

Workplace Giving in Universities: A U.S. Case Study at Indiana University

Genevieve G. Shaker, Ph.D. *

Assistant Professor of Philanthropic Studies,
Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy
Associate Dean for Development and External Affairs,
Indiana University School of Liberal Arts
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
425 University Boulevard, Cavanaugh Hall 436
Indianapolis, IN 46202
(317) 278-1058 gshaker@iupui.edu

Victor M. H. Borden, Ph.D.

Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies,
Indiana University Bloomington
Senior Advisor to the Executive Vice President for University Academic Affairs,
Indiana University
201 N. Rose Avenue, Wright Education Building 4274
Bloomington, IN 47405
(812) 856-0855 vborden@iu.edu

Brittany L. Kienker, Ph.D.

Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy
550 West North Street, Suite 301, Indianapolis, IN 46202
(317) 679-2876 millbrit@iemail.iu.edu

* Corresponding author

Keywords

workplace giving, employee philanthropy, higher education fundraising, institutional advancement, organizational identification, organizational commitment

Authors Note

This research was made possible through the support of Indiana University and the Indiana University Foundation. Special thanks to Indiana University Foundation president emeritus Eugene Tempel, the presidential staff, and the senior leadership team for their commitment to this collaborative project.

Abstract

The phenomenon of workplace giving is under-examined in the scholarly literature; philanthropic gifts by employees to their nonprofit employers have received less attention within national and transnational contexts. This study considered the association between university staff propensity toward “internal workplace giving” and donor characteristics, drawing on literature about organizational commitment and identification as a beginning for advancing theoretical understanding of employee-employer relationships and giving at both the microlevel and mesolevel. The sample of 17,038 employees covered three years at Indiana University, an American, public, multi-campus institution. Despite its specific national and cultural context, the study raises relevant issues about workplace giving. Relational and personal characteristics were found to be significant predictors for determining who donates; using these characteristics to predict giving levels, however, was less successful. The study anticipates a growing need for related research and provides direction for further methodological and theoretical approaches.

Workplace giving campaigns take place worldwide; however, these efforts are especially prevalent in the United States where over \$4.2 billion dollars was raised at the workplace in 2006-2007 (Giving USA, 2007; Haski-Leventhal, 2012; Romney-Alexander, 2002). United States workplace giving gained momentum after World War II when gifts made through payroll deduction became tax deductible (Barman, 2006). The percentage of employees invited to give in the workplace is a source of debate; with anywhere from 25%-60% of workers reported as having the opportunity to give at work (National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, 2003; Osili, Hirt, & Raghavan, 2011). Employees may give through centralized distribution agencies, directly to individual nonprofits, or even back to their own nonprofit employers. The Federal government is the site of the largest campaign, in which more than \$200 million is gifted annually (Bowman, 2003). The United Way, a worldwide, volunteer-led, nonprofit organization that redistributes funds to social service agencies, is the best-known and longest-standing workplace campaigner (Barman, 2006).

Research on employee giving to their nonprofit place of employment, such as hospitals, public schools, and universities (i.e. “internal workplace giving”), is especially limited (Shaker, 2013a). These employees share communities of place *and* professional purpose. Giving to the “federated fund” of options that may be presented within their workplaces connects employees closely to the gift and generates personal investment in internal workplace giving outcomes (Shaker, 2013b). Organizational theory offers a perspective for examining this phenomenon from an established base (Agypt, Christensen, & Nesbit, 2011, 2012; Nesbit, Christensen, & Gossett, 2012). Our study results document a need for further theory development in internal workplace giving and make preliminary strides through consideration of organizational identification and commitment.

To address the literature gap, this study utilized employee and donor information across three years at Indiana University (IU), a large, public, multi-campus institution, in the American Midwest. Specifically, we asked two key questions. Who is most and least likely to donate? Among those who donate, what factors impact the amount that they give? We considered how personal and relational characteristics correlate with internal workplace giving and how organizational theory can inform an understanding of giving differences.ⁱ Studying this phenomenon at the microlevel, through personal characteristics, and mesolevel, through relational characteristics, as others have with external workplace giving campaigns (Agypt et al., 2011, 2012; Nesbit et al., 2012), can aid scholars seeking to understand employee-employer relationships, nonprofit professionals seeking to conduct similar internal workplace campaigns, and methodologists studying workplace giving or combining data from multiple sources.

Literature Review

Theoretical framework: Organizational identification and commitment

The notion of connectivity between an individual and his or her employer and the outcomes of that connectivity on work performance, loyalty, and longevity are well-explored through psychological theories of organizational identification and commitment (e.g., Fuller et al., 2006; van Knippenberg & Sleebos, 2006; Wan-Huggins, Riordan, & Griffeth, 1998). The literature is vast and complicated. It is surveyed here in broad strokes, largely because this initial exploration was intended to help determine future directions for data collection and research methodologies, as well as to provide a foundation for more specific theoretical applications.

Briefly, organizational identification (also referred to as “attachment”) and organizational commitment are related constructs that seek to explain: (1) how an individual’s sense of self can include the organization and is defined by that organizational “membership” (i.e. identification);

and (2) how an individual is bonded with an organization's purpose (i.e. commitment) (Mael & Ashforth, 1992; Meyer, Becker, & Van Dick, 2006; van Knippenberg & Sleebos, 2006). Each construct is generally considered to result in different outcomes. Identification is associated with job performance and possibly extraordinary efforts on behalf of the organization (Ricketta, 2005). Commitment relates to the social exchange between the employer and the employee, and the "match" whereby the employee responds in an equivalent manner either to the treatment received from the employer or to the reflection of the workplace's external prestige on his or her individual reputation (Fuller et al., 2006; van Knippenberg & Sleebos, 2006).ⁱⁱ Identification is organization specific, while commitment can extend to multiple organizations with similar values and goals (Mael & Ashforth, 1992).

For this study, we hypothesized that giving, especially at higher levels, demonstrates both organizational commitment and identification as manifest through the studied associations with relational variables. Although it is impossible to completely disentangle these relational variables, they reflect dimensions of identity and commitment. Through this study and its accompanying discussion, we intended to generate further ideas for approaches to delineate the two constructs.

University staff are distinguished by their academic and non-academic roles. The former group conducts more "mission-related" work with clearer connotations for commitment while non-academic staff perform more generic managerial and operational duties. Other relational characteristics, such as years of service, are connected more closely to the identification that builds with the familiarity and comfort of a long-lasting relationship. We further hypothesized the existence of confounding and compounding effects between relational and personal factors, exemplified by age, race, and gender differences in giving and in employee roles (for example,

that older, white men dominate senior-level administrator and tenured professor positions). Individuals may have “cross-cutting” identities, which can be at odds with one another (for example, both an academic staff member and an administrator or both a member of the larger university community and an employee of a smaller campus) (Ellemers & Rink, 2005). Organizational commitment and identification have the potential to affect philanthropic giving by employees, but these effects may be realized differently (Borden, Shaker, & Kienker, 2014). Nesbit et al. (2012), for example, surveyed academic and non-academic staff about participation in an external workplace campaign, characterizing them as willing donors (who gave to demonstrate their identification), reluctant donors (who felt obligated to give), and resistant nondonors (who did not give as a protest against their institution), but the personal and relational characteristics of these groups were not described. Mael and Ashforth (1992) linked organizational identification with social identity theory, in which individuals classify themselves as part of a group (to include organizational memberships as well as personnel identifiers such as gender, age, and race), suggesting the importance of considering the two sets of variables in examining workplace giving.

This study is differentiated from other similar workplace studies (Agypt et al., 2011, 2012; Nesbit et al., 2012) because we considered both constructs in relation to giving proclivities and sought to distinguish the outcomes of one from the other (See also Borden et al., 2014).

University staff giving in context

In the United States, non-tenure track personnel constitute a majority of academic staffing (American Federation of Teachers, 2010). The proportion of non-instructional personnel has risen dramatically in the last quarter century. Tenure-eligibility and tenure remain the gold-standards of academic appointments (Kezar & Sam, 2010). Non-tenure-track academic staff lack

the security of tenure, are subject to position uncertainty, and experience poorly-delineated service expectations. Data and anecdote show that many non-tenure-track academic staff feel marginalized, exploited, and insecure—perceptions unlikely to generate fond institutional sentiments. Regardless of these difficulties most of these academics wish to remain in academia (Kezar & Sam, 2010).

Within this context, university employees donated approximately \$171.9 million (1.3%) of the \$13.5 billion given to higher education in the United States by individuals (with total higher education philanthropy equaling \$30.3 billion) in 2011 (Council for Aid to Education [CAE], 2012; Shaker, 2013a). An analysis of 2011 CAE data across 664 2- and 4-year institutions revealed that 23% of staff in public higher education donated to their institutions (Shaker, 2013a). Although this represents a small portion within this large subset of American educational giving, higher education institutions continue to invest in employee giving campaigns with one research study indicating that three-quarters of institutions (77%) solicit staff (March, 2005). Staff giving is deemed important because it demonstrates employee commitment to institutional missions, legitimizes fundraisers' quests for external gifts, creates an internal culture of giving, and introduces academic and administrative staff to the donor perspective (Byrne, 2005; Dove, Lindauer, & Madvig, 2001; March, 2005; Shaker, 2013a).

Holland (1997) asked academic staff (n=183), the majority of whom were senior rank, to select their strongest giving motivations from 30 options. The top selections included: altruism, social responsibility to the institution, self-fulfillment, professional attitude, conviction, and institutional loyalty, with the last holding constant across the three study institutions. In the study, employee giving was not a purely quid-pro-quo exchange; instead, it stemmed from a complicated sense of personal conviction and institutional relationships, suggesting potential

difficulties in parsing and differentiating organizational commitment and identification. Knight (2004) explored why university employees donate and noted that “enhancing the institution’s revenue base” and the institution’s mission itself were reasons for giving. Shaker (2013b) interviewed a small group of academic staff donors within one university division who had made large gifts and found a connection between institutional attitudes, sentiments about academic citizenship, and philanthropic rationales. The donors were motivated to give by a mission-centered commitment, perpetuating what they deemed valuable to their institutions and careers, and aligning with views of education as a public good, evidencing both organizational commitment and identification.

Microlevel analysis of personal characteristics and staff giving

Although not adequately examined in the academic workplace setting, particularly within internal campaigns, the topic of personal characteristics and giving as considered at the microlevel (individual level) is extensively researched and highly theorized. Broadly, in relation to the variables in this study, increasing age is associated with increased giving, findings on gender and giving are mixed, and, in the United States, Whites are more likely to give than other racial groups (Bekkers & Weipking, 2010).

Race and gender can relate to employee identification with their organization and, therefore, are personal characteristics with socially-dependent outcomes that warrant greater attention in future studies of inner-workplace giving. When individuals are different than the majority population in their particular workplace (e.g., members of a minority group), organizational attachments tend to be lower (O’Reilly, Caldwell, & Barnett, 1989). With age, employees’ organizational requirements and desires change (for example, from the desire for promotion to the desire for security), resulting in changing levels of affective organizational commitment

(identification) dependent on organizations' capacity to accommodate those requirements (Kooik, Jansen, Dijkers, & De Lange, 2010).

Some extant research closely parallels this project. The Agypt et al. (2011, 2012) studies examined employee giving at a public university, also using personal and relational factors as associated with proclivity toward giving (2011) and donation amounts (2012). The Agypt et al. research, however, examined two local external campaigns, for the United Way and for a community arts effort. The Knight (2004) study took place at a single, public institution and explored characteristics of employee donors and examined giving directed to the university.

Agypt et al. (2011) found that females and older employees were more likely to donate compared to males and younger employees, respectively. Gender and age, meanwhile, were not significantly associated with gift amounts (2012). Knight (2004) found that men were more likely to give, but the difference was not statistically significant. The Knight study did not consider age and the Agypt et al. (2011, 2012) studies did not address race. Race was significant in the Knight study with Black faculty and staff being the most likely to donate followed by their White colleagues and then those of Hispanic and Asian origin.

How personal characteristics associate with university workplace giving has not been sufficiently examined to be satisfactorily insightful. It is noteworthy that personal and individual contextual characteristics proven to be highly relevant in other philanthropic giving research—including educational attainment, household composition, socio-economic status, religious participation, and contextual variables—were not addressed in Agypt et al. (2011, 2012), Knight (2004), or this study, due to limitations of the data and access to sensitive information (perhaps limiting this study's findings generalizability to other situation). In their survey study, Nesbit et al. (2012) were able to examine religious participation and household composition, finding

neither to be statistically significant. The current study joins the Knight (2004) and Agypt et al. (2011, 2012) studies in offering an integrated consideration of organizationally-centered variables, highlighting how they may overlap.

Mesolevel analysis of relational characteristics and faculty and staff giving

Characteristics associated with employee-employer relationships, such as work site, salary, years of service, and position type, are significant for understanding giving at the mesolevel, that is the place of connectivity between the individual and organization (Agypt et al., 2011, 2012; Borden et al., 2014; Knight, 2004; Nesbit et al., 2012). Employees are thought to develop a portion of their connection with and shape their behavior toward their employer based on how the organization treats and regards them—from flexibility and self-determination to the more tangible qualities of salary and position classification (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson, & Sowa, 1986; Foa & Foa, 1980).

Organizations may enact employment policies differently (Tierney, 2008), leading to the development of place-specific organizational cultures, the outcomes of which neither Agypt et al. (2011, 2012) nor Knight (2004) examined in their single institution studies. Shaker's (2013a) analysis of CAE data reinforces the value of considering institutional distinctions, as it indicated vast differences in average individual gifts, total giving across institutional types, and participation rates.

Salary is an example of the organizational/employee interface, and therefore is highly relevant in organizational commitment and social exchange (Gouldner, 1960). Knight (2004) found the salaries of staff donors to be higher on average than nondonor salaries. Agypt et al. (2011, 2012) found that salary was significant in predicting donation likelihood and donation amount to the external campaigns in their study. As a small part of a larger interview-based

study, Shaker (2013b) found that the mean annual salary for a group of academic staff major donors was not above the average for peers within their academic division, suggesting the importance of exploring alternate variables in predicting giving.

Agypt et al. (2011) found significance in predicting who donated using length of service, academic rank, and hourly versus salaried status. The 2012 Agypt et al. study found, however, that of the relational variables, only length of service was significantly associated with how much the employees gave, and in just one campaign. The authors used organizational identification to hypothesize that high position type and status would positively affect donation amounts. However, they found the reverse to be true. Lower status employees donated more than their tenured and salaried counterparts—suggesting that organizational identification alone may not be the most effective grounding for studying these relational factors in external workplace giving, or that identification did not stem from the expected sources. Because Agypt et al. (2011, 2012) examined external giving, these findings may not be as salient for this study as those of Knight (2004), who found that length of service was significant and that administrators and professional staff were more likely to give than academic staff.

The importance of length of service in both sets of studies (Agypt et al., 2011, 2012; Knight, 2004) aligns with organizational theory, which suggests that the connectivity of an employee to an employer increases over time (Fuller et al., 2006). The mixed findings about faculty status and giving seem at odds with studies of organizational identification, which indicate that those who feel the most in control over their work (i.e. tenured academics) are more strongly organizationally identified (Wan-Huggins et al., 1998) and more likely to give. Tenured and tenure-track academic staff tend to have strong ties to their disciplinary communities, however, which might lessen giving inclination. The institutional commitment of non-tenure-track

academic staff is unclear (Kezar & Sam, 2010), suggesting that giving could be an interesting indicator to unanswered questions. Fuller et al. (2006) also found that organizational regard was more important in shaping the commitment of non-academic staff than was the reflection of the institution's external prestige. The reverse was true for academic staff. The donors in the Shaker (2013b) study were one-time administrators with varying levels of responsibility and long institutional employment. Collectively, these studies indicate, albeit not definitively, that giving levels differ between academic and non-academic staff and across campuses, even those in one university system.

Moving from employee donors to alumni donors, research about the latter group has used organizational identification and commitment (Caboni & Eisenman, 2005; Mael & Ashforth, 1992), with mixed results, suggesting that identification may or may not engender giving. How alumni status and alumni connections interact with employee-employer relationships is a specialized component of organizational relationships that warrants exploration. In the Knight (2004) study more than half of faculty and staff who were institutional alumni contributed, compared to one-third of non-alumni donors, indicating an intersection worthy of further study.

Research questions

A review of related literature indicates that knowledge about workplace giving and particularly giving back to one's workplace, as in the case of university staff institutional giving, is limited and sometimes contradictory. In this study, we incorporated information from other workplace giving studies and organizational theory to develop a strategy for studying why some are inclined to give and to give more than others. The discussion reveals the nuances of the complicated institutional environments and inconclusive findings about giving that support a variety of hypotheses. The available literature on organizational commitment and identification

serves as a theoretical point of departure for increasing understanding of employee-employer relationships and giving at both the microlevel and mesolevel. For this reason, rather than making predictions about the research outcomes, we sought to answer two broad research questions and identify some of the distinctions of personal and relational characteristics associated with academic and non-academic staff giving.

1. Do personal characteristics (age, gender, and race) predict (a) who gives and (b) how much they give?
2. Do relational characteristics (alumni status, campus, position, salary, salary increase, and years of service) predict (a) who gives and (b) how much they give?

As with any study, the scope of variables considered was limited due to practical considerations. Rather than attempting to be exhaustive, we sought to extend prior studies through a deeper exploration of how various factors are associated with giving and to offer insights into areas for further inquiry.

Data and Methods

The data for this study came from IU's human resources (HR) system, and the IU Foundation and IU Alumni Association's shared alumni/donor information data system. We extracted the employment records of full-time faculty and staff who were actively employed for at least one year, or who began employment in the most recent year, between January 1, 2009, and December 31, 2011. The 17,038 total employees represented (8,795 academic and 8,243 non-academic) served as the base population for the study. Information extracted from the HR system included basic personal characteristics, information about the occupied position, total years of service at the university, and salary history over the period. Data from the foundation/alumni system indicated the individual's status as an IU degree recipient (alumni).

Gift information from the Foundation's donor database was separately extracted for all individual donations made during this same time period. The employee records (with added alumni status) were matched to the donation data to identify those who donated and the amounts given. The match was initially based on the university ID number for known staff and alumni donors.ⁱⁱⁱ Matches were found for 5,305 (31.1%) of the employee records. A secondary name/gender/date of birth comparison was performed to identify donor records that might also represent staff who were not identified as such on the donor system. Careful review of the prospective matches yielded 258 additional individuals, bringing the total matches up to 5,563 or 32.7%.

The analysis focuses on the characteristics of employees who had given a donation compared to employees who had not given. In the case of employees who had given, annual gift amounts were also included in the study's data set. Three personal characteristic variables were included in the study: age, gender, and race/ethnicity. These variables represent demographic characteristics that may be associated with workplace social structures, functioning as inherent traits of the individual, rather than as a characteristic of the employee-employer relationship. Employee alumni status^{iv} was grouped with other variables that related to employee characteristics, including staff position type (rank and tenure status among academic staff and professional status and position grade among non-academic staff); campus affiliation; salary level and recent salary increase history; and length of time at the university. Although alumni status is not condition of the position, like employee characteristics, it is an attribute of the relationship between the employee and the university. Similarly, the campus of employment may appear to be more appropriately characterized as an institutional variable. However, we categorized it as relational because, from the employee perspective, the campus site is the object

of the relationship for identification and commitment, which may in turn, effect employee responses to other relational factors. The varying campuses and lack of contextual factors incorporated in this research represent limitations of the study that can be addressed in future comparative studies.

Results

Descriptive Statistics and Univariate Predictor Relationships

IU is comprised of eight geographically-dispersed campuses. Two of the eight have shared degree programs with Purdue University (another large public research university); only the campus managed by IU was included in the study. Table 1 provides a basic description of the campuses included in this study. The Bloomington and Indianapolis campuses are both listed as “Research/Doctoral” in the basic classification system of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Three of the other “regional campuses” (Northwest, South Bend, and Southeast) are Master’s level institutions and two (East and Kokomo) were, at the time of this study, Baccalaureate campuses.

[Table 1 here]

Table 2 provides an overall summary of philanthropic giving among all donors across the IU campuses. Bloomington and Indianapolis, which includes the IU School of Medicine, have the most donors and largest philanthropic contributions. In comparison, the regional campuses have much lower average gifts per donor and overall numbers of donors.

[Table 2 here]

Just under one-third of all full-time employees (32.7%) donated at some level to the institution, which includes donations they made to their own campuses or its programs, as well as to any other IU campus (e.g., if they are also alumni or parents of students at other campuses).

The overall average annual donation among those who gave any amount was \$622. Table 3 presents this figure and examines differences according to the personal characteristic variables of age, gender, and race/ethnicity.

Personal Characteristics

Table 3 summarizes the relationship between the personal characteristics and the two outcome variables: donation rate and average donation amount. Both age and race/ethnicity were significantly related to donation likelihood but only age was a statistically significant predictor of the donation amount. More specifically, the descriptive results reveal that the percentage of employees who donated increased by approximately 10 percentage points between each age range. Gender did not have a significant relationship with either outcome. Similarly, the average annual donation consistently doubled for each additional decade of age. White employees had the highest donation rate, followed by African American and Hispanic employees, while employees affiliated with other racial/ethnic groups exhibited the lowest rates of giving. Although differences in average gift amount were not statistically significant, the pattern was similar, except that the “other race” group had the second highest average. Clearly, additional personal characteristics need to be considered to develop an adequate theoretical perspective for future studies.

[Table 3 here]

Relational Characteristics

All seven relational characteristics were significantly associated with the donation rate and four were significantly related to the average donation amount (Table 4). Employees with an IU degree were far more likely to donate than their non-alumni peers, highlighting the strong link between alumni status and university gift giving. However, this strong relationship only applied

to the likelihood of giving as the average donation amount did not differ, statistically, between the alumni and non-alumni employees.

[Table 4 here]

The two smallest campuses, East and Kokomo, had the highest donation rates among all employees (71.7% and 59.2%, respectively), while the Northwest campus and School of Medicine had the lowest donation rates (19.7% and 24.4%).^v The larger campuses, Bloomington and Indianapolis (IUPUI), had percentages that were closer to the system-wide average. The difference in average donation amount was not found to significantly differ by campus.

Employee position type was grouped into a set of categories that combines the academic/non-academic dimension with tenure status, contract type (ongoing or contingent, that is, term-specific with varying prospects for renewal), and professional status among non-academic staff. The resulting typology includes six categories that were statistically significantly related to both donation rates and average donation amount. Tenured academic staff, including those in administrative roles and those with emeritus status, were the most likely to donate and to donate the highest average amounts. The next most likely group to donate were non-academic executive and professional staff, although their giving rate was almost half of the tenured academic staff group and their average gift less than half the amount. The non-tenure-track full-time academic staff who were hired for ongoing appointments (mostly as lecturers or clinicians) closely followed this second group in likelihood of donation and had higher average gift amounts, placing them second on this measure to the tenured academic staff. Slightly behind both of these groups in donation rate, but much lower in average gift, were tenure eligible (but not yet tenured) academic staff, who were relatively younger, less well-paid, and less-attached than their tenured colleagues. There is a large drop in average donation rate of the next group,

“all other non-academic” employees, which included the clerical, technical and skilled, and unskilled laborer ranks. This group also had the lowest average donation amount but not the lowest donation rate. At the lowest donation rate level were the contingent, non-tenure track academic groups, that is, the visiting academics, post-docs, and “soft money” research associates hired on grants and contracts.

Employees were also differentiated according to their administrator status. High-level administrators had both the highest donation rate and the highest average amount. Mid-level administrators were far less likely to donate than high-level ones and, although they had slightly higher donation rates than employees with no administrative responsibilities, their average gift was nominally smaller on average than the non-administrative group.

The “years of service at IU” variable was a robust predictor of both donation rate and average donation amount. However, there was some non-linearity to this association. Specifically, donation rates increased steadily until about 15 years and then flattened out until exhibiting another increase in the category of highest longevity (over 25 years). The average donation amount exhibited this general pattern, although it peaked earlier and exhibited an actual decline before rising notably in the final category.

Employees’ monthly salary was linearly related with the donation rate with increases noted for each higher salary level category. As with years of service, the average donation amount increased across the lower range of categories, declined in the middle range, and then reached its highest levels in the top salary ranges. Finally, employees who received a modest or higher increase in salary were more likely to donate. There was, however, no significant difference in the average annual donation made based on salary change.

It is important to reiterate and reemphasize that these associations did not take into account strong associations between and among personal and relational characteristics. For example, age and years of service were highly correlated, as were years of service and income and position type and income. Regression analyses were conducted to disentangle some of these effects.

Multivariate Analysis of the Predictors of Donation Rate and Amount

Using a Tobit regression to predict in a single model both the probability of giving and the amount given requires each predictor to have the same directional effect on both the probability and expected amount. We had no *a priori* basis for this assumption and, additionally, the univariate analyses suggested very different relationships between our predictors and these two outcomes. Therefore, we took the hurdle analysis approach outlined by Cragg (1971), wherein we separately estimated the probability of giving using a binary logistic regression model and the expected donation amount among those who donated using ordinary least squares regression.

In reporting the results of this analysis, we continue our organizational scheme of separating the personal and relational characteristics. However, the variables were entered simultaneously and we did not examine the interactions between predictors.^{vi} For example, there were some modest gender differences by campus, but we considered the effect of age independent of campus.

Donation Rate

Binary logistic regression was used to simultaneously examine the impact of the personal and relational variables on likelihood of donation. The overall regression results were highly significant ($\chi^2(23) = 4575, p < .001$). The quasi- R^2 values for the model ranged from .24 (Cox & Snell) to .34 (Nagelkerke) with an overall classification accuracy 76% (88% for the high probability event, not donating, and 52% for the low probability event, donating). The predictor

coefficients for this model (Table 5) showed a strong predictive relationship for every single variable.

For the three continuous predictors—age, years of service, and monthly salary—Table 5 first shows the overall average (mean) and standard deviation (sd). For the nominal variables that are represented by one (gender, alumni status, salary change) or more (race/ethnicity, campus, employee type, and administrator type) dummy variables, the reference group with its corresponding percentage of cases was identified in the variable label, with the percentage of employees in each group represented by the respective dummy variables shown in the “mean” column.

[Table 5 here]

For all predictors, Table 5 displays the unstandardized regression coefficient (B), its standard error (S.E.), and the values associated with its test for statistical significance (Wald statistics and a flag indicating if the p-level is less than .001). The final two columns provide an estimate of the effect size for the predictor, both in terms of the change in likelihood ratio (odds of donating relative to odds of not donating) for each unit change in the predictor ($\text{Exp}(B)$), as well as the estimated change in percent of who were likely to donate for a unit change in the predictor (Δp). For example, for age, the odds ratio indicates that for each increase of one year in age, an employee had 1.04 times the odds of giving relative to not giving. This difference in odds ratio translates to an increase of just less than one percentage point (0.8% Δp) in the likelihood of donating for each additional year of age. For single binary variable predictors, such as gender (represented by being female or not), the Δp value shows that females had an average donation rate that was 6.9 percentage points higher than males when all other variables are held constant at the mean sample value.

The categorical predictors in the model that represent more than two groups (race/ethnicity, campus, employee type, and administrator status) are represented by a set of variables numbering one less than the number of categories. For race/ethnicity, where White employees were the reference group, Table 5 shows that Black employees, who represented 6.6% of the total sample, had a donation rate that is estimated to be 4.2 percentage points below white employees who were identical on all other predictors in the model. The other two racial/ethnic groups had even lower predicted rates of giving, controlling for the other predictors (10.8 percentage points lower for Hispanic employees and 11.8 percentage points lower for “all other” employees compared to their White counterparts).

Differences in the impact of a “unit change in predictor” between continuous and binary predictors make it difficult to compare across these two types of predictors when interpreting the strengths of the relationships. Estimated changes for continuous variables will generally be much smaller than for binary predictors, where a unit change represents a group difference rather than an incremental change in quantity. For example, even though years of service was a highly significant predictor, the change in estimated likelihood of donating was rather small; for each additional year of service, the percentage likelihood of donating increased by 0.2. In other words, if a person with 10 years of service had a 40.0% predicted chance of donating (controlling for all other variables), a person with 11 years of service had a 40.2% predicted chance of donating. Note that for monthly salary, the unit increment is \$100 dollars (i.e., if someone making \$5000 a month has a 40% chance of donating, a person with a monthly salary of \$5100 had a 40.2% chance of donating). Some of the delta-p values in Table 5 parallel closely the observed group differences in Table 4. For example, the observed donation rate difference between alumni and non-alumni shown in Table 4 (18.8 percentage points) is just slightly less

than the 21.4 delta-p value in Table 5. Therefore, the effect of alumni status appears to be fairly independent of the other predictor variables. However, other group differences between the observed and regression-modeled values were more striking. For example, there is virtually no difference in the observed donation rates among females (33.1%) and males (32.2%), but the delta-p value of 6.9% for females shows that gender was a significant predictor that is masked among the observed differences due to differences between males and females in other predictor variables, such as position type and salary.

The campus differences in this model are expressed relative to the Bloomington campus as the comparison group. Results show that, controlling for all other variables, employees at the two small campuses (East and Kokomo) were more likely to donate than Bloomington campus employees. Non-medical school employees at the Indianapolis campus (IUPUI) were slightly more likely to donate compared to their Bloomington counterparts, but School of Medicine employees and those at the remaining three regional campuses (Northwest, South Bend and Southeast) were less likely to donate.

In general, Table 5 depicts strong relationships between the personal and relational characteristics and likelihood of donating. It is particularly interesting to note that these relationships emerged even when controlling for some highly inter-correlated predictors. For example, despite the high correlation between age and years of service ($r=0.63$), both still emerged as significant predictors.

Donation Amount

Ordinary Least Square (OLS) regression was used to assess the statistical relationship between the personal and relational characteristics included in this study and the average donation amount among those who donated. It is important to note that, whereas the model

predicting donation rate was based on the entire sample of over 17,000 employees, the donation amount model was based on only the 5,382 employees who made a donation. Using the same predictor variables as in the first model, the resulting model was statistically significant overall ($F(23,5358)=7.716, p<.001$) but far weaker ($R^2=.032$) and only two continuous variables—age and monthly salary—were statistically significant predictors. Recalling that the univariate analysis revealed that employee type, years of service, and administrator status were also cited as significant predictors, the regression results indicate that the impact of these variables disappears when accounting for age and monthly salary. That is, they did not contribute to the prediction of the donation amount over and above age and monthly salary.

Discussion, Implications, and Future Research

Binary logistic regression was used to isolate the impact of each predictor. Table 6 compares the observed donation rate for the groups defined by the various predictor variables to the estimated donation rate according to the binary logistic regression formula when all other predictors were set to the sample average. Although no employee is “average” (for example, the average employee is 51% female and 49% male), this estimate enables us to discuss how each factor contributed to the prospects of employee donation independent of the other predictors. This estimation procedure reduces the overall donation rate from 32.7% to 27.6%, which is an artifact of partialing out the effects among predictors that were significantly associated with each other. Because the model predicting donation amounts was not very strong, we do not offer a corresponding table of observed and estimated amounts by predictor.

[Table 6 here]

Even without delving deeply into campus giving differences in this analysis, they are striking, with a 50% range in participation. This suggests that campus classification (e.g.,

Carnegie status) may be a characteristic worthy of separate examination incorporating a macrolevel perspective, better considering how campus-level differences and practices effect giving. Additionally, the range raises the question of the consequences of internal fundraising campaigns and messaging, particularly related to encouraging participation at any level (Shaker et al., 2014). The campus differences were greater among the estimated rates and more dramatic than the 10% span in CAE data participation rates (Shaker, 2013a). This study's small number of campuses precludes a more thorough quantitative analysis regarding campus-level characteristics. Future research incorporating additional colleges and universities and a hierarchical modeling methodology would be useful; other methodological considerations would be required for a transnational comparative study although national studies could be replicated based on this study's variables.

Univariate analyses results suggest that age and race, but not gender, significantly distinguish between donors and nondonors. Age was a significant predictor of donation amount, while gender was not significant in either case. However, the regression analyses revealed a significant effect for gender, suggesting that other gender differences (e.g., position type and salary levels) mask the higher propensity of women to give compared to peer males (i.e., with similar characteristics examined in this analysis). These results are consistent with Agypt et al. (2011, 2012) with regard to age, but all provided mixed results with regard to gender and race. Personal characteristics such as religious orientation, location of residence, non-workplace giving, education, citizenship status, and marital status were not available for this study, but would be a useful project extension and could further develop theory on organizational relationships—and their limitations. Likewise, information about staff gift purposes (scholarships, research,

department needs) and their association with personal and relational characteristics would enhance knowledge.

All relational characteristics—alumni status, campus of employment, employee type, administrator level, years of service, and salary change—significantly distinguished between donors and nondonors. Only alumni status, campus, and salary change were not significant in differentiating individuals' annual donation amounts according to the univariate results but the regression analyses reveal that, accounting for age and salary, no other variables contributed significantly to predicting donation amount. Reproduction of the Agypt et al. (2011) finding regarding years of service contributing to the prediction of donation amount over and above age did not occur. Our findings coincide with Agypt et al. (2011, 2012) in that predicting donation amounts was more difficult than predicting general proclivity to give.

Observed (unadjusted) differences in donation rates by employee type reveal that tenured staff are the most likely to donate and contingent academic staff the least likely. When accounting for the other factors, even contingent academics were estimated to donate at higher rates than non-academic, non-professional staff. Surprisingly, the group with the second highest observed donation rate—non-academic executive or professional staff—had a much lower estimated donation rate when controlling for salary, years of service, age, and all other predictor variables. Moreover, non-tenured full-time academic staff, regardless of tenure-track status, had similar estimated donation rates that are marginally below their tenured colleagues. These findings suggest that academic staff generally donate at rates higher than non-academic staff when accounting for other characteristics. Expanded qualitative inquiry, such as Shaker's (2013b) work, is an avenue for exploring group differences and applying organizational theory to explain donative differences in workplaces. Moreover, examining the “insider knowledge” of

nonprofit employee-donors and its effects on giving likelihood could inform knowledge about donor confidence.

The hurdle analysis employed in this study illustrates the importance of separating the prediction of donation propensity from donation amount and of using regression techniques to examine each variable's contributions. We also note the usefulness of comparing the univariate and multivariate results because of the artificiality of isolating variable effects. The best illustration is the gender effect, where the univariate results showed no difference but the multivariate results indicated that women had a higher giving propensity when equal to men on the other factors. Unless gender differences in salary and access to highest level positions are obviated, the gender effect on propensity to give will not be seen in the overall rates.

Future research as well as descriptive studies of workplace giving can extend and refine relevant theories (organizational identification, attachment, commitment) that could only be partially addressed here. The connection between relational variables and the likelihood of both giving and gift amount was readily apparent and shows the potential of organizational theory. Because personal variables also were significant—and at times in ways different from external giving—organizational theory may help unpack these findings as well. Numerous opportunities exist to extend the theory base and explore how future research and descriptive studies can contribute to extrapolating these relevant theories in relation to workplace giving. In within-organization and traditional workplace giving contexts, relational characteristics seemingly have deep consequences for employees' giving likelihood, indicating the role of organizational relationships in philanthropic decisions—and offer insight into general organizational sentiments among employee populations. That non-tenure-track academic staff, for example, followed closely tenured peers and professional staff in giving likelihood and made larger average gifts

than the professional staff (with tenure-track faculty giving less) runs counter to views about the limited organizational connectivity of the tenured and non-tenure-eligible academic staff, raising questions about the interface of organizational commitment versus identification. Employees at the two smallest, and least prestigious, campuses were more likely to donate, in contrast to views of organizational commitment that hinge on external prestige. Additionally, employees who received raises were more likely to donate, but not to give larger gifts, encouraging contemplation of the limits of organizational commitment in relation to gift size and suggesting that the construct of identification may be a better predictor in certain instances. When analyzed comprehensively to determine how commitment and identification may generate different outcomes, future studies of workplace giving can contribute to expanding theoretical perspectives while aiding practitioners in developing fundraising strategies to establish exemplar donors and maximize actual giving among employees.

For academic fundraisers, this study's findings provide a preliminary profile of the most likely donors. These staff appear to be older and at the highest salary levels. The "best" donor prospects are most likely tenured academics with long institutional histories. The progression of giving over time suggests that these relationships are developed as academic careers mature, reinforcing the importance of philanthropic cultivation early in individuals' institutional experiences. The specifics could be examined through a longitudinal analysis of giving patterns and key points in staff employment (as initiated by Agypt et al., 2011, 2012), including campus characteristics.

The overall donation rate of IU staff (32.7%) is notably higher than revealed in the CAE (2012) data across 2- and 4-year public institutions (an average of 23% of staff donated) (Shaker, 2013a). The IU average annual donation was lower than in CAE reports (\$622 compared with

\$701), but notably higher than in the Agypt et al. (2012) study where the combined average given in the two externally-directed campaigns was \$185; this difference indicates the advantage of internally versus externally-facing workplace campaigning, suggesting that American nonprofits should consider internal campaign implementation.

References

- Agypt, B., Christensen, R. K., & Nesbit, R. (2011). To give or not to give: Longitudinal predictors of donation decisions in workplace giving campaigns. Paper presented at the ARNOVA annual meeting, Toronto, ON.
- Agypt, B., Christensen, R. K., & Nesbit, R. (2012). A tale of two charitable campaigns: Longitudinal analysis of employee giving at a public university. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *41*(5), 802-825.
- Barman, E. (2006). *Contesting communities: The transformation of workplace charity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011). A literature review of empirical studies of philanthropy eight mechanisms that drive charitable giving. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *40*(5), 924-973.
- Borden, V. M. H., Shaker, G. G., & Kienker, B. L. (2014). The impact of alumni status on institutional giving by faculty and staff. *Research in Higher Education*. DOI: 0.1007/s11162-013-9318-3
- Bowman, W. (2003). Workplace giving: A case study of the combined federal campaign. *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, *41*, 27-37.
- Byrne, J. (2005). Forming a culture of giving: A case study in successful university internal fundraising. *Metropolitan Universities*, *16*(4), 71-84.
- Caboni, T. C., & Eisenman, J. (2005). Organizational identification as a predictor of alumni giving behaviors. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, *5*(3), 221-231.
- Council for Aid to Education. (2012). [Voluntary Support for Education survey data miner]. Unpublished raw data available to survey participants.

Cragg, J.G. (1971). Some statistical models for limited dependent variables with applications for the demand for durable goods. *Econometrica*, 39(5), 829-44.

Dove, K. E., Lindauer, J. A., & Madvig, C. P. (2001). *Conducting a successful annual giving campaign*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ellemers, N., & Rink, F. (2005). Identity in work groups: The beneficial and detrimental consequences of multiple identities and group norms for collaboration and group performance. *Advances in Group Processes*, 22, 1–41.

Fuller, J. B, Hester, K., Barnett, T., Frey, L., & Relyea, C. (2006). Perceived organizational support and perceived external prestige: Predicting organizational attachment for university staff, faculty, and administrators. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 146(3), 327-347.

Giving USA. (2007). Chicago, IL: Giving USA Foundation.

Gouldner, A. W. (1957). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2(3), 281–306.

Holland, A. P. (1997). Faculty motivations for giving to their employing institutions. Dissertation Abstracts International (UMI. 9735711)

Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2010). Understanding the new majority of non-tenure-track faculty in higher education. Demographics, experiences, and plans of action. (ASHE Higher Education Report Vol. 36 No. 4). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Knight, W. E. (2004). Influences on participation in a university faculty and staff annual giving campaign. *The CASE International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 4(3), 221-232.

Kooij, D. T. A. M., Jansen, P. G. W., Dikkers, J. S. E., & De Lange, A. H. (2010). The influence of age on the associations between HR practices and both affective commitment and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 1111–1136.

Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 103–123.

March, K. S. (2005). A descriptive study of faculty and staff giving practices at public institutions of higher education within the United States. *Dissertation Abstracts International* (UMI No. 3173632).

Meyer, J. P., Becker, T. E., & Van Dick, R. (2006). Social identities and commitments at work: Toward an integrative model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 665-683.

National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy. (2003). *Giving at Work 2003*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Nesbit, R., Christensen, R. K., & Gossett, L. M. (2012). Charitable giving in the public workplace: A framework for understanding employees' philanthropic performance. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 35(3), 449-474.

O'Reilly, C. A., III, Caldwell, D. F., & Barnett, W. P. (1989). Work group demography, social integration, and turnover. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 34, 21-37.

Osili, U. O., Hirt, D. E., & Raghavan, S. (2011). Charitable giving inside and outside the workplace: The role of individual characteristics. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 16, 393-408.

Riketta, M. (2005). Organizational identification: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66, 358-384.

Romney-Alexander, D. (2002). Payroll giving in the UK: Donor incentives and influences on giving behavior. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*, 7(1): 84–92.

Shaker, G. G. (2013a). Giving on campus: Faculty and staff as prospects and donors. In N. Drezner (Ed.), *Expanding the donor base in higher education: Engaging non-traditional donors*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Shaker, G. G. (2013b). The generosity of the professoriate: Faculty as donors and academic citizens. *Metropolitan Universities*, 23(3), 5-25.

Shaker, G. G., Kienker, B. L., & Borden, V. M. H. (2014). The ecology of internal workplace giving at Indiana University: A case study of academic and non-academic staff campus campaign fundraising. *International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing*. DOI: 10.1002/nvsm.1501

Tierney, W. G. (2009). *The impact of culture on organizational decision-making: Theory and practice in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Wan-Huggins, V. N., Riordan, C. M., & Griffeth, R. W. (1998). The development and longitudinal test of a model of organizational identification. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 724–749.

Biographical Paragraphs

Genevieve G. Shaker is on the faculty at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis as assistant professor of philanthropic studies at the Lilly Family School of Philanthropy and associate dean for development and external affairs at the School of Liberal Arts. Her research examines higher education advancement, faculty work, and workplace giving.

Victor M. H. Borden is professor of higher education and policy studies and senior advisor to Indiana University's executive vice president for University Academic Affairs. Dr. Borden's general area of scholarship is the assessment of higher education institutional and program performance.

Brittany L. Kienker recently received her Ph.D. in philanthropic studies from the Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. She also served as a research fellow for IU's Tobias Center for Leadership Excellence, with research emphasis on philanthropic funding, leadership, and multigenerational relationships between organizations and their funders.

Table 1. Indiana University campus comparisons (2011-2012)

Campus	Students	Staff		Living Alumni	Operating Budget (\$thousands)	Year Founded	Carnegie Classification
		Academic ¹	Non-Academic				
Bloomington	42,731	2,297	5,958	332,261	\$1,296,096	1820	Research (Very High Activity)
Indianapolis*	30,530	3,208	5,087	130,672	1,263,549	1969	Research (High Activity)
East	3,725	258	150	5,360	35,293	1971	Baccalaureate (Diverse)
Kokomo	3,318	187	131	10,232	32,838	1945	Baccalaureate (Diverse)
Northwest	6,035	401	246	23,201	61,839	1963	Master's (Medium)
South Bend	8,385	542	303	28,964	124,739	1916	Master's (Medium)
Southeast	7,256	487	253	21,777	75,444	1941	Master's (Larger)
Total	110,436	7,412	12,132	555,755	\$3,169,396²		

* Includes IUPUI, IU School of Medicine (est. 1903), and IUPU-Columbus (est. 1970).

¹ Includes administrators with academic rank

² Includes \$125 million for central university administration budgets.

Table 2. Indiana University philanthropic comparisons (2011-2012)

Campus	Philanthropic Contribution (\$thousands)	Number of Donors	Average Gift per Donor
Bloomington	\$57,903	74,490	\$777
Indianapolis*	89,121	28,287	3,151
East	276	856	322
Kokomo	385	1,031	374
Northwest	374	1,087	344
South Bend	895	2,204	406
Southeast	398	1,825	218
Total	\$149,391	104,354	\$1,432

* Includes IUPUI, IUPUI – IU School of Medicine, and IUPU-Columbus.

Table 3. Associations between Personal Characteristics and Faculty/Staff Donations

	N	Percent that Donate	Average Annual \$ Donation
All Full-Time Employees	17,038	32.7	622
Age			
<30	1,099	10.8	57
30-39	4,152	18.8	173
40-49	4,312	29.6	325
50-59	4,708	39.8	608
>60	2,767	54.7	1,148
Significance		*	*
Gender			
Female	8,717	33.1	477
Male	8,321	32.2	778
significance			
Race/Ethnicity			
African American	1,130	24.9	304
Hispanic	354	22.0	169
White	13,538	35.8	650
Other Race or Unknown	2,016	17.8	586
significance		*	

*Significant at $p < .001$ based on a Chi-Square test for independence for the percent who donate, and an F-test for mean differences for Average Annual Donation.

Table 4. Associations between Relational Characteristics and Faculty/Staff Donations

	N	Percent that Donate	Avg. Annual \$ Donation
Alumni Status			
Indiana University Alumni	5,553	44.2	614
Not Alumni	11,485	27.0	629
significance		*	
Campus			
Bloomington	7,930	33.4	658
IUPUI except School of Medicine	4,757	34.6	635
IU School of Medicine (Indianapolis)	2,328	24.4	879
East	233	71.7	184
Kokomo	238	59.2	303
Northwest	456	19.7	252
South Bend	642	27.6	298
Southeast	454	27.3	227
significance		*	
Employee Type			
Tenured Academic including Emeritus	2,773	64.4	1083
Tenure Track Academic	1,221	32.5	155
Non Academic Executive or Professional Staff	4,050	36.8	412
Academic Non-Tenure Track Ongoing	3,126	35.2	683
Academic Non-Tenure Track Contingent	1,675	9.3	175
All other non-academic	4,189	15.1	85
Significance		*	*
Administrator Type			
High Level	1,104	60.6	1192
Mid Level	3,895	38.7	494
Not an administrator	12,035	28.1	566
Significance		*	*

(continued)

Table 4. (continued)

	N	Percent that Donate	Average Annual \$ Donation
Years of Service			
<1	1,296	10.5	154
1-5	5,213	23.5	433
6-10	3,258	32.8	407
11-15	2,075	40.0	616
16-20	1,388	45.7	519
21-25	1,304	45.5	634
>25	1,916	52.8	1196
Significance		*	*
Monthly Salary			
<\$3,000	4,995	17.0	188
\$3,001-\$4,000	3,513	21.4	195
\$4,001-\$5,000	2,298	32.8	236
\$5,001-\$6,000	1,658	38.4	621
\$6,001-\$7,000	1,254	48.1	468
\$7,001-\$8,000	893	51.1	397
\$8,001-\$9,000	577	58.9	891
\$9,001-\$10,001	415	61.0	849
>\$10,001	1,305	70.3	1750
Significance		*	*
Salary Change			
Little or no increase	4,389	19.6	699
Modest or higher increase	12,649	37.2	609
Significance		*	

*Significant at $p < .001$ based on a Chi-Square test for independence for the percent who donate, and an F-test for mean differences for Average Annual Donation.

Table 5. Binary Logistic Regression Results Predicting Percent that Donate

	Mean	SD	B	S.E.	Sig.	Exp(B)	Delta P
Personal Characteristics							
Age	47.6	11.6	0.04	0.00	*	1.04	0.8%
Gender (Male [48.8%] as reference group)							
Female	51.0%	0.50	0.32	0.04	*	1.37	6.9%
Race/Ethnicity (White [79.5%] as reference group)							
Black	6.6%	0.25	-0.20	0.08	~	0.82	-4.2%
Hispanic	2.1%	0.14	-0.51	0.15	*	0.60	-10.1%
Other Race	11.8%	0.32	-0.59	0.07	*	0.56	-11.8%
Relational Characteristics							
IU Alumni	33.0%	0.47	0.94	0.04	*	2.55	21.4%
Campus (Bloomington [46.5%] as reference group)							
Indianapolis Non-Med	27.9%	0.45	0.22	0.05	*	1.24	4.8%
Indianapolis Med	13.7%	0.34	-0.47	0.07	*	0.62	-9.7%
East	1.4%	0.12	1.98	0.16	*	7.26	45.3%
Kokomo	1.4%	0.12	1.18	0.16	*	3.25	28.5%
Northwest	2.7%	0.16	-1.18	0.14	*	0.31	-20.0%
South Bend	3.8%	0.19	-0.50	0.11	*	0.61	-10.1%
Southeast	2.7%	0.16	-0.61	0.13	*	0.54	-11.9%
Employee Type (Non-academic, non-professional [24.6%] as reference group)							
Tenured Academic	16.3%	0.37	1.75	0.09	*	5.73	40.9%
Tenure Track (not yet tenured) Academic	7.2%	0.26	1.39	0.09	*	4.02	33.3%
Non-Academic Executive or Professional Staff	23.8%	0.43	0.19	0.11		1.21	4.3%
Academic Non-Tenure-Track Ongoing	18.4%	0.39	1.18	0.07	*	3.26	27.9%
Academic Non-Tenure-Track Contingent	9.8%	0.30	0.21	0.13		1.23	4.7%
Administrator Type (Non administrator [70.7%] as reference group)							
High Level	6.5%	0.25	1.02	0.12	*	2.77	4.4%
Mid Level	22.9%	0.42	0.46	0.09	*	1.58	10.4%
Years of Service	11.6	10.1	0.01	0.00	*	1.01	0.2%
Monthly Salary (\$100s)	50.3	33.5	0.01	0.00	*	1.01	0.2%
Salary Change	74.2%	0.44	0.44	0.06	*	1.56	9.3%
Constant	1		-4.84	0.13	*	0.01	

*p<.001

Table 6. Observed and Adjusted* Donation Rates by Personal and Relational Characteristics.

	Observed %	Adjusted %
All Full-Time Employees	32.7	27.6
Age		
<30 (25)	10.8	13.9
30-39 (35)	18.8	19.1
40-49 (45)	29.6	25.7
50-59 (55)	39.8	33.6
>60 (65)	54.7	42.5
Gender		
Female	33.1	30.8
Male	32.2	24.6
Race/Ethnicity		
African American	24.9	25.7
Hispanic	22.0	20.2
White	35.8	29.5
Other Race or Unknown	17.8	18.9
Alumni Status		
IU Alumni	44.2	41.7
Not IU Alumni	27.0	21.9
Campus		
Bloomington	33.4	28.2
IUPUI except School of Medicine	34.6	32.8
IU School of Medicine (Indianapolis)	24.4	19.6
East	71.7	74.0
Kokomo	59.2	56.1
Northwest	19.7	10.8
South Bend	27.6	19.2
Southeast	27.3	17.5
Administrator Type		
High Level	60.6	47.2
Mid Level	38.7	33.7
Not an administrator	28.1	24.4

(continued)

Table 6. (continued)

	Observed %	Adjusted %
Employee Type		
Tenured Academic including Emeritus	64.4	51.1
Tenure Track Academic	32.5	42.0
Non Academic Executive or Professional Staff	36.8	21.8
Academic Non-Tenure Track Ongoing	35.2	43.0
Academic Non-Tenure Track Contingent	9.3	22.5
All other non-academic	15.1	14.8
Years of Service		
<1 (.5)	10.5	25.3
1-5 (3)	23.5	26.0
6-10 (8)	32.8	27.4
11-15 (13)	40.0	28.8
16-20 (18)	45.7	30.3
21-25 (23)	45.5	31.9
>25 (28)	52.8	33.4
Monthly Salary		
<\$3,000 (2,500)	17.0	24.5
\$3,001-\$4,000 (3,500)	21.4	26.0
\$4,001-\$5,000 (4,500)	32.8	27.6
\$5,001-\$6,000 (5,500)	38.4	29.2
\$6,001-\$7,000 (6,500)	48.1	30.9
\$7,001-\$8,000 (7,500)	51.1	32.6
\$8,001-\$9,000 (8,500)	58.9	34.3
\$9,001-\$10,001 (9,500)	61.0	36.1
>\$10,001 (10,500)	70.3	38.0
Salary Change		
Little or no increase	19.6	22.2
Modest or higher increase	37.2	30.8

*Adjusted rates represent the estimated donation according to the binary logistic regression based on sample average for all variables except the target variable, for which the value is set according to the group membership (for binary predictors) or the value indicated in parenthesis used to represent the range.

ⁱ In our study, we use the term “personal” to describe factors that are independent of the employee-employer relationship and “relational” to describe factors that are dependent on that relationship.

ⁱⁱ However, the construct of “affective commitment” is at times used as a proxy for “organizational identification,” demonstrating the confusing relationship between theories (Riketta, 2005).

ⁱⁱⁱ The donor/alumni ID within the donation database differs from the University ID used within the HR system. However, the University ID is maintained, where known, as a secondary ID within the donor/alumni system.

^{iv} Just over one-third of all employees were identified as alumni.

^v Due to its size and attributes, the IU School of Medicine was treated as a separate campus.

^{vi} We decided not to include any interactions in this more exploratory study in order to focus our attention first on the “main effects” of the predictors. Another study (Borden et al., 2014), attends especially on the interaction between alumni status and the other relational characteristics. We also studied campus and other characteristics in a related congruent case study (Shaker, Kienker, & Borden, 2014).