Faculty Work as Philanthropy or Philanthropy as Faculty Work?

Cagla Okten, Associate Professor, Department of Economics, Bilkent University
Kerim Peren Arin, Associate Professor, Colege of Business, Zayed University, Dubai, UAE

Introduction

Employing Robert Payton's (1988) definition of philanthropy, "Voluntary action for the public good" (p. 4), *Faculty Work and the Public Good: Philanthropy, Engagement, and Academic Professionalism* offers a fresh look at faculty work as philanthropy. The purpose of this review essay is to provide a brief review of some of the key propositions in this book and to explore how faculty work as philanthropy may be understood in non-U.S. cultural contexts. We start our exploration of faculty work as philanthropy in non-U.S. contexts by examining this construct in the U.S. as presented by *Faculty Work and the Public Good* and by laying out key forces that it sets forth as shaping faculty work as philanthropic practice: institutional structure and employment frameworks, resource constraints, and discretionary constraints.

In Chapter 4 of *Faculty Work and the Public Good*, Austen notes that faculty members in the United States hold an array of appointment configurations (tenure track with job security versus non-tenure track with little job security) and work in an array of institutional types including research universities, liberal arts colleges, regional institutions, and community colleges. Austen posits that faculty have considerable discretion in how they allocate their time, with much of their activity clearly contributing to the good of their students, colleagues, institutions, communities, and the larger society.

It seems likely that the type of institution, institutional culture and the faculty appointment configurations will be important factors in determining institutional and faculty perspectives toward faculty work as philanthropy because they considerably affect the extent of discretion that faculty has in how they allocate their time. Considering the extensive literature on faculty work, we believe that no examination of faculty work as philanthropy can be complete without questioning the impact of institutional arrangements, appointment configurations, and organizational culture (Stark et. al, 1986; Fairweather 2005; Gappa et. al 2007).

In chapter 5, Laird further advances these arguments and posits that not all forces encourage faculty to "gift" their time. For faculty whose role is defined largely by teaching (e.g., non-tenure-track faculty or faculty at teaching-oriented institutions), the expectations imposed upon them by this role (teaching faculty) drive them to invest ever increasing sums of time in teaching and learning activities to the exclusion of research and service (Gappa, Astin, & Trice 2007). For research-oriented faculty, personal motivation, reward structures within institutions and disciplines/departments (including promotion and tenure), and academic culture can push them to almost exclusively prioritize personal publications thus gifting less time to the contribution of the public good through scholarly, educational and service related activities. Laird offered evidence of these phenomena when he noted that from 1972 to 1998, the average number of hours per week per faculty at 4-year universities devoted to research and teaching rose from 44 to 51 hours with that additional time coming from areas like service or non-work-related activities.

In Chapter 6, Shaker notes that non-tenure-track faculty in the United States teach the majority of undergraduate credit hours and are the faculty majority composing 75% of the faculty

population. Non-tenure-track faculty positions tend to be more structured than tenure-track ones and faculty members have limited discretion in how they allocate their time. This new reality then compels us to ask how the shift towards more structured faculty appointments affects faculty contribution to the public good.

The nature of faculty work and reward is almost universal. Faculty responsibilities in research institutions are tripartite: (a) research, (b) teaching, and (c) service. The distribution of these responsibilities amongst faculty and expectations of accomplishment are unique and determined by institutional, vocational, and cultural expectations. For example service expectations may be met through an array of options such as service to the field, service to the department/university, student contact hours, and/or the use of innovative teaching methods. Research expectations are more narrowly interpreted to mean (almost exclusively) publication. These expectations have homogenizing effects when it comes to faculty understanding, orientation, and participation in philanthropic activities.

Arguments developed by Laird and Shaker also bring to mind Kerr's (1995) well known article on the folly of rewarding *A* while hoping for *B*. Research, teaching, and service all contribute to the provision of the public good but incentives and rewards for tenured faculty at research-oriented campuses are aligned to almost entirely personal publications and not to scholarly, educational and service activities that contribute to the public good.

Spending time to analyze a colleague's research and giving feedback, organizing a research or a teaching workshop, serving on the board of a grant agency, providing technical support for local government are all activities that contribute to the public good and yet might be considered to be beyond the job requirements of faculty.   The simple reality in research universities is as long as a faculty member publishes well, promotion is likely even when these other contributions are lacking.

Burlingame's "Faculty Behaving Well" explores creating an academic culture that supports and inspires faculty engagement in the academic institution and the society. This idea has a counterpart in organizational psychology called organizational citizenship behavior (OCB). OCB is a concept that describes a person's *voluntary* commitment within an organization or company that is not part of contractual tasks (Organ, 1987, 2006).

In the organizational psychology literature, much attention has been paid to the relationship between OCB and individual outcomes. At the individual level, extensive research has been conducted showing that task and citizenship behavior are important in determining outcomes such as performance evaluations and rewards (N. P. Podsakoff, Whiting, Podsakoff, & Blume, 2009). At the same time, some researchers have argued that OCB may be a handicap (Salamon & Deutsch, 2006) and that there may be "costs" to those individuals who engage in more OCB (Bergeron, 2007).

Bergeron et al. (2014) point out the importance of context in determining the effects of OCB on individual outcomes. First, long-term benefits and costs of OCB may be different than their more immediate effects. For example, while short-run evaluations may reward OCB, long-run evaluations may depend on more quantifiable outputs such as sales. Second, in professions such as academe, medicine and law, OCB may be directed towards professional associations and communities rather than internally toward the employing organization. Third, the effects of OCB may differ in outcome-based reward systems, with measurable results (e.g. publications in academe, billable hours in law) relative to behavior-based reward systems where a wide variety of job behaviors are recognized and rewarded. When evaluations and rewards are based on

objective outcomes rather than on behaviors (Oliver & Anderson, 1994), it is likely that there will be a smaller range of behaviors that lead to rewarded results.

Hence, in understanding the faculty work as philanthropy, the relevant public policy question to ask is how the shift towards more structured faculty appointments, output-based measures (e.g., number of publications, student contact hours), and the growing prominence of professional associations affect the organizational citizenship behavior and faculty engagement in the employing institution and the community. Another way to look at this problem is to pose the following question: Are good organizational citizenship behavior, and faculty engagement in the institution and society essential parts of faculty work? How do institutional arrangements, appointment configurations, organizational culture, societal norms affect their relevance in today's academia?

A Framework for Understanding Faculty Work as Philanthropy in International Contexts

In an international context, the voluntary contribution of faculty to the provision of public good will depend upon the unique qualities of the institution (e.g., institutional structure, resource constraints), its appointment configurations (e.g., employment frameworks, discretionary constraints), and societal norms. However, despite these potential differences, there are also reasons to expect that commonalities with regard to participation in philanthropy may exist amongst faculty across the globe.

First, faculty members working outside of the United States may have been trained in the United States. This training incorporates not only mastering a profession or a discipline but also developing a cultural notion, a value-set of what it means to be a good faculty member. Second, conferences, faculty exchanges, and written and oral communications occur within an increasingly global academic community that provides faculty with opportunities to share ideas and enables faculty members to transcend local norms. Third, the professorate constitutes a vocational culture that spans borders. People who enter certain professions (e.g., academe, accounting, medicine, nursing, law) formally agree to adhere to codes of ethics and adopt common practices that define professional cultures. Such cultural groups cut across boundaries of nationality and ethnicity (Jameson, 2007). Fourth, within higher education, accreditation has started to play a major role in quality assurance and institutional effectiveness. In general, the accreditation process involves evaluation by an external body based upon a set of agreed standards. Hence we expect this process to have homogenizing influences in the role of faculty across the world especially if these accrediting bodies recognize the nature and value of faculty work as contributing to the public good.

In this section we first provide a brief review of models of philanthropy to pin down the role of context in understanding the behavior of gifting time. Next we examine some of the key cultural norms that are likely to affect the contributions of faculty to the public good.

Motivation for Philanthropic Behavior

Culture is predicated upon values. As such, an understanding of philanthropic behavior in different cultural contexts must first acknowledge the differing value propositions that underpin philanthropy. Faculty from different cultural contexts may draw upon different motives (values) for engaging in philanthropy.

A rich body of literature provides varied explanations for charitable giving (i.e., philanthropy). The 'pure altruism' model is based on a selfless concern for others and can be

traced to Becker's (1974) seminal paper. Diametrically, Andreoni (1989) presents the "warm glow" motive, which is formulated as a preference for giving -- distinct from the benefits enjoyed by the recipient. A third model offered by researchers such as Charness and Rabin (2002) and Fehr and Schmidt (1999) is centered on social preference in which motivation to engage in philanthropy is predicated on social norms such as inequity aversion, efficiency, and reciprocity. Sugden (1999) argues that individuals contribute to the public good because they derive satisfaction when they achieve compliance with societal norms. Brekke, Kverndokk, and Nyborg (2003) present a model that by contributing to a specific cause, individuals can enhance their self-esteem. Toninand Vlassopoulos (2013) provides experimental evidence that giving is motivated by self-image and identity concerns. Carmen (2004) and Smith et al. (2013) point to the influence of social relationships on charitable giving. Hence the literature provides evidence that self-identity, social norms and social relationships all influence charitable giving behavior.

The Influence of Culture on the Role of Faculty

When examining the impact of culture on key sites within the organizational architecture that have been identified as impacting faculty work as philanthropy (i.e., institutional structure and employment frameworks, resource constraints, and discretionary constraints), Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1997) provide a useful lens. In particular, the three factors discussed in the next section are of particular help in understanding how faculty work as philanthropy may be understood in different cultural contexts: a) individualism versus communitarianism/collectivism; b) universalism versus particularism; and c) achieved versus ascribed status. We have tried to link our arguments to the literature, but a survey of the international literature on this topic revealed to us that there has been little comparative analysis on the role of faculty work in the provision of the public good in across cultural contexts.[1] These factors have been more extensively studied within the context of business and contractual relations between US and other countries. We believe that it would be a worthwhile effort to consider their effects in defining the role of faculty in higher education.

Individualism vs. Communitarianism/Collectivism. Individualism is about the rights of the individual. It seeks to let each person grow or fail on his or her own. Communitarianism is about the rights of the group or society. It seeks to put the family, group, company, and country before the individual. It sees individualism as selfish and short-sighted. Individualism centers reward on achievement that distinguishes one from the group (i.e., promotion and tenure).

Emphasis on the relative importance of the individual versus the community may differ across societies. USA ranks number one followed by other Western countries on the individualism scale (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005). Comparing mission statements of universities in the U.S. versus Turkey highlights how attitudes towards individualism and communitarianism may influence the role of faculty across the two societies. Morphew and Hartley (2006) examined mission statements of US universities and found that the elements that public and private institutions choose to emphasize differ significantly. Public universities more heavily emphasize service—both as institutions within a region and through instilling in students a sense of civic duty, whereas private universities, by contrast, focus more on the formative aspects of education—promoting student development and helping prepare students for the real world through programs that are academically rigorous. A few elements (e.g., that the institution is committed to diversity, providing a liberal arts education) appear frequently across institutional

---

[1] The Talloires Network provides many good examples of civic engagement from universities across the world. However, there has not been a comparative analysis of civic engagement in higher education across countries in the literature.

types. These findings suggest that the individual is at the heart of higher education in the US with some elements of communitarianism in the emphasis on serving society's needs present in the mission statements of public universities.

Efe and Ozer (2015) conducted a keyword analysis of mission and vision statements of Turkish Universities. The keywords comparison revealed that there are no significant differences in the lexical choices of public and private universities contrary to findings from the US. Also, a closer look at different types of universities, such as technical or medical universities and military academies, showed that institutional differences did not mark significant vicissitudes in their respective mission and vision statements. That is, all universities emulate and garner a variety of almost identical mission and vision statements. Their findings reveal that universities attempt to construct their legitimacy through strategies of impersonal authorization and abstraction, as well as references to the principles of Atatürk, the founder of modern Turkey. We argue that the abundance of value-related terms can be related to this need for legitimacy and result from the fact that all universities are subject, in Turkey, to the nation's higher education council (YÖK). Also, common references to modernity and revolutions of Atatürk are reminiscent of the historical separation of modern Turkey with its Ottoman past. Since the inception of modern Republic of Turkey, Turkish universities have played a significant role in the top-down modernization of the country. Hence this top down approach is also reflected in the governance of Turkish Universities since they are all subject to the stringent YÖK regulations.

Emphasizing the public good and the community over the individual might encourage faculty to engage in actions that contribute to this public good, although what constitutes a public good might be too narrowly defined. There are striking examples where Turkish academics put their careers at risk and even faced possible jail time in order to promote democracy and human rights in Turkey. For example, in 1984, 1,383 intellectuals who were mostly academics in Turkish universities signed a petition titled "Observations and Demands for a Democratic System in Turkey", and delivered it to the office of President Kenan Evren, the former general who led the 1980 coup. Subsequently, President Evren launched a violent attack on the petitioners. He accused them of being traitors who wanted to embarrass Turkey abroad with their allegations of disrespect of human rights in the country. Many academics who signed the petition lost their jobs. More recently, about 1,200 academics from 90 Turkish universities calling themselves "Academicians for Peace", signed a petition calling for an end to the months-long violence between Turkish military and Kurdish rebels in Southeast of Turkey (Guardian, 14 January, 2016). This also resulted in an investigation of academics and some petitioners have already lost their jobs and three have been arrested. Hence, these actions by Turkish academics show that they think it is their responsibility to speak for democracy and human rights even when doing so might jeopardize their careers and personal lives.

Universalism vs. Particularism. Universalism is about finding broad and general rules. When no rules fit, it finds the best rule. Particularism is about finding exceptions. When no rules fit, it judges the case on its own merits, rather than trying to force-fit an existing rule. In some cultures (organizational, national or otherwise), faculty contributions for the good of the community are expected and usual (Universalism) whereas in others such faculty contributions are contextual and exceptional. According to Trompenaars (1997), Americans score high on the universalism scale. As universalists, Americans rely on general rules as guarantors of their moral compass (Richards, 2014). Universalism, might be one of the driving forces behind more structured appointment configurations in academia leaving less discretionary time to faculty members. China and other countries in East Asia rank high on the particularism scale. How this might play out in defining the role of faculty in Asian universities is an open question.

Achieved status vs. Ascribed status. Achieved status is about gaining status through performance. It assumes individuals and organizations earn and lose their status every day. Ascribed status is about gaining status through other means, such as seniority. It assumes status is acquired by right rather than daily performance. How a culture determines status and legitimacy arguably is also a potent force in the interpretation of faculty work as philanthropy. In western universities, tenure has been an important factor in rewarding merit. Chen and Chung (2002) indicate that most Asian nations, especially those influenced by Confucianism in East Asia such as China, Japan, and Korea, highly value seniority, which refers to both age and length of service in an organization. Hofstede & Hofstede classify US and Germany as countries with reward systems according to achievement status and China and Japan as societies with reward systems according to ascribed status. These different reward structures have potential effects on the voluntary contribution of faculty to the public good that requires a closer examination.

Concluding Thoughts

To assist understanding of faculty work as philanthropy, it may also be useful to employ the four-facet framework proposed by Bolman and Deal (1984). Their structural frame is based on considering the rules, regulations, formal structures, and policies of the organization. Do these processes require and/or expect philanthropy from faculty? The human resource frame examines the skills and limitations of an organization's members. Are stakeholders capable and able to execute philanthropic behaviors? The political frame seeks to understand the resourcing (tangible and intangible) of the organization and how that can be used to support (or not) philanthropy. The last frame, symbolic, may be the most frequently overlooked. The symbolic frame analyzes the traditions, rituals, and stories/mythology of the organization and how they serve to endorse expectations concerning the faculty-philanthropy relationship.

We think that *Faculty Work and the Public Good* has started a very important discussion that ought to be interdisciplinary and draw on various literatures including education, organizational citizenship behavior, economics, and psychology. Quantitative and qualitative assessments on how institutional arrangements, appointment configurations, organizational culture and societal norms affect faculty gifting their time will be of particular value in this endeavor. The crucial question is to ask whether faculty consider philanthropy and gifting of time as a part of being a faculty member, something they feel morally compelled to do because they are faculty. In others words, reminiscent of Burlingame's addendum to Payton's definition of philanthropy, the voluntary action taken by the faculty member that is *intended* for the public good rather than for private benefit should be at the heart of this debate.

References

Andreoni, J. (1989). Giving with impure altruism: Applications to charity and Ricardian Equivalence. *Journal of Political Economy, 97,* 1447-1458.

Andreoni, J. (1990). Impure Altruism and Donations to Public Goods: A Theory of Warm Glow. *Economic Journal*, *100(401),* 464-477.

Bergeron, D. M. (2007). The potential paradox of organizational citizenship behavior: Good citizens at what cost?. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*(4), 1078-1095.

Bolman, Lee G., and Terrence E. Deal (1991). *Reframing organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Brekke, K.A., Kverndokk, S., and Nyborg, K. (2003). An Economic Model of Moral Motivation. *Journal of Public Economics, 87,* 1967-1983.

Caner, A and Okten, C. (2013) Higher Education in Turkey: Subsidizing the Rich or the Poor? *Economics of Education Review*, 35: 75-92.

Carman, K. (2004). Social Influences and the Private Provision of Public Goods.Evidence from Charitable Contribution in the Work Place. Harvard University, Working Paper.

Campbell, J. (2007) "Why Would Corporations Behave in Socially Responsible Ways?An Institutional Theory of Corporate Social Responsibility". *Academy of Management Review* 32 (3), 946-967.

Charness G. and Rabin, M. (2002). Understanding Social Preferences with Simple Tests. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *117(3),* 817-869.

Chen G. and Chung J. (2002), Seniority and Superiority: A Case Analysis of Decision Making in a Taiwanese Religious Group, Intercultural Communication Studies: 41-56.

Efe, I. & Ozer, O. (2015) A corpus-based discourse analysis of the vision and mission statements of universities in Turkey, Higher Education Research & Development, 34:6, 1110-1122, DOI: 10.1080/07294360.2015.1070127.

Fairweather, J. S. (2005). Beyond the rhetoric: Trends in the relative value of

teaching and research in faculty salaries. Journal of Higher Education, 76(4),

401–422.

Fehr, E. and Schmidt, K. M. (1999). A Theory of Fairness, Competition and Cooperation. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *114(3),* 817-868.

Gappa, J. M., Austin, A. E., & Trice, A. G. (2007). *Rethinking Faculty Work: Higher Education's Strategic Imperative*. Jossey-Bass*.*

Guardian, 14 January, 2016, http://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jan/14/turkish-prosecutors-investigate-academics-criticised-erdogan-petition

Hampden-Turner, C., & Trompenaars, F. (1997). *Mastering the Infinite Game: How East Asian Values are Transforming Business Practices*. Oxford: Capstone.

Geert Hofstede, Gert Jan Hofstede, *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind.* 2nd Edition, McGraw-Hill USA, 2005

Jameson, D. (2007). "Reconceptualizing Cultural Identity and Its Role in Intercultural Business Communication", *International Journal of Business Communication*, 44(3): 199-235.

Kerr, S. (1995) "On the folly of rewarding a while hoping for b", *Academy of Management Executive*.

Massy, W. F., & Zemsky, R. (1994). Faculty discretionary time: Departments and the "academic ratchet." The Journal of Higher Education, 65(1), 1–22.

Morphew C. and Hartley M. (2006) "Mission Statements: A Thematic Analysis of Rhetoric Across Institutional Type" Journal of Higher Education 77(3).

Payton, R. (1988). *Voluntary Action for the Public Good*. ACE/Macmillan.

Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual-and Organizational-Level Consequences of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,*94*(1), 122.

Salamon, S. D., & Deutsch, Y. (2006). OCB as a handicap: An evolutionary psychological
        perspective. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27(2), 185-199.

Scott, R. W. (1995) "*Institutions and Organizations*" Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.

Smith, S., Windmeijer F., and Wright E. (2013). Peer Effects in Charitable Giving: Evidence from the
        (Running) Field. *Economic Journal*, *125(585),* 1053-1071.

Stark, J. S., Lowther, M. A., & Hagerty, B. M. K. (1986). Responsive professional education: balancing
        outcomes and opportunities (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 3). Washington, DC:
        Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Sugden, R. (1999). Public goods and contingent valuation. In Bateman I.J. and Willis K.G. (Eds.), *Valuing
        environmental preferences. Theory and Practice of the Contingent Valuation Method in the US,
        EU and Developing Countries,* 131-51*.* Oxford University Press.

Oliver, R. L., & Anderson, E. (1994). An Empirical test of the consequences of behavior-and outcome-
        based sales control systems. *The Journal of Marketing*, 53-67.

Organ, D. W. (1997). Organizational citizenship behavior: It's construct cleanup time. Human
        Performance, 10(2), 85-97.

Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie S. P. (2006). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its
        nature, antecedents, and consequences. London: Sage Publications.

Richards, (2014). Contracting from East to West: Bridging the cultural divide. *Business Horizons*, 57 (5):
        677-684.

Tonin, M., & Vlassopoulos, M. (2013). Experimental evidence of self-image concerns as motivation for
        giving. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, *90*, 19-27.

Trompenaars, F., Hampden-Turner, C. (1997) *Riding the Waves of Culture*.