The Generosity of an Urban Professoriate: Understanding Faculty as Donors and Academic Citizens

Genevieve G. Shaker

Abstract

Although faculties are often portrayed as institutionally uninvolved, evidence exists that many of them are actually academic citizens who contribute beyond requirements and expectations. Using a phenomenological approach to examine major giving by faculty and their academic citizenship at an urban university, this study of limited sample size shows that faculty citizenship was grounded by philanthropic values such as those that inspired financial giving among the participants.

In this era of financial and policy uncertainty, faculty are often portrayed as disconnected from their institutions, hesitant to engage in service and governance assignments, and loath to accept the institutional responsibilities that accompany tenure (Burgan 1998, 2006; MacFarlane 2005; Thompson, Constantineau, and Fallis 2006). With the changing composition of the academic workforce to a majority non-tenure–track (American Federation of Teachers 2010, 3), these conditions point to problems for institutions (especially urban ones), which rely on a smaller number of full-time faculty to contribute to shared governance, to serve on committees, to advise students, to administer programs, and to create campus communities—among other tasks.

Not only are the institutions' functional needs fulfilled by faculty, much of what defines institutional culture (and even quality) takes place in the unregulated space and time left to faculty members' professional discretion. From unplanned and unintentional sharing of knowledge and expertise to the routine support given to students, to community work on the institution's behalf to applied research and practice, faculty contribute in a multitude of unreported venues and modes. Urban institutions, and their faculty, are particularly shaped by the expectations of the metropolitan environments in which they serve, their diverse communities, and their responses to civic needs (Brownell 1993, 17) and a belief in the "urban mission." These activities enhance academia and society in a manner in which the public has come to depend but does not always acknowledge.

Moreover, faculty make tangible contributions of physical and financial resources to their institutions. Collectively, faculty donors give millions of dollars to their departments, schools, and campuses. For example, at the University of Minnesota, 11,000 faculty, staff, and retirees gave $67 million during the 1996–2003 Campaign for Minnesota (Palmer 2004). At my institution, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, which is a large public urban university, employee donors gave $2.4 million in 2011. Is faculty giving a proxy for institutional loyalty, a commitment to the

profession, and a duty for the public good? An in-depth analysis of faculty who give may point the way to future research.

Instead of being disconnected, faculty who give beyond the requirements and expectations may be the embodiment of academic citizenship, successfully completing the spectrum of their responsibilities with contributions to their many communities (Kennedy 1997; MacFarlane 2007; Thompson, Constantineau, and Fallis 2006). Often lacking in material rewards, this work must be intrinsically driven by motives that supersede self-interest and may well be rooted in the same philanthropic values that inspire financial giving. "Voluntary action for the public good" (Payton 1988, 3), or philanthropy, is the shared value at the heart of educational enterprise as a communal effort undertaken for the betterment of society and others' lives (Boyer 1990; MacFarlane 2005, 2007; Plater 1998; Shils 1997).

Voluntary action includes not only voluntary contributions of money, but also voluntary service of time and talent, and an individual's voluntary association with a group whose purpose is philanthropic. Through philanthropy, people express their moral values about how to make society better or how to maintain what is good about society (Payton and Moody 2008, 97). Thus, a professional philosophy built on the moral value that education is a public good (Saltmarsh and Hartley 2011), and that higher education is a vehicle for that good, helps explain faculty commitments to academic citizenship.

Exploring the connection between philanthropy and citizenship will expand knowledge about the professoriate and the meaningfulness of academic endeavor. Furthermore, in an era of concern about the future of the faculty profession, building linkages between these concepts may have important consequences for public perceptions about the professoriate. An appropriate method for assessing the viability of this kind of exploration is conducting an in-depth qualitative phenomenological analysis of a small sample at a single purposefully chosen site where the phenomena in question are evident (Creswell 1998, 51–55). As a prelude to a broader quantitative or qualitative approach, this article's study is a conceptual and methodological exploration that asked: Is there a connection between academic citizenship and financial philanthropy?

Ten individual faculty and couples (several of whom had primarily administrative appointments) with large financial philanthropic commitments to their urban university participated in this study. Each participant was found to be an active academic citizen and their financial generosity was revealed as a single, albeit extraordinary, expression of a lifetime spent serving their multiple communities. All were keenly aware of their urban environment, and for most this awareness was a major factor in their giving. Their careers were infused by a broad approach to academic citizenship and contributing to the greater good, careers that began, in most cases, long before this model for faculty behavior was recognized in the 1990s (Boyer 1990, 1996). The participants' financial giving and citizenship were interwoven and framed by the paradigm of education as a public good.

Information on Giving by Faculty and Staff as the Contextual Framework

Out of the $28 billion given to higher education in 2010, 44 percent was given by individuals. Specifically, $7.1 billion came from alumni and an additional $4.9 billion from non-alumni donors (Council for Aid to Education 2011). In 2010, on average faculty and staff at research/doctoral institutions donated at a rate of 18.5 percent and gave $685,997; at master's institutions, 25.4 percent gave a total of $103,418; and at baccalaureate institutions, 26.3 percent of the faculty and staff together gave $64,716 (Council for the Advancement and Support of Education 2010). Regular employee giving campaigns are now commonplace (March 2005) and are beginning to be examined (Cardon 2009) as are techniques for involving faculty and staff in the fundraising process (Dube 2005). Research about giving by faculty, administrators, and staff is limited to a few case studies about fundraising practices (Byrne 2005; Cardon 2009; Gray and Hohnstreiter 2012) and to empirical studies of who gives and why (Holland 1997; Holland and Miller 1997; Knight 2004; March 2005; Agypt, Christensen, and Nesbit 2011); a brief review of the latter group of studies is relevant to this analysis and follows.

A survey of full-time faculty from three institutions used social exchange theory in its conceptualization, proposing that faculty were giving in exchange for something received from the university; but little evidence was found to support this hypothesis (Holland 1997; Holland and Miller 1997). The mid-1990s study found senior faculty to be the most likely to give. The survey asked participants ($n = 183$) to select from a list of thirty factors that may have motivated them to give. Results indicated that the top giving motives were altruism, social responsibility to the institution, self-fulfillment, professional attitude, conviction, and institutional loyalty. Of these, institutional loyalty was the only motive that constantly held across the three institutions in the study.

A mixed-method study of faculty and staff from Bowling Green State University found that giving was most likely among those in full-time administrative professional positions rather than among full-time faculty, part-time faculty, or hourly staff (Knight 2004). Using data from a 2001–2002 giving campaign, the researcher found that longer institutional employment equated to an increased likelihood of giving as did higher salaries, living in the town of Bowling Green, and being an alumnus of the university. Also, those with giving histories were more likely to be current donors. The study interviews, with twelve faculty members, focused on the participants' understanding of the faculty and staff's fundraising campaign and opinions regarding its administration and effectiveness. Participants hypothesized that the top reasons that others gave were allegiance, especially at the departmental- and school-level, and connectivity; barriers were thought to include poor morale, lack of community spirit, low salaries, limited resources, and philosophical concerns related to fundraising priorities and employee campaigns.

March (2005) surveyed chief advancement officers at 164 public universities and sought to discern institutional differences in faculty and staff philanthropy. Enhanced giving levels, though rarely statistically significant, were discovered at institutions with fewer than 1,000 students as well as at Carnegie-classified baccalaureate institutions. Faculty members at Midwestern institutions were more likely to give than those in other regions. Department chairs/peers and faculty/staff campaign co-chairs were deemed the most effective fund solicitors. Finally, March concluded that restricted giving was much more common among both faculty and staff than unrestricted giving, highlighting the desire of the donors to express their specific institutional priorities through their philanthropy.

A study using data collected between 2001–2008 focused on giving by faculty and staff to external nonprofit organizations through two annual on-campus campaigns—one for local arts organizations and the other for human and social services (Agypt, Christensen, and Nesbit 2011, 7). The longitudinal study of a large public university considered individual characteristics and donation levels. Neither sex nor age significantly affected giving. The single accurate predictor of giving across both studies was salary; length of service also predicted giving in one of the two campaigns. Looking across the two campaigns, the giving of hourly staff and associate professors was somewhat consistent and more generous than that of full professors, assistant professors, and salaried staff.

Most research on faculty and staff giving is aimed principally at developing understandings for fundraising purposes and strategy by exploring giving across institutions, providing insight into the reasons faculty and staff give, and delineating which university employees are more likely give. The Generosity of the Urban Professoriate project extends the line of research by focusing on faculty major donors, utilizing in-depth interview methodology, and simultaneously examining philanthropy and academic citizenship.

Academic Citizenship as the Analytical and Theoretical Framework

The idea of faculty as citizens charged with using their work for the greater good rests most visibly on Boyer's (1990) classic *Scholarship Reconsidered*, in which the scholarship of faculty is defined as research and discovery, integration, application (or engagement), and teaching. Boyer (1996) and others (O'Meara and Rice 2005; Plater 1999; Rhoads and Szelenyi 2009; Saltmarsh et al. 2009) who have continued in this vein describe citizenship for academia and its members as a force to be used for the success of society. For the sake of "colleges and universities as citizens" and to succeed in endeavors like civic engagement (Bringle, Games, and Malloy 1999), faculty should define professorial work as being for the collective good, within their institutions and disciplines as well as outside of these boundaries.

Academic citizenship itself is a nebulous idea with interpretations that are difficult to categorize. One line of thought focuses on academics' and academia's responsibility to society, hinging, for example, on the faculty's role in educating students for citizenship and fostering civic-minded development (Boyer 1990; Astin 1999). Civic engagement, "a movement defined by teaching, research, and service with public purposes" (O'Meara 2011, 177), fits with the philosophy of academic work as a compact with society, inherently relating to and requiring a strong commitment to academic citizenship and to higher education as a participatory and socially influenced endeavor.

Another thread in discussions of citizenship brings the concept into alignment with service activities. MacFarlane (2005) calls for a reinvigoration and recognition of faculty citizenship in a manner aligning with public citizenship education and the emphasis on political literacy, community involvement, and social and moral responsibility—inside and outside the university and through service activities (309). These are characteristics we often associate with urban-serving institutions. In a subsequent work, MacFarlane (2007, 264) interviewed U.K., U.S., Australian, Canadian, and European faculty, and found the participants defined academic citizenship as membership in a community with reciprocity as a component of that membership.

Academic duty is akin to citizenship in that faculty have responsibilities to accompany their rights and freedoms. Indeed, the "AAUP Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure" has been the harbinger of the tenure-track since its formalization in 1940 and is based on the balance of duties and rights. However, the reciprocity that should underpin the relationship of faculty with their universities—in return for academic freedom faculty have certain "duties" as citizens—is often lacking in practice. A dissonance of purposes, Kennedy (1997, 2) argues, exists whereby academic freedom is well-understood and idiomatic, while academic duty remains poorly defined and lacks clarity.

Citizenship by other definitions is largely related to faculty involvement in governance and encompasses a general sense of institutional responsibility and cultural capital (Burgan 1998). Like Kennedy (1997), Plater (1998) positions citizenship as the responsibility that accompanies tenure, and he even proposes that citizenship and tenure should be interchangeable tenets. In this case, faculty are citizens of the academic community just as they are citizens of a nation and, unlike employees of a company, they have certain obligations in return for the benefit of institutional investment. Tenure, and the bond of mutual responsibility, signals that the institution also is obligated to provide particular protections. Plater (1998) warns, however, the diversification of the academic workforce makes citizenship increasingly vulnerable and using tenure as its only rationale puts citizenship in the line of fire. Faculty self-determination of their academic citizenship or involvement broadly considered, the defining features of that involvement, and how these formed their relationship with the institution were important in this study.

Research Design and Methodology

The study was phenomenological in nature and was meant to describe "the meaning of the lived experiences for several individuals about a concept or the phenomenon" (Creswell 1998, 51). In this case, the phenomena considered were faculty members' philanthropy on a large scale and the academic citizenship of faculty who give, and the goal of the research was discovering the essence of being individuals who engaged in both behaviors. Phenomenology requires bracketing of (or putting aside) the researcher's preconceptions, relies on intuition, builds on imagination, and results in the formation of a picture of an experience. Research plans are developed specifically for the phenomena of interest and study samples are small, between five and twenty-five participants, and purposeful; final reports leave the reader feeling as though he or she understands better how a person experienced the phenomena (Polkinghorne 1989, 50).

Ten faculty members, senior, retired, and/or primarily administrative with significant gift commitments to a single academic unit formed the purposeful sample. Notably, many others had substantial cumulative giving over time, but those in the study population made a gift or bequest at or above the $25,000 level. This threshold was chosen because it aligned with the unit's definition of a "major gift" in fundraising terms. The study participants constituted more than 80 percent of the individuals with documented commitments at the designated level made during an eleven-year period spanning two campus-wide comprehensive fundraising campaigns; only a few faculty members made gifts of this magnitude and the majority participated in this study. The six women and four men were Caucasian (as were the major faculty donors who did not participate). A conservative estimate values the gifts and commitments made by the participating individuals at $2.4 million, or an average of $240,000 per donor with actual gifts ranging from $30,000 to over $1 million.

Interviews were conducted until the point of "saturation," a recognized state in qualitative research (Creswell 1998, 56; Kvale 1996, 101–103). The limited number of participants allowed for examination of the interest's behavior within context and exploration of the association between the individual and situation (Kvale 1996, 101–103). The academic unit where the study took place is a large school with more than 300 faculty and staff on an urban campus. This institution was selected for this study because of its recognized commitment to civic engagement and history of connectivity to its community—characteristics that the researcher suspected might be important in the faculty donors' relationships with the institution and their philanthropy. A faculty- and staff-giving campaign had taken place annually since the 1980s. Although the study's single site limits its scope, it creates a baseline setting in the under-researched area of faculty philanthropy, which will be critical in defining the future research agenda. Moreover, even when extended, this type of research with faculty major donors will have a relatively small sample size because of the limited number of individuals able to make similar philanthropic gifts.

In the Institutional Review Board's approved study, participants took part in sixty to ninety minute audio-recorded interviews and answered questions about their professional histories, institutional experiences, and philanthropic activities. The results summarized there represent over fifteen hours of intensive and focused reflections on faculty philanthropy. The interviews were conducted over a five-year period in coordination with the timing of the individuals' gifts. A structured protocol with designed flexibility created a conversational exchange, which encouraged openness by the participants and enabled for interviewer spontaneity (Burgess 1993; Seidman 2006). This encouraged the deep reflection necessary for a discussion spanning an extended time period and for the breadth of a full career. Participants were ensured confidentiality to the fullest extent possible.

The coding table included a series of themes derived from broad categories about academic citizenship, giving and philanthropy, and institutional context. It was constructed to highlight relationships between philanthropic motivations, philosophies of academic work, and professional roles. Interview transcriptions were analyzed individually with the predetermined codes; additional codes also emerged during the process. Next, a phenomenological data analysis was undertaken as a method for understanding the phenomena of giving and of citizenship (Creswell 1998, 55). In seeking the commonalities and differences, a series of analytical techniques including consideration of individual statements and themes, clustering of meanings, development of collective meanings, and formulation of representative themes preceded construction of the final descriptions and narrative. In addition, a visual reconstruction in the form of a table also was assembled to illustrate the findings (see Table 1). Informal member checks involved the participants during the analysis and construction of the findings, thus ensuring the viability of the interpretation (Creswell 1998, 202; Miles and Huberman 1994, 275).

Findings

When interviewed, the participants had been associated with the university for between fifteen and forty years. All but two were eligible for and had achieved tenure and moved through the professorial ranks; a few were emeritus. All had served in an administrative capacity at the program, department, center, school, and/or university level—some primarily in this role, some for the majority of their careers, others for just a short time. Taken as a whole, the following sections reveal the shared characteristics of these academic citizen-philanthropists within a model shaped by three key approaches to academic life: (1) involvement as a matter of course, (2) integration of agency across purpose and practice, and (3) innovation as a culture of academic understanding. The study findings and conclusions are briefly previewed in Table 1, which was conceived as tool for summarizing this study, but also for practical use and to foster consideration of future research possibilities.

Table 1: Summary of Key Approaches, Shared Characteristics, and Institutional Conditions at the Intersection of Faculty Giving and Academic Citizenship

Key Approaches to Academic Life	Description of Approach to Academic Life	Shared Characteristics of Faculty as Donors and Academic Citizens	Institutional Conditions of Support for Approach to Academic Life
Involvement as a matter of course	Meaningful participation as an academic citizen and a philanthropist as a natural component of academic life	Commitment to education's larger societal purpose Engagement with people, processes, and entities Generous contribution of intellectual resources for the benefit of others Institutionally focused Participation despite uncertainty of outcomes Philanthropy as a value Self-perpetuation of philanthropy and citizenship as a result of personal satisfaction	A culture of faculty responsibility, ownership, and duty toward the institution Peer collegiality and mentorship Community spirit within the institution and its units Institutional policies and practices that value and recognize involvement
Integration of agency across purpose and practice	Strategic, boundary-spanning institutional activity, involvement, and philanthropy with common emphases	Inclusion of a public benefit in professorial philosophy Attention to institutional success Personal and professional fulfillment from local impact of academic work and role Collaboration with other like-minded individuals Connectivity of personal and professional life Academic role as a central aspect of personal identity Change-making through academic service and philanthropy	Freedom to align personal strengths and interests in shaping career Involvement beyond the department silos Institutional civic engagement Recognition structures for boundary-spanning work Friendships with colleagues and development of shared social networks within academic units

Innovation as a culture of academic understanding	Shared individual and institutional philosophies of participation encouraging exploration, discovery, change, and evolution	Groundbreaking approaches to involvement and integrated practice Creativity in conceptualizing disciplinary strategy Willingness to change and grow as a professional Ability to help shape institutional development Camaraderie in collective and progressive undertakings Citizenship and philanthropy as tools for change	Institutional support for experimentation Professional growth and development A culture of institutional evolution and adaptation rather than stagnation Match between institutional and individual academic philosophies

Involvement as a Matter of Course

For the faculty in the study, being part of a university meant participating as much as they were able, well beyond the completion of expected role responsibilities. Participation took place through consequential involvement with students and colleagues, the institution and discipline, and the public. Typically with little prompting and in general conversation of career histories, each participant discussed involvement with most or all of these groups or entities. Attending to students outside of the classroom, whether through co-curricular programming, mentoring, advising, or curricular development, was a professorial responsibility requiring little explanation. "Everything, everything resides in our students. . . . I think I have been able to contribute somewhat, at least serve . . . to improve the learning of our students," said one professor. One of the most senior participants reported the satisfaction of learning to advise and assist the institution's student body through developing an awareness of its unique needs and challenges.

Another colleague observed how a neglected subset of the student population—rural students—led her to take individual action. Frustrated that the university would do little, she developed specialized programming on her own, feeling a responsibility toward the students. One prolific researcher explained that early mentoring by a colleague had inspired her to serve in a similar way, providing long-term, transformative, collegial service. She explained her support for junior faculty, ". . . when you work together collaboratively in research, it's a different kind of mentoring." Through formation of a partnership, the mentee benefited, the mentor continued her research in the field, and the institution's desire for increased research prominence was addressed. The arrangement demonstrates that involvement for the good of others and self-sacrifice did not always have to go hand in hand.

Few held back when it came time to help their workplace community. Participation in the life of the university could be fostered, but was also a reflexive response to being an academic community member. One person put it this way, "I've always been a strong believer that wherever you are, you participate in what makes it go." Another said, "I've been quite involved with faculty governance. That's important. It also gives you the feeling of being part of the whole thing." Because it was prefaced on a shared set of convictions and principles about the power and potential of higher education, the importance of engagement superseded more self-centered concerns.

The participants' early financial philanthropy was neither as generous as participation in shared governance nor as intentional as other acts of citizenship. All but one had a history of giving. Reflecting on her giving history the non-donor said, "I kind of saw my contribution to the university as my time and energy and talent and [I made] monetary contributions in other areas of my life." She reported, however, a private plan to create an endowed award for students at her retirement, showing how philanthropy factored into her long-term philosophy as it did for her study peers. Looking back on their early gifts participants commented, "I made a little bitty token gift so I could be counted as one of the participants," and, "I wouldn't even say I [made the gift] generously." Nevertheless, they gave perhaps out of professional duty or community spirit. Others began their philanthropic involvement as an avenue for memorializing a colleague or modeled on how colleagues were giving, both demonstrating an awakening awareness of a philanthropic community within the workplace. Small annual gifts were yet another aspect of membership in a shared community and, in many cases, became a habit.

Informal and in-kind gifts for departmental events, student recognition, and office needs as well as growth in general school and department support heralded the directed giving that would come later, shaped by and integrated with the participants' own academic hopes and goals. Using publically available data, an informal institutional analysis shows that the majority of the study participants earned less than the average salary for comparable faculty when they made their major gift commitments. This is at odds with the notion that those with the largest annual incomes always have the strongest propensity to make the largest gifts. Discussions about giving indicate how, through their philanthropic awakening, the participating faculty came to recognize giving as a tool for expressing the importance of education and hopes for their students, disciplines, institution, and communities. "I think education is one of the most important things that can happen for an individual, to carry them forward, something they can't lose. It makes such a difference in people's lives. . . . So, to me it's a very worthwhile thing to support," one participant said to explain her gift. The importance of academic work to society underscores another's comments: "We're not just here doing a job. This is something we believe in so strongly that we're willing, in a sense, to forgo any money that we might leave to our children." A third individual spoke of how philanthropy could enable him to contribute in perpetuity. "It also gives you the feeling that you're doing something longer lasting for the campus and the program. It's satisfying."

14

Integration of Agency across Purpose and Practice

The faculty's ability to act within their many communities was made possible through an integrated approach to service, academic work, personal and professional life, and philanthropy resulting from the agency (or sense of empowerment) to shape and follow their own course. The lack of boundaries delineated a philosophy of academic work, spanning life and career, and at odds with claims of the faculty's narrowing worldview. Connectivity enabled the participants to use their academic skills and interests for a public benefit, while helping them see their gifts to the university as a means to also advance society: "The idea was that everything that we were doing, making our community a better place was dependent upon making [the university] a better place. These all fit together in ways that for me were very easy to make the connection."

Scholarly, disciplinary, and intellectual life, and the service the participants gave to others inside and outside the university were not divided or divisive. One participant described how a sense of classroom inadequacy led to a personal exploration of multicultural teaching practices that in turn led to long-standing service with a key diversity initiative at both the institution and department levels. Success and satisfaction resulted from an openness to move beyond the boundaries of one's discipline or school. Another person described how his executive level faculty governance experience shaped his professional understandings: "I also became involved in faculty governance at the school level and . . . I chaired the [university] faculty for two years . . . so that gave me the opportunity to be exposed to all the other programs and faculty on campus, and I learned a lot that way."

All of the participants joined in shared governance, conducted multi-disciplinary research, performed campus-level responsibilities, and served on committees addressing institutional priorities. They were integrated into the university, and therefore could see and be part of the bigger picture. Thus, personal success and a citizenship-oriented perspective could be increasingly combined as an intentional approach to academic work as self-awareness about "doing good" grew through experience.

Connectivity between professional and personal worlds also was characteristic for the participants. Only one noted a boundary between these spheres, intentionally created to maintain a sense of perspective beyond academe. Still, this division was indistinct, as descriptions of abiding friendships with colleagues demonstrated. Disciplinary interests often shaped personal pursuits. One person related her role as an English professor to interaction with her social community: "I'm an English professor. I go to the theater. I go to the symphony. I go to movies," noting that these engagements offered her opportunities to relate her work to her community life, building relationships, and making connections outside academia.

The bonding of academic identity and personal identity emphasizes how the acts of living and community participation were inherent in the participants' sense of purpose as professionals. "I guess we always feel like we're ambassadors for the university even when we're out in other social venues. . . . you meet people where you can find

there are things you could do with them or some person you could get them in contact with at the university that would help." The institutional pride and commitment of the faculty shaped their academic identity just as it defined community membership, which likewise influenced their interactions in academe and financial philanthropy.

Speculating about the motives and inspirations of her fellow philanthropists, one participant said, "I think that the faculty who have made larger gifts are primarily citizens of the campus more than of the discipline, who see the potential of [the university] to make a difference." Philanthropy and institutional citizenship are intertwined and shaped by perspectives on community membership and involvement in a range of capacities. The faculty donors recognized their institution's broad contributions to the good of society. But, intimate knowledge of their discipline and school, as well as trust in the leadership and in their colleagues, led them to direct their philanthropy within these smaller academic units.

Many of the participating faculty supported numerous nonprofit organizations with their philanthropy, but to none did they give more than to the university. In this, the institution and their academic work were again at the center of their commitment to bettering society. Of the three bequests creating faculty chairs, two included a requirement of active civic engagement. Institutional values as well as personal preferences are reflected in two separate statements about the positions' conceptions. "[The gift was influenced by] all this community involvement and the way the university had worked with the community and trying to guarantee that there would be something [continued] here at the university. [That is] why it's a gift that really involves the chairholder in the community and brings that civic engagement piece, and trying to think of the [school] in its entirety, not just a single discipline." The third chair was created as multi-disciplinary with appointments across disciplines and membership in an academic research center. Thus, in the largest gifts, integration in multiple forms, either as service that spanned institution and community or that encompassed multiple disciplines, was a guiding force.

Just as acts of citizenship served multiple purposes and often aligned teaching with research and service, so too did philanthropy provide an avenue for assembling priorities and experiences—both personal and professional. One faculty member funded a scholarship for study abroad, citing both the importance of international experience in her life and the proven value of such experiences for all students. Likewise, another mentioned the importance of graduate studies in preparing professionals to contribute fully to society as a reason for the focus of her graduate student scholarship. Academic philanthropy enabled the faculty to express their personal, professional—and professorial—values simultaneously with the satisfaction of perpetuating the indefinite continuation of their academic work.

Innovation as a Culture of Academic Understanding

Innovation was a defining feature in the careers, citizenship, and philanthropy all of the study participants. Through atypical activities they developed an enhanced sense of

ownership, responsibility, and commitment to their disciplines, community, and institution. They helped create a shared understanding of academic work at their institution, which in turn encouraged involvement as an avenue for exploration and discovery. Growing and moving through their work-life, the participants' respective development paralleled the maturation of the campus that they helped to create.

An institutional environment that fostered creativity and new ideas about academic work was a critical factor in the faculty's ability to follow alternate paths, suggesting unusual avenues for institutional and individual development. This atmosphere likely attracted a certain kind of faculty member—those who sought a dynamic environment and contributed to a demonstrated level of institutional commitment over time. A language professor explained, "The department . . . has always been very interested in trying things, in engaging in curricular changes. . . . So, whatever was there we would try it! And, that's exciting, that's good. It also creates this kind of loyalty to the program because it's hard to do those things elsewhere." The faculty's openness to risk in their own work and philanthropy simultaneously imbued the institution with a tolerance for uncertain change on the path to improvement: "I've seen our department change. I've seen the school change. I mean when I started teaching there in the 80s . . . it really was like the Wild West. . . . It was just an entirely different kind of environment than now. "

The participants witnessed and contributed to the institution's transformation and evolution. They spoke of a "communicable sense of going forward," "positive outlook of working together," and of "grow[ing] up with the institution." A researcher reported learning to teach and serve; another, initially a teacher by her own choice, learned the value of research and service. In other words, the institutional environment fostering growth and exploration was inspiring and well-utilized by the study faculty. "One person with perseverance can do virtually anything [here], and that's such a powerful thing," pointed out a participant.

The entrepreneurial spirit manifested in these faculty-campus-community endeavors also was evident in how the participants developed new curricula and enhanced the reach of their disciplines. One remarked upon his desire to create "programs that had an applied focus. So that when people graduated they didn't have a single career option, being a teacher at a college or university." Whether it was seeing an opportunity and taking it, or creating an opportunity where there had been none, the participants refused to remain hemmed in by time or place, preferring to use their own personal resources for purposes that looked outward.

Just as the participants chose to use their academic work for innovative purposes, so too did they look upon philanthropy as a tool for innovation and achieving objectives beyond their own self-interest. This realization came in the aftermath of a national tragedy for one respondent who described her philanthropic awakening. "[It came with] the Challenger accident. . . . And, the morning after the disaster, I had been up, as everybody else had been, all night long thinking, 'What can I do?' Can't go and adopt her kids or anything like that. It came to me that I could establish a scholarship program." She couldn't fund

this scholarship alone, but realized with philanthropy she could shape a program to perpetuate a set of values and encourage others to join her. With their gifts, all of the participants created new opportunities for colleagues and students.

Simply by using philanthropy to perpetuate the values for academe that they held dear, the participants were taking (for them), an unanticipated and unusual approach to leaving a legacy through the university and influencing its course. Doing this required not only financial resources and generosity, it also necessitated a vision for the future and a willingness to go to great lengths to ensure the success of their institution. "We are here to educate," said one participant who wanted to ensure that those doing the core work of teaching foundational courses were recognized through an endowment.

After witnessing what earlier gifts of colleagues accomplished, the participants' eyes were opened to the potential of philanthropy. Many in turn hoped to inspire other peers to innovate similarly, drawing on their own philanthropic spirit as a force for academic good. To accomplish this goal of perpetuating innovative philanthropic behavior in others would be to enhance the institution, student experience, disciplinary development, and public life as a natural outgrowth of their contributions through involvement and service.

Findings Summary

The common characteristics of philanthropic action and academic citizenship put forth in the findings lead to two summarizing points, useful as the basis for future research. First, the participants were good academic citizens because of a philanthropic approach to professorial work. They were fulfilled philanthropists because they tied their giving to the values expressed throughout their careers in their citizenship activities. Although most of the participants did not explicitly put philanthropy and citizenship together—the commonalities instead emerged through the analysis—one did, and his words capture the essence of the connection. He explained, "There's a lot of room for continued philanthropy, both the direct kind—volunteering and giving—but also the indirect kind where you put more into your work than you would otherwise because you know it's making a difference." Personal recognition and reward, though likely a byproduct, did not surface as the primary factor motivating engagement; such activities were instead "labors of love" done out of regard for others. For example, one donor insisted that the family name not be attached to the chair's title until after his retirement. Another allowed no public recognition of her scholarship gift.

Second, the urban institution and the participants developed in a complimentary fashion, showing that institutional culture may have the potential to encourage the behavior described here. How these faculty would have fared at institutions that discourage applied research and community outreach is not clear nor is the effect of institutions that lack opportunities for faculty to innovate or integrate the purposes of their various roles. In this study, institutional commitment was at the heart of the participants' action, as was the ability to help set a course for the institution's future. It is evident that institutional

leadership, whether administrative or grassroots faculty leaders, had created a culture of involvement, integration, and innovation. Therefore, not only did the participants have these characteristics, so did their institution. While the culture may not have suited everyone, when the match was good, the results were extraordinary.

Future Research

This study extended the limited research about how and why faculty members give. However, building a rich and useful literature—one that might help predict giving— requires additional consideration of giving over time, different types of universities, a greater variety of academic units, and different classifications of faculty. This study demonstrates why additional research is warranted at the individual and institutional levels. At the broadest level, discovering how much faculty and staff give across higher education and at various institutional types would provide a contextual understanding that is not yet available. Higher education's fundraising practitioners in particular would benefit from new knowledge about faculty and staff giving as they work to foster giving among their colleagues.

The conceptual work about academic citizenship holistically understood and empirical citizenship examination are both areas ripe for additional development. For example, to understand the fungible nature of citizenship and service requires additional qualitative work focused on developing better conceptualized models and deeper understandings. Citizenship and service and the relationship to faculty giving also could be examined using quantitative methods, providing a comparison to this qualitative inquiry. Additional theoretical lenses from the business and psychology literature that explore the relationship of individuals to organizations, including workplaces, could be useful for studying both academic citizenship and giving in conjunction or separately. These theories include: organizational citizenship behavior, organizational identification, and organizational commitment (Mael and Ashforth 1992; Lepine, Erez, and Johnson 2002; Caboni and Eisenman 2005; Grant, Dutton, and Rosso 2008).

Finally, the nature of faculty work itself, including faculty allocations of time, their motivations, and their involvement in initiatives like civic engagement, could be explored through the lens of philanthropy as an avenue for reexamining what is already thought to be known about faculty. An alternative theoretical model based on the dimensions of faculty work that may be philanthropic could be highly relevant to public policy debates about how faculty effort is deployed and how faculty time is counted. Findings from this study will be useful in many of these research undertakings for the counterpoint they provide to the existing body of knowledge and for the practical work of running a university.

Discussion

This study created a more nuanced portrait of giving based on the factors meaningful to those found in earlier studies (for example, Holland and Miller 1997) and affirmed that these factors are interrelated. Institutional loyalty involving social responsibility

and professional self-awareness, for example, included an altruistic perspective on academic work. Self-fulfillment was found through enacting behaviors based on these underlying motivations. The profile established by Knight (2004) delineating the kind of employees who give—those with long institutional histories, a record of giving, and administrative appointments—aligns with the findings of this study in which nearly all of the participants also had these characteristics.

Through this examination, however, new knowledge was gained about how these qualities are part of a professional experience and a philosophy about change that led to enhanced giving at the institution. March's (2005) institution-level analysis of faculty and staff fundraising campaigns indirectly relates to this individually centered research project, and a comparison of the approaches suggests that subsequent expanded research may reveal distinct differences of philanthropic attitude by institutional type. It also is difficult to draw parallels between this project and that of Agypt, Christensen, and Nesbit (2011), but suffice it to say, length of service also was relevant and seniority was, in this case, an important predictor of major giving. Top salaries, meanwhile, did not necessarily predict top level giving.

The seamless approach to all matter of academic work and community life that comes across in this study affirms Boyer's (1990) model of faculty responsibility, but adds a new rationale for integration through philanthropy. For faculty in this study, their undertakings presented opportunities to *integrate* a community purpose and to *apply* one's scholarly expertise. Integration thus took on a more expansive meaning that carried citizenship into personal life—sometimes even retaining a disciplinary grounding and set of preferences.

The participants' careers reflected a commitment to active participation in one's academic community, an overarching element of citizenship by most measures (Kennedy 1997; Burgan 1998; Plater 1998, 1999; MacFarlane 2005, 2007; Thompson, Constantineau, and Fallis 2006). Although participants rarely used the nomenclature of civic engagement, working for public purposes and working directly with the community were apparent components of their ongoing activities (O'Meara 2011, 177). The multiple and integrated goals and purposes for that level of participation and involvement in institutional life demonstrate the challenge of delineating academic work in general—and service in particular—into distinct categories, as MacFarlane (2007, 265) did in his research. The participants' "got it" when it came to academic duty described in Kennedy (1997) and Plater's (1998) models. They comprehended the interconnectedness of the rights and responsibilities of academic life. In their financial and intellectual philanthropy, the participating faculty's desire to do more than required and to go beyond duty are the signal factors pushing the limits of existing ideas about citizenship.

Conclusion
Increasing the value of institutional service and citizenship—or perhaps simply maintaining it—is a challenging proposition given increased pressure on institutions to

focus on external participation in research and on teaching rather than on activities whose value and outcomes are more difficult to assess. Urban institutions and their particular charge to be responsive to their metropolitan environments are at the center of this quandary. If institutions fail to recognize the communal—and philanthropic—dimension of faculty work, or even more critically, to value it, even essential operational support structures, including those instituted by faculty committees and through faculty-driven initiatives, could fracture and deteriorate. Perpetuating voluntary aspects of faculty engagement is of interest to all those who seek to retain the sense of community that has demarcated academia from most workplaces. A more open and explicit recognition of voluntary contributions of all types may be necessary to preserve the culture of support and shared purpose on which so many institutions depend. If colleges and universities are to attract to the professoriate not only the best and brightest, but the most caring and committed, they may need to offer reassurance to prospective employees of careers made whole by the creative power of "voluntary action for the public good" (Payton 1988, 3).

References

Agypt, Brett, Robert K. Christensen, and Rebecca Nesbit. September 2011. "A Tale of Two Charitable Campaigns: Longitudinal Analysis of Employee Giving at a Public University." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly.* http://nvs.sagepub.com/content/early/2011/09/02/0899764011418836.

American Federation of Teachers. 2010. *American Academic: A National Survey of Part-Time/Adjunct Faculty.* Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers. http://www.aft.org/pdfs/highered/aa_partimefaculty0310.pdf.

Astin, Alexander W. 1999. "Promoting Leadership, Service, and Democracy: What Higher Education Can Do." In *Colleges and Universities as Citizens*, edited by Robert G. Bringle, Richard Games, and Edward A. Malloy, 31–47. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Boyer, Ernest L. 1990. "The Scholarship of Engagement." *Journal of Public Outreach* 1 (1): 11–20.

Boyer, Ernest L. 1996. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.* Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Bringle, Robert G., Richard Games, and Edward A. Malloy. 1999. *Colleges and Universities as Citizens.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Brownell, Blaine. 1993. "Metropolitan Universities: Past, Present, and Future." *Metropolitan Universities* 4 (3): 13–21.

Burgan, Mary. 1998. "Academic Citizenship: A Fading Vision." *Liberal Education* 8 (4): 16–22.

Burgan, Mary. 2006. W*hat Ever Happened to the Faculty?: Drift and Decision in Higher Education.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Burgess, Robert G. 1993. *In the Field: An Introduction to Field Research.* London: Routledge.

Byrne, Jaime. 2005. "Forming a Culture of Giving: A Case Study in Successful University Internal Giving." *Metropolitan Universities* 16 (4): 71–84.

Caboni, Timothy C., and James S. Eiseman. 2005. "Organizational Identification as a Predictor of Alumni Giving Behaviors." *International Journal of Educational Advancement* 5 (3): 221–231.

Cardon, Ron. 2009. "Developing and Implementing a Successful Employee Giving Campaign: A Case Study from Southern Utah University." Master's capstone, Cedar City, UT.

Council for Aid to Education. 2011. *2010 Voluntary Support of Education.* New York. http://www.cae.org/content/pdf/2010_VSE_pages_for_Web.pdf.

Creswell, John W. 1998. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dube, Suzanne. *How to Engage Staff, Faculty, and Alumni as Volunteers in Fundraising at Royal Roads University.* 2005. MA thesis, Royal Roads University. ProQuest (MR04080).

Council for the Advancement and Support of Education. 2010. "Faculty & Staff Giving Data for 2010." http://www.case.org/Samples_Research_and_Tools/Good_Question_Archive/Faculty_Staff_FR_Giving/Faculty_Staff_VSE_Data.html.

Grant, Adam M, Jane E. Dutton, and Brent D. Rosso. 2008. "Giving Commitment: Employee Support Programs and the Prosocial Sensemaking Process." *Academy of Management Journal* 51 (5): 898–918.

Gray, Tara, and Mark Hohnstreiter. 2012. "Go for the Gold: Fundraising for Teaching Centers." *To Improve the Academy* 28: 262–276.

Holland, Andrea P. W. 1997. "Faculty Motivations for Giving to Their Employing Institutions." PhD diss., University of Alabama.

Holland, A. Priscilla, and Michael T. Miller. 1997. *Faculty as Donors: Why They Give to Their Employing Institutions.* ERIC (ED 439648). http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED439648.pdf.

Kennedy, Donald. 1997. *Academic Duty.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Knight, William E. 2004. "Influences on Participation in a University Faculty and Staff Annual Giving Campaign." *International Journal of Educational Advancement* 4 (3): 221–232.

Kvale, Steinar. 1996. *InterViews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

LePine, Jeffrey A., Amir Erez, and Diane E. Johnson. 2002. "The Nature and Dimensionality of Organizational Citizenship Behavior: A Critical Review and Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87 (1): 52–65.

Mael, Fred, and Blake Ashforth. 1992. "Alumni and Their Alma Maters: A Partial Test of the Reformulated Model of Organizational Identification." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 13 (2): 103–123.

March, Karen S. 2005. "A Descriptive Study of Faculty and Staff Giving Practices at Public Institutions of Higher Education within the United States." PhD diss., State University of New York at Buffalo. ProQuest (3173632).

McFarlane, Bruce. 2007. "Defining and Rewarding Academic citizenship: The Implications for University Promotions Policy." *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management* 29 (3): 261–273.

McFarlane, Bruce. 2005. "The Disengaged Academic: The Retreat from Citizenship." *Higher Education Quarterly* 59 (4): 296–312.

Miles, Matthew B., and A. Michael Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*, second edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

O'Meara, KerryAnn. 2011. "Faculty Civic Engagement: New Training, Assumptions, and Markets Needed for the Engaged American Scholar." In *To Serve a Larger Purpose: Engagement for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education*, edited by John Saltmarsh and Matthew Hartley, 177–198. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

O'Meara, KerryAnn, and R. Eugene Rice. 2005. *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Palmer, Tracey. January 2004. "AdvanceWork: Giving Begins at Home." *CASE Currents Magazine.* http://www.case.org/Publications_and_Products/2004/January_2004/AdvanceWork_Giving_Begins_at_Home.html. Accessed March 15, 2012.

Payton, Robert L. 1988. *Philanthropy: Voluntary Action for the Public Good.* New York: American Council on Education/Macmillan Publishing Co.

Payton, Robert L., and Michael P. Moody. 2008. *Understanding Philanthropy its Meaning and Mission.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Plater, William M. 1998. "Using Tenure: Citizenship within the New Academic Workforce." *American Behavioral Scientist* 41 (5): 680–715.

Plater, William M. 1999. "Habits of Living: Engaging the Campus as Citizen One Scholar at a Time." In *Colleges and Universities as Citizens*, edited by Robert G. Bringle, Richard Games, and Edward A. Malloy, 141–172. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Polkinghorne, Donald E. 1989. "Phenomenological Research Methods." In *Existential-Phenomenological Perspectives in Psychology: Exploring the Breadth of Human Experience*, edited by Ronald S. Valle and Steen Halling, 41–60. New York: Plenum Press.

Rhoads, Robert A., and Katalin Szelenyi. 2009. "Globally Engaged Universities and the Changing Context of Academic Citizenship." *Education and Society* 27 (2): 5–26.

Saltmarsh, John, Dwight E. Giles Jr., Elaine Ward, and Suzanne M. Buglione. 2009. "Rewarding Community-Engaged Scholarship." In *Institutionalizing Community Engagement in Higher Education: The First Wave of Carnegie Classified Institutions*, edited by Lorilee R. Sandmann, Courtney H. Thornton, and Audrey J. Jaeger, 25–36. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Saltmarsh, John, and Matthew Hartley, eds. 2011. *To Serve a Larger Purpose: Engagement for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Seidman, Irving. 2006. *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences*, third edition. New York: Teachers College Press.

Shils, Edward. 1997. *The Calling of Education and the Academic Ethic and Other Essays on Higher Education.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Thompson, Paul, Phillipe Constantineau, and George Fallis. "Academic Citizenship: An Academic Colleagues Working Paper." *Journal of Academic Ethics* 3 (2–4): 127–142.

Author information

Genevieve G. Shaker, PhD is assistant professor of philanthropic studies at the Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University and Director of Communications and Creative Services for the IU School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI. She is a past winner of the Professional and Organizational Development Network's "Robert J. Menges Award for Outstanding Research in Educational Development" and the Association for the Study of Higher Education's "Bobby Wright Dissertation of the Year" award.

Genevieve Shaker, PhD
IU School of Liberal Arts at IUPUI
425 University Boulevard
Cavanaugh Hall 441
Indianapolis, IN 46202
E-mail: gshaker@iupui.edu
Telephone: 317-278-1058
Fax: 317-278-2525