

2022

Building The Social Capital of The Academic Library Through Fundraising

Kathryn Dilworth

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/hcfpubs>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries.
Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

This is a preprint of a chapter accepted for publication by Facet Publishing. It has been taken from the author's original manuscript and has not been edited. The definitive version of this piece may be found in *The Social Future of Academic Libraries: New Perspectives on Communities, Networks, and Engagement* (pp. 273-285), edited by Tim Schlak, Sheila Corral and Paul J. Bracke (Facet, London, ISBN 978-1-78330-471-4), which can be purchased from www.facetpublishing.co.uk/socialfuture (or www.alastore.ala.org/socialfuture for customers in North America).

Social Capital in Academic Libraries – A Model for Successful Fundraising

Kathryn Dilworth

Introduction

The social future of libraries needs funding, and libraries need to fundraise. At a time when libraries struggle to connect their value to important stakeholders, fundraising is a vehicle for developing strong relationships built upon understanding and appreciation. Cases for giving are cases for relevance. The donor cultivation process includes the development and exchange of social capital between an individual and a fundraiser. Social capital is both the social network that evolves through an individual's connections and the tangible outcomes of those connections. Connections between donors and the library engage individuals with the mission. A donation to the library is an expression of perceived value.

The Social Capital Fundraising Model is not new, but as of this moment, it has a name. The model is already utilised across the nonprofit sector whether practitioners realise it or not. Building connections and relationships is fundamental to fundraising. The point of this chapter and the reason for its new name is to explain why social capital fundraising works and argue that its core element (social capital) be better understood and leveraged intentionally. By implementing a fundraising strategy that is designed to support and expand the social capital of others, fundraising activity will be more efficient and have better outcomes (King 2004). The social capital that the library, itself, builds through this informed practice will support and expand the impact of fundraising.

There is never enough funding, and often the exciting projects are the ones that get put on the back burner to meet the cost of basic resources. Philanthropic funding is an important and often transformative mechanism for not only filling in the gaps in funding but supporting the most exciting ideas, innovations and initiatives. These are funds that come from private sources, from individuals and philanthropic organisations. Unfortunately, recent studies on

fundraising in the academic library reveal that while needs and expectations for raising private funds have gone up in the last 20 years, the resources acquired to fundraise have remained the same (Keith, Salem & Cumiskey 2018). This chapter makes a case for more support and encourages academic library leaders that the effort to get more support is worth it. To that end, it will integrate philanthropy research on giving with academic libraries, provide some helpful information about fundraising in higher education and talk about the benefits of fundraising for the library that go beyond the dollars.

The Social Capital Fundraising Model builds stronger and more meaningful connections with individuals who are in a position to give to the library, and it increases the reputation and value of the library. Finally, because so little scholarship exists on fundraising for the academic library, this piece adds to this literature. It also brings the academic library into philanthropy literature, which is an area of tremendous growth in recent years. My intent is that this chapter will serve as evidence for higher education development programs to invest more in academic library fundraising, recognising it as a viable case for giving for higher education donors. I also hope that it encourages library leaders, staff and faculty to embrace fundraising. In order to fulfil the promise of the social future of libraries, the library must turn outward, beyond the campus and its users, and engage with individuals and entities that can be partners in that future.

There are many academic libraries that enjoy successful fundraising. There are more, however, that struggle (Keith, Salem & Cumiskey 2018). During the past two years conducting a study with a colleague on the changing practice of fundraising in academic libraries, I heard many challenges that fundraisers face to successfully navigate the process and meet expectations and needs for funding. I have had calls from deans who are frustrated that central development will hardly listen to their claim that the library is a viable fundraising unit. Many libraries lack fundraising support at all. Through the discussion of a fundraising model built upon social capital, I will describe this fundraising process, provide some insight into the fundraiser's experience and demonstrate how fundraising in this way not only brings in funds but creates a culture of philanthropy.

The challenges for fundraising in academic libraries

Central development units across higher education routinely assign prospective donors to the colleges from which they took their degree. This practice is the fundamental barrier to successful fundraising in the academic library. In fact, the phrase 'no natural constituents' is in virtually every publication about fundraising in the academic library including my own (Dilworth & Henzl 2016). The alumni model is an efficient way to organise a very big job. Many universities have hundreds of thousands of living alumni, and grouping them in this way helps organise a lot of individuals and anticipate what they may like to support. In addition to presenting a fundraising challenge for all campus units that get left out in this model, this practice makes it less likely for alumni to hear about other interesting things to support at the university.

A 2015 study of 20 years of giving to a university revealed that providing donors with the opportunity to give across campus increased their likelihood of making a major gift to the university, increased the amount they gave compared to those who only gave to a single unit and reduced the likelihood that their giving would go down in difficult economic times (Khodakarami, Petersen & Venkatesan 2015). When prospective donors never hear from the library they do not know about opportunities to support it, which is a lost opportunity for the donor and the institution. The scoped communication to donors managed and cultivated solely by their academic college makes it difficult for the library to communicate its value broadly. Thus, prospective donors lack knowledge about how the library supports learning and research at the institution. In the traditional higher education fundraising model, when the library fundraiser does have the opportunity to engage alumni, they have the additional challenge of what one fundraiser described as 'education before cultivation'. Gaining access to potential donors is a crucial step in successful fundraising. There are many creative ways that fundraisers in academic libraries navigate this challenge. That issue will be discussed at greater length in the larger project on this topic, but this chapter is about how to take advantage of opportunities libraries do have and how to grow and strengthen that engagement.

It might come as a surprise to learn that fundraising for higher education occurs mostly with donors who are not alumni. Of the total fundraising to support education in the United States last year, 70% of it went to institutions of higher learning. However, only 26% of those funds came from alumni (White 2018). Another reality is that academic units have thousands of alumni who are not managed by fundraisers and available for the library to cultivate. Even the large development units in big research institutions lack the capacity to reach even a fraction of their constituency. Libraries can also collaborate with academic units on proposals for their graduates. In a sense, libraries do have 'alumni' in the form of retired and former faculty, staff and student workers who already know the value of the library.

Individuals who are already in the library need to be aware that it functions in part due to private giving and that there are many opportunities for people to support the funding needs of the library. This includes individuals on both sides of the service scenario. Faculty and staff need to be resourced with information and comfort in order to communicate this information. Cultivation through student and faculty is a long game, but beginning the process in that engagement is crucial to future success. The best time to help users understand how philanthropy functions in the library is yesterday. And, as we will discuss next, individuals are very open to hearing about giving back to the library when they are benefiting from it. Also, by involving faculty and staff in the fundraising process, they can help identify prospective donors whom they engage with already through their user service.

Library service builds social capital for the library user. Resources and services from the library provide the user with benefits that, much like financial capital, can be spent, invested, given away and shared in order to enhance the life of the individual and others in their network. These benefits include information, knowledge, spaces to study and gather. I once received a gift from an alumna because he was grateful for being able to sleep at the 24/7 library on campus during a year when he had terrible room-mates. The fundraising model based on

cultivating alumni is not going to change in higher education because it works so well for the academic units. But if the library embraces and mobilises the model for fundraising grounded in building the social capital of others, it can achieve strong, sustained success as well.

Relationship-building strategies that build social capital for donors and prospective donors connect the library to them as well as their networks. The larger the network and the stronger the connections within that network to the library, the more the library's social capital will also grow (Strauss 2010). A library with strong social capital has a greater likelihood of receiving philanthropic support.

What is social capital?

Social Capital is really having a moment. A Google analytics search for the term suggests it hardly existed before 1990, but since then it has exploded in both academic and public scholarship and across disciplines (Google Books ©2013). Much of the credit goes to Robert Putnam whose best-selling book, *Bowling Alone*, confirmed the fears of many working in the nonprofit sector: individual engagement with groups and associations is waning. When he pointed this out to the world in 2000, the nonprofit sector scrambled to respond. Scholars started looking at how social capital influenced behaviour. In the field of philanthropy, this included charitable giving. It became clear in this research that social capital and giving have strong ties.

The evolution of the definition of social capital resembles the process of building social capital. It starts with the network and builds in complexity. Early scholarship defines social capital as simply the networks that allow for certain actions by individuals in the structure (Coleman 1988). This held firm for about ten years until Fukuyama's (1999) work a decade later claimed that the norms that develop on these networks were what defined social capital. Putnam (2000) was developing his theory at the same time and ended up differentiating between two kinds of connections in the network: bridging and bonding. The bonded connections were between similar kinds of people. These held up well to external forces, but also put individuals at risk for clannish ideologies. Bridged connections are those made between people who have differences. These are not as strong as bonds, but they bring diverse ideas, perspectives and cultural norms into the network. Another scholar whose addition to the definition is important for this discussion suggests that the benefits that result from high social capital are also a fundamental part of its definition (Portes 1998).

The benefits are an important piece for the field of philanthropy where research had already shown that the benefits of volunteering and giving are strong motivators for giving. In a study that first identified the most common motivation for giving, Schervish and Havens (1997) demonstrated that self-serving motivations were actually greater than altruistic ones. They were not suggesting that donors give for selfish reasons, necessarily, but that they are more motivated when giving is not just a cost but, instead, provides a benefit. Before we get stuck on the term 'benefit', consider Simmons (1991, pp. 10, 16) who pointed out that acts taken in the

service of others are still something to admire even when 'subtle self-rewards' might have encouraged them to do so.

The academic library has many benefits to offer donors. Information, knowledge, friendship, an opportunity to meet others with affinity for the library, or simply a good feeling for doing something good are examples. However, in recent interviews with library fundraisers discussing social capital, it became apparent that the term benefit has strongly negative connotations. This model is not meant to encourage benefits that undermine the mission of the library. Thankfully, higher education fundraising has developed ethics of practice through their professional associations and these can be a guide for defining the parameters of ethical benefits (CASE 2019). In her book on the ethics of fundraising, philosopher Marilyn Fischer (2000) examines and sets standards for decision-making on all matters of practice from relationships with donors to organisational mission and trust.

Part of the challenge to agree on a definition of the term social capital is due to its broad application. For this discussion, I define it in two parts: The first is the network created by bonding and bridging connections. The second is the benefits that come from those connections. Brown and Ferris (2007, p. 86) explain the impact of social capital on philanthropy in terms of the 'norms of trust and reciprocity that facilitate collective action'. An individual can increase and decrease his or her social capital, spend it, save it or use it to build the social capital of others. For example, having connections with others who are well-regarded and have a positive reputation can increase the social capital of an individual who is connected to them simply due to a perceived value. Not surprisingly, donating money to organisations that help others can increase an individual's social capital (Putnam 2000). Organisations can also build their social capital through activities that support their mission including fundraising (King 2004). Fundraising is particularly meaningful for building organisational social capital because it is a way to connect to individuals who have positive reputations, which is one of the most meaningful kinds of social connections for building social capital (Strauss 2010). For the academic library, intentionally leveraging social capital with its network is a strategy to expand its reach and build the kinds of connections that support giving.

Impact of social capital on fundraising

Social capital matters in fundraising because individuals with high social capital have been shown to donate more than others (Brown & Ferris 2007). Therefore, donors who are already giving are the best prospects for future giving. Another study finds that reputation and peer recognition are the 'social consequences' of giving and actually encourage more giving (Bekkers & Wiepking 2011, p. 936). Supporting the social capital of a donor by stewarding their giving makes it much more likely that they will give again. Rather than spend the majority of time discovering new donors, the academic library is better off providing meaningful engagement with individuals who are already giving something, even if it is their time (Wang & Graddy 2008). This is also why staff and faculty are so valuable to the fundraising effort because they

are often the ones who engage with potential donors first. A meaningful engagement is a strong foundation for giving in the future.

In a study by Kearns et al. (2014), the researchers interviewed nonprofit leaders to determine the kind of funding most often preferred. They overwhelmingly reported they prefer gifts that motivate more giving. More giving can come in the form of a donor whose giving becomes larger or repetitive, a new donor who gives because of the example of an individual in their social network, or a foundation that renews grants because of the positive impact of previous funding. In each of these examples there is an exchange in social capital. Fundraising training in donor relations and stewardship describes the value of a positive giving experience as part of a process in the donor continuum. Though the term social capital is not used in this description, they acknowledge the phenomenon that if donors experience a meaningful engagement following their gift the likelihood is very high that they will stay engaged. There are also strong measurements that show that the cost of finding a donor is much more than properly stewarding one you already have (McGrath 1997). Fundraisers want to cultivate lifelong donors. Brown and Ferris (2007, p. 90) determined that the 'network-based social capital' is a key indicator for a donor's likelihood to give. This evidence is strong support for a strategy to connect the library with the social networks of current donors and contribute to the social capital of prospective donors because their robust social networks are made up of individuals who are likely to participate in philanthropy.

Beyond this idea that individuals with strong social capital are likely connected with individuals who give, a study on how social capital relates to fundraising discovered that having an individual who asks for donations on a social network is also a powerful motivator to give. They explain, 'Both having a giver and an asker in one's social network increase the likelihood that one participates in charitable giving' (Herzog & Yang 2018, p. 390). This explains the common question posed to fundraisers in training seminars: 'What is the main reason that people do not give?' The answer: 'They have not been asked'. The academic library is in a strong position to successfully fundraise by creating and leveraging social capital. There are many entry points to potential donors. Special and discipline-specific collections are entry points to connect to someone's social network through a specific interest. Initiatives can connect to prospective donors whose values and interests align. Cases for giving around open access, scholarly publishing, digital scholarship, information literacy, informed learning, equal access to information and the application of emerging technologies to teaching and learning are all entry points for connection. There are potential donors far beyond the institution who have great passions for the examples above and many more. Giving to the library can be mutually beneficial when library resources and services align with the personal passions of individuals with robust social networks and high social capital.

The social capital phenomenon in the fundraising process requires a highly skilled fundraising practice. That includes at the very least a professional fundraising staff, a long-term fundraising strategy, and a strong narrative about the value of the library. This kind of investment is costly, and it requires a team of professionals with diverse skills. Professional practice is not the same as transactional giving, and transactional giving does not strongly impact social capital.

Professional practice includes fundraising that offers individuals an opportunity to do something meaningful for the library and the individual. Hank Rosso, the Founding Director at the Fund Raising School at Indiana University, describes fundraising as ‘the gentle art of teaching the joy of giving’ (Lilly Family School of Philanthropy 2019). Research on giving shows that everyone involved in fundraising can benefit from the positive experience of contributing to a meaningful mission (Anik et al. 2009). In the United States, over half of the households give to philanthropic organisations. The average amount given is over \$2,500 per household with \$900 being the median amount. As individuals get older, the percentage of households goes up. By age 65, nearly 75% of households give (Ottoni-Wilhelm et al. 2017). This is a remarkable reality and a robust indicator that the library has strong opportunities to enjoy successful donor engagement and fundraising. The mission of libraries to support teaching, learning and research is a very attractive philanthropic priority for a wide range of individuals and philanthropic organisations.

In order to fully leverage the Social Capital Fundraising Model, the library needs a fundraising team. Social capital is not built simply because there is a connection. That connection has to be developed in such a way that trust forms and reciprocal benefits are created (Putnam 2000). Doing this requires more than one person. Unfortunately, recent surveys reveal that if an academic library has fundraising staff at all, it is usually only a single individual (Keith, Salem & Cumiskey 2018). Some libraries share one fundraiser with other units, but many do not have one at all. In a recent survey to show change over a 25-year period, Dilworth and Heyns (2020) discovered that while fundraising needs have increased, the investment in fundraising in the form of staff had remained very much the same. One fundraiser for the library is simply not enough to facilitate a social capital model for fundraising or any other fundraising model, frankly. The four stages of fundraising below require time, skill and talent that a single person cannot possibly provide. Each stage requires unique skills.

The following is a shortened version of *The Eight Step Major Gift Management Cycle* taught at The Fund Raising School at the Lilly Family School of Philanthropy at Indiana University:

- **Identification** – This stage includes research and evaluation of prospective donors who have the inclination and wealth capacity to make a major gift. From this research comes the creation of a list of prospective donors. This stage is typically the first time a fundraiser engages with a prospect. Professionals required for this stage are the fundraiser, prospect researcher, data manager and support staff to assist with visits, travel and reporting.
- **Cultivation** – This stage is when cases for giving to the library are developed with library leadership, faculty and staff to define and prioritise needs and opportunities for philanthropic support. It is when giving opportunities are discussed with prospective donors to determine the appropriate focus and amount and to build interest. It is when relationship building occurs. Professionals required for this stage are the fundraiser, library dean in some cases or faculty, communications staff for building collateral around opportunities to give and staff to support travel and reporting.

- **Solicitation** – This is ‘the ask’. It can take years to get to this stage. Proposals are written and those who will make the solicitation plan and rehearse. The fundraiser will be at this important meeting and often the library dean. Other professionals required for this stage are gift services staff who book the gift in the institution’s financial system. Often managers in central development are crucial for collaboration and oversight to ensure proposals meet the institution’s policies and best practice.
- **Stewardship** – This stage includes IRS (US federal government Internal Revenue Service) processes for reporting a gift. The donor is acknowledged during this phase and provided with tax documentation. Often visits with the fundraiser continue in order to maintain the relationship and prep them for the next cultivation phase. University-wide events, access to key leaders and strategic volunteer opportunities help maintain and grow the relationship. Professionals needed in this stage include the fundraiser, dean, strategic staff and faculty and central development leadership to assist with important tasks like building a new strategy for the next cultivation cycle, annual financial reporting for endowments from finance specialists and data management.

Robert Putnam’s (2000) definition of social capital as a network that provides benefits is particularly poignant when thinking about the process of engaging a donor, building a relationship with them, asking them for support, walking them through the process of making a gift and maintaining a long term relationship with them. He identified two types of social capital: bonding and bridging. He theorised that *bonding* is the kind of social capital that forms between similar people or groups (Putnam 2000). A family is a good example of this as well as a religious community. Those who share bonding connections share similarities, and these bonds are extremely strong. An example of a bonding connection for library fundraising is a retired library faculty member setting funds aside in a bequest to benefit student workers. The social capital created between the library faculty member, for example, and the library is based on a similar passion for academic libraries and strong affection for the one where he or she enjoyed a meaningful career.

The other kind of connection is bridging capital. These are the bonds across difference. They are easily broken, unfortunately, because they are made between people who do not share similarities (Putnam 2000). However, they are valuable because they support diversity and give voice to more ideologies and ideas. A bridging bond is a graduate whose bond is with their department but who has come to appreciate the fact that making a gift to library resources is a valuable way to support his or her department. This connection is not strong like the first example, but it is a valuable gift and an opportunity for the library to become a part of a very different social network than the one they shared with the library faculty member.

The words bonding and bridging are also commonly used in fundraising. Fundraisers talk about bridging people to a mission or a particular case for giving. A prospective donor can become bonded to the fundraiser, others engaged in the process and the organisation itself through fundraising. These bonds are built by engaging the interests and philanthropic goals of the prospective donor with the organisation. The bonds are held together through trust and

authentic relationships between the donor, individuals in the library and the library itself. Bonds are made stronger between the library and the donor when they can see the impact of their gift. The process of fundraising is a mechanism that can transform a bridging connection to a bonding one. An interest in a giving opportunity can grow into a passion for the library and its mission with skillful fundraising practice. Many who have been a part of this transformation can attest to that phenomenon. It may be one explanation for the reason why giving motivates more and increased giving. It also is a warning that, as with any connection, if the fundraising process breaks down, the bridge and the bond can be lost.

This new model of building social capital to support fundraising for the library begins with a recognition and acknowledgment that the library's social capital enables fundraising. It will not, in fact, happen without it. Social capital built through fundraising not only facilitates giving to the library but also creates a cycle of giving. Each engagement connects the social capital of the library to others, and in turn this connects the library to their network. Building the social capital of the library happens with intention. A simple way to begin is by investing time and attention on the donors who are already bonded to the library. If they already love the library, they are more likely to consider further support. Even if an existing donor lacks a strong personal social network, the story of that donor and that connection can attract more donors.

Another priority should be discovering the nature of the library's social capital. Who is already a part of the library's social network? How can this network be leveraged to support fundraising? An example is a research collection that is unique, popular, trendy or relevant to current social or political activities. There may be no researchers in a position to financially support this collection, but who are they writing for? Who is their audience? Who already supports the kinds of research that utilises this collection? Thinking more broadly in this way with social capital as a driver for strategies can identify potential donors never considered before. The library also can make progress building their social capital and networks by helping donors and prospective donors build theirs. Even those who do not know what social capital is want to do this. This takes strategic engagement that brings people together in meaningful ways where they can bridge and bond.

Fundraising requires investment. It takes a lot of time, collaboration and information to identify and cultivate donors. This process needs to be successful in order to ensure the future of academic libraries. That means more than simply survival. The activities connected to fundraising must also be mastered to ensure the innovation of the future. Connecting to social networks and realising the mutual benefits that come from those connections improves the overall success of the library. This model of engagement can positively impact service, collaborations and the reputation of the library and those connected with it. It can be expensive, but a collective effort has the capacity to achieve high social capital for the library across the full range of efforts and initiatives. However, a single fundraiser is not going to have any more success doing this for fundraising than a single information professional trying to push through a new, complex initiative.

Fundraiser turnover in higher education is extremely high. A recent survey of over 1000 fundraisers in North America by *The Chronicle of Philanthropy* revealed that half the fundraisers surveyed intend to leave their current position in under two years (Joslyn 2019, p. 8). Some of the reasons include high pressure to succeed, a lack of appreciation and not enough help to do their job (Joslyn 2019, pp. 9, 10). Fundraisers do not want to be in a situation where they cannot be successful. This is a role in which assessment is entirely quantitative. If a fundraiser cannot meet and exceed fundraising goals then he or she will not stay. However, 93% of the fundraisers surveyed said they could not work for an organisation if they did not believe in their cause ((Joslyn 2019, p. 11). With a mission-driven passion for their professional work, it makes sense that of those who leave, they most often cite a feeling of betrayal when an organisation makes it impossible for them to succeed ((Joslyn 2019, p. 10).

Culture of philanthropy in the library

The work of building social capital begins on the inside by building a culture of philanthropy. This is achieved by treating employees as if they are potential donors. Cultivating a positive environment for library faculty and staff, anticipating their needs, connecting them to potential colleagues and friends in the organisation and cultivating their passion for their work are examples of ways to create connections that are meaningful and mutually beneficial. A culture of philanthropy sets a tone for compassionate, professional treatment of faculty and staff towards each other. Thinking of users as potential donors positively influences service. The benefits to the library take the form of commitment to mission, long and valuable service and maybe one day even giving.

Fundraisers in the academic library are often new to this environment and need to develop an understanding of how the library contributes to the success of the institution. They should therefore be embraced and taught about the library. The fundraiser's lack of awareness about the library reflects the condition they face with potential donors. The faster they get up to speed on what a modern academic library does, the sooner they can develop cases for giving to present to potential donors. Another important way to create a culture of philanthropy in the library is by engaging faculty and staff with the fundraising process. For giving opportunities that support research or teaching, faculty can be part of the cultivation process by joining donor meetings to talk about their work and its impact on student success, for example. All faculty and staff can be a part of helping fundraisers demonstrate the impact of giving to existing donors through their participation in events and the effort to make donors feel they are part of the library. Individuals give to organisations because they want to do something good, help solve problems or contribute to something exciting. It is often crucial for them to get to know the ones who are facilitating all the good things that the fundraiser is telling them about. Bridging and bonding someone from the outside to the mission of the library is powerful. And, of course, landing major gifts can be transformative. Inviting and including library faculty and staff to be a part of this process will bond them to the mission as well, expand their social network and positively impact their social capital.

Conclusion

One of the goals of this chapter is to encourage and empower the library to take a new approach to fundraising. The alumni model is not going to ever go away in higher education, and many decades of library fundraising have proven that it is not effective for the library. The other goal is to demonstrate what the new approach requires to be successful. The Social Capital Fundraising Model can begin with the existing staff, but it cannot reach its true potential with a single fundraiser. This model is, in fact, intended to provide evidence that more resources for fundraising are required and will pay off. Poor fundraising performance in the library is not about a lack of compelling giving opportunities; it is about a lack of resources.

In regard to social capital, success breeds more success. Activities related to fundraising build the social capital of the library even though every engagement will not result in a gift. A long-term strategy to build the social capital of the library will result in successful fundraising. The future of the library will be leveraged on social capital built across all relationships. Donors can play a big part in this future helping the library achieve dreams and goals that expand the capacity to facilitate the mission of the library.

References

- Anik, L., Aknin, L.B., Norton, M.I. and Dunn, E.W., (2009). *Feeling good about giving: the benefits (and costs) of self-interested charitable behavior*. Harvard Business School Marketing Unit Working Paper 10-012. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1444831>
- Bekkers, R. and Wiepking, P., (2011). A literature review of empirical studies of philanthropy: eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. **40**(5), 924-973. doi:10.1177/0899764010380927
- Brown, E. and Ferris, J.M., (2007). Social capital and philanthropy: an analysis of the impact of social capital on individual giving and volunteering. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. **36**(1), 85-99. doi:10.1177/0899764006293178
- CASE., (2019). *Ethics resources*. Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement and Support of Education. <https://www.case.org/resources/ethics-resources>
- Coleman, J.S., (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *American Journal of Sociology*. **94**(Supplement), S95-S120. doi:10.1016/j.socec.2007.06.014
- Dilworth, K. and Henzl, L.S., (2016). *Successful fundraising for the academic library: philanthropy in higher education*. Cambridge, MA: Chandos.
- Dilworth, K. and Heyns, E.P., (2020). Fundraising in academic libraries: looking back and defining new questions. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*. **46**(5), 102192. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2020.10219
- Fischer, M., (2000). *Ethical decision making in fund raising*. New York: John Wiley.
- Fukuyama, F., (1999). Social capital and civil society. In: *International Monetary Fund Conference on Second Generation Reforms, November 8-9, Washington, DC.* <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/seminar/1999/reforms/fukuyama.html>
- Google Books (2013). Ngram Viewer. *Google Books*. <https://books.google.com/ngrams>

- Herzog, P.S. and Yang, S., (2018). Social networks and charitable giving: trusting, doing, asking and alter primacy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. **47**(2), 376-394. doi:0.1177/0899764017746021
- Joslyn, H., (2019). Moving on: why fundraisers leave, and how to keep them. *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*. **31**(10), 8-16.
- Kearns, K.P., Bell, D., Deem, B. and McShane, L., (2014). How nonprofit leaders evaluate funding sources: an exploratory study of nonprofit leaders. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. **43**(1), 121-143. doi: 10.1177/0899764012458038
- Keith, B.W., Salem Jr., J.A. and Cumiskey, K., (2018). *Library development*. SPEC Kit 359. Washington DC: Association of Research Libraries. <https://doi.org/10.29242/spec.359>
- Khodakarami, F., Petersen, J.A. and Venkatesan, R., (2015). Developing donor relationships: the role of the breadth of giving. *Journal of Marketing*. **79**(4), 77-93. doi:10.1509/jm.14.0351
- King, N.K. (2004). Social capital and nonprofit leaders. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*. **14**(4), 471-486. doi:10.1002/nml.48
- Lilly Family School of Philanthropy., (2019). *About the Fund Raising School*. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University, Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. <https://philanthropy.iupui.edu/professional-development/fundraisingschool/index.html>
- McGrath, S., (1997). Giving donors good reason to give again. *Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*. **2**(2), 125-135. doi:10.1002/nvsm.6090020204
- Ottoni-Wilhelm, M., Pasic, A., Rooney, P.M., Osili, U.O., Bergdoll, J., Han, X. and Gondola, T., (2017). *Overview of overall giving: based on data collected in 2015 about giving in 2014*. The 2015 Philanthropy Panel Study. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis. pp. 1–16. <http://generosityforlife.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Overall-Giving-10.5.17-jb-CJC.pdf>
- Portes, A., (1998). Social capital: its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*. **24**, 1-24. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.24.1.1
- Putnam, R.D., (2000). *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Schervish, P.G. and Havens, J.J., (1997). Social participation and charitable giving: a multivariate analysis. *Voluntas*. **8**(3), 235-260. doi:10.1007/BF02354199
- Simmons, R.G., (1991). Presidential address on altruism and sociology. *The Sociological Quarterly*. **32**(1), 1-22. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.1991.tb00342.x
- Strauss, J.R., (2010). Capitalizing on the value in relationships: a social capital-based model for non-profit public relationships. *PRism*. **7**(2). <https://www.prismjournal.org/uploads/1/2/5/6/125661607/v7-no2-c3.pdf>
- Wang, L., and Graddy, E., (2008). Social capital, volunteering, and charitable giving. *Voluntas*. **19**(1), 23-42. doi:10.1007/s11266-008-9055-y
- White, A.E., (2018). Giving USA 2018: implications for higher ed. *JGA Blog*. 20 July. <http://info.jgacounsel.com/blog/giving-usa-2018-implications-for-higher-ed>