable giving will play during the rest of your life?
13. When you donate to a non-profit, what do you expect to receive back (i.e. – recognition, communication, etc.)?

#### Section 2 – Giving Methods

14. What methods do you use to give (i.e. - online, mail, in person, etc)?
15. Which method or methods do you most prefer and why?
16. What do you usually do with fundraising letters that you receive in the mail?
17. What do you usually do with fundraising emails you receive?
18. How do you usually respond to fundraising phone calls?
19. Have you ever made a donation to a non-profit using a social media site? If yes, would you do it again? If no, do you think you ever will?

#### Section 3 – Hospital-specific Questions

20. Do you feel that it's important to support your local hospital through giving?
21. Do you think you will ever become a supporter of the hospital? Why or why not?

*Exhibit 3 - Nonprofits named by participants in response to the following questions:*

Can you name some nonprofits?

American Cancer Society (2)  
American Indian College Fund  
Benco  
Boys and Girls Club of America  
Boys and Girls Club of Corvallis  
Boys and Girls Club of Lebanon  
Calvary Chapel Corvallis  
Center Against Rape and Domestic Violence  
ChristyCare  
Cornerstone (2)  
Corporate Accountability International  
Corvallis Art Center  
Corvallis Montessori School  
Court Appointed Special Advocates of Benton County  
Doctors Without Borders  
Episcopal Relief Fund  
Goodwill  
Green for All  
Habitat for Humanity  
Heartland Humane Society (5)  
Lane County Relief Nursery  
Linn-Benton Food Share  
Love Inc.  
Lutheran Relief Fund  
National Public Radio  
Options Pregnancy Center (2)  
Oregon Food Bank  
Oregon State University  
Parent Enhancement Program  
Prison Entrepreneurship Program  
Salvation Army  
Samaritan Health Services (4)  
Samaritan's Purse  
Save the Children  
Southside Youth Outreach  
United Nations  
United Way (3)  
United Way of Benton and Lincoln Counties (3)  
World Vision  
Young Professionals of Corvallis

What are the specific nonprofits you personally support?

American Cancer Society  
Boys and Girls Club of Corvallis  
Boys and Girls Club of Lebanon

Boys and Girls Club of Salem  
Boys and Girls Clubs of Sweet Home  
Capital Communication Credit Union  
Children's Advocacy Center  
Community Outreach Inc.  
Cornerstone  
Corporate Accountability International  
Corvallis Arts Center  
Corvallis Montessori School  
Court Appointed Special Advocates of Benton County  
Doctors Without Borders  
Engineers Without Borders  
Episcopal Relief Fund  
Evangelical Alliance Mission  
Focus on the Family  
Friends of the Family  
Garfield Elementary Art Program  
Good Samaritan Hospital Foundation  
Grace City Church  
Green for All  
Green Peace  
Heartland Humane Society (3)  
K-Love Radio  
Lane County Relief Nursery  
Linn-Benton Food Share (3)  
Love, Inc.  
Lutheran Relief Fund  
Mt. Bachelor Ski Patrol  
Northwest Hills Church  
Options Pregnancy Center (3)  
Oregon Coast Community College  
Oregon Educational Association Foundation  
Oregon Public Broadcasting  
Oregon State University  
National Public Radio  
Pacific Communities Health District Foundation  
Prison Entrepreneurship Program  
Society of Automotive Engineers  
Stanford University  
United Way of Benton and Lincoln Counties (3)  
United Way of Linn and Lincoln Counties  
University of Oregon  
Urban Outreach  
Vina Moses  
World Impact  
Wycliffe

Young Life of Corvallis  
Young Professionals of Corvallis

---

**References**

- 1 Sloan, Frank A., Hoerger, Thomas J., Morrisey, Michael A., and Hassan, Mahud (1990). The Demise of Hospital Philanthropy. *Economic Inquiry* 28, p. 725.
- 2 Growth Rate of U.S. Giving for Health Care Falls More than 50 Percent in 2007 (2008). Association for Healthcare Philanthropy. <http://www.ahp.org/in-the-news/press-releases/docs/2008/102808.php>
- 3 *American Generations: Who They Are and How They Live*, (2005). Ithaca, NY: New Strategist Publications, pp. 8-13.
- 4 Acri, Sue (2008). Passing the Torch: Attracting and Cultivating the Next Generation of Philanthropists. *Advancing Philanthropy* June 2008, p. 16.
- 5 Light, Paul C. (2004). Fact Sheet on the Continued Crisis in Charitable Confidence. New York: New York University, p. 1.
- 6 Howe, Neil, and Strauss, William (2000). *Millennials Rising: The Next Great Generation*. New York: Vintage, p. 216.
- 7 Rose, Michael (2009). Dreams and Machines, Cultivating Young New Donors. <http://www.childrenshospitals.net/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Homepage&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&CONTENTID=42540>.
- 8 Berkshire, Jennifer (2006). Courting Generation Next. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*. Nov. 9, 2006, <http://philanthropy.com/free/articles/v19/i03/03002501.htm>.
- 9 Acri, Sue (2008). Passing the Torch: Attracting and Cultivating the Next Generation of Philanthropists. *Advancing Philanthropy* June 2008, p. 16.
- 10 *The Chronicle of Philanthropy* (2007). Don't Give Up on Young Donors. <http://philanthropy.com/giveandtake/article/173/dont-give-up-on-the-young>.
- 11 *The Chronicle of Philanthropy* (2007). Giving Up on Young Donors? <http://philanthropy.com/giveandtake/article/170/giving-up-on-young-donors>.
- 12 Kottasz, Rita (2003). How should young charitable organizations motivate young professionals to give philanthropically? *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 9:1.
- 13 Kottasz, Rita (2004). Differences in the Donor Behavior Characteristics of Young Affluent Males and Females: Empirical Evidence from Britain. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 15:2, p. 189.
- 14 Kottasz (2003), p. 21.
- 15 Kottasz (2003), pp. 21-22.
- 16 Kottasz (2003), pp. 22.
- 17 Kottasz (2003), p. 23.
- 18 Kottasz (2004) p. 198.
- 19 Stone, Andrea (2008). The new face of giving. *USA Today*. [http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/charity/2008-10-07-newface-giving\\_N.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/charity/2008-10-07-newface-giving_N.htm).
- 20 Jackson, Tysus (2001). Young African Americans: A new generation of giving behavior. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing* 6:3.
- 21 Jackson (2001), p. 248.
- 22 Jackson (2001), pp. 249-50.
- 23 The Center for Philanthropy at Indiana University (2008). Generational Differences in Charitable Giving and Motivations for Giving. <http://www.campbellcompany.com/articles.html>.
- 24 Jackson (2001), p. 251-52
- 25 Giving New Hampshire (2003). Charitable Giving and Volunteering in New Hampshire. [www.nhcf.org/FileDownload.cfm?file=2003\\_Giving\\_NH\\_-\\_Charitable\\_Giving\\_and\\_Volunteering\\_Report.pdf](http://www.nhcf.org/FileDownload.cfm?file=2003_Giving_NH_-_Charitable_Giving_and_Volunteering_Report.pdf), p. 18.
- 26 Howe, Neil, and Strauss, William (2000), p. 216.
- 27 Perry, Suzanne (2009). Charities Get Ready to Put Millions of Federal Volunteers to Work. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, April 2009, p. 32.

- 
- <sup>28</sup> Corporation for National and Community Service (2009). Volunteering in the United States. <http://www.volunteeringinamerica.gov/national.cfm>.
- <sup>29</sup> Howe, Neil, and Strauss, William (2000), p. 234.
- <sup>30</sup> Howe, Neil, and Strauss, William (200), p. 234
- <sup>31</sup> Light, Paul (2008). How Americans View Charities: A Report on Charitable Confidence, 2008. *Issues in Governance Studies* 13, pg. 1.
- <sup>32</sup> Light, Paul (2008), pg. 2.
- <sup>33</sup> Light, Paul (2008), pg. 7.
- <sup>34</sup> *American Generations* (2005), p. 117.
- <sup>35</sup> *American Generations* (2005), p. 63.
- <sup>36</sup> Steinberg, Richard, and Wilhelm, Mark (2003). Tracking giving across generations. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising* 42, Winter 2003.
- <sup>37</sup> The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University (2008). Generational Differences in Charitable Giving and in Motivations for Giving. <http://www.campbellcompany.com/articles.html>.
- <sup>38</sup> Steinberg, Richard and Wilhelm, Mark (2003), pg. 76.
- <sup>39</sup> The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University (2008), Summary.
- <sup>40</sup> *American Generations* (2005), Pg. 387.
- <sup>41</sup> Economy Affects Different Donor Demographics (2008). *Advancing Philanthropy* December 2008, pg. 6.
- <sup>42</sup> Iragui, Marcelo Iniarra, and Botti, Alfredo (2008). Social Trysumers and the Hidden Gate in the Pyramid. *Advancing Philanthropy* December 2008, pg. 12.
- <sup>43</sup> Cramer, Bob (2008). Building membership with social media. *Philanthropy Journal*. <http://www.philanthropyjournal.org/resources/managementleadership/building-membership-social-media>.
- <sup>44</sup> Hughes, Jared (2009). Twitter: It Isn't Just for Breakfast Anymore. *Bellwether Fundraising*. [http://www.bellwetherfundraising.com/Blog/Entries/2009/3/9\\_Twitter\\_-\\_It\\_Isnt\\_Just\\_for\\_Breakfast\\_Anymore.html](http://www.bellwetherfundraising.com/Blog/Entries/2009/3/9_Twitter_-_It_Isnt_Just_for_Breakfast_Anymore.html).
- <sup>45</sup> Floyd, Elizabeth (2008). Social networks: A tool for fundraising. *Philanthropy Journal*. <http://www.philanthropyjournal.org/resources/fundraisinggiving/social-networks-tool-fundraising>.
- <sup>46</sup> Wasley, Paula (2009). More Charities Are on Social Networks – but Few Have Raised Much. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy* May 2009, pg. 21.
- <sup>47</sup> Howe, Neil, and Strauss, William (2000), p. 216.
- <sup>48</sup> Acri, Sue (2008). Passing the Torch: Attracting and Cultivating the Next Generation of Philanthropists. *Advancing Philanthropy* June 2008, p. 18.
- <sup>49</sup> Wallace, Nicole (2009). Size of Average Online Gift Dropped in 2008, from \$86 to \$71. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy* may 2009. <http://philanthropy.com/news/updates/8256/size-of-average-online-gift-dropped-in-2008-from-86-to-71>.
- <sup>50</sup> *American Generations* (2005), p. 117.
- <sup>51</sup> Kottasz (2004), p. 198.