University of Kentucky Master's Theses   Graduate School

2011

THE EFFECTS OF NEW MEDIA ON ALUMNI ENGAGEMENT AMONG MILLENNIALS: A CASE STUDY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES ALUMNI

Allison M. Horseman
University of Kentucky, allison.horseman@uky.edu

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

THE EFFECTS OF NEW MEDIA ON ALUMNI ENGAGEMENT AMONG
MILLENNIALS: A CASE STUDY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES ALUMNI

This thesis explores the effects of new media, specifically the Internet and the popular social networking site Facebook, on alumni engagement among Millennials in the University of Kentucky College of Health Sciences. Millennials are defined as those born in or after 1982. Alumni engagement is defined as part of the larger social science term of social capital and is defined here as consisting of volunteerism and financial giving. To explore this topic, a survey was constructed and sent electronically to all Millennial alumni from the UK College of Health Sciences. Data reveal Millennial alumni from the College of Health Sciences are not particularly engaged through volunteerism or financial giving. Survey responses, however, indicated that most young alumni are recommending the college to prospective students and plan to give financially in the future. Practical implications from this study may prove beneficial for advancement practitioners and administrators in the University of Kentucky College of Health Sciences.

KEYWORDS: Internet, Social networking site, Alumni Engagement, Millennial,
        Facebook

_Allison M. Horseman_____
                Signature

_8-3-2011_____
                Date

THE EFFECTS OF NEW MEDIA ON ALUMNI ENGAGEMENT AMONG
MILLENNIALS: A CASE STUDY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES ALUMNI

By

Allison M. Horseman

__Dr. Seungahn Nah_____
          Director of Thesis

__Dr. Gary Hansen_____
          Director of Graduate Studies

__8-3-2011_____
          Date

RULES FOR THE USE OF THESES

Unpublished theses submitted for the Master's degree and deposited in the University of Kentucky Library are as a rule open for inspection, but are to be used only with due regard to the rights of the authors. Bibliographical references may be noted, but quotations or summaries of parts may be published only with the permission of the author, and with the usual scholarly acknowledgments.

Extensive copying or publication of the thesis in whole or in part also requires the consent of the Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Kentucky.

A library that borrows this thesis for use by its patrons is expected to secure the signature of each user.

Name   Date

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

THESIS

Allison M. Horseman

The Graduate School

University of Kentucky

2011

THE EFFECTS OF NEW MEDIA ON ALUMNI ENGAGEMENT AMONG
MILLENNIALS: A CASE STUDY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES ALUMNI

_____

THESIS

_____

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Science in the
College of Agriculture
at the University of Kentucky

By

Allison M. Horseman

Lexington, Kentucky

Director: Dr. Seungahn Nah, Professor of Community and Leadership Development

Lexington, Kentucky

2011

Copyright $^{©}$ Allison M. Horseman 2011

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The following thesis has been a labor of love. Completing a master's degree and writing a thesis has been a personal goal since completing my undergraduate degree. Due to my love for community and for agriculture, I enrolled in the Community and Leadership Development program to fulfill this goal. I could not have completed this work without the patience and guidance of my thesis chair, Dr. Seungahn Nah. His knowledge in community communications and his commitment to seeing his students succeed is unparalleled. My thesis committee members have also played an integral part in this process and I offer my sincerest thanks to Dr. Richard Maurer and Dr. Randy Weckman for their support and assistance with this project. I also want to thank Bruce Gage, without whom I certainly would not have been able to complete this process. Your patience and guidance is greatly appreciated.

I want to thank my husband Kelly and son Ian for their unwavering support. Kelly: Thank you for always supporting me and making sacrifices in order for my dreams and wishes to come true. To my entire family, especially my parents Jim and Mary May, my sister Emily and my Aunt Brenda: Thank you for pushing me through this process and believing in me. I also want to thank my co-workers in the College of Health Sciences for their help through this process, and throughout all of graduate school. I'd like to especially thank Dean Lori Gonzalez for encouraging me to further my education, Dr. Rena Murphy for reading and re-reading my drafts, and Denise McCarthy for lending an ear.

In one way or another, every person in my life – friends, family, co-workers, etc. – played a role in helping me in this process. I thank each of you sincerely.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

The Effects of New Media on Alumni Engagement among Millennials:

A Case Study of the University of Kentucky College of Health Sciences Alumni

Chapter One: Introduction

Problem Statement/Background

Social science researchers have long debated how media affects community

engagement and social interactions (Coleman, 1990; Habermas, 1979). Generally,

studies looked at traditional media (television, radio, and newspaper), and most measured

the amount of media use and how use frequency translates into community engagement.

Several factors were found to boost community participation. These include: "age and

education, membership in the racial majority, employment, church attendance, and

general sociability" (Shah, McLeod, & Yoon, 2001, p. 465). In most studies, mass

media, especially heavy television use, was found to enhance a mean-world view and

lead to a decrease in civic participation (Putnam, 1995).

Since Putnam's (1995) early claims that social capital was decreasing mainly due

to television use, communication theorists and political theorists have attempted to both

prove and disprove his argument. Those who disagree insist that media use is not a black

or white issue. Instead, they contend that research must look at not only the length of

time an individual uses media for information gathering, but also the purpose.

Understandably, negative views on mass media and its effect on social capital have

trickled over to the Internet, with some research suggesting that the Internet is unhealthy

for society (Kraut, Patterson, Lundmark, Keisler, Mukopadhyay, & Scherlis, 1998;

Putnam, 2000). Others, however, argue the Internet can boost civic participation by

allowing for shared conversations, grass roots political movements, and wide-spread calls

for action (Norris & Jones, 1998).

This thesis explores these issues in the context of a case study at the University of

Kentucky College of Health Sciences. This paper adds to existing research by

conceptualizing how the Internet (specifically websites) and Facebook (a popular social

networking site) affect alumni engagement among Millennials at the University of

Kentucky College of Health Sciences.

Purpose of the study

It has been said that "moral panic is a common reaction to new forms of

communication," (Valenzuela, Park, & Kee, 2009, p. 875). But, not all forms of

communication are bad once we begin to use and understand them. In fact,

communication has the power to shape our civic society, foster trust, and build a more

effective democracy. That may be more applicable among Millennials, since the

generation is often seen to be at the helm of the decline in social capital, yet they are the

group that has the most knowledge and expertise associated with new communication

technology.

How do all of these aspects come together and what is the importance of studying

them here? To answer these questions, this thesis will explore the role of new media,

specifically the Internet (web pages) and the social networking site Facebook, and its

relevance in predicting alumni engagement. This topic has been sparingly explored in

previous literature (Eisenberg, 2009; Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007; Farrow &

Yoon, 2011; Holmes, Meditz, & Commers, 2008; Masterson, et al., 2010; Weerts, et al.,

2007; Steinfield, et al., 2008; Wang & Graddy, 2008; Weerts, et al., 2008). Scholars

have not provided a sufficient framework in which to study the relationship between the Internet and the social capital that may or may not exist within a community.

This work will also seek to make a simple connection between alumni engagement and financial giving. This paper will seek to add to current economical, sociological and psychological research by further defining existing models and testing them in a controlled environment.

Composition of the thesis

Recognizing the limitations of past research, this thesis will first consist of a literature review that explores research in the areas of social capital, new media and social capital, alumni engagement in the U.S., and characteristics of Millennials. Next, the theoretical framework will be described, followed by the study methodology, and results. Finally, it will conclude with a discussion of the findings and provide suggestions for future research.

Chapter Two: Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

Social Capital

Although it can be defined negatively, social capital is generally perceived to be positive. While theorists provide numerous definitions for the term, a survey of literature reveals that social capital is most commonly defined in terms of social networks, trust, civic engagement, and satisfaction (Bourdieu, 1983; Brehm & Rahn, 1997; Coleman, 1988; Dekker & Uslaner, 2001; Lin, 2001; Newton, 2006; Putnam, 2000; Valenzuela, Park & Lee, 2009). According to Valenzuela et al. (2009), the concept of social capital is uncomplicated, stating, "It is the resources available to people through their social interactions. Individuals with a large and diverse network of contacts are thought to have more social capital than individuals with small, less diverse networks" (p. 877).

Applicable to this study, theorists have argued that the building blocks of social capital are formed by long-term engagement, thus increasing participation in group activities and stimulating interpersonal trust (Romer, Jamieson, & Pasek, 2009). But although some research argues that those with larger and more diverse networks have more social capital, others contend that it is the interaction in smaller groups that builds an individual's networks because of the benefits that one receives from having a relationship with others (Lin, 1999). Shah et al. (2001) contend that "social trust developed in small group interactions [such as in a higher education setting] is thought to function as a heuristic that is applied to decisions to participate in large-scale collective action efforts" (p. 143). Activities such as serving on an advisory board, making phone calls to legislators on behalf of a university, giving financially, and participating in

alumni association activities are all events that can help make up the social capital of an alumni network (Weerts, et al., 2010).

The term social capital was coined around 1986 by Bourdieu and expanded soon thereafter by Coleman, Fukuyama, and Putnam (Guillen, Coromina, & Saris, 2011). The leading theorist on social capital is arguably Robert Putnam. Putnam refers to social capital as the "networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefits" (1995, p. 67). He argues that the civil society in America has been on the decline, stating that possible explanations for this include more women in the workplace, the increased mobility of families, the rise in popularity of television, and changing demographics that have occurred in the recent decades (Putnam, 1995). He states that "networks of civic engagement foster sturdy norms of generalized reciprocity and encourage the emergence of social trust" (p. 2). To give weight to his argument, Putnam points out that declining voter participation, trust in government, religious affiliation, and lack of labor unions, among others, are specific examples of how American society is changing. No longer do Americans define themselves by the groups they are in. Instead, they "bowl alone," meaning Americans have lost, or are beginning to lose, the social interaction and civic conversations that often accompany such activities as league bowling (1995).

Others disagree with Putnam's claim all-together. In reviewing the publication *The Ladd Report*, Walker states that social capital has never declined (1999). Instead, how social capital looks has changed. "The Elks and the Boy Scouts are less prominent and active now than they were half a century ago, but the Sierra Club is much more so. Bowling leagues are down, but U.S. Youth Soccer has emerged *de novo* and engages

more than two million boys and girls, together with an army of adult volunteers," (Ladd, quoted by Walker, 1999, p. 68).

Social capital is defined here as the community resources that are available to people and enable them to coordinate collective action and come together to achieve common goals (Shah, et al., 2001a). This paper also supports that there are three individual-level indicators of social capital: civic engagement, interpersonal trust, and personal contentment (Shah, et al., 2001b).

New Media and Social Capital

Mass media (television, radio, and mail) is no longer the only outlet for communicating with targeted audiences, such as higher education alumni. Instead, the Internet, which includes not only Web 1.0 (websites), but also Web 2.0 (user-generated content such as social networking sites, blogs, wiki, and more), has been thrown into the mix, thus creating new one-way and two-way communication outlets by which alumni can be reached. These outlets, defined here as new media, can have an impact on the way a potential donor, especially a Millennial donor, interacts with, and gains knowledge of, his or her alma mater. Research has not been able to pinpoint how the Internet affects a civic society, much less how emerging technologies such as social networking sites affect society. Some argue that the Internet causes a lack of social capital by allowing users to retreat into a fictitious world (Putnam, 2000), while others argue that this research is one dimensional and that the Internet use can actually benefit society by spurring intellectual conversation and civic participation that may start on the web, but end on the street (Norris & Jones, 1998).

Differing opinions surround how media can connect people and build social capital. Some argue that it can have negative effects, as Putman states, and others have found the opposite can occur (Das, Kerkhof & Kuiper, 2008; Economist, 2008; Pentecost & Andrews, 2010; Preston, 2009; Preston & Wallace, 2009; Romer, et al., 2009). As aforementioned, Putnam (1995) argues that part of the decline of civic activities in America can be attributed to media use, specifically television. Other theorists argue that advances in media, such as the Internet, have actually reinvigorated social capital, albeit in a different form and fashion than in the past. In fact, an increasing body of literature suggests that new media actually enhances social ties by putting more people in contact with family, friends, political action groups, civic organizations, and other organizations (DiMaggio, et al., 2001; Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007). Social networking sites (SNSs), such as Facebook, can be found at the heart of this controversy. Some argue that online SNSs allow users to retreat inside a world that isn't real and doesn't allow for meaningful communication. Kraut et al. (1998) found that new media use negatively affected psychological well-being, concluding that those who have a heightened use of the Internet are less likely to communicate with friends and family and are more susceptible to depression and loneliness. It has been noted, however, that individuals use the Internet for various reasons and it is not a "black or white" media outlet. Instead, the Internet is multidimensional and theorists such as Norris and Jones (1998) argue that "informational and communicative uses of media may prove beneficial to the health of society, whereas recreational and entertainment uses may erode public involvement" (Shah et al., 2001, p. 144). Others have found that new media use, specifically Facebook use, is associated positively with social capital formation (Ellison, et al., 2007), stating,

"for the college-age populations, sites like Facebook may play a vital role in maintaining relationships that would otherwise be lost" (Steinfield, 2008, p. 435). These relationships allow the formation of social capital and past research suggests that young adults with more social capital have better health, are more emotionally developed, and perform better academically (Steinfield, et al., 2008).

More must be done to increase the body of knowledge surrounding this topic (DiMaggio, Hargittai, Neuman, & Robinson, 2001). Overall, "there is little agreement on how to understand and assess relevant dimensions of social and civic life" (Shah, et al., 2001). It also is important to note that studying new media is a challenging notion. DiMaggio, et al. (2001) compare it to the alphabet, stating the Internet is "establishing new forms of social organization" (p. 309). They also provide two reasons why the opportune time to study the Internet is now. First, this is a once-in-a-lifetime chance to study a method of communication in its early stages. Second, they argue that the Internet integrates communication and a new way of delivering that communication, into one medium.

The Internet is still a fairly new technology, emerging publically around 1982. Its use has exploded within the United States and has grown exponentially over the past three decades. Now, social networking sites such as Facebook are emerging and deserve a place in social science research. According to Valenzuela et al. (2009), "the development of SNSs dedicated to fostering civic and political engagement among users, particularly young people, speaks in a loud voice to the potentialities of social media as a tool for collective action," (p. 879).

Research has noted the difference between both the Internet and its link to social capital, as well as SNSs and their link to social capital. Although SNSs are found online, they can be quite different from the Internet and research on the two may not be interchangeable. Valenzuela (2001) stated that the Internet, like television, is more likely to have fewer face-to-face interactions, whereas online communities are more likely to have a positive effect on social trust and actual participation in community life. By "making users feel connected to a community and increasing their knowledge of other members, sites such as Facebook can foster norms of reciprocity and trust and, therefore, create opportunities for collective action" (p. 881).

Of particular importance to this study, Thackeray and Hunter (2010) contended that technology use is an important part of building social capital, especially in young adults. They state that technology, the Internet, and SNSs are a part of the typical young American's life and that young adults must be given opportunities to participate in social change. These opportunities must be convenient, easy, and integrated into daily life. This is particularly important because the social networks that an individual participates in serves three main purposes – connecting them to an opportunity to participate, socializing them to an issue, and shaping their decision about whether or not to become involved (Thackeray & Hunter, 2010). "Providing opportunities for youth to successfully participate in social change, giving them a voice, and be involved in civic affairs may develop a generation of youth who carry these skills into adulthood" (p. 578).

Here, new media is defined as Web 1.0 (websites) and Web 2.0 (user-generated content such as social networking sites, blogs, etc.). It is a medium from which

information can be sought, and specifically, is a tool used for finding information and for delivering electronic forms of communication.

Alumni Engagement

Although limited, scholarly interest in alumni engagement has been gaining popularity over the past decade. The majority of research, however, has focused heavily on alumni giving (Weerts, Cabrera, & Sanford, 2010). This emphasis is understandable given that public higher education institutions, such as the University of Kentucky, are facing a large budget shortfall and the need for private and foundation financial support is higher than ever. State funding for higher education institutions has been cut dramatically, thus leaving colleges and universities relying more on private giving, such as that from alumni support (Weerts et al., 2010). Over the past several years overall giving to higher education institutions has declined, according to the annual Voluntary Support of Education survey. In fact, last year, the survey recorded the lowest alumni-giving rate in its history (Masterson & Carew, 2010). On average, higher education institutions have an alumni giving rate of 10 percent and the majority of those alumni who give back are older, established professionals (Masterson, et al., 2010).

It is important to note; however, that monetary giving is only one aspect of alumni engagement. A recent study explored the role of social networking sites and their role in alumni engagement, including volunteerism (Farrow & Yuan, 2011). The researchers found a direct impact on social networking usage to both giving and volunteerism, showing that "technical affordance of a communication technology on its own can bring about significant changes in behavior" (p. 459).

The current study recognizes that there are numerous activities and characteristics that could define the term "alumni engagement." Here, alumni engagement is defined as participation in any university-related activity that occurs after graduation, specifically volunteering or giving financially. This conceptual definition of alumni engagement is considered to be one of many aspects of the broad concept called civic engagement, also defined as part of social capital.

For higher education institutions in the United States, private and alumni giving is not a new concept. Instead, some of the earliest colleges – such as Harvard University – were supported by private resources and were, in turn, named for significant donors. Many early development programs were initiated by alumni. In 1980, Yale established the Yale Alumni Fund and raised $11,000 from 365 graduates in the first year (Mora & Nugent, 1998). Giving USA reported that 70 to 80 percent of Americans contributed annually to at least one charity in 2006 and higher education institutions are often the recipients of these gifts (Wang et al., 2008). All donors are motivated to give by different reasons. Some give for tax incentives, others because of an emotional commitment to a particular institution or organization, others because of peer pressure or burden of wealth, and some because of altruism and egoism (Brooks, 2005; Mora & Nugent, 1998).

Regardless of why individuals give, higher education institutions have invested significant resources to establish development, or advancement, programs and many receive a large portion of their operating budget from donations. According to the Council for Aid to Education's latest report, charitable giving contributions to colleges and universities in the United States totaled $27.65 billion in 2009. While that number is great, it is an 11.9 percent decrease from the previous year, the largest in the survey's

history (CAE, 2010). Prior to 2009, contributions to higher education institutions had enjoyed an average increase of 4.1 percent per year. According to the report, alumni giving ranked second behind foundation giving, with alumni giving 25.6 percent of the total gifts. In 2009, the University of Kentucky was the top fundraising higher education institution in Kentucky, reportedly raising $66,789,779 (CAE, 2010).

While charitable giving by alumni is an important part of alumni engagement, it is only one aspect of the term. Alumni can be engaged with their university on other levels as well. For instance, they can be a volunteer for their college or program and be called on to provide political influence, recruit students, provide strategic direction, mentor students and young alumni, and serve on boards, among other things (Farrow & Yuan, 2011; Weerts, Cabrera, & Sanford, 2010).

> Despite the growing emphasis on leveraging alumni support for higher education, the topic of alumni involvement in colleges and universities remains largely understudied. Institutions spend millions of dollars engaging alumni with the hope that they will become more active in supporting their alma maters. But, in many cases, campus leaders know very little about the impact of these efforts, the types of alumni most likely to serve the institution, and the range of ways that alumni support the institution (Weerts, et al., 2010, p. 347).

In many cases, volunteerism is more valuable than a check. Whether or not alumni volunteer for their alma mater may provide some insight into the student experience. Literature on the topic suggests that volunteerism is often linked to the quality of a person's experience, the reputation of the organization, and any investment they may have in the organization. Literature also has suggested those ages 35 to 44 are the most likely to volunteer and those in their early twenties are among the least likely to volunteer, thus providing an argument for the importance of this study (Weerts, et al., 2010).

Both aspects of alumni engagement, volunteerism and charitable giving, are important to a university; however, by putting the emphasis on giving, researchers and practitioners have virtually ignored the non-monetary roles that alumni can, and do, play for their alma mater. This work seeks to help fill that gap by exploring alumni engagement as a more comprehensive term.

Millennials

Today's young alumni are mostly considered to be part of the Millennial generation, born between 1982 and 1995. These young adults are an important piece of any alumni network, and keeping them involved with the college or university after graduating is important to the long-term strength of an alumni program. Eventually, these people will be called upon to donate financially, advise students, lobby for causes, and more. Involving alumni as volunteers soon after graduation allows them to start giving back to the college, thus developing a pattern that will likely last throughout their lives (Masterson, et al., 2010). According to Romer, Jamieson, and Paskek (2009), involving young alumni early may predict long-term engagement, thus forming "the building blocks of social capital, including participation in group activities and stimulating interpersonal trust" (p. 65).

The Millennial generation is different than any generation that has preceded it for the following reasons:

- they are more technologically advanced than previous generations;
- they have been privy to a greater amount of educational opportunities;
- they have more access to expendable wealth and place a priority on charitable giving;

- they demand transparency and involvement; and

- they value a work-life balance.

Millennials are unique and interesting in their own way and deserve attention in the realm of social science research (Howe & Strauss, 2000). Here, Millennials are defined as those born in or after 1982 until 1995.

> Millennials are "more numerous, more affluent, better educated, and more ethnically diverse. More important, they are beginning to manifest a wide array of positive social habits that older Americans no longer associate with youth, including a new focus on teamwork, achievement, modesty, and good conduct…Over the next decade, the Millennial Generation will entirely recast the image of youth from downbeat and alienated to upbeat and engaged – with potentially seismic consequences for America" (Howe et al., 2000, pg. 3).

Some prior research on social capital has found that young adults are not invested in their community. They have low social capital and are engrossed in technology and television (Howe, et al., 2000). Other research has argued the opposite and has proposed that social networking sites, namely Facebook, and tools like the Internet, have actually enhanced social capital among young adults. Ellison, et al. (2007) pose that Facebook use is closely related to both forming and maintaining social capital because it is used to form relationships and "among young adults, relationships with peers are important both for generating offline benefits, commonly referred to as social capital, and for psychosocial development" (Steinfield et al., 2008, p. 434). Again, little research has been done on this topic, yet preliminary studies indicate their importance. The ages between 18 and 25 are defined as "emerging adulthood" and are a critical time in life (Arnett, 2000). During these formidable years, young adults build social skills and establish relationships and habits that will most likely follow them throughout life (Steinfield et al., 2008).

Hypothesis

As Shah and other researchers have argued, three of the main components of

social capital are civic engagement, interpersonal trust, and contentment. For this study, I

will be expanding on their work, as well as work from McDearmon and Bradley, to

explore new media, specifically the Internet and the social network site Facebook, and its

role in predicting alumni engagement, a term identified earlier as part of the larger

concept of civic engagement.

Research has been conducted in the areas of civic engagement, media use, and

every other aspect of this study; however, few have combined the concepts to study them

in a specific setting. Prior research on social capital has found that young adults, or

Millennials, are not invested in their community and have low levels of civic

engagement, mostly due to heavy media use (Howe, et al., 2000). Other research has

proposed that social networking sites, namely Facebook, and Internet websites, have

actually enhanced social capital among young adults. Accordingly, the following

hypotheses are offered:

Hypothesis 1

Internet use frequency and attention (regarding the University of Kentucky

College of Health Sciences) among Millennial alumni will be positively related to alumni

engagement.

a. Internet use frequency regarding the University of Kentucky College of Health
   Sciences will be positively related to volunteering.

b. Internet use frequency regarding the University of Kentucky College of Health
   Sciences will be positively related to financial giving.

c. Internet attention regarding the University of Kentucky College of Health Sciences will be positively related to volunteering.

d. Internet attention regarding the University of Kentucky College of Health Sciences will be positively related to financial giving.

Hypothesis 2

Facebook use frequency and attention (regarding the University of Kentucky College of Health Sciences) will be positively related to alumni engagement.

a. Facebook use frequency regarding the University of Kentucky College of Health Sciences will be positively related to volunteering.

b. Facebook use frequency regarding the University of Kentucky College of Health Sciences will be positively related to financial giving.

c. Facebook attention regarding the University of Kentucky College of Health Sciences will be positively related to volunteering.

d. Facebook attention regarding the University of Kentucky College of Health Sciences will be positively related to financial giving.

Chapter Three: Methodology

Data Collection

Prior studies on social capital have focused on measuring the three components of the concept – interpersonal trust, personal contentment, and civic engagement. The few that have looked at alumni engagement sought to discover characteristics of alumni donors, ways to predict alumni involvement, alumni outcomes, job performance, competencies, and networking (Cabrera, Weerts & Zulick, 2003; Cohen & Malloy, 2010; Ellison, et al., 2007; Hoge & Ankney, 1982; Holmes, Meditz, & Sommers, 2008; McDearmon & Bradley, n.d.; Taylor & Martin, Jr., 1995; Terkla, O'Leary, Wilson & Diaz, 2007; Weerts, et al., 2007; Weerts, et al., 2008). It is important to address how prior studies have measured social capital since alumni engagement is being defined here as a specific part of the greater term.

In order to look at the relationship between two new media tools (the Internet and Facebook) and young alumni engagement and financial giving, a survey approach was taken. The survey utilized prior research questions and built on the existing knowledge base by proposing newly formulated questions. Prior to the survey being sent to the identified population, it was tested by 20 individuals, including a group of student who are part of the College of Health Sciences Student Ambassadors, as well as colleagues of the researcher and the thesis committee members. Upon finalization, the survey was sent to alumni of the University of Kentucky College of Health Sciences, born in or after 1982. The survey was conducted with the assistance of the University of Kentucky Alumni Association and was approved by the university IRB. It was designed using Qualrics.com, an online survey software, and was delivered via e-mail from the

University of Kentucky Alumni Association. Due to its limited scope, the results of this survey cannot be generalized to the greater public, but are generalizable to the larger sample since all graduates from the College of Health Sciences born in or after 1982 were solicited for participation in this research project, which had a response rate of 11.64 percent.

Sampling and Response Rate

Due to the small size of the survey population, the sample includes all graduates of the College of Health Sciences at the University of Kentucky who were born in 1982 or after. According to the official University of Kentucky records, this included 583 individuals. Of those, 481 had e-mail addresses listed in Millennium, the alumni and donor database used by the university. The sample population was born between 1982 and 1988. The survey was sent to the entire list three times. Due to low responses, the survey deadline was extended to June 20 and a final reminder was sent on June 13.

According to the UK Alumni Association, the e-mail sent on May 13 was sent to 481 individuals. Of those, 73 were returned with incorrect e-mail addresses, 57 were opened, and 19 individuals clicked on the survey link. A second message was sent on May 27 to 412 people. Three e-mails were returned due to incorrect e-mail addresses and 42 people opened the e-mail. Of those, five individuals clicked on the survey link. The third and final e-mail was sent from the UK Alumni Association on June 13. On that date, 408 e-mails were sent and two were returned to the sender. Fifty-one individuals opened the e-mail and 20 people clicked on the survey link.

To encourage responses, two incentives were offered to those who responded and chose to voluntarily fill out additional identifying information that was not connected or traceable back to survey responses. These incentives included an autographed basketball

18

from the University of Kentucky men's basketball coach John Calipari and a $25 gift card to Amazon.com. In addition to the e-mails that were released from the Alumni Association, announcements concerning the survey were posted numerous times to various UK College of Health Sciences Facebook pages and requests for responses were also sent from the researcher to alumni who fit the criteria. The survey was open for five weeks. During that time, 77 individuals responded. Due to incomplete surveys, missing information, or other unknown reasons, only 56 responses were valid, providing a response rate of 11.64 percent. Those valid responses were the only ones used in data analysis.

Of the valid responses, 17 individuals had a bachelor's degree, 31 a master's degree, and eight had an advanced degree, including a clinical doctorate or Ph.D. All of the respondents were Caucasian and the largest percent of them, 26.8 percent, earned between $75,001 and $100,000 per year.

Measurement

This study has two independent variables – Internet use and Facebook use. The two variables were measured through questions related to frequency of use and attention. To measure Internet frequency, respondents were asked to approximate the number of times in the past year they have used the Internet to search for information about the UK College of Health Sciences. To measure Internet attention, respondents were asked how they respond to information they receive via the Internet from the UK College of Health Sciences by indicating they read it, share it electronically, or neither. Respondents could choose one, two or all three attention-related options.

To measure Facebook use frequency, respondents were asked to indicate if they "liked" any of the official UK College of Health Sciences Facebook pages. According to facebook.com, "like" is a way to give positive feedback or to connect with things an individual cares about on Facebook. A Facebook user can like content that his or her friends post to give them feedback or can like a page they want to connect with via Facebook (http://facebook.com, n.d.). There are five official Facebook pages the college operates centrally and respondents were asked to indicate all pages they liked. These pages include:

- UK College of Health Sciences;

- UK Physical Therapy Program;

- Communication Sciences and Disorders Program;

- UK Physician Assistant Studies Program; and

- UK Physician Assistant Program Alumni.

To measure Facebook use attention, respondents were asked to indicate how they typically respond to Facebook updates on any of the pages they like. They could respond by reading the post, sharing the post, or neither. Respondents could choose one, two, or all three ways of responding.

The dependent variables in this study are volunteerism and financial giving. Volunteerism was measured dichotomously through yes or no questions as well as through frequency related questions. There were six questions that addressed volunteerism. The six dichotomous questions asked respondents to answer yes or no in regards to if they had ever attended an on-campus alumni event, recommended the College of Health Sciences to a prospective student, contacted the college on behalf of a

20

prospective student, served on a college board or committee as an alumnus, attended an off-campus alumni event, or volunteered at a student event. If respondents indicated they had participated as a volunteer in any of those aforementioned capacities, they were asked to indicate the number of times they had attended an on-campus event, recommended the college to a prospective student, contacted the college on behalf of a prospective student, served on a board or committee, attended an off-campus alumni event, or volunteered at a student event.

Financial giving was measured dichotomously by indicating whether or not the respondent had ever financially supported the University of Kentucky through a monetary gift. Giving was also measured based on amount, with those who stated they had given a gift indicating the amount given. Choices were $1 to $50, $51 to $100, $101 to $250, $251 to $500, and $500 plus. Those who stated they had not given a gift were asked to specify if they did or did not plan to give a gift in the future.

Basic parameters of the independent and dependent variables are presented in Table 3.1. Total amount given and frequency are reported Table 3.2.

Table 3.1

Independent and Dependent Variable Parameters

	N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
IA	56	0	1	0.46	0.50
IF	56	0	10	6.99	15.38
FA	56	0	1	0.52	0.51
FF	56	0	3	1.13	1.08
OC	56	1	2	1.32	0.47
OC#	56	0	9	0.94	1.84
RP	56	1	2	1.98	0.13
RP#	45	0	8	3.37	1.89
CC	55	1	2	1.07	0.26
CC#	56	0	10	0.25	1.37
CB	56	1	2	1.07	0.26
CB#	56	0	4	0.13	0.57
OF	56	1	2	1.20	0.40
OF#	56	0	6	0.45	1.09
SE	56	1	2	1.07	0.26
SE#	56	0	5	0.20	0.82
G	56	1	3	1.88	0.72

1. IA=Internet use attention, IF=Internet frequency, FA=Facebook use attention, FF=Facebook frequency,

OC=On-campus event attendance, RP=Recommended to prospective student,

CC=Contacted college on behalf of prospective student, CB=College board or committee service,

OF=Off-campus event attendance, SE=Student event volunteer, G=Given to UK

#=If yes, how many times

Table 3.2

Total Amount Given to UK and Frequency

Amount	Frequency	Percent
$1-$50	5	6.8
$51-$100	3	4.1
$101-$250	2	2.7
$50+	2	2.7

In Table 3.3, the frequency and percent for each independent and dependent variable is outlined. For Internet and Facebook frequency (IF and FF), *no* refers to the frequency and percent of respondents who did not receive information via the Internet regarding the College of Health Sciences and who did not like any of the Facebook pages operated centrally from the college. In terms of internet attention and Facebook attention, *yes* frequency and percent refers to those who indicated they read and/or shared the information from either source.

Table 3.3

Independent and Dependent Variable Frequency and Percent

| | Yes | | No | |
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
IA	26	46.4	30	53.6
IF	28	37.8	28	37.8
FB	29	51.8	27	48.2
FF	34	60.7	22	39.3
OC	18	24.3	38	51.4
RP	55	74.3	1	1.4
CC	4	5.4	51	68.9
CB	4	5.4	52	70.3
OF	11	14.9	45	60.8
SE	4	5.4	52	70.3
G	11	14.9	45	60.8

1. IA=Internet use attention, IF=Internet frequency, FA=Facebook use attention,
FF=Facebook frequency, OC=On-campus event attendance,
RP=Recommended to prospective student, CC=Contacted college on behalf of prospectiv
CB=College board or committee service, OF=Off-campus event attendance,
SE=Student event volunteer, G=Given to UK

Data Analysis

Once data were gathered using Qualtrics.com, a survey instrument approved by

the University of Kentucky, it was then entered in SPSS and analyzed. Due to the small

response rate, Pearson Correlations were run on data. As aforementioned, the responses

from the group were fairly homogenous, yet there were some questions that skewed the

data, thus illustrating the importance of looking at them as separate and distinct variables.

More sophisticated data analysis was not appropriate as the reliability score was too low and combining variables did not provide any further insight.

Pearson Correlation was used to examine the relationship between the independent and dependent variables (See Table 3.4). It is important to note that Internet and Facebook frequency (IF and FF) variables refer to respondents who use the Internet to search for information about the College of Health Sciences and the number of pages "liked" in regards to the official Facebook pages operated by the University of Kentucky College of Health Sciences. Internet attention and Facebook attention (IA and IF) variables refer to those who indicated they read or shared the information from either source. Those correlations are discussed under each hypothesis.

Table 3.4

Correlations among Independent and Dependent Variables

	IA	IF	FA	FF	OC	RP	CC	CB	OF	SE	G
IA		0.630*	-0.177*	0.039*	-0.027*	-0.145*	-0.256*	-0.142*	0.171*	0.159*	-0.189*
IF	0.630*		0.010*	0.006*	0.748*	0.91*	0.518*	0.816*	0.678*	0.159*	0.023*
FA	-0.177*	0.010*		0.000*	0.128*	0.14*	0.971*	-0.165*	-0.243*	-0.097*	0.818*
FF	0.039*	0.006*	0.000*		0.647*	0.297*	0.496*	0.479*	0.297*	0.476*	0.400*
OC	-0.027*	0.748*	0.128*	0.063*		-0.196*	0.402*	0.106*	-0.148*	-0.12*	0.229*
RP	-0.145*	0.910*	0.14*	0.297*	-0.196*		0.038*	0.037*	0.067*	0.033*	-0.024*
CC	-0.256*	0.518*	-0.005*	0.496*	0.402*	0.038*		0.191*	0.035*	-0.059*	0.442*
CB	-0.0119*	0.816*	-0.149*	0.476*	0.106*	0.037*	0.191*		0.212*	0.617*	0.147*
OC	0.171*	0.678*	-0.243*	0.297*	-0.148*	0.067*	0.035*	0.212*		0.047*	0.024*
SE	0.159*	0.159*	0.129*	0.476*	-0.042*	0.037*	-0.067*	0.462*	0.037*		-0.049*
G	-0.189*	0.023*	0.032*	0.006*	0.229*	-0.024*	0.442*	0.147*	0.024*	-0.049*	

1. *p≤05, Sig. (2-tailed)

2. IA=Internet use attention, IF=Internet use frequency, FA=Facebook use attention, FF=Facebook use frequency, OC=On-campus event attendance, RP=Recommended to prospective student,, CC=Contacted college on behalf of prospective student, CB=College board or committee service, OF=Off-campus event attendance, SE=Student event volunteer, G=Given to UK

Chapter Four: Results

Basic Findings

When looking at correlations within the data, very few relationships were found. The data did indicate a negative correlation between those that used the Internet frequently to search for information about the UK College of Health Sciences and those who had attended more on-campus alumni-events such as Homecoming, class reunions, galas, etc. The data indicate a positive correlation in regards to those who had given to UK and those who used the Internet to search for information about the college; however, due to the low number of respondents, 11, who had actually given financially to the University of Kentucky, we cannot make any generalizable statements regarding giving. No correlations were shown between Facebook frequency and attention and the volunteer and financial giving variables.

The most interesting finding in the study come from the basic data and percentages, and the implications, as will be discussed later, are of important practical use.

In terms of volunteerism as related to the UK College of Health Sciences, 38 respondents (67.9 percent) had never attended an on-campus event. Of the 18 individuals (32.1 percent) that had attended an on-campus alumni event, the majority had attended between one and five events. Likewise, 51 respondents (91.1 percent) had never contacted the college of behalf of a prospective student, 52 (92.9 percent) had never served on a college committee or board, 45 (80.4 percent) had never attended an off-campus alumni event, and 52 (92.9 percent) had never volunteered at a student event. The most interesting finding, however, is that a large majority of respondents, 55 (98.2

percent), had recommended the College of Health Sciences to a prospective student. Eleven respondents (19.6 percent) indicated they had done so three times. One individual indicated he/she had recommended the college 140 times, thus indicating the importance of recognizing each variable as separate and distinct.

Only 11 respondents (19.6 percent) indicated they had ever given to UK. Those that had never given were asked if they planned to give in the future. Of those that had not given, 18 (32.1 percent) said they never planned to make a financial contribution to the university and 27 (48.2 percent) said even though they had not given, they did plan to do so in the future.

When looking at media use, specifically Internet and Facebook, nine respondents (16.1 percent) had not used the Internet to search for information about the College of Health Sciences; however, the remaining 47 (83.9 percent) had done so and the majority, 10 individuals, had searched for information four times. Twenty-eight of the respondents, or 50 percent, received the electronic newsletter from the College of Health Sciences, yet only 26 (46.4 percent) indicated they read the information. Of those who receive the information via the Internet, only one individual (1.8 percent) said they share the information with others electronically and six respondents (10.7 percent) indicated they neither read it nor shared it. In terms of Facebook, 20 respondents (35.7 percent) indicated they liked the UK College of Health Sciences Facebook page, five (8.9 percent) like the Physical Therapy page, nine (16.1 percent) like the Communication Sciences and Disorders page, 17 (30.4 percent) like the Physician Assistant page, and 12 (21.4 percent) like the Physician Assistant Alumni page. In terms of attention, 29 respondents (51.8 percent) of respondents indicated the read updates from the Facebook pages they like,

three (5.4 percent) said they share the information, and 14 (25 percent) said they do neither.

The group of respondents was fairly similar in terms of demographics. All respondents (100 percent) identified themselves as Caucasian. Those targeted were born between 1982 and 1988. More than half of respondents, 55.4 percent, had a master's degree, 30.4 percent indicated they had a bachelor's degree, and 14.3 percent had an advanced degree, including a clinical doctorate degree or Ph.D. The largest percent, 26.8 percent, had an annual household income of $75,000 to $100,000, 17.9 percent made less than $25,000, 16.1 percent between $25,001 and $50,000, 17.9 percent between $50,001 and $75,000, and 21.4 percent indicated an annual income greater than $100,000.

Hypothesis 1

Due to the low number of responses and the similarities of responses, data could not be combined in order to look at each part of the hypothesis as a complex variable. For that reason, each variable was treated as separate and distinct.

When looking at each variable this way, it was necessary to compare Internet frequency and attention to each part of the dependent variable: attending on-campus events, recommending the college of prospective students, contacting the college on behalf of a prospective student, serving on a college board or committee, attending off-campus alumni events, and volunteering at a student event. The same comparisons were looked at in terms of Internet frequency and attention and any correlations that were shown in regards to financial giving.

To test Internet use frequency and attention, survey respondents were asked to identify the approximate number of times in the past year they have used the Internet to

search for information about the University of Kentucky. They were also asked to determine how closely they pay attention to electronic communication from the UK College of Health Sciences, indicating e-communication use via Internet.

All proposed hypotheses related to Internet frequency and attention showed no correlation, with one exception. The data indicate a negative connection between those who used the Internet to more frequently search for information about the University of Kentucky and those who had attended more on-campus alumni events such as Homecoming, class reunions, galas, etc. (See Table 4.1). This relationship is not one-way, thus we cannot contend that one causes the other, only that there is a relationship between the two categories.

Table 4.1

Correlation between Internet frequency and on-campus event attendance

	IF	
AE#	Pearson Correlation	-0.504
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.033
	N	18

1. *p≤.05, Sig. (2-tailed)

2. AE#=If yes, approximately how many on-campus alumni
events have you attended?
IF=Internet Frequency (Approximately how many times in
the past year have you used the internet to search for
information about the UK College of Health Sciences)

To test the Internet frequency and attention in regards to financial giving, survey respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they have given financially to the University of Kentucky, and if so, at what amount. Respondents were also asked to indicate if they planned to give in the future if they had not done so previously. Due to the low number of respondents who had actually given to the University of Kentucky, we cannot make any generalizable statements. Only 11 individuals indicated they had given to UK. The data did reveal, however, that there was some correlation between those who had given to UK and those who used the Internet to search for information about UK, indicating a potential relationship between the two groups that could be explored further with a more valid number of respondents (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2

Correlation between Internet frequency and giving

		IF
G	Pearson Correlation	0.865
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0
	N	12

1. *p≤.05, Sig. (2-tailed)
2. G=If yes, what total amount have you given to UK

IF=Internet Frequency (Approximately how many times in the past year have you used the internet to search for information about the UK College of Health Sciences)

Hypothesis 2

As aforementioned, each variable was analyzed as separate and unique. To test the second hypothesis, Facebook frequency and attention was compared to each part of the dependent variable: attending on-campus events, recommending the college of prospective students, contacting the college on behalf of a prospective student, serving on a college board or committee, attending off-campus alumni events, and volunteering at a student event. The same comparisons were looked at in terms of Facebook frequency and attention and any correlations that were shown in regards to financial giving.

To test Facebook frequency and attention, survey respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they "liked," or received status updates from, any of the official Facebook pages operated out of the College of Health Sciences. There were five official Facebook pages listed in the survey and frequency is reported as the number of Facebook pages liked. Thirty-four respondents liked at least one of the five official pages and seven respondents "liked" three of the total pages. No respondents indicated they "liked" all five pages. Facebook use attention was measured by asking respondents how closely they pay attention to status updates from these pages. Respondents could indicate they

32

read the updates, shared the updates or neither. Facebook use attention refers to those who indicated they either read or shared the information. Of the respondents, 29, or 51.8 percent, indicated they pay close attention to status updates.

When looking at Facebook frequency and attention as related to the identified volunteering variables, no areas of correlation were shown. Likewise, no correlations were shown between Facebook attention and frequency and financial giving.

Chapter Five: Discussion

Summary of the Results

Due to the low number of respondents, it is difficult to find correlation between the variables. It is important to note, however, that the survey population uses media frequently. The data collected shows that the majority of respondents use the Internet approximately three to four hours per day, with 35.1 percent. In addition, 31.1 percent of respondents reported they spend 30 minutes to one hour using Facebook each day. Only two individuals indicated they do not use Facebook at all. This indicates that the Internet and social media are important parts of their lives, as proposed by Thackeray and Hunter (2010).

In terms of alumni engagement, most are not involved with the UK College of Health Sciences. Fifty-one percent of the respondents indicated they had never attended an on-campus alumni event, 68.9 percent said they had never contacted the college on behalf of a potential student, 70.3 percent had never served on a college board or committee and 60.8 percent had never attended an off-campus alumni event. It is important to note, however, that 98.2 percent *had* recommended the College of Health Sciences to a prospective student.

In addition, respondents did indicate they have used the Internet to search for information on the College of Health Sciences, with 10 individuals, or 13.5 percent, indicating they had searched at least four times in the past year. An equal amount of participants receive the official electronic newsletter from the College of Health Sciences as those that do not. In terms of Facebook use, 27 percent of respondents "like," or have elected to receive information from, the College of Health Sciences official Facebook

page and smaller amounts "like" the individual program Facebook pages the college operates. Again, most simply read the Facebook posts issued through the college and do not respond or share them with their own social networks. In terms of financial giving, the majority of respondents have not made a monetary gift to the University of Kentucky; however, 36.5 percent indicated that while they have not made a monetary gift, they plan to do so in the future.

It is also important to point out that while the respondents did not indicate a high level of volunteerism within the University of Kentucky College of Health Sciences, they are volunteering elsewhere. All respondents indicated they had volunteered between one and 36 times during the past 12 months, with the majority indicating they had volunteered at least three times during the year. Thirteen individuals, or 17.6 percent, also indicated they had worked on a community project at least once in the past year. As Shah, et al. (2001) stated, "social trust developed in small group interactions is thought to function as a heuristic that is applied to decision to participate in large-scale collective action efforts." In addition, arguments that new media is corroding social capital are not supported by the findings here, although limited in scope. The respondents – all Millennials – are, in fact, involved in their communities and are making a contribution to society through civic involvement regardless of the fact that they indicated they are high users of new media, including the Internet and Facebook.

As aforementioned, research suggests that those in their early twenties are among the least likely to volunteer within organizations such as a college or university (Weerts, et al., 2010). According to the data, this proves true when comparing the amount this group is volunteering to the amount they are engaging themselves with the college.

Research has also suggested that Millennials typically have low social capital. According to the data here, that is true when looking at alumni engagement as part of the larger social capital term, since the majority of respondents were not involved with the college either through volunteering or financial giving.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the data gathered indicate that respondents are using the Internet and Facebook; however, those two forms of communication are not translating into alumni engagement for the University of Kentucky College of Health Sciences. Even though some respondents are using the Internet as an information-seeking tool in regard to the college, and others are receiving and paying attention to college information through Facebook, they are not volunteering or giving financially.

Very few correlations were found within the data. What was revealed included:

- A negative correlation between those that use the Internet to search for information on the UK College of Health Sciences and those who had attended on-campus alumni events.

- A positive correlation between those who gave to UK and those that used the Internet to search for information at the College of Health Sciences.

These findings have several practical implications for the UK College of Health Sciences. First, the number of e-mails sent and not opened could be indicative of a problem with communication between the college and its alumni. It could be interesting to see how many individuals open other types of e-communication from the college to know whether or not the fact that they were receiving a survey was an issue. Regardless, out of nearly 481 valid e-mail addresses, very few were opened or read. This also raises

questions about the validity of contact information the UK Alumni Association has in its database. One potential explanation for the low reading and response rate is that perhaps young alumni have numerous e-mail addresses used for various reasons. If the UK Alumni Association is using e-mail addresses that are not checked by the user, or rarely checked, that might help explain the low response rate. If that is the case, the question is raised as to how the college and the university as a whole can ensure communication is actually reaching the target audience.

In addition, of those who chose to respond, few were engaged with the college through volunteerism or financial giving. The college must do a better job in connecting with these alumni and getting them involved. Respondents were between 23 and 29 years of age, and getting young adults involved in an organization early is important because it establishes a pattern that will most likely to continue and build as they age (Arnett, 2000; Steinfield, et al., 2008). As a college, it should be important to continue the existing relationship faculty, staff, and administrators have with students soon after graduation, rather than wait until they are older to reestablish ties. Doing so should help build a robust advancement program for the college.

Limitations and Suggestions

The obvious limitation to this study is its scope. Due to restrictions within the University of Kentucky, only alumni from one college were allowed to be surveyed. Future research might prove more beneficial if data can be gathered from all alumni of the University of Kentucky. In addition, future research could compare alumni engagement from multiple colleges and universities. Is there a difference between larger schools and smaller, or public and private institutions? Future research might also focus

on age groups. While Millennials were targeted here, perhaps those that are older and more established are more engaged as alumni.

Another limitation of this study was the small response rate. A larger sample would be ideal to get a better comparison of the groups. Future research might utilize telephone and mail surveys as supplemental to e-mail surveys to attempt to increase response rate.

Third, a limitation of this study is the fact that sample group respondents were so similar in age, race, gender, and other demographic data. Due to the similarities in the responses, variables were not able to be combined to provide more in-depth and sophisticated data analysis.

Future research can build on the progress made in this study. As we continue exploring the role of social capital in our society, it will become increasingly important to look at the role new media takes in the concept. Likewise, it is important for colleges and universities to explore the ways in which they are reaching alumni of all ages and to ensure that social media is part of that communications plan. Perhaps by using social media to connect young alumni with their alma mater in ways that are meaningful to them, higher education institutions can boost both volunteerism and financial giving efforts. By expanding on the issues and topics addressed here, practical and academic advances can be made.

Survey Instrument

Thank you for your assistance with this important project. Your participation is completely voluntary. Your response is confidential and only group data will be reported.

To ensure your responses/opinions will be included, please respond electronically by June 15, 2011.   If you have questions about this survey, please contact:

Allison Horseman, College of Health Sciences, University of Kentucky
PHONE: 859-218-0563
E-MAIL: allison.horseman@uky.edu.

Don't Forget: Upon conclusion of the survey, you will have the option to enter into a drawing for an autographed Coach John Calipari basketball. The entrance into this drawing is optional and your name will not be associated with the survey responses in any way. Please proceed with the survey by clicking the button below, at right. Your progress will be measured at the bottom of each page.

The first section of this survey is designed to measure Civic Engagement, Interpersonal Trust, and Contentment. I have listed below some activities in which you, yourself may or may not have engaged. For each activity listed, please indicate the number of times (regardless of the number of hours) you, yourself, have engaged in the activities in the past 12 months by entering a number in the box below each statement:

1. Number of times you've done volunteer work in the past 12 months:

2. Number of times you've worked on a community project in the past 12 months:

3. Number of times you've gone to a club or organization meeting in the past 12 months:

This section asks basic demographic information about your year of birth, education level, race, and income.

1. In what year were you born?

2. Highest Completed Education
❍ High School
❍ Associate Degree
❍ Bachelor Degree
❍ Master's Degree
❍ Advanced degree

3. Race
○ White
○ Black or African American
○ Hispanic or Latino
○ American Indian or Alaska Native
○ Asian
○ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
○ Prefer not to disclose
○ Other

4. Annual Household Income
○ Less than $25,000
○ $25,001-$50,000
○ $50,001-$75,000
○ $75,001-$100,000
○ Over $100,000

Questions in this section are designed to measure media use.

1. INTERNET: Approximately how much time do you spend using the Internet on an average day? Please indicate your daily use below:
○ I don't use the Internet
○ Less than 30 minutes
○ 30 minutes to 1 hour
○ 1–-2 hours
○ 3–-4 hours
○ 5+ hours

2. FACEBOOK: Approximately how much time do you spend using Facebook on an average day? Please indicate your daily use below:
○ I don't use Facebook
○ Less than 30 minutes
○ 30 minutes to 1 hour
○ 1-2 hours
○ 3-4 hours
○ 5+ hours

Questions in this section are designed to measure alumni engagement.

6. Have you ever attended an on-campus alumni event (Homecoming, reunion, gala, etc.)
◯ No
◯ Yes

7. If yes, approximately how many on-campus alumni events have you attended?

8. Have you ever recommended your college to a prospective student?
◯ No
◯ Yes

9. If yes, approximately how many times have you recommended your college to a prospective student?

10. Have you ever contacted your college on behalf of a prospective student?
◯ No
◯ Yes

11. If yes, approximately how many times have you contacted your college on behalf of a prospective student?

12. As an alumnus, have you ever served on a college committee or board (i.e. college or program advisory board)?
◯ No
◯ Yes

13. If yes, approximately how many committees or board have you served on for your college?

14. Have you ever attended an off-campus alumni event?
◯ No
◯ Yes

15. If yes, approximately how many off-campus alumni events have you attended?

16. As an alumnus(a), have you ever volunteered at a student event?
◯ No
◯ Yes

17. If yes, approximately how many times have you volunteered at a student event?

The questions in this section are designed to measure Internet and Facebook use as it directly relates to the College of Health Sciences.

1. Approximately how many times in the past year have you used the Internet to search for information about the UK College of Health Sciences?

2. Do you receive an electronic newsletter (E-News) from the UK College of Health Sciences?
❍ No
❍ Yes

3. If yes, how do you respond to information you receive electronically from the UK College of Health Sciences?
❑ I read it
❑ I share it with others electronically
❑ Neither

4. Do you "like" of any of the official Facebook pages? Select all that apply.   As defined by facebook.com, "Like" is a way to give positive feedback or to connect with things you care about on Facebook. You can like content that your friends post to give them feedback or like a Page that you want to connect with on Facebook. You can also connect to content and Pages through social plugins or advertisements on and off Facebook.
❑ University of Kentucky College of Health Sciences
❑ University of Kentucky Physical Therapy Program
❑ Communication Sciences and Disorders Program
❑ University of Kentucky Physician Assistant Studies Program
❑ University of Kentucky Physician Assistant Program Alumni

5. When you see a Facebook status update from the UK College of Health Sciences pages you "like," how do you respond?
❑ I read it
❑ I "share" it
❑ Neither
The questions in this section are designed to report financial support of the University of Kentucky.

6. Have you financially supported the University of Kentucky through a monetary gift?
❍ No
❍ Yes

7. If yes, what total amount have you given UK?
❍ $1-$50
❍ $51-100
❍ $101-$250
❍ $251-500
❍ $500+

8. If no, please select an option below.
❍ I have not given a gift and do not plan to do so.
❍ I have not given a gift, but plan to do so in the future.

References

Adloff, F. (2009). What encourages charitable giving and philanthropy? *Ageing & Society, 29*, 1185-1205. doi: 10.1017/s0144686x08008295

Arnett, D. B., German, S. D. & Hunt, S. D. (2003). The identity salience model of relationship marketing success: The case of nonprofit marketing. *The Journal of Marketing, 67*(2), 89-105.

Artman, J. (2008). Motivate your millennials! *Library Journal, 133*(3), 39-39.

Berkshire, J.C. (2007). Guiding future philanthropists. *Chronicle of Philanthropy, 19*(14), 14-17.

Brehm, J., & Rahn, W. (1997). Individual-level evidence for the causes and consequences of social capital. *American Journal of Political Science, 41*, 999-1023.

Brooks, A.C. (2003). Public goods and posterity: An empirical test of intergenerational altruism. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 13*(2), 165-175.

Brooks, A.C. (2005). Does social capital make you generous? *Social Science Quarterly, 86*(1), 1-15.

Council for Aid to Education. (2010). *Contributions to colleges and universities down 11.9 percent to $27.85 billion: Greatest decline ever recorded.* New York, NY.

Coleman, J.S. (1998). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 95-120.

Das, E., Kerkhof, P., & Kuiper, J. (2008). Improving the effectiveness of fundraising messages: The impact of charity goal attainment, message framing, and evidence on persuasion. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 36*(2), 161-175. doi: 10.1080/00909880801922854.

DiMaggio, P., Hargittai, E., Neuman, W.R., & Robinson, J.P. (2001). Social implications

of the internet. *Annual Review of Sociology, 27*, 307-336

Eckel, C.C. & Grossman, P.J. (1998). Are women less selfish than men?: Evidence from

dictator experiments. *The Economic Journal, 108,* 726-735.

Eisenberg, P. (2009). The nonprofit world needs an intellectual push. *Chronical of

Philanthropy, 21*(20), 38.

Ellison, N.B., Steinfield, C. & Lampe, C. (2007). The benefits of Facebook "friends:"

Social capital and college students' use of online social network sites. *Journal of

Computer-Mediated Communications, 12*, 1143-1168.

Farrow, H. & Yuan, Y. C. (2011). Building stronger ties with alumni through Facebook

to increase volunteerism and charitable giving. *Journal of Computer-Mediated

Communication, 16,* 445-464.

Gary Hubbell Consulting. (2003). *Donors of the future*. Milwaukee, WI: Gary J. Hubbell.

Generational values: Their impact on message persuasiveness in direct mail fundraising.

Proceedings from National Communication Association Conference Papers.

Habermas, J. (1979). *Communication and the evolution of society*. Boston: Beacon.

Hoge, D.R. & Ankney, T.L. (1982). Occupations and attitudes of former student activists

10 years later. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 11*(5), 355-371.

Holmes, J.A., Meditz, J.A. & Sommers, P.M. (2008). Athletics and alumni giving:

Evidence from a highly selective liberal arts college. *Journal of Sports

Economics, 9*(5), 538-552.

Ingenhoff, D., & Koelling, A.M. (2009). The potential of Web sites as a relationship

    building tool for charitable fundraising NPOs. *Public Relations Review, 35*(1), 66-

    73. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2008.09.023

Kraut, R., Patterson, M., Lundmark, V., Kiesler, S., Mukopadhyay, T., & Scherlis, W.

    (1998). Internet paradox: A social technology that reduces social involvement and

    psychological well-being? *American Psychologist, 53*, 1017-1031.

Kohli, M. & Kunemund, H. (2003) Intergenerational transfers in the family: What

    motivates giving? In V. L. Bengtson & A. Lowenstein (Eds.), *Global Aging and*

    Challenges to Families (123-142). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Masterson, K. & Carew, E.L. (2010). 5 colleges that inspire alumni giving, and how they

    do it. *Chronical of Higher Education, 56*(24), 20.

McDearmon, J.T. & Bradley, K.D. Operationalizing and measuring role identity and

    charitable giving behaviors of college and university alumni: The instrumentation

    process.

Merchant, A., Ford, J. B., & Sargeant, A. (2010). Charitable organizations' storytelling

    influence on donors' emotions and intentions. *Journal of Business Research,*

    63(7), 754-762. doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.05.013

Mora, J., & Nugent, M. (1998). Seeking new resources for European universities: The

    example of fundraising in the U.S. *European Journal of Education*, *33*(1), 113-

    130.

Newman, R. (2000). Gender differences in philanthropy. *Fund Raising Management,*

    31(1), 28-29.

Newton, K. (2006). Political support: Social capital, civil society and political and economic performance. *Political Studies*, 54, 846-864.

O'Neil, J. (2007). The link between strong public relationships and donor support. *Public Relations Review, 33*(1), 99-102. doi: 10.1016/j.pubrev.2006.11.021

Pentecost, R. & Andrews, L. (2010). Differences between students and non-students' willingness to donate to a charitable organization. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing, 15*, 122-136.

Preston, C. (2009). Charities look for ways to unlock the benefits of social-media tools. *Chronicle of Philanthropy, 22*(4), 16.

Preston, C. (2009). New nonprofit reality ahead, report says. *Chronicle of Philanthropy, 22*(4), 36.

Preston, C. & Wallace, N. (2009). Study examines donors' views of online networks. *Chronicle of Philanthropy, 22*(3), 18.

Putnam, R.D. (1995a). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy, 6,* 65-78.

Putnam, R.D. (1995b). Tuning in, tuning out the strange disappearance of social capital in America. *Political Science and Politics, 284*, 664-683.

Romer, D., Jamieson, K.H., & Pasek, J. (2009). Building social capital in young people: the role of mass media and life outlook. *Political Communication, 26*, 65-83.

Sargeant, A., West, D.C., & Jay, E. (2007). The relational determinants of nonprofit web site fundraising effectiveness: An exploratory study. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 18*(2), 141-156. doi: 10.1002/nml.178.

Sausner, R. (2005). Getting to one-click giving. www.universitybusiness.com, accessed
    11-1-2010.

Scheufele, D.A. (2002). Examining differential gains from mass media and their
    implications for participatory behavior. *Communication Research, 29*, 46-65. doi:
    10.1177/009365020202900103.

Scheufele, D.A. & Shah, D.V. (2000). Personality strength and social capital: the role of
    dispositional and informational variables in the production of civic participation.
    Communication Research, 27(2), 107-131.

Shah, D.V., Kwak, N. & Holbert, R.L. (2001a). "Connecting" and "disconnecting" with
    civil life: Patterns of internet use and the production of social capital. *Political
    Communication, 18*, 141-162.

Shah, D.V., McLeod, J.M. & Yoon, S. (2001b). Communication, context, and
    community: An exploration of print, broadcast, and internet influences.
    Communication Research, 28, 464-506. doi: 10.1177/009365001028004005.

Shah, D.V. & Scheufele, D.A. (2006). Explicating opinion leadership: Nonpolitical
    dispositions, information consumption, and civic participation. *Political
    Communication, 23*, 1-22.

Steinfield, C., Ellison, N.B. & Lampe, C. (2008). Social capital, self-esteem, and use of
    online social network sites: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Applied
    Developmental Psychology, 29*, 434-445.

Thankeray, R. & Hunter, M. (2010). Empowering youth: Use of technology in advocacy
    to affect social change. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 15,* 575-
    591.

Tonin, M. & Vlassopoulos. (2010). An experimental investigation of intrinsic

    motivations for giving. *Proceedings from School of Social Sciences, Economic*

    Division, University of Southampton. Southampton SO17 1BJ, UK.

Valenzuela, S., Park, N. & Kee, K.F. (2009). Is there social capital in a social network

    site?: Facebook use and college students' life satisfaction, trust, and participation.

    Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 14, 875-901.

Wang, L. & Graddy, E. (2008) Social capital, volunteering, and charitable giving.

    Voluntas, 19, 23-42. doi: 10.1007/s11266-008-9055-y.

Waters, R.D. (2008). Applying relationship management theory to the fundraising

    process for individual donors. *Journal of Communication, 12*(1), 73-87.

Weerts, D. J., Cabrera, A. F. & Sanford, T. (2010). Beyond giving: Political advocacy

    and volunteer behaviors of public university alumni. *Research in Higher*

    Education, 51, 346-365.

Weerts, D.J. & Ronca, J.M. (2008). Characteristics of alumni donors who volunteer at

    their alma mater. *Research in Higher Education, 49*, 274-292.

Vita

Allison M. Horseman was born June 12, 1980 in Somerset, Kentucky. She received a Bachelor of Art degree from Georgetown College in 2002. She currently works as the Director of Advancement for the University of Kentucky College of Health Sciences.