

1 Published in Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education, 2018, vol. 30, no. 2, pp. 109-117  
2 which should be cited to refer to this work

3 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10963758.2018.1437350>  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 Exploring Alumni's Intention to Engage in Non-Monetary Activities: A Cross-Generational  
16 Comparison Study  
17  
18

19  
20  
21  
22 Meng-Mei Chen, Ph.D.  
23

24  
25 Assistant Professor  
26  
27

28  
29 Learning Department  
30  
31

32 Ecole hôtelière de Lausanne, HES-SO // University of Applied Sciences Western Switzerland  
33

34 [meng-mei.chen@ehl.ch](mailto:meng-mei.chen@ehl.ch)  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Abstract

A growing supporting and involving alumni group is one of the critical components of a quality hospitality management program. Universities increasingly count on their alumni to make monetary and non-monetary contributions. Yet, different generational alumni's intentions to make non-monetary contributions, such as participating in activities and social events, have not been thoroughly examined. Through an online alumni survey (N = 566, response rate 7%), this research identified different generational alumni's intentions to get involved in activities and social events. Our research findings indicated that alumni have the lowest intentions to make financial contributions. Alternatively, alumni have high intentions to become a local chapter member, become a school ambassador, participate in class reunions, and in chapter events. ANOVA and Tukey tests showed significant generational differences in alumni's intentions to get involved. These findings provide faculty and administrators opportunities to benchmark and explore activities and social events to get alumni involved.

*Key words:* alumni; alumni association; alumni engagement; alumni involvement; alumni network

## Introduction

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 A strong alumni group is one of the critical components of a quality hospitality  
8 management program (Cha, Kim, Cichy, 2013; Assante, Huffman, Harp, 2010). Universities and  
9 colleges increasingly rely on the service and influence of their alumni to achieve institutional  
10 goals (Weerts & Ronca, 2008). Alumni could actively contribute to their alma mater through both  
11 monetary and non-monetary support, including political influence (Palmer and Koenig-Lewis,  
12 2008). Alumni giving is one of the criteria used by US News and World Report Best Colleges  
13 (Morse and Brooks, 2016). A growing number of hospitality education programs appear to be  
14 actively involved in soliciting alumni support (Cha et al., 2013; Palmer et al., 2008). Yet, as most  
15 researchers are interested in alumni financial giving to colleges and universities, there is a lack of  
16 understanding of alumni non-monetary contribution within hospitality programs (Cha et al.,  
17 2013).

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 Furthermore, American universities count on alumni giving to supplement declining  
34 government funding, but most European universities funded by their governments do not have  
35 the same concern, and may feel awkward asking alumni to give money (Ebert, Axelsson, and  
36 Harbor, 2015). This European mentality may obscure the value that alumni can provide to a  
37 university through non-monetary contributions, which are often critical to starting and building  
38 an effective alumni relations program (Ebert et al., 2015). It does not imply that European  
39 universities do not value alumni relations, but have different motivations. For example, the main  
40 drive for Stockholm University to develop alumni relations is to build relations with non-  
41 university organisations and increase the interactions with society through alumni's marketing  
42 support and connections to the labour market (Ebert et al., 2015).

43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Lastly, most universities and colleges have designated alumni staff or associations responsible for alumni communication at the university level, hence, most faculty members are not directly involved with alumni affairs. Yet, the unique nature of structurally independent hotel or tourism schools indicates that their faculty members may know and have closer relationships with alumni than do faculty members in typical universities. Hence, it is important for both faculty members and administrators in these schools to know and get more involved with alumni affairs.

Given the call from previous researchers (Cha et al., 2013), and the different mentalities towards alumni relations between American and Non-American universities, as well as the unique nature of hotel and tourism schools, this research aims to explore the intentions of alumni to participate in non-monetary activities and social events, which may be a key point of an affective alumni relations program. In addition, prior research (McAlexander, Koenig, and DuFault, 2016; Vieregge et al., 2013) suggested that future alumni research needed to focus on generational differences in post-graduation activities that will increase alumni involvement. This research is based on an alumni survey conducted in spring 2015 at Ecole hôtelière de Lausanne (EHL), the first hotel school in the world (EHL History, n.d.). Accompanied by the rich heritage is an alumni body of about 25,000 members. Hence, this research not only contributes to the understanding of the intentions to get involved in non-monetary activities, but also compares the intentions between generations of alumni. To hospitality and tourism faculty and staff members, these research findings provide insights about the suggested activities to get alumni involved, and allowing them to benchmark their existing alumni related activities.

### Literature review

1  
2  
3 Alumni associations should be viewed as strategic and vital assets (Martin, Moriuchi,  
4  
5 Smith, Moeder, Nichols, 2015), as alumni could provide monetary and non-monetary  
6  
7 contributions to their alma maters. Universities and colleges in the U.S. have a long tradition to  
8  
9 cultivate alumni relations, compared to their European peers. These differences in managing  
10  
11 alumni relations could attribute to the lack of college sports for European universities as a means  
12  
13 to connecting to alumni (Vieregge et al., 2013). Most higher education organizations are  
14  
15 supported by government or public funding in Europe; and there are different cultural norms  
16  
17 between European countries which influence the way alumni from these countries perceive their  
18  
19 roles as alumni (Vieregge et al., 2013; Ebert et al., 2015). For universities just starting to explore  
20  
21 alumni relations, having explicit institutional goals; recognizing the time, commitment and  
22  
23 resources needed; maintaining an alumni database; and considering the cultural settings are  
24  
25 critical considerations (Ebert et al., 2015).  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 The reduction in public funding for U.S. state universities has pressured administrators to  
33  
34 look for alternative funding, including alumni giving. Researchers have identified demographic  
35  
36 factors differentiating behaviours between donors and non-donors. Female alumni are more  
37  
38 likely to donate, and donate more frequently but with smaller amounts than male alumni do  
39  
40 (Dvorak & Toubman, 2012). Wunnava and Okunade (2013) found that male alumni in  
41  
42 fraternities, and higher-order executives tend to give more. The success of an academic  
43  
44 institution's athletic performance could positively influence male alumni's donations, but not  
45  
46 female's donations (Meer and Rosen, 2008). Alumni seldom made large donations during the  
47  
48 first eight years after their graduation (Marr, Mullin, & Siegfried, 2005).  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 In addition to identifying demographic variables which differentiate donors and non-  
55  
56 donors, researchers also examined antecedent factors relating to donation behaviour. Satisfaction  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 with student affairs (e.g. social opportunities, campus environment, student activities, and fun),  
4  
5 and satisfaction with campus resources (e.g. housing, the library, bookstore, and available  
6  
7 technology) contribute to promotional behaviours, such as word of mouth, wearing university  
8  
9 clothing, and providing recommendations (Stepheson & Yerger, 2015). Yet, only satisfaction  
10  
11 with student affairs increases the odds to donate (Stepheson & Yerger, 2015). Alumni who  
12  
13 perceive the university has established unique traditions and rituals will develop a stronger  
14  
15 overall integration within the alumni brand community and hence more loyal than those who do  
16  
17 not have this perception (Martin et al., 2015). For institutions with hospitality programs,  
18  
19 encouraging involvement in clubs and student-led events could serve as a starting point that may  
20  
21 contribute to alumni support after graduation (Cha et al., 2013). It is found that volunteers for  
22  
23 non-profit organizations are also more likely to donate (Freeman, 1996; Webb, 2002). Non-  
24  
25 monetary contributions from alumni may be critical to starting and building an effective alumni  
26  
27 relations program (Ebert et al., 2015). Alumni could contribute non-monetarily through activities,  
28  
29 such as posting job openings, offering student class projects, delivering guest lectures, offering  
30  
31 scholar exchanges, mentoring, becoming a school ambassador, participating in focus groups and  
32  
33 conferences, providing local chapter support, as well as offering references (Barron, 2015). For  
34  
35 example, Stockholm University provides other non-monetary examples such as alumni reunions,  
36  
37 homecoming days, alumni seminars, career events, mock interviews between students and alumni,  
38  
39 etc. (Ebert et al., 2015).  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 Another issue related to alumni relations is the increasing internationalization of the  
50  
51 student body. International enrolment in hospitality and tourism management programs at the  
52  
53 undergraduate and graduate levels in the United States have been growing steadily (Madanoglu &  
54  
55 Martin, 2003). Higher education institutions in Thailand, Austria, and Australia also seek foreign  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 students in order to create an international environment for students and faculty members, to  
4  
5 compensate for the declining government funding and to strengthen the local economy through  
6  
7 export education (Dredge, Benckendorff, Day, Gross, Walo, Weeks, Whitelaw, 2013; Wisansing,  
8  
9 J. 2008; Zehrer, Lichtmanegger, 2008). This means that a majority of the international students  
10  
11 probably will return to their home countries, and may not return to their alma maters. This trend  
12  
13 may challenge alumni associations to stay in touch with their alumni.  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 From alumni's perspective, Swiss hotel school graduates expect the alumni networks to  
19  
20 provide information about employment opportunities, for example a job bank; and keep alumni in  
21  
22 touch with each other (Vieregge et al., 2013). Hotel school graduates, from either Swiss or Non-  
23  
24 Swiss schools, have the similar expectation of their alumni associations, however, Swiss  
25  
26 graduates have higher participation rates in alumni networks than non-Swiss graduates (Vieregge  
27  
28 et al., 2013).  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 In summary, previous researchers have examined the motives to develop alumni relations  
34  
35 between American and Non-American universities; focused on alumni's financial giving  
36  
37 behaviour but not on non-monetary contributions; and stated that volunteer activities may lead to  
38  
39 financial donations. Nevertheless, researchers advocated more research is needed to understand  
40  
41 non-monetary contribution within the hospitality context (Cha et al., 2013), and to conduct  
42  
43 longitude studies (Cha et al., 2013) or studies involving older graduates (Vieregge et al., 2013;  
44  
45 Martin et al., 2015). Lastly, the growing internationalization of student bodies may impact on  
46  
47 alumni relations. This lack of research is significant because universities should utilize their  
48  
49 limited resources effectively and focus on recruiting alumni to their preferred activities in which  
50  
51 they want to engage. This research intends to address these calls.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The overarching research question is, “Do alumni differ in their intentions to participate in non-  
4 monetary activities?” The main research question is addressed in two separate sub questions.  
5  
6  
7

- 8  
9 1. For alumni, what are the levels of intention to get involved in alumni association related  
10 activities and social events?  
11
- 12  
13 2. For different alumni generations, are there differences in the levels of intention to  
14 participate in non-monetary activities?  
15  
16  
17

## 18 19 **Research Method**

### 20 21 *Population and Sample*

22  
23  
24  
25 Founded in 1893, Ecole hôtelière de Lausanne (EHL) is the first hotel school in the world.  
26  
27 By 1951, EHL had about 500 students from 30 countries. In 1969, EHL introduced the  
28  
29 internships concept. In 1996, EHL created the English section, and became a bilingual school.  
30  
31 As of April 2016, EHL has 2608 students from 107 countries. The top 5 student nationalities are  
32  
33 Swiss (32.7%), French (20.7%), Italian (6.8%), Chinese (4.8%), and American (3.7%). EHL  
34  
35 offers a bachelor program in hospitality management, a Master of Science program in global  
36  
37 hospitality, and an EMBA program. Most students are in the bachelor program.  
38  
39  
40  
41

42  
43 EHL set up its alumni association, l'Association des Anciens, in 1926 with 110 alumni.  
44  
45 Now, EHL's alumni association is known as AEHL, and has about 25,000 alumni in 120  
46  
47 countries. AEHL has 4 staff members working with 70 chapters, in 5 continents. AEHL offers  
48  
49 services including about 400 events around the world every year; e-newsletters, personal profiles  
50  
51 maintained in the AEHL database; information and recruitment sessions; and career services.  
52  
53 The events include class reunions (5, 10, 20 years, etc.) at EHL; local chapter gatherings and  
54  
55 social activities; as well as the annual AEHL gathering.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 The population for this research was defined as all alumni who provided their e-mail  
4 addresses to AEHL. EHL only started supporting university e-mail accounts for alumni in the  
5 past two decades, and counts on alumni to update their e-mail addresses. Consequently, EHL has  
6 8,060 active e-mail addresses among about 25,000 alumni.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

### 12 ***Instrument***

13  
14  
15 The survey items were developed through literature review (Cha et al., 2013; Vieregge et  
16 al, 2013; Ebert, et al., 2015; Stephenson & Yerger, 2015; Barron, 2015; Palmer et al., 2008; Fogg,  
17 2008); and interviews of AEHL staff members and alumni during spring 2015. The survey  
18 questionnaire consists of three parts; personal information, including gender, the graduation year,  
19 and nationality; the levels of intention to get involved in various activities, eight items; and the  
20 levels of intention to participate in various social events, 8 items. Activities and social events are  
21 differentiated based on the reasoning that activities demand efforts and commitment from alumni,  
22 while social events are more entertaining and require less effort from alumni. Items within the  
23 two intention sections were evaluated using 5-point Likert scales ranging from 1 (not likely at all)  
24 to 5 (most likely). After the pilot test to ensure clarity of items, minor adjustments were made.  
25  
26 The final version of the survey was presented in French and English.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 ***Data Collection and Data Analysis***

44  
45  
46 An e-mail explaining the purpose of the survey along with a link to the online survey was  
47 distributed to 8,060 AEHL members in spring 2015. Two weeks later, a second e-mail was sent  
48 to encourage participation.  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 Data were analysed using descriptive statistics and one-way ANOVA. All statistical tests  
55 used  $p \leq 0.05$  to determine significance.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Results

Out of 8,060 e-mail addresses, 830 alumni responded. As this research intended to investigate cohort differences, any responses without answering the question about the graduation year were eliminated, and resulted in 739 responses. Furthermore, the listwise deletion method was used to treat missing data. The listwise deletion method is simple to operate at the cost of removing incomplete responses. Consequently, the total responses were reduced to 566, and the corresponding response rate is slightly above 7%. This response rate is comparable to previous alumni studies of 5.5% (Viergge et al., 2013), 6% (Palmer and Koenig-Lewis, 2008), 7% and 12% (McAlexander et al., 2016).

The respondents were mainly male (57%); and Swiss (40%). The range of graduation years is between 1957 and 2014. Five cohorts were created. Cohort 1 to 4 each represents a duration of 10 years. For Cohort 5, the duration is more than 10 years, as it contains alumni graduated in and before 1974 (between 1957 and 1974). All respondents were assigned into a cohort corresponding to their graduation years. Table One shows the number of respondents within each cohort. The typical age of EHL alumni when they graduated was in their early twenties. Hence, the corresponding ages for Cohort 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 are twenties, thirties, forties, fifties, and sixties or older.

Insert Table One Near Here

1  
2  
3 The first research question is addressed by findings presented in Table Two, which shows  
4  
5 the mean and standard deviation of the level of the intention to participate in activities and social  
6  
7 events for all respondents.  
8  
9

10  
11 Insert Table Two Near Here  
12  
13

14 In terms of activities, respondents are more likely to get involved by becoming a chapter  
15  
16 member (M = 3.96, S.D. = 1.21); becoming an EHL ambassador (M = 3.49, S.D. = 1.40);  
17  
18 participating in the selection process (M = 3.45, S.D. = 1.40); being a mentor for students (M =  
19  
20 3.37, S.D. = 1.34); offering jobs or internships (M = 3.27, S.D. = 1.43); becoming a guest speaker  
21  
22 (M = 3.14, S.D. = 1.14); being a mentor for alumni (M = 2.92, S.D. = 1.35); and making financial  
23  
24 contributions (M = 2.10, S.D. = 1.17). It is interesting to note that the standard deviation for  
25  
26 financial contribution is the smallest among these eight items, meaning alumni are more in  
27  
28 agreement on this item comparing to their evaluations of other items.  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 In terms of social events, respondents are more likely to participate in class reunions (M =  
34  
35 3.87, S.D. = 1.25); chapter events (M = 3.74, S.D. = 1.14); AEHL events (M = 3.69, S.D. = 1.11);  
36  
37 industry conferences at your region (M = 3.53, S.D. = 1.19); AEHL conferences with other  
38  
39 industries (M = 3.26, S.D. = 1.29); AEHL conferences with other universities (M = 3.04, S.D. =  
40  
41 1.25); AEHL & student events (M = 2.93, S.D. = 1.31), and industry conferences at EHL (M =  
42  
43 2.83, S.D. = 1.19). Clearly, social events such as class reunions, chapter events, and AEHL  
44  
45 events, are important.  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 The second research question regarding the comparison of generations is addressed  
51  
52 through the findings shown in Table Three and Figure 1. Table Three presents the mean and  
53  
54 standard deviation by cohort groups for 16 items. As shown in Table Three, a general pattern of  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 younger cohorts having higher mean scores than older cohorts do, seems to exist among the five  
4  
5 cohorts. To examine if there are statistical differences between the mean scores among five  
6  
7 cohorts, ANOVA tests have been conducted for 16 items, and presented in Table Four.  
8  
9

10  
11 Insert Table Three Near Here  
12

13  
14 Insert Figure One Near Here  
15  
16

17 Since the range of the graduation years is around 57 years (between 1957 and 2014), it is  
18  
19 not a surprise to find significant differences between five cohorts for all except two items. These  
20  
21 two exceptional items are to get involved by becoming a chapter member, and to participate in  
22  
23 chapter events.  
24  
25  
26

27  
28 Insert Table Four Near Here  
29

30 As ANOVA results shown significant differences among five cohorts for 14 items, Tukey  
31  
32 post-hoc tests have been conducted to further identify the differences between cohorts. The  
33  
34 findings from the Tukey post-hoc tests are presented by cohorts in the following paragraphs.  
35  
36  
37

38 Comparing Cohort 1 and Cohort 2, significant differences were found for “class reunions”  
39  
40 and “AEHL events”, ( $0.00 < p < 0.05$ ). Comparing Cohort 1 and Cohort 3, significant differences  
41  
42 were found for “become an EHL ambassador”, “be a mentor for students”, “offer jobs or  
43  
44 internships”, “AEHL events” ( $p = 0.00$ ); “participate in the selection process” and “class reunions”  
45  
46 ( $0.00 < p < 0.05$ ). Comparing Cohort 1 and Cohort 4, significant differences were found for  
47  
48 “become an EHL ambassador”, “participate in the selection process”, “be a mentor for students”,  
49  
50 “offer jobs or internships”, “become a guest speaker”, “be a mentor for alumni”, “AEHL events”,  
51  
52 “AEHL conferences with other industries”, “AEHL conferences with other universities”, “AEHL  
53  
54 & students events”, “Industry conferences at EHL”, ( $p = 0.00$ ); and “make financial  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 contribution”, “class reunions” ( $0.00 < p < 0.05$ ). Comparing Cohort 1 and Cohort 5, significant  
4  
5 differences were found for “become an EHL ambassador”, “participate in the selection process”,  
6  
7 “become a mentor for students”, “offer jobs or internships”, “become a guest speaker”, “be a  
8  
9 mentor for alumni”, “class reunions”, “AEHL events”, “industry conferences at your region”,  
10  
11 “AEHL conferences with other industries”, “AEHL conferences with other universities”, “AEHL  
12  
13 and students events”, and “industry conferences at EHL”, all with  $p = 0.00$ ; as well as “make  
14  
15 financial contribution” ( $0.00 < p < 0.05$ ).  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 Cohort 2 and Cohort 3 has only one significant difference in “offer jobs or internships” ( $p$   
22  
23 = 0.00). Cohort 2 and Cohort 4, significant differences were found for “participate in the  
24  
25 selection process”, “be a mentor for students”, “offer jobs or internships”, ( $p = 0.00$ ); “become an  
26  
27 EHL ambassador”, “be a mentor for alumni”, “make financial contribution”, “AEHL conferences  
28  
29 with other industries”, and “AEHL conferences with other universities” ( $0.00 < p < 0.05$ ).  
30  
31

32  
33 Comparing Cohort 2 and Cohort 5, significant differences were found for “become an EHL  
34  
35 ambassador”, “participate in the selection process”, “be a mentor for students”, “offer jobs or  
36  
37 internships”, “become a guest speaker”, “make financial contribution”, “industry conferences at  
38  
39 your region”, “AEHL conferences with other industries”, “AEHL conferences with other  
40  
41 universities”, “AEHL & students events”, “industry conferences at EHL” ( $p = 0.00$ ); “AEHL  
42  
43 events” ( $0.00 < p < 0.05$ ).  
44  
45  
46

47  
48 Cohort 3 and Cohort 4 have significant differences in “AEHL & students events”, and  
49  
50 “industry conferences at EHL” ( $0.00 < p < 0.05$ ). Cohort 3 and Cohort 5 have significant  
51  
52 differences in “participate in the selection process”, “offer jobs and internships”, “industry  
53  
54 conferences at your region”, “AEHL conferences with other industries”, “AEHL conferences  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 with other universities”, “AEHL & students events”, “industry conferences at EHL”, ( $p = 0.00$ );  
4  
5 and “become a guest speaker” ( $0.00 < p < 0.05$ ).  
6  
7

8  
9 Comparing Cohort 4 and Cohort 5, significant differences were found for “offer jobs and  
10  
11 internships” ( $p = 0.00$ ), and “participate in the selection process”, “industry conferences at your  
12  
13 region”, “AEHL conferences with other industries” ( $0.00 < p < 0.05$ ).  
14  
15

16  
17 The above findings address the second research question, and there are significant  
18  
19 differences between different alumni age groups. It seems like disjoin cohorts have more  
20  
21 differences than adjoin cohorts. The findings suggest that segmenting the alumni to understand  
22  
23 them better, instead of treating alumni as a homogeneous stakeholder group, adds value.  
24  
25

## 26 27 **Discussions**

28  
29 The findings presented in Table Two show that “making financial contributions” is the  
30  
31 least likely activity alumni would participate. Hence, the number of actual donors does not  
32  
33 represent the number of alumni interested in getting involved with their alma mater. In other  
34  
35 words, in addition to the alumni financial donors, if there are non-monetary activities available,  
36  
37 other alumni may get involved with their alma mater as well.  
38  
39

40  
41  
42 Offering jobs and internships and guest lectures are the common practices to get alumni  
43  
44 involved, but the levels of intentions were only number five and six among eight activities. Other  
45  
46 activities, such as asking alumni to be the ambassadors of the university or department, becoming  
47  
48 student mentors, or getting involved in the student selection process are viable alternatives.  
49  
50

51  
52 In terms of offering jobs or internships, the oldest cohort rated it even lower than making  
53  
54 financial contributions! It is likely that a percentage of older alumni may be retired and not able  
55  
56 to provide activities such as internships. Yet, they may be able to use industry connections to  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 support student recruitment by previous employers. Comparing to Cohort 5 and Cohort 3, Cohort  
4  
5 4 was more positive about offering jobs and internships, but their mean score is significantly  
6  
7 lower than the means from Cohort 1 and 2. Given their ages, these findings may imply that  
8  
9 younger alumni have higher intentions to offer jobs and internships than senior alumni do. Yet,  
10  
11 whether these younger alumni have the authority to hire students still needs to be examined.  
12  
13 Ebert et al. (2015) stated that the main goal for Stockholm University to develop alumni relations  
14  
15 is to give students contacts with and knowledge about the labour market. Based on the findings,  
16  
17 it may be useful to set realistic students' expectations by emphasizing the alumni contacts do not  
18  
19 generally hand out jobs or internships.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25           Regardless of cohorts, alumni are most likely to join the local chapters and chapter events.  
26  
27 The most popular social event is the class reunions, hence the importance of class reunions  
28  
29 cannot be overstated. Nevertheless, class reunions only take place every 5 or even 10 years.  
30  
31 Therefore, chapter events and to some extent, AEHL gathering events provide opportunities to  
32  
33 socialize with alumni from other classes. Satisfaction with student affairs had a larger impact on  
34  
35 alumni supportive behaviour than satisfaction with campus resources did (Stephenson & Yerger,  
36  
37 2008). Student affairs are related to social opportunities, campus environments, student activities,  
38  
39 and fun. Although alumni won't be present on campus, chapter gatherings certainly could be the  
40  
41 extension of student affairs after graduation. Local gatherings provide opportunities for alumni  
42  
43 to socialize and have fun, receive updated information about their alma mater, and may over the  
44  
45 long run contribute to alumni supportive behaviour.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51           Given the growing internationalization of student bodies in the hospitality and tourism  
52  
53 programs, alumni associations should develop international based alumni programs. Take EHL  
54  
55 as an example. With students from 107 countries, AEHL has years of experience working with  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 international students, including 70 local chapters in different countries. As stated before, alumni  
4 are very likely to become chapter members and participate in chapter events. Establishing local  
5 chapters and organizing chapter gatherings provide additional accessible touch points outside of  
6 the campus, and enable alumni to develop local relationships between different classes and  
7 generations.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 The mean scores for Cohort 1 and 2 tend to be higher than the other three cohorts'. This  
17 indicates that younger alumni are more likely to participate in activities and social events. It is  
18 worth noting that EHL created the English section in 1996, and became a bilingual school.  
19 Hence Cohort 1 and 2 are alumni from both English and French sections, which are different  
20 from French only Cohort 3, 4, and 5. It is logical to assume that the different cultural orientations  
21 exist between the first two cohorts and the elder three cohorts. The differences could be  
22 attributed to multi-cultural/ heterogeneous vs. single culture /homogeneous membership, or age /  
23 stage of life. Hence, it is necessary to conduct follow up research comparing intentions between  
24 different generations in order to determine whether the differences between cohorts result from  
25 culture or age / stage of life. It is critical to identify the cause of different behaviours because  
26 different strategies may be needed to address the issue. For example, if the difference between  
27 younger and elder cohorts is due to culture, then the difference will disappear over time, as the  
28 future alumni are from both English and French sections. On the other hand, if the difference  
29 between younger and elder cohorts is due to age or stage of life, EHL will need to develop  
30 specific marketing strategies to engage elder alumni.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

### 51 52 **Conclusions and Limitations**

53  
54  
55 The most important findings were alumni are more likely to engage in non-monetary  
56 activities than the monetary activity; and identified statistically significant differences between  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 intentions to participate in activities and social events of different generations. Regardless of  
4  
5 their cohorts, EHL alumni are most likely to join the chapters and chapter events. Other  
6  
7 important non-monetary activities are becoming an EHL ambassador, participating in the student  
8  
9 selection process, joining class reunions and AEHL events. Given the increasing number of  
10  
11 international students in higher education institutes and globalization of professionals, setting up  
12  
13 local chapters in key alumni countries and encouraging chapter gatherings could increase touch  
14  
15 points between class reunions, as well as develop and strengthen relationships between alumni  
16  
17  
18 from different generations.  
19  
20  
21

22  
23 The academic contributions of this research addressed calls made by previous researchers  
24  
25 by conducting a cross-generational comparison study, focusing on the non-monetary activities in  
26  
27 the hospitality context (McAlexander et al., 2016; Cha et al., 2013; Vieregge, et al., 2013).  
28  
29 Although it is not a surprise that there are differences between generations of alumni, this  
30  
31 research clearly showed the statistical evidences of the existence of these differences.  
32  
33  
34

35 For practitioners, involving alumni in non-monetary activities could strengthen alumni's  
36  
37 emotional attachment, and update alumni on institutional progresses and resources needed for  
38  
39 projects. Alumni associations count on personal nostalgia for donations, and could provide  
40  
41 volunteering activities for alumni to make non-financial contributions. Volunteers for non-profit  
42  
43 organizations are more likely to donate (Freeman, 1996; Webb, 2002). When alumni see first-  
44  
45 hand the impact from their non-financial contributions, they may also recognize the impact made  
46  
47 by financial contributions and chose to donate. Even though this research identified that alumni  
48  
49 have the lowest intention of making financial contributions, more research is needed to examine  
50  
51 any improvements of this intention and its relationship with non-monetary contributions.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 To increase alumni involvement, universities and colleges need to plan the alumni  
4 program logistics and invest the required supportive resources. Ebert et al. (2015) provided  
5 valuable insights and suggestions in building, structuring, and developing alumni relations.  
6  
7 Developing the guidelines for chapters, ambassadors and mentors; establishing criteria and  
8 recruiting ambassadors and mentors; matching mentors and students; all are not typical  
9 responsibilities for staff working at alumni associations. Alumni associations could leverage the  
10 relationships between alumni and faculty or staff members to help in developing these logistics.  
11  
12 Universities and colleges are encouraged to develop a more holistic alumni strategy to better  
13 utilize alumni, a vital asset.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 Certainly this research is not without limitations. The data set from EHL covers 57 years  
26 of alumni, but may limit the generalizability of the findings. Given the different expectations to  
27 alumni financial giving and experiences in operating alumni associations between universities  
28 and colleges in the US and Europe, the U.S. readers should interpret these findings with caution.  
29  
30 This research identified different intentions to participate in non-monetary activities between  
31 generational groups, but did not investigate the causes.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 EHL expanded its program from a French only to bilingual programs in 1996, and this  
41 change may have caused the different intentions between younger cohorts (1 and 2) and senior  
42 cohorts (3, 4, and 5). To what extent does culture influence alumni's intention to contribute still  
43 needs to be examined. For example, the research did not examine potential differences between  
44 alumni nationalities which will require extensive research on cultural norms which change over  
45 time. Furthermore, intentions may not equal to actions. Lastly, even though volunteers for non-  
46 profit organizations are more likely to donate (Freeman, 1997; Webb, 2002), do alumni follow  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

the same pattern and move from non-monetary activities to financial contributions? These are topics that need to be further examined by researchers.

## References

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Assante, L. M., Huffman, L., & Harp, S. S. (2010). A taxonomy of academic quality indicators  
7  
8 for US-based 4-year undergraduate hospitality management programs. *Journal of Hospitality*  
9  
10 & Tourism Research, 34(2), 164-184.
- 11  
12  
13  
14 Barron, J. (2015). Building a chain of success in marketing higher education: the alumni  
15  
16 connection. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 47(5), 253-256.
- 17  
18  
19  
20 Cha, J., Kim, S., & Cichy, R. F. (2013). Hospitality Students' Intent to Become Involved as  
21  
22 Active Alumni: A Predictive Model. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 25(1), 1-  
23  
24 10.
- 25  
26  
27 Dredge, D., Benckendorff, P., Day, M., Gross, M. J., Walo, M., Weeks, P., & Whitelaw, P. A.  
28  
29 (2013). Drivers of change in tourism, hospitality, and event management education: An  
30  
31 Australian perspective. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 25(2), 89-102.
- 32  
33  
34  
35 Dvorak, T., & Toubman, S. R. (2013). Are women more generous than men? Evidence from  
36  
37 alumni donations. *Eastern Economic Journal*, 39(1), 121-131.
- 38  
39  
40  
41 Ebert, K., Axelsson, L., & Harbor, J. (2015). Opportunities and challenges for building alumni  
42  
43 networks in Sweden: a case study of Stockholm University. *Journal of Higher Education*  
44  
45 *Policy and Management*, 37(2), 252-262.
- 46  
47  
48 EHL History. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.ehl.edu/en/about-us/our-organization/ehl-history>  
49  
50
- 51  
52 Freeman, R. B. (1996). *Working for nothing: The supply of volunteer labor* (No. w5435).  
53  
54 National bureau of economic research.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Fogg, P. (2008). How Colleges Use Alumni to Recruit Students. *Chronicle of Higher*  
4  
5 *Education*, 54(34).  
6  
7  
8  
9 Madanoglu, M., & Martin, L. (2003). Recruitment of international students to US hospitality  
10  
11 graduate programs: students' perceptions. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 15(4),  
12  
13 43-49.  
14  
15  
16 Marr, K. A., Mullin, C. H., & Siegfried, J. J. (2005). Undergraduate financial aid and subsequent  
17  
18 alumni giving behavior. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 45(1), 123-143.  
19  
20  
21  
22 Martin, M. C., Moriuchi, E., Smith, R. M., Moeder, J. D., & Nichols, C. (2015). The Importance  
23  
24 of University Traditions and Rituals in Building Alumni Brand Communities and Loyalty.  
25  
26 *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal*, 19(3), 107-118.  
27  
28  
29  
30 McAlexander, J. H., Koenig, H. F., & DuFault, B. (2016). Millennials and Boomers: increasing  
31  
32 alumni affinity and intent to give by target market segmentation. *International Journal of*  
33  
34 *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*. Sect. Mark. (21), 82-95.  
35  
36  
37  
38 Meer, J., & Rosen, H. S. (2009). The impact of athletic performance on alumni giving: An  
39  
40 analysis of microdata. *Economics of Education Review*, 28(3), 287-294.  
41  
42  
43 Morse, R., & Brooks, E. (2016, Sept. 12). Best colleges ranking criteria and weights. US News  
44  
45 and World Report. Retrieved from [http://www.usnews.com/education/best-](http://www.usnews.com/education/best-colleges/articles/ranking-criteria-and-weights)  
46  
47 [colleges/articles/ranking-criteria-and-weights](http://www.usnews.com/education/best-colleges/articles/ranking-criteria-and-weights)  
48  
49  
50  
51 Palmer, A., & Koenig-Lewis, N. (2008). Experiential bases for relationship development: A  
52  
53 study of alumni relationships. *Journal of Relationship Marketing*, 7(1), 65-90.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Stephenson, A. L., & Yerger, D. B. (2015). The Role of Satisfaction in Alumni Perceptions and  
4  
5 Supportive Behaviors. *Services Marketing Quarterly*, 36(4), 299-316.  
6  
7  
8  
9 Vieregge, M., Robinson, H. J., & Drago, L. (2013). Alumni Associations at Swiss Hospitality  
10  
11 Schools: Alumni's Expectations and Satisfaction. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism*  
12  
13 *Education*, 25(1), 40-47.  
14  
15  
16  
17 Webb, C. H. (2002). The role of alumni relations in fund raising. *New strategies for educational*  
18  
19 *fund raising*, 332-338.  
20  
21  
22 Weerts, D. J., & Ronca, J. M. (2008). Characteristics of alumni donors who volunteer at their  
23  
24 alma mater. *Research in Higher Education*, 49(3), 274-292.  
25  
26  
27  
28 Wisansing, J. (2008). The three waves of internationalisation sweeping Thailand's tourism and  
29  
30 hospitality education: Current progress and future prospects. *Journal of Hospitality &*  
31  
32 *Tourism Education*, 20(1), 13-19.  
33  
34  
35  
36 Wunnava, P. V., & Okunade, A. A. (2013). Do business executives give more to their alma mater?  
37  
38 Longitudinal evidence from a large university. *American Journal of Economics and*  
39  
40 *Sociology*, 72(3), 761-778.  
41  
42  
43  
44 Zehrer, A., & Lichtmannegger, S. (2008). The internationalization of tourism education-the case  
45  
46 of MCI. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 20(1), 45-51.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table One Alumni Cohort Distributions			
	Graduation Year	Number	Percentage
Cohort 1	2005- 2014	253	45%
Cohort 2	1995 – 2004	122	22%
Cohort 3	1985 – 1994	90	16%
Cohort 4	1975 – 1984	59	10%
Cohort 5	1957 and 1974	42	7%
Total		566	100%

Table Two  
 Intentions to Get Involved and Participate in Social Events: Means and Standard Deviations  
 (N = 566)

	How likely would you get involved in the following activities	Mean	S.D.
IN 1	Become a chapter member	3.96	1.21
IN 2	Become an EHL ambassador	3.49	1.40
IN 3	Participate in the selection process for the potential EHL students	3.45	1.40
IN 4	Be a mentor for students	3.37	1.34
IN 5	Offer jobs or internships	3.27	1.43
IN 6	Become a guest speaker	3.14	1.41
IN 7	Be a mentor for alumni	2.92	1.35
IN 8	Make financial contribution	2.10	1.17
	How likely would you participate in the following social events?	Mean	S.D.
SE 1	Class reunions	3.87	1.25
SE 2	Chapter events	3.74	1.14
SE 3	AEHL events	3.69	1.11
SE 4	Industry conferences at your region	3.53	1.19
SE 5	AEHL conferences with other industries	3.26	1.29
SE 6	AEHL conferences with other universities	3.04	1.25
SE 7	AEHL & students events	2.93	1.31
SE 8	Industry conferences at EHL	2.83	1.19



Table Three  
 Intentions to Get Involved and Participate in Social Events: Means & Standard Deviations by Cohorts

Cohort	1		2		3		4		5	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Become a chapter member	4.06	1.11	3.79	1.25	3.88	1.29	4.07	1.26	3.90	1.36
Become an EHL ambassador	3.84	1.25	3.54	1.37	3.21	1.46	2.92	1.38	2.69	1.55
Participate in the selection process	3.76	1.33	3.70	1.14	3.23	1.43	2.86	1.41	2.12	1.37
Be a mentor for students	3.67	1.19	3.52	1.25	3.09	1.40	2.68	1.31	2.67	1.65
Offer jobs & internships	3.73	1.26	3.51	1.21	2.74	1.36	2.80	1.61	1.55	1.04
Become a guest speaker	3.40	1.34	3.25	1.43	2.98	1.42	2.66	1.35	2.26	1.38
Be a mentor for alumni	3.16	1.26	2.98	1.38	2.80	1.35	2.34	1.17	2.38	1.59
Make financial contribution	2.22	1.17	2.30	1.26	1.99	1.09	1.75	0.90	1.57	1.11
Class reunions	4.14	1.15	3.73	1.30	3.63	1.25	3.63	1.27	3.43	1.36
Chapter events	3.87	1.10	3.61	1.12	3.62	1.26	3.71	1.10	3.64	1.23
AEHL events	4.01	1.02	3.61	1.06	3.47	1.13	3.25	1.08	3.05	1.17
Industry conferences at your region	3.71	1.12	3.70	1.17	3.43	1.09	3.27	1.20	2.50	1.29
AEHL conferences with other industries	3.55	1.20	3.37	1.23	3.28	1.25	2.73	1.22	1.90	1.16
AEHL conferences with other universities	3.27	1.18	3.12	1.22	3.10	1.21	2.56	1.21	1.95	1.25
AEHL & students events	3.06	1.31	3.20	1.21	3.10	1.30	2.41	1.19	1.79	1.02
Industry conferences at EHL	3.05	1.16	2.82	1.11	2.94	1.16	2.37	1.19	1.88	1.06

Table Four

## One-Way Analysis of Variance of Intentions to Participate by Cohort Groups

	SOURCES	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
IN 1 Become a chapter member	Between Groups	4	7.77	1.94	1.33	0.26
	Within Groups	561	818.45	1.46		
	Total	565	826.22			
IN 2 Become an EHL ambassador	Between Groups	4	84.28	21.07	11.57	0.00
	Within Groups	561	1'021.19	1.82		
	Total	565	1'105.47			
IN 3 Participate in the selection process	Between Groups	4	131.55	32.89	18.85	0.00
	Within Groups	561	978.57	1.74		
	Total	565	1'110.11			
IN 4 Be a mentor for students	Between Groups	4	81.52	20.38	12.32	0.00
	Within Groups	561	928.04	1.65		
	Total	565	1'009.56			
IN 5 Offer jobs or internships	Between Groups	4	222.49	55.62	33.42	0.00
	Within Groups	561	933.76	1.66		
	Total	565	1'156.25			
IN 6 Become a guest speaker	Between Groups	4	66.36	16.59	8.77	0.00
	Within Groups	561	1'060.89	1.89		
	Total	565	1'127.25			
IN 7 Be a mentor for alumni	Between Groups	4	48.73	12.18	6.99	0.00
	Within Groups	561	977.85	1.74		
	Total	565	1'026.58			
IN 8 Make financial contribution	Between Groups	4	28.61	7.15	5.41	0.00
	Within Groups	561	741.44	1.32		
	Total	565	770.06			
SE 1 Class reunions	Between Groups	4	37.86	9.47	6.28	0.00
	Within Groups	561	845.93	1.51		
	Total	565	883.80			
SE 2 Chapter events	Between Groups	4	8.11	2.03	1.56	0.18
	Within Groups	561	727.75	1.30		
	Total	565	735.85			
SE 3 AEHL events	Between Groups	4	59.92	14.98	13.23	0.00
	Within Groups	561	635.35	1.13		
	Total	565	695.27			
SE 4 Industry conferences at your region	Between Groups	4	60.71	15.18	11.50	0.00
	Within Groups	561	740.40	1.32		
	Total	565	801.10			
SE 5 AEHL conferences with other universities	Between Groups	4	115.87	28.97	19.66	0.00
	Within Groups	561	826.46	1.47		
	Total	565	942.34			
SE 6 AEHL conferences	Between Groups	4	78.18	19.55	13.54	0.00

with other universities	Within Groups	561	809.88	1.44		
	Total	565	888.07			
SE 7 AEHL & students events	Between Groups	4	86.94	21.73	13.82	0.00
	Within Groups	561	882.51	1.57		
	Total	565	969.45			
SE 8 Industry conferences at EHL	Between Groups	4	63.74	15.94	12.09	0.00
	Within Groups	561	739.29	1.32		
	Total	565	803.03			

