The Effect of Public Service Motivation on Board Member Commitment

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Economics and Business

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

Bachelor of Arts

By

Brian Rubin

February 2018

The Effect of Public Service Motivation on Board Member Commitment

Brian Rubin

February 2018

Economics

Abstract

While there is research demonstrating public service motivation's relevance for board members, there is none that shows PSM's impact on board member commitment. Board member commitment is becoming increasingly vital to maintain responsible governance of large nonprofit organizations. This article fills this the gap by analyzing whether levels of PSM and antecedents to membership influence a board member's tenure at a single organization, as well as their number of hours committed per month to board and committee work. Despite two significant findings it can be concluded that a board member's tenure and level of participation cannot be predicted based on parental socialization, religious activity and level of public service motivation, suggesting that there is not one prototypical "committed board member."

Table of Contents

Introduction

Not for profit companies are a vital part of the American economy. In the United States there are approximately two million of these tax-exempt organizations that serve important public roles ranging from hospitals and universities to environmental advocacy and civil rights organizations (Salamon, 2012). Many are large corporations with massive operating budgets. However, nonprofits face a tremendous challenge because of their "dual-identity", this being that they are not for profit companies that have a motive to do social good but they are operating within a capitalist market place (Salamon, 2012). This comes as a challenge as nonprofits must balance their desire to promote the mission of the organization while remaining financially stable (Connelly, 2004), despite relying on philanthropy and government grants for much of their funding (Salamon, 2012). Due to the current political environment, government funding has been harder to come by and the situation is expected only to get worse (Salamon, 2012). With the lack of funding and resources available, along with increased competition between organizations it is only becoming more difficult to responsibly and affectively govern nonprofit organizations.

Every not for profit has a governing board that works to ensure that company is being responsibly governed; working to oversee that the organization is serving its mission, is financially responsible and is holding the CEO and other members of the company accountable for their work (Worth, 2017). As the nonprofit industry has grown and become increasingly complex, their responsibilities and expectations of performance have grown tremendously (Connelly, 2004). Nonprofit board membership has changed from being an honorary appointment to more like an unpaid job (Connelly, 2004). This high level of performance can only be maintained through consistency and engagement

1

from board members, as well as a long-term commitment in order to allow time for the members to understand the complexities of the nonprofit sector, their organization and their role.

The issue becomes first attracting qualified board members and then retaining them for long periods. Nonprofit board members are volunteers who allocate only a limited amount of time to the organization (Cornforth and Brown, 2014). Therefore it is vital to have board members who have a "dual identity"; they can handle the demanding work that must be done and are also passionate about the mission of the organization. It takes a specific type of individual to take on this challenging and time consuming role for no monetary compensation and an even more uniquely motivated worker to continue to operate in this capacity for an extended length of time.

This paper will look to address this dilemma by answering the question; do committed and long tenured board members have increased levels of public service motivation? In addition, what are the antecedents in terms of family socialization and religious activity for these committed and long serving board members? By utilizing the public service motivation framework (Perry, 1996; Perry, 1997) and a survey of 726 board members this paper will assist nonprofit organizations in making smart decisions in the recruitment of board members in order to have responsible, committed and cohesive governance.

The article will first discuss previous literature on the public service motivation framework and how it has developed from Perry and Wise's initial article in 1990. After, there will be an analysis of the research that has been conducted on board member performance and it's relationship to commitment. The literature review will conclude with

an examination of the various work that has been done on PSM and its relevance for the nonprofit sector and nonprofit board members. An explanation of the methodology used, the results of the regressions and a discussion of the implications will follow the literature review. The article will end with conclusions that can be drawn from the results and implications for future research.

Literature Review

Public Service Motivation Framework-

Perry and Wise (1990) define public service motivation as an individual's predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions. The thought is that an individual who works in the public sector has variant motives to a private sector worker. While Perry and Wise (1990) only apply their framework to the public sector, it has been proven that it also has significance in the nonprofit sector (Miller-Stevens, Ward and Neill, 2014; Miller and Ward 2017; Mann, 2006; Word and Carpenter, 2013).

The PSM model tells us that workers in the public sector's motivation can be divided into three distinct categories: rational, norm-based and affective (Perry and Wise 1990). Rational motives are rooted in utility maximization, suggesting a selfish desire (Perry and Wise 1990). Examples of this include a role that enhances an individual's image of self-importance or possibly gives them an outlet for advocacy of a special interest that they identify with (Perry and Wise 1990). Norm-based on the other hand has a sense of altruism, as it refers to individuals' desire to serve a public interest based on their values or a sense of duty (Miller-Stevens, Ward and Neil). It could also include a desire to bring social equity to those less fortunate than themselves. Affective motives are emotional responses

to a social problem and represent a completely altruistic reaction to those in need (Perry and Wise, 1990). Perry and Wise (1990) suggest that norm-based motives are most commonly associated with public service but affective and rational should still be considered.

In Perry's (1996) study he breaks these motives down further into four subgroups in order to empirically test his results. The four categories are as follows: attraction to policymaking, commitment to public interest, compassion and self-sacrifice (Perry, 1996). Utilizing this framework Perry (1996) designed a survey that tests individuals' level of public service motivation by having respondent's respond to statements on a five-point scale. Model 5 in this study will utilize Perry's (1996) survey in order to analyze the relationship between the level of PSM and board tenure.

In Perry's (1997) research he analyzes PSM's relationship with five sets of antecedents: parental socialization, religious socialization, professional identification, political ideology and individual demographic characteristics. He found that this framework could be "fruitful for understanding motivation" (Perry, 1997, pg 181). This paper will analyze two of these categories: parental and religious socialization.

Nonprofit Board Member Performance and Commitment-

With the increase in both complexity and importance of nonprofit boards, there has been intensified scrutiny on board members' performance. Connelly (2004) suggests that the role has become more challenging but there is a lack of understanding from many trustees of what their job entails. Board members are not prepared for the intricacies that differentiate nonprofit and for profit organizations, including balancing financial results

with success of the mission (Connelly, 2004). In addition, the 2002 passage of the Sarbanes- Oxley Act created stricter accountability regulations, holding nonprofits to higher standards and raising the pressure on board members (Herman, 2009).

In Ostrower's (2002) study she examined if board members are meeting their performance expectations by looking at specific board responsibilities such as fund-raising, financial oversight, evaluation of the chief executive, policy making, monitoring programs, community relations, public advocacy, performance review and advising management. She found that boards were only active in two of these areas: financial oversight and policymaking (Ostrower, 2002). Performance was rated low in all other actions, especially fund-raising, program monitoring, community relations and public advocacy (Ostrower, 2002). Her findings suggest that boards are generally poor in their governance and are not effective at carrying out their roles and responsibilities (Ostrower, 2002).

Herman (1989) states that there is a gap between board performance and the expectations of boards, caused by a lack of ownership that board members feel towards their organizations. This in turn causes a lack of engagement, defined as an individual's readiness to bring themselves cognitively, emotionally and physically to their job (Kahn, 1990). Thus, there has been an emphasis on research analyzing factors that can improve performance. Preston and Brown (2004) studied the relationship between a board member's level of commitment and their relative performance and found that committed board members were perceived to be more engaged and valuable, especially those with affective motivations. O'Regan and Oster (2005) found that the strongest indicator of strong board performance is tenure. Their results display that up to a point; time on a board is associated with an increase in likelihood and magnitude of giving, attendance rates

at meetings and time spent on organizational activities. They find that giving is maximized at 13.6 years and attendance at meetings is maximized at 10.5 years (O'Regan and Oster, 2005). Carver's (2006) study reinforces this concept, stating that an individual's time spent working on a nonprofit board will result in more effective boards. The above studies demonstrate that performance improves with increased levels of commitment. As board members gain more experience, they begin to gain a greater understanding of the complexities of the nonprofit sector, the organization they serve and how they can provide the greatest levels of assistance within their role.

Nonprofit Participation and Motivation-

To improve board governance it becomes vital for organizations to select board members that are willing to commit many years to assisting an organization. To find the adequate volunteers, it is necessary to understand the intricacies and diverse motivations of individuals who are eager to commitment their time to organizational and personal development. Public service motivation allows one to measure an individual's predisposition to respond to motives grounded in public service (Perry 1996).

Numerous studies have shown PSM's validity and relevance in the public sector (Perry, 1996; Crewson 1997; Wright, 2007; Moynihan and Pandey, 2007). Relevant findings include that public service motivation is positively correlated to membership and commitment in organizations (Crewson, 1997; Moynihan and Pandey, 2007). While it is limited, there has been an increased emphases in PSM's value in the not for profit sector (Mann, 2006; Word and Carpenter, 2013). Building off Mann's (2006) work, Word and Carpenter (2013) found that most nonprofit workers were generally motivated by

"intrinsic" or affective rewards. Research has also been done to study individual's motives to volunteer in a traditional volunteer capacity. Studies have found that volunteers are most rewarded by working for a cause that is important to them (Starnes and Wymer, 2001). Others site rational motives such as participating because a friend asked (Freeman, 1997) or for social recognition (Le Grand, 2003), suggesting that the motives of volunteers may be complex and varied.

Research on nonprofit board motivation is relatively scarce. However, there are a number of studies that utilize alternatives to PSM to analyze this subject matter. Widmer (1985) employs an incentives based approach to study nonprofit board members, which assumes that board members participate in order to receive tangible rewards. She organizes these rewards into four groups: material, social, developmental and ideological (Widmer, 1985). Material refers to work-related benefit such as the opportunity to gain more experience by working with the organization or to network. Social incentives are chances to increase in status or honor by working with other esteemed individuals on the board. Developmental are personal rewards that allow for development, such as acquiring knowledge or skills. Finally, ideological incentives are emotional rewards, like gratification or satisfaction that an individual can gain from performing public good. The study used questionnaires, interviews and observations and came to strong conclusions on board members' motivations.

Overall she found that board members' motivations are complex and many combine factors from all four categories (Widmer, 1985). Regarding board service tenure, she found that those who responded to multiple forms of incentives were likely to have the most stability in their motivation (Widmer, 1985). On the other hand those who were motivated

by a sole factor were likely to end their operation on a board quickly (Widmer, 1985). She also concluded that specific motives, such as ideological reasons and joining because a friend asked, did not supply ongoing rewards for participation and led to short term service (Widmer, 1985). It is also noteworthy that many members' reasons for joining were not the same as their reasons for continuing to participate (Widmer, 1985).

Inglis and Cleave (2004) built off Searle (1989) and Inglis (1994) to study motivations of board members using a six-component model. Their framework includes: enhancement of self worth, learning through community, developing individual relationships, unique contributions to the board and self-healing. Respondents took a survey responding to questions related to these six factors of motivations, by rating both levels of importance and degree of fulfillment on a five-point scale. Their findings suggest that board members are motivated to join and serve due to altruistic reasons rather than to better themselves (Inglis and Cleave, 2004)

Miller-Stevens, Ward and Neill (2014) considered a similar research question but applied within the Public Service Motivation framework. By conducting roundtable discussions with nonprofit board members, they explored rational, normative and affective motives and their connection to motives for initially serving and their continued service. Their results demonstrate that affective motives are important for a board member's decision to join a board of directors but rational motivators are just as or more important in an individual's rationale to continue to serve (Miller-Stevens, Ward and Neill, 2014). This being that individuals may be motivated by "impure altruism", where a board member does genuinely want to do good and assist in advancing the organization's mission, but also

wants some form of personal reward (Miller-Stevens, Ward and Neill, 2014). Normative

motivations were rarely cited as reason for service (Miller-Stevens, Ward and Neill, 2014).

Miller-Stevens and Ward (2018) extended their research by doing an additional

study with more empirical work on boards and the nonprofit sector. They utilized an online

survey (the same one that will be used in this study) that was distributed to nonprofit

board members, asking for demographic information and to rate the importance of the

reasons they initially joined a nonprofit board and their motivations for continued service.

They find that board members are initially motivated to join boards for self-interest and

altruistic purposes (Miller-Stevens and Ward, 2018). However, after joining the board

"organizational and mission specific reasons became more important to board members"

and rational motives became of little significance (Miller-Stevens and Ward, 2018).

Miller-Stevens and Ward's (2018) continued their research by utilizing the same

online survey in order to find if Perry's (1996) framework had relevance for nonprofit

board members and found positive results. They also looked at the whether there are

differences in PSM based on board members' primary employment and discovered that

levels are similar regardless of primary employment (Miller-Stevens and Ward, 2018).

While this research is a fantastic starting point, Miller-Stevens and Ward (2018) admit that

more work needs to be done to study board commitment. This study is a response to their

call for action, as it hopes to fill in much of the gaps in research discussed earlier, by

combining board member performance and motivation. Because board tenure is known to

be positively related to performance (O'Regan and Oster 2005), analyzing the relationship

of PSM and antecedents of membership with tenure will help recruitment of committed

board members improve.

Data

The dataset was collected from an online survey administered to organizations that are affiliated with the Georgia Center for Nonprofits from January 11th to February 11th, 2013. There were 1,046 respondents but only 726 of the responses were usable for the study, as surveys were removed if 25% or more of the answers were left unanswered. The respondents included board members from many of the largest nonprofits in Georgia, with 40% of organizations in the study having current operating budgets above one million dollars and 4% having operating budgets over 25 million dollars. The respondents' names and organizational ties were anonymous and the total number of nonprofits that received the survey is unknown since the administrator of the survey, the Georgia Center for Nonprofits, did not track this information. Board members' tenure on their current board ranges from a minimum of less than one year to a maximum of forty-five years, with a mean of five years.

The survey asked a number of questions of individuals, including demographic information as well as having respondents rate the reasons they initially joined a board and the reasons they continued to serve. In addition, it included questions from Perry's (1996) public service motivation scale, the antecedents of public services motivation (Perry 1997), along with other organization and personal attributes.

Methodology

All of the models will use a linear regression. Models 1 through 3 will use board members' tenure on the board they currently serve on (Tenure) as the dependent variable and models 4 through 6 will use average hours spent on board or committee work for the organization per month (Avg_Hours). See Table 1 for specific questions answered by

respondents. Models 1, 2, 4 and 5 will analyze the antecedents (Perry, 1997) of board

members motivation and model 3 and 6 will evaluate board member's level of public

service motivation (Perry, 1996).

Table 1

Dependent Variables for Models 1-6

Variable	Question
Tenure	How many years have you served on this board? *Please round to the nearest whole year*
Avg_Hour	On average, how many hours per month do you spend on board or committee work for this organization?

Model 1-

This model will look at the relationship between board tenure and a members' family

socialization.

$Tenure = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Parents\_Vol + \beta_2 Help + \beta_3 Moral + \beta_4 Helping\_Hand + \beta_5 Involved$

The variables correlate to respondents' responses to statements on a five-point scale (see

Table 2). The respondent marks a 1 if they strongly disagrees with the statement and

answer of five means the respondent strongly agrees.

Table 2

Independent Variables for Model 1

Variable	Statement	Hypothesis for Relationship with Tenure
Parents_Vol	My parents participated in religious volunteering.	Positive
Help	In my family we always helped one	Positive

	another.	
Strangers	Concerning strangers experiencing distress, my parents thought it was more important not to get involved.	Negative
Moral	My parents frequently discussed moral values with me.	Positive
Helping_Hand	When I was growing up my parents told me I should be willing to "lend a helping hand".	Positive
Involved	When I was growing up, my parents very often urged me to get involved with volunteer projects.	Positive

Model 2-

This model will analyze the relationship between board member tenure and their religious activities.

$Tenure = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Attendance + \beta_2 Pray + \beta_3 Practice + \beta_4 Group\_Partcipation + \beta_5 Religous\_Org$

The variables correlate to respondents' responses to statements on a five-point scale (see Table 3). The respondent marks a 1 if they never do what statement says and answer of five means the respondent very often does what the statement says.

Table 3

Independent Variables for Model 2

Variable	**Statement**	**Hypothesis for Relationship with Tenure**
Attendance	Attend religious services.	Positive
Pray	Pray or read religious texts.	Positive
Practice	Practice traditional religious rituals at home.	Positive
Group_Participation	Take part in any of the activities or groups of a church, synagogue, temple	Positive

	or other place of worship (other than attending a service).	
Religious_Org	Take part in any of the activities or groups of a religion or faith service organization.	Positive

Model 3-

This model will analyze the relationship between board tenure and public service motivation (Perry, 1996).

$Tenure = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Policy\_Making + \beta_2 Public\_Interest + Compassion + \beta_4 Self\_Sacrifice$

The variables correlate to respondents' responses to statements on a five-point scale (see Table 4). The respondent marks a 1 if they strongly disagree with the statement and answer of five means the respondent strongly agrees. The 26 statements were broken down into six categories based on Perry's (1996) survey and form the variables in regression. To see the original questions and how they were categorized go to Appendix A.

Table 4

Independent Variables for Model 3

Variable	Category	Hypothesis for Relationship with Tenure
Policy_Making	Attraction to Policy Making	Positive
Public_Interest	Commitment to the Public Interest	Positive
Compassion	Compassion	Positive
Self_Sacrifice	Self Sacrifice	Positive

Model 4-

This model will analyze the relationship between board members' average hours spent on

company activities per month and their family socialization.

$Avg\_Hours = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Parents\_Vol + \beta_2 Help + \beta_3 Moral + \beta_4 Helping\_Hand + \beta_5 Involved$

Table 5

Independent Variables for Model 4

Variable	Statement	Hypothesis for Relationship with Tenure
Parents_Vol	My parents participated in religious volunteering.	Positive
Help	In my family we always helped one another.	Positive
Strangers	Concerning strangers experiencing distress, my parents thought it was more important not to get involved.	Negative
Moral	My parents frequently discussed moral values with me.	Positive
Helping_Hand	When I was growing up my parents told me I should be willing to "lend a helping hand".	Positive
Involved	When I was growing up, my parents very often urged me to get involved with volunteer projects.	Positive

Model 5-

This model will analyze the relationship between board members' average hours spent on

company activities per month and their family socialization.

$Avg\_Hours = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Attendance + \beta_2 Pray + \beta_3 Practice + \beta_4 Group\_Partcipation +$

$\beta_5 Religous\_Org$

Table 6

Independent Variables for Model 5

Variable	Statement	Hypothesis for Relationship with Tenure
Attendance	Attend religious services.	Positive
Pray	Pray or read religious texts.	Positive
Practice	Practice traditional religious rituals at home.	Positive
Group_Participation	Take part in any of the activities or groups of a church, synagogue, temple or other place of worship (other than attending a service).	Positive
Religious_Org	Take part in any of the activities or groups of a religion or faith service organization.	Positive

Model 6-

This model will analyze the relationship between board member's average hours spent on company activities per month and public service motivation (Perry, 1996).

$$Avg\_Hours = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Policy\_Making + \beta_2 Public\_Interest + Compassion + \beta_4 Self\_Sacrifice$$

Table 7

Independent Variables for Model 6

Variable	Category	Hypothesis for Relationship with Tenure
Policy_Making	Attraction to Policy Making	Positive
Public_Interest	Commitment to the Public Interest	Positive
Compassion	Compassion	Positive
Self_Sacrifice	Self Sacrifice	Positive

Results

After running OLS regressions on all six models, nearly all of the results presented were found to be insignificant. All six models experienced heteroskedasticity so robustness tests were run to control for this error. All but two of the independent variables in the regression displayed P-Values well above .1, suggesting that they had no effect on the dependent variable. The models also displayed low R^2 values. There were only two significant relationships found, the first being a positive correlation between Tenure and Attendance in model 2 (see Table 9). The one other being found in model 5, which displayed a positive correlation between Avg_Hours and Participation (see Table 5 and Table 10). Despite these two significant findings it can be concluded that a board member's tenure and level of participation cannot be predicted based on parental socialization, religious activity and level of Public Service Motivation. The following section will analyze in detail why this relationship does not exist for each of the six models. While the majority of findings were found to insignificant, they are indicative of many important conclusions, which will be discussed.

Table 7

Model 1: Effect of Family Socialization on Board Member Tenure

Tenure	Coefficient	Standard Error	t	P>|t|
Parents_Vol	0.2046481	0.1959259	1.04	0.297
Help	-0.0001	0.2721994	0	1
Strangers	-0.3182224	0.1969223	-1.62	0.107

	Coefficient	Standard Error	t	P>|t|
Moral	-0.1557679	0.2973118	-0.52	0.601
Helping_Hand	0.1188086	0.3227497	0.37	0.713
Involved	-0.2651245	0.23786	-1.11	0.265

Table 8

Model 4: Effect of Family Socialization on Average Hours Spent on Board Activities

Avg_Hours	Coefficient	Standard Error	t	P>|t|
Parents_Vol	0.151494	0.3901663	0.39	0.698
Help	-0.5579338	0.640541	-0.87	0.384
Strangers	0.4356531	0.4446467	0.98	0.328
Moral	0.0442139	0.5737674	0.08	0.939
Helping_Hand	-0.0017304	0.7556742	0	0.998
Involved	0.2440621	0.6297125	0.39	0.698

The results for model 1 and 4 were insignificant, with all of the dependent variables showing high P-Values (see Tables 7 and 8). It was hypothesized that there would be a positive correlation between both tenure and average hours spent on organizational work with parental socialization. Research has demonstrated that there is correlation between childhood experiences and altruistic behavior in adulthood (Clary and Miller, 1986; Rosenhan, 1970). Clary and Miller (1986) even found that parents who taught altruism in their household had children who were more likely to sustain their volunteer commitments.

While parental socialization is of importance to the commitment of traditional volunteers (Clary and Miller, 1986), it seems that this is not applicable to the intensive and demanding position of a board member. Perry's (1997) survey has individuals respond to statements that refer to socialization of altruistic values, rather than other types of motivations. Therefore correlation may not exist because researched has demonstrated that a desire to serve on a board of directors is derived from "impure altruism"(Miller-Stevens, Ward and Neil, 2014). The insignificant results suggest that the most committed board members are driven by a mix of rational, normative and affective motives. A board member may be committed because they "want to do good" but they also may be committed, for example, by a sense of duty or because of the strong networking connections they gain through their role.

Table 9

Model 2: Effect of Religious Activity on Board Member Tenure

Tenure	Coefficient	Standard Error	t	P>|t|
Attendance	0.6814866	0.3394513	2.01	0.045
Pray	-0.0148585	0.30411	-0.05	0.961
Practice	-0.1457906	0.2951331	-0.49	0.621
Group_Participation	-0.0364782	0.3815605	-0.1	0.924
Religious_Org	-0.3103022	0.353805	-0.88	0.381

Table 10

Model 5: Effect of Religious Activity on Average Hours Spent on Board Activities

Tenure	Coefficient	Standard Error	t	P>|t|
Attendance	-0.7537568	0.5728013	-1.32	0.189
Pray	0.4168306	0.7807257	0.53	0.594
Practice	-0.5941884	0.8461592	-0.7	0.483
Participation	2.858929	1.557521	1.84	0.067
Religious_Org	-2.511165	1.724363	-1.46	0.146

The results for model 2 displayed one significant result, "Attendance", with all other dependent variables showing insignificant results with high P-Values (see Table C). Attendance at religious services was found to have a positive relationship with length of tenure, displaying an intuitive result that is in line with this paper's hypothesis. This result demonstrates that continued commitment to religious services provides a lens to view if a board member will be committed to board activities. However, the rest of the results supplied insignificant findings. Religious foundational beliefs are related to multiple aspects of public service (Perry, 1997) so it was believed that increased levels of religious participation could increase a board member's tenure. However, it is apparent why this relationship does not exist. Board members come from a variety of backgrounds and individuals can have values of commitment and service instilled into them from a multitude of experiences other than religion.

The results from model 5 display only one significant result (see Table D). The regression shows a positive relationship between average hours worked per month and

individuals who "take part in any of the activities of…place of worship (other than

attending a service)". This is an interesting occurrence, which is contradicted with the

insignificant relationship between average hours worked per month with both individuals

who take "part in any of the activities or groups of a religion or faith service organization"

and attendance at religious services. When dissecting the differences between the variables

in order to discover the root of these divergent results, one can return to Perry's (1997)

paper on the antecedents of PSM. In the analysis he found a significant negative

relationship between "church involvement" and PSM. He argues that those who spend a

large amount of time at church have less time to spend on civic commitments and that they

may respond to the PSM survey in more doctrine ways leading to divergent results (Perry,

1997). Therefore, the insignificant results suggest that this is true for some of the board

members who attend services frequently and participate in religious activities. On the

other hand, the relationship with the variable "participation" is positive because it involves

activities "other than attending services", which means that these individuals may consider

themselves "culturally religious". Therefore, they have the values of religion instilled into

them while not being occupied with services and study, leading to more time for civic

commitments. In addition, these individuals may respond to survey in less doctrine ways

than a person who consistently attends services or studies religious texts.

Table 11

Model 3: Effect of PSM on Board Member Tenure

Tenure	Coefficient	Standard Error	t	P>|t|
Policy_Making	0.0523163	0.2544872	0.21	0.837
Public_Interest	0.334018	0.6307252	0.53	0.597
Compassion	-0.1571706	0.4449332	-0.35	0.724
Self_Sacrafice	0.5359449	0.6014379	0.89	0.373

Model 12

Model 6: Effect of PSM on Average Hours Spent on Board Activities

Avg_Hours	Coefficient	Standard Error	t	P>|t|
Policy_Making	0.5354079	0.7524703	0.71	0.477
Public_Interest	1.798689	1.742125	1.03	0.302
Compassion	1.362138	1.237243	1.1	0.271
Self_Sacrafice	-1.268353	1.559491	-0.81	0.416

The results for model three and six displayed completely insignificant results with P-Values much greater than .05 and a very low R^2 suggesting that there is no connection between both board tenure and time spent on work activities with level of PSM (see Tables E and F). Because levels of commitment have been shown to increase board performance (O'Regan and Oster, 2005; Preston and Brown, 2004; Carver 2006) it is disappointing to find that these factors have no relationship with PSM (Perry, 1997). However, these results

can be explained by the complexities of nonprofit workers motivations, and specifically board member motivations. In other words, research has cited tremendous diversity in the motivations of these workers and therefore it can be posited that there is diversity in the motivations of "committed" board members. While more research must be done, the results suggest that there is not one prototypical committed board member; they can be driven by an attraction to policymaking, a commitment to the public interest, compassion or by self-sacrifice. This matches the findings of Widmer (1985) who found that regarding board service tenure, those who responded to multiple forms of incentives were likely to have the most stability in their motivation.

Conclusion

Public service motivation theory's application in the nonprofit sector is becoming more and more vital as the industry grows and responsible governance of these organizations becomes more difficult. Although many companies in the sector have grown to become large corporations, they are still governed by volunteers that serve as board members. This paper adds to the basis of knowledge, by exploring the antecedents and motivations of board members and their relationship to commitment and tenure. While the regressions displayed mostly insignificant results, we now know that this correlation does not exist and therefore a board members level of commitment cannot be predicted by these factors. This suggests that there is not one prototypical "committed board member".

The research supports other work done on board member motivation, in that board members' motivations (Widmer, 1985; Inglis and Cleave, 2004; Miller-Stevens, Ward and Neill, 2014; Miller-Stevens and Ward, 2017) and their antecedents for serving (Le Grand,

2003) are multifold. From the lack of correlation in the models presented in this study, it can be assumed that the motivations of the most committed board members are just as complex, and therefore we can not differentiate these individual's commitment based on their level of public service motivation and antecedents to service. Additional research should be continued on devoted board members to understand what other factors could possibly drive this unique work ethic. Possible factors could include: primary sector employment, yearly income or whether the board member was recruited or applied themselves.

Appendix A

Attraction to Policy Making (Policy_Making)
> Politics is a dirty word. (Reversed)
> The give and take of public policy making doesn't appeal to me. (Reversed)
> I don't care much for politicians. (Reversed)

Commitment to the Public Interest (Public_Interest)
> It is hard for me to get intensely interested in what is going on in my community. (Reversed)
> I unselfishly contribute to my community.
> I consider public service my civic duty.
> Meaningful public service is very important to me.
> I would prefer public officials do what is best for the whole community even if it harms my interests.

Compassion (Compassion)
> It is difficult for me to contain my feelings when I see people in distress.
> Most social programs are too vital to do without.
> I am often reminded by daily events how dependent we are on each other.
> I am rarely moved by the plight of the unprivileged. (Reversed)
> To me patriotism includes seeing to the welfare of others.
> I have little compassion for people in need who are unwilling to take the first step to help themselves. (Reversed)
> There are few public programs that I wholeheartedly support. (Reversed)
> I seldom think about the welfare of people I don't know personally. (Reversed)

Self-Sacrifice (Self_Sacrifice)
> Doing well financially is definitely more important to me than doing good deeds. (Reversed)
> Much of what I do is for a cause bigger than myself.
> Serving other citizens would give me a good feeling even if no one paid me for it.
> Making a difference in society means more to me than personal achievements.
> I think people should give back more to society more than they get from it.
> I am prepared to make enormous sacrifices for the good of society.
> I am one of the rare people who would risk personal loss to help someone else.
> I believe in putting duty before myself.

*(Reversed) indicates that statement is counted as a negative towards level of PSM

References

Carver, J. (2006). *Boards that make a difference: a new design for leadership in nonprofit and public organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Connelly, M. D. (2004). The Sea Change in Nonprofit Governance: A New Universe of Opportunities and Responsibilities. *Inquiry,41*(1), 6-20. Retrieved November 27, 2004.

Cornforth, C., & Brown, W. A. (2014). *Nonprofit governance innovative perspectives and approaches*. London: Routledge.

Clary, E. G., & Miller, J. (1986). Socialization and Situational Influences on Sustained Altruism. *Child Development,57*(6), 1358. doi:10.2307/1130415

Crewson, P. E. (1997). Public-Service Motivation: Building Empirical Evidence of Incidence and Effect. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,7*(4), 499-518.

Herman, R. (1989). *Nonprofit Boards of Directors: Analyses and Applications*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Pubilshers.

Herman, R. D. (2009). Are Public Service Nonprofit Boards Meeting Their Responsibilities? *Public Administration Review,69*(3), 387-390. doi: http://www.jstor.org/stable/27697880

Inglis, S. (1994). Exploring Volunteer Board Member and Executive Director Needs: Importance and Fulfilment. *Journal of Applied Recreation Research,19*(3).

Inglis, S., & Cleave, S. (2006). A Scale to Assess Board Member Motivations in Nonprofit Organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership,17*(1).

Kahn, W. (1990). Psychological Conditions of Personal Engagement and Disengagement at Work. *The Academy of Management Journal,33*(4).

Mann, G. A. (2006). A Motive to Serve: Public Service Motivation in Human Resource Management and the Role of PSM in the Nonprofit Sector. *Public Personnel Management,35*(1), 33-48. doi:10.1177/009102600603500103

Miller-Stevens, K., Ward, K., & Neill, K. (2014). Public service motivation theory in a nonprofit context: An exploratory study of nonprofit board member motivations. *Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership, 4*(2), 162-178.

Miller-Stevens, K. & Ward, K. (2018, under review) *Nonprofit board members' reasons to join and continue serving on a volunteer board of directors.*

Moynihan, D. P., & Pandey, S. K. (2007). Finding Workable Levers Over Work Motivation. *Administration & Society,39*(7), 803-832. doi:10.1177/0095399707305546

O'Regan, K., & Oster, S. (2005). Does the Structure and Composition of the Board Matter? The Case of Nonprofit Organizations. *Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization,21*(1), 205-227. Retrieved September 11, 17.

Ostrower, F. (2002). *Trustees of Culture: Power, Wealth, and Status on Elite Art Boards*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Perry, J. L., & Wise, L. R. (1990). The Motivational Bases of Public Service. *Public Administration Review,50*(3), 367-373. Retrieved September 11, 17.

Perry, J. L. (1996). Measuring Public Service Motivation: An Assessment of Construct Reliability and Validity. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,6*(1).

Perry, J. L. (1997). Antecedents of Public Service Motivation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,7*(2), 181-197. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a024345

Preston, J. B., & Brown, W. A. (2004). Commitment and performance of nonprofit board members. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership,15*(2).

Rosenhan, D. L. (1970). The Natural Socialization of Altruistic Autonomy . *New York Academic Press,*251-268.

Salamon, L. M. (2012). *The State of Nonprofit America*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Searle, M. (1989). Measuring recreation board members' needs. *Recreation Research Review*. Retrieved from cabdirect.org.

Ward, K. & Miller-Stevens, K. (2018, under review) *Public service motivation in nonprofit board members and the impact of primary sector of employment.*

Widmer, C. (1985). Why Board Members Participate. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly,14*(4), 8-23.

Worth, M. J. (2017). *Nonprofit management: principles and practice*. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Wright, B. E. (2007). Public Service and Motivation: Does Mission Matter? *Public Administration Review,67*(1), 54-64. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00696.x