

Multi-Generational Governance: Is There Such a Thing?

Julia E. Classen
Aurora Consulting
314 Clifton Ave, Suite 301
Minneapolis, MN 55403
Julia@auroraconsult.com

Melissa M. Stone
Director, Public and Nonprofit Leadership Center
Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs
University of Minnesota
301 19th Avenue, South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Stone039@umn.edu

Paper prepared for the Midwest Center for Nonprofit Leadership conference, “Boards in Uncertain Times: Exploring the Implications of Financial, Technological and Generational Change for Nonprofit Governance” April 23-24, 2009, Kansas City, MO. The authors would like to thank the participants in this research for their time and insights.

Multi-Generational Governance: Is There Such a Thing?

Abstract

This paper explores the potential effects of a generational transition in leadership on the governance of nonprofit organizations. We view this generational transition as one among many contingencies that can affect governance; as such, we ask the question whether a generational shift in leadership is a fundamentally different kind of contingency and if so, what challenges and opportunities for governance practices does it present? To begin to address these questions, we interviewed five matched pairs of board chairs and executives who represent different generational cohorts. In general we found few differences among respondents concerning governance roles and responsibilities and underlying values. The most important differences concerned attitudes toward technology and the ways technology affected the work of the board, the working styles of both board chairs and executives, and interpersonal relationships. Given this, we speculate that potential effects of generational transitions on governance include some operational issues but more importantly differences concerning the relationship-building and boundary-spanning activities of boards.

Multi-Generational Governance: Is There Such a Thing?

The purpose of this conceptual paper is to examine the potential effects of a generational transition in leadership positions on the governance of US-based nonprofit organizations and to present the implications of those effects for research and practice. We view this generational transition as one among many contingencies that can affect governance; as such, we ask the question whether a generational shift in leadership is a fundamentally different kind of contingency and if so, what challenges and opportunities for governance functions and systems does it present? Interest is growing among practitioners and scholars in both generational transition issues and the contingent nature of governance; therefore, we propose to leverage what we know about contingencies affecting governance in order to inform questions concerning generational transitions.

Recently, the popular press as well as some research have highlighted the potential leadership vacuum and overall impact of Baby Boomer retirements on nonprofit and public sector organizations (Annie E. Casey Foundation 2005; Arsenault & Patrick 2008; Rotolo & Wilson 2004). While some argue that the true impact of these retirements may be overstated in the short-run (Salamon & Geller 2007), few doubt that over the next decade, this demographic shift will affect the leadership of the nonprofit sector. Assuming the current economic conditions of the country do not halt or dramatically postpone the anticipated exodus of the Baby Boomer generation from their workplaces, there are both opportunities and challenges for the nonprofit sector. For example, surveys indicate that retired corporate managers will be looking for volunteer

opportunities in the nonprofit sector, including board service [Geller & Salamon 2008] – what kinds of managerial *and* governance skills, assumptions and values will they bring with them and how might these affect nonprofit decision-making?

The contingent nature of governance is also gaining prominence in the thinking of both scholars and practitioners (see, for example, Vanderwall and Benavides 2006; Ostrower and Stone 2006, 2008). By “contingent nature,” we mean that governance of nonprofit organizations is a highly dynamic set of functions that are influenced at any one time by many factors, including those internal and external to nonprofits (Ostrower and Stone 2008). Our question is whether and how leadership transitions driven by generational shifts are an *additional* critical governance contingency.

To examine the impact of generational shifts on nonprofit governance, the paper focuses on two major areas: 1) the impact of generational differences on board-executive relationships; and, 2) the implications of developing boards whose composition is multi-generational. We arrived at these areas inductively – they are the two themes that have consistently surfaced in professional development and training, classroom, and consulting venues as the ones for which practitioners are seeking guidance. These two themes reflect more general governance issues – board -executive relationships and board composition – that have also attracted a considerable amount of research. To address these areas, we focus on small to midsized nonprofits across nonprofit fields.

In general, based on our exploratory project, we found few differences among respondents concerning governance roles and responsibilities and underlying values. The most important differences concerned attitudes toward technology and the ways

technology affected the work of the board, the working styles of both board chairs and executives, and interpersonal relationships.

Below, we first present a brief review of relevant governance research and work on generational differences. We then describe our methodology and present findings. The final section discusses these findings and their implications for practice and future research.

What the Research Shows

As just described, our central question concerns whether and how leadership transitions driven by generational shifts is an *additional* critical governance contingency of interest to both scholars and practitioners in the nonprofit sector. In this section, we examine previous research that helps illuminate aspects of this question. We first review research on the governance of nonprofits, focusing on age-related questions, board-staff relationships, and executive director professionalization. We then turn to recent research on generational differences to help us understand whether and how these differences might affect nonprofit governance in light of the governance research just reviewed.

The Contingent Nature of Nonprofit Board Governance

Scholars have long argued that no singular model exists of nonprofit board governance and that a “contingency-based” approach offers more promise for research and practice. A contingent approach emphasizes the context within which governance takes place, meaning that the factors that influence board activities are conditional on both the board’s and organization’s circumstances. For example, nearly 25 years ago, Kramer (1985) argued that a unitary model of board-executive relations is inadequate because they will vary, depending on a host of internal and external variables, such as

prestige of board members, seniority and professionalization of the CEO and resource scarcity. More recently, a review of the literature on nonprofit board governance (Ostrower and Stone 2006) and findings from the Urban Institute *National Survey of Nonprofit Governance* (Ostrower 2007) revealed more broadly that many dimensions of the context surrounding board governance are likely to affect board behavior. In general, these dimensions include aspects of the external environment (e.g., funding sources, legal and policy contexts), internal organizational characteristics (e.g., executive director attributes, organization size, stage of development), and board characteristics (e.g., recruitment practices, board composition and structure) (Ostrower 2007; Ostrower and Stone 2008). For the project reported here, we are particularly interested in research that has focused on the influence of individual age characteristics on board activity and board-staff relationships.

Questions about who serves on nonprofit boards have persisted throughout recent research on nonprofit governance (Ostrower and Stone 2006). Both older and more recent studies have found that these boards, in general, consist of white males who are members of elite groups (Ostrower 2007). The Urban Institute *National Survey of Nonprofit Governance* (Ostrower 2007) also looked at the age characteristics of board members and found that:

- Thirty-seven percent of all board members are between 36 and 50 years of age;
- Forty-one percent are between 50 and 65;
- Only sixteen percent are over 65 and only seven percent are younger than 35.
- In general, older board members were associated with larger nonprofit organizations.

These findings, then, clearly indicate that most board members are from the Baby Boomer generation with far fewer from both older and younger generations. But, what effect does age have on overall board activity? According to the Urban Institute study, not much. Of the 11 different board roles examined in the study, age of board members was only significantly associated with board activity in “setting policy;” there were no significant relationships for any of the other board roles, including, for example, monitoring the CEO, financial oversight, and fundraising.

More significant may be the effects of age on board-staff/CEO relationships and the relative power of each. Earlier studies, while not focusing on age per se, found that prestige or greater socio-economic status of board members is associated with greater board power (Zald 1969; Kramer 1965), while greater CEO seniority and professional credentials are related to more CEO power (Kramer 1981, 1985, 1987; Zald 1967, 1969). A more recent study by Murray and his colleagues of over 400 Canadian health and human service nonprofits (1992) related some of these variables to five patterns of board-executive director dominance. Findings relevant to our project include those indicating that younger board members were positively associated with power-sharing boards and a higher percentage of board members over 60 years of age was associated with chair-dominated and powerless boards and negatively related to power-sharing boards.

These findings present a mixed picture of the relative influence of age on board activities and dynamics. Age per se may not have much direct impact on what a board does (as suggested by the Urban Institute study) but may affect the board-executive power relationship (as suggested by the Murray et al study). Furthermore, characteristics that are likely associated with age may be more influential. For example, to the extent

that older age is related to higher socio-economic status and organizational seniority, it may influence the balance of power between a board and a CEO.

The Urban Institute study also found that CEO professionalization (as measured by whether the CEO was paid) was important in relation to board activity levels. For instance, 43 percent of nonprofit boards without a paid professional CEO actively monitor programs and services compared with 25 percent of boards of nonprofits with one. Boards with a professional CEO were more active in providing financial oversight, evaluating the CEO/executive director, and acting as a sounding board than in program monitoring. It is not clear, however, how professionalization may be associated with age – it is possible that younger nonprofit executives actually have more management-specific training than their board members but this is pure speculation and not something addressed in extant research.

We now turn to research on generational differences to expand our understanding of the potential influences of age on nonprofit board governance.

Research on Generational Differences

In establishing the sociological significance of “generation,” Mannheim (1952) argued that generations reflect components that are both objective/historical (being born in a specific year) and subjective (an identity formed in response to major socio-political events occurring during one’s coming-of-age years) where the latter component is critical to the formation of a “generational consciousness.” More recent research has emphasized how generational cohorts build generational consciousness not only through shared experiences with major historical events but also through such shared cultural symbols,

as music (Eyerman and Turner 1998 as cited by McMullin, Comeau & Jovic 2007) and experiences with technology (McMullin, Comeau & Jovic 2007).

Generational differences have increasingly attracted the attention of the popular press and others as it is becoming evident that large waves of Baby Boomers will be retiring within this decade and the next. A central question concerns what those retirements may mean for shifts in organizational leadership and power especially as generational differences indicate critical differences in work styles, decision-making, work life balance and values (Brinkerhoff 2007). Common demarcations and characteristics of present generations (see, for example, Lyons, Duxbury and Higgins 2007; Beutell and Wittig-Berman 2008) include the following:

- Matures (born before 1945): devoted, hard working, accepting of authority and willing to conform;
- Baby Boomers (1945-1964): indulgent, self-absorbed, nonconformists, and high achievers, “Live to Work;”
- Generation X or Gen Xers (1965-1979): cynical, independent and entrepreneurial, value work-family balance and have less work place loyalty, “Work to Live;”
- Millennials (born after 1980): comfortable with continuous change, highly innovative and independent, self-absorbed and achievement-oriented.

Research is just beginning on whether these generational differences are myth or reality and on whether or how differences impact work life. Three recent studies are illustrative. One large national survey on work motivators among public sector

employees (Yang and Guy 2006) found no significant differences between Boomers and Gen Xers. These findings replicated those of a smaller, regional study conducted by Jurkiewicz and Brown in 1998. Yang and Guy conclude, as did the earlier study, that “employee motivation – and perhaps work style – is more likely to be a function of biological age than generational identity” (2006:280). On the other hand, when examining generational differences and issues of work-family balance, Beutall and Wittig-Berman (2008) found significant differences between Boomers and Gen Xers regarding work-family conflict and synergy – Gen Xers experienced significantly lower levels of work-family conflict and higher levels of work-family synergy than did Boomers. The researchers suggest, however, that family and career stage differences may be as significant as generational differences on work-family issues, similar to Yang and Guy’s argument. In a third study, Lyons, Duxbury and Higgins (2007) assessed generational differences with respect to human values, using the popular literature to hypothesize that Matures and Boomers would value the welfare of others and security and conformity more than Gen Xers and Millennials, who would value change, independence, and personal success. In general, these hypotheses were upheld with regard to differences with Gen Xers but less so with Millennials who were similar on several value measures to Boomers and Matures.

A fourth study by McMullin, Comeau, and Jovic (2007) takes a different approach by directly connecting the formation of generational consciousness with computing technology experience. They argue persuasively that these experiences have created generational solidarity in much the same way as Mannheim’s major socio-political event, and they articulate finer degrees of generational differences based on

specific computing technology experiences (for example, the pre-Atari generation vs. the console generation vs. the internet generation). From their research, they claim that these kinds of generational differences are affecting the workplace and creating divides between older and younger managers.

From this brief literature review, we are left with more questions than answers. Research on the effects of an individual's age on governance suggests that age per se may not be as strong a factor as other variables that may be associated with age, including socio-economic status, organizational seniority and professionalization (although, professionalization may have more important generational correlates than age). To the extent that age or age-related factors are important to governance, they seem to influence the board-CEO relationship more than board activity, but there is too little research in this latter area from which to draw conclusions. Research on generational differences of relevance to organizational life is also scant. The work summarized above suggests that one should be cautious in attributing wide scale significance to generational differences in the workplace. More promising may be work that focuses on how different generations have experienced the technological revolution. This "event" may rise to the level suggested by Mannheim as critical in shaping generational consciousness. As such, these differences in experience with technology and technological change may impact organizational life.

Methodology

As described in the Introduction, we came to our questions inductively from our experiences with practitioners. To gain further insight into how generational differences may affect board governance, we decided to collect more systematic information,

although still very much in an exploratory mode. The design for our project, then, was simple. We chose a sample of nonprofit organizations with which we were somewhat familiar and asked to interview both the executive director and the board chair. We chose organizations that had executive director and board chair of different generations and we focused on small to midsized nonprofits. Table 1 gives a brief profile of the five organizations included in the sample.¹

Table 1. Organizational Profile

Organization	Organizational Type	2008 Budget Size	Executive Director Generation	Board Chair Generation	Executive Director Education Degree Attained	Board Chair Education Degree Attained
1	Social Service	\$500,000-1,000,000	Baby Boomer	Gen Xer	BA	Ph.D.
2	Social Service	Less than \$500,000	Gen Xer	Baby Boomer	2 MA Degrees	MA
3	Community Foundation	\$1,000,000-2,000,000	Gen Xer	Baby Boomer	MA	BA
4	Infrastructure Organization	\$500,000-1,000,000	Baby Boomer	GenXer	BA	BA
5	Public Policy	Less than \$500,000	Gen Xer	Baby Boomer	MA	2 MA Degrees

¹ Two organizations were dropped from the sample because of interviewing problems or because we could not interview both the executive director and board chair.

Interviews followed a semi-structured format with questions that focused on our major areas of interest -- 1) the impact of generational differences on board-executive relationships; and, 2) the implications of developing boards whose composition is multi-generational. Each person was asked the same series of questions (please see Appendix I for a list of research questions). Responses were recorded by hand.

Responses were then coded by age/generation and role (board or ED) and, for one question, by educational level achieved and role. Both authors separately reviewed the categorized data to look for common themes, differences and similarities across generations and across roles and generations.

Themes

We will first present topics for which there were few differences among respondents which include general agreement on governance responsibilities, the roles of the Executive Director and of the board, and core, professional values.

When asked to describe major governance responsibilities, there were striking similarities in answers between our matched pairs of executives and chairs, even though they came from different generations. For example, the Board Chair of Organization #1, who is a Gen X'er, said the most important responsibilities of her board included, "to steer the organization in the current environment and try to enable it to take advantage of opportunities to achieve its mission." Organization #1's executive director, a Baby Boomer, responded to the same question by saying, "Governance, strategic direction, strategic partnerships." Likewise, the Board Chair of Organization #3 (a Baby Boomer) said the board's major responsibilities included "to fully understand the mission and

growth of the organization,” while its Executive Director, a Gen X’er, said “creating that broad vision that we are working toward and basic governance and fiscal oversight.”

The same kind of similarities held when board chairs and executives were asked to describe the functions of the other as well as how they thought the other viewed their functions. For example, when asked, "What do you think the ED/board sees as the ED’s most important responsibilities?" Organization #4’s board chair (a Gen X’er), said “maintaining a strategic plan, monitoring and executing the strategic plan,” while its executive (a Baby Boomer) said, “implementing the strategic plan, keeping the finances of the organization in shape, providing staff leadership...”

There were also strikingly similar answers by Board Chairs and their Executive Directors, regardless of generational differences, to a question concerning their core professional and personal values. For example, the Board Chair of Organization #1 listed as core values, “integrity, creativity, effectiveness, humility and passion,” while the Executive Director named “integrity, justice, equality, honesty and passion.” Furthermore, nine of the ten respondents thought that their boards more generally shared values with them.

All five nonprofits had boards of directors that were multi-generational and for four of the five, generational diversity was an intentional recruitment strategy. The outcomes they hoped to achieve generally included expanding the nonprofit’s networks to include younger stakeholders relevant to their mission and developing leadership skills within younger generations. All ten respondents also recognized that having a multi-generational board made the board-executive relationship more complex because:

- “We all come from different places and it might be easier if we were all older or younger” (Boomer board chair);
- “We know different things; they [the board] pull on expertise on what they learned in school, different life experiences” (Boomer Executive);
- “It takes longer to build trust regarding competency – as to my ability to do the work” (Gen X Executive).

Board-executive relationships were also more complex because of what respondents saw as generational differences regarding work-life balance. For example, a Gen X executive director said, “Work is part of what you do, not your entire identity. I saw my parents’ generation putting their heart and soul into their job and then the Enron scandals happened and they lost everything. Growing [in the job] is a large part of it. When I am done growing, I will move on to another job.”

The most persistent theme regarding generational differences between boards and executive relationship concerned technology. All ten respondents acknowledged generational differences in attitudes and skills concerning technology, and comfort (or lack of) with various technologies arose in answers to several questions, whether those questions directly addressed technology or not. How those differences in attitudes and skills toward technology manifest themselves occurred in three important areas.

First, we saw them mentioned in relation to *work-life balance*. For example, in Organization #2, the Gen X executive director said “not all work needs to be done in the office. I would prefer results-only management; it’s not about where the work is done but the quality of the work.” The Boomer board chair acknowledged that the executive director is more technologically astute and “on line.”

Second, these differences in attitudes and skills emerged when respondents discussed various *work-styles*, especially regarding communications within the board and between the board and executive. One board chair who is a Baby Boomer said, “I am having to learn to be more patient about communication. I see technology as an adjunct to communication. They [Gen X’ers] are more comfortable with it.” Three examples are especially striking. In the first, Organization #1’s Gen X board chair described their recent executive director search – “When we met as a search committee, the default thinking was [that this would involve] lots of paperwork. Instead, we could do a Google group virtually. Boomers did not understand this. Gen X’ers and Gen Y [Millennials] are okay with it.” For Organization #3 with a Boomer board chair and a Gen X executive, both talked about using technology to facilitate meetings but with different levels of enthusiasm. The board chair said in describing how they are organizing an upcoming event, “The co-chair [for the event] is in his 30s and said we will have one face-to-face meeting and do the rest online. I asked for two more face-to-face meetings.” Using technology for these communications was not a problem for the executive director – “We use it to decrease face-to-face meetings and save necessary time.” A third example concerned how regular communications between Organization #4’s board chair (a Gen X’er) and executive director (a Baby Boomer) should occur. The board chair said, “I meet with the Executive Director every two weeks and tried to do it via Instant Messaging rather than face-to-face. The ED was not willing to do that.” On the other hand, the executive director maintained that “technology can be an obstacle between generations. Young people are not so troubled by the fact that relationship building occurs remotely.”

Several of these quotations also suggest a third area, *interpersonal relationships*, where attitudes and skills regarding technology showed important differences between generations. We might label these differences as “face-to-face vs. Facebook” or “phone book vs. Facebook.” The Baby Boomer executive in Organization #4 clearly valued in-person meetings with his board chair while the chair was comfortable with remote communication. The Baby Boomer executive director in Organization #3 was troubled by the lack of face-to-face meetings to plan the upcoming event; this did not concern the executive director. As the Gen X executive director of Organization #2 said, there is a “smugness by younger people with Facebook and Twitter and ‘get with the program.’ Older people think ‘I’m too old to do this.’” The Boomer board chair for this organization largely agreed with this assessment – “older generations do networking through the phone book rather than the computer. We work with already established networks. I am not interested in creating new relationships.”

To summarize, our exploratory interviews with ten individuals representing five matched pairs of executive directors and board chairs from different generations indicated that few differences existed with regard to the ways each views critical governance responsibilities, the roles of the executive relative to the board and the board relative to the executive director. Few differences were also detected in how each pair described core personal and professional values. Important differences across generations did exist, however, in relation to attitudes and skills concerning technology and these differences were expressed in terms of various work-life, work-style and interpersonal relationship issues. In the next section we will push further on the implications of these differences for governance practices.

Discussion and Implications for Governance

At first blush, some generational differences concerning technology seem to focus on operational issues. For example, technology enables flexibility in scheduling as well as when and where work actually occurs. This is a benefit for Gen X'ers to the extent that they value a more balanced work-life mix. Some communications issues may be similar in situations where different preferences for the ways people want to receive information can be handled easily. In this case implications for governance may be relatively straightforward, although perhaps not without controversy. For example, Gen X (or Millennials) may prefer to be evaluated based on results and not on measures of time spent in the office, as our Executive Director from Organization #2 suggests. Governance materials and even the structure of board meetings may shift to include more electronic or web-based transmission of board information and meetings held remotely. Resistance by older board members or CEOs to these changes, particularly concerning virtual vs. face-to-face meetings, may be strong and relate more to issues we address next.

There may, however, be quite significant issues that lay just under the surface. For instance, an underlying theme in the interviews concerned what constituted “legitimate” relationships – the examples above on the executive director search, event planning, and the regular meetings between the board chair and executive director are cases in point. Here we saw Baby Boomers expressing skepticism about relationships formed through various communications and social networking technologies. For Gen X'ers, whether they were board chairs or executive directors, these mechanisms were easy, fast, and reliable ways to interact with or reach more people.

The implications of this for governance are important in terms of the ways the board enacts the external relationship building function of the board. The boundary-spanning function of the board has long been established in research as well as practice (see, for example, Middleton 1987). This function includes the utility of having board members with elite connections, linkages to funding sources and to critical constituency groups. It has been shown that through these relationships, boards are better able to manage resource uncertainties and dependencies (Pfeffer and Salancik 1978; Provan 1980). To the extent that older generations view these functions in terms of relationships that rely on familiar, and largely face-to-face, networks, boundary-spanning opportunities may be unnecessarily limited in scope when compared to the expansiveness of relationship building made possible by social networking technologies..

On the other hand, motivations for participating on boards include personal networking opportunities as well as working directly with others who share a similar passion for the nonprofit's mission. For older board members, their motivation for (as well as satisfaction with) board service may depend more strongly on face-to-face relationship building and sustaining personal encounters rather than virtual meetings.

Generational differences that reflect experiences with technology, then, may be particularly significant for governance. McMullin and colleagues (2007) found that technological skills "hardened" in generational milieus, meaning that generations reluctantly adopt new technologies, if at all. The quotation cited earlier by a Baby Boomer board chair is illustrative and used again here:

Older generations do networking through the phone book rather than the computer. We work with already established networks. I am not interested in creating new relationships.

In addition, it may be that differences in attitudes and skills concerning technology are associated with different approaches to the work itself, not just how it is completed. Drawing on work by Down and Reveley (2004) on entrepreneurial identities, McMullin and colleagues (2007) suggest that older managers are connected with older technologies and thereby left behind in the minds of younger managers who believe that the new technologies spawn new business practices, new strategies, and new assumptions about social change. For example, a recent article in the New York Times describes how Twitter, a relatively recent social networking device, is influencing marketing. “Twitter reverses the notion of the group,” said Paul Saffo, the Silicon Valley futurist. “Instead of creating the group you want, you send it and the group self-assembles.” (Miller, 4.13.09)

To the extent a connection exists between technological expertise and new ways to think about organizational functions, generational differences in nonprofit organizations may increase tensions over fundamental organizational strategies as well as ideas about social change. These differences are not just about the *How?* but also about the *What?* and the *Why?* To be clear, we did not see these kinds of differences expressed in our respondents but we also did not explicitly ask. Linking attitudes towards technology with explicit governance and management practices and strategies as well as assumption about various kinds of social change is an area for future research.

Conclusions

We have cautioned throughout this paper that generational differences may be more myth than reality in terms of how these differences affect the work place and governance in particular. For example, in our interviews, we found far more agreement

than disagreement across generations on important issues such as professional values and fundamental roles and responsibilities of the board and the executive director. The theme that seems to warrant the most attention for both practice and research concerns technology and generational differences associated with skills, attitudes, and experiences toward technology. “Experience with” or “attitudes toward” technology, for example, are potentially variables that deserve attention as critical contingencies related to governance, especially with regard to board-executive relationships and board activities, such as boundary-spanning.

In terms of practice, we offer in Appendix II a **Technology and Communication Assessment Guide** to help evaluate the comfort level board and staff members in using technology for their communications.

References

- Annie E. Casey Foundation. 2005. "Up Next: Generation Change and the Leadership of Nonprofit Organizations"
- Arsenault, P., Patrick, M. 2008. "Are the shoes appropriate to wear? A study of cohort values." *Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing*, Vol. 16,2, pp.99-107.
- Bradshaw, P. and Jackson, P. 2007. "Loyal Opposition". *The Nonprofit Quarterly*, Vol. 14 (2) Summer reprinted with permission from *CAmagazine*, published by the Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants, Toronto.
- Brinkerhoff, P. 2007. *Generations: The Challenge of a Lifetime for Your Nonprofit*. Fieldstone Alliance. St. Paul.
- Beutell, N.J. and Wittag Beurman, U. 2008. "Work-family conflict and work-family synergy for Generation X, Baby Boomers and Matures: Generational differences, predictors, and satisfaction outcomes." *Journal of Management Psychology*. 23(5): 507-523.
- Down, S. and Reveley, J. 2004. "Generational encounters and the social formation of entrepreneurial identities: "Young guns" and "Old farts." *Organization*. 11(2):233-250.
- Geller, S. and Salamon, L. 2008. "A Nonprofit Workforce Action Agenda." *Communique #10*. www.jsu.edu/listeningpost/news.
- Kramer, R.. 1981. *Voluntary Agencies in the Welfare State*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- . 1987. "Voluntary agencies and the personal social services." In *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, edited by W.W. Powell. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kupperschmidt, B. 2000 "Multigeneration Employees: Strategies for Effective Management". *Health Care Manager*, Vol. 19,1, pp.65-76.
- Lyons, S.T., Duxbury, L. and Higgins, C. 2007. "An empirical assessment of generational differences in basic human values." *Psychology Reports*. 101: 339-352.
- Mannheim, K. 1952. *Ideology and utopia: An introduction to the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Harcourt Brace and Co.
- McMullin, J.A., Comeau, T.D. and Jovic, E. 2007. "Generational affinities and discourses of differences: A case study of highly skilled information technology workers." *British Journal of Sociology*. 58(2): 297-316..
- Middleton, M. (1987). Nonprofit boards of directors: Beyond the governance function." In W.W. Powell (Ed.), in *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook*, (pp.141-153). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Murray, Victor, V. Patricia Bradshaw, and Jacob Wolpin. 1992. "Power in and around nonprofit boards: A neglected dimension of governance." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* 3:165-182.

Ostrower, F. 2007. "Nonprofit Governance in the United States: Findings on Performance and Accountability from the First National Representative Study" The Urban Institute.

Ostrower, F. and Stone, M.M. 2006. "Governance: Research Trends, Gaps and Future Prospects" The Nonprofit Sector : A Research Handbook, Second Edition. Walter W. Powell and Richard Steinberg, editors. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Ostrower, F. and Stone, M.M. "Board Accountability and Engagement: A Framework and Application." Paper presented at the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management conference, November 6-8, 2008, Los Angeles, CA.

Pfeffer, J. and Salancik, G. 1978. The External Control of Organizations. New York: Harper and Row.

Provan, Keith. 1980. "Board power and organizational effectiveness among human service organizations." *Academy of Management Journal* 23:221-236.

Rotolo, T., Wilson, J. 2004. "What Happened to the 'Long Civic Generation'? Explaining Cohort Differences in Volunteerism" *Social Forces*, Vol 82,3, pp. 1091-1121.

Salamon, L. and Geller, S. 2007. "The Nonprofit Workforce Crisis: Real or Imagined?" *Communique* #8. www.jsu.edu/listeningpost/news.

Vanderwall, K. and Benavides, E. 2006. "Coloring Outside the Box; One Size Does Not Fit All in Nonprofit Governance." www.MapforNonprofits.org.

Yang, S-B. and Guy, M.E. 2006. "GenXers versus Boomers: work motivators and management implications." *Public Performance and Management Review*. 29(3):267-284.

Zald, Mayer. 1967. "Urban differentiation, characteristics of boards of directors, and organizational effectiveness." *American Journal of Sociology* 73:261-272.

----- . 1969. "The power and functions of boards and directors: A theoretical synthesis." *American Journal of Sociology* 75:97-111.

Appendix I. Interview Questions

1. What is your level of education achieved?
 - a. What was your area of concentration/major?
2. Do you think the age difference has an affect on your relationship with your board/executive?
 - a. If so, what do you think are the affects?
 - i. Work style differences?
 - ii. Decision-making differences?
 - iii. Work-life balance differences
3. What do you believe are the most important responsibilities of your board?
 - a. What do you think the board/ED thinks are its most important responsibilities?
4. What do you think are the most important responsibilities of the executive?
 - a. What do you think the ED/board sees the ED's most important responsibilities?
5. Do you have a multi-generational board?
 - a. Was that an intentional recruitment strategy? If so, why?
 - i. What are the hoped for outcomes?
 - ii. Have those outcomes become realized?
 1. If so, how./ If not, why not?
6. Do you see generational differences in attitudes and skills concerning technology?
 - a. If so, what are they?
 - i. What do you think is the impact of those differences?
7. Do you think having a multi-generational board affects the board executive relationship?
 - a. If so, how?
8. Please identify 5 of your core professional/personal values?
 - a. Do you think the board shares them?
 - b. If not, what do you think they do not share?
9. Do you think you are more formally educated than most of your board members?
 - a. If so, what do you think are the effects of that discrepancy?
10. Age
11. Organizational Budget

Appendix II. Technology and Communication Assessment Guide

This assessment is to find out your comfort with using various technologies to communicate with others. The information will be used to determine when and if additional training and development are necessary as we use technology to further the work of the board of directors.

Please check the box that best describes your current situation

Hardware

I do not have access to a computer	I have access but do not own a computer	I own a computer but rarely use it	I have a computer and use it sometimes	I have a computer and use it frequently

Cell Phone

I do not own a cell phone	I own a cell phone and rarely use it	I own a cell phone and use it for calls only	I have a cell phone and use it for calls and texting	I have a smart phone and use it for calls, calendar, email, etc.

Social Networking

I prefer to do this face to face	I prefer to do this face to face but know what Facebook is	I am comfortable with either face to face and Facebook	I primarily use Facebook	I only use Twitter, Facebook, etc.

Communication Preference

I only use the phone	I use the phone and email	I use phone, email and Facebook/Twitter	I use phone, Facebook/Twitter and IM (instant messaging)	I use phone, Facebook/Twitter, IM, Skype and Chat