Value-based Succession Planning in Governance Boards

By David Feldman

Masters Research Project

Master of Arts Interdisciplinary Studies

Royal Roads University

Submitted to,

Ann Perodeau

October 24, 2014
Abstract

My Masters research project looked at the viability of using a modified version of the Schwartz Value Survey (SVS), a survey used to assess an individual's core motivational values, as a succession planning and recruitment tool for governance Boards of Directors (boards). A multimodal research methodology was used to gather data from not-for-profit boards from across Alberta. The primary method of inquiry was an online survey that is a combination of a modified SVS and a collection of questions intended to analyze the boards' current perceived effectiveness. An analysis of each board's collective values data was used to assess that board's value symmetry against its self-perceived effectiveness. The survey was followed up by one-on-one interviews with select participants to allow for fuller responses and clarification, data triangulation and to analyze data accuracy.

The project found that in the modified state the SVS was unable to properly determine Person Organization fit (PO-fit) for board members but did display promise as a conflict management and facilitation tool to enable the organizations to reduce asymmetry and conflict levels. Notably, the project found that individuals who expressed a motivational value as significantly more important than their peers expressed greater levels of frustration when that value was not being fulfilled in the governance process, thereby indicating continued support for a SVS PO-fit assessment tool.
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Chapter One: FOCUS AND FRAMING

Organizations in today's complex world are constantly forming teams, advisory panels, and governance bodies. These groups are meant to come together, learn how to work together, and engage in their work. According to Jehn, Rispens, and Thatcher (2010), conflict within groups is not always detrimental to success, but may allow for better discussion and exploration of issues. These high level decision making teams need to be more than multidisciplinary or even interdisciplinary, as defined by Choi and Pak (2006), but must be transdisciplinary. Klein (2004) expands on the idea of transdisciplinary, stating:

In recent decades, the ideas of interdisciplinarity and complexity have become increasingly entwined. This convergence invites an exploration of the links and their implications. The implications span the nature of knowledge, the structure of the university, the character of problem solving, the dialogue between science and humanities, and the theoretical relationship of the two underlying ideas.

Transdisciplinary teams integrate and transcend the boundaries of their disciplines (Choi and Pak, 2006, pg 351). According to Klein (2003) “transdisciplinarity is involved in a series of shifts” for example:

- from segmentation to boundary crossing and blurring
- from fragmentation to relationality
- from unity to integrative process
- from homogeneity to heterogeneity and hybridity
- from isolation to collaboration and cooperation
- from simplicity to complexity
- from linearity to non-linearity
- from universality to situated practices. (Klein, 2003)

However, transdisciplinary teams become vulnerable when parts of their membership change. Turnover and team member renewal may prevent the team from functioning on a
transdisciplinary level. In order to reduce uncontrolled turnover, teams such as Boards of Directors may have term lengths built into their bylaws.

Board recruitment is often described as “putting warm bodies into seats” or “needing a lawyer” (BDP Program, 2013). Though skills such as legal expertise are essential for the organization’s success, having these skills does not ensure organizational compatibility with individual members, also known as Person-Organizational (PO) fit. Such fit would assist in mediating or rebuilding the team’s transdisciplinary status. Hiring decisions stemming from the desire for easier, faster recruitment often results in higher than desired turnover of members as the PO fit becomes a problem and continues to impact the team’s problem solving capacity (BDP Program, 2013; Greer, Caruso, & Jehn, 2011). These boards have recruited on a needs basis and not on a fit basis and, as a result, often lose their new board members earlier than desired due to disengagement.

Turnover can pose a significant problem. Any rapid and unplanned turnover may greatly impact an organization’s ability to be generative or even effective in its goals as a team. With constant turnover and a misalignment of values and trust, the interpersonal relationships may suffer (Jehn, Greer, Levine, & Szulanski, 2008; Jehn, Northcraft, & Neale, 1999b). Additionally, project value misalignment causes the likelihood of misinterpretation, power asymmetry, and conflict asymmetry to increase significantly (Hüttermann & Boerner, 2011).

The purpose of my research project was to assess the value of using a modified version of the Schwartz Value Survey to assist teams in checking for PO fit between their possible candidates for board membership and the organization’s values. If using the modified version of the survey is practical and accurate, such a tool could bring increased team compatibility and engagement to the organizations that use it. It could allow for stronger team relationships,
increase generative thinking, and encourage higher levels of engagement leading to greater overall project success. The modification changed the nature of the Schwartz Value Survey to ask participants to focus on the project and organizational values and how they are perceived to be a fit with the candidate, rather than the candidates’ personal motivating values. The modified SVS showed promise in assessing the PO fit of a board or project team against potential new members.

**Opportunity**

In Canada alone there are over 86,000 registered charities and each of these organizations is run by a Board of Directors that are held in public trust (CRA, 2014). As the Baby Boomers continue to retire, their roles within these organizations will change. These changes may be through increased or decreased engagement, power shifts in volunteer roles, or increased absences as they travel. These changes may add to the current existing stressors that already face these governance bodies. Board recruitment is already an issue as organizations struggle to find able, willing and skilled individuals to be part of the decision-making bodies of their organizations (BDP Program, 2013). For organizations such as Volunteer Alberta, Charity Village, or even bodies like the Alberta Food Bank Networks Association, having a tool that assists them in matching interested individuals with organizations that align with their values may play a key role in supporting the future of the charitable and larger not-for-profit sector. For individual organizations such a tool can become part of their individual recruitment strategies to help them better ensure that they are recruiting the right person for their organizations.

Such support might become even more necessary as we continue to struggle with the changing nature of volunteerism. Canadians no longer volunteer like they used to. Indicators
show that the number of individuals who volunteer in a structured capacity has decreased significantly, however the smaller group of individuals who do volunteer contribute more hours to volunteering than ever before (Statistics Canada, 2012). According to Statistics Canada (2012), 10% of volunteers accounted for 53% of all volunteer hours given to non-profit and charitable organizations in 2010. These volunteers dedicated more than 390 hours each to their volunteer activities, which is the equivalent of at least 10 weeks in a full-time job (Statistics Canada, 2012). Though time constraints have played a major role in these changes, so has the difficulty in finding a match between the volunteer and the organization. Given that the largest volunteering demographic is between the ages of 15 and 24, creating a positive volunteer experience has become an essential component in building Canada's future volunteer capacity (Volunteer Canada, 2010).

**Research Objectives**

The objectives of my research project were:

1. To explore how a modified Schwartz Value Survey might be used to assess a person's project values, i.e. values relating to the project or specific organization, rather than their individual values.

2. To determine the nature of the relationship between a board's collective results from the modified Schwartz Value Survey and self-reported board effectiveness.

3. To determine if the modified Schwartz Value Survey would be suitable as recruitment tool for future board members.

My research sought to identify a practical and tangible way to assist governance bodies in the recruitment of their future members and to ensure internal compatibility for optimal organization success. The literature review highlights research on transformational leadership, value leadership, conflict management, universal values, and group dynamics that focus on successful project teams and decision making bodies. The review provides the basis for the modification of the Schwartz Value Survey and the supporting questions, which will be used in
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analysis of the participant teams. In addition, the supporting questions will be used to supplement the SVS in the final modified survey.

Research Question

Though the Schwartz Value Survey has been found to be a viable tool for assessing PO fit, it is not considered complete for examining all aspects of the workplace environment (Borg, Groenen, Jehn, Bilsky, & Schwartz, 2011). The Schwartz Value Survey has shown promise as a simpler and just as accurate a PO fit tool than the commonly used Organizational Culture Profile produced by O’Reilly, Chatman, & Caldwell in 1991 (Borg, Groenen, Jehn, Bilsky, & Schwartz, 2011). Additionally, board members do not engage in their organizations in the same manner as employees as they are not a regular part of the “office” environment. For this reason, while the SVS may be simple, it may also be better able to assess board member PO fit.

The overall research question is:

How might a modified version of the SVS be used as a PO fit assessment tool for board member recruitment when working to create collaborative problem solving boards?

Secondary questions which are explored in the Literature Review are:

• What tools and resources can help nomination committees find the correct candidates for their boards?
• What traits make somebody the best candidate for a particular board?
• What interpersonal dynamics promote good governance?
• What are the defining characteristics of good PO fit for board members?

Significance of the Opportunity

Canada’s not-for-profit (NPO) sector is a major contributor not only to the national economy but also to the greater public good. NPOs that obtain registration as charities are legally required to be governed by a Board of Directors (BDP Program, 2013). Fulfilling the
board requirement is becoming increasingly difficult as fewer individuals wish to sit on boards (BDP Program, 2013). Even the curriculum for the Alberta Board Development Program, a free training and retreat service provided for non-profit boards by the Government of Alberta, contains multiple comics mocking the dislike individuals have in joining “another” committee or board (BDP Program, 2013). Bailen (2013) noted that, in a conversation regarding a religious board “we have new people join all the time but they never stay”. In order for this sector to survive we not only need to maintain the health of these organizations’ governing bodies but also to create an environment where individuals new to boards join organizations that are the right fit to their beliefs and values. This will ensure that they have positive experiences and continue to invest their limited time in charitable organizations.

Currently in Alberta the primary method of developing effective governance boards is by providing training through programs like the Alberta Board Development Program (Government of Alberta, 2014) and working with Community Development Facilitators, both of which are provided by Alberta Culture, a Department of the Government of Alberta. Both of these tools, however, focus on the current membership of the board, not potential future board members (Government of Alberta, 2014). While these tools do cover board dynamics and what makes a better board, the discussion focuses on current membership significantly more than on recruitment of future members, leaving a significant opportunity to further investigate and develop tools to assist with the creation and recruitment stages of boards.

**Board Recruitment and Succession Planning**

A board’s ability to recruit and select its future members is limited by its bylaws and policies. These terms vary greatly and can include full democratic elections, candidates needing to be nominated at the Annual General Meeting (AGM) by other members, boards that are able
to select their future members and appoint them directly to the board, and boards that can make recommendations for board nominations to the membership. Not all of these scenarios allow for optimal pre-selection and filtering of ideal board members. Some of these situations allow for a board to reflect on its needs and future in order to find and recruit candidates that help it move forward. Other organizations are at the whim of their membership and the individuals who have cause enough to put their name forward for election or whose names are put forward on their behalf, though not always their request. All of these processes have advantages and disadvantages. The closer the process is to direct democracy, the higher the levels of accountability a board has to its membership but the lower its control of its future and the harder succession planning becomes (Bůcek, 2000). A board that has more control of its selection process, however, may have less accountability to its membership but has the ability to select candidates it believes are beneficial to its future. Negative situations such as fraud, abuse, bad visioning, mismanagement, etc. can arise in either situation (BDP Program, 2013).

As a result, many different reactionary strategies are provided in training programs to boards (BDP Program, 2013). Reactive boards, those who have little control either from a lack of planning or as a result of their regulating documents, may try post-selection training (BDP Program, 2013). Groups that have high levels of control of their membership may hand pick future members. These groups are often looking for specific skills or expertise. Currently some of the most sought after members are those that have skills as lawyers, accountants, policy makers and fundraisers (BDP Program, 2013). Though having these skills on the board may be ideal, often these members do not stay to the completion of their term or, if they do stay for their term, they often do not run for a second term. Sinek (2011) stated that this may be due to the fact that they have performed the task or favours asked of them but they may not have the passion to keep them with the organization.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

In the literature review, a variety of aspects that influence person-organization fit will be explored. Person-Organization Fit (PO fit) is defined by Kristof (1996, pp. 4-5) as “the compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when: (a) at least one entity provides what the other needs, or (b) they share similar fundamental characteristics, or (c) both.” High levels of PO fit are positively correlated with outcomes such as job satisfaction and organizational compatibility, low intention to quit, low employee or volunteer turnover, job performance, and organizational identity (Borg et al., 2011, p. 1).

The first topic covered in this review of the literature is asymmetry and how different forms of diversity contribute to asymmetry. The second introduces various forms of conflict and explores the relationship between conflict and asymmetry. The final topic explores the Schwartz theory of universal values and how value symmetry may reduce conflict that arises from asymmetry.

Asymmetry

In 1971, Jones & Nisbett proposed the actor-observer asymmetry theory, also known as actor-observer bias. Actor-observer bias explains the differences in how an observer explains the behavior of another person, the actor, versus how the actors themselves rationalize their actions (Jones & Nisbett, 1971). Jones and Nisbett (1971) proposed that all conflict is rooted in asymmetry. As group size increases so do the levels of diversity and asymmetry leading to a higher probable level of conflict.

Asymmetry in groups, like individuals, is an unacknowledged or unknown misalignment of values, power, conflict, or worldview (Jehn et al., 2010). According to Jehn et al. (2010), conflict within groups is not always detrimental to success, and may sometimes allow better
discussion and exploration of issues. Studies have also shown that asymmetry can result in high levels of energy being used to resolve or mitigate a conflict that not all parties recognize exists. The asymmetry results in decreased productivity, a drop in morale, and the group experiencing increasing difficulty working together and exchanging information (Janss, Rispens, Segers, & Jehn, 2012; Jehn et al., 2010; Jehn, Rupert, & Nauta, 2006).

In the field of conflict management, two types of asymmetry often explored are power asymmetry and conflict asymmetry. Power asymmetry is defined as a lack of agreement and understanding of the authority and power of individual team members within the group (Janss et al., 2012). For example, Individual A believes that both individuals are equal and that all decisions must be done by consensus while individual B believes that he or she is in charge and responsible for the final decision (Jehn & Bezrukova, 2004). Conflict asymmetry is defined as a situation in which members differ in their perceptions of the level of conflict in the group, which is correlated highly with unproductive team conflict. (Jehn et al., 2010) For example, Individual A may believe that there is no conflict since the situation was solved, while Individual B may believe that they were forced to agree to the solution and that Individual A is trying to take all the credit (Jehn & Bezrukova, 2004). One of the key causes of conflict asymmetry is that group members may believe that all the other members of the group have the same perceptions of the conflict as themselves. Or, as neatly summarized by Kahneman (2011, p. 85), "What you see is all there is."

**Diversity as a contributing factor to asymmetry**

One of the largest contributing factors to power or conflict asymmetry is the level of diversity within a group (Jones & Nisbett, 1971). Diversity can be better understood by examining three distinct categories: social, information, and value diversity.
The first category, social diversity, is what is most often meant when someone uses the term ‘diversity.’ Social diversity relates to the social identifiers placed on individuals by others or themselves (Jehn et al., 1999b). For example an individual may be Jewish or Christian, a PC or Apple user, a dog owner, an engineer, white, a jogger, a Nike wearer, or combinations of a variety of defining personal characteristics. According to Jehn, Northcraft, and Neale (1999a, p. 741) social diversity positively influences group member morale over the length of team membership.

The second type, information diversity, relates to the differences between individuals in training, personal experience, knowledge, and understanding (Jehn et al., 1999b). For example, an urban planner and a transportation engineer may both be trained in designing transportation networks, however the knowledge and the experience that they bring to the subject may be completely different. According to Jehn et al. (1999a, p. 741) information diversity positively influences group performance, though it is mediated by task conflict.

Value diversity is the third category, referring to variations in the fundamental values that motivate individuals (Jehn et al., 1999b). The priority and the importance of certain values can be significantly different between individuals to the point of fundamental incompatibility within a group or team (Jehn et al., 1999a). For example, for two team members working on a project, one might value supporting their family and needing to make money to put their child through university. The other might highly value the environment and would rather make less money on the project but have it be more environmentally friendly. According to Jehn et al. (1999a, p. 741) value diversity decreases satisfaction, intent to remain, and commitment to the group.
Asymmetry in value diversity is the key predictor of intergroup conflict in comparison to the other types of diversity (Jehn et al., 1999a). For this reason, reducing asymmetry in this area would be highly beneficial for teams in changing the way conflict occurs and is managed.

**Conflict**

With a strong correlation between diversity and conflict it is important to understand the types of conflicts studied in teams. Conflict takes many forms and comes from multiple sources. Team conflict is described as taking one or a combination of three forms: task conflict, process conflict, and personal conflict (Jehn et al., 1999a).

Task conflict is conflict caused by disagreements about the tasks and outcomes of the project (de Wit, Greer, & Jehn, 2012). According to Jehn et al. (1999a), task conflict can be moderated by low information diversity. Low information diversity is often found in teams designed to do the work associated with the task, such as welders working together on a project. In comparison, de Wit et al. (2012) suggest that process conflict, which is caused by disagreement over the logistics of how tasks will be accomplished, is not correlated strongly with information diversity and tends to arise in all teams.

The third type, personal conflict, also referred to as relationship conflict (Wittenbaum et al., 2004, p. 32), is equally prevalent in all group settings. Personal conflict is not related to the task at hand; it is directly related to the individuals experiencing conflict with others, often because of an issue of trust or reliability (de Wit et al., 2012). Personal conflict frequently relates to past experiences, perceived differences, events, and asymmetries between the individuals experiencing the conflict (de Wit et al., 2012). Personal conflict sometimes evolves from a task or process conflict or an asymmetry that has escalated beyond the original stimulus (de Wit et al., 2012). The concepts of asymmetry, diversity, and conflict all come together in
many ways and play a role in board leadership. These factors have a compounding role in how the group works together to fulfill its fiduciary, strategic, and generative mandates.

**Generative Thinking**

Generative thinking, also referred to as generative governance (Bayley, 2014), is the part of organizational governance that involves exploring possible futures for the organization and the opinions, options, and dreams that are possible in those futures. Healthy generative conversations often explore uncomfortable topics and therefore require that teams which engage in these processes, are collaborative and have high levels of trust (Bayley, 2014). Asymmetries, conflict dynamics, and levels of diversity create an interesting balance for interdisciplinary teams such as Boards of Directors. These groups would benefit from moderate to high levels of process conflict because debating “what to do” leads to greater generative thinking. The generative requirements of governance however must be balanced in a way that does not allow dysfunctional behaviours to become permanent or create fault lines (Jehn & Bezrukova, 2010). Some of these insights may be found in research on highly functional transformational teams and used in the team design strategies that would better allow for the creation of high functioning boards (Hüttermann & Boerner, 2011; Schein, 1997).

**Transformational Leadership**

Bass (1995) defined transformational leadership as having four dimensions:

1. Charisma: The leader provides vision and a sense of mission; instills pride, faith and respect; excites, arouses and inspires their subordinates.
2. Individual consideration: The leader provides coaching and teaching; delegates projects to stimulate learning experiences; provides for continuous feedback; and treats each follower as an individual.


4. Inspiration: The leader acts as a model for subordinates; behaves in ways that motivate and inspire followers by providing meaning and challenge; communicates a vision.

Based on the definitions of transformational leadership, Ozaralli (2003) suggested that transformational leaders create a dynamic organizational vision that often necessitates a metamorphosis in cultural values to reflect greater innovation. One of the key strategies used by transformational leaders is to create a shared set of project values. A team that already shares such values would have significantly less value diversity, which may allow them to better benefit from their social and information diversity (Hüttermann & Boerner, 2011).

According to Hüttermann and Boerner (2011), a transformational leader is able to mitigate the effects of diversity by unifying a team around a common set of values and a vision and is able to motivate, empower, and trust his team members while providing coaching and support where it is needed. More importantly, a transformational leader has been shown to increase the effects of group salience (a type of social symmetry), thereby reducing the impact of future conflict and power asymmetry (Hüttermann & Boerner, 2011). Part of establishing group salience is having the right PO fit in the creation process of the group.
The Theory of Universal Values

According to Debats and Bartelds (1992, p. 1) “values are conceived of as guiding principles in life which transcend specific situations, may change over time, guide selection of behaviour and events and which are part of a dynamic system with inherent contradictions.”

Rokeach (1973, n.p.) defined the value concept as “an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence”.

According to Spini (2003): Rokeach (1973) and Hofstede (1980) inspired the development of a cross-cultural theory of values, since they revealed the possibility of obtaining dimensions of values as an outside observer. Although Rokeach (1973) paved the way for values research, the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) has been considered biased towards western countries and their cultures (Hofstede & Bond, 1984).

The Schwartz Theory of Basic Human Values, also known as the Schwartz Theory of Universal Values, discusses the nature of values and articulates the features that are common to all values as well as what distinguishes them from one another (Schwartz, 2012, p. 2). The theory identifies ten basic personal values that are recognized across cultures (Schwartz, 2012, p. 2). According to Schwartz (2012, p. 3), values are crucial for explaining personal and social organizations and they play an important role in sociology, psychology, anthropology, and related disciplines. As a model of understanding, values can be used to characterize cultural groups, societies, and individuals as well as observe changes in these groups over time (Schwartz, 2012, p. 3). Using values as an analytical lens helps researchers understand groups because the motivational values help to explain the motivational bases for attitudes and behaviours (Schwartz, 2012, p. 3).
The Schwartz Theory of Basic Human Values does not include all human values but is limited to those that the theory claims have been found to exist in all cultures (Schwartz, 2012, p. 3). For example, Spiritualism was found to be a near-universal value and closely linked to Universalism, however Spiritualism did not demonstrate consistent meaning across cultures (Schwartz, 2012, p. 7). As a result, Spiritualism is not included as a value in the Schwartz Theory, while Universalism is included. The ten universal values are actually value categories, which contain more specific drivers that align with the universal value (Schwartz, 2012). These ten categories are:

POWER: Social status and prestige, control or dominance over people and resources. (Social Power, Authority, Wealth) [Preserving my Public Image, Social Recognition]

ACHIEVEMENT: Personal success through demonstrating competence according to social standards. (Successful, Capable, Ambitious, Influential) [Intelligent, Self-Respect]

HEDONISM: Pleasure and sensuous gratification for oneself. (Pleasure, Enjoying Life)

STIMULATION: Excitement, novelty, and challenge in life. (Daring, a Varied Life, an Exciting Life)

SELF DIRECTION: Independent thought and action choosing, creating, exploring. (Creativity, Freedom, Independent, Curious, Choosing own Goals) [Self-Respect]

UNIVERSALISM: Understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature. (Broadminded, Wisdom, Social Justice, Equality, a World at Peace, a World of Beauty, Unity with Nature, Protecting the Environment)

BENEVOLENCE: Preservation and enhancement of the welfare of people with whom one is in frequent personal contact. (Helpful, Honest, Forgiving, Loyal, Responsible) [True Friendship, Mature Love]
TRADITION: Respect, commitment and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide the self. (Humble, Accepting my Portion in Life, Devout, Respect for Tradition, Moderate)

CONFORMITY: Restraint of actions, inclinations, and impulses likely to upset or harm others and violate social expectations or norms. (Politeness, Obedient, Self Discipline, Honoring Parents and Elders)

SECURITY: Safety, harmony and stability of society, of relationships, and of self. (Family Security, National Security, Social Order, Clean, Reciprocation of Favors) [Sense of Belonging, Healthy]

(Borg et al., 2011; Schwartz, 1996, 2012)

Borg et al. (2011) demonstrated that the Schwartz’s Theory of Universal Values can be applied to study value symmetry in groups. The Schwartz Value Survey can thus be modified to assess not just individual values but also an individual’s values with respect to a project or organization (Borg et al., 2011).
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Due to the potentially emotional and sensitive nature of my inquiry, a multi-method approach was used to encourage open and honest participation and allow individuals to feel more comfortable discussing and sharing personal information. In addition, a multi-method approach allowed me to build upon the data and better triangulate information from all sources as I continue to explore transformational decision-making teams (Kalof, Dan, & Dietz, 2008). I used a modified version of the Schwartz Value Survey with all participating organizations, as well as one-on-one interviews with my existing clients from my consulting practice who had agreed to participate.

Initially, building on the literature review, I explored related material and concepts from the current research literature and ideas. The expanded review included an exploration of the literature on design thinking, conflict management, worldview conflict, and human values and morals. Information and ideas gathered informed the project surveys and interviews as well as the analysis and recommendations.

Once the literature review was underway, I began to modify the SVS and compile my additional questions. Shalom Schwartz granted me permission to use the Schwartz Universal Values Survey in my research project. The Schwartz Value Survey will act as an Organizational Culture Profile. Tools such as the Organization Culture Profile (OCP) are used to assess the individual and the organization for compatibility (Borg et al., 2011, p. 2). Though traditional OCP tools assess more than values, Borg et al. (2011, p. 9) have shown that the Schwartz Value Survey is a viable and simpler tool to assess PO fit. Borg et al. (2011, p. 10) also suggest that the Schwartz Theory of Basic Human Values applies well in the workplace but does not cover the complete dynamics of the workplace environment. As such the SVS may be the perfect tool to
assess board fit as boards are not affected by the daily work environments or regular employee interaction.

Though various agencies had previously agreed to send out the survey request including the Edmonton Chamber of Voluntary Organizations, the Government of Alberta Board Development Program, Trisula Solutions to its clients, and members of the Alberta Food Banks Network Association, the introduction of the Canadian Anti-Spam Legislation and early adoption of internal policies occurred at an inopportune time and interfered with the dispersal of request for participants. As a result, I utilized the advertising options available in a listserv for social sector events and jobs which is maintained by a local consultant, and paid for my advertisement to be included in two mail outs that were sent two weeks apart through this listserv. As part of the survey, self-identified volunteers were contacted for an additional one-on-one interviews. The one-on-one interviews enabled me to explore some of the questions and answers to the survey in greater detail as well as benefiting from a multi-modal approach to check for validity and build trust (Jehn & Jonsen, 2010, p. 315). The one-on-one interviews also allowed me to develop a more refined understanding of each group’s conflict (Jehn, 1995, p. 256).

The one-on-one interviews were conducted with my client boards and additional interested parties, all of which had taken the survey. In exchange for participation in the survey and study, the participating organizations will receive the values assessment of their team as well as an option to help design a recruitment tool for their future use.

The research began by allowing charitable organizations to self-identify as participants in the study. Once the organization agreed to participate they were directed to an electronic survey that engaged them in three parts: general information related to board experience, a
modified version of the Schwartz Value Survey (SVS), and questions on how they rate and feel about how their board works as a team.

**Qualitative Approach**

Qualitative research is beneficial and often used to investigate sensitive and emotional issues because conflict-based qualitative research focuses on how individuals in the organization perceive the construct of the organization rather than how the researcher perceives the construct (Jehn & Jonsen, 2010, p. 316). Values based recruitment requires a deeper understanding of both the values of an organization and those of the individuals who make up its leadership team. Therefore qualitative research is critical to define specific opportunities and candidates in an organization’s succession planning. A participatory research approach is also critical in verifying and supporting any data collected through an electronic survey. As conflict, like many organizational behaviours, is complex, multifaceted, and highly sensitive (Jehn & Jonsen, 2010, p. 313), the ability to develop a relationship in the qualitative approach allows for significantly greater disclosure and accuracy.

Values alignment and team conflict is unique within every organization. The semi-structured interviews (see Appendix C) sought to explore the relationship between the level of value symmetry displayed in the SVS and the questions relating to board effectiveness and collaboration. A mixed methods approach was applied by merging the qualitative data obtained from the interviews with quantitative data gained from the surveys. As the implementation of any organizational tool is ultimately dependent on ease of use, the electronic survey paired with the interviews were used to gauge the applicability and simplicity of applying the SVS in the modified format for future use by boards.
Tools:

Electronic Survey

The survey contained three sections and consisted of approximately three ranking subsections and 35 questions. The web-based survey was distributed electronically to all affiliated organizational members. The ranking section was based on the work of Shalom Schwartz and his Theory of Universal Values. I modified the questions to reflect an individual’s project values – the values that they have towards a project’s goals – rather than their personal values. The ranking section was prefaced by an introduction and general information gathering and concluded with an assessment of the board’s collaborative health and a conflict symmetry assessment. These questions included an exploration of the participant’s experience and length of service with boards in general and the participating organization more specifically, as well as self-reflections on how well the participant feels that their board collaborates in decision-making (see Appendix B).

Organizations participating in the research project and survey were self-selected. In exchange for participating in the survey, all of the organizations that participated are being offered a group analysis to help their organization with future recruitment. In order for the group analysis feedback to be possible, at least 90% engagement by the board and its Executive Director was required from each board. As a result, participation in the survey required almost unanimous agreement by all of the board members to participate. Also, it is important to note that while unanimous agreement to participate in the research may occur this did not guarantee actual unanimous participation in completion of the survey tool.
Four boards participated in the study. Of these four, two participated at 100%, one at 95%, and one at 75%. These groups were labeled as Group A, Group B, Group C, and Group D respectively. This resulted in a total of 42 participants including 3 staff.

**Interviews**
As part of the survey, individuals were offered the opportunity to self-identify as volunteers to be contacted for an additional one-on-one interview. The one-on-one interview enabled me to explore any discrepancies that were present in the self-reflection questions and to explore important areas in greater depth. The interviews were approximately one hour long and were focused around asking for examples that explored the participants’ answers to the survey.

Four interviews were conducted to ensure the reliability of the electronic survey. Semi-structured questions were posed to allow for open dialogue while maintaining a focus on confirming and expanding the data provided in the survey. Semi-structured interviews provided the interviewer with opportunities to develop rapport with members of the organization and learn about critical areas that are not readily assessed through standardized questionnaires (Bickman & Rog, 2009). The semi-structured approach was essential in developing the trust necessary to explore emotionally charged issues such as intergroup conflict, conflict asymmetry, and fault lines (Jehn & Bezrukova, 2010).

**Conduct of the Research**
As a general introduction to the research project and myself as a researcher, a letter of intent was made available and distributed to interested participants as a pre-cursor to any data collection by survey and interview (see Appendix H). In order to provide meaningful data to groups participating and to encourage 100% participation, consensus from the board was
requested. Following completion of the surveys and data analysis, one-on-one interviews were conducted with select participants to follow up on trends and questions. After successful completion of the survey by an organization and analysis of the data, a presentation was offered to share the results of the study and relevant data. The presentation also offered insights and recommendations for their future board succession planning.

**Ethical Issues**

My research project adhered to the Guiding Ethical Principals under the Royal Roads University Research Ethics Policy. Throughout my research project, through every step to completion of this final report and to completion of the value added presentations to the participants, I held and will continue to hold in the highest regard the interests, opinions, and integrity of the participating organizations and individuals.

The following section highlights how my research project has meet Royal Roads Ethics Review.

**Respect for Human Dignity**

Although the viability of the survey tool used in the study is ultimately dependent on its usability and simplicity, there must be a heavy emphasis placed on each participant's human dignity. Because the individuals using the survey were placed in an opportunity to present their introspective awareness, they could have been exposed to their internal motivational drivers in a way that they are not accustomed to. To ensure individual human dignity is maintained, only the amalgamated data analysis are available to each organization. All data presented in this report as an amalgamation of entire an organization’s data.

**Respect for Free and Informed Consent**

All participants provided free and informed consent. No one expressed a wish to withdraw from the project, though all were clearly informed that they may do so at any time, and that the associated information that they provided would be deleted. The online survey clearly asked for
informed consent on the first page and indicated that completion of the survey would signify consent for the data to be used in my research project.

Respect for vulnerable persons

No vulnerable persons were identified among the participants.

Respect for privacy and confidentiality

Documented interview data in its initial form (pre-analysis) were not shared with anyone. Excerpt quotations and analysis from the interview data are critical pieces to the research process and final report and eventually will be made public. No participants or identifying organizations are named in this final report and any other associated documents, nor are they able to be identified indirectly through the data or quotation comments. All primary research data that is electronically documented are accessible only to myself as the researcher and are kept in a locked location. Should a participant still wish to withdraw from the research project all data collected up to this point from that individual would be destroyed.

Privacy became a larger concern than expected during the governance successions. Many individuals in the groups were excited and held a desire to see their personal results of the values assessment. I was not comfortable handing out individual results and had only expressed a commitment to sharing the group’s collective data. I was able to follow through on my original commitment but there were expressions of disappointment.

Respect for justice and inclusiveness

Building on the first principal of respect for human dignity, all research participants were treated equally as an inclusive and important contributor to the research.

Balancing harms and benefits

Though possible dissonance may occur if an individual identifies with a set of values that they find negative, I envision that people will only benefit from the research process. Though some of the values may be perceived as loaded or negative, my experience with the survey has indicated that people find any value that they associate with to be positive. In a situation where conflict may occur as a result of the research process, I am a trained mediator and will apply these skills to assist in resolving the conflict.

Minimizing harms
All people provided free and informed consent to participate in the process, and were treated with the utmost respect and dignity throughout every stage of the research process. These fundamental principles minimized any potential harm that participants might experience during the research or upon reading the report.

Maximizing benefit

This final report will be made publically available to ensure information access to all research participants. Due to the results of the study, the researcher does not feel that the tool is ready to be made publicly available to the not-for-profit sector. Additionally, the research assisted all participating organizations in using their data in their future recruitment processes.

Data Analysis

The data were collected using simplysurveys.ca, a Canadian only survey company. The value survey was analyzed using the SVS key to determine an individual’s value scores, the board dynamic questions were used to test for comprehension and understanding, and the satisfaction questions were used to assess an individual’s level of satisfaction in their participation and contribution as a board member. In half of the participating organizations, the clarity between their role in governance and implementation was not clear to some of the participant. As a result these individuals may greatly enjoy their experiences with the organization but may not be engaged at the governance level. For this reason the satisfaction questions were focused on an individuals engagement in the board’s discussion.

The SVS section of the survey was analyzed using Shalom Schwartz’s analysis key (Figure 1) and presented using a radar graph based on the SVS Graph (see Figure 2). The challenge with the SVS is that participants may answer with what they perceive to be socially desirable responses.

Figure 1: SVS Assessment Key (Schwartz, 2013)
**Value** | **SVS items**
--- | ---
Conformity | 11,20,40,47
Tradition | 18,32,36,44,51
Benevolence | 33,45,49,52,54
Universalism | 1,17,24,26,29,30,35,38
Self-Direction | 5,16,31,41,53
Stimulation | 9,25,37
Hedonism | 4,50,57
Achievement | 34,39,43,55
Power | 3,12,27,46
Security | 8,13,15,22,56

*Figure 2: SVS Layout* (Schwartz, 2012)

The conflict/board assessment section of the survey results was analyzed using quantitative methods to first identify the level of fit with the interview data from the associated groups, and then to assess trends associated with each focus area.
Data from the interviews were analyzed and characterized according to themes and subthemes and their interconnections. However, it is difficult to compare and to analyze openended questions (Bickman & Rog, 2010). To provide clarity and easier assessment, three of the interviews were performed with two of my client organizations that had volunteered to participate as the initial participants. The other interview was with a member of a board with whom I had previously worked. The organizational familiarity allowed me to compare the assessment tool to my professional experiences and assessment of the organization.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Overall, the empirical data showed little correlation between satisfaction and values alignment. However, during the interviews and observation we noted that individuals who held a value in the positive range that was not shared by the group often expressed frustration when they perceived that value was not being fulfilled. This behavior was most evident for the values of stimulation, security, and self-direction. One of the major difficulties in the analysis was that there were no trend setting groups or clear individual that set the organizational values. Unlike a business owned by a single individual, this PO-fit assessment was unable to compare the individual board members results against a pre-established standard or norm. With the boards researched there was an expectation that an organizational norm would be clear but that was not found in the testing. As no distinct values grouping emerged for any of the boards it was impossible to compare board members to a group norm other than the group average.

Collective Data

Chart 1: Average values scores by group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Value scores by group</th>
<th>Universalism</th>
<th>Benevolence</th>
<th>Conformity</th>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Hedonism</th>
<th>Stimulation</th>
<th>Self-Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-1.97</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-2.11</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-2.03</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># &gt; 0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># &lt; 0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collectively there is a fair amount of discrepancy in the numeric importance assigned to a value between the organizations surveyed (Chart 1). However there was agreement on what values do and don’t play a role in decision making with all the participating organizations. All four groups found Universalism, Benevolence, Achievement, and Self-Direction to be key guiding values (Chart 1). Additionally, Security, Power, Hedonism, and Stimulation were found to not be motivating values for any of the four groups even though the four groups came from significantly different areas of activity within the social services sector. Two of the groups are social agencies that serve the community in very different ways. One is more active, seeking out people to assist out of poverty, whereas the other is more passive, helping those that have sought aid. Another group is a religious spiritual organization, providing spiritual services to a congregation. The fourth group is an arts and culture organization.

**Chart 2: Levels of group alignment towards a value**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of alignment towards a value (either positive or negative)</th>
<th>Universalism</th>
<th>Benevolence</th>
<th>Conformity</th>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Hedonism</th>
<th>Simulation</th>
<th>Self-Direction</th>
<th>Average Value</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>ST. DEV</th>
<th>Outside 1 ST. Dev.</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2 displays the level of alignment for each value category per board surveyed. Overall, each of the four groups displayed an average values agreement from 79% to 82%, demonstrating no significant difference between the groups (Chart 2). Values alignment is calculated as the percentage of individuals that found the value to be negative or positive based on the leanings of the majority. For example, in Group A, nine of the ten individuals agreed that stimulation was not important. Though values agreement was fairly consistent, the range of
importance placed on values between the groups varied. This was calculated by determining the standard deviation between the average and the group member's values. The standard deviation ranged significantly, from 0.57 to 0.83.

**Group A**

Group A was composed of nine board members and the Executive Director. Of these nine, two were new to the board and had only participated in one board meeting prior to participating in the study. To accommodate this factor, the data were analyzed both with and without the new members.

Chart A1 shows the number of board members who had a positive or negative attribution to each value for Group A as well as the average, standard deviation, and the minimum and maximum scores for each value. Group A shared 70% or greater agreement in six of the ten universal values with an overall average standard deviation of 0.543 and an average standard deviation of 0.528 for all returning board members. Value agreement is defined as the number of members holding a shared positive or negative value in a value category after the data have been normalized. An agreement score of 70% means that 70% of the members of this group agreed that the value was either important (or not important) in their decision making for the organization.

*Figure 3: Value Average for Group A*
Figure 3 demonstrates group A’s strong positive preference towards Conformity, Benevolence, Self Direction and Achievement. Self-Direction was at 70%, and the rest were at or above 80% agreement. The group collectively displayed no preference towards Stimulation, Hedonism, and Power in their decision-making. The group displayed mixed feelings for the values of Tradition, Universalism, and Security.

*Figure 4: Group A Radar Graph*
Figure 4 provides a visual display of this board's values alignment. Occasionally, around the graph a distinct visual outlier exists. These outliers, especially when an individual places more emphasis on a value than fellow members, made comments in their interviews associated with those values related to their board experience.
Though Group A displayed significant alignment in its motivating values, the level of emphasis on these values varied. On average, individuals scored 3.6 values outside of one standard deviation from the mean as indicated in Chart A3. For values such as Universalism, five individuals were more than one standard deviation from the average, (see Chart A2). In terms of the motivating value of Security, only two individuals were outside of one standard deviation. Individuals outside of one standard deviation are considered to place significantly more (or significantly less) importance on a value than the majority of members on that board.

Individuals themselves varied in how they compared to the mean. Only three individuals had one or two values outside of one standard deviation. Five individuals had three or fewer values within one standard deviation of the mean, including the one that only had one such value. This indicated that they were closer in line to the group average. Individuals that presented with a greater number of values outside of one standard deviation, though they may share the value with the group, held that value in significantly greater (or lower) regard than the rest of the board.

*Figure 5: Group A Values Compared to the Average*
Figure 5 provides a clean visual of group A’s values compared to their average. The T-bars indicate one standard deviation from the mean and provide a clean visual of trends that are both inside and outside of that range. The outliers, such as individual 3 for Security and individual 7 for Stimulation and Self-Direction presented potential areas of conflict with their peers. This is in contrast with Individual 1 who scored within one standard deviation for every value and has demonstrated a behavior of being more open in governance discussions.

Chart A4 indicates the group average per question and Chart A5 indicates the individuals’ average satisfaction score. Group A reported an overall engagement and satisfaction score of 3.3/4.0. All but one of the individuals presented with a score at or above 3.0/4.0. The one outlier, individual 8, is also the individual who did not align with the rest of the group in the values of Stimulation and Benevolence. It is important to note that the individual did receive a
score of 2.6/40, which is well above the 50% mark. This outlier individual did have significant asymmetry in one of the values compared to the mean and in the follow up interviews expressed frustration over issues related to the outlying value.

**Group B**

Group B was composed of seven board members, two of whom were also Co-Executive Directors. Of these seven, six were new to the organization as of two years ago and one was elected within the last three months. All of the members had an existing relationship with the organization stretching back a minimum of five years.

In Group B, five of the seven demonstrated agreement in seven of the ten universal values. Four out of seven agree in all ten universal values with an overall average standard deviation of 0.833 (see Chart B1).

*Figure 6: Value Average for Group B*
Group B displayed a strong positive preference towards Benevolence, Achievement, Universalism and Self-Direction (See Figure 6). All of the group members agreed that Benevolence and Achievement were key motivational values in their organization (Chart B1). Universalism and Self-Direction were both supported by five of the seven members. The group collectively displayed no preference towards Tradition, Security, Power, and Hedonism in their decision-making. The group displayed mixed feelings for the values of Stimulation and Conformity. This organization's mandate is to develop and mentor the next generation through professional experiences that support individuals in need of aid. This aligns with the group’s emphasis on the opposing but strongly held values of benevolence and achievement.

*Figure 7: Group B Radar Graph*
Figure 7: Group B Radar Graph

Figure 7 provides a visual display of this board’s values alignment. There are occasional outliers in the group. Unlike Group A, the outliers in Group B were less likely to be a single individual and more likely to be a divide in the group with multiple individuals on both sides of the value. This aligns well with the interview data collected on the group and the fault lines that exist within the board.

Though Group B displayed significant alignment in its motivating values, the level of emphasis in these values varies. On average, individuals scored outside of one standard deviation from the average on 4.7 values (see Chart B2). Only one individual was within one standard deviation on all but one value. For values such as Achievement, five individuals were more than one standard deviation from the average (see Chart B3). In terms of the motivating value of Universalism, only two individuals were outside of one standard deviation.

Figure 8: Group B Values Compared to the Average
Figure 8 provides a clean visual of Group B's values compared to their average. The T-bars indicate one standard deviation from the mean and provide a clean visual of trends that are outside of that range.

Group B reported an engagement and satisfaction score of 3.0/4.0 (Chart B4). Four of the seven (4/7) individuals presented with a score at or above 3.0/4.0. The three most dissatisfied individuals, individuals 1, 5, and 7 represent those with the highest and lowest levels of value alignment. It is important to note that these individuals did receive a score of 2.3, 2.4, and 2.6 respectively, out of 4.0 – all above the 50% mark. In addition, it is important to note that one of these individuals has moved, is communicating remotely, and is therefore unable to engage with the group to the same level as previously. Two also hold labour-intensive and day-to-day focused roles in the organization and this may play a role in their overall satisfaction in the governance process.
For this group, one satisfaction question stood out above the rest (see Chart B5). The question: “Do you leave meetings feeling like the entire board is on the same page” had a score of 2.1 with a standard deviation of 0.5. This is of interest since this group confirms most votes by consensus or as close to consensus as they can achieve which implies that the board is on the same page with the final decision. Even with the decision being made in consensus the individuals within the group do not feel that members are on the “same page” on an individual level.

**Group C**

Group C is a faith based organization and is composed of 18 board members, a religious leader, and an office administrator. Of these 20 individuals, 6 were new, 5 have been on the board between 2-5 years (average 2.4 years), 7 have been on the board between 8 and 28 years (average of 18.12 years), and 1 did not participate in the study. Two of the new board members had not participated in any meetings prior to election and as a result did not fill out the satisfaction of the survey. To accommodate, the data was analyzed both with and without the new members.

Group C shared 79% or greater agreement in 6 of the 10 universal values. The values aligned with an overall average standard deviation of 0.634, an average standard deviation of 0.637 for all board members who have served more than 10 years, and an average standard deviation on 0.691 for all returning board members. Due to the size of this group an agreement of 79% indicates that there are 4 outliers (see Chart C1). Additionally, there is a distinct difference in the average value scores of the three subgroups: new members, members with less than 10 year service, and members with over 10 year service. In categories such as Tradition, member’s values scores ranged from -1.822 to 1.687 and the organization was split 10 to 9,
positive verses negative as a motivator. This raises some vision and direction challenges for the future of a faith-based organization.

*Figure 9: Value Average for Group C*

Figure 9 provides a clear visual display of the group’s motivational values. There is a clear preference towards Universalism and Benevolence, but Tradition and Security straddle the zero line.

*Figure 10: Number of individuals who labeled values as positive - Group C*
Group C displayed a strong positive preference towards Benevolence, Universalism, Conformity, Self-Direction, and Achievement in order of preference (Figure 10). All but one of the group members agreed that Benevolence was a key motivational value in their organization. Universalism and Conformity were both supported by 15 or more of the 19 members.

The group collectively displayed no preference towards Power, Stimulation or Hedonism in their decision-making. The group displayed mixed feelings for the values of Tradition and Security as both values ranked close to zero, with Tradition scoring slightly positive and Security slightly in the negative. For both values, one third of the board did not agree on the role of the value in decision making (see Figures 9 and 10). This is a strong indicator of potential conflict for the decision making process.

*Figure 11: Group C Radar Graph*
Due to the size of this board, from a visual perspective there seems to be very little alignment around any value (see Figure 11). Group C had the greatest average range between its lowest and highest values scores (see Chart 1) indicating the highest level of value diversity of any of the 4 groups that participated in the study.

Though Group C displayed fair alignment in its motivating values, the level of emphasis in these values varies. Individuals themselves varied anywhere from having only one value that
was an outlier to having eight of the ten values being out of the range (see Chart C2). On average individuals scored 4.37 values outside of one standard deviation from the mean (see Chart C2). For values such as Tradition, 10 of the 19 individuals are more than one standard deviation from the average. Overall, 7 to 10 individuals were one or more standard deviations outside of the mean on any motivational value. This is more than one third of the board on any guiding principle.

*Figure 12: Group C Values Compared to the Average*
Figure 12: Group C Values Compared to the Average
Figure 12 provides a clean visual of group C’s values compared to their average. The T-bars indicate one standard deviation from the mean and provide a clean visual of trends that are outside of that range.

Group C reported an engagement and satisfaction score of 2.65/4.0 (see Chart C3). Five of the individuals presented with a score at or above 3.0/4.0 and two did not participate in this section of the survey as they felt it was not applicable since they had not yet participated at a board meeting. This was the largest board to participate in the study and the results varied accordingly. Individuals who had served on the board for more than ten years had a higher than average satisfaction score (3.0/4.0) than their newer counterparts. Length of service and holding a leadership role appeared to correspond with a higher satisfaction score. Overall, members rated satisfaction as 3.12/4.0, however being on the same page, spending time on ideas and solutions, and being agreed with all rated poorly (see Chart C4). This poor rating may indicate that members are satisfied in the organization but not in the governance process of the organization.

Based on my professional interactions with Group C as well as the interviews the score to the question “are these meetings focused on ideas and solutions?” proved insightful. This question tied for the lowest value at 2.24/4.0 and relates well to the frustrations from the group. This organization has a large number of administrative committees and though there have been attempts at having written reports from the committees over the years, receiving reports in writing or ahead of time has never become the practice of the organization. Additionally, the question “do you leave meetings feeling like the entire board is on the same page?”, which also tied for lowest score, may be a result of the above factors. This may also be due to the group’s in diversity of feelings towards the values of Tradition and Security as many of the members would be in a values conflict over these values.
**Group D**

Group D was composed of eight board members. Of these eight, two withdrew from the study and one member was new. This is the only participating group with which the author has no professional relationship. No members indicated a desire for a follow up interview.

Group D had a minimum of four of the six members in agreement in all of the 10 universal values. Five or more members agreed with six of the ten values. Group D had an overall average standard deviation of 0.760 (see Chart D1).

*Figure 13: Value Average for Group D*

Group D displayed a strong positive preference towards Benevolence, Conformity, Self-Direction, and Achievement in order of preference (Figure 13). All of the participating group
members agreed that Benevolence, Conformity, and Self-Direction were key motivational values in their organization. Achievement was supported by five of the six members.

The group collectively displayed no preference towards Tradition, Security, Power, and Hedonism in their decision-making. The group displayed mixed feelings for the values of Stimulation and Universalism. Using Figure 14 as a visual guide, Group D appears to have symmetry in its motivational values.

*Figure 14: Group D Radar Graph*
Though Group D displayed high alignment in its motivating values, the level of emphasis in these values varies (see Chart D2). Individuals themselves varied anywhere from having only one value that was an outlier to having seven of the ten values being out the range (see Chart D2). On average individuals had 4.83 values outside of one standard deviation from the mean. For values such as Tradition and Hedonism, four of the six individuals are more than one standard deviation from the average (Chart D3). Except for Benevolence, Security, and Stimulation, half of the group or more was one standard deviation outside of the mean on any motivational value. This is half or more of the board on seven of the guiding principles.

*Figure 15: Group D Values Compared to the Average*

![Figure 15: Group D Values Compared to the Average](image-url)

Figure 5 provides a clean visual of Group D’s values compared to their average. The T-bars indicate 1 standard deviation from the mean and provide a clean visual of trends that are
outside of that range. It is important to note that individual 5, who represents as an outlier for being ranked high in security and low in stimulation, is in a role that requires patience and holds significant legal and fiduciary responsibility. Though this value asymmetry may result in higher conflict, it may be worth additional exploration to determine if such value diversity may be beneficial in such a fiduciary capacity.

Group D reported an engagement and satisfaction score of 2.8/4.0. Half of the individuals presented with a score at or above 3.0/4.0 (see Chart D4). No individual presented with a score below 2.44/4.0. Group D also indicated that they often leave meetings with the feeling that the members are not aligned and that members rarely feel that others agree with the direction they propose (see Chart D5).

**Secondary Data Observations**

One of the unexpected surprises in the data was how closely the four different organizations aligned in their rankings of values and importance. Though Figure 17 does not list the individual numeric value that each group assigned to a motivational value, it does show a surprising alignment of values that are found to be important within the charitable sector. Note once more that the participating organizations included groups from the social services, religious institutions, and arts societies. Even with this range of diversity all of the groups agreed that Universalism, Benevolence, Achievement, and Self-Direction are motivating values. Conformity was a motivating value for 75% of the groups. Additionally, all of the groups agreed that Security, Power, Hedonism, and Stimulation are not motivating values driving their organizations. Further, 75% of the groups found that Tradition was not a driving factor.

*Figure 17: Percentage of Groups Assigning Importance to a Value*
Though this result needs to be explored in more detail and additional research needs to be conducted to increase the sample size, the results themselves are worth acknowledging in our current political environment. There is currently a strong push from many levels of government to reduce the number of charitable organizations by amalgamating organizations through mergers and acquisitions. There is also political pressure to increase the number of audits and government control in the sector (Hayward, 2014). These pressures play strongly against strong drive for self-direction in all the organizations represented in this research.

Data Analysis

Ultimately the purpose of the research study was to set the groundwork for an SVS-based board recruitment tool. It is meant to provide the feasibility groundwork regarding the logistics for implementing the tool, and science behind its usefulness.

The anticipated results of the research project were to find a viable and simple values-based approach to board recruitment and governance succession planning. Additionally, I had hoped that the research would produce a valuable tool to assist in values-based recruitment.

One desired outcome of the research project was to explore what relationship exists between group values alignment and conflict verses generative discussion in the boards studied.
Any correlation may have provided support for the value-based recruitment model and the modified SVS tool. The analysis of the survey will provide a foundation for future research and exploration.

*Figure 18: Group Comparison*

Fundamentally, there was no correlation between values scores, average standard deviation of individual values from the mean, or number of members outside of one standard deviation from the value and satisfaction (Figure 16 and 17). The satisfaction value was calculated based on the reported feelings of engagement, participation, and the perceived respect received by one's peers. There was however significant correlation between expressed frustrations in the follow up interviews and individuals who had values that were expressed as more important than the group norm. These points of frustration appear to center around these values and issues that are relevant to the value category.

Notably, in the follow-up interviews and from my professional exposure to many of the groups, those groups that did express higher levels of value alignment, shared more stories related to team success. Many of these stories focused on team openness, willingness to engage in positive conflict, and collaboration to create better end products. The board that had the lowest value diversity (Group A), standard deviation, and number of members inside one
standard deviation gave more detailed answers and spoke of more group success in their interviews. Even members among these groups who had lower satisfaction ratings gave strong positive stories. For example, one less satisfied interviewee shared the following story when asked about his or her level of satisfaction as part of the board:

"It depends on what you mean by satisfaction. I feel satisfied with the work I do for the community but I am very frustrated by the lack of respect for my expertise... When I bring a policy to the table the rest of the board spends a lot of time finding the exceptions to the rules and in the end sends the policy back to the committee. I don’t think you shouldn’t pass a policy because there are exceptions... Though the final product that we come back with a month later is much better and holds true against all of the exceptions listed earlier. I am proud of the end product and I think that it is better than what I originally proposed." (Interviewee A)

This and other interviews highlighted that the SVS was of value in detecting possible conflict areas by monitoring for individuals who placed significantly more emphasis on a value then the majority. To use the SVS in this way requires each individual to be analyzed at a higher level of detail then was originally explored in this project.

Overall, the interviews shed light on a few key themes that were missing from the survey and helped in the data analysis. Knowing that the SVS included a significant portion of a PO fit assessment, the goal was to determine if the SVS was able to be used to determine PO fit for a board since they did not work in a regularly shared working environment.

It appears that a few key and unexpected factors interfered with the satisfaction of certain individual participants and the group averages. One group was experiencing high levels of interpersonal conflict between friends and in some situations organizational decisions and
operations had become the combat zone for expressing their feelings and frustrations. In more than one interview there were expressed frustrations between the pace of the organization's meetings and individuals' personal desire for accomplishment and input. Two respondents from the same group demonstrated the difference best: "I often feel that the others feel that board efficiency is second to comradery." (Interviewee A). And from the same board, this opposing view:

Our shared dinners before the meetings give us time to get together and visit. This gives us a relationship where we can have complicated conversations with no judgment. On this board we can ask uncomfortable questions and be open and honest. (Interviewee C)

Though the SVS would not be a practical tool to indicate intergroup or interpersonal conflict, it may provide insight into possible value conflicts of group members. For example, in one group, two individuals were indicated as having a personal conflict that was being extrapolated to the group. With respect to their scores, these individuals were opposed in six of the ten organizational motivational values. Due to the differences of opinion towards the group's driving values, this may explain why they were comfortable pushing the organization in different and occasionally opposing directions. According to interviewee B, it was not uncommon for one or the other individual to "throw up a roadblock" if he or she felt that the organization was moving in a direction set by the other. For confidentiality purposes these individuals and their group will not be named, however Figure 18 displays these individuals' values and allows for easy comparison of their differences.

*Figure 19: Organizational Values of Board Members in Interpersonal Conflict according to interviewee B*
Interviews and conversations with groups holding lower satisfaction scores tended to express a need to “get things done” or “move on to the next important topics” (Interviewee D).

In comparing the interviews with my professional exposure with three of the participating organizations, the Schwartz Values Survey results were aligned with my observations of behaviour in meetings. Individuals who held strong feelings that were counter to the larger group also had values that were ranked strongly in the opposite direction of the majority. This was especially true on issues where these values were a factor in the decision making process. For example, Interviewee D was clear in understanding his or her counter-stance in issues as he or she “feels [he or she] has a duty to be on the board and bring that different and counter perspective to the board” even if all it does is create conflict. Since, “there is no uptake anyway,” the interviewee continued by adding that he or she “has this weird optimistic hope that things
will change.” The board that this individual belonged to had a high degree of social diversity in their membership as well as outliers in their values data.

Overall, points of frustration and dissatisfaction seem to arise in value areas where a participant had a distinctly elevated value from than the average. For example, one of the interviewees that scored significantly higher than their peers on Stimulation focused highly on accomplishments when interviewed: “I tend to view the work functions as very businesslike and efficient” (Interviewee A). By contrast, fellow board members made comments such as, “Our retreats have been my favourite as they let us understand each other’s point of view and that has made it easier to work together at board meetings. This board is close and meetings feel like getting together with friends” (Interviewee C).

The one area of evaluation that the interviews revealed to be lacking in the SVS is clustered around task, decisions and goals: an evaluation of pace, the desire to move on, get things done, and to show progress. Pace has been a constant discussion point in the follow up interviews. To one interviewee, while seeking clarification, I asked “would you express this as a struggle between getting it done verses getting it right?” Interviewee B replied “we have been getting too much done, it makes us look good, but it’s time we start getting it right.” This desire to vote, get a majority, and move on appears to be a driving force towards some individual’s satisfaction in their participation. Others appear to be on the other end of the spectrum. This may be a conflict between individuals’ personal motivating values, most notably stimulation, and the behaviours of the organization.

The biggest insights into values and their effects on the groups studied did not come from an overall view of the average differences but by examining the outliers that stood out from the group norm. More specifically it was outliers that held a value as positive and
motivating in their behaviour in comparison to indifference by the rest of the group. This emphasis may both add value to the conversation but may also result in a shift of focus in the conversation while adding tension to the board. Generally the results indicated that though the different motivational values added short-term value to the board, they also increased conflict and decreased long term satisfaction as anticipated.

It may be possible and beneficial to use the SVS as a governance tool to allow board members to better understand the positions and driving factors of other board members when discussing contentious issues. The SVS may be able to reduce levels of conflict asymmetry since it would allow for and create a space for an open discussion around the motivational values that are driving a disagreement.

**Outcomes and Recommendations**

Overall, the analysis has not demonstrated that the SVS on its own is sufficient to determine board PO-fit. One factor lies in the unique nature of boards. The research conducted by Borg et al. (2011) and Kristof (1996) found that boards, unlike single owner businesses, do not have a single individual establishing the organizations motivational values in which to compare an individuals results. This research does however raise elements for exploration when comparing an individual to their peers. In alignment with Kristof (1996), both in the individual satisfaction results and in the follow up interviews, individuals who had a motivational value that was different from the prevailing group norm often experienced and inadvertently created conflict when that value was threatened. Though this does indicate a possible benefit of using the SVS to determine PO-fit, it does present additional challenges and
may well be used for a number of purposes by boards. That being said, the SVS needs to be used with caution, as the current group norm may not be aligned with the values of the organization.

SVS did present an accurate interpretation of an individual’s project values for their organization. Thus, the modified SVS stood out as a valuable tool to test for values alignment and assess for value asymmetry within an existing board. In the workshops carried out following the study, the presentation of the group’s values profiles created a safe environment to explore the asymmetries within the board. This produced a reduction in their conflict levels by making such asymmetry public to allow parties involved to explore their guiding motivational values for the organization and move the conflict from an interpersonal dimension to a strategic planning and task conflict exploration. By creating conversation around the asymmetry, the motivational value differences may not change but the conflict may be reduced as it is no longer be perceived by either party as interpersonal (Jehn & Bezrukova, 2004; Jehn et al., 2008). By bringing these motivational differences to the table the board may be better able to explore options that satisfy all of the motivational values or collectively decide which values are important for the issue they are trying to address (Jehn et al., 2008).

Given these factors, my recommendations from this research are as follows:

1. Continue to test the modified SVS as a possible tool for determining values alignment between board members and organizational values.

Both Borg et al. (2011) and this research, as identified on page 57, have demonstrated a possible use of the SVS as a PO fit tool. According to this research, a group baseline for comparison with board members is not currently possible to achieve using the SVS in this format. Finding a method to determine such an organizational baseline would allow the SVS to be used as a PO fit tool.
2. To use the SVS assessment to provide a visual for discussion and alignment purposes for interviewing or orientation of new members.

Though the research has not provided a clear organizational baseline in which to assess new member fit, using the produced visual may allow for open-ended conversations around the organization’s values and the values of potential new members. Such conversations were held in the follow up presentations with current members, see page 59, and resulted in increased levels of values symmetry. This symmetry within the governance of the organization resulting in lower conflict and higher levels of collaboration and teamwork as described by Hüttermann and Boerner (2011) and Ozaralli (2003).

3. Utilize the modified SVS as a conflict management facilitation and assessment tool.

The modified version of the SVS in this paper has been found sufficient for exploring the general values of the board members related to governance of their organization as discussed on page 59. If needed, a simple modification can be performed to focus the SVS on a specific topic. While in this format it would not act as a perfect PO fit assessment tool as described by Borg et al. (2011), it would serve as a neutral tool to support the board in reducing conflict by addressing team asymmetry (Homan, Greer, Jehn, & Koning, 2010).

4. Explore the use of the SVS presentation of asymmetry as a tool to help boards identify the value of degrees of diversity in how these can contribute to richer exploration of strategies, problems and decision-making.

During the follow up presentation to the participating organizations it was noted that the presentation of their SVS profiles created a safe environment for the board to explore their differences and discuss their values, see page 59. As a facilitation tool alone this modified version of the SVS has demonstrated value by helping these boards move towards a shared set
of values in their organization, thereby allowing them to increase their level of productivity and the quality of their conversations (Ozaralli, 2003).

5. Continued research into the creation of an SVS organizational profile.

Most prominently the SVS has been used to observe and study society’s changing values (Schwartz, 2012). Though it has been focused on citizens of nations and their personal values, the modified profile should be able to assess the members of an organization and be used to study the shifting values within the leadership and staff of these organizations (Borg et al., 2011). Using the SVS in a longitudinal study on larger organization may allow researchers to better understand the values of both leadership and their staff and the value changes that take place as organizations shift operational models, mature or enter into stages of dissolution.

Additionally, with further research it may be possible to create a central database of organizational profiles. This central database could allow interested potential candidates to find organizations with the correct value match and may be a solution to lead us into the next century of board recruitment. Imagine an interested individual going to a website where they are able to fill out a personal profile survey that leads them to results of possible charities that would not only match their interests, but also align with their values.

Closing

It has taken me considerable time to focus my intent and vision on my Master’s degree research project. While I am disappointed with the lack of anticipated results, I am excited about the additional opportunities it has left me to explore. This research project has demonstrated that the SVS can be used to assess an individual’s values in organizational decision-making instead of an individual’s personal motivational values. This has opened up the opportunity for
the participating boards to engage in clarifying activities the reduce asymmetry both from a values conflict perspective as well as power asymmetry. The collective results may have held different data than expected, but the individual outliers provided unexpected insights. These outliers primarily aligned with the group but held one or two values in significantly higher regard than their peers. These individuals thereby demonstrated how such motivational values could become focal points for tension. Additionally, when debriefing the groups, the awareness of the differing motivational values provided an opportunity for exploration of these issues and diffused the conflict to a constructive level.

Though the modified SVS may be a good starting point for the board to explore its motivating values, it is still imperfect as a recruitment tool. The original desire had been to allow individuals to submit a SVS profile and be matched with organizations that matched their values. The results demonstrate that this is not currently possible. However, individual boards could ask applicants to submit a profile to monitor for extreme differences between themselves and their potential candidates.

Regardless, the modified SVS has shown to hold value as a tool and has been added to my professional toolkit as a mediator and conflict management professional. It has proven itself as a valuable resource in encouraging generative and values-based governance conversations. More importantly, the collective sector data has given my peers and I much to discuss. I look forward to bringing the sector data forward to my peers in government and relevant organizations for their reflections and potential future collaborations.
Value-based Succession Planning in Governance Boards
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Appendix A: Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent Form

This informed consent form is for members of boards who are participating in research on PO fit, effectiveness and recruitment. The research is titled “Using SVS to assess PO fit for ideal board recruitment”

**Principle Investigator:** David Feldman  
**Organization:** MAIS Program at Royal Roads University  
**Supervisor:** Ann Perodeau

This Informed Consent Form has two parts:  
• Information Sheet - to share information about the study with you  
• Certificate of Consent - for signatures if you choose to participate

You will be given a copy of the full Informed Consent Form

Part I: Information Sheet

**Introduction**

Hello, my name is David Feldman, a Masters student at Royal Roads University. I am doing research on transdisciplinary teams and how they form. I am going to give you information about the research, which you are invited to participate in. Please feel free to discuss the information within this letter to anyone who can help you better decide if you would like to participate in the research or not. If there is anything within this letter that you would like clarification on please feel free to ask. I am also happy to explain this letter in more detail as you read it. Please feel free to ask questions at any time.

**Purpose of the research**
To better assist boards of directors in their recruitment of future members

**Type of Research Intervention**

This research requires the filling out of a 25 minute survey. If you are interested there may also be a follow up interview.

This survey is intended to explore two areas of focus: the values of your organization and how well you believe that your board works together.

Your individual answers will be kept confidential and at no time will any individual know your answers to the questions.

**Participant Selection**

You are being invited to participate in this research because you are part of the board of directors for a local organization. It is you and your team that we are inviting to participate in this research because we feel you can contribute much to our understanding and knowledge of board dynamics and recruitment.

**Voluntary Participation**

Your participation in this research is completely voluntary and choosing to participate or not will not have any bearing on you, your organization, or my role with the organization.

**Procedures**

We are asking that you and your fellow board members agree to all fill out the survey. We are best able to analyze the data only when it is completed by all of your board members.

**Duration**

The survey has 3 parts and will take approximately 25 minutes to complete and there is an option to volunteer for a 1 hour one-on-one interview.
Risks

We do not believe that there any risks associated with this survey.

Benefits

As part of this study we are offering you and your board a review of your collective, but not personalized, data and support in using this information in creating a board recruitment tool.

Confidentiality

All personal information will be kept confidential. The collective results of the organization will only be shared with the project researchers and the organization itself.

Sharing the Results

The aggregated results that we get from this research will be made available to all of the participants. Each participant will have access to a summary of our findings before they are made widely available to the public provided that they choose to provide us with contact information. I will also be available to explain the results to any participating boards that are interested.

Right to Refuse or Withdraw

You or your organization does not have to take part in this study if you do not wish to do so. If your organization chooses not to participate this choice will not affect you or your organization in any way.

Unfortunately, we will not be able to provide a feedback analysis to any organization that does not have 90% participation due to incomplete data.

Who to Contact
If you have any questions, you can ask them now or later. If you wish to ask questions later, you may contact me at: David Feldman, (XXX) XXX - XXX, XXXXXXX@XXXXX.XXX

This proposal has been reviewed and approved by the Royal Roads Ethical Review Committee which is a committee whose task it is to make sure that research participants are protected from harm. If you wish to find about more about the ethics review process contact Colleen Hoppins at the Office of Research. tel: (XXX) XXX - XXX, ext. XXX, or XXXXXXX@XXXXX.XXX.

Part II: Certificate of Consent

I, _______________, have been invited to participate in the research about model conflict in teams.

I have read the foregoing information, or it has been read to me. I have had the opportunity to ask questions about it and any questions I have been asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I consent voluntarily to be a participant in this study

Print Name of Participant _______________

Signature of Participant _______________

Date ____________________

Day/month/year
Appendix B: Draft Online Survey

DRAFT QUESTIONS FOR ONLINE SURVEY
To start please tell us a little bit about you and which board you are filling out this survey for:
Organization: ______________________
Role: ____________________________
Gender:
□ Male    □ Female
Date of Birth:
VALUE SURVEY

In this questionnaire you are to ask yourself: "What values are important to ME as guiding principles when I make decisions in this organization, and what values are less important to ME in making these organizational decisions?" There are two lists of values on the following pages. These values come from different cultures. In the parentheses following each value is an explanation that may help you to understand its meaning.

Your task is to rate how important each value is for you as a guiding principle in your decision making role with this organization. Use the rating scale below:

0--means the value is not at all important, it is not relevant as a guiding principle for you.
3--means the value is important.
6--means the value is very important.

The higher the number (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6), the more important the value is as a guiding principle for you in THIS organizations decisions.

-1 is for rating any values opposed to the principles that guide you.
7 is for rating a value of supreme importance as a guiding principle in your organization; ordinarily there are no more than two such values.

In the space before each value, write the number (-1,0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7) that indicates the importance of that value for you, personally. Try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using all the numbers. You will, of course, need to use numbers more than once.
AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE FOR ME IN THIS ORGANIZATION, this value is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opposed to my values</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Supreme importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>importance</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before you begin, read the values in List I, choose the one that is most important to the organization and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is most opposed to the organization’s values and rate it -1. If there is no such value, choose the value least important to you and rate it 0 or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values in List I.

VALUES LIST I

___EQUALITY (equal opportunity for all)
___INNER HARMONY (at peace with myself)
___SOCIAL POWER (control over others, dominance)
___PLEASURE (gratification of desires)
___FREEDOM (freedom of action and thought)
___A SPIRITUAL LIFE (emphasis on spiritual not material matters)
___SENSE OF BELONGING (feeling that others care about me)
___SOCIAL ORDER (stability of society)
___AN EXCITING LIFE (stimulating experiences)
___MEANING IN LIFE (a purpose in life)
___POLITENESS (courtesy, good manners)
___WEALTH (material possessions, money)
___NATIONAL SECURITY (protection of my nation from enemies)
___SELF RESPECT (belief in one’s own worth)
___RECIPIROCATION OF FAVORS (avoidance of indebtedness)
___CREATIVITY (uniqueness, imagination)
___A WORLD AT PEACE (free of war and conflict)
___RESPECT FOR TRADITION (preservation of time-honored customs)
___MATURE LOVE (deep emotional & spiritual intimacy)
___SELF-DISCIPLINE (self-restraint, resistance to temptation)
___PRIVACY (the right to have a private sphere)
___FAMILY SECURITY (safety for loved ones)
___SOCIAL RECOGNITION (respect, approval by others)
___UNITY WITH NATURE (fitting into nature)
___A VARIED LIFE (filled with challenge, novelty and change)
___WISDOM (a mature understanding of life)
VALUE AUTHORITY (the right to lead or command)
VALUE TRUE FRIENDSHIP (close, supportive friends)
VALUE A WORLD OF BEAUTY (beauty of nature and the arts)
VALUE SOCIAL JUSTICE (correcting injustice, care for the weak)

* * * * *

VALUES LIST II

Now rate how important each of the following values is for you as a guiding principle in THIS ORGANIZATION. These values are phrased as ways of acting that may be more or less important for you. Once again, try to distinguish as much as possible between the values by using all the numbers.

Before you begin, read the values in List II, choose the one that is most important to you and rate its importance. Next, choose the value that is most opposed to your values, or—if there is no such value—choose the value least important to you, and rate it -1, 0, or 1, according to its importance. Then rate the rest of the values.

AS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE FOR ME IN THIS ORGANIZATION, this value is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>opposed to my values</th>
<th>not important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>very important</th>
<th>supreme importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VALUE INDEPENDENT (self-reliant, self-sufficient)
VALUE MODERATE (avoiding extremes of feeling & action)
VALUE LOYAL (faithful to my friends, group)
VALUE AMBITIOUS (hard-working, aspiring)
VALUE BROADMINDED (tolerant of different ideas and beliefs)
VALUE HUMBLE (modest, self-effacing)
VALUE DARING (seeking adventure, risk)
VALUE PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT (preserving nature)
VALUE INFLUENTIAL (having an impact on people and events)
VALUE HONORING OF PARENTS AND ELDERS (showing respect)
VALUE CHOOSING OWN GOALS (selecting own purposes)
VALUE HEALTHY (not being sick physically or mentally)
VALUE CAPABLE (competent, effective, efficient)
VALUE ACCEPTING MY PORTION IN LIFE (submitting to life's circumstances)
__HONEST (genuine, sincere)
__PRESERVING MY PUBLIC IMAGE (protecting my "face")
__OBEYED (dutiful, meeting obligations)
__INTELLIGENT (logical, thinking)
__HELPFUL (working for the welfare of others)
__ENJOYING LIFE (enjoying food, sex, leisure, etc.)
__DEVOUT (holding to religious faith & belief)
__RESPONSIBLE (dependable, reliable)
__CURIOS (interested in everything, exploring)
__FORGIVING (willing to pardon others)
__SUCCESSFUL (achieving goals)
__CLEAN (neat, tidy)
__SELF-INDULGENT (doing pleasant things)

******

ORGANIZATIONAL GOVERNANCE

Years of experience working on ALL boards

Years of experience working on THIS boards

On average how many hours a month do you spend on board work for THIS organization?

On average how many hours a month do you participate in board related meetings for THIS organization?

What percentage of these meetings are multidisciplinary? (Involve people of more than one field of expertise)

☐ <25%   ☐ 25 – 49%   ☐ 50 – 74%   ☐ 75 - 99%   ☐ 100%

What percentage of time spent in meetings is focused on reporting?

☐ <25%   ☐ 25 – 49%   ☐ 50 – 74%   ☐ 75 - 99%   ☐ 100%

What percentage of time spent in meetings is focused on idea generation or problem solving?

☐ <25%   ☐ 25 – 49%   ☐ 50 – 74%   ☐ 75 - 99%   ☐ 100%

What percentage of idea generating sessions end with a decision by the end of the meeting?

☐ <25%   ☐ 25 – 49%   ☐ 50 – 74%   ☐ 75 - 99%   ☐ 100%

What percentage of idea generating sessions end with a decision within a month?
What percentage of idea generating sessions end with a decision eventually?
- <25%
- 25 – 49%
- 50 – 74%
- 75 - 99%
- 100%

How satisfied are you with your involvement in the decision-making?
- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Not at all satisfied
- Not applicable

What percent of the time do you leave a meeting feeling engaged?
- <25%
- 25 – 49%
- 50 – 74%
- 75 - 99%
- 100%

How much input do you feel you have on the final decision?
- None
- A little
- Some
- Often
- A lot

What percentage of your input do you feel was taken into consideration?
- None
- A little
- Some
- Often
- A lot

Do you feel heard at team meetings?
- None
- A little
- Some
- Often
- A lot

Do you leave meetings feeling like the entire board is on the same page?
- None
- A little
- Some
- Often
- A lot

Are these meetings focused on ideas and solutions?
- None
- A little
- Some
- Often
- A lot

How often does the team agree with what you think is right?
- None
- A little
- Some
- Often
- A lot

Do you feel secure in your position on the board and supported by your colleges?
- None
- A little
- Some
- Often
- A lot

Additional Comments:
We would like to be able to contact you for potentially participate in further aspects of this study. There is no obligation to share your personal information.

Would you like to be contacted when the results of this survey are available?
- Yes
- No

Would you be interested in participating in a follow up interview to help us better understand the results of this study?
- Yes
- No
If you answered yes to either of the above questions please provide us with your contact information so that we will be able to reach you in the future.

Name: _______________________
Phone Number: _______________
Email: ______________________

Thank you for your participation.
Appendix C: Draft One-on-one Interview Questions (Semi-standardized Interview)

QUESTION FOR INTERVIEWS

1. Do you feel satisfied with your experience in this organization?

2. Please tell me about a time when the organization's values came into conflict with your own values and how you resolved the situation.

3. Please share with me your best board experience with this organization.

4. Please share an experience that reflects a typical board meeting.

5. What does good governance look like to you?

6. How would you compare this organization to that image?

7. Please tell me about the people on this board.

8. At one of your meeting have you ever learned something that changed the way you saw a problem or situation?

9. Did this help the team make a better solution?

10. Has there been a time when you felt someone was trying to undermine you at a meeting?

   a. Did you feel they were trying to get you off the board?

   b. Did you or anyone else address it with all parties involved?

   c. Were your feelings validated?

   d. How did you handle your feelings?
Dear Board Members,

As some of you may know, I am currently entering the research stage of my masters research project, Value based Succession Planning in Governance Boards. As such I would like to invite you to be part of my research project. This research project forms part of the requirement for my Master's Degree in Interdisciplinary Studies, at Royal Roads University.

The objective of this research is to assist boards in building a long term succession strategy by strengthening their recruitment techniques. I wish to determine if current research on transformational teams and value symmetry is transferable to governance bodies in a form that could be applied as a recruitment survey.

You are receiving this letter because at least one member of your organization has expressed interest in participating in this study. In order for the data collected to be used to its fullest potential we hope to achieve at least 90% participation from the board members of each organization that participates. As a result we are asking the boards to decide as a group if they wish to participate in this study.

This phase of the research project will consist of an online survey and is estimated to last approximately 25 minutes.

For organizations that have 95% participation in the study I will be offering a few hours of my time to explain your group results and how you can use this information to improve your future board recruitment strategy. At no time will any individual’s answers be identifiable to the organization.

Appendix D: Email Invitation Sample

E-MAIL INVITATION SAMPLE

Dear Board Members,

As some of you may know, I am currently entering the research stage of my masters research project, Value based Succession Planning in Governance Boards. As such I would like to invite you to be part of my research project. This research project forms part of the requirement for my Master's Degree in Interdisciplinary Studies, at Royal Roads University.

The objective of this research is to assist boards in building a long term succession strategy by strengthening their recruitment techniques. I wish to determine if current research on transformational teams and value symmetry is transferable to governance bodies in a form that could be applied as a recruitment survey.

You are receiving this letter because at least one member of your organization has expressed interest in participating in this study. In order for the data collected to be used to its fullest potential we hope to achieve at least 90% participation from the board members of each organization that participates. As a result we are asking the boards to decide as a group if they wish to participate in this study.

This phase of the research project will consist of an online survey and is estimated to last approximately 25 minutes.

For organizations that have 95% participation in the study I will be offering a few hours of my time to explain your group results and how you can use this information to improve your future board recruitment strategy. At no time will any individual’s answers be identifiable to the organization.
The attached document contains further information about the study conduct and will enable you to make a fully informed decision on whether or not you wish to participate. Please review this information before continuing.

Please be aware that you are not required to participate and, should you choose to do so, your participation would be entirely voluntary. If you do choose to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without prejudice before you submit your survey results. If you do not wish to participate, simply do not proceed to the survey. Your decision to not participate will also be maintained in confidence.

Please feel free to contact me at any time should you have additional questions regarding the project and its outcomes.

Email: XXXXXXX@XXXX.XXX or Telephone: (XXX) XXX - XXXX

Sincerely,

David Feldman,
MA Candidate
Royal Roads University
Appendix E: Email Participation Ad

EMAIL PARTICIPATION AD

Board Development and Research Opportunity

David Feldman, a MA Student at Royal Roads University, is looking for NPO Boards that would be interested in participating in research related to board recruitment and succession planning. Participation includes a short online survey taken by each individual board member and the Executive Director.

In exchange for your participation the your organizations will receive a short personalized workshop on your data and guidance in using this information to increase your recruitment and succession planning strategies. For more information or to enrol in the study please contact David Feldman at Xxxxxx@xxxx.xxx or (XXX) XXX - XXXX.
Appendix F: Survey Preamble
SURVEY PREAMBLE

My name is David Feldman and this research project, Value Based Succession Planning in Governance Boards, is part of the requirement for a Masters of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies at Royal Roads University. My credentials with Royal Roads University can be established by contacting Dr. Wendy Schissell, Program Head, Faculty of Social and Applied Science: XXXXXXX@XXXX.XXX or (XXX) XXX - XXXX.

The research will consist of this survey and is estimated to take approximately 25 minutes to complete. The questions will help us understand the values that motivate your decisions as a board member of your organization and how well you perceive you board collaborates when it experiences differences. Although your organizations results individual results will not be published for public review, the data may be retained to inform future research and . Findings pertaining to your organization from the research may be presented to your organization upon request. A copy of the research findings will also be made available upon request.

The information you provide will be summarized, in anonymous format, as part of the presentation. At no time will any specific comments or answers be attributed to any individual. All data received will be kept confidential.

At any time during the survey process you may withdraw from the study. Closing your computer browser will delete all of your responses. However, because the data is collected from anonymous participants, removal of your response is impossible after the survey has been completed and submitted. Data will be retained until the completion of the study and submission of the final report. I will thereafter and within one month of receiving academic
approval of my results and completing any requested presentations by your organization, delete the online survey and all associated data from the online survey server. I will manage all data at my residence on a password encrypted external hard drive which will be locked in a secure location until it is destroyed. I am the only person with access to this hard drive.

You are not required to participate in this research project. If you do choose to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without prejudice. Similarly, if you choose not to participate in this research project, this information will also be maintained in confidence. Your completion of this survey will constitute your informed consent.

Please contact David Feldman at XXXXXXX@XXXX.XXX for more information. Please retain a copy of this information letter for your records.
Appendix G: Draft Research Consent Form: Online Survey

DRAFT RESEARCH CONSENT FORM: ONLINE SURVEY

By continuing and completing this online survey, you agree that you are over the age of 18 and have read the information letter accompanying the link to this survey. Further, you are giving your voluntary and informed consent to participate in this project.

You agree and understand that due to the anonymous nature of this study, the answers you provide will form part of anonymous data collected by a third party survey company and cannot be removed.

You may at any time withdraw from this survey by closing your internet browser and your answers will not be added to the data.
Appendix H: Letter of Intent

Letter of Intent

Value Based Succession Planning in Governance Boards

My name is David Feldman, and this research project, understanding value symmetry in board recruitment, is part of the requirement for a Masters of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies at Royal Roads University. My credentials with Royal Roads University can be established by contacting Dr. Wendy Schissell, Program Head, Faculty of Social and Applied Science: XXXXXXX@XXXXXXX or (XXX) XXX - XXX.

Purpose of the Study

The objective of this research is to assist boards in building a long term succession strategy by strengthening their recruitment techniques. I wish to determine if current research on transformational teams and value symmetry is transferable to governance bodies in a form that could be applied as a recruitment survey.

Your Participation and how Information will be Collected

Although you are not required to answer this survey, I invite you to participate in this research project in hopes of strengthening our understanding of board dynamics. The research will consist of an online survey and is anticipated to take no longer than 25 minutes. Though you are not required to participate I will only be able to provide customized feedback to boards that have greater than 95% engagement with the study.
Please be aware that there is no obligation to share personal information when participating in this survey. At the end of the survey, we will ask if you are interested in participating in a more detailed follow-up interview. If so, we will ask for your contact information. You can withdraw from the study at any time. To withdraw please notify the researcher so appropriate measures can take place with the data you have provided. Confidentiality is assured and at no time will the answers you provide be attached to your name.

**Benefits and Risks to Participation**

The study will help to build a greater understanding of possible recruitment and selection processes for organization such as your in finding and recruiting future board members and may be used to enhance the structures of other boards across Alberta. Understandings generated from the study will be used to enhance Board member recruitment and engagement skills leading to improved leadership and engagement in the NPO sector.

As an anonymous contributor through a third party survey provider, there are no negative risk to yourself, your family or your business. Alpha-numeric coding will be used to replace any data that may lead indirectly to the respondent or the possibility of establishing any implied, inferred, or direct identity of the participant.

**Research Team**

The all research and interviews will be conducted by David Feldman Masters of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies Student at Royal Roads University.
Real or Perceived Conflict of Interest

Minimal real or perceived conflict of interest exist with the collection of anonymous data.

Confidentiality, Security of Data, and Retention Period

I will work to protect your privacy throughout this study. All information I collect will be maintained in confidence with hard copies (e.g., consent forms) stored in a secured location in my home office. Electronic data (such as transcripts or audio files) will be stored on a password protected external hard drive that will be stored in a locked safe in my home office. Information will be recorded in hand-written and audio recorded format and, where appropriate, summarized, in anonymous format, in the body of the final report. At no time will any specific comments be attributed to any individual unless specific agreement has been obtained beforehand. All documentation will be kept strictly confidential. Raw data will be utilized throughout the data analysis process and during creation of my research project report. Data will not be available to any parties outside of myself and a consultant transcriber. All raw data will be destroyed either via physical destruction or electronic deletion within one month of receiving notification that my research project has received academic approval and that all requested presentations are complete. No data will be retained from participants who withdraw from the online survey.

Sharing Results

In addition to submitting my final report to Royal Roads University in partial fulfillment for a Masters of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies, I will also be sharing my research findings and organizational interpretations with the organizations that
participated. Findings from the research will be available to organizations such as the GoA Board Development Program, ECVO, and Volunteer Alberta. A copy of the research findings will be made available upon request through Trisula Solutions Inc (xxxx@xxxxxxxx.xxx).

**Procedure for Withdrawing From the Study**

At any time during the survey process you may withdraw from the study. Simply closing your computer browser will delete all of your responses. However, because the data is collected from anonymous participants, removal of your response is impossible after the survey has been completed and submitted.

You are not required to participate in this research project. By participating in the online survey you indicate that you have read and understand the information above and give your free and informed consent to participate in this project.

Please contact David Feldman at XXXXXXX@XXXXX.XXX or (XXX) XXX - XXXX for more information. Retain a copy of this information letter for your records.
Appendix I: Research Consent Form

By signing this form, you agree that you are over the age of 18 and have read the information letter for this study. Your signature states that you are giving your voluntary and informed consent to participate in this project.

☐ I consent to the audio recording of this interview

☐ I understand that I can end this interview at any time by expressing to the interviewer a desire to end.

☐ I consent to the use of this conversation in supplement the information provided in the online survey.

☐ I understand that my answers will be kept confidential and that at no time will any identifying information be available to the members of this organization or the public.

Name: (Please Print): __________________________________________

Signed: ______________________________________________________

Date: _________________________________________________________
### Appendix J: Additional Charts and Graphs

**Chart A1: Positive or Negative Value Correlation – Group A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conformity</th>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Benevolence</th>
<th>Universalism</th>
<th>Self-Direction</th>
<th>Stimulation</th>
<th>Hedonism</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total +</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>-0.287</td>
<td>1.153</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td>-0.901</td>
<td>-0.867</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>-1.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Dev.</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Returning</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>-0.974</td>
<td>-0.724</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>-2.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Dev – Returning</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>0.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>-0.196</td>
<td>-1.700</td>
<td>-0.296</td>
<td>-0.398</td>
<td>-0.822</td>
<td>-1.696</td>
<td>-2.761</td>
<td>-0.630</td>
<td>-3.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>2.300</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td>1.304</td>
<td>0.304</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>2.304</td>
<td>-1.217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart A2: Participant values outside of one standard deviation from the mean for Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universism</th>
<th>Benevolence</th>
<th>Conformity</th>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Hedonism</th>
<th>Stimulation</th>
<th>Self-Direction</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart A3: Participant values outside of one standard deviation from the mean for Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</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>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of times</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 St. dev.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chart A4: Group A engagement satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Leave a meeting feeling engaged?</th>
<th>How satisfied are you with your involvement in the decision-making process?</th>
<th>How much input do you feel you have in final decisions?</th>
<th>What percentage of your input do you feel is taken into consideration?</th>
<th>Do you feel heard at team meetings?</th>
<th>Are these meetings focused on ideas and solutions?</th>
<th>Do you leave meetings feeling like the entire board is on the same page?</th>
<th>What percent of the time do you leave a meeting feeling engaged?</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart A5: Group A engagement satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</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>Average</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart B1: Positive or Negative Value Correlation – Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conformity</th>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Benevolence</th>
<th>Universalism</th>
<th>Self-Directed</th>
<th>Stimulation</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total +</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total -</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Score</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>-0.614</td>
<td>0.929</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>-0.357</td>
<td>-0.881</td>
<td>1.393</td>
<td>-2.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Dev.</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.428</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>-1.750</td>
<td>-1.817</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>-0.810</td>
<td>-0.437</td>
<td>-2.246</td>
<td>-2.246</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>-3.967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chart B2: Participant values outside of one standard deviation from the mean for Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside one ST. Deviation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart B3: Group total values outside of one standard deviation from the mean for Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Universalism</th>
<th>Benevolence</th>
<th>Conformity</th>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Hedonism</th>
<th>Stimulation</th>
<th>Self-Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart B4: Group B engagement satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart B5: Group B engagement satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you feel engaged?</th>
<th>Leave a meeting feeling engaged?</th>
<th>How satisfied are you with your involvement in the decision-making process?</th>
<th>How much input do you feel you have in final decisions?</th>
<th>What percentage of your input do you think is taken into consideration?</th>
<th>Do you feel heard at team meetings?</th>
<th>Do you feel secure in your position on the board and supported by your colleagues?</th>
<th>How often does the team agree with you and solutions?</th>
<th>How often do you think the team is on the same page?</th>
<th>Are these meetings focused on ideas and solutions?</th>
<th>Do you leave meetings feeling like the entire board is on the same page?</th>
<th>How do you feel about the team's decision-making process?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## Chart C1: Positive or Negative Value Correlation – Group C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conformity</th>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Benevolence</th>
<th>Universalism</th>
<th>Self-Direction</th>
<th>Stimulation</th>
<th>Hedonism</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total +</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total -</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Average</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>-0.830</td>
<td>-1.006</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>-2.032</td>
<td>-0.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total St. Dev</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>0.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 10+ yr</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>1.831</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>-0.680</td>
<td>-0.958</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>-2.027</td>
<td>-0.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. &lt;10, returning</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>-0.851</td>
<td>-1.018</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>-2.060</td>
<td>-0.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Dev &lt;10, returning</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>0.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. Returning</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>-0.118</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>-0.851</td>
<td>-1.018</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>-2.060</td>
<td>-0.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. New</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.594</td>
<td>0.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. Dev - New</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>-0.855</td>
<td>-1.055</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>-2.172</td>
<td>-0.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. Dev All Returning</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>1.148</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>0.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. Min</td>
<td>-0.891</td>
<td>-1.822</td>
<td>-0.291</td>
<td>-0.397</td>
<td>-1.230</td>
<td>-2.471</td>
<td>-2.667</td>
<td>-1.391</td>
<td>-3.500</td>
<td>-1.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. Max</td>
<td>1.359</td>
<td>1.687</td>
<td>2.370</td>
<td>1.984</td>
<td>1.413</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>1.442</td>
<td>1.609</td>
<td>-0.891</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Chart C2: Participant values outside of one standard deviation from the mean for Group C

### Group C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</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>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>Ave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```
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# Outside 1 St. Dev. | 4 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 4.37

**Chart C3: Number of participant values outside of one standard deviation from the mean per category for Group C**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Universism</th>
<th>Benevolence</th>
<th>Conformity</th>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Hedonism</th>
<th>Simulation</th>
<th>Self-Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart C3: Group C engagement satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</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>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart C4: Group C engagement satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you leave meetings feeling engaged?</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with your involvement in the decision-making?</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you feel you have in final decisions?</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What percentage of your input do you feel is taken into consideration?</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel heard at team meetings?</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you leave meetings feeling like the entire board is on the same page?</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are these meetings focused on ideas and solutions?</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often does the team agree with what you think is right?</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How secure do you feel in your position on the board and supported by your colleagues?</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart D1: Positive or Negative Value Correlation – Group D**
### Value-based Succession Planning in Governance Boards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Universalism</th>
<th>Benevolence</th>
<th>Conformity</th>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Hedonism</th>
<th>Stimulation</th>
<th>Self-Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total +</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total -</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>-2.62</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>-2.85</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart D2:** Participant values outside of one standard deviation from the mean for Group D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># outside of 1 st. dev.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart D3:** Number of participant values outside of one standard deviation from the mean per value category for Group D
**Chart D4: Individual compared to their satisfaction score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction score</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart D5: Satisfaction score average responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</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>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What percent of the time do you leave a meeting feeling engaged?</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied are you with your involvement in the decision-making?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much input do you feel you have in final decisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What percentage of your input do you feel is taken into consideration?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel heard at team meetings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are these meetings focused on ideas and solutions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often does the team agree with what you think is right?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel secure in your position on the board and supported by your colleagues?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 16: Satisfaction vs. St. deviation and Outliers**
Figure 16: Satisfaction vs. Standard Deviation and Outliers

Figure 20: Satisfaction vs Total Sum of the Distance from the Value Averages
Figure 20: Satisfaction vs Total Sum of the Distance from the Value Averages

Figure 21: Satisfaction versus Total Value Alignment

Figure 22: Satisfaction vs. # of Values outside 1 st.dev. from the mean
Figure 22: Satisfaction vs. # of Values outside 1 st.dev. from the mean
Appendix K: Schwartz Value Survey – Original Form

A sample of the survey can be found at: http://www.yourmorals.org/explore.php