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GENDER AND THE GOVERNANCE AND PERFORMANCE OF NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS: WOMEN AND THE UNITED WAY

Women comprise the majority of nonprofit employees and volunteers; however, board membership and board and executive leadership still skews towards male. I contend that this is due to the gendered nature of institutions and the expected gender status beliefs held regarding female leaders within them. Institutional logics, a meta-theory of institutional theory, is defined as the “socially constructed, historical patterns of cultural symbols and material practices, including assumptions, values and beliefs, by which individuals and organizations provide meaning to their daily activity, organize time and space, and reproduce their lives and experiences” (Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012, p.2). I posit that these socially constructed beliefs include gender status beliefs that consciously or subconsciously guide the assumptions made about women’s abilities to lead, whether as board members or executive directors of organizations. This work will review the potential influence of gender status beliefs and status characteristic theory on institutional logics through studying United Ways. What social structures may influence the recruitment of women to United Way boards of directors? Does the gender composition of the board impact performance? And do women in these roles work to actively represent the interests of women and girls? These research questions are addressed, grounded in status characteristic theory and institutional logics, using longitudinal data from a nationally representative sample of United Ways. This research contributes a new theoretical way of understanding gender and boards of directors, as well as board governance of grant-making nonprofits.
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Chapter 1:

Introduction

The nonprofit sector has historically been a major source of employment, outlet for volunteerism, and provider of leadership opportunities for women in the United States (Joiner, 2015; O’Neill, 1994; Ostrower & Stone, 2007). The U.S. nonprofit sector has a majority of female employees (Themudo, 2009; Gazley, 2015). Women also comprise the majority of the volunteer labor force in the United States (Rotolo & Wilson, 2006; Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2016). However, board membership and executive leadership of nonprofit organizations still skews on average slightly towards men, and there is an even greater imbalance in the largest nonprofits (Gibelman, 2000; Preston, 1994; Pynes, 2000; Ostrower, 2007). Boards draw on their communities for directors, and while women comprise just over half the U.S. population as of 2015 (51%; U.S. Census Bureau, 2016) their minority presence on boards suggest potential bias in the selection process. As of 2014 women comprise 43% of nonprofit board members, and this number decreases to 33% when observing only nonprofits with budgets of $25 million or more (Shankie, 2015). BoardSource’s (2017a) 2016 convenience sample survey of its membership found that 48% of reported board members and 42% of Board Chairs were female. Still, 28% of Executive Directors were unsatisfied with the amount of gender diversity on their boards. And while the nonprofit sector has more equal proportions of women vs. men as compared to the for-profit sector—19.2% of board seats in all S&P 500 companies are female as of 2014 (Catalyst, 2015)—there remains a gap that has yet to be explored.

Stone and Ostrower (2007) call for more research regarding how board composition affects
organizational performance. While there is a developing literature regarding nonprofit governance best practices, performance, and impact measurement systems, the governing mechanisms involved in developing and implementing these systems remain relatively unexplored, particularly in regard to the social composition of the board members themselves.

While institutional theory acknowledges the outside influence organizations have upon one another through isomorphism and organizational fields (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) the meta-theory of institutional logics identifies the “link between individual agency and cognition and socially constructed institutional practices and rule structures” (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008, p. 101). These socially constructed institutional practices are comprised of status beliefs.

Status characteristic theory states that gender status beliefs are different than gender stereotypes (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). Gender stereotypes are sets of beliefs about the individual traits, attributes, or behaviors expected of people given their gender or sex category. Gender status beliefs is the organizing principle that men are more socially valued and competent than women at things that “count,” and it establishes structural constraints and guidelines for institutional action. This is a useful way to understand organizational behavior and board dynamics, because it establishes rules of behavior and expectations within interactions and outcomes. Institutional logics are ingrained within this foundational organizing structure. I go further into depth on Status Characteristic Theory and gender status beliefs in Chapter 2.

Institutional logics, as defined by Thornton and Ocasio (2008), are the “socially constructed, historical patterns of cultural symbols and material practices, including assumptions, values and
beliefs, by which individuals and organizations provide meaning to their daily activity, organize time and space, and reproduce their lives and experiences” (Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012, p. 2). Logics manifest themselves at multiple levels of analysis, with seven ideal types of societal-level logics: family, religion, community, state, market, professions, and corporations (Besharov & Smith, 2014; Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012, p. 2). These ideal types are all infused with norms and beliefs that preexist and are perpetuated by the organizational structures they describe. They can be nested within one another, manifesting at multiple levels of analysis (Besharov & Smith, 2014). For example, Besharov & Smith (2014) highlight Thornton’s 2002 study that “described the [education publishing] industry’s editorial and market logics as derived from societal-level professional and market logics (p. 366). Gender and other demographic characteristics have yet to be studied in light of their potential influence on institutional logics. Gender status beliefs are key sets of expectations and norms regarding people within these logics and institutions that have yet to be analyzed systematically. Institutional logics are discussed in more detail in Chapter 2.

Representativeness of a demographic group can lead to organizational outcomes as well. The theory of representative bureaucracy states that representatives of particular groups can convey the concerns and values of that group in organizational settings (Keiser, Wilkins, Meier & Holland, 2002; Krislov, 1974; Meier, 1975; Mosher, 1968). The gendered beliefs of women and their particular concerns may be transmitted through the representation of women on boards of directors. This relationship will be discussed further in Chapters 2 and 6.

Given institutional logics and representative governance, how do status beliefs manifest in the
organizational practices of a nonprofit? Are the governance and performance of U.S. nonprofit organizations affected by the gender composition of their board and executive leaders? This research seeks to understand gender status beliefs’ effect on nonprofit governance and performance through institutional logics. How does gender play out in the creation and performance of nonprofit boards and executive leadership? I argue that one of the most salient organizing principles influencing board composition and performance is that of the gender status belief system, whose existence may lead to predictable performance outcomes. Given the social expectation of gender status beliefs of the superiority of men in certain situations and at certain tasks, we may expect to see an impact on board composition itself, on the performance of the organization financially, and on the giving of grant-making organizations. Using the United Way system as the focus, I investigate the relationships between social characteristics, the gender composition of United Way leadership and boards, and measures of financial performance through the amount of allocations they distribute and to whom.

In Chapter Two, I will review the extant literature regarding institutional logics, status characteristic theory and how they relate. Chapter Three will present the main dataset used for these studies and the methods behind its collection. Chapters Four through Six will provide empirical tests testing hypotheses related to the overarching research question presented above. First, I will investigate the antecedents and expectations that lead to the gender composition of United Way boards of directors. Next, following the findings of recent studies regarding for-profit organizations, I will test whether the gender composition of the board and its executive leadership is related to the organization’s programmatic performance. Thirdly, I will delve more specifically into performance to see whether the gender composition of the board is related to the
funding of particular organizations, particularly those that explicitly focus on women and girls. These organizations will be identified through their names and missions. This chapter will delve into state and corporate logics and the expectation of representative bureaucracy. I will conclude with a discussion of the findings as a whole and their implications for nonprofit organizations.
Chapter 2:

Theoretical Framework

Sex and Gender

The terms “sex” and “gender” are often used interchangeably, but are in fact different. West and Zimmerman (1987) clarify the terminology in their seminal piece “Doing Gender.” Sex refers to one’s biological reproductive physiology and the way in which it is be categorized within the socially accepted definitions of what is male and female. Those sex categories are “socially required identificatory displays that proclaim one’s membership in one or the other category” (p.127). Our sex is not generally on public display, but the accepted corresponding behavior is used as a social identifier and a means of setting expectations of how one should act and how one should be interacted with. These cues and expectations lead to gender, which is, according to West and Zimmerman, the behavior and active management of one’s membership to a particular sex category.

Gender is not an intrinsic characteristic, but a system of dividing people, rather than recognizing natural variation. Despite the oversimplification of the division, gender status beliefs have long established norms for social arrangements, behavior, and even reasoning (Ferree & Hess, 1987; Ridgeway, 1997; Risman, 2004; West & Zimmerman, 1987). Martin (2003) conceptualizes gender as a social institution that endures across time and space, entails distinct social practices, and establishes and constrains behavioral norms. The power structure and norms of gender are internalized by individuals and express themselves as personalities, or “gender displays” (West & Zimmerman, 1987). These displays include how one dresses, speaks, and interacts with others. Schilt and Westbrook’s (2009) case study showed that gender was signified by clothing choice,
hairstyles, and intonation of voice. The “gender displays” involved in interactions between
gender pairs is also telling. Goffman (1976) provides the example of the differences between a
man and women being awarded prizes, medals, or diplomas. Two men shake hands and the
award is bestowed, whereas if the recipient is a woman, she may be offered a social kiss. For
example, when Alene Duerk was promoted to be the first female admiral in the U.S. Navy's
history, the male officiate “added to what was done by kissing her full on the lips” (p. 70). The
male gender display here was one of dominance and over-familiarity with the woman.

Children are socialized to the norms of the gender system through exposure to the practices and
ideologies that associate maleness and femaleness to a range of attributes that are assigned social
and functional significance (Bem, 1983). Imagine a baby is born. One of the first details
recorded in the hospital besides length and weight is its sex (Fletcher, 1998). Thanks to modern
medicine and advancing technology, it is possible that its parents have been aware of the baby’s
gender neonatally and have already begun assigning it to the social and behavioral categories
associated to that sex. Gender is a diffuse status characteristic, meaning it carries “very general
expectations for competence, in addition to specific expectations for greater or lesser competence
at particular tasks” (Correll & Ridgeway, 2003, p. 32). For example, men are often attributed to
be more competent with computers, mechanical tasks, and general attributes of stereotypical
leadership, while women are attributed with less of these technical skills and rather more
nurturing characteristics such as cooperativeness, mentorship, and collaborative engagement
(Correll & Ridgeway, 2003; Eagly, 2007). Bem (1974) established the Sex Role Inventory of
masculine, feminine, and neutral attributes. The masculine attributes include “act as a leader,”
“analytical,” “makes decisions easily,” and “willing to take risks,” (p. 156) while the feminine
traits include “childlike,” “soft spoken,” “gullible,” and “yielding.” (p. 156). Value is attributed to each gender dependent upon these general and specific expectations of competence and value attributed to that characteristic. Socialization amongst men and women places more value on male-associated attributes, as they are more highly socially desirable. These gender status beliefs are key to the endurance of the gender bias in that they maintain the hierarchy of one gender over the other (Correll, 2004; Martin, 2004; Risman, 2004).

**Institutional Logics**

There is evidence to assert a rather controversial argument: that organizational theory claims to be gender-neutral, while it is in fact male-dominant (Acker, 1990; Orlaff, 1993). One can assume that the concept of an ideal worker is based solely on their individual merits. However, Acker (1990) describes the ideal worker as the “disembodied worker;” where merit is based on the ability to work at all hours, do whatever it takes, and have a worker who can place their job as the exclusive priority. This ideal-type worker would preclude those with demands from their personal lives and those with responsibilities that would split their interests. Women are at the natural disadvantage as they still handle the majority of housework/caregiving regardless of their job requirements (Bittman, England, Sayer, Folbre & Matheson, 2003; Brines, 1994; Hartmann, 1981). Men also hold the majority of positions in work institutions where a lot of formative organizational theory was established, such as the work of Weber (1946), Waldo (1948), and Taylor (1914), making their observations and the theories derived from them inherently male-centric. For example, Taylor’s “time and motion” observations were of all male-workrooms with male leadership. In Taylor’s *The Principals of Scientific Management* (1914), each reference to the worker is through using the words “man,” “men,” or “workman.” Weber analyzed the public
bureaucracy, which at that time was predominantly male. The ideal type bureaucracy for Weber included a strong hierarchy, which would, especially at that time, place men above women (Weber, 1946; Acker, 1990). Calás and Smircish (1991) note that women entered organizational research through the second wave of the women’s liberation movement in the 1960s and 1970s through what they call ‘women in management’ research. This, they argue, occurred because “the biological entities—women—suddenly arrived into management…prior to the entrance of women there is (apparently) no ‘gender’ in management” (p. 229).

Institutions have motivations to follow certain prescribed practices in order to remain competitive. DiMaggio and Powell (1983) developed the concept of isomorphism, or the "constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions" (p. 149). Organizations are competing for resources and customers, as well as legitimacy and power. Pressure to conform can be driven by outside sources within their sectors or fields, by funders, or by social norms and expectations. The choice to mimic other organizational models may be made if the leaders of one organization assess that the other model is more efficient and effective than their own (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Scott & Davis, 2007; Thornton & Osacio, 2008). The result of conforming to these practices is isomorphism.

March and Olsen (1989) and DiMaggio and Powell (1983) incorporate the human agency behind institutions. March and Olsen (1989) coin the “logic of appropriateness” that guides certain types of behaviors within organizations and fields. Mackay, Kenny, and Chappell (2010) highlight the work of DiMaggio and Powell (1991) writing: “Yet while institutions are seen to be powerful
constraints on human agency, they are also viewed as products of human agency, constructed through processes of negotiation, conflict and contestation” (p. 575). Status beliefs, particularly about gender, can set this logic of appropriateness and influence the balance of power in these negotiations, conflicts, and contestations.

Institutional logics are a meta-theory to evaluate institutional theories, but they focus more on the role of culture, cognition, and taken-for-granted rules of behavior that may not be rational, but must be undertaken for organizational legitimacy (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Selznick, 1948; Zucker, 1977). Selznick (1948), for example, argues that organizations can be viewed as adaptive social structures. There are seven ideal types of logics proposed in the literature that can operate alone or in combination in a given situation: family, community, religion, state, market, profession, and corporation (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Marquis, Glynn & Davis, 2007; Thornton, 2004; Thornton & Ocasio, 1999; Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012). Each has “building blocks” that detail, “how individuals and organizations, if influenced by any one institutional order, are likely to understand their sense of self and identity” (Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012, p. 54). These include sources of legitimacy, sources of authority, sources of identity, and basis of norms (p. 72). While gender is not discussed as a background identity to these logics, it is explicitly referenced by Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury (2012) within the sources of authority for both the family logic (“patriarchal domination”) and religion logic (“priesthood charisma”) (p. 72). Each of these logics, being products of the social norms surrounding them, are infused with gender status beliefs that consciously or subconsciously affect the presence and performance on women in their sphere. The social expectation of women to be lacking the same leadership abilities as men may impact how frequently they speak up in
board meetings, alter how assertive they are in the decision-making process, and prevent them from asking difficult questions to avoid appearing too difficult.

Thornton, Ocasio and Lounsbury (2011) write that “conceptualized as a theoretical model, each institutional [logic] of the interinstitutional system distinguishes unique organizing principals, practices, and symbols that influence individual and organizational behavior” (p.2). Thornton and Ocasio (2008) delineate some key features of institutional logics. First, there is embedded agency where outcomes depend on the interplay between individuals and institutional structures. Next, logics add the normative forces that drive organizational forms and decision-making and provide a contingent set of social norms. In addition, logics are fluid and can change over time as systems of beliefs and behavior change.

Institutional theory and logics establish organizations as existing and interacting with their environments and other organizations (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Thornton & Ocasio, 2008; Tolbert & Zucker, 1983). As opposed to rational theory, organizational leaders are motivated not only by rational, efficiency concerns, but also by societal pressures and “mindless behavior in response to cultural rationalization” (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008, p. 100). Rationality is rejected in favor of using cognitive shortcuts in the form of assumptions, beliefs, and mimetic behavior of similar organizations (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Tolbert & Zucker, 1983). Institutional logics describe contradictory practices and beliefs inherent in the institutions, with each institution possessing one or more sets of logics that constrain or prescribe its behaviors. The focus is not solely on isomorphism, but on the differentiated effects of inherent belief systems on individuals and organizations in a variety of contexts, how they shape rational, mindful behavior, and how
individuals and organizational actors in turn shape and change these logics, given that they are socially constructed and are not static (Thornton & Ocasio, 2008).

**Status Characteristic Theory and Gender Status Beliefs**

As per Ridgeway and Bourg (2005) status beliefs are “widely shared cultural beliefs that inform people of the status relationship between one social group and another in society” (p. 219). Status beliefs create inequality at the “social relational level,” forming people’s expectations for one another in social interaction (Ridgeway, 2014, p. 3; Berger et al. 1977). What people believe are status characteristics, such as the ability to do math or leadership skills, derive from these status beliefs (Berger et al. 1977; Ridgeway & Bourg, 2005; Ridgeway & Correll, 2004). They establish hierarchical dominance of one group over another.

According to Rashotte and Webster (2005), gender is frequently a salient factor in social interaction for three key reasons. First, gender classification is one of the most common that people make; gender displays communicate to others the gender group to which they feel they belong and can be assessed by others in a few seconds. Secondly, there are “roughly equal numbers of men and women in society making cross-group interaction maximally likely” (Rashotte & Webster 2005, p. 619; Ridgeway & Smith-Lovin, 1999). The likelihood of being in a mixed sex setting is extremely high and will make assessing gender displays and assigning the appropriate gender belief to an individual virtually automatic. Finally, “interactions between women and men usually occur in structural contexts of roles and status relationships that are unequal” (Rashotte & Webster 2005, p.619). Most United Way boards of directors, for example, have at least one woman serving. As per Status Characteristic Theory, a branch of expectation
states theory, our cultural beliefs attach greater social value to one status over another, creating social hierarchies and attaching expectations of ability and behavior upon individuals (Anderson, Berger, Cohen & Zelditch, 1966; Berger, Cohen & Zelditch, 1972; Ridgeway, 2001; Ridgeway & Bourg, 2005; Simpson, Willer & Ridgeway, 2012). Gender is a diffuse status characteristic, salient in most situations, with men historically having the advantage of being considered more competent than women (Correll, 2004; Ridgeway, 2001; Ridgeway & Bourg, 2005). Status Characteristic Theory states that a gender status belief is different than a gender stereotype, however. Gender stereotypes are sets of beliefs about the types of traits, attributes, or behaviors that are expected of a person given their gender or sex category. Gender status beliefs establish a foundational understanding that men are more socially valued and competent than women at things that “count.” (Berger et al, 1977; Correll, 2004; Ridgeway & Correll, 2006). Status beliefs are at the core of gender stereotypes (Ridgeway, 2001). This is a self-perpetuating status generalization that occurs at the individual level as well as the institutional and more global levels. Some empirical evidence demonstrating the background role of gender beliefs has been found. Research by Sell (1997) experimentally tested whether gender composition of a pair of individuals impacted their giving to public goods. The theory was that men paired with women would take a proactive role, take more risks, and their higher contributions would encourage women to donate more in later rounds. Sell found that male-female pairs cooperated better than males paired with males, or women paired with either men or women, and females gave more in subsequent rounds following the male’s lead. MacNell, Driscoll and Hunt (2014), for example, studied whether student course evaluations were influenced by a student’s ability to identify the gender of an online course instructor by name. Either a male or female instructor’s name identified sections of the class. A man and a woman taught the course online, but the man and
woman swapped classes mid-way through the course. Even though a woman taught half of each course, students gave lower performance evaluations when they believed their course was being taught exclusively by a woman.

While there is great intersectionality regarding the relative advantages and disadvantages faced due to gender, race, class, and other socio-demographic characteristics (Collins, 2000; Glenn 1999; hooks, 1984; McCall, 2005), this research focuses exclusively on gender. Gender draws divisional lines establishing differing social norms and expected behavioral practices within categories of class, ethnicity and race, educational level, and age (Acker, 2006; McCall, 2005; Risman, 2004).

Status beliefs are generally not consciously implemented, as many people will claim that they do not see differences in competence between men and women and do not agree that the sexes are unequal. Yet, these status beliefs still influence institutional logics, as Thornton, Ocasio, and Lounsbury (2012) explain, “…individuals and organizations, if only subliminally, are aware of the differences in the cultural norms, symbols, and practices of different institutional orders and incorporate this diversity into their thoughts, beliefs, and decision making” (p.4). Lab studies and experiments have found time and again that certain genders are still associated with beliefs of competence and ability, and certain types of outward behavior. For example, Smith-Lovin, Skvoretz and Hudson (1986) found that men controlled about twice the discussion time as women in mixed-sex groups of six college students. Rashotte and Webster (2005) found that men and women still associated competence differently according to gender for specific tasks and would hypothetically hire according to gender-typed jobs. Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, and Xu
(2002) established that stereotypes of competence and warmth (agentic and communal traits) are particularly salient for status and gender. Status beliefs are important when looking at leadership and ability (Ridgeway, 2001). Men are often associated with being more competent in leadership positions, whether true or not, and subconsciously both men and women are affected by this shared belief.

Both men and women share beliefs in the roles and competencies of women. Glick and Fiske (2001) found that across 19 nations and over 15,000 participants, women rejected hostile sexism, but “often endorsed benevolent sexism” (p. 109) in which the role of men is to protect and care for women, in exchange for women having less status and power. Bem (1975) sampled 50 male and 50 female college undergraduates and found a significant (p<0.05) proportion of both men and women associated the terms “acts as a leader” and “has leadership abilities” with men, while both men and women associated the terms “yielding,” “compassionate,” “gullible,” and “loyal” with women. Similar surveys were undertaken by Street & Meek (1980), Street, Kimmel, & Kromrey (1995), and Holt and Ellis (1998) with results still showing these terms were still associated with males and females.

Gender status beliefs are a precursor to institutional logics. They comprise the cognitive shortcuts, the societal pressures, and constraints, and shape the normative and instrumental choices organizations make. Each individual brings gender as a “background identity” that:

“…Operates as an implicit, cultural/cognitive presence that colors people’s activities in varying degrees but that is rarely the ostensible focus of what is going on in the situation…although gender beliefs are cognitively primed for individuals in virtually all social relational contexts, the impact of those beliefs on behavior and evaluations is not invariant across such contexts… Thus, in most contexts, gender becomes a bias in the way one enacts the role of manager, clerk, flight attendant, or student rather than a
coherent and independent set of behaviors in itself. This is another way of understanding
the insight that gender is something one “does” rather than “is” (Ridgeway & Correll,

The social environment in which an organization exists instills its status beliefs on institutional
logics and therefore organizational practices. And while race also plays a formative role in the
intersectionality of these processes, the gender divide exists within racial groups themselves
making minority-status women doubly burdened in institutional settings.

If gender is a system of beliefs that imbue all interactions and institutions with cues of social
norms and accepted practices, then truly it has a larger role to play (West & Zimmerman, 1987;
Ridgeway & Correll, 2004, Martin, 2003; Martin, 2004; Deutsch, 2007). Gender is socially
constructed, and therefore there exist foundational assumptions as to what is male and masculine,
and what is female or feminine. I argue that based on the acknowledged pre-existence of social
norms, gender status beliefs inform all institutional logics and act as a normative background
operating system in which organizational practices take place (Figure 2.1). These beliefs also are
transmitted through the representation of women and their interaction with men in formal
organizations.

Gender is the foundation of all social norms and, in turn, is foundational to organizational
theories and practices. Once we allow for this basic assumption and account for it within
organizational processes, we see that decision-making regarding programming, evaluation,
accountability, and outcome/impact measurement are distilled from socially ingrained gender
beliefs and bias (whether overt or covert) regarding the abilities of the individuals involved.
Viewing gender status beliefs as foundational to all behavior adds a crucial missing element to existing and developing organizational theory. Gender manifests itself through the processes of group decision-making and executive leadership (Acker 1990; Acker 2006; Apesteguia, Azmat, & Iriberri 2012; Baines, Charlesworth, Cunningham, and Dassinger 2012; Barasko, 2007; Nielsen & Huse, 2010). The impact that gender has on nonprofit organizational theories and practice is still an area that needs further inquiry and understanding.

We tend not to discuss gender systematically or across scholarly disciplines. Organizational performance has been investigated through decision-making and nonprofit management in general, but few attempts have been made to unify these threads in light of the social frameworks implicit in all organizational interactions. Some exceptions have attempted to look at gender in the nonprofit context. Dimitriadis, Lee, Ramarajan and Battilana (2017) analyzed the effect gender composition of nonprofit boards of directors has on the use of commercial activity. They
found that female social venture founders use commercial practices to a lesser extent than their male founder counterparts. They also found that as the number of women business owners in the community increases, the more likely women social venture founders were to use commercial practices. Siciliano’s (1996) study that found gender diversity on the board of directors for 240 YMCAs positively impacted the fulfillment of the organization’s goals. Another study is Bradshaw, Murray and Wolpin’s (1996) research on the board composition of nonprofit organizations and perceived performance. They found that women were more likely to sit on less prestigious boards with lower revenue, but found no relationship between the percentage of women on the board and change in annual budget. Dimitriadis et al (2017) do not mention Status Characteristic Theory but do support their hypotheses from gender status beliefs. Siciliano (1996) and Bradshaw et al. (1996) observe gender as a variable potentially impacting performance independent to other factors, but provide no theoretical framework to as to why gender would be pertinent to the organization’s performance. Siciliano (1996) draws on resource dependence theory and that board members each bring different resources to the organization. They also discuss the board’s role to serve as an internal control function, but they do not expand upon why gender would explicitly matter in either of these theories. Bradshaw et al. (1996) base their hypotheses on Sciciiano’s work and research that women may have different leadership styles than men.

**Representative Bureaucracy and Gender Beliefs**

Another avenue of thought is representative bureaucracy. Pitkin (1967) critiques representative bureaucracy, stating that “[t]he representative does not act for others; he ‘stands for’ them, by virtue of a correspondence or connection between them, a resemblance or reflection” (p. 61).
Pitkin argues that a “good spokesman” can speak on behalf of a group but descriptive representation does not lead to acting on behalf of a group. Other scholars of representative bureaucracy state that passive representation of a particular demographic group within the administrative system will translate into active or functional representation in the outcomes of that group’s activities (Keiser, Wilkins, Meier & Holland, 2002; Krislov, 1974; Mosher, 1968). The social origins of the individual alter its socialization experiences and therefore the values it possesses (Meier, 1975). Socialization based on demographics impacts one’s behavior, whether it is due to race, gender, or other characteristics. Inherent in this socialization process is the sharing of status beliefs. This research will use Meier’s (1993) definition of representative bureaucracy which is: “A bureaucracy is representative in the passive sense if the bureaucrats share the same demographic origins (race, sex, education, religion, etc.) as the general population . . . A bureaucracy is an active representative if it produces policy outputs that benefit the individuals who are passively represented” (p. 393). The major focus of representative bureaucracy research tends to be on federal, state and local bureaucratic agencies, but this research applies the representative bureaucracy framework to community serving nonprofit organizations. The theory supports the belief that the presence of women and minorities within an organization will improve the organization’s responsiveness to the needs of those populations and potentially service delivery (Krislov, 1974; Meier, 1975; Kennedy, 2014). Key to representative bureaucracy is that the individual has the power to impact outcomes.

The nonprofit setting of this study is unique in that the board of directors of a charity are usually prominent people in the community, already distinguishing themselves in some demographic categories such as education and class from the recipients of their organization’s services.
Mosher (1968) argues that while top-level bureaucrats may not fully passively represent the population, they may “assure active representation of broad interests due to their education, experience, and political orientations” (Kennedy, 2014, p. 402). Researchers primarily find race and gender to be salient demographic characteristics for representative bureaucracy (Hindera, 1993a; Keiser, Wilkins, Meier, & Holland, 2002; Kennedy, 2014). The board of directors for a nonprofit organization is the legal fiduciary of the organization and are responsible for setting the goals and policies of the organization. They possess the discretion to guide programming decisions and bring their sociodemographic characteristics with them into the boardroom. These policy and funding discussion are where the gender status beliefs of those on the board may become salient and impact how successful individuals are in being able to represent their particular demographic group.

What evidence is there that gender impacts the actions of bureaucrats? Research regarding women’s passive representation translating to active representation has been sparse with mixed findings. Neither Hindera (1993b) nor Seldon (1997) find that passive representation of women led to active representation. Research regarding representative bureaucracy within nonprofits specifically is sparse and primarily focuses on racial diversity. One nonprofit study (Ostrower 2007) finds that women’s representation on a representative sample of nonprofit boards was positively associated with “the percentage of clientele served by the nonprofit that are female” (p. 19) but direction of the relationship is not clear. Gittell, Covington and Gross (1994) find that increased representation of women on the boards of neighborhood development organizations was related to increased likelihood that the organization provides childcare, eldercare and other programs targeted to women. Having a female Executive Director, however, had no significant impact on types of programming offered. In other fields, we find more research. Dolan (2002)
finds that gender impacts attitudes toward spending priorities controlling for organizational socialization amongst federal Senior Executive Service members. Attitudes towards spending mimic the gendered priorities of the public. Meier and Nicholson-Crotty (2006) find that “the percentage of women police officers is positively associated with the number of reports of sexual assault and with the number of arrests for sexual assault” (p. 850). Legislatively, studies assess whether women’s passive representation translates to active representation, with the results being in the affirmative (Bratton & Haynie, 1999; Reingold, 2006). Patterns of female representation and philanthropic giving will be discussed in Chapter 6.

Are there patterns in women’s giving that may be predicted by the presence of women in the funding decision-making process? There are a few corroborated findings (for more details see the working paper literature review by Mesch (2009)). Women are more likely to give to educational causes (Einolf, 2006; Piper & Schnepf, 2008; Rooney, Brown, & Mesch, 2007) and to human services, children, and health-related organizations (Einolf, 2006; Marx, 2000; Midlarsky & Hannah, 1989; Piper & Schnepf, 2008). The Women’s Philanthropy Institute’s Women Give 2010 Part 2 report indicated that out of a sample of approximately 2,500 single-headed households, women were more likely than men to give donations across all charitable subsectors, particularly to international, community, religious, health care, and youth or family organizations (Women’s Philanthropy Institute, 2010). IUPUI Women’s Philanthropy Institute’s study “Giving to Women and Girls: Who Gives and Why?” (Mesch, Osili, Pactor, Ackerman, Bergdoll, & Dale, 2016) finds that while in a nationally representative survey sample of donors, women were more likely to give to women and girls supporting organizations, only 14.6 percent of donors reporting giving to organizations that impact women and girls in particular.
Women and Organizational Leadership

The workplace is one of the most prevalent sources of perpetuating gender status beliefs through institutional logics, yet scholars have studied these organizations primarily through gender-blind methods (Acker, 1990; Acker, 1992). Organizations are studied for their structure or relationship to their environment, but do not acknowledge that men are quite frequently the managers and have positions higher on organizational hierarchies, with women and minorities generally at lower levels. Gender, Acker (1990, 1992) argues that organizational theories are gender biased in favor of male dominance and the “disembodied worker”—the worker free of gender, personal, and physical needs and wants. The concept of “woman” was “grafted onto the pre-existing structures of questioning” (Calás & Smircich, 1991, p. 229). Over the past 30 years, research has emerged that is critical of the notion that organizational theory is gender neutral and has begun to produce empirical evidence of the gender inequalities perpetuated within the workplace (Joshi, Son & Roh, 2015; Martin, 2003; Pratto, Stallworth, Sidanius & Siers, 1997). For example, Mueller, Mulinge, and Glass (2002) found that in mixed gender research teams, men enjoy more autonomy, have higher pay, have heavier workloads, and experience greater group cohesion and less role ambiguity than their female counterparts. Women in highly masculinized workplaces, such as female police officers, may be expected to perform in a highly masculinized manner (Mastracci & Bowman, 2015) or in more feminized leadership styles when confronted with leading male-dominated organizations (Nicholson-Crotty, 2005). The community, profession, and corporation institutional logics can be observed through women attempting to be part of a group, and gain status in their profession and within the institutional hierarchy.
The community in which the organization resides provides the resources that assist the organization’s efforts towards professionalization. If the community is small or rural, examples of professionalized organizations may be slim to choose from. The size of the business community may not support the expectations of local nonprofits in terms of providing “professional” or male leadership. In contrast, large cities provide both examples of professionalized organizations and a human resources pool of organizational experts. Social roles and workforce participation vary across geographic labor markets. For example, the entry of women into the labor force varies across rural-farm, rural non-farm, and urban areas (Ollenburger, Grana & Moore, 1989). Beggs (1995) finds that place impacts gender equality on the state level, with wage inequality lesser in states that have high support for equality. These issues relate to the community, profession, and corporation logics. Gender status beliefs’ impact on organizational leadership choices will be investigated in Chapter 4.

Gender status as per the status characteristic theory has an effect upon how women and men behave and interact in all settings (Ridgeway, 1997; Risman, 2004, West & Zimmerman, 1987). In formal organizational settings, we see that men often are attributed with the characteristics of leadership, ability with finances and numbers, and rationality, while women are often associated with sentimentality, social compassion and interpersonal skills (Beutel & Marini, 1995; Cech, Rubineau, Silbey, & Seron, 2011; Eagly, Diekman, Johannesen-Schmidt & Koenig, 2004; Nielsen & Huse, 2010). Historically, women professionals were cast as self-sacrificing and passive while true professionalism required the “confidence and self-assertion” (Muncy, 1991, pxiii) ascribed more frequently to men. The innate structure of gender status beliefs can be seen in Schilt and Westbrook’s (2009) case study that found that in the workplace, cisgendered men,
that is individuals with gender display that is culturally in alignment with their sex organs, found it easier to accept a transgendered heterosexual male (a female who displays or is transitioning to male) into the workplace than a homosexual male or masculine female. The transitioning female was welcomed into workplace conversations with men more frequently. These are just some examples of how the gender status belief system imposes itself on the organizational world.

Women’s leadership styles are not fully in line with managerialist methods embraced by professionalized organizations. Nearly 25 years ago, Schein and Davidson (1993) wrote their piece “Think Manager, Think Male,” with findings showing that business students still associated leadership characteristics such as “leadership,” “decisive,” and “skilled at business matters” with men. In 2003, Sczesny followed up on that study and found that “male and female [management students] estimated that female leaders possess person-oriented skills more often and task-oriented skills less often than leaders-in general” (p. 359), though there was more androgyny in the skills associated with female and male leaders than in earlier studies. Koenig, Eagly, Mitchell, and Ristikari (2011) find in their meta-analysis of stereotypical leadership qualities and gender that managerial skills were still more associated with men, though again, the effect was more for men and was declining in general. Baines, Charlesworth, Cunningham, and Dassinger (2012) find that feminized strategies of management depend on “idealized, female self-sacrifice and reinforce social justice ethics while [masculine strategies] challenge nonprofit ethics and alter work practices to be more consistent with managerialist aims” (p. 362). Baines, Charlesworth, and Cunningham (2015) find that as more men enter the predominantly female nonprofit sector of care work, “hegemonic, masculinist-oriented practices in the workplace appear to be more amenable to managerialism” (p. 459) and professionalism find that However,
Eagly (2007) contends that though effective leadership is contextual, some research shows that stereotypical feminine leadership styles such as cooperation, mentoring, and collaboration are key in many contexts. Leadership styles are key to corporate logics and gender status beliefs operate through these logics to impact organization performance. This relationship will be explored in Chapter 5.

Viewing women’s participation from the representational bureaucracy framework, nonprofits would be normatively expected to be open to workforces and leadership that represent the communities they serve. This representation would fall in line with the idea of a community institutional logic. However, the nonprofit sector has become increasingly professionalized. They seek to mimic successful organizations and pursue continuous improvements. According to Hwang and Powell (2009), “In this context, a corpus of terms related to professionalism—such as professional, expert, expertise, authority—has acquired many varied and culturally elaborated connotations” (p. 269). If the status belief system establishes men to be associated with these terms and characteristics, and nonprofits seek to mimic successful organizations we would expect to see more men in leadership positions. As the profession institutional logic becomes more prevalent in nonprofits, it supports organizations’ move away from nonprofit leadership being representative of one’s community towards an effort to be professional, using successful for-profit institutions as their model. Representative bureaucracy and gender’s impact on organizational performance will be further explored in Chapter 6, viewing funding choices in light of gender composition of the board.
**Implications for Theory and Practice**

If these studies show us anything, it is that there is consensus that gender systems are institutionalized and establish rules of behavior in the workplace. While nonprofit boards are voluntary institutions, they still require interaction between genders and across power hierarchies. Nonprofit organizations exist to fulfill a mission, and the board is the steward of the practices chosen to achieve that mission. If this is the case, then gender, as a structural constraint will alter the results and outcomes of the interactions during discussion, board meetings, and decision-making processes. This is due to the salient presence of gender beliefs and group decision-making practices. This may also come into play if women serve in leadership roles of the organization and/or board, theoretically running the organization in a different stylistic manner.

This research seeks to advance theory and practice in three key ways. First, it seeks to expand upon the institutional theory of organizations by naming and expanding upon the key sociological basis of its operations. Status beliefs inherent in our everyday interactions change the way the organization operates and the processes by which it comes to decisions. Framing organizational behavior in this way provides insight into non-rational means of decision-making and organizational operations.

These studies expand the literature and research of gender composition effects into nonprofit management. The for-profit literature has begun to explore the impact of diversity on boards of directors, but, as highlighted above, little work has been done focusing on the nonprofit sector
and their boards that play a vital role in management of the organization. It addresses group work dynamics, gender composition, and leadership studies.

Finally, boards of directors play an instrumental role in nonprofit organizations. They are the legal representatives and stewards of the organization, ultimately responsible for organizational finances and program performance. They are responsible for monitoring the executive director (BoardSource, 2016; Worth, 2016). Providing a better understanding of how gender composition may influence performance and decision-making would be beneficial knowledge for any nonprofit board. It can provide self-awareness to one’s own board composition in a way that may help the board operate and work together. This research attempts to answer the question of how gendered expectations of women influence the presence of women on boards, and what women’s impact is on performance, governance, and outcomes of U.S. nonprofit organizations. In the subsequent chapters, I will present supporting literature and empirical tests to assess:

- Whether community level logics and expectations of women impact the gender composition of nonprofit boards of directors;
- Whether the presence of women on these boards impacts overall performance;
- And, more specifically, what benefits may accrue to women- and girl-serving partner organizations given the gender composition of grant-making boards.
Chapter 3:

Data

The United Way is a federated group of organizations overseen by United Way Worldwide, with the common mission of making an impact on their local communities by raising funds that support vetted local nonprofit service providers and programs, particularly in the areas of education, income, and health (United Way Worldwide, 2018a). Even with some mission variance, this structure allows us to hold relatively constant the values element across all organizations. While each branch has organizational autonomy, they receive support from United Way Worldwide through educational trainings, advertising, and strategic planning (United Way of the Greater Triangle, 2016).

Most United Way chapters have self-perpetuating boards, meaning the current board members and executive leadership recruit new board members from the community. The board then votes on whether the candidate will be accepted after preliminary meetings with current board members and/or the executive director. This board selection process is most frequent in the charitable sector (Ostrower, 2014; BoardSource, 2016) but has particular qualities. Board members are often selected based who is already on the board and would like to serve additional terms. More boards are instituting term limits—72% of those surveyed in BoardSource’s latest survey (2017) have board term limits, with two three-year terms being most popular—but this keeps the composition of the board fairly steady for years at a time. New board members are also recruited through the networks of existing members. Outreach may be done to certain individuals based on the skills they are believed to bring to the board as well, for example, financial abilities, marketing skills, or relationship with local labor chapters, which can be gendered positions.
United Ways are well known organizations within their communities. While individual United Ways may have similarities we can hold constant, there is wide variety in organizational size, location, and other community and social characteristics. There are currently approximately 1,200 United Ways in the United States.

This is a proportionately stratified one-stage cluster sample of full states using Census region (Northeast, South, Midwest, and West) and number of United Ways (UWs) per state as the two stratification variables. There were two size strata for each region: states with 1-25 UWs and those with 26+ UWs. The size stratum excludes the Midwest due to the fact that no Midwestern state had less than 26 United Ways and two states were to be selected per stratum. Within strata, states are selected probability proportionate to size, with the number of United Ways in the state being the measure of size. This criterion gives a higher chance of selection to states with larger number of UWs. Then, it’s a take-all design within cluster, since all United Ways from selected states will be included.

This analysis uses the data for 23 states: New Hampshire, Vermont New York and New Jersey in the Northeast; Maryland, Kentucky, Mississippi, Alabama, South Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, and Texas in the South; Kansas, Missouri, Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio in the Midwest; and Idaho, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, New Mexico, and California in the West. The current sample includes information on 612 United Ways. Information was collected for six points in time over 15 years: 2000, 2004, 2008, 2010, 2013, and 2015. The gaps in time allow us to view change over time as most board members serve for multiple years, and often two three-year terms are
recommended (BoardSource, 2017; Jardine, 2016; Weisman, 2001). According to a BoardSource survey, “three quarters of the [charity] respondents reported using three year terms” (BoardSource, 2017b, para. 3). The time gaps allow us to account for board turnover. The data used were collected through the transcription of publically available IRS 990 forms. The list of United Ways in the country comes from 2010 and was provided by United Way Worldwide.

The three key variables of interest in this study are the percentage of women on the board, and whether the board chair or executive director is female. These variables were coded using data procured through GuideStar. Data included all directors’ names as provided on the 990 form for each organization for each year. Missing data was hand transcribed when available from a GuideStar.org search using the organization’s 990 form. Approximately 132,000 names were analyzed across all time periods.

In order to methodically assess the gender of each name, the R package Gender was used. This package uses three historical datasets of name and gender affiliation: “the U.S. Social Security Administration’s baby name data…the U.S. Census data in the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, and the Kantrowitz corpus of male and female names” (Package ‘gender,’ 2018). Probabilities of a name being male or female were generated from each of the three databases and then averaged to reach one result. Names receiving a .50 probability were coded “either,” while other names not found in any dataset and were coded “N/A.” 3% of names from the sample were listed as ‘either’ or N/A (4,206 out of 123,411 GuideStar provided names). Examples of ‘either’ names include Kim, Pat, Randy, Leslie, and Lauren. These individuals were then individually researched on Google, beginning with search queries that included their name.
and the United Way with which they were affiliated. This procedure provided information on approximately two-thirds of individuals through news articles, photos, and LinkedIn and Facebook profiles. The remaining names were coded as male to include them in the analysis and provide conservative estimates of board composition. Approximately 8,000 additional names were collected via 990 forms for this sample. The 8,000 names were coded using the results from the original R package name probabilities.

While the names were coded through the R Gender program’s data, the number of board members reported, the number of women on each board, the percentage of women on the board, and the coding for whether the board chair and executive director were women were calculated individually using Excel. The author and two research assistants assessed each United Way for each year. The percentage of women on each board was calculated from the number of names actually reported on the 990 form. For instance, if there were 18 names listed on the 990 form and 6 were coded as probably female, the percentage 30% was calculated using those numbers. If there were only 4 members listed and 2 were female, the percentage 50% was calculated in the same manner. Some more recent 990 forms ask for the total number of voting board members, for example on line 3 for the 2015 form. This study included only names that were provided, not the given total number of board members listed in this manner. There were occasions where the number provided did not match the number of names recorded. GuideStar data provided the board position titles and this information was also hand collected for missing years from 990 forms. These titles allowed me to create binary variables Chair Female or ED Female, with 1=female board chair or female executive director. Basic descriptive statistics on these variables are available in Table 1 below.
Table 3.1 Descriptive Statistics of Key Gender Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ED Female</td>
<td>2,948</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Female</td>
<td>3,078</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Women</td>
<td>3,075</td>
<td>39.78</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Excluding Female Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over time we see clear change in these variables. For example, we see a clear increase in the number of women board chairs over time (Figure 3.1). We see an approximately 43% increase in the number of female board chairs, however, they are still in the minority.

Figure 3.1

[Bar chart showing gender of chair by year]

Women make up the majority of executive directors of this sample of United Ways, however they are making up a smaller proportion as time goes on (Figure 3.2).
The general distribution of women by percentage across United Way boards is fairly normal, with a slight right skew (Figure 3.3).

The average percentage of women on the board by year can be seen in Figure 3.4. It is slowly increasing over time. There’s been an approximately 16% increase in the number of women serving on United Way boards from 2000 through 2015.
Figure 3.2 Frequency Distribution of the Percentage of Women on Boards

Figure 3.4

Average Percentage of Women on UW Boards
Additional community level data was derived from multiple sources. United Ways often serve more than one county, so all county-level data was collapsed by the United Way service region as of 2010. Service regions were collected from the United Way Worldwide’s website at https://www.unitedway.org/local/united-states.

Population numbers derive from two sources. The county population numbers for 2000 and 2010 are provided by the U.S. Census Bureau’s decennial census. County population numbers for 2004, 2008, 2013, and 2015 were obtained through the U.S. Census Bureau’s Population Estimates Program (PEP). The PEP uses decennial population numbers and current data on “births, deaths, and migration to calculate population change since the most recent decennial census” (U.S. Census Bureau, 2016, para. 1). Population numbers were aggregated across service regions. Percent white calculations also derive from the U.S. Census Bureau’s Population Estimates Program for all years.

Size of the business community is calculated per 1,000 people in the service region. This data derives from the County Business Patterns data collected through the U.S. Census Bureau and the Department of Commerce (2000, 2004, 2008, 2010, 2013, 2015). Data derive from multiple sources: “the Economic Census, the Annual Survey of Manufactures, and Current Business Surveys, as well as from administrative records of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), the Social Security Administration (SSA), and the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS)” (U.S. Census Bureau Economic Statistics, 2017). These datasets were combined for all sample years and collapsed by United Way service region.
The number of farms was collected from the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Census of Agriculture. The information is available at the county level for the years 1997, 2002, 2007, and 2012. This is a complete count of all farms and ranches throughout the United States that make $1,000 or more on their products. Data for our sample years was interpolated for 2000, 2004, 2008, and 2010 and extrapolated for 2013 and 2015 using STATA based on the trends between Census years. All results were calculated per 1,000 people in the service region.

Poverty rates were collected from the U.S. Census Bureau’s Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates Program (SAIPE). A “combination of multiple regression estimation techniques and shrinkage techniques [were used] to create these estimates” (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017).

“Modelling relies on administrative data derived from tax returns, counts of participants in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, data from the Bureau of Economic Analysis, decennial census estimates, postcensal population estimates, and the American Community Survey (ACS)” (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017, para. 2). Calculations at the county level were modeled by overall number of people in poverty. According to the Census Bureau, year over year comparisons are more reliable from 2006 through 2015. Descriptive statistics for these community characteristics are below in Table 3.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables*</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Businesses per 1K</td>
<td>3,630</td>
<td>22.37</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>43.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3,630</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>87.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms per 1K Population</td>
<td>3,630</td>
<td>357.95</td>
<td>932.40</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>10991.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population by 1K</td>
<td>3,630</td>
<td>14.99</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>44.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Poverty Rate</td>
<td>3,630</td>
<td>85.06</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>23.70</td>
<td>99.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average % White</td>
<td>3,630</td>
<td>85.06</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>23.70</td>
<td>99.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(All Calculated for UW Service Region)
Allocation amounts for each United Way were hand collected for years 2000, 2004, 2008, and 2010. GuideStar provided allocation data for years 2013 and 2015. The values were then lagged using STATA to show the effects of allocation increases or decreases over time.

Table 3.3 Descriptive Statistics for Allocations Per Capita

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocations per Capita</td>
<td>2,696</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>72.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GuideStar provided the additional organizational controls such as total year expenses and year excess from 990 transcription for Chapter 5.

For Chapter 6, the name of each organization that received funding and the amount of funding they received was recorded by hand for each United Way for years 2000 through 2010. GuideStar’s transcription service provided the names of the organizations and the amount they received for years 2013 and 2015.

All data have been cleaned for duplicates and spot checked for accuracy. The methodology used for each study will be discussed within the appropriate chapter.

Additional ethnographic data was collected for this project. I conducted a series of 14 United Way board meeting observations across 4 United Ways within a Midwest region from September 2017 though April 2018. During these meeting I took copious jottings and notes reflecting content, body language, and interactions amongst the Executive Director, Board Chair, and Board Members. After each meeting, the jottings were using to write expanded field notes. These
field notes took from 6 to 12 hours to write. I will refer to these field experiences throughout this research to provide examples and context when appropriate.
Chapter 4:
Gender Status Beliefs and Community Antecedents
to Board Gender Diversity

Diversity in organizations is considered in multiple forms. Gender is just one of many forms of diversity organizations are now considering when forming their leadership. One such debate occurred in a small United Way in a small manufacturing community nearly an hour’s drive from a small metro region. Manufacturing plants have been closing over the past 10 years, leaving one large employer in the region. This United Way is led by a female executive director, Pam, who is loquacious and occasionally borders on providing more information than may be appropriate about organizational operations, such as expanding at length about her “major pay cut” and the deficiencies of her board. In a one-on-one interview she states that the board knows very little about governance and must be guided. This United Way’s board consisted of 6 women and one man as of the beginning of observations (86% women) in September of 2017, declining to women composing 63% of the board through the last observation in April 2018. During the April meeting, diversity of the board was raised. No one addressed gender as a diversity issue, but rather discussed that the community was “97.8% white.” The Executive Director stated: “We don’t have [diversity] policies because it’s just not there. No one cares.” In this small town, diversity was looked at as “Protestant and Catholic,” or racially, with no mention of the gender imbalance on their board. Of the three men who occupied board seats, one was the Board President and he showed up to one meeting. The two additional men were new to the board, with one being a local banker and another who was already actively involved in the local nonprofit community.
Nonprofits are often very reliant upon the communities that they serve. How gender plays a role in that community, and in turn, within the diversity of each organization is not known. Larger nonprofits have a lower female to male board member ratio and an “emphasis on financial skills and reputation in the community as a [board] recruitment criteria were negatively associated with the percentage of women on the board…and location in a metropolitan statistical area” (Ostrower, 2007 p.19). Dimitriadis et al. (2017) found that the female nonprofit founders used more commercial business approaches when there were was a higher concentration of female business owners in the community. Here, the status expectation of women being less business oriented was mitigated by the community support of other female business owners. Kalnins and Williams (2014) study finds that female-owned businesses out-survive male-owned businesses in large cities, potentially displaying changing attitudes towards women and leadership in urban areas. As will be discussed in this chapter, there are sociological studies that find geographic deterrents of female leadership. In this case I argue that one of the salient organizing principles influencing board composition is that of the gender status belief system transmitted by community logics. The status beliefs inherent in the community regarding professionalization, women’s place in the community, and other abilities impact the number of women asked to be leaders of local United Ways.

Status beliefs are not established in a vacuum. Ostrower and Stone’s (2010) contingency-based framework of influences on nonprofit boards includes external conditions. They argue that research should expand from resource-dependence theories to analyzing the institutional environment through normative practices. However, their own study focuses solely on the
external impact of funding, government oversight, and field of activity rather than local social conditions. For example, field of activity may depend heavily on local need and poverty rates. Other scholars are looking at board governance from a “systems” viewpoint. Musick and Wilson (2008) discuss the “ ecological” determinants of volunteering, and how social membership to a community impacts the way one volunteers. They note that most research on volunteerism and community characteristics focuses on negative attributes of the community, like high unemployment and other poor neighborhood conditions. They do not connect these attributes to social norms that may be attached to community characteristics. Gazley and Nicholson-Crotty (2017) assess the internal and external dimensions of board governance and performance, however they do not consider geographic social norms or demographic variables. Miller-Millsen (2003) provides a framework incorporating multiple theoretical perspectives into a system of nonprofit governance, yet again, external concerns revolved around regulations and resource acquisition. Demographic characteristics are mentioned in board recruitment, but gender and social norms are not explicitly discussed. Cornforth (2012) argues for a broader systems perspective in studying nonprofit organization governance, particularly highlighting the need to review contextual and historical factors. The study of governance as a system of related internal and external factors has overlooked community social norms and beliefs, particularly with regard to gender. Nonprofit board governance is influenced by the community’s characteristics and social expectations at large.

There is some precedence for analyzing these particular environmental factors. In 1967, Zald investigated community demographics’ association with nonprofit organizational performance, but did not assess the social implications of those community characteristics, including gender-
related impacts. Marquis and Battilana (2009) argue that investigation of the direct impact of the community “fell out of fashion” with the arrival of the study of institutional fields in the 1980s (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Institutional fields studies organizations not by individual communities, but by field of operation and mission, such as academic publishers or healthcare agencies, that operate in tandem and develop mimicry patterns and homogenous structures. Many modern industries span communities and make community characteristics less important. However, I argue that community characteristics are still relevant to nonprofit agencies, particularly those that rely on their local community for resources, both human and financial. Organizations may be embedded in both their communities and their organizational field at the same time, making community characteristics for nonprofits important. For example, United Ways rely on local businesses for employee funded campaigns, and their goals are influenced by the amount of social need that exists in their community. Status beliefs held by members of the community based on social environmental factors can alter the expectations we have for women in organizational settings. For example, women in rural settings face a more patriarchal structuring of the labor force than in urban or suburban areas (Hughes, 1997). These beliefs lead to organizational outcomes such as leadership selection as decisions are based upon them.

What is considered an organization’s community? According to one United Way executive director, United Ways are assigned communities to serve by the United Way Worldwide (L. Hamer, personal communication, October 19, 2017). Counties are assigned to each United Way, though a United Way may in reality only serve part of a given county. United Ways may also petition to change their geographic territories. If they are serving the needs of a county that is not in their official domain, they can petition to have it added, or to have it reassigned from another
United Way. These territory exchanges may happen at the local organizational level and then be reported to the United Way Worldwide. Local United Way headquarters are located within one of the counties they serve. The geographic community includes “the active businesses, the territory in which they are located and the people living in that territory, with their values and their history” (Brusco, 1995, p. 63).

The United Way system is one of self-perpetuating boards, meaning they recruit new members, usually though their community networks. The profile of boards depicted here may explain the continuance of male dominated boards. Zald (1967) sought to disentangle local community characteristics from board composition, analyzing variables such as local racial composition, local population, median family income, and employment. He writes, “To understand fully the ability of organizations to recruit "good" board members, demographic factors influencing supply and organizational factors influencing attractiveness must be taken into account.” (p. 262). However, as a United Way board is self-perpetuating, the current demographics of the board may also play a role in its continuing composition. For example, if a board member is part of a male-dominated labor union or banking entity, their network ties may encourage them to nominate other male, union-members or bankers for consideration to the United Way board of directors. The current board member’s embeddedness in their own professional and social networks provide candidates for nomination that may match their own demographic characteristics.

The community in which the organization resides provides the resources that assist the organization’s efforts towards professionalization. Social roles and workforce participation vary
across geographic labor markets. For example, the entry of women into the labor force varies
across rural-farm, rural non-farm, and urban areas (Ollenburger, Grana & Moore, 1989).
Individuals in leadership positions or on boards of prominent local firms are often encouraged to
serve on local charity boards. The community in which the organization resides provides the
resources that assist the organization’s efforts towards professionalization. The size of the
business community may not support the expectations of local nonprofits in terms of providing
“professionalized” or characteristically male leadership. In contrast, large cities provide both
tables of professionalized organizations and a human resources pool of organizational
experts. Metropolitan regions usually house the largest United Ways. One can expect to find
nonprofits incorporating successful for-profit strategies in their operations, making the size of the
business community impact the number of women on nonprofit boards of directors and in
leadership positions on those boards. As per scholars of institutionalism and institutional logics
as discussed in Chapter 3, organizational leaders may bring on manegerialist practices if they are
viewed to be more efficient or effective. With an increasing emphasis on professionalizing the
nonprofit sector, this may mean bringing on more male board members and chair people
(DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Scott & Davis, 2007; Thornton & Osacio, 2008). In the corporate
world, men constitute a major majority of board members. As of the 2015 Catalyst Census,
women fill 19.9% of board seats in all S&P 500 companies (Catalyst, 2016). Ostrower (2007)
also finds that an emphasis on financial skills and reputation as a recruitment criteria has a
negative relationship with the percentage of women found on boards. Given the status of women
in the for-profit world and the corporate logics in play, I expect to see a negative impact of large
business communities on the percent of women sitting on United Way boards and holding board
chair positions.
H1: The size of the business community, as measured by private, non-farm businesses per 1,000 people, will be negatively associated with the percent of United Way female board members and female board leadership.

If communities are rural, examples of professionalized or manegerialist organizations from which to choose may be slim. The size of the business community may not support the expectations of local nonprofits in terms of providing “professional” or male leadership, and local rural industries such as farming or natural resource extraction (coal-mining for example) may have many male leaders but none that are willing to expand their work days into community service (Oberhauser, 1995). However, many rural communities hold another set of status beliefs that impact their institutions. Rural communities are more often patriarchal in their belief systems relegating women to household and family work (Oberhauser, 1995), and women are still in the minority in political leadership positions (Bourke & Luloff, 1997). Patriarchal demands can be seen in Oberhauser’s 1995 interview study where one interviewee in rural West Virginia stated, “After we got married, my husband wanted me to quit (work). He had his good job, so he wanted me to be at home. I haven’t had any jobs since then except for my volunteer work at the craft store and I was a volunteer teacher’s aide at Head Start” (p. 235). Here we see that women do move into the volunteer sector as opposed to formal business community, but not in leadership roles. According to Claridge (1998): “It is generally accepted that rural women have little or no public power but considerable private power (Alston, 1995; Teather & Franklin, 1994; Hogan, 1994)” (p. 183). Claridge (1998) cites an interviewee as stating the social barriers to women’s leadership as due to “... the extreme conservative views of the rural community” (p. 183).
putting women’s participation at odds with men’s expectations. In another case, an interviewee stated that “Husbands don't want women to go to meetings. They want them there for them. Therefore women don't like to go out to meetings too often or at all” (p. 187). This would preclude women from attending board meetings. Merrett and Gruidl (2000) cite these social theories in their study of female entrepreneurs in rural versus urban areas. They find that rural women have less access to opportunities at skill development and support for entrepreneurship than their urban female or male counterparts. United Ways as institutions are generally more prestigious in nature even in smaller communities. We hypothesize that rurality, measured by the number of farms per 1,000 people\(^1\), will be negatively associated with the percent of women on boards of directors and female board leadership.

H2: Rurality, as measured by farms per capita, will be negatively associated with the percent of female board members and with female board leadership.

Population of a community may impact the expectations of women. Dense population centers may have more females working outside of the home who are more concerned with instrumental volunteering, or volunteering focused on networking and professional development (Wilson, 1990). Large population density may break down an individual’s ties to their community (Musick & Wilson, 2008), but it increases the likelihood of being located near a large, prestigious nonprofit organization. The difference in choices may be related to community characteristics and not just gender. Large cities provide both examples of professionalized organizations and a human resources pool of organizational experts. Larger population centers

\(^1\) Another measure of rurality is population density. Farms per 1,000 people was chosen following research on agricultural region attitudes towards women as well as for data availability reasons. Controlling for service region population attempts to get at population density.
also have a larger pool of women with professional backgrounds from which to choose, if the nonprofit is seeking a more professionalized operation. Population centers also tend to be more progressive in their political and social ideologies, supporting diversity and women’s equality. Findings have shown that larger cities are more hospitable to female elected council members and mayors (Smith, Reingold, & Owens, 2012). Zald (1967), for example, uses the population of YMCA service regions as a predictor of board composition. However, Ostrower (2007) found that organizations within larger metropolitan statistical areas had fewer women on their boards. I test for this in our model by including the service region population in thousands.

H3: Size of service region population will be positively related to the number of women on United Way boards and female board leadership.

As an organizational level control, I analyze performance. The United Way serves as an instrumental organization, due to the fact it controls the funding of partner organizations (Wilson, 1990). Bradshaw, Murray and Wolpin (1996) research the board composition of nonprofit organizations in 276 Canadian nonprofit organizations and find that prestige also played a role in composition, with women serving on less prestigious boards at organizations with lower revenue. The phenomenon, known as the “glass cliff”, finds that women are more likely to enter boards and leadership positions of firms that are already failing. In previous research, people rated stereotypical female characteristics as preferable in times of organizational crisis, such as being good people managers, intuitive, and aware of the feelings of others (Bruckmüller & Branscombe, 2010; Ryan, Haslam, Hersby, & Bongiorno, 2011). Ryan and Haslam (2007) also find through interviews that there is an expectation that women are better at
“want[ing] to help the underdog” and can “cope with failure more pragmatically than men” (p. 190) belying gender status beliefs in the expectations we hold for women managers. To test these status beliefs, I assess lagged organizational performance in order to see whether past performance is an indicator of current board composition.

H4: As lagged allocations decrease, the number of women on United Way boards and in board leadership positions will increase.

I also control for additional community and organizational characteristics. First, women are presumed to take on traditional gender roles in their volunteering, “offering help and comfort to those around them” (Petzelka & Mannon, 2006, p. 237). Women overall take different roles in volunteering, and are generally more identified with “expressive” rather than “instrumental” volunteer activities (Wilson, 1990). Instrumental volunteering describes goal-oriented activities such as network building and professional advancement, whereas expressive patterns of volunteering involve social group membership and “an ethic of care and responsibility for others” (Musick & Wilson, 2008, p. 176). United Ways’ main function is to fundraise to support local social service providing organizations. Women are expected to step up and directly serve those in need, and the United Way’s mission of aiding social service nonprofits may align with those expectations. I include a measure of service region poverty to analyze this question. I also control for the racial composition of the community as per Zald (1967) and to view the potential intersectionality of gender and race (Acker, 2006).
As an organizational control, in the model of the percent women found on the board, I include a lagged variable of whether the board chair was female in the preceding time period. For the dependent variable of whether the chair is female, I include the lagged percent of women found on the board. I include these to see if existing female presence increases the likelihood of having continued or growing female presence, based in the logic that as women take on leadership positions and positions on the board, self-perpetuating boards may continue to network with women for these roles. For the same reason, I also include a variable for whether the ED was female, and whether both chair and ED were female simultaneously.

**Analysis & Findings**

This analysis begins with a review of the pertinent variables included in the models. The dependent variables included here are the percent women on the board (excluding the board chair if she is female) and whether the board chair is female. These dependent variables will be included as independent variables in the opposing model to see if there is any relationship between the two over time. Descriptive statistics for the variables of interest are found in Table 4.1. While the finding and results of each hypothesis test will be presented within this section, further implications and alternative hypotheses will be examined in the Discussion section. Practitioner recommendations and contributions to the literature will be provided in this document’s conclusion.

**Dependent Variables**

The dependent variables in this study are the percent of women found on the board in a particular year and whether the Board Chair is female. These variables were collected as per the process outlined in Chapter 3.
**Independent Variables**

The independent variables are community and organizational variables collected as per the process outlined in Chapter 3. Community characteristics include the number of businesses in a region per 1,000 people; the number of farms in a service region per 1,000 people; the log of the total service region population; the poverty rate; and the percent of the population that is white in the service region. The organizational controls include the log of the total allocations given out by the organization as a performance measure; whether the Executive Director was female; and whether both the Executive Director and Board Chair were female in the previous time period.

**Analysis**

Hausman test results rejected the null hypothesis that a random effects model was better specified for the data and thereby recommend a fixed effects approach. Year dummy variables were included to allow for year fixed effects to account for secular time trends across the panels (Cameron & Trivedi, 2010). This accounts for the time-invariant unobservable characteristics in our model. United Way level dummies were not included to allow for comparison across communities, rather than just within communities. One limitation is that this has the potential of omitted variable bias (Blumenstock, 2011). However, data in the panel show more between-United Way variation than within-group variation, with a rho test showing the intraclass correlation across panels is 92%. 92% of a panel fixed effects model variance is due to across panel differences. The only variable that displayed more within-group variation was Board Chair gender. As I want to capture between-group variation and estimate population average effects of my variables of interest, I choose year fixed effects alone. This method is good for allowing inquiry into variables that “elude study in simple cross-sectional or time-series” studies (Podestà,
2002, p. 7). “This is because their variability is negligible, or not existent, across either time or space” (Podestà, 2002, p. 7). As per Robison and Crenshaw (2010), pooled OLS is preferable in this case, writing “[a]s our time period is limited and some of our variables are time-invariant or near time invariant, using fixed effects dummies for every case would absorb a large number of degrees of freedom (and improperly obscure some genuine relationships in the data)” (p. 44).

Using robust standard errors controls for heteroskedasticity in the independent variables and for any standard error inconsistency (King & Roberts, 2015). I then incorporate clustering of standard errors to account for within-cluster correlation by United Ways (Cameron & Miller, 2015). According to King and Roberts (2015), “if clustering and time dependence is well modeled, so that the residuals have no clustering or time-series pattern, then the classical and cluster- or autocorrelation-robust variance matrices should be approximately the same” (p. 166).

As we see in Tables 4.4 and 4.5, this similarity in results is verified, and cluster-robust standard errors provide a more conservative estimate of standard errors and significance levels.

It is the between community effects that are key to this study, as we try to understand the social impacts of gender beliefs across service regions, so clustering by United Way and not by year is preferable. All independent variables are lagged to account for the panel nature of the data set. This means we lose approximately 612 observations due to missing values for the year 2000. That, along with missing allocation or board information brings the N down to 1,580. All calculations use cluster-robust standard errors. Given small but highly significant correlations across variables (Table 4.2), a variance inflation test was run. The variance inflation test shows results within the acceptable range for multicollinearity—less than 10 as per Hair, Anderson, Tatham, and Black (1995)—between independent variables (Table 4.3).
Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Women on Board</td>
<td>39.778</td>
<td>17.352</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Board Chair</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses/ 1K Population</td>
<td>22.367</td>
<td>5.137</td>
<td>8.284</td>
<td>43.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms/ 1K Population</td>
<td>14.554</td>
<td>13.652</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87.14545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Total Allocations</td>
<td>13.087</td>
<td>1.593</td>
<td>8.372</td>
<td>18.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Service Region Pov. Rate</td>
<td>14.988</td>
<td>5.440</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>44.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Service Region % White</td>
<td>85.059</td>
<td>13.791</td>
<td>23.700</td>
<td>99.476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Exec. Director</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Female Chair and Exec. Director</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings**

The correlations in Table 4.2 show coefficients and significance levels, and provide some interesting results. First, each variable is significantly correlated with the percent of women on the board. Female Board Chair is not significantly correlated with the service region poverty rate, nor is having a Female Executive Director. The log of total allocations is negative and significantly correlated with the percentage of women on a board, whether it has a female Board Chair, and whether it has a female Executive Director.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>(9)</th>
<th>(10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Percent Women on Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Businesses/1K Population</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Farms/1K Population</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Log Service Region Population</td>
<td>-0.321</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>-0.606</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Log Total Allocations</td>
<td>-0.366</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>-0.470</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Avg. Service Region Pov. Rate</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>-0.365</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>-0.115</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Avg. Service Region % White</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>-0.307</td>
<td>-0.198</td>
<td>-0.478</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Female Board Chair</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>-0.119</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Female Exec. Director</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>-0.339</td>
<td>-0.344</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Both Female Chair and ED</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>-0.224</td>
<td>-0.225</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>1/VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both Female Chair and Exec. Director</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.279761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Board Chair</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.328722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Service Region Population</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.35818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Total Allocations</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.475221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2010</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.594929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2013</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.601263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Service Region % White</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.613283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms/ 1K Population</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.614288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2008</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.617619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2004</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.621629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Exec. Director</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.629304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Region Poverty Rate</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.630993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2000</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.64987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses/ 1K Population</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.83527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean VIF</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4.4 are the results of a series of models run on the dependent variable, “Percent Women on the Board.” After running a series of stepwise models, the three presented here provide the most information. All models include year fixed effects to account for unobserved time-invariant characteristics of the cases. The first model includes the basic variables delineated in table 4.2, but lagged to show whether previous characteristics impacted the nomination of women to the current board. The second fixed effects model adds a quadratic term for the log of population, the log of total allocations, and the poverty rate to see if these effects are linear or nonlinear. The nonlinear terms increased the r-squared results of the models and were therefore better specified. The third model is using cluster-robust standard errors to test for variation and the potential “over rejection of the null hypothesis” (Cameron & Miller, 2015). The observations across
Table 4.4

**OLS Regression with Year Fixed Effects and Robust Standard Errors**
(All models contain robust standard errors and unstandardized coefficients unless otherwise specified)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES (Lagged)</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Businesses/ 1K Population</td>
<td>-0.152*</td>
<td>-0.187*</td>
<td>-0.187+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.075)</td>
<td>(0.076)</td>
<td>(0.103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms/ 1K Population</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.0328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
<td>(0.046)</td>
<td>(0.067)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.455)</td>
<td>(4.780)</td>
<td>(6.316)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Service Region Population^2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.351+</td>
<td>0.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.184)</td>
<td>(0.245)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Total Allocations</td>
<td>-1.964***</td>
<td>-15.14***</td>
<td>-15.14***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.344)</td>
<td>(3.358)</td>
<td>(3.862)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Total Allocations^2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.494***</td>
<td>0.494***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.117)</td>
<td>(0.137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Region Poverty Rate</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>-0.638*</td>
<td>-0.638*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.087)</td>
<td>(0.257)</td>
<td>(0.323)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Region Poverty Rate^2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.016*</td>
<td>0.0164+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Region % White</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.250)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.046)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Board Chair</td>
<td>3.230**</td>
<td>3.188**</td>
<td>3.188*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.136)</td>
<td>(1.120)</td>
<td>(1.258)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Exec. Director</td>
<td>2.157**</td>
<td>2.025*</td>
<td>2.025*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.824)</td>
<td>(0.824)</td>
<td>(0.988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Female Chair and Exec. Director</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.518)</td>
<td>(1.497)</td>
<td>(1.586)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2004</td>
<td>-5.346***</td>
<td>-5.548***</td>
<td>-5.548***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.231)</td>
<td>(1.222)</td>
<td>(1.203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2008</td>
<td>-3.429**</td>
<td>-3.441**</td>
<td>-3.441**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.147)</td>
<td>(1.119)</td>
<td>(1.055)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2010</td>
<td>-1.635</td>
<td>-1.764+</td>
<td>-1.764+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.046)</td>
<td>(1.024)</td>
<td>(0.940)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year2013</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.983)</td>
<td>(0.965)</td>
<td>(0.738)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted Year 2015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>91.59***</td>
<td>240.9***</td>
<td>240.9***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10.07)</td>
<td>(26.29)</td>
<td>(35.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>1,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05, + p<0.07
years within United Ways may be associated, though we assume they are independent across United Ways. Clustering on United Way accounts for correlation of the error terms within United Ways across observations, providing conservative estimates of significance based on fewer independent cases (Schechter, 2017). Due to this, both standard robust and cluster-robust tests were run.

First, the findings are discussed in light of the hypothesized relationships. Hypothesis 1 stated that the size of the business community would have a negative relationship with the percent of women on the board due to masculine gender status beliefs of the business sector and the overall professionalization of nonprofits in large business communities. The coefficients are negative, and statistically significant at the p<0.05 level. Hypothesis 1 is supported for the percent of women found on these boards. In the cluster-robust model, the coefficients are the same but the significance level has dropped to only marginally significant (p<0.07). The quadratic term was tested to see if there was a non-linear relationship between the size of the business community and the percentage of women on the board, but it was not significant, and therefore not reported.

Hypothesis 2 focused on the size of the farming community as a manifestation for rural social norms and gender structures. It was hypothesized that rurality would have a negative relationship with the number of women on United Way boards. However, we see in all models that lagged rurality was not significantly related to the percentage of women on United Way boards, though the coefficients were indeed negative. These findings run contrary to the belief that rural, agricultural regions would have fewer female board members due to more traditional, patriarchal
power structures and less political representation. Across all models, Hypothesis 2 is not supported.

Hypothesis 3 asserted that as population in a region grew, so too would the number of women on United Way boards. This was due to access to a larger pool of “professionalized” women and due to more liberal norms and expectations of women in metropolitan regions. This hypothesis is not supported. When the basic model is run with a linear term for population, I find highly significant (p<0.001) results with moderate negative effect sizes. However, in model two, I add a quadratic term for lagged population to see if it in fact has a linear or non-linear effect. The models show a marginally significant positive relationship between the quadratic term and the percentage of women found on the United Way board (p<0.057). This indicates that there is a nonlinear relationship between population and the percentage of women on United Way boards of directors, though perhaps very slight. It appears that United Ways in the smallest population centers have the most women serving on their boards, with a precipitous decline as the community grows in size. There is a slight increase in the percentage of women on boards in the very largest communities. This relationship has been run as a marginsplot (Figure 4.1), controlling for all other variables in the model. We see a slight increase in the percentage of women in the very largest population regions. When run with clustered standard errors, the linear effect of population drops to a significance level of (p<0.076), and the quadratic term is not significant, indicating there may in fact be little to no relationship between population and the percentage of women serving on United Way boards given this sample size. However, the clustering tells our statistical software that there are in fact 512 independent observations (clusters) (Schechter, 2014) making the significance levels of the test much more conservative.
The fourth hypothesis looks at our gendered expectations of women in organizations with less allocations. This hypothesis is strongly supported across all three models. There exists a negative and highly statistically significant ($p<0.001$) effect of the lagged log of allocations on the percentage of women on boards. As lagged allocations decrease, we find a larger percentage of women on boards. However, here too we see a non-linear relationship. In model 2 and 3, the quadratic term for allocations is included. This term proved to be positive and significant ($p<0.001$), though with a much smaller coefficient. Again, we find a U-shaped relationship between a key independent variable and the percentage of women on boards. Graphing this relationship (Figure 4.2), we see that though the slope is less dramatic than for population, the percentage of women on boards decreases as allocations increase until about $3.5$ million dollars.

**Figure 4.1:**
However, many of these organizations with high allocations per capita are outliers and we see the confidence interval increases greatly toward the tail ends of the distribution. The smallest allocating organizations have the most women on their boards, at over 60% female board representation.

Figure 4.2:

![Predictive Margins for Percent Women by Log of Allocations Lagged](image)

controlling for all other factors in the model. The mean total annual allocation is about $120.5 thousand across this sample. The largest percentages of women on United Way boards are found on boards that allocate less than the sample average.

The control variables are also notable. In the second and third model, the poverty rate has a non-linear relationship with the percentage of women on United Way boards. As we seen in the margins plot in Figure 4.3, controlling for all other variables in the model, the communities with
the largest poverty rates saw a 22% increase in women on their boards compared to those with the lowest poverty rates. However, the confidence intervals for the largest regions of poverty are very high due to fewer observations. This limits the ability to state with certainty the generalizability of this finding.

Figure 4.3

The largest effect on the percentage of women on United Way boards was the previous presence of a female chair or a female Executive Director. The previous presence of a female chair increases the percentage of women on United Way boards by approximately 3% (p<0.01 in model 2 and p<0.05 in model 3). This relationship may reflect both how they recruit for members, but also who in their networks they can choose from. The previous presence of a female Executive Director also increased the percentage of women on boards by approximately
2% (p<0.05). Having a female chair and a female Executive Director simultaneously was not significant.

To analyze the possible predictors of having a female board chair, I run a logistic regression on “Female Chair” (Table 4.5). Models are run with standard and cluster-robust standard errors. Nonlinear terms for population and allocations were not significant and therefore not reported in the tables. 33% of United Ways in this sample have had female board chairs.

Two community factors impact the likelihood of finding a female United Way board chair. These factors are the number of businesses within the community and the racial composition of the service region. As per Hypothesis 1, we do see a negative and significant (p<0.05) relationship between the size of the business community and the gender of board leadership. The log odds of finding a female board leader decrease by .029 for every additional business per 1,000 people. This finding is in line with the fixed effects findings above for the dependent variable “Percent Women on Board.” Racial composition of the community is also related to the likelihood of finding a female board chair. The log odds of finding a female board chair increase by 0.011 for every unit increase in the percentage of white population in the service region at the p<0.05 level for the standard robust model and at the p<0.055 level for the cluster-robust model.

The lagged independent variable for percent women on the board is the most significant finding in this model, with the log odds of finding a female board chair increasing by .017 per every unit increase in percent women (p<0.001). The existing percentage of women on the board increases the likelihood of having a female board chair in the future.
### Table 4.5

**Logistic Regression with Year Fixed Effects: Female Board Chair**

(All models contain robust standard errors and unstandardized coefficients unless otherwise specified)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES (Lagged)</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clustered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses/ 1K Population</td>
<td>-0.028*</td>
<td>-0.028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms/ 1K Population</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Service Region Population</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
<td>-0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.072)</td>
<td>(0.076)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Total Allocations</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
<td>(0.056)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Region Poverty Rate</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Region % White</td>
<td>0.011*</td>
<td>0.011+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Women on Board</td>
<td>0.017***</td>
<td>0.017***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Exec. Director</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.132)</td>
<td>(0.137)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Female Chair and Exec. Director</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.144)</td>
<td>(0.143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2004</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.189)</td>
<td>(0.195)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2008</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.179)</td>
<td>(0.186)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2010</td>
<td>-0.205</td>
<td>-0.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.168)</td>
<td>(0.164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2013</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.159)</td>
<td>(0.154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted Year 2015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.307</td>
<td>-0.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.202)</td>
<td>(1.251)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>1,578</td>
<td>1,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in parentheses
*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05, + p<0.1
Discussion

Viewing these analysis results, there are certain factors from the community at play in determining the role of women on United Way boards. The percent of women on boards of directors appears to be most impacted by the size of the community, the previous performance of the organization, the poverty found in the community, and whether there are already women in leadership roles in the organization. We do see some evidence that the size of the business community impacts the percentage of women on boards. However, it is significant for the likelihood of finding a female board chair. This may indicate that even in communities with fewer businesses, leadership is still seen as male oriented (Bem, 1975; Holt & Ellis, 1998). It may also show that United Ways are viewed as instrumental organizations in larger business communities, used to network and build professional credentials (Wilson, 1990).

Service region population is negatively associated with the percentage of women found on United Way boards. The larger the service region, the fewer the women except at in the largest outliers. Musick and Wilson (2008) suggest that regardless of gender, fewer people volunteer in larger cities and suburbs. “Women’s work” (Joiner, 2015) effects may be greater in smaller communities. According to Musick and Wilson (2008) rural communities have strong social solidarity and have less ability to rely on public goods, leading those with available time to step up and volunteer. As Salamon (2003) states: “Subdivision people are “too busy” to participate in volunteer efforts that make a small town work as a connected whole” (p. 79). Women in smaller communities are less invested in paid work outside the home and may feel a responsibility to participate in community building volunteer activities. Research also suggests that regardless of how much a woman works, they still bear the brunt of household and child care responsibilities,
absorbing time that may be spent volunteering on boards (Horne, Johnson, Galambos, & Krahn, 2018).

The potential U-shaped relationship of percent women to population and to allocations indicate that the results to Hypothesis 3 and 4 are more nuanced than anticipated. For most of the communities in this sample, the larger they become, the fewer women are found on their boards. It is only in the largest communities do we again see an increase in women on boards of directors. Why could this be? One could postulate that this decline in women is due to the rising level of professional jobs and status hierarchies found in those jobs from which board members are recruited. With the professionalization of the nonprofit sector, we may be seeing men brought on as legitimizing factors, particularly as the size of the United Ways increases in larger communities (Baines, Charlesworth, & Cunningham, 2015; Baines, Charlesworth, Cunningham, & Dassinger, 2012). This would work in tandem with the effect of size of the business community. Women in smaller and more rural communities were more likely to serve on United Way boards of directors, as well as those in the very largest communities. In contrast, lagged population and allocations were not significant in the board chair fixed effects logistic regression. These variables did not impact whether it was more likely to see a female board chair. Again, the size of the business community in relation to the service region population was negative and significant. Status characteristic theory of the expectations of women as possessing true leadership qualities may be in play when selecting board chairs. Business communities bring in more male leadership, which reinforces the selection of men to higher status community positions.
Perhaps as a community grows in size, the nature of a nonprofit organization change from being community logic oriented to dominated by a more corporate logic. As this change occurs and these logics compete, the gender status beliefs that men are more competent at business and leadership affect the selection of board members and board leadership. This may mean that the United Ways in larger communities are more impacted by the status beliefs of men being leaders and following traditional hierarchical models of organization, which usually place men in positions of power. Different communities may lead to differences in how nonprofits are perceived and therefore status beliefs have different outcomes. These status expectations are established norms of behavior. “Through choice and exclusion, [women tend to] to gravitate toward groups that engage in ‘community housekeeping,’ are leisure oriented, or devoted to the service of others” (Wilson, 1990, p. 108), while men gravitate towards organizations that will help them professionally and through building social networks. These status expectations frame the composition of institutions within the community. United Way’s main function is to fundraise to support local social service providing organizations, and often provide services themselves in the smallest communities. Women are expected to step up and directly serve those in need, and the United Way’s mission of aiding social service nonprofits and providing services in smaller communities may align with those beliefs, leading to a larger portion of boards to be composed of women. As communities increase in size, men may see the United Way as a means of networking and may step into these roles. These “old boys” networks may set the stage for recruitment of more men to boards through self-perpetuating boards.

However, there is a potential non-linear relationship between community size and the percentage of women found on boards, with the very largest communities showing signs of increasing
female representation. These United Ways are extremely visible and act as flagship organizations, close to being on par with the umbrella organization of United Way Worldwide. These extremely large communities are more liberal and have high status in the ranks of national United Ways. The United Ways in these communities may be the first to follow United Way Worldwide in applying best governance practices and research to their organizations. One United Way Executive Director stated that United Way Worldwide surveys its chapters and specifically asks whether the chapter has a diversity plan in place (L. Hamer, personal communication, April 24, 2018). The United Way Worldwide asks about organizational best practices and whether they are in place in order to gauge, but also to guide United Ways. The flagship United Ways in extremely large communities are likely the first adopters of these practices. Demand for more women on the boards of the United Ways in extremely large communities is increasing as best practices literature permeates these extremely corporatized organizations. The United Ways in the largest communities are starting changes in organizational culture. These practices may trickle down into smaller cities and suburbs based on institutional norms. In these communities, where traditional male dominated corporate norms and the status beliefs associated with them are still strong, we may eventually see increasing numbers of women on boards if institutionalism from within the United Way is stronger. The slope of the marginsplot line may flatten, but status beliefs, being so ingrained, may prevent the boards in these communities from fully embracing equality on their boards.

Strong effects are found in these models for the existing presence of women on boards and in leadership roles. Lagged independent variables show that if the board chair and ED are already female, there is a positive and significant relationship with the percent of women who serve on
the board. This existing representation in key leadership roles may help provide legitimacy for women’s abilities and help mitigate effects of gender status beliefs at play through community and corporate logics. The finding that having a female executive director is positively related to the number of women on nonprofit boards confirms Bradshaw, Murray and Wolpin’s (1996) finding regarding Canadian nonprofit boards. The strong relationship between the percentage of women on the board and having a female board chair makes sense if not simply for numerical grounds. A board chair is not selected to join the board with no experience with the organization, but is usually nominated from within the board itself. A larger proportion of women already on the board would inherently give a woman a better chance at being chosen as board chair.

Finally, the fact that race has a relationship to the likelihood of having a female board chair is notable. The larger the white community, the more likely it is to find a female board chair. African-American and other minority women are doubly disadvantaged by status beliefs and therefore least likely to be chosen for leadership positions (Parker, 2004). One United Way Executive Director in a community with a very small minority population stated that it was difficult to find minority individuals to serve on the board at all, much less as to have served long enough to become board chair (L. Hamer, personal communication, April 24, 2018). However, as we have no data on the racial composition of members of these united Way boards, it is not possible to draw conclusions.

Overall, it is clear that there is some relationship between the communities in which United Ways are located and their board gender composition. Gender status beliefs at play in these communities and through institutional logics can craft the composition of the board and the
likelihood of finding a female board chair. Men continue to dominate boards in larger, white communities with higher performing United Ways, while women dominate smaller, poorer communities where resources may be scarcer. The status of the organization in the community draws certain genders to participate. In smaller, resource poor communities, man are less likely to get involved with work they deem as women’s work. Women are expected to step up to help those most in need. In larger, richer communities, men are expected to build professional networks. They are more willing to participate in social service work, especially when it involved stereotypically male tasks such as financial management and networking with prominent business figures. More research is necessary to parse out the exact status beliefs that may be impacting selection of board members and board chairs. Next steps for this research include board member interviews and systematic ethnographic observation of board meetings.
Chapter 5:

Gender Diversity and Organizational Performance

The differences between men’s and women’s impact on organizational performance are now being studied, particularly in the for-profit sector. However, social expectations of gender status beliefs play a role in what we expect of women and men in directorships and leadership positions on both for-profit and nonprofit boards. For example, United Way #2 exists in a medium-sized city in the Midwest with approximately 170,000 people in the metropolitan region. This city has both corporate and manufacturing resources, as well as a few institutes of higher learning. The board is larger, with 30 members, 15 of whom are women (50%), including the female Board Chair. In their April meeting, the Executive director, Edward, seeks assistance from the board to make CEO visits to businesses that do not yet have employee campaigns or once had thriving campaigns that have since decreased. He wants to make a “value proposition for their business” and is looking for board members with personal relationships that may help them get in the door. Edward says he’s looking, for example, for someone who “golfs with Norm,” the head of one of the local banks. The golfing allusion is generally aimed at the men in the group. Everyone is to look through a list of the top 100 potential campaigns and volunteer to join Edward for a CEO visit. Only three women volunteer, but take seven organizations amongst them. Six men volunteer and take 10 organizations. Women volunteered less, but took more organizations on average between them than their male counterparts. In sum, the women who volunteered took on more individual work than then men in soliciting donations. However, more men stepped up and had more business connections than the women of the board. Men dominated when it came to business networks.
Women dominate the nonprofit workforce, but its board leadership remains male dominated (see Chapter 3’s demographic findings). Researchers have argued that the nonprofit sector is gendered female due to its employee base and its general social and community mission focus (Odendahl, 1994; Odendahl & Youmans, 1994). Still, men dominate the governance on boards of the largest nonprofit organizations. In one sample of nonprofits, boards tended to recruit members with higher education levels and management or professional experience (Abzug & Galeskiewicz, 2001). Abzug and Galeskiewicz (2001) found that from 1931 through 1991, “men, Whites, college educated people, managers, and professionals have always been overrepresented on nonprofit boards” (p.68). Ostrower’s (2007) nationally representative study of nonprofits found that on average 86% of board members are white, and that with women comprise only 29% of board seats in the largest nonprofits. “Emphasis on financial skills and reputation in the community as recruitment criteria were negatively associated with the percentage of women {on boards}” (Ostrower, 2007, p. 19). Status beliefs of women in terms of financial ability and status in the community presumably play a part in this finding. The United Way system is one of self-perpetuating boards, meaning they recruit new members internally, usually though their community networks. The previous profile of boards depicted in Chapter 4 may explain the continuance of male dominated boards. But what difference does gender diversity on boards make?

While the impact of gender composition on for-profit boards is being studied, less is known regarding the impact of voluntary board members of nonprofit organizations. We think gender of board members is tied to performance based on research out of both the nonprofit and for-profit
sectors. For-profit research regarding gender composition and interaction on boards supports that there is some effect. Post and Bryon’s (2015) systematic meta-analysis of for-profit board gender composition finds that the “relationship between female board representation and market performance is … positive in countries with greater gender parity” and that this effect may be due in part to the “societal gender differences in human capital [that] may influence investors’ evaluations of the future earning potential of firms that have more female directors” (p. 1546). Singh Kang and Payal (2012) note in their literature review of women on corporate boards that the individual perceptions of men and women and societal male dominance lowers female participation and recruitment to boards of directors. Roles of women on corporate boards are found to be “female” oriented, such as assessing corporate social responsibility or addressing “human and community needs” (Pynes, 2000, p. 36) versus men who were more likely to be on financial, planning, and budgeting committees. Bilimoria and Wheeler (2000) see corporate women directors as “champions for change because they tend to be younger than their male counterparts and are open to relatively newer ideas and approaches to doing business” (Erhardt, Werbel & Shrader, 2003, p. 10).

Additional empirical studies focus on for-profit organizations. Post and Byron’s (2015) meta-analysis found that overall, empirical findings support that women’s presence on for-profit boards of directors is positively associated with firm financial performance. They measure financial performance through accounting returns and market performance. They also study two board performance measures: board monitoring, which they describe as “the extent to which boards engage in activities that entail oversight of the firm and seek to control managerial opportunism” (p. 1547)), and board strategy involvement, “the extent to which boards engage in
activities related to their strategic advising role and engage in decision making about how the firm should compete in the marketplace” (p. 1547)). Post and Byron (2015) situate their meta-analysis in Upper Echelons Theory, citing Finkelstein, Hambrick, and Cannella. (2009, p.11) to argue that boards are “supra top management teams” (p. 1548). They argue that “because, in general, female and male directors differ in their cognitive frames, director heterogeneity in terms of gender is likely to influence firm performance” (p. 1548).

I argue that these cognitive frames consist of socialized status characteristic beliefs and individual roles played throughout the institutional logics of profession, corporation, and community. As has been discussed, expectations of competence and abilities, as well one’s place within an organizational structure and hierarchy are determined in part by one’s gender. While Post and Byron acknowledge some level of cognitive framework, they do not address the processes through which these frameworks are established and perpetuated through institutions. For example, they note the work of Groysberg and Bell (2013) who find that for-profit female board directors have more interest in philanthropy and community service (Post & Byron, 2015, p. 158). This finding supports the theory that women may join nonprofit boards of directors for expressive rather than exclusively instrumental grounds (Wilson, 1990; see Chapter 4). Overall, they find that across 144 independent samples, the percentage of women on a for-profit board was positively and significantly associated with accounting returns (returns on assets; return on equity; return on invested capital, and employee productivity (Post & Byron, 2015, p. 1554)), but was not significantly related to market performance (market-to-book ratio, stock performance, and shareholder returns) without the addition of moderating variables for gender parity in the country or shareholder protections, such as the ability of shareholders to remove board directors.
who are not upholding their responsibilities to the organization. As stated above, they find that female ratio on the board is positively and significantly associated with market performance when moderated by the country’s level of gender parity. The higher the societal gender parity, the larger the market performance returns of having women on the board (p<0.05). Post and Byron (2015) posit that this relationship is due to women’s greater access to the educational and economic resources that would make them more viable candidates for board roles, as well as the reputational improvements having women on the board may have for the organizations in such environments.

Schrader, Blackburn, and Iles (1997) find that gender diversity in upper management had mixed results for firm financial performance. They hypothesize that women are better at maintaining and supporting relationships than men (Hisrich & Brush, 1994; Rosener, 1995) and are generally “more satisfied in their jobs than men” (Schrader, et al. 1997, p. 358) so that they improve the overall climate and performance of the organization. The financial performance measures used in their study of Wall Street Journal’s “200 U.S. firms with largest market value” (p. 359) were net income and profitability ratios (return of sales, return on assets, return on income, and return on equity). They found that for 1992, across the board, the percentage of women in management (leadership) positions was positively associated with firm financial performance, but not for 1993. However, the percentage of women on the board is negative and significant for these firms for both 1992 and 1993.

Joecks, Pull, and Vetter (2013) reviewed 18 empirical articles on the impact of women on boards across eight countries and found studies that had negative, positive, and no results. Among
studies of United States based firms, positive and significant links were found between the ratio of women on boards and performance (as measured by return on assets, Tobin’s Q, return on investments, and social performance) in Carter, Simkins and Simpson’s (2003) study of 638 U.S. Fortune 1,000 firms; Erhardt, Werbel and Shrader’s (2003) study of 112 U.S. Fortune 1,000 firms; and partially Sciliano’s (1996) study of 240 YMCAs. As detailed in the previous paragraph, Shrader et. al. (1997) found negative, significant results for the percentage of women on 200 U.S. firms, and Adams and Ferreira (2009) found a negative link between the women’s ratio and firm value in 1,939 U.S. firms. Using Blau’s index of heterogeneity as the independent variable, He and Huang (2011) found a negative link to return on assets in 530 U.S. manufacturing firms over 6 years. Finally, Miller and del Carmen Triana (2009) used the Blau index and found no link to performance. The findings are therefore inconclusive.

Joecks, Pull, and Vetter (2013) and Konrad, Kramer, and Erkut (2008) find that board performance is impacted when there is more than one woman on a board, and the gender composition must hit a “critical mass.” Joecks et al. (2013) argue, based on Kanter’s (1977) work, that three types of groups exist—skewed groups with males dominating 80% or more of the board positions and women acting as “tokens”; tilted groups, in which women make up 20% to 40% of the board positions and are able to “ally and influence the culture of the group” (Joecks et al., 2013, p. 62); and balanced groups with 40 to 60% women, in which gender becomes less important as an attribute compared with the skills of the group members. In Joecks et al.’s (2013) own empirical study of 160 German companies, they find that the maximum positive return on having women on the board is reached when 30% of the board is comprised of women, supporting in part Konrad, Kramer, and Erkut’s (2008) findings that having at least three
women on a board decreases female stereotypes and tokenism, increases performance, and allows women to no longer be seen as representing all women. However, there were only 79 tilted boards (20%-40% women) and 5 examples of balanced boards in Joecks et al.’s (2013) study, making it difficult to make causal claims. Konrad, Kramer, and Erkut (2008) find that with three or more women, there is an increase in board collaboration and inclusiveness. However, in the corporate world, men comprise a majority of boards. As of the 2014 Catalyst Census, women comprise 19.2% of board seats in all S&P 500 companies (Catalyst, 2015). Compared to for-profit organizations, nonprofit boards have more female representation, with the median proportion across a representative sample being 44% in 2005 (Ostrower, 2007). The largest nonprofits (over $40 million in expenses) have the lowest female to male ratio with only 29% female representation.

As discussed in Chapter 4, there is the argument of the “glass cliff”—that women are brought on to already declining organizations (Ryan, Haslam, Hersby & Bongiomo, 2011; Main & Gregory-Smith, 2018). The findings in Chapter 4 suggest that this is happening in our sample of United Ways, though perhaps each board does not consciously undertake increasing gender diversity when they notice performance begins to decline, though men may chose not to serve on organizations they feel may be having difficult financial times. These findings make analysis of the impact of women on boards complicated by the tendency to bring on diversity at tough financial times. This is one limitation to measuring performance on a strictly financial basis. However, independent variables in this model have been lagged to account for some level of causality.
On the question of organizational performance’s relationship to gender dynamics, the nonprofit sector research is much thinner and tends to contradict the for-profit literature. There are fewer studies examining the effects of gender on the operation of the organization itself, for example how gender differences in leadership relate to internal organizational culture or performance of nonprofits. Some exceptions include Bradshaw, Murray and Wolpin’s (1996) research on the board composition of nonprofit organizations and perceived performance. Their study of 276 Canadian nonprofit organizations finds a significant relationship between the gender of the executive director and the proportion of women on the board. Prestige also played a role in these placements, with women found on less prestigious boards with lower revenue. They did not find any relationship between the percentage of women on the board and board performance as measured by perceptions of effectiveness or prestige of the board, or change in annual budget. In another nonprofit study, Siciliano (1996) finds that gender diversity was positively associated with social performance but negatively associated with amount of funds raised across 240 YMCAs. Nonprofit and for-profit studies are similar in their mixed findings, but it is evident that the proportion of women on the board of directors has some relationship with an organization’s performance. Given these findings, I hypothesize the following:

H1: The gender ratio of nonprofit boards will have a nonlinear relationship with the United Way’s financial performance as per Joecks, Pull, and Vetter (2013) and Konrad, Kramer, and Erkut (2008).

Status beliefs permeating institutional logics of the professions and corporations place women in precarious positions. As detailed in Chapters 2 and 4, women are viewed as more self-sacrificing
and caring, but not as professional or leader-like as men. If the leadership of the United Way is female, these beliefs may come through in the way the rest of the board and staff views the executive director and board chair. Women’s own status beliefs regarding their competence with finances or other leadership qualities may impact their performance in leadership roles. They may defer to the board as a whole or a particular individual on the board with the skill sets they feel they are lacking. Deferring to the board can be seen as a governance best practice, given that the board is ultimately responsible for the organization.

However, women are bringing soft skills such as “team building and employee development that are very much in tune with today's competitive realities.” (Schrader et al., 1997, p.355). Eagly and Karau (2002) and Eagly (2007) discuss the prejudices in place regarding attitudes toward female executive leaders. From 1953 through 2000, both women and men stated holding a preference for a male boss. Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen’s (2003) meta-analysis of 45 studies of leadership styles finds that women leaders have more transformational leadership styles than their male counterparts, which is positively associated with leader effectiveness. Eagly (2007) states that while female leadership styles may initially be similar to men due to having to meet similar, male-centric requirements to gain access to leadership roles, once in place, they often exhibit more transformational styles which are again related to positive organizational outcomes. However, female leaders must both possess the agentic leadership qualities associated with men and the communal expectations of women in order to manage for each circumstance (Eagly, 2007; Nicholson-Crotty, 2005). Status beliefs of women’s competence as leaders generally place them at a disadvantage, but they may in fact be impactful and positive leaders once in place. Based on this literature, I hypothesize:
H2: Having a female Board Chair is positively related to the United Way’s performance.

H3: Having a female Executive Director is positively related to the United Way’s performance.

The following section will discuss the measures for these hypotheses, and the empirical findings.

Analysis & Findings

**Dependent Variables**

As opposed to the for-profit literature, nonprofits do not garner financial ratios such as return on assets, return on investments, and overall market value. In this nonprofit context, variables are derived from what is reported on the IRS form 990. Ritchie and Kolodinsky (2003) used three key performance measures for nonprofits: fundraising efficiency, public support, and fiscal performance. Similarly, I will be using measure of fiscal performance and efficiency. There are two dependent variables analyzed in this study: the Log of Total Revenue and the Log of Total Organizational Allocations. As stated in Chapter 3, the total allocations data were collected from IRS form 990s. Log of Allocations is a measure of programmatic performance, as the United Way has a mission to allocate funds to social service organizations and programs in their communities. This can be viewed as a measure of efficiency, as this measures the grant-making expenses paid for through the income of the organization when the model is controlled for revenue. Total allocations have been logged to normalize the distribution for analysis. The
measure of total revenue can be viewed both as an overall measure of fiscal health and as a manifestation of fundraising ability.

**Independent Variables**

The independent variables included in these analyses include the key gender-associated variables discussed throughout the literature: the percentage of women on the board; whether the board chair is female; and whether the Executive Director is female. Details on how these variables were collected can be found in Chapter 3. Descriptive statistics of the model are displayed in Table 5.1. On average women comprise about 40% of United Way boards, were employed as Executive Directors 64% of the time, and served as board chair in about 33% of organizations. The mean of allocations distributed across this sample is approximately $482,000 with the minimum being as low as just over $4,000 and the maximum over $100 million. Consequently, allocations and revenue were logged to reduce skewness and outlier effects. Stata’s ln() command returns the natural logarithm (base e) transformation and was used to account for right skewness (Cox, 2007).

**Table 5.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Total Allocations</td>
<td>13.087</td>
<td>1.593</td>
<td>8.372</td>
<td>18.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Total Revenue</td>
<td>13.872</td>
<td>1.565</td>
<td>9.565</td>
<td>18.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Women on Board</td>
<td>39.778</td>
<td>17.352</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Exec. Director</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Chair</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Control variables for population of the service region and the organization’s overall revenue are included to account for regional density and organizational size. Controlling for revenue in the Allocations model also allows for the interpretation of allocations as an efficiency measure.

**Analysis**

Pooled OLS regressions with year fixed effects and cluster-robust standard errors were run for the analysis. These tests were run with cluster-robust standard errors to account for heteroscedasticity in the independent variables and correlation of the error terms across cases for particular United Ways. Cameron and Trivedi (2009) state that: “for panel data, it is essential that OLS standard errors be corrected for clustering on the individual [United Way]. In contrast, the default standard errors assume that the regression errors are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.)” (p. 250). Clustering tells STATA that the observations are not independent. All independent variables are lagged to account for simultaneity, on the assumption that it takes time for changes in board composition and leadership to change board culture and financial decision-making. Additional information on the specification of this model can be found in Chapter 4, Analysis.

**Findings**

Table 5.2 displays the results of correlation tests and their significance levels. Each variable in this model is significantly correlated. A variance inflation factor test on the regression of Log of Total Allocations was run due to highly correlated independent variables. The results of this test are in Table 5.3. No score was above 2.77, indicating little multicolinearity in this model, which is more than acceptable as per the discussion of variance inflation factors in Chapter 4 (Hair,
Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995). As with Chapter 4, Log of Total Allocations is negatively and significantly correlated to the percentage of women on the board, whether there is a female Executive Director, and whether there is a female Board Chair.

Table 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Table</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Percent Women on Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Female Exec. Director</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Female Chair</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Log Total Allocations</td>
<td>-0.366</td>
<td>-0.344</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Log Total Revenue</td>
<td>-0.329</td>
<td>-0.347</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Log Service Region Population</td>
<td>-0.321</td>
<td>-0.339</td>
<td>-0.119</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Log Lagged Total Revenue</td>
<td>-0.363</td>
<td>-0.362</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 shows the results of the OLS regression with year fixed effects run for Log Total Revenue. This model includes all United Way data for all years.
Model 1 shows a basic model without controlling for past performance of the organization. In this model, both the lagged percent of women on the board and having a female executive director are negative and significantly related to the log of total current revenue even controlling for service region population. However, in model 2, lagged revenue is added as a predictor. This is highly predictive of current revenue, and makes both the lagged percent of women on the board and executive director drop from significance. Presumably, lagged total revenue, along with population, is absorbing most of the variation in this model.

However, based on the literature, there is a hypothesized non-linear relationship between the percent of women on the board and performance measures. When the quadratic term for lagged percent women is added to the model, the variable again becomes significant at the p<0.05 level. The relationship appears to have an inverted U-shape, increasing to a peak and then declining.

The predictive margins were run on this relationship, controlling for the other lagged variables in
the model, and shows a peak at approximately 40% women on the board (Figure 5.1). The standard errors for the values from 70% women and beyond are quite large due to the fact there

Table 5.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship of Past Composition of Board and Leadership on Log of Total Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(All models contain cluster-robust standard errors and unstandardized coefficients unless otherwise specified)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES (Lagged)</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Women on Board,</td>
<td>-0.010***</td>
<td>1.07e-04</td>
<td>0.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(8.25e-04)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Women on Board^2</td>
<td>-9.92e-05*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.00e-05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Executive Director</td>
<td>-0.227**</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.086)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
<td>(0.028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Chair</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
<td>(0.020)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log of Population</td>
<td>0.830***</td>
<td>0.086***</td>
<td>0.088***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
<td>(0.021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log of Total Revenue</td>
<td>0.910***</td>
<td>0.905***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.024)</td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted Year 2000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2004</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.084*</td>
<td>0.095*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.076)</td>
<td>(0.042)</td>
<td>(0.043)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2008</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.162***</td>
<td>0.166***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.058)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2010</td>
<td>0.130*</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.056)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2013</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.048+</td>
<td>0.049+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.047)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
<td>(0.029)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted Year 2015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>4.537***</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.615)</td>
<td>(0.178)</td>
<td>(0.177)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations | 1,516 | 1,304 | 1,304 |
R-squared | 0.627 | 0.926 | 0.927 |
Clusters | 502 | 462 | 462 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses, clustered on United Way
*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05, + p<0.1
are fewer boards in this sample with such high female to male ratios and so it is difficult to ascertain the precise slope of the decline in current revenue. Hypothesis 1 is supported for the performance measure Log of Total Revenue. Neither hypothesis 2 or 3 are supported when controlling for lagged revenue nor a non-linear functional form of the percent of women found on the board. There appears to be neither financial benefit nor detriment from having a female Board Chair or female Executive Director.

Table 5.5 provides the results of the regression on the Log of Total Allocations provided by each United Way. The first of the three models in Table 5.5 is run without lagged revenue. As in the model for Log of Total Revenue, the relationship between the Lagged Percent Women on the Board and Log of Total Revenue is shown in Figure 5.1.
Board is negative and significant at the p<0.001 level. Again, having a female Executive Director is also negative and significant. Once past revenue is controlled for, the significance of

Table 5.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES (Lagged)</th>
<th>Depend: Log of Total Revenue</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Women on Board</td>
<td>-0.014***</td>
<td>-0.003+</td>
<td>0.007+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Women on Board^2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.24e-04*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.96e-05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Executive Director</td>
<td>-0.313**</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.100)</td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
<td>(0.054)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Chair</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0631)</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log of Population</td>
<td>0.744***</td>
<td>-0.062+</td>
<td>-0.057+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log of Total Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.951***</td>
<td>0.944***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.031)</td>
<td>(0.032)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted Year 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2004</td>
<td>0.118+</td>
<td>0.413***</td>
<td>0.434***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.068)</td>
<td>(0.047)</td>
<td>(0.048)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2008</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.397***</td>
<td>0.401***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.062)</td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2010</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.142**</td>
<td>0.147**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.053)</td>
<td>(0.044)</td>
<td>(0.045)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2013</td>
<td>-0.147**</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.052)</td>
<td>(0.052)</td>
<td>(0.0525)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted Year 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.053***</td>
<td>0.693+</td>
<td>0.541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.685)</td>
<td>(0.371)</td>
<td>(0.374)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05, + p<0.1
the Executive Director variable drops out of the model, but the Percent Women on the Board remains negative and marginally significant. This result indicates that holding all else constant, the more women on the board, the less of overall future revenue goes to grant allocations. In other words, revenues may be spent on other non-grant programming or administrative costs. Lagged population and revenue remain positive and significant controls for the Log of Allocations.

Once again, the quadratic term for Percent Women on the Board is tested in model 3 (Table 5.5). In this model, a non-linear relationship between the Lagged Percent Women on the Board emerges for current Allocations, though the linear coefficient is only marginally significant (p<0.099). The quadratic term is significant at the p<0.013 level. Similar to Log of Revenue, the percent of women on the past board appears to have a nonlinear and significant relationship to current revenue, all else constant. This relationship has been graphed in Figure 5.2. It appears that the benefits of the percentage of women on the board peaks at approximately 30% women. The relationship then becomes negative and significant (p<0.05) as the percentage of women on the board approaches 100%. This finding aligns with Joecks, Pull, and Vetter’s (2013) finding that 30% is the critical mass of female representation for a board. It is important to note that the predictive margins have quite large confidence intervals as Percent Women on Board increases from 60% to 100%. And while the scale is in Log of Total Allocations, the difference between the value of 30% women and 100% women translates to quite a substantial amount—a difference of approximately $385,000 from the predicted peak to its value at 100% women. Hypothesis 1 is again supported for the log of Total Allocations, while hypotheses 2 and 3 are not supported.
There does not appear to be any difference in the effect of male or female leadership on total allocations. The implications of these finding will be discussed in the following section.

**Figure 5.2**

![Graph showing predictive margins for log allocations by percent women lagged](image)

**Discussion**

Previous studies have found mixed results when analyzing the potential effects of gender on organizational performance (Adams and Ferreira, 2009; Miller and del Carmen Triana, 2009; Simkins and Simpson, 2003). This study adds to this literature by testing the performance impacts, measured in financial terms, that women in leadership roles may have in grant-making nonprofit organizations. It tests previous hypotheses, but is situated in gender status beliefs and the corporate logics of these organizations.
What story are these data telling? First, when it comes to executive leadership, having a female Board or Executive Director is the same as having a male for these two performance outcomes. Societal expectations that women are in some way less adept at leadership than men and are less designed for that type of work seem contradicted. They are neither better nor worse when measuring for revenue or allocations. However, this is not to say there are no differences in leadership style or other outcomes. As Eagly (2007) notes, women’s transformational leadership styles may be more useful in today’s marketplace. More research is required to analyze gendered leadership and board outcomes like responsiveness, board culture, and other financial ratios of performance. Does the board feel more supported by female Executive Directors or Board Chairs? Is distribution of finances more in line with mission objectives when women are leaders? Some of this work can only be done through surveys, interviews, and observations.

The effects observed in these tests are non-linear, significant relationships between the lagged percentage of women on the board and the revenue and allocations of the United Ways in this sample. The return on having women on the board appears to decline at approximately 30-40% of the board’s composition. This is in line with the critical mass theories and falls neatly into status beliefs about women’s competencies (Joecks, et al., 2013; Konrad, Kramer, & Erkut, 2008). Having some women on the board increases diversity of opinions and approaches, but go beyond that threshold and status beliefs would have us believe individuals would believe that boards begin to lose men’s stronger management qualities. These status beliefs also are in line with the logics of the corporation (Thorton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2011). Status hierarchies are at the core of the corporation, and as discussed, generally situate men at their pinnacle. Women
are often only given chances at reaching upper levels of the hierarchy when performance is already declining (Ryan, Haslam, Hersby & Bongiorno, 2011; Main & Gregory-Smith, 2017).

However, the mean percentage of women on boards in this sample is 40%. A nonlinear relationship is observed here between the percentage of women on the board and effectiveness. This relationship may be a signal of lacking examples of large female to male ratios in organizations in high population areas or with high revenues. Chapter 4 details that as past allocations decrease, the percentage of women on the board tends to increase. Here, as the past percentage of women on the board increases, there is a peak in performance at 30-40%, but then a reduction in revenue and allocations as the proportion of women on the board increases. The previous literature discussed above assessing gender’s impact on performance does not discuss the potential for simultaneity in their independent and dependent variables. Merton (1968) addresses this as the Matthew Effect. The Matthew Effect states that those individuals in the advantaged group will continue seeing additional benefits solely for being advantaged, while those in disadvantaged or non-dominant groups must work harder to reach levels of achievement and reward that come easier to advantaged groups (Merton, 1968). The Matthew Effect may be in play with men serving on boards of nonprofits. The more men are seen as prominent providers of funding to local organizations, the more men are asked to sit on these high allocating boards. Lagged independent variables are used in these models to account for some of this simultaneity, but use of a strong instrumental variable and a two-stage least square model may better get at the effects women have on these performance measures.
A robustness check of the allocations (efficiency) model was run with a calculated measure of the overhead ratio as the dependent variable. Overhead was measured as the difference between revenue and allocations divided by revenue. This model also showed a positive effect of the percent women on the board on the overhead ratio, and a U-shaped effect when the quadratic of percent women was included. The relationship between the percent women on the board and measures of allocations (efficiency) may be due in part to the measurement of allocations and the size of the organizations at which women are typically in the majority.

Another impact is that many United Ways engage in their own programming, such as Success by Six, Real Men Read, or 2-1-1 services. Based on my board observations as detailed in Chapter 3, the larger, male dominated United Ways are moving away from providing their own programming, preferring to show their worth as an organization in convening strategies to solve larger community problems as per United Way Worldwide’s Community Impact direction. Community Impact is meant to focus United Way efforts towards three key areas of impact funding—health, education, and income (United Way Worldwide, https://www.unitedway.org/our-impact/focus). The smaller, female dominated United Ways I observed during my seven-month observation period focus on showing their United Way had tangible programs in order to solicit donations. Allocations may decline while the percentage of women on the board increases because dollars used for hands-on programming are not being included in the allocations lists on the form 990, particularly in the smaller communities where women are dominating the boards. Money may not be used for administrative costs, but for active programming that is no longer occurring or occurring at lower levels in larger United Ways.
The distribution of percentage of women on the board was provided in Chapter 3 (Figure 3.2) shows that in our sample, the percentage of women found on boards peaks at about 30% to 40%. A categorical model based on the segments laid out in Joecks, et al. (2013) would be a valuable next step in observing effects within categories. This type of test would divide the percentage of women into categories based on Kanter’s (1977) delineation of skewed groups (0%-20% women); tilted groups (20% to 40% women); and balanced groups (40 to 60% women). Perhaps additional categories for 60% to 80% and 80% to 100% women should be added to account for female skewed and tilted groups. This way, the analysis can view particular categories rather than overall averages.

Finally, though we see a drop-off in performance before parity in this sample, we still observe less than average performance on boards with 60-100% men and 40-100% women. Diversity of gender is preferable to solidly single gendered boards, or boards with token females or males (Joecks, Pull & Vetter, 2013; Konrad, Kramer & Erkut, 2008). Having more women on boards is beneficial up to a point, but more research is needed into boards with 40% or more women to see whether these effects are due to the actual presence of women, or confounding factors such as what types of communities and United Ways we typically see women dominating boards.
Chapter 6:

Gender Diversity and the Funding of

Women- And Girl-Serving Organizations

United Ways require agencies seeking funding to apply in order to ascertain whether the organization is aligned with the United Way’s general mission of “improve[ing] lives by mobilizing the caring power of communities around the world to advance the common good” (United Way Worldwide, https://www.unitedway.org/our-impact/mission#). The application process is thorough and includes the applicant organization providing mission and financial information, as well as interviews with the Executive Directors of the applicant organization. The board and appropriate committees debate, based on determined guidelines, whether an applicant is eligible for funding. Women- and girl-serving organizations are but one type of organization that apply to United Ways as part of United Way’s efforts to support local social services and education. The gendering of the policy issues happens at each United Way. Health, income, and education are broad mission areas that can easily target women and girls. The number of women participating in the allocation decision process may alter how gendered the policy issue is perceived, given the types of organizations that have applied for grants from the United Way.

What, if any, impact does having female leadership and board directors have on a United Way’s choice of helping a women- and girl-serving organization get certified or funded? United Way #3 is in the middle of one such debate. Located in a service region of approximately 144,000 people, it relies heavily on the local University for fundraising. It is in a town of many local nonprofits and many start-ups that are too small or too new to be recognized by the United Way.
Recently, a female Executive Director took over her position from a male Executive Director. In their February 2018 meeting, the new female Executive Director noted that there were a few “new agencies asking about being involved” with the United Way. Key amongst them is the Girl Scouts. The Girl Scouts were once funded members of the United Way, but for some reason are no longer. They “now want back on.” The Executive Director expressed her interest in helping the Girl Scouts come prepared for the certification process. She met with the local Girl Scout director to discuss what the Girl Scouts would need to do to become affiliated with the United Way once again. The Executive Director stated that “[the Girl Scouts] may not pass the certification process this year, but they will try this spring. They are much more serious about it and want the United Way affiliation.” The Executive Director may or may not be making a conscious gendered decision, but she is using her position to assist a girl-serving organization become eligible for United Way funding.

Local communities consist of a wide variety of organizations, and many may not achieve the United Way’s certification requirements if they have set policies. Of those organizations that can, only a small portion may support women- and girl-centered missions. These local agencies are all working to receive a piece of the funding pie the United Way is able to allocate each year. Certified agencies apply for a certain amount of funding from the United Way and must be able to support their request based on programmatic costs, needs, and past performance. Though a committee may, in some cases, be responsible for certifying organizations and reviewing grant applications, the board has the final say on how funds are allocated. What, if any, relationship does board and leadership gender composition have on the distribution of funds, particularly to women- and girl-serving organizations?
As discussed in Chapter 2, there is research into whether the presence of women in decision-making positions increases the attention given to women and girl-centered issues. This work relies on Representative Bureaucracy theory. There are two types of representation of groups—active and passive. I use Meier’s (1993) definition of representative bureaucracy: “A bureaucracy is representative in the passive sense if the bureaucrats share the same demographic origins (race, sex, education, religion, etc.) as the general population . . . A bureaucracy is an active representative if it produces policy outputs that benefit the individuals who are passively represented” (p. 393). Research has found that having more women in certain positions of power has led to representation of policies and issues focused on women and girls. For example, women in positions of elected political power propose and support more legislation and activity around women and girl centered policy issues (Bratton, 2005; Bratton & Haynie, 1999; MacDonald & O’Brien, 2011; Reingold, 2006; Swers, 2002, 2013; Thomas & Wilcox, 2014). MacDonald & O’Brien (2011), for example, found that women legislators sponsored more women’s issue focused bills than men who served the same constituents.

Depending on her motivations, the Executive Director introduced at the start of this chapter may be engaging in active representation. However, as detailed in Chapter 2, the findings have been mixed as to whether women actively represent the interests of other women. Fernandez, Malatesta, and Smith (2012) find that women in positions to make funding decisions did not provide more contract dollars to women-run small businesses. In fact, they found that having an advocate for funding women-owned small businesses was significantly negatively (p<0.10) related to the amount awarded to women-owned small businesses. They hypothesize that these negative or null findings about representation can be attributed to a variety of factors. Among them is the likelihood that women in positions of power may “endorse gender stereotypes”
(Fernandez et al. 2012, p. 113) based on the research of Ellemers, Heuvel, Gilder, Maass, and Bonvini (2004) and Garcia-Retamero and López-Zafra (2006). Women are just as likely as men to hold gender status beliefs about the abilities of other women. For example, in Ellemers et al. (2004) female faculty members most strongly felt that female doctoral students were less committed to their work than their male counterparts. They discuss female faculty, who have now risen in the hierarchy, as socially removing themselves from the female-group stereotyping but reinforcing their gendered beliefs towards lower ranking female students. This removal of oneself from the out-group stereotype while reinforcing these gendered beliefs for others in their group is named the “queen bee syndrome” (Ellemers, et al. 2004; as coined by Staines, Tavris, & Jayaratne, 1974). Women in positions of authority may view the needs of other women as contrary to what they needed to get to their positions and may look unfavorably on them. However, several factors indicate women in leadership positions in United Ways may actively represent the women and girls in need in their communities.

Keiser et al. (2002) write that there are seven institutional factors influencing whether passive gender representation will express itself through active representation. These factors are “discretion, the gendering of a given policy issue, mission/socialization, hierarchy, stratification, critical mass, and professionalization” (p.557). How do these factors play out in the context of this sample, and how many produce active representation of women and girls issues? This study analyzes the boards and executive leadership of United Ways across the United States. First, discretion; full discretion over allocations depends upon the unique dynamics of each United Way. The United Way board approves allocation decisions, though a different committee consisting of volunteers and board members may in some cases review funding applications and make funding recommendations. Data on these funding committees is not available, but the
board sets the policies and processes for these committees, influences the direction of these
decisions, and has final approval of the recommended funding amounts. The Executive Director
can also play a role in the process through management of the applications for funding and of the
allocation committee. This study attempts to measure the influence of the board, the Chair, and
Executive Director on funding decisions.

The gendering of the policy issues at hand coincides with the mission. As stated above, the
United Way Worldwide’s mission is to mobilize community resources to “advance the common
good” (United Way, 2017b). In the United States, this focuses on the policy areas of income,
education, and health, though each local United Way has their own mission statement and issue
focus. The overarching umbrella mission allows for consistency across United Ways, however,
and funding social services are a key element of the United Way agenda. Women- and girl-
serving organizations are found in each of the three key national focus areas. For example,
women’s health organizations that deal with pregnancy are prevalent in many communities,
through organizations such as Planned Parenthood and Birthright. Helping women find stable
income through education and employment services is also a major mission for some
organizations. Women and girls are key constituents in many of the United Way’s key focus
areas.

Fourth and fifth on Keiser’s list are hierarchy and stratification, which come into play through
status beliefs and formal roles. Boards have executive committees that impose some form of
hierarchy within the group. Also, status characteristic beliefs about the abilities of each member
on the board may influence group dynamics. One’s gender, race, occupation, and community
standing can impact his or her behavior in group decision-making settings and their influence
over other board members (Correll & Ridgeway, 2003). For example, men are often associated
with being more competent in leadership positions, whether true or not (Ridgeway, 2001).
Women also tend to speak less in mixed-gender group settings (Smith-Lovin, Skvoretz &
Hudson, 1986). If queen bee syndrome is in effect with female board members, they may be less
sympathetic to organizations seeking assistance for women or girls. This study seeks to identify
whether having women in positions higher in the hierarchy or in leadership roles is salient to
moving passive representation to active representation as defined in Chapter 2.

Critical mass is the sixth element discussed by Keiser et al. (2002). As discussed in Chapter 5
Joecks, Pull, and Vetter (2013) and Konrad, Kramer, and Erkut (2008) find that board
performance is impacted by the number of women sitting on the board of directors and that the
gender composition must hit a “critical mass” of women. Joecks et al. (2013) argue this critical
mass is reached only when 30% or more of the board comprises women, while Konrad et al.
state that it must be at least three women. Nonprofit organizations have historically higher
percentages of women on their boards than for-profit firms, though they have not reached parity.
The mean percentage of female board members for this sample of United Ways is 39.8%. The
median percentage of the sample is 38.9%. Given that critical mass as per Joecks et al. (2013)
has been achieved in the majority of cases, we can assume that this institutional factor for
moving passive to active representation has been met.

Finally, Keiser et al (2002) contend that greater professionalization will “facilitate the translation
of passive representation into active representation” (p. 557). They argue that professionals
receive some of their motivation and reward from groups outside of the bureaucracy and in turn
bring their values into it. This transference is particularly true for nonprofit boards of directors,
all of whom are volunteers and usually have roles in the community outside of being a board member. For board members, the professionalization occurs through a robust and widespread educational industry devoted to strengthening nonprofit governance. United Way boards are high-profile actors in this area, given their community visibility and obligation to practice what they expect from their member agencies. Keiser et al. (2002) argue that professionalization of roles and behaviors will increase the capacity of moving from passive to active representation. This professionalization could include having training particular to running a business or nonprofit, or enacting certain standardized business practices, such as marketing or strategic planning.

However, the professionalization of the nonprofit sector occurs in a different way. Viewing women’s participation from the representational bureaucracy framework, nonprofits would be normatively expected to be open to workforces and leadership that represent the communities they serve. However, the nonprofit sector has become increasingly influenced by for-profit business practices and the institutional logics of the corporation (Dobrai & Farkas, 2016; Hwang & Powell, 2009; Suárez, 2010) They frequently seek to mimic successful for-profit organizations and pursue continuous improvements they view as being produced by adopting professional managerialist methods. According to Hwang and Powell (2009), “In this context, a corpus of terms related to professionalism—such as professional, expert, expertise, authority—has acquired many varied and culturally elaborated connotations” (p. 269). In formal organizational settings, we see the status characteristics that men often are attributed with are characteristics of leadership and expertise while women are believed to be better with soft-skills (Beutel & Marini, 1995; Cech, Rubineau, Silbey, & Seron, 2011; Eagly, Diekman, Johannesen-Schmidt & Koenig, 2004; Nielsen & Huse, 2010). As discussed in Chapter 2, women’s leadership styles are not fully
in line with managerialist methods embraced by professionalized organizations, and that even as recently as a 2011, men were still associated with professionalism and managerial practices (Schein & Davidson, 1993; Sczesny, 2003; Koenig, et al, 2011). If the status belief system establishes men to be associated with these terms and characteristics, and nonprofits seek to mimic successful organizations, we would expect to see more men in leadership positions. This effort to be professional would support organizations’ move away from nonprofit leadership being representative of one’s community, instead using the successful boards of other non-profit or for-profit institutions as their model. Leadership may take on a more masculine tone in boards, even for female board members and leadership. Their positions of authority may lead them to look for organizations to fund that are more professionalized, while focusing less on their own identity-driven, emotional or representational relationship to the organization.

Given these criteria, this study expects to find the following.

**H1a:** The percentage of women on the board of directors will be positively and significantly related to whether a United Way gives to women- or girl-serving organizations.

**H1b:** Having a female United Way Executive Director will be positively and significantly related to whether a United Way gives to women- or girl-serving organizations.

**H1c:** Having a female Board Chair will be positively and significantly related to whether a United Way gives to women- or girl-serving organizations.
H2: United Ways with female leadership, either as an executive director or board chair, will lead to more active representation through increased funding of women’s and girls’ organizations.

H3: There will be a positive relationship between having a higher proportion of women on the board and the proportion of allocations given to women- and girl-serving organizations.

Details on the data, analysis and findings follow in the next section.

**Analysis & Findings**

**Dependent Variables**

Data for this section were derived through the methods detailed in Chapter 3, with some additional coding to identify women- and girl-serving organizations. The coding of women’s and girls’ organizations was conducted in STATA using word recognition and NTEE codes. The names of all allocation recipients were obtained from each United Way, and a keyword search protocol was used (Table 6.1) employing terms associated with women- and girl-serving organizations. Some words were not searched alone, such as “girl” due to the fact it would bring back results for organizations such as The Boys and Girls Club, whose mission is not solely focused on girls. These terms were used as they are associated with some of the most common women- and girl-serving organizations in United Way service regions nationally. This strategy provides us with a conservative estimate of how many women-and girl-serving organizations
were funded, but still brought back results in over 2,169 cases (59%) in the sample. Cases are counted as each individual year for each United Way.

Table 6.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women and Girl Focused Organization Search Terms (Inclusive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girl Scout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Parenthood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NTEE codes were matched to recipient organizations using EIN codes. All organizations coded as P43, Family Violence Shelters, were included as presumed women-focused organizations. Examples of the organizations identified through this search are listed below (Table 6.2).

Table 6.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women- and Girl-Serving Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girls Inc. of NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Parenthood of Northern New England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse and Rape Crisis Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont Girl Scout Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 6.3 are the descriptive statistics of the included variables. The mean percentage of total allocations provided to women’s and girls’ organizations is 5.1% of total yearly allocations, meaning in any single year 5.1% of an average United Way’s allocations funded a women-focused organization. In all years, 59% of United Ways had some form of allocation to a
women’s and girls’ focused organization, meaning over the six measured annual allocation periods, 59% of United Ways funded a women- or girl-focused organization at one point in time.

Table 6.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donates to Women’s and Girls' Orgs.</td>
<td>0.591</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total Allocations to Women’s and Girls' Orgs.</td>
<td>5.100</td>
<td>6.633</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log of Percent of Total Allocations to Women’s and Girls’ Orgs.</td>
<td>1.574</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>-7.070</td>
<td>3.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Women on Board</td>
<td>39.778</td>
<td>17.352</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Exec. Director</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Board Chair</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log of Total Revenue</td>
<td>13.872</td>
<td>1.565</td>
<td>9.565</td>
<td>18.655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standard deviation for the dependent variable “Percent of total allocations to women’s and Girls’ Organizations’ is over 6.5 percent. This creates a coefficient of variation over 1, indicating a higher dispersion of data. The distribution of allocation percentages is very heavily right-skewed as can be seen in Figure 6.1.

**Independent Variables**

The key independent variables included in this model are the variables regarding gender of the board and leadership. Percent of women on the board, gender of the Board Chair, and gender of the Executive Director were collected through the methods described in Chapter 3. The variable Log of Total Revenue controls for the size and performance of the United Way, while the service region population serves as another control.
Analysis

Pooled OLS regression with year fixed effects and cluster-robust standard errors are used for this analysis as per Chapters 4 and 5. This analysis does not lag the independent variables, however, as the current board and Board Chair, guided by the Executive Director, make the final decisions on allocations for that year. Current year revenue and population provide controls for the amount the organization has to allocate and the size of the current community.

Findings

Initial correlations were run between dependent and independent variables (Table 6.4). The percent donated to women’s and girls’ organizations was highly significant and negatively related to the percentage of women represented on the board, as well as the presence of a female
Executive Director. The coefficients were small, however, indicating a strong but small relationship. The natural log of the percent of allocation to women- and girl-serving organizations proved only significantly related to revenue and population.

Table 6.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation Table</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Donates to Women and Girls' Orgs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Percent of Total Allocations to Women and Girls' Orgs.</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Log Percent of Total Allocations to Women and Girls' Orgs.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Percent Women on Board</td>
<td>-0.131</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Female Exec. Director</td>
<td>-0.104</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Female Board Chair</td>
<td>-0.038</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Log of Total Revenue</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>-0.182</td>
<td>-0.329</td>
<td>-0.347</td>
<td>-0.112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Log Service Region Population</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-0.124</td>
<td>-0.321</td>
<td>-0.339</td>
<td>-0.119</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A variance inflation test was conducted (Table 6.5). No score was above 2.99, therefore well within acceptable limits for multicollinearity (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1995).
Table 6.6 provides the results of the logistic regression on “Donates to Women’s and Girls’ Organizations.” This is a binary variable, with 1 denoting the United Way gave to a women or girl-serving nonprofit in that year. In model 1, the gender variables are run alone with a control for local population. There are 43 United Ways that did not give to women- or girl-serving organizations.

Table 6.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variances Inflation Factor</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>1/VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Log of Total Revenue</td>
<td>2.990</td>
<td>0.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Service Region Population</td>
<td>2.810</td>
<td>0.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2010</td>
<td>2.150</td>
<td>0.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2000</td>
<td>2.100</td>
<td>0.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2008</td>
<td>2.080</td>
<td>0.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2013</td>
<td>2.070</td>
<td>0.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2004</td>
<td>1.870</td>
<td>0.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Women on Board</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>0.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Exec. Director</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>0.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Board Chair</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>0.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean VIF</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

organizations. Since this analysis is predicated on the opportunity to give to a women- or girl-serving organization, half of this group was randomly sampled to test for the presence of such organizations in a community. It was found that 90% of these United Ways had women- or girl-serving organizations that could be funded within their service regions and that would have been identified in the name and NTEE code search. This analysis can assume that the United Ways involved had the discretion to give to women- and girl-serving organizations, rather than were limited by lack of this type of service provider in their area.
Here we see a negative and significant (p<0.01) relationship between the number of women on the board and donating to a women and girls’ organization. Having a female Executive Director is also negatively associated, but is just marginally significant. Once organizational revenue is controlled for in model 2, the gender variables drop out and revenue is highly significant.

### Table 6.6

**Logistic Regression: Donates to Women’s and Girls' Organizations**  
(All models contain cluster-robust standard errors and unstandardized coefficients unless otherwise specified)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Women on Board</td>
<td>-0.00989**</td>
<td>-0.00182</td>
<td>0.0239+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00333)</td>
<td>(0.00409)</td>
<td>(0.0124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Women on Board^2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.000314*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Exec. Director</td>
<td>-0.207+</td>
<td>-0.140</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.117)</td>
<td>(0.120)</td>
<td>(0.121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Board Chair</td>
<td>0.0566</td>
<td>-0.00915</td>
<td>0.0129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0988)</td>
<td>(0.116)</td>
<td>(0.117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Service Region Population</td>
<td>0.255***</td>
<td>-0.140+</td>
<td>0.0134+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0514)</td>
<td>(0.0763)</td>
<td>(0.0768)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log of Total Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.440***</td>
<td>0.425***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0678)</td>
<td>(0.0682)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2000</td>
<td>0.472**</td>
<td>0.558**</td>
<td>0.606***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.153)</td>
<td>(0.180)</td>
<td>(0.181)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2004</td>
<td>0.632***</td>
<td>0.511**</td>
<td>0.529**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.145)</td>
<td>(0.197)</td>
<td>(0.196)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2008</td>
<td>0.658***</td>
<td>0.614***</td>
<td>0.624***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.141)</td>
<td>(0.176)</td>
<td>(0.176)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2010</td>
<td>0.752***</td>
<td>1.095***</td>
<td>1.097***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.115)</td>
<td>(0.160)</td>
<td>(0.167)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2013</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
<td>-0.0500</td>
<td>-0.0535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0924)</td>
<td>(0.128)</td>
<td>(0.129)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted Year 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.255**</td>
<td>-3.960***</td>
<td>-4.296***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.687)</td>
<td>(0.848)</td>
<td>(0.850)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>2,545</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>1,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R-sq</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in parentheses, clustered on United Way

*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05, + p<0.08
(p<0.001) and positive for the likelihood of funding women and girls’ organizations. The year
dummy variables are also significant, indicating that the United Ways were significantly more
likely to fund women- and girl-serving organizations in 2000, 2004, 2008, and 2010 compared to
2015.

As per the findings in Chapters 4 and 5, a quadratic term for Percent Women on Board is
included in model 3. A nonlinear, inverted U-shaped relationship between Percent Women on
Board and the likelihood to donate to a women and girl supporting nonprofit is revealed. The
linear term is marginally positively significant at the p<0.054 level, and the quadratic term is
negatively significant (p<0.05). Here findings conclude that in United Ways with higher
percentages of women on their boards are less likely to donate to women and girls’ causes in a
particular year. Hypothesis 1a is partially supported, while Hypotheses 1b and 1c are not
supported.

Expanding on this line of inquiry, regressions were run on the percentage of that year’s
allocations that went to a woman or girl-serving organization (Table 6.7). The results of a
histogram analysis on the distribution of the dependent variable showed an extreme right-skew,
so the log of this variable was employed. This choice unfortunately drops all percentages that
were zero, so only observations that had some allocations to women- and girl-serving
organizations are analyzed.

As with models in Table 6.6, Table 6.7 shows the stepwise development of the final model
(model 3). In Model 1 and 2, few predictors were statistically significant. In model 1, no gender
variable is significant, but the Log of Service Region Population shows a highly significant (p<0.001), negative relationship with the amount donated to women and girls organizations. A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Pooled OLS Regression: Log Percent of Dollars Allocated To Women and Girls' Organizations
(All models contain cluster-robust standard errors and unstandardized coefficients unless otherwise specified)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent Women on Board</td>
<td>-0.000408</td>
<td>-7.34e-05</td>
<td>0.0145+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.00209)</td>
<td>(0.00260)</td>
<td>(0.00739)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Women on Board^2</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.000188*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8.80e-05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Exec. Director</td>
<td>-0.0899</td>
<td>-0.134</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0738)</td>
<td>(0.0809)</td>
<td>(0.0814)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Board Chair</td>
<td>0.0795</td>
<td>0.0964</td>
<td>0.107+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0527)</td>
<td>(0.0575)</td>
<td>(0.0579)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log Service Region Population</td>
<td>-0.132***</td>
<td>-0.0550</td>
<td>-0.0519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0352)</td>
<td>(0.0551)</td>
<td>(0.0545)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log of Total Revenue</td>
<td>-0.102*</td>
<td>-0.110*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0443)</td>
<td>(0.0442)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2000</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.0968</td>
<td>0.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0824)</td>
<td>(0.0988)</td>
<td>(0.0991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2004</td>
<td>0.0416</td>
<td>0.0577</td>
<td>0.0618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0736)</td>
<td>(0.101)</td>
<td>(0.101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2008</td>
<td>-0.0463</td>
<td>-0.0530</td>
<td>-0.0461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0782)</td>
<td>(0.0996)</td>
<td>(0.0991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2010</td>
<td>0.0327</td>
<td>0.0439</td>
<td>0.0475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0616)</td>
<td>(0.0824)</td>
<td>(0.0826)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2013</td>
<td>0.0381</td>
<td>0.0488</td>
<td>0.0494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0551)</td>
<td>(0.0726)</td>
<td>(0.0728)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted Year 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.145***</td>
<td>3.692***</td>
<td>3.509***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.463)</td>
<td>(0.518)</td>
<td>(0.519)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations 1,592 1,285 1,285
R-squared 0.034 0.051 0.055
Clusters 493 454 454

Robust standard errors in parentheses, clustered on United Way
*** p<0.001, ** p<0.01, * p<0.05, + p<0.066
10% increase in population would decrease the percentage of overall dollars given to women and girls’ organizations by 14.5%. Once revenue is added in Model 2, population drops away and revenue is now negative and significantly related to the dependent variable. In this case, as revenue increases by 10%, giving to women’s and girls’ organizations decreases by about 11% (p<0.05). Following the pattern above, Model 3 includes both revenue and the quadratic of percent women on the board. Revenue remains negative and significantly related to giving to women and girls’ organizations, but now the gender variables for Percent Women on Board become significant and positive. The negative quadratic term (p<0.05) indicates the relationship looks like an inverted U, with allocation percentages increasing to a point, and then declining as the percent of women on the board increases. Figure 6.2 illustrates this relationship holding all other variables in the model constant. The logged percentage of allocations peaks at approximately 40% women on the board, with about 5% of donations going to women- and girl-serving organizations. It then decreases at and above gender parity, but the confidence interval width increases greatly due to sample as the percentage of women on the board increases past 70%. Whether the Board Chair is female also becomes marginally significant at the p<0.066 level. It is positively related to the percentage of allocations provided to women- and girl-serving organizations. H2 and H3 are partially supported. Discussion of these findings can be found in the following section.

Discussion

Overall, the results of this analysis would indicate that the percentage of women on the board matters for giving to women- and girl-serving organizations. Giving increases until the board reaches the upper end of the “tilted” group (Joecks, et al. 2013; Kanter, 1977)—40% women.
However, at gender parity and beyond, we see an overall decrease in giving to women- and girl-serving organizations across the sample.

Figure 6.2

![Graph showing predictive margins for log percentage allocations to women and girls' organizations by percent women on board.]

In this study, representative bureaucracy is not a linear concept. Similar to discussions of public funding and services in Nicholson-Crotty, Grissom, and Nicholson-Crotty (2011), allocations by United Ways is a zero-sum process. Allocating more to one organization decreases what is available to another organization. The idea that adding more representatives of a particular group will continuously increase giving to those similar to them would go beyond equity. However, they propose that equity is a modifier for active representation, and that once equity is met, minority bureaucrats are not able to keep pushing for benefits as other groups will begin to actively advocate for their clients. In this study, the equity point is not clear. Should it be at
50%? There are many other minority groups in need of social services, and some general organizations serve both men and women. Can we say women- and girl-supporting organizations are getting equitable treatment when they receive 5% of average spending? Equity of spending must be measured by the distribution to many different minority groups, such as the homeless, children in general, or the mentally challenged. In this research, the organizations considered as women- and girl-serving are limited to those with particular names and NTEE codes, making estimates more conservative.

What is more interesting is that support for women and girls’ organizations appears to fall off after reaching a certain threshold of female representation. This nonlinear trend generally peaks at 40% women and indicates that as women approach parity with men with respect to board membership, that organization’s giving to women and girls’ services drops off. In light of hypotheses 1a-1c, the only statistically significant finding is that the percent of women on the board is nonlinearly associated with the likelihood of donating to a women- and girl-serving organization. The relationship is shaped like an inverted U, and after a certain percentage, the likelihood of donating to a women- and girl-serving organization decreases. This inverted U relationship holds for the percentage of allocations donated to women- and girl-serving organizations. Hypothesis 3 is supported to a point. At approximately 40% women on the board, the percentage of allocations begins to decrease.

Wilkins and Keiser (2004) found that having more women in supervisory roles at Missouri Division of Child Support Enforcement offices leads to greater child support enforcement, and argue this relationship is due to child support being a highly gendered issue for women. The
question of how much to fund an organization with a mission focused on women or girls is a highly gendered decision, and as per Keiser et al. (2002) this is one factor that would move passive representation into active representation. In this current study, there is little support for the idea that women in leadership positions generally or in the majority of cases exert active influence over funding for gendered organizations. There is marginal statistical support for the idea that having a female Board Chair increases the percentage of funds going to women and girl supporting agencies, but no findings support a relationship between allocations and having a female Executive Director. These findings indicate that situations like the one in the opening anecdote may occur, but they do not necessarily occur in the majority of cases, or lead to actual allocation of funds to women- and girl-serving organizations.

The attitudes toward giving to women’s or girls’ organizations may change on the board depending on its composition. Benevolent sexism may lead to boards with more men feeling the need to support women and girls who are in need. Very often, United Ways are supporting local domestic violence shelters and men may feel this is a way to protect vulnerable women. Boards composed of a majority of women may overcompensate and feel as though they should not favor women and girls’ organizations. These findings may be more aligned with Fernandez, Malatesta, and Smith’s (2012) discovery that women are less likely to actively represent women, either based on the “queen bee” syndrome or status beliefs they may hold about the types of women they would be serving.

The findings here suggest that Keiser et al.’s (2002) factors that move passive to active representation are partially supported. The board appears to have discretion over the funding
decisions and outcomes, but while funding women- and girl-serving organizations is a gendered decision, it does not fully take precedence over other types of funding. The mission of the United Way includes giving to women and girls’ organizations; however, as the United Way Worldwide’s focus has become more centered on education, financial stability, and health, female-oriented organizations may not be viewed as in alignment with these mission areas. As the hierarchy and stratification within the organization is established over time through changing board members, Board Chairs, and Executive Directors, we may see changes in giving patterns. Here we only test for overall average effects, controlling for year fixed effects. In one respect, it appears that there is a slight impact of having a female board chair and increased giving to women and girls’ organizations, but having a female Executive Director shows no effect. The hierarchy structure of power in leadership roles shows little evidence of moving female passive representation to active representation in this sample.

Reaching a critical mass of women—according to Joecks, et al. (2013) it is 30%—appears to help funding women and girls’ causes, but beyond that critical mass, there is a drop off in active representation. This drop may have something to do with the final factor, which is professionalization. Most women-dominated boards are found in small communities with fewer businesses. Women professionalized and trained in business or organizational management may be less available to serve on boards. Female dominance may improve women’s standing in the hierarchy and stratification of the board’s decision-making process, but may leave the board open to less professionalization and less ability to move from passive to active representation.
There is research suggesting that women are more likely than men to abide by “the rules” (Morrison, 2006; Portillo & DeHart-Davis, 2009) in organizations. Having larger female representation may be leading women to lean more toward following the United Way Worldwide’s position of funding primarily organizations that have education, financial stability, and health missions. The women in these female-dominated organizations may not see the direct relation between women- and girl-serving organizations and this newer set of guidelines from the umbrella organization.

More research regarding the motivations and dynamics of giving to particular types of organizations must be conducted to better assess these findings. The density of women- and girl-serving organizations within the community would be a key variable to access. To assess whether there was the option of donating to a women or girl-serving organization, I reviewed a random sample consisting of half these United Ways that never gave to a women or girl-serving organization. 90% of these service regions had organizations that would have been picked up in the name and NTEE search to identify such organizations. We can say based on this sample of the “never-gaves” that they most likely had the opportunity to give to a women or girl-serving organization. However, as per Chapter 4, more women serve in areas of smaller population with fewer allocations to provide. Women- and girl-serving organizations in these smaller towns may not meet United Way funding standards if they exist. There may be a very limited number of women- and girl-serving organizations in the service region to fund. Funding also depends on how much the women- and girl-serving organizations request. Their requests may be fully funded by the United Way, but they may have requested a small portion of the overall allocations. Ideally, access to applicant-funding requests would be collected. Being able to see
who applied for funding and what percentage of that request was fulfilled would be an excellent dependent variable to better assess giving rates to women- and girl-serving organizations. Unfortunately, at this time that information is not public and would rely on United Ways’ cooperation with reporting this information for research purposes.
Chapter 7: 
Implications and Conclusion 

Gender is at the core of societal interaction (Ferree & Hess, 1987; Ridgeway, 1997; Risman, 2004; West & Zimmerman, 1987). It is one of the first social dividing lines established for individuals, even before birth, along with race and other socio-demographics such as class. Women and men are socialized into roles and performance expectations, which are reinforced by the institutions with which we interact. For example, the family institution is based on historically patriarchal domination as its source of authority (Thornton, Ocasio & Lounsbury, 2012). It is legitimized through unconditional loyalty, and one’s status in the household is a focus of attention (p. 73). Communities are another institution built upon the family unit, using shared defining characteristics of the family to establish “community values and ideologies” (p. 108). Gender status beliefs permeate community institutional logics, as was hypothesized in Chapter 4. The size of the community and other factors impact the proportions of women found on the board and in Board Chair positions.

Gender, as filtered through corporate logics of institutions that emphasize hierarchy and professionalism, also impacts the composition of boards. Business leadership is generally gendered male (Beutel & Marini, 1995; Cech, Rubineau, Silbey & Seron, 2011; Eagly, Diekman, Johannesen-Schmidt & Koenig, 2004; Nielsen & Huse, 2010), and the previous size of the business community in this study proves to decrease the percentage of women on United Way boards of directors. As the size of the business community decreases, more women are asked to join boards. Without more business leadership, women are asked to step up. This appears to also
be the case for previous organizational performance. As allocation amounts decrease—a performance measure associated with overall revenue and mission achievement—more women are found on United Way boards. The “glass cliff” effect appears to be in effect, with expectations that women step up in times of crisis and to be better prepared for failure (Ryan, Haslam, Hersby, & Bongiorno, 2011).

Another predictor of having women on the board is the previous existence of women in leadership positions such as Board Chair and Executive Director. The previous existence of women in both of these roles increases the percentage of women on the board in the future. There appears to be a network effect as perhaps women recruit more women, and their performance proves to be satisfactory. This finding deserves further exploration through a network analysis framework. This analytical method would allow investigation into the relationships and network ties that may drive the presence of women on boards of directors.

Most of this study’s findings regarding gender variables are nonlinear. In Chapter 5 and Chapter 6, the peak in performance occurs at approximately 40% women on the board. The population average for percentage of women on United Way boards is also nearly 40%. This is in alignment with critical mass theories of gender representation, though 10% higher than those findings (Joecks, Pull & Vetter, 2013; Konrad, Kramer & Erkut, 2008). It appears that there is some correlation between having a board consisting predominantly of men and performance, even when it comes to representing women’s and girl’s issues. Hypotheses of increased performance and giving to women- and girl-serving organizations given a larger percentage of women on the board and female leadership are only supported up to a 40% peak. More women on boards
increase outcomes to a point, but then continued increasing female presence past 40% women is associated with decreasing performance and giving to women’s and girls’ causes. However, findings from Chapter 4 may moderate these findings. If women are found predominantly on boards in smaller population centers, with fewer allocations, and more poverty, these findings may in fact be indicating a bias towards bringing women onto successful boards.

It is particularly interesting to see that male dominated boards tend to give larger percentages of their overall funding to women- and girl-serving organizations. This may be due in part to benevolent sexism, but also due to the fact that male dominated boards tend to be in larger towns with more resources to distribute. There may be a larger number of women- and girl-serving organizations from which to choose in these larger communities, providing more opportunity to fund women- and girl-focused services. Women- and girl-serving organizations in larger communities may be larger and more professionalized themselves, which some United Ways may look favorably upon in terms of their minimum grant recipient standards.

**Theoretical Contributions**

This study contributes to the fields of gender studies, general management literature, and nonprofit research. Gender researchers have been investigating the socialization of our expectations of women in leadership for some time, but not in this context. This study provides some support for the fact that community characteristics and socially held beliefs impact the presence of women in leadership positions. It also contributes to the research on gender and performance in organizational settings.
I posit that gender status characteristics operate through a new framework—institutional logics. Viewing status beliefs through the institutional logics framework, it is apparent that many logics are influenced by the status characteristic beliefs of the people in these institutions. Multiple logics are at play in United Ways. First, they have an element of the community logic, being representative of community organizations and social needs, and drawing board members from the communities they serve. These factors all bring in each participants’ expectations of competence developed through membership in their community, profession, and family.

Next, United Ways are becoming more and more professionalized to manage their organizations with more formal structures. Board members with particular skills are being sought after for board positions, highlighting the influence of the professions logic. The source of legitimacy for the individuals on the board is their personal expertise (Thornton, Oscasio & Lounsbury, 2012). The field from which their expertise is derived establishes norms of behavior and expectations of competence. As men are generally in higher positions in the local business and workplace communities, their professional experience is more highly valued and expectations of their competence is high. Women must doubly prove their professional expertise and their competence on boards. For example, in one United Way observed, a male representative from a bank spoke infrequently, but his opinions were discussed thoroughly and taken seriously. This may be due to his position and expectations of his competence. A female bank representative at another United Way I observed spoke more frequently and often repeated herself, even though her professional opinion should have borne the same weight as the man’s. Expectations of women’s competence permeate their professional lives and the institutions they participate in.
Each United Way board observed strove for a professional approach to their work, with clear lines of communication, levels of expertise, and even some developments in technology. Corporate logics were clear in operations, with the Board Chair, board, and executive managers at the top of the organizational hierarchy. Bureaucratic roles on committees and in the executive committee were distributed and board members generally performed according to these roles. Again, women are historically lower in status hierarchies than men, but on observed boards, women did make their presence known. The status expectations held of these women, however, were difficult to outwardly gauge.

Evidence of the “glass cliff” was found in this sample. Lower total allocations in previous years are related to more women found on boards in subsequent years. The mechanisms for this process are unclear. Are men leaving declining organizations, only to be replaced by women? Are women more willing to take on difficult situations? Or is an organizational awareness of diversity increasing recruitment of women while simultaneously United Ways across the country are seeing declining overall performance? More research is necessary to parse out how this relationship is truly unfolding. A survey on United Way diversity practices and policies over time combined with longitudinal data on revenues may help illuminate causality.

Organizations are influenced by many competing logics, but these logics all begin with assumptions of lines of authority, legitimacy, and the establishment of norms. In United Ways, multiple logics are at play, but the socialization processes of gender and gender status beliefs influence logics at their foundation. These studies scratched the surface of investigating this
relationship. More detail on how to expand this research will be discussed in the Future Research section below.

Finally, nonprofit management studies of boards of directors have yet to explore social norms and gender roles in their operations. This study opens up new possibilities in management studies and expands what we know beyond board practices into the black box of motivations for those practices in the first place. This also expands our knowledge of diversity of board directors and the clear negative impacts when boards are unbalanced at either end of the gender spectrum.

**Management Implications**

These findings suggest a few questions and considerations for nonprofit managers and boards. These considerations include how a board could understanding gender as an element of diversity, recruitment of board members, and training.

While diversity amongst the United Ways in this representative sample is on average 40% women, diversity of gender must be explored from both men’s and women’s perspectives. The BoardSource (2017) survey indicated that 28% of executives were still unsatisfied with the gender representation of their boards and leadership. However, as in my observation of United Way #1, diversity may be viewed only in terms of limited characteristics such as race. That board was predominantly female, in a small community with below average allocations. During my observations, they brought on 2 additional male board members. An average of 40% women board members has been found in this study to be related to the best performance results and to the most giving to women’s and girls’ causes. However, as per hypotheses in Chapter 4, it is
likely that men are less likely to serve on low performing boards, or those in small communities. It is also less likely to find women on the higher performing boards. Training on the various forms of diversity could help board members and executive leadership better form their boards to be more equitably distributed across gender, possibly with better results.

Recruitment of board members is key to the gender composition of the board. Current board members and staff leadership have the organizational boundary spanning responsibility of identifying new board recruits that can provide necessary resources and expertise. Networks may possibly play a large role in this activity (Brown, 2007; Ryan & Tippins, 2004). Gazley and Bowers (2013) find that a majority of member-serving nonprofits report difficulties finding qualified board members, and only one in ten reported having gender diversity goals in their recruitment diversity plans. Even in the majority of instances where a Nominating Committee leads board member selection (a governance “best practice”) if a board member’s network tends to be more homogenous and embedded in their professional role, they may only identify nominees who look and think like them. Such an effect is bound to be compounded by the practice of nominated “slates” of candidates, which offer no means for candidates to self-nominate. For example, gender imbalances may be compounded when members of the local Chamber of Commerce may seek out board members from those networks, which may already be more male-dominated. Women on boards may reach out to other people they know from their networks through work, friendship, or service activities. These gendered expectations mirror earlier gendered experiences, and can continue the patterns of recruitment already in place and keep attracting more men to male-dominated boards and more women to female-dominated boards.
However, these trends can be influenced. As per data in Chapter 3, the average percentage of women on United Way boards of directors has increased over the past 15 years. This trend may be due to more active recruitment of women, but also of more women entering male-dominated, professionalized fields and being viewed as equally competent and well-networked as their male counterparts. Female-dominated boards appear to struggle with performance outcomes, and further research should attempt to understand whether this results from the gender imbalance or rather from imbalances in the skillsets brought by men and women in different United Way communities. Recruitment of more professional women or men to these boards may help them perform better.

Important to note is that the average percentage of women ideally on the board to maximize performance and giving in this sample is 40%--this is 10% more than the board percentages found in the critical mass literature. As more women are invited to join more boards of larger United Ways, the ideal percentage of women represented may also increase. If the trend of increasing female presence on United Way boards continues, this turning point may increase further. Overall, heavily male- and female-dominated boards have less than optimum performance.

The final recommendation presented here is to evaluate boards and their strengths regularly and to enact board training for those that are weak in some areas. Reviewing board skills and abilities assists leadership and board members to decide what skills are needed for the board. Female board volunteers may be involved more for expressive reasons than instrumental reasons, which
may help them pursue the mission with fervor, but lose sight of the more technical aspects of operating a fundraising organization. Male dominated boards may focus too heavily on the corporate aspects of the organization and less on mission achievement. Broad training in the financials, fundraising processes, mission, and allocations processes may help all board members, whether they are male or female, better run the organization. As stated in Chapter 5, women have particular skills that may make them quite successful in managing organizations, however in this sample, they appear to be pushed to communities with fewer resources. Additional training in marketing, fundraising, and general nonprofit management may help female dominated boards make due with fewer resources and improve their organizations.

Limitations & Future Research

Limitations to this study are due in part to the scarcity of previous research that can guide the analysis, limitations of the data versus the theoretical framework, and to the choice of methodological strategies. First, in Chapter 4, the literature is sparse on community effects on gender status beliefs. The hypotheses are based on what literature can be found and previous studies of community factors. More research into these attitudes would illuminate the status beliefs that develop into community differences, which lead to board selection practices. Surveying local attitudes toward community nonprofits would expand the findings to better assess how gender status beliefs relate to nonprofits in different types of communities. Efforts to ascertain causality were attempted by lagging the independent variables; however, gender status beliefs were not measured directly. Status characteristic theory focuses on individual level beliefs and interactions. It is most often studied through surveys of individual attitudes and behaviors towards particular identity groups. Status characteristic theory is used here as a
foundational assumption for small groups, in this case boards of directors, as well as communities. The theory itself has yet to be tested regarding interactions on boards of directors specifically. An experiment could be undertaken to test this theory directly on a population of board members in varying communities using situational vignettes. Experimental research regarding board member attitudes toward nonprofits and gender status beliefs in nonprofit contexts would help open the black box of the direct effect of status beliefs on board composition choices. A network analysis of board members would also reveal pathways to board service and recruitment.

Chapter 4 would benefit from additional or slightly altered community level variables. The prevalence of local religion may alter gender status beliefs. Varying religions may have different expectations of women and their roles in leadership. A categorical variable for the dominant local religion may control for these differences. Local politics is another variable that should be assessed. The election results for the service region could be added to the model, however there are some concerns with this measure. A service region can cover multiple counties, with varying political outcomes. For example, it may cover one urban county that skews heavily Democratic, and two rural counties that are Republican. Decisions on how to code this would need to be made. Controls for state and U.S. geographic region may have explanatory power as well. Finally, a different measure of the business community could be used besides the number of businesses per 1,000 people. The size of the businesses themselves may tell us more about the business climate. A service region may rely heavily on one very large corporation, skewing the number of businesses.
Chapter 5 is based on previous studies of board composition and performance outcomes in primarily for-profit institutions. Allocations, as a proxy for performance and efficiency, and revenue are not the only measures of mission accomplishment and performance in United Ways. Identifying other performance indicators that may be collected from United Ways would help researchers and practitioners understand if women’s presence and leadership lead to different types of improved performance. For example, Post and Byron (2015) look at the performance measures of monitoring activity and strategy involvement. The lacking findings for Board Chair and Executive Director effects do not mean that they have no impact in other areas such as responsiveness, board culture, and other financial ratios of performance. Offering direct programming may also alter the results of the allocations (efficiency) models. If revenue is held back for United Way run programs such as Success by 6, the allocation numbers may be skewed downward. Lagging the independent variables is used in these models to account for autocorrelation and provide some causal inference, but a strong instrumental variable that impacts outcomes only through the gender composition variables would help account for reverse causality and omitted variable bias.

Chapter 6 investigates giving specifically to women- and girl-serving organizations. Identifying these organizations by name and NTEE code is effective, but there is still the likelihood of missing organizations without explicit names, and those that are not domestic violence shelters. As there is no specific NTEE code for women- or girl-serving organizations, the allocation recipients’ missions must be reviewed individually to ensure complete coding of these organizations. The presence of women- and girl-serving organizations in the service region would also be beneficial to assess. Few of these organizations may exist, or may reach the United
Way’s minimum qualifications for funding, limiting allocation opportunities for the United Way to give. Collaboration with a sample of United Ways to access funding requests would help relieve some omitted variables in terms of how much of the allocations are actually requested by women- and girl-serving organizations. However, overall in this sample, women’s and girls’ organizations appear to be best served by tilted gender boards.

The common threshold of 40% women on a board must be further investigated. This will require more qualitative research into board practices, board member backgrounds and experience levels, and member attitudes towards women on boards. Board observations should be continued to look for patterns in behavior during board meetings. Board members should be interviewed regarding their service and experiences on the board, especially their views on diversity, recruitment, and allocation processes. Interviews can be supplemented by a wider survey of board members, Board Chairs, and Executive Directors provided cooperation by United Ways. Through these qualitative methods, as well as the experimental methods suggested above, status beliefs will be able to be measured along with institutionalized practices. Overall, these studies show that there is a relationship between gender, board selection, and organizational performance. Gender beliefs ground institutional practices and guide behaviors in board settings. More empirical research is necessary to parse out causal effects and further explore how socialization impacts our institutions.

Finally, the choice of using pooled OLS with year fixed effects may not provide the most efficient results. Using pooled OLS with year fixed effects provides consistent results under the basic assumption that the error term is uncorrelated with any of the explanatory variables. The
choice to use this modeling method was made based on the desire to view population-averaged results rather than within individual United Ways. None of the estimated effects in these studies are interpreted as causal. Pooled OLS assumes that the error term is uncorrelated with any of the regressors, but does not account for within and between error correlation. Clustering the error terms on individual United Way attempts to account for some of this correlation. Running a Breusch and Pagan Lagrangian multiplier test suggests that a random effects model would provide results that are more efficient and still include between-United Way effects as well as consider within-effects. However, a random effects model also makes a stronger assumption—that there is no bias due to correlation in error terms. This assumption is hard to defend. As a robustness check, I ran the random effects model and it provides similar results to that of the pooled OLS. In order to abide by the Breusch and Pagan Lagrangian multiplier test, a random-effects model will be employed in future iterations of this research.

**Concluding Thoughts**

The United Way is a prestigious and highly visible network of organizations, funding social services nationally. In fact, the United Ways in this sample allocated over $1 billion in 2015 alone. This network consists of organizations of all sizes, in a wide variety of communities that are all influenced by the diversity of their boards and gender status beliefs. The network is also considered to serve as role models for general charitable good governance practices by virtue of the higher standards they set for member agencies (i.g., their grant recipients).

As in the anecdote in Chapter 4, racial and skill diversity may be viewed as important to board diversity plans, while gender is not discussed. However, gender diversity is just as important as
other forms of diversity. Women and men bring different life experiences, skills, and leadership styles to organizations. As more attention is being paid to the representation of women in for-profit board settings, little research explores the antecedents to and results of gender diversity on nonprofit boards of directors. This study attempts to fill this gap.

Organizational choices are influenced, and arguably biased, by our socially held beliefs regarding women’s abilities and roles. These beliefs are held by both men and women and vary based on the organizations’ communities, as shown in Chapter 4. These gender beliefs will not be changed by this study, but this work shines a light on how these beliefs may influence organizational composition and performance.

I was inspired to delve into this topic based on statistics that showed women were less prevalent on boards than men, especially on boards of organizations with higher revenues. Thinking of non-profits that focus on community services, I questioned why United Way boards were not necessarily representative of their communities, given that women generally comprise half of local populations. This fact cuts out the voices of a large portion of an organization’s client base.

Women are gaining in educational and professional attainment (Hersh, 2016), with women now attaining more bachelor’s, masters, and Ph.D.s than men as of 2016. Women are more than able to bring the necessary expertise to boards of directors. If higher revenue nonprofits are seeking professionals, the pool of female applicants is increasing. However, there appears to be some barrier to recruiting women to these board positions. Women are more frequently brought on to United Ways that have less revenue, fewer allocations, and perhaps less opportunity for growth.
Gender appears to make a difference in organizational performance and decision-making. We would hope that we would see no difference—that men and women are equally as competent and effective in organizational situations. This study suggests that, for the moment, performance returns peak at having about 40% women on the board, not parity. What does this mean? Broadly, there is a difference between boards with skewed male membership and those at parity or with a majority of women serving. This may be due to the gendered expectations of the abilities of men serving on boards and the pool of candidates from which the board self-selects new members. The average percentage of women on the boards in this sample is also 40%. As per Figure 3.2, while there are a number of boards at parity, the distribution is right skewed. Performance results here may be tied not to just women’s performance on the boards and in leadership positions, but in the general distribution of women on particular types of boards. More women are stepping up at boards with declining allocations (and therefore declining revenue), potentially skewing these results in favor of male dominated boards.

Most interestingly, giving to women- and girl-serving organizations seems to peak at 40% women serving on the board as well. Having more women represented seems to be related to lower allocations to these types of organizations. This is contrary to theories of representative bureaucracy. If these types of decisions are gendered, there may be implications with how social services are funded in this country. As discussed, women may be more likely to fall in line with the United Way Worldwide stance of community impact focus areas that may not include organizations like the Girl Scouts, while men may see them more as guidelines and be more willing to stray from prescribed allocation directives. Women may also want to spread their giving across more organizations, a theory not yet tested here. But as of this sample, giving to
women’s and girls’ organizations is most fruitful in communities where women are just in the minority of board members.

Overall, this study expands our knowledge of gender diversity on nonprofit boards and opens up new avenues of research. While new movements for women’s equality in the workplace expand, the nonprofit sector is one place where women have made great strides, but clearly have ground to make up in terms of board and executive leadership.
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