

Utah Valley University

From the SelectedWorks of Susan R. Madsen

March 2009

The Recruitment and Retention of Nonprofit Employees

Contact
Author

Start Your Own
SelectedWorks

Notify Me
of New Work



Available at: http://works.bepress.com/susan_madsen/78

Running head: RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

The Recruitment and Retention of Nonprofit Employees

Susan R. Madsen

Melissa Swasey

Utah Valley University

Western Academy of Management

Accepted and Presented in Midway, Utah

March 21, 2009

Important Explanation

Although I do not have a full scholarly paper completed for this submission, I have written a detailed report on this research study. The report was based upon a community-based research project with students and after the research was complete the report was distributed to the nonprofit community. The nonprofit community has absolute loved and utilized the findings of this study in their practices and future plans, but I have never presented the results at an academic conference or published in a refereed journal.

I plan to complete the scholarly paper later this year, but wanted to submit to this conference so that I could present the interesting and engaging results at the Western Academy of Management in the spring. I am including a copy of the report, but suggest the reviewers just read Section I (Introduction and Background) to get a “feel” for the research and then glance through samples of the remaining manuscript. I believe it would add great value to the conference to report on this research data.

It is important for me to note that if this is accepted I will need to present it on Saturday morning of the conference, not in a pipeline session (particularly if those are scheduled for Thursday as in past years). I have committed to do a keynote address at a university in Ohio and cannot get to the conference until Friday evening.

The next few pages will provide a type of abstract and explanation of the study. I value WAM because of its flexibility in submissions during past years, and I challenge the reviewers to look at the value of the research above and beyond the fact that the paper is not written in a traditional academic style. This is research that matters and is making a real difference.

Table of Contents

Section I	Introduction and Background	4
Section II	Retention and Recruitment	6
	A. Willingness to stay	6
	B. Length of plans to stay	6
	C. Job satisfaction	7
	D. Job availability outlook	8
	E. Job referral method	9
Section III	Work Attitudes	10
	A. Mission attachment	10
	B. Public service motivation	11
	C. Organizational self esteem	13
	D. Communication	14
Section IV	Compensation, Benefits, and Contingent Rewards	16
	Pay	16
	Benefits	17
	Contingent rewards	19
Section V	Career Advancement Opportunities	21
	Opportunities for career advancement	21
	Promotion	22
Section VI	Supervision and Coworkers	24
	Satisfaction with supervision	24
	Peer trust	25
	Coworkers	26
Section VII	Job-Specific and Personal Variables	28
	A. Workload	28
	B. Operating procedures	29
	C. Psychological participation	31
	D. Emotional exhaustion	32
	E. Nature of work	33
	F. Prior plans	35
Section VIII	Value Perspectives	36
	A. Humanist	36
	B. Collective	37
	C. Individual	38
Section IX	Demographics	40
Section X	Past Volunteerism	43
Appendices	A. Nonprofit Employee Survey	45
	B. Demographics	49
	C. Descriptive Statistics	50
	D. Primary Resources	51

Section I: Introduction and Background

Importance

Employee turnover has become a serious management challenge in the nonprofit sector.¹ In addition to agencies needing to continue to offer basic services sometimes without qualified employees, high turnover can damage the morale of employees who remain. Hence, we chose the topic of attracting and retaining qualified nonprofit employees in NAME County as a critical area for a research study.

Background

At the beginning of fall semester 2007, I met with NAME (President/CEO of United Way of NAME County) to determine the critical recruiting and staffing challenges in the county's nonprofit sector. I planned to work with seven undergraduate human resource students at NAME for the independent study course titled *Workforce Planning and Staffing*. I wanted to provide them with an opportunity to be involved in a *real-world* employee survey to help them learn the research process and develop higher level of quantitative analysis skills. I have used the academic service-learning pedagogy for years in my teaching and believed this would lead to benefits for both students and the nonprofit community.

Instrument Development

In September of 2007, I asked the students to research the published scholarly literature to locate the most critical issues in nonprofit recruitment and retention. I explained that they needed to identify all of the variables that may influence the desire and motivation of employees to accept a position and then remain in the nonprofit arena. Three students (NAMES) rose to that challenge and located many articles that provided insight into the task at hand. These three students and I met repeatedly to understand the literature and determine the appropriate scales to include in the employee survey. NAMES also met with us on occasion to provide their helpful perspectives. Through this detailed process we developed the final instrument (see **Appendix A**).

Institutional Review Board Approval

During the instrument development phase, the three initial students and I developed the research methods for this study. This included data distribution and collection procedures, ethical considerations in maintaining confidentiality, and concerns of human subjects protection. NAME and NAME completed the first draft of the forms needed to submit to the UVU Institutional Review Board (IRB) for approval. NAMES, and I reviewed and refined the protocol packet. This included a short informed consent statement that was provided to employees to read before completing the survey. All of the students also completed a one to two hour online IRB student certification. I had previously completed the faculty version of this training. I submitted the paperwork to the IRB early October 2007, and it was approved within the week.

Participating Agencies

We worked with United Way of NAME County to recruit agencies within the county to participate in this study. [STUDENT NAMES] attended a nonprofit agency directors' meeting in late September to briefly describe the study. They provided copies of the scales as well as a draft of the actual survey to the eight agency directors who attended. The agency directors were very interested in participating and were enthusiastic to get started. I then made personal contacts with over 20 nonprofit agencies in the county. The following 13 agencies participated in this study:

1. Project Read
2. Utah Legal Services
3. Rural Housing Development
4. Habitat for Humanity
5. Family Support and Treatment Center
6. United Way

¹ Kim, S. E., & Lee, J. W. (2007). Is mission attachment an effective management tool for employee retention? An empirical analysis of a nonprofit human services agency. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 27(3), 227.

7. Kids on the Move
8. Alpine House
9. Community Health Connect
10. Centro Hispano
11. Recreation and Habilitation Services
12. Boys & Girls Club
13. American Red Cross

Survey Distribution and Collection

[STUDENT NAMES] and I met for a few hours to fold the surveys and put them into distribution envelopes. Each survey envelope included a half-page informed consent letter and a four-page survey (two pages front and back). The front of the envelope had a sticker with information for the employees about where they should return surveys at their own sites. We asked participants to seal their surveys in the provided envelopes and then place them in a large return envelope we had given to our site contacts. In mid-October the students delivered the individual surveys (one for every paid part-time and full-time employee) as well as one or two large return envelopes to each agency contact so the surveys would easily be returned. One week after they were delivered, the students made contact with the agency directors (or other assigned contact) by phone or e-mail to ensure the surveys were completed. This served as both a reminder call and coordination call so that the students would know when they could pick up the completed surveys. The students then returned to their assigned agencies and collected the surveys. Some of the surveys were still not completed when the students returned, so NAME volunteered to go back to many of the agencies three or four days later.

Surveys Distributed:	275
Surveys Collected:	186
Return Rate:	67%

Data Input and Analysis

The students returned all of the completed survey envelopes to me. I opened them, assigned them survey numbers based on the order I received them, and gave each survey an agency code. NAME and NAME were assigned to enter the survey data into an excel spreadsheet I had created. They did so within a one-week period and provided me with an electronic copy of the spreadsheets and the hard copies of the surveys. Next, I gave NAME the completed surveys and she typed all of the qualitative responses into another excel spreadsheet for later analyses.

I pasted the results into an SPSS file (a well-known statistical program). The students had no training in running statistics (as it was outside the scope of this course), so I then ran all of the statistical results for each student's portion of the study. After the semester was completed, I reran all of the statistics (along with many more) for this report. I utilized the following statistical tests: means and standard deviations, frequencies, Crosstabs, Pearson's correlation, one-way ANOVAs, Tukey ad hoc analyses, linear regressions, Cronbach's alpha (scale reliabilities), and other exploratory statistics.

Demographics and Descriptive Statistics

We collected the following demographic data: gender, age range, marital status, highest educational level, number of dependent children, length of time with agency, ethnicity, total household income, position in agency, hours worked per week, and job referral method. **Appendix B** includes a detailed demographic table that provides the frequencies and percentages. **Appendix C** is a complete table of the descriptive statistics (number of respondents who answered the questions, minimum response, maximum response, mean, and standard deviation). Means and standard deviations can also be found for each item in the applicable sections throughout this report. The remainder of this report presents the detailed results of this research study in the sections outlined in the Table of Contents.

Section II: Retention and Recruitment

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the various elements influencing recruitment and retention of nonprofit employees within NAME County. We measured retention by asking questions in four primary categories: 1) willingness to stay; 2) length of plans to stay (how long the employee plans to stay); 3) job satisfaction; and 4) perceived job availabilities. We measured one element of recruiting by asking employees about their job referral method (i.e., how they heard about the job opening for their current position). This section (Section II) will only discuss findings among the five variables as they relate to each other and selected demographics (gender, age, marital status, highest educational level, number of dependent children, length of time with agency, ethnicity, total household income, position in agency, job referral method, and hours worked per week). Other findings for these variables can be found within each of the remaining sections of this report.

A. Willingness to Stay

Willingness to stay was used to measure “turnover intentions,” defined by researchers as “employees’ expressed likelihood of staying or leaving the organization.”² Researchers have consistently found that intentions to change jobs leads to actual turnover.

*Survey Item*³ (Scale 1-7)

“Considering everything, I am likely to continue to work for this agency.”

Findings

The statistical mean for this item is 5.53, which suggests that overall the employees in this study agree that they want to continue working at their current agencies. However, it is important to note that the standard deviation is fairly wide, so there were some broad differences in responses. Other findings include the following:

1. Employees who are more satisfied with their jobs are more likely to continue working at their current agencies.
2. Employees with less education say they are more likely to continue working at their agencies when compared to those with higher levels of education.
3. Highest educational level is the only demographic predictor of a worker’s willingness to stay at his or her agency. The less education a worker has, the more he or she is willing to stay.
4. The most important non-demographic predictors of employees’ willingness to stay include satisfaction with supervision, perceptions of psychological participation, and job satisfaction.

Mean	SD	Correlations
5.53	1.78	(+) Job satisfaction** (-) Education** (+) Length of plans to stay**

** = highly significant correlation

B. Length of Plans to Stay

Length of plans to stay was also used to measure turnover intentions. We determined that discovering the length of time an employee plans to remain at the agency may be helpful in discovering useful retention strategies.

² Kim, S. E., & Lee, J. W. (2007). Is mission attachment an effective management tool for employee retention? An empirical analysis of a nonprofit human services agency. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 27(3), 229.

³ Slightly adapted from the turnover intention item in Kim & Lee (2007, p. 245).

Survey Item⁴ (Scale 1-6)

“How much longer do you intend to stay in an employment relationship with your current organization?”

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 6 months | <input type="checkbox"/> 3-4 years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Between 6 months and one year | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more years |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 years | <input type="checkbox"/> I have no intention to leave |

Findings

This item has a statistical mean of 3.52, which suggests that the overall response mean was between “1-2 years” and “3-4 years,” with a wide variety of responses (*SD* = 1.75). Other findings include the following:

1. Older employees plan to stay longer with their agencies than younger employees.
2. Workers with more dependent children plan to stay longer than those who have fewer or no children at home.
3. Employees with higher household incomes plan to stay longer at their current agencies than those with lower incomes.
4. More satisfied employees plan to stay longer than those less satisfied.
5. Married employees plan to stay longer than those who are not.
6. Workers who have been with their agencies longer are those who plan to stay even longer.
7. Male employees plan to stay longer than females.
8. Of the demographics already mentioned, gender (being male) and age (being older) are the two demographic predictors of how long a worker intends to continue working at his or her agency.
9. The most important non-demographic predictors of how long employees in this sample will stay with his or her current agency include satisfaction with benefits, satisfaction with contingent rewards, and job satisfaction.

Mean	SD	Correlations
3.52	1.75	(+) Age** (-) Gender* (+) Children* (+) Household income** (+) Job satisfaction** (+) Marital status* (+) Time with agency** (+) Willingness to stay**

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

C. Job Satisfaction

There are many job satisfaction scales available in the literature. However, we chose to use one that has two items focused particularly on turnover intentions (a major part of this study) as a form of satisfaction.

Survey Items⁵ (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .739

- “I would leave this agency if offered the same job with another agency.”
- “In general, I do not like my job.”
- “I plan to look for another job in the near future outside of the nonprofit sector.”

⁴ Land, D. L. (2003). *Identifying strategic leadership practice motivators of nonprofit employee retention*. Unpublished dissertation. University of Phoenix.

⁵ Our scale has been slightly adjusted (we added item 3) from the job satisfaction scale found in Macy, G. (2006). Outcomes of values and participation in ‘values-expressive’ nonprofit agencies. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 7(2), 171.

Findings

Job satisfaction has a statistical mean of 5.45, which suggests that employees in this study are generally satisfied with their jobs. Other findings include the following:

1. The longer workers are with their agencies, the more satisfied they are with their jobs.
2. The more willing employees are to stay, the more satisfied they are with their jobs.
3. Employees with fewer dependent children are more satisfied with their jobs.
4. Less educated workers are more satisfied with their jobs.
5. Employees who work more hours per week are less satisfied with their jobs.
6. The demographic variables found to predict job satisfaction include age (the younger, the more satisfied), number of dependent children (the less, the more satisfied), ethnicity (Pacific Inlanders are more dissatisfied than others), and hours worked per week (the fewer hours, the more satisfied).
7. The most important non-demographic predictors of job satisfaction include satisfaction with pay, satisfaction with the nature of work (e.g., enjoyment, recognition), and prior plans to work in a nonprofit environment (meaning that the people who planned to work in the nonprofit sector early in their careers have greater job satisfaction later in their careers).

Mean	SD	Correlations	
5.45	1.54	(+) Length of time with agency**	(-) Children*
		(+) Willingness to stay**	(-) Education*
			(-) Hours worked per week*

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

D. Job Availability Outlook

This simple item (*job availability outlook*) is intended to see if employees are aware of the job market around them. Some researchers believe this awareness (or lack thereof) may be related to thoughts of leaving a job.

Survey Item⁶ (Scale 1-7)

“I see a good job market for what I do.”

Findings

Job availability has a statistical mean of 4.83, which shows that employees agree (although not strongly) that they see a good job market for what they do. Other findings include the following:

1. An employee with more dependent children tends to see a better job market for what they do.
2. Number of dependent children (the more children, the better outlook) and household income (the more income, the better outlook) might be predictors of a worker’s view of the market for what he or she does.
3. The most important non-demographic predictors of job availability outlook include the employees’ public service motivation (the higher, the better outlook), peer trust (the higher, the better outlook), and nature of work (the higher, the better outlook).

Mean	SD	Correlations
4.83	1.64	(+) Children*

* = significant correlation

⁶ Kim & Lee (2007, p. 244).

E. Job Referral Method

The literature does not have many questions focused specifically on attracting and recruiting future employees. We decided to ask a question about how employees heard of the openings for their current positions (i.e., job referral method). We thought this would provide insight for future recruitment strategies.

Survey Item (8 choices)

“How did you hear about your position?”

Choices: newspaper, word of mouth, professional associations, internal posting, internet, e-mail networks, consultant, other: _____

Findings

1. The employees surveyed heard about their job openings in different ways: word of mouth (29.6%), other (17.2%), internet (15.6%), professional organizations (14.0%), newspaper (12.4%), e-mail networks (4.8%), and internal postings (4.8%). Hence, employees working in nonprofits heard about their current positions via a wide variety of recruiting strategies with word of mouth being the most successful, followed by internet, professional organizations, and newspaper strategies.
2. Based on employees' ages, there is a significant difference between a few of the ways employees heard about their job positions. Specifically, employees under 21 used the internet and other much more than the newspaper. More employees over the age of 21 found their positions posted in the paper more often than the internet or other. It is important to note that this difference accounts for only some of the employees. There were no significant differences between various age groups with the other methods of hearing about their positions (i.e., word of mouth, professional organizations, internal posting, and e-mail networks).
3. There are some differences between annual household incomes and job referral methods. All employees with annual household incomes of more than \$100,000 heard about their positions by word of mouth, professional organizations, internal postings, and other. Half of the employees who heard about their positions via word of mouth have household incomes between \$20,000 and \$40,000. No one with household incomes over \$80,000 heard about their position from the internet. Professional organizations were important sources of postings for employees with household incomes between \$20,000 and \$80,000.
4. Employees who were hired to work full-time are less likely to have heard about the job posting via the internet or e-mail networks.

Section III: Work Attitudes

This section reports the findings related to work attitudes, which includes mission attachment, public service motivation, organizational self esteem, and communication. Before proceeding, however, it is important to note that any of the findings mentioned from correlations can be considered two ways. I will typically only mention one possibility, but correlations are not directional. For example, #3 below states that “Workers with high mission attachment are also more satisfied with their pay, benefits, and contingent rewards.” In correlation statistics it is not clear whether high mission attachment causes this satisfaction or if the satisfaction may have caused the higher mission attachment. We just know there is a link of some kind. When I use the word “predict” or “predictor,” there are directional components that have been found from other statistical analyses (i.e., linear regressions). ANOVAs with ad hoc analyses were also used to determine more specific relationships.

A. Mission Attachment

An agency mission is a clear and concise statement that defines the ultimate result that the organization aims to achieve, the general business by which the results are to be achieved, and the beneficiaries that the organization seeks to serve. When workers have *mission attachment* they are aware of and believe in the agency’s mission. They also see a strong connection between how their job duties and responsibilities link to the agency mission. Hence, this mission attachment scale measures an employee’s “awareness and contribution to the agency’s mission.”⁷

*Survey Items*⁸ (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .831

- “I am well aware of the direction and mission of this organization.”
- “The programs and staff at my work unit support the mission of this organization.”
- “I like to work for this organization because I believe in its mission and values.”
- “My work contributes to carrying out the mission of this organization.”

Findings

The statistical mean of the mission attachment scale is 6.28, suggesting employees strongly agreed that they understand the mission of the agency and that their jobs influence that mission. The standard deviation is less than 1.00, which means that 95% of the employees answered with a “5”, “6”, or “7” on the seven-point Likert scale. Other statistics provide the following insights:

1. Employees with high mission attachment are more satisfied with their jobs, more willing to stay with their organizations, and are planning to stay longer than those with lower perceptions of mission attachment.
2. The higher an employee’s level of mission attachment, the higher his/her motivations toward public service, organizational self-esteem, and communication perceptions.
3. Workers with high mission attachment are more satisfied with their pay, benefits, and contingent rewards.
4. Employees with lower mission attachment see fewer career and promotional opportunities.
5. Employees who are more satisfied with supervision, coworkers, and peer trust have higher perceptions of mission attachment.
6. Workers with high mission attachment have higher perceptions of operating procedures, psychological participation, and nature of work. They are also less emotionally exhausted.

⁷ Kim & Lee (2007, p. 236).

⁸ Kim & Lee (2007, p. 244). Original instrument from Brown and Yoshioka (2003).

7. Employees who had prior plans to work in the nonprofit sector have higher levels of mission attachment than those without prior plans.
8. Higher mission attachment is also linked to an employee’s humanistic or collectivist value perspective (the higher attachment, the more humanist and collective).
9. Employees with mission attachment are more satisfied with their workload and believe their workload allows them to do a good job.
10. Less educated employees report higher mission attachment levels.
11. Although there were no demographic predictors of mission attachment, a linear regression revealed that public service motivation and satisfaction with promotion opportunities were the most significant predictors of mission attachment.

Mean	SD	Correlations
6.28	.98	(+) Career advancement** (-) Education*
		(+) Collectivist value perspective** (-) Emotional exhaustion
		(+) Communication**
		(+) Coworkers**
		(+) Humanist value perspective**
		(+) Job satisfaction**
		(+) Length of plans to stay**
		(+) Nature of work**
		(+) Operating procedures**
		(+) Organizational self-esteem**
		(+) Pay, benefits, and rewards**
		(+) Peer trust**
		(+) Prior plans*
		(+) Promotion**
		(+) Psychological participation**
		(+) Public service motivation**
		(+) Satisfaction with supervision**
		(+) Willingness to stay**
		(+) Workload’s influence on job**
		(+) Workload satisfaction*

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

B. Public Service Motivation

Public service motivation represents an “altruistic inclination to help others and provide meaningful community services, even if it requires self-sacrifice.”⁹ It is “an individual’s predisposition to respond to motives to make a difference or motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions and organizations.”¹⁰

Survey Items¹¹ (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .730

- “Meaningful community service is very important to me.”
- “I am not afraid to ‘go to bat’ for the rights of others even if it means I will be ridiculed.”
- “Making a difference in society means more to me than personal achievements.”
- “I am prepared to make enormous sacrifices for the good of society.”
- “I am often reminded of daily events about how dependent we are on one another.”

⁹ Kim & Lee (2007, p. 231).

¹⁰ Mann, G. A. (2006). A motive to serve: Public service motivation in human resource management and the role of PSM in the nonprofit sector. *Public Personnel Management*, 35(1), 33.

¹¹ Kim & Lee (2007, p. 244).

Findings

The statistical mean of the level of public service motivation amongst employees in this sample was 5.51 and most workers ($SD=.95$) at least *somewhat agree* that they have motivations toward public service. Other statistics provide the following insights:

1. Employees with high public service motivation are more satisfied with their jobs, more willing to stay with their current organizations, and are planning to stay longer than those who do not.
2. The higher an employee's public service motivation, the higher his/her mission attachment, organizational self-esteem, and communication perceptions. Workers with high public service motivation are also more satisfied with their pay, benefits, and contingent rewards.
3. Employees with higher public service motivation are more optimistic about their future career and promotional opportunities. Employees with higher levels of satisfaction with supervision, coworkers, and peer trust have higher public service motivation.
4. Workers with high public service motivation have higher perceptions of operating procedures, psychological participation, and nature of work. They are also less emotionally exhausted.
5. Employees who had prior plans to work in the nonprofit sector have higher levels of current public service motivation. Higher public service motivation is also linked to humanistic or collectivist value perspectives.
6. Employees with high public service motivation are satisfied with their workload and believe that their current workload allows them to do a good job. Less educated employees report higher public service motivation.
7. Although there were no demographic predictors of public service motivation, a linear regression revealed that mission attachment (the higher, the more motivation), organizational self esteem (the higher, the more motivation), emotional exhaustion (the lower, the higher motivation), and workload heaviness (the heavier, the lower motivation) were all significant predictors of public service motivation.

Mean	SD	Correlations
5.51	.95	(+) Career advancement** (-) Education*
		(+) Collectivist value perspective** (-) Emotional exhaustion**
		(+) Communication**
		(+) Coworkers**
		(+) Humanist value perspective**
		(+) Job satisfaction**
		(+) Length of plans to stay**
		(+) Mission attachment**
		(+) Nature of work**
		(+) Operating procedures*
		(+) Organizational self-esteem**
		(+) Pay**, benefits*, and rewards**
		(+) Peer trust**
		(+) Prior plans**
		(+) Promotion**
		(+) Psychological participation**
		(+) Satisfaction with supervision**
		(+) Willingness to stay**
		(+) Workload satisfaction**
		(+) Workload's influence on job**

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

C. Organizational Self Esteem

Organizational self esteem is the knowledge that one's input is of value to the organization, that one's efforts make a difference, and that one is a valued asset to the organization.

*Survey Items*¹² (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .960

1. "My knowledge and experience are valued in this agency."
2. "I can make a difference here."
3. "People here have faith in me."
4. "My contributions to the agency are appreciated."
5. "I am taken seriously around here."
6. "I feel like a valued and unique person around here."

Findings

The statistical mean of organizational self esteem is 5.51, which suggests that the employees who completed the survey report fairly high levels of this variable. Other statistics provide the following insights:

1. Employees with high organizational self esteem are more satisfied with their jobs, more willing to stay with their organizations, and plan to stay longer than others.
2. Less educated employees have higher organizational self esteem
3. High organizational self esteem is connected to the following: high mission attachment, public service motivation, and communication perceptions; high satisfaction with pay, benefits, and contingent rewards; better satisfaction with supervision, peer trust, and coworker relationships; optimism around career advancement and opportunities for promotions; high psychological participation and low emotional exhaustion; positive views of operating procedures and nature of work; prior plans to work in the nonprofit sector; and strong collectivist and humanist value perspectives.
4. Employees with low organizational self esteem are not satisfied with their workload, feel more workload heaviness, and do not see how their workloads help them do a good job.
5. The following demographic variables appear to predict organizational self esteem: gender (being male), number of dependent children (having fewer), position (being an administrator/manager or driver), and hours worked per week (working less). Hence, males in this study had higher organizational self esteem, people with less dependent children had higher organizational self esteem, and people who work more hours had lower organizational self esteem.
6. A linear regression revealed that significant non-demographic predictors of high organizational self esteem include high public service motivation, high satisfaction with contingent rewards, perceptions of good opportunities for career advancement and promotion, high satisfaction with supervision, high psychological participation, and low perceptions of workload heaviness.

¹² Macy, G. (2006, p. 171).

Mean	SD	Correlations	
5.61	1.46	(+) Career advancement**	(-) Children*
		(+) Collectivist value perspective**	(-) Education*
		(+) Communication**	(-) Emotional exhaustion**
		(+) Coworkers**	(-) Gender*
		(+) Humanist value perspective**	(-) Hours worked per week**
		(+) Job satisfaction**	(-) Workload heaviness*
		(+) Length of plans to stay**	
		(+) Mission attachment**	
		(+) Nature of work**	
		(+) Operating procedures*	
		(+) Pay, benefits, and rewards**	
		(+) Peer trust**	
		(+) Prior plans**	
		(+) Promotion**	
		(+) Psychological participation**	
		(+) Public service motivation**	
		(+) Satisfaction with supervision**	
		(+) Willingness to stay**	
		(+) Workload influence on job**	
		(+) Workload satisfaction**	

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

D. Communication

Communication in this context refers to the technique of ensuring that employees are aware of the general practices and assignments of the organization. We chose to use two of the four items in this scale: one general communication question and one that would demonstrate how well the employee believes tasks and assignments were explained to them.

*Survey Items*¹³ (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .671

- “Work assignments are often not fully explained.”
- “Communications seem good within this organization.”

Findings

The statistical mean of communication is 4.73 (SD=1.57), which suggests that the employees who completed the survey report more agreement than disagreement that the organization’s communication is good. Other findings include the following:

1. Employees with high perceptions of communication are more satisfied with their jobs, more willing to stay with their organizations, and plan to stay longer than those with lower perceptions.
2. High perceptions of communication effectiveness are also statistically correlated with the following variables: high mission attachment, public service motivation, and organizational self esteem; high satisfaction with pay, benefits, and contingent rewards; better satisfaction with supervision, peer trust, and coworker relationships; optimism around career advancement and promotion opportunities; high psychological participation and low emotional exhaustion; positive views of

¹³ Two of the four communication items from a subscale found in Spector, P. E. (1985) [Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13(6), 693-713] were used for this study. One item was slightly adapted.

operating procedures and nature of work; prior plans to work in the nonprofit sector; and strong collectivist and humanist value perspectives.

3. Employees who do not feel communication is good are also unsatisfied with their workload, feel more workload heaviness, and do not believe their current workload helps them do a good job.
4. Employees who are less educated and/or work less hours per week believe communication is better than those who are more educated and/or work more hours.
5. Drivers (M=5.40) appear to be the most satisfied group with communication, followed by clerical and administrative support (M=5.19), other (M=5.12), professional (M=4.56), and administrators/management (M=4.25).
6. Educational level (less education) and/or hours worked per week (less hours) are strong predictors of positive perceptions of communication.
7. One statistical test also found a relationship between feelings of good communication and fewer dependent children at home.
8. A linear regression revealed that significant non-demographic predictors of perceptions of communication include career advancement opportunities (better communication, better opportunities), satisfaction with supervision (better communication, more satisfaction), peer trust (better communication, more trust), emotional exhaustion (better communication, less exhaustion), and nature of work (better communication, better perceptions).

Mean	SD	Correlations	
4.73	1.57	(+) Career advancement**	(-) Education**
		(+) Collectivist value perspective**	(-) Emotional exhaustion**
		(+) Coworkers**	(-) Hours worked per week**
		(+) Humanist value perspective**	(-) Workload heaviness**
		(+) Job satisfaction**	
		(+) Length of plans to stay**	
		(+) Mission attachment**	
		(+) Nature of work**	
		(+) Operating procedures**	
		(+) Organizational self esteem**	
		(+) Pay, benefits, and rewards**	
		(+) Peer trust**	
		(+) Position**	
		(+) Prior plans*	
		(+) Promotion**	
		(+) Psychological participation**	
		(+) Public service motivation**	
		(+) Satisfaction with supervision**	
		(+) Willingness to stay**	
		(+) Workload's influence on job**	
		(+) Workload satisfaction**	

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

Section IV: Compensation, Benefits, and Contingent Rewards

This section reports the findings related to employee satisfaction with compensation, benefits, and contingent rewards.

A. Pay

Pay refers to employee satisfaction of salary. Pay dissatisfaction continues to be a primary reason staff leave nonprofit organizations today.¹⁴ Yet, researchers warn that if nonprofit managers place greater emphasis on material incentives rather than commitment to the organization (e.g., mission attachment, job satisfaction) and other intrinsic factors, there may be more recruitment and retention challenges in the short- and long-term. Hence, creating a strong attachment to the agency mission may be more important than pay increases in creating a positive work culture.

*Survey Items*¹⁵ (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .795

1. "I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do."
2. "Raises are too few and far between."
3. "I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me."
4. "I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases."

Findings

The statistical mean for pay is 4.03 (SD=1.46) which is fairly neutral. Most employees responded between a 2.5 and 5.5, which shows most did not have strong opinions when responding to these items. The mean shows an indifference to pay, possibly indicating this may not be the most important factor for employee satisfaction. The employees may understand and accept the financial limitations of nonprofit entities. Other findings include the following:

1. Employees who are satisfied with their pay are satisfied with their jobs, more willing to stay with their organizations, and plan to stay longer than those who are less satisfied.
2. High satisfaction with pay is also statistically correlated with the following: high mission attachment, public service motivation, organizational self esteem, and communication; high satisfaction with benefits and contingent rewards; high satisfaction with supervision, peer trust, and coworker relationships; optimism around opportunities for career advancement and promotion; high psychological participation and low emotional exhaustion; positive views of nature of work; and strong collectivist and humanist value perspectives.
3. There is also a correlation between satisfaction with pay and individualistic values, but no correlation between satisfaction with pay and prior plans to work in the nonprofit sector or satisfaction with operating procedures.
4. Employees who do not feel satisfied with pay are not satisfied with their workloads, feel more workload heaviness, and do not see how their workload influences positive job performance.
5. Workers who are satisfied with their pay are male, have fewer dependent children, and/or are less educated.
6. Gender (being male), number of dependent children (fewer is better), household income level (the more, the better), and position (administrative and management, M=4.38; clerical and administrative

¹⁴ Kim & Lee (2007, p. 232, 242).

¹⁵ Spector, P. E. (1985, pp. 708-711).

support, M=4.27; drivers, M=4.04; other, M=4.02; professional, M=3.60) were all found to be strong predictors of an employee's satisfaction with pay.

7. A linear regression revealed that significant non-demographic predictors of satisfaction with pay include satisfaction with benefits and contingent rewards, promotion opportunities, satisfaction with supervision, and job satisfaction.
8. There seems to be a link between satisfaction with pay and the way employees report hearing about their jobs: professional organizations (M=4.27), other (M=4.21), word of mouth (M=4.01), internal (M=3.92), newspaper (M=3.89), internet (M=3.80), and email networks (M=3.75). There are some significant differences between the highest and lowest recruiting methods.

Mean	SD	Correlations	
4.03	1.46	(+) Benefits and rewards**	(-) Children**
		(+) Career advancement**	(-) Education*
		(+) Collectivist value perspective**	(-) Emotional exhaustion
		(+) Communication**	(-) Gender*
		(+) Coworkers**	(-) Workload heaviness**
		(+) Humanist value perspective**	
		(+) Individual value perspective*	
		(+) Job satisfaction**	
		(+) Length of plans to stay**	
		(+) Mission attachment**	
		(+) Nature of work**	
		(+) Organizational self-esteem**	
		(+) Peer trust*	
		(+) Promotion**	
		(+) Psychological participation**	
		(+) Public service motivation**	
		(+) Satisfaction with supervision**	
		(+) Willingness to stay**	
		(+) Workload's influence on job**	
		(+) Workload satisfaction**	

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

B. Benefits

Typically most employees understand *benefits* to mean those that are not required by federal and state law (non-mandatory benefits). To the employees, these include such benefits as medical/health insurance, retirement, savings plans, vacation days, and flexible scheduling.

*Survey Items*¹⁶ (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .842

1. "The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer."
2. "The benefit package we have is equitable."
3. "There are benefits we do not have which we should have."
4. "I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive."

¹⁶ Spector, P. E. (1985, pp. 708-711).

Findings

The statistical mean for benefits pay is 4.46 (SD=1.47) which is slightly above neutral. As with pay, the mean shows some indifference regarding their satisfaction with the benefits they receive. Other findings include the following:

1. Employees who are highly satisfied with their benefits are also satisfied with their jobs, more willing to stay with their organizations, and plan to stay longer than those who are less satisfied.
2. High satisfaction with benefits is also connected to the following: high mission attachment, public service motivation, organizational self esteem, and communication; high satisfaction with pay and contingent rewards; high satisfaction with supervision; optimism around opportunities for career advancement and promotion; high psychological participation and low emotional exhaustion; positive views of nature of work; and strong humanist value perspectives.
3. There is no connection between satisfaction with benefits and peer trust, coworkers, operating procedures, collective value perspectives, and any of the workload variables.
4. Full-time employees are more satisfied with the benefits they receive than part-time employees.
5. Employees who have higher annual household incomes are more satisfied with their benefits than those with lower incomes.
6. Workers in certain positions are more satisfied with their benefits than others: administrative/management (M=5.06), other (M=4.48), clerical and administrative support (M=4.36), professional (M=4.07), and drivers (M=3.16).
7. Some ethnic groups are more dissatisfied with benefits: Caucasian (M=4.51), Hispanic (M=4.30), other (M=3.20), and Pacific Islander (M=2.75).
8. The demographic predictors of high satisfaction with benefits include ethnicity (Caucasian, Hispanic, or other), household income level (more income, more satisfied), and position (all position but drivers).
9. A linear regression revealed that two significant predictors of satisfaction with benefits include satisfaction with pay and career advancement opportunities.

Mean	SD	Correlations
4.46	1.47	(+) Career advancement**
		(-) Emotional exhaustion
		(+) Communication**
		(-) Ethnicity**
		(+) Hours worked per week**
		(-) Position**
		(+) Household income*
		(+) Humanist value perspective**
		(+) Job satisfaction**
		(+) Length of plans to stay**
		(+) Mission attachment**
		(+) Nature of work**
		(+) Organizational self-esteem**
		(+) Pay and rewards**
		(+) Promotion**
		(+) Psychological participation**
		(+) Public service motivation*
		(+) Satisfaction with supervision**
		(+) Willingness to stay**
		(+) Workload satisfaction**

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

C. Contingent Rewards

Contingent rewards in this survey refers to intrinsic rewards, which typically focuses on employees' feelings of appreciation and recognition, special favors from supervisors (like letting employees have time off when needed), and so forth.

*Survey Items*¹⁷ (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .795

1. "I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated."
2. "There are few rewards for those who work here."
3. "I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be."
4. "When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive."

Findings

The statistical mean for contingent rewards is 4.90 (SD=1.47), which is the highest of the three presented in this section. It is probably safe to say that the majority of the employees are at least *not dissatisfied* with the contingent rewards they receive. Other findings include the following:

1. Employees who are highly satisfied with contingent rewards are satisfied with their jobs, more willing to stay with their organizations, and plan to stay longer than those who are less satisfied.
2. High satisfaction with contingent rewards is also statistically linked with the following: high mission attachment, public service motivation, organizational self esteem, and communication; high satisfaction with pay and benefits; high satisfaction with supervision, peer trust, and coworkers; optimism around opportunities for career advancement and promotion; high psychological participation and low emotional exhaustion; positive views of nature of work and operating procedures; prior plans to work in the nonprofit sector; and strong humanist and collective value perspectives.
3. Employees who are satisfied with contingent rewards are also satisfied with their workload, feel less workload heaviness, and see how their workload positively influences their job performance.
4. Workers who are more satisfied with contingent rewards have fewer dependent children, less education, work less hours per week, have been with the agency a shorter time, and/or are male.
5. Gender (being male), number of dependent children (less), time with agency (less), and hours worked per week (less) are strong predictors of satisfaction with contingent rewards (feelings that they are recognized and appreciated for their contributions).
6. A linear regression revealed that significant non-demographic predictors of satisfaction with contingent rewards include organizational self esteem (high esteem, higher satisfaction with rewards), satisfaction with pay (higher satisfaction with pay, higher satisfaction with rewards), and operating procedures (higher perceptions, higher satisfaction with rewards).

¹⁷ Spector, P. E. (1985, pp. 708-711).

Mean	SD	Correlations
4.90	1.47	(+) Career advancement** (+) Collective value perspective** (+) Communication** (+) Coworker** (+) Humanist value perspective** (+) Job satisfaction** (+) Length of plans to stay** (+) Mission attachment** (+) Nature of work** (+) Operating procedures** (+) Organizational self-esteem** (+) Pay and benefits** (+) Peer trust** (+) Prior plans* (+) Promotion** (+) Psychological participation** (+) Public service motivation** (+) Satisfaction with supervision** (+) Willingness to stay** (+) Workload satisfaction** (+) Workload's influence on job**
		(-) Children** (-) Education** (-) Emotional exhaustion (-) Gender** (-) Hours worked per week** (-) Time with agency** (-) Workload heaviness**

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

Section V: Career Advancement Opportunities

This section reports the findings related to the employees' perceptions of career advancement opportunities using two scales: satisfaction with opportunities for career advancement and promotion. Researchers have found a connection between promotion and career advancement opportunities with employees' intentions to leave. In fact, the lack of upward opportunities continues to influence some workers to leave the nonprofit sector altogether.¹⁸

A. Opportunities for Career Advancement

For many employees, *opportunities for career advancement* also refers to chances the employees may have to participate in career development opportunities and experiences. This is why we chose to keep an item about promotion and an item about continued training. It is important to note that the reliability on these two items is very low. This means that the way employees responded to one of the items was significantly different than the way they responded to the other. Yet, with this low reliability the findings may still be helpful. There are two other items particularly focused on promotion so this element will be assessed again in the next segment.

*Survey Items*¹⁹ (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .192

1. "Fulfilling all my job responsibilities does improve my chances for promotion."
2. "I receive continued training to perform my job."

Findings

The statistical mean of employee satisfaction with the opportunities for career advancement is 5.17 (SD=1.46), which suggests that the majority of employees can see at least some opportunities. Other findings include the following:

1. Employees who are satisfied with their opportunities for career advancement are more satisfied with their jobs, more willing to stay with their organizations, and plan to stay longer than those less satisfied.
2. High satisfaction with opportunities for career advancement is also statistically correlated with the following: high mission attachment, public service motivation, organizational self esteem, and communication; high satisfaction with pay, benefits, and contingent rewards; high satisfaction with supervision, peer trust, and coworkers; optimism around the availability of future promotions; high psychological participation and low emotional exhaustion; positive views of nature of work and operating procedures; prior plans to work in the nonprofit sector; and strong humanist and collective value perspectives.
3. Employees who are satisfied with opportunities for career advancement are also satisfied with their workload, feel less workload heaviness, and believe their workload allows them to do a good job.
4. Less educated workers and/or those who work less hours per week appear to see more opportunities for career advancement.
5. Employees who have fewer children seem to be more satisfied with their opportunities.
6. The only demographic predictor of satisfaction with opportunities for career advancement is the number of hours worked per week (the fewer, the better).

¹⁸ Kim & Lee (2007, p. 232-233).

¹⁹ Items (used two of the three) from this variable were taken from Kim & Lee (2007, p. 244).

7. A linear regression revealed that significant non-demographic predictors of career advancement opportunities include organizational self esteem (the more esteem, the more opportunities), communication (the better communication, the more opportunities), satisfaction with benefits (the more satisfaction, the more opportunities), peer trust (the more trust, the more opportunities), emotional exhaustion (the less exhausted, the more opportunities), and nature of work (the better perceptions, the more opportunities).

Mean	SD	Correlations
5.17	1.46	(+) Collectivist value perspective** (-) Education**
		(+) Communication** (-) Emotional exhaustion**
		(+) Coworkers** (-) Hours worked per week**
		(+) Humanist value perspective** (-) Workload heaviness**
		(+) Job satisfaction**
		(+) Length of plans to stay**
		(+) Mission attachment**
		(+) Nature of work**
		(+) Operating procedures**
		(+) Organizational self-esteem**
		(+) Pay, benefits, and rewards**
		(+) Peer trust*
		(+) Prior plans*
		(+) Promotion**
		(+) Psychological participation**
		(+) Public service motivation**
		(+) Satisfaction with supervision**
		(+) Willingness to stay**
		(+) Workload satisfaction**
		(+) Workload's influence on job**

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

B. Promotion

Researchers have found that if employees have unique opportunities within their current roles and have a positive relationship with their supervisors, they may choose to stay at least for a time.²⁰ Long-term, however, younger employees with high levels of education may go elsewhere if the nonprofit arena does not provide more career development opportunities.

*Survey Items*²¹ (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .672

1. "People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places."
2. "I am satisfied with my chances for promotion."

Findings

The statistical mean of employee satisfaction with opportunities for promotion is 3.87 (SD=1.50), which suggests the majority of employees feel neutral or slightly disagree that they see opportunities for promotion. Other findings include the following:

²⁰ Kim & Lee (2007).

²¹ Only two of the four promotion items from a subscale, found in Spector (1985, pp. 710-711), were used for this study.

1. Employees who are satisfied with their opportunities for promotion have more job satisfaction, are more willing to stay with their organizations, and plan to stay longer than those who are less satisfied.
2. Employees who see more opportunities for promotion also have the following: higher mission attachment, public service motivation, organizational self esteem, and communication; higher satisfaction with pay, benefits, and contingent rewards; higher satisfaction with supervision, peer trust, and coworkers; more optimism around the availability of career advancement; higher psychological participation and lower emotional exhaustion; more positive views of nature of work; prior plans to work in the nonprofit sector; and stronger humanist and collective value perspectives.
3. Employees who are satisfied with opportunities for promotion are also more satisfied with their workload, feel less workload heaviness, and believe their workload allows them to do a good job.
4. Workers who see greater opportunities for promotion are male, work less hours per week, and/or have been with the agency a shorter time.
5. Gender (being male), number of dependent children (the fewer, the better), time with agency (the less, the better), and hours worked per week (the less, the better) are strong demographic predictors of workers' beliefs that they have opportunities for promotion.
6. A linear regression revealed that significant non-demographic predictors of opportunities for promotion include mission attachment, organizational self esteem, satisfaction with pay, and collectivist values.

Mean	SD	Correlations
3.87	1.50	(+) Career advancement**
		(+) Collectivist value perspective**
		(+) Communication**
		(+) Coworkers
		(+) Humanist value perspective**
		(+) Job satisfaction**
		(+) Length of plans to stay**
		(+) Mission attachment**
		(+) Nature of work**
		(+) Organizational self-esteem**
		(+) Pay, benefits, and rewards**
		(+) Peer trust*
		(+) Prior plans**
		(+) Psychological participation**
		(+) Public service motivation**
		(+) Satisfaction with supervision**
		(+) Willingness to stay**
		(+) Workload satisfaction**
		(+) Workload's influence on job**

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

Section VI: Supervision and Coworkers

This section reports the findings related to the employees' perceptions of their supervisors and coworkers by using three scales: satisfaction with supervision, peer trust, and coworkers.

A. Satisfaction with Supervision

This *satisfaction with supervision* scale specifically focuses its items on the workers' direct supervisors for two of the three items and more subtly with the third. Research has consistently found that an employee's relationship with his or her supervisor influences job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and many of the variables researched in this study.

*Survey Items*²² (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .954

1. "I am respected and treated fairly by my supervisor."
2. "I am satisfied with the amount of support and guidance I receive from my supervisor."
3. "I am satisfied with the overall quality of the supervision I receive at work."

Findings

The statistical mean for employee satisfaction with supervision is 5.59 (SD=1.66), which is fairly high. It suggests that the majority of employees are satisfied with their current supervisors. Other findings include the following:

1. Employees who are satisfied with their supervisors are also satisfied with their jobs, willing to stay with their organizations, and plan to stay longer than those who are less satisfied.
2. High satisfaction with opportunities for career advancement is also statistically correlated with the following: high mission attachment, public service motivation, organizational self esteem, and communication; high satisfaction with pay, benefits, and contingent rewards; high satisfaction with peer trust and coworkers; optimism around the availability of career advancement and promotion; high psychological participation and low emotional exhaustion; positive views of nature of work and operating procedures; prior plans to work in the nonprofit sector; and strong humanist and collective value perspectives.
3. Employees who are satisfied with their supervisors are also satisfied with their workload, feel less workload heaviness, and believe their workload allows them to do a good job.
4. Employees with less education, who work fewer hours per week, and/or have spent less time working for the agency are those who are more satisfied with their supervisors.
5. Male employees seem to be more satisfied with their supervisors.
6. Gender (being male) and hours worked per week (fewer is better) are the two demographic variables that were found to be predictors of satisfaction with supervision.
7. A linear regression revealed that significant non-demographic predictors of satisfaction with supervision include organizational self esteem (more esteem, more satisfaction), communication (higher perception, more satisfaction), satisfaction with pay (more satisfaction with pay, more satisfaction with supervision), psychological participation (higher participation, more satisfaction), nature of work (higher perceptions, higher satisfaction), and the understanding that workload influences their job performance (better understanding, more satisfaction).

²² Slightly adapted from the supervision scale in Kim & Lee (2007, p. 244).

Mean	SD	Correlations
5.59	1.66	(+) Career advancement** (-) Education**
		(+) Collectivist value perspective** (-) Emotional exhaustion**
		(+) Communication** (-) Gender*
		(+) Coworkers** (-) Hours worked per week**
		(+) Humanist value perspective** (-) Time with agency**
		(+) Job satisfaction** (-) Workload heaviness**
		(+) Length of plans to stay**
		(+) Mission attachment**
		(+) Nature of work**
		(+) Operating procedures**
		(+) Organizational self-esteem**
		(+) Pay, benefits, and rewards**
		(+) Peer trust**
		(+) Prior plans*
		(+) Promotion**
		(+) Psychological participation**
		(+) Public service motivation**
		(+) Willingness to stay**
		(+) Workload satisfaction**
		(+) Workload's influence on job**

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

B. Peer Trust

Peer trust measures a worker's feelings about the reliability and trustworthiness of his or her coworkers. It also specifically asks about how trustworthy their coworkers are regarding their contributions to the organization.

Survey Items²³ (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .800

1. "Most of my coworkers can be relied upon to do as they say they will do."
2. "I have full confidence in the skills of my coworkers."
3. "Most of my coworkers would do their jobs even if they were not supervised."
4. "I can rely on other workers not to make my job more difficult by careless work."

Findings

The statistical mean for employees' trust in peers is 5.78 (SD=1.08), which is fairly high. It suggests that the majority of employees trust their peers. Other findings include the following:

1. Employees who have high levels of peer trust also have high job satisfaction and are more willing to stay at their agencies. Interesting, this variable did not significantly correlate with plans to stay longer like many of the other variables.
2. Having high peer trust perceptions is also statistically correlated with the following: high mission attachment, public service motivation, organizational self esteem, and communication; high satisfaction with pay and contingent rewards (not benefits); high satisfaction with supervision and coworkers; optimism around the availability of career advancement and opportunities for promotion; high psychological participation and low emotional exhaustion; positive views of nature of work (not operating procedures); and strong humanist and collective value perspectives.
3. Workers with more peer trust see a good market for jobs outside the agency.

²³ We used a slightly adapted version of the peer trust subscale in Macy (2006, p. 171).

4. Employees with more peer trust are also satisfied with their workload, feel less workload heaviness, and believe their workload allows them to do a good job.
5. Workers who have more peer trust work fewer hours.
6. Workers with high levels of peer trust have significantly low individualistic value perspectives.
7. High peer trust is also linked to an employee's position: professional (M=6.04), drivers (M=5.85), other (M=5.75), clerical and administrative support (M=5.64), and administrative/management (M=5.53).
8. The most important demographic predictors of peer trust are annual household income (more income, more trust) and hours worked per week (less hours, more trust).
9. A linear regression revealed that significant non-demographic predictors of peer trust include communication (better communication, more trust), career advancement opportunities (more opportunities, more trust), coworkers (better coworker perception, more trust), prior plans to work in the nonprofit sector (prior plans, more trust), individualist values (the less individualist, the more trust), workload heaviness (the heavier, the less trust), and workload's influence on job (the more influence, the more trust).

Mean	SD	Correlations	
5.78	1.08	(+) Career advancement*	(-) Emotional exhaustion**
		(+) Collectivist value perspective*	(-) Hours worked per week**
		(+) Communication**	(-) Individual value perspective**
		(+) Coworkers**	(-) Workload heaviness**
		(+) Humanist value perspective**	
		(+) Job availabilities**	
		(+) Job satisfaction**	
		(+) Mission attachment**	
		(+) Nature of work**	
		(+) Organizational self-esteem**	
		(+) Pay* and rewards**	
		(+) Promotion**	
		(+) Psychological participation**	
		(+) Public service motivation**	
		(+) Satisfaction with supervision**	
		(+) Willingness to stay**	
		(+) Workload satisfaction**	
		(+) Workload's influence on job**	

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

C. Coworkers

Unlike the peer trust scale, the *coworker* scale asks questions about how much employees appreciate and enjoy their coworkers. This includes perceptions of the conflicts their coworkers create around them.

Survey Items²⁴ (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .718

1. "I find I have to work harder at my job than I should because of the incompetence of people I work with."
2. "I enjoy my coworkers."
3. "There is too much bickering and fighting at work."
4. "I like the people I work with."

²⁴ These items are from the coworker scale found in Spector (1985, pp. 708-711).

Findings

The statistical mean for employees’ feelings about coworkers is 6.21 (SD=.93), which is fairly high. It suggests that the majority of employees appreciate and enjoy their coworkers. Other findings include the following:

1. Employees who have high regard for their coworkers also have high job satisfaction, are willing to stay at their agencies, and have plans to stay longer than those who do not.
2. Having high perceptions of coworkers is also statistically correlated with the following: high mission attachment, public service motivation, organizational self esteem, and communication; high satisfaction with pay and contingent rewards (not benefits); high satisfaction with supervision and strong perceptions of peer trust; optimism around the availability of career advancement and opportunities for promotion; high psychological participation and low emotional exhaustion; positive views of nature of work (not operating procedures); and strong humanist and collective value perspectives.
3. Employees who have better opinions of coworkers are satisfied with their workload, feel less workload heaviness, and believe their workload allows them to do a good job.
4. Workers who think more highly of their coworkers seem to work fewer hours and/or are less educated.
5. Having higher coworker perceptions is also connected to position (drivers, M=6.48; professional, M=6.33; other, M=6.27; administrative and management, M=6.06; clerical and administrative support, M=6.03).
6. A linear regression revealed that significant non-demographic predictors of positive coworker feelings include peer trust (more trust, higher perceptions), humanist value perspectives (more humanist, higher perceptions), workload heaviness (less heaviness, higher perceptions), and workload’s influence on job (greater influence, higher perceptions).

Mean	SD	Correlations
6.21	.93	(+) Career advancement**
		(-) Education*
		(+) Collective value perspective**
		(-) Emotional exhaustion**
		(+) Communication**
		(-) Hours worked per week**
		(+) Humanist value perspective**
		(-) Workload heaviness*
		(+) Job satisfaction**
		(+) Length of plans to stay**
		(+) Mission attachment**
		(+) Nature of work**
		(+) Organizational self-esteem**
		(+) Pay and rewards**
		(+) Peer trust**
		(+) Promotion**
		(+) Psychological participation**
		(+) Public service motivation**
		(+) Satisfaction with supervision**
		(+) Willingness to stay**
		(+) Workload satisfaction**
		(+) Workload’s influence on job**

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

Section VII: Job-Specific and Personal Variables

This section reports the findings for employees' job-specific and personal variables using four scales: workload, operating procedures, psychological participation, and emotional exhaustion.

A. Workload

Workload is defined as the amount of work or working time expected or assigned.²⁵ An employee's perception of workload was measured by responses to three questions. Each of these items was measured on a different scale.

*Survey Items*²⁶

1. "I feel my workload is... (Scale: 1=Never too heavy, 2=Seldom to heavy, 3=Sometimes too heavy, 4=Often too heavy, 5=Almost always too heavy)."
2. "How does the amount of work you're expected to do influence the way you do your job? (Scale: 1=It never allows me to do a good job, 2=It seldom allows me to do a good job, 3=It has no effect on how I do my job, 4=It usually allows me to do a good job, 5=It always allows me to do a good job)."
3. "I am satisfied with the amount of work I'm expected to do." (Scale: 1-7, strongly disagree to strongly agree).

Findings

The statistical means for the various workload variables are included in the chart below. It is important to note that item #1 is a negative question. The higher the number, the heavier the employees believe their workload is. With the other two items, the higher the number, the more satisfied they are with their current workload. Keep these details in mind when looking at the table. Below I will highlight only some of these findings:

1. Employees who have high levels of workload satisfaction also have high job satisfaction, are willing to stay with their agencies, and have plans to stay longer than those who do not.
2. Higher workload satisfaction (i.e., lower levels of workload heaviness) is also statistically correlated to the following: high mission attachment, public service motivation, organizational self esteem, and communication; high satisfaction with pay and benefits (low heaviness correlates with pay and contingent rewards); high satisfaction with supervision, coworkers, and peer trust; optimism around the availability of career advancement and opportunities for promotion; high psychological participation and low emotional exhaustion; positive views of nature of work and operating procedures; prior plans to work for a nonprofit, and strong humanist and collective value perspectives.
3. Less educated workers who work fewer hours per week, have spent less time with the agency, and/or have lower income levels seem to be more satisfied with their workload, feel less workload heaviness, and can see how their workload influences how well they do their jobs.
4. More married employees and/or those in certain positions (administrative/management, M=3.67; professionals, M=3.03; clerical and administrative support, M=2.71; drivers, M=2.25) feel workload heaviness. Females seem to have less workload satisfaction than males.
5. Workload satisfaction is linked to lower education levels and fewer children, while position is linked to an employee's beliefs that his or her workload influences job performance. Employees in

²⁵ Kim & Lee (2007).

²⁶ The items in this subscale were taken from Kim & Lee (2007, p. 245). Item three was slightly adapted to fit our Likert scale.

certain ethnic groups (Caucasian, M=3.09; Hispanic, M=2.91; Pacific Islander, M=2.67; and other, M=2.40) believe their workloads are heavier than other ethnic groups.

6. The demographic predictors of perceptions of workload heaviness include educational level (the higher, the more heaviness), position (see previous statistics), job referral method (word of mouth, M=3.24, professional organization, M=3.23; other, M=3.19; internet, M=2.89; email networks, M=2.89, internal, M=2.77; newspaper, M=2.54), and hours worked per week (the more hours, the more heaviness). The strongest predictor of how employees feel about the influence of workload on the way they do their jobs is the number of hours they work per week (more hours, less influence). The predictors of workload satisfaction are gender (being male), educational level (having less), and hours worked per week (working less).
7. A linear regression revealed that non-demographic significant predictors of workload heaviness include public service motivation (more motivation, less heavy), organizational self esteem (more esteem, less heavy), coworkers (better perceptions, less heavy), operating procedures (better perceptions, less heavy), emotional exhaustion (more exhaustion, heavier), and workload's influence on job (more influence, less heavy).
8. Demographic predictors of workloads influence on job satisfaction include satisfaction with supervisor (more satisfaction, more influence), peer trust (more trust, more influence), coworkers (higher perceptions, more influence), emotional exhaustion (less exhaustion, more influence), prior plans (prior plans, more influence), and workload heaviness (less heaviness, more influence).

Mean	SD	Correlations
1) 3.04	1.06	(+) Career advancement** [2,3] (-) Career advancement** [1]
2) 3.67	0.93	(+) Collectivist value perspective** [2,3] (-) Collective value perspective** [1]
3) 4.83	1.80	(+) Communication** [2,3] (-) Communication** [1]
		(+) Coworkers** [2,3] (-) Coworkers** [1]
		(+) Education** [1] (-) Education** [3]
		(+) Emotional exhaustion** [1] (-) Emotional exhaustion** [2,3]
		(+) Hours worked per week** [1] (-) Gender* [3]
		(+) Household income* [1] (-) Hours worked per week** [2,3]
		(+) Humanist value perspective** [2,3] (-) Household income* [2]
		(+) Job satisfaction** [2,3] (-) Job satisfaction** [1]
		(+) Length of plans to stay** [2,3] (-) Nature of work** [1]
		(+) Marital status* [3] (-) Operating procedures** [1]
		(+) Mission attachment** [2,3] (-) Organizational self esteem* [1]
		(+) Nature of work** [2,3] (-) Pay and rewards** [1]
		(+) Operating procedures** [2,3] (-) Peer trust** [1]
		(+) Organizational self-esteem** [2,3] (-) Position** [1]
		(+) Pay** [2,3] and benefits** [3] (-) Promotion** [1]
		(+) Peer trust** [2,3] (-) Satisfaction with supervision** [1]
		(+) Prior plans** [2] (-) Time with agency**
		(+) Promotion** [2,3] (-) Willingness to stay** [1]
		(+) Psychological participation** [2,3]
		(+) Public service motivation** [2,3]
		(+) Satisfaction with supervision** [2,3]
		(+) Time with agency** [1]
		(+) Willingness to stay** [2,3]

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

B. Operating Procedures

Operating procedures are typically defined as the established or prescribed methods that employees routinely follow so that the designated operations or situations perform effectively. This includes an

employee’s perceptions of unnecessary rules, procedures, and regulations. We also included an item that measures workload to see if it influences perceptions of operating procedures.

Survey Items²⁷ (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .556

1. “My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.”
2. “I have too much to do at work.”
3. “Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.”

Findings

The statistical mean for operating procedure perceptions is 4.16 (SD=0.99), which is fairly neutral. This suggests that the majority of employees made neutral responses, meaning that they have little satisfaction *or* dissatisfaction with the operating procedures. Other findings include the following:

Mean	SD	Correlations
4.16	0.99	(+) Career advancement** (-) Workload heaviness** (+) Communication** (-) Time with agency** (+) Humanist value perspective* (+) Job satisfaction** (+) Mission attachment** (+) Nature of work** (+) Organizational self-esteem** (+) Psychological participation** (+) Public service motivation* (+) Rewards** (+) Satisfaction with supervision** (+) Willingness to stay** (+) Workload’s influence on job** (+) Workload satisfaction**

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

1. Employees who are satisfied with operating procedures are those who have job satisfaction and are willing to stay with their organizations.
2. Positive perceptions of operating procedures is also statistically correlated with the following: high mission attachment, public service motivation, organizational self esteem, and communication; high satisfaction with contingent rewards (not pay or benefits); high satisfaction with supervisor (not peer trust and coworkers); optimism around career advancement opportunities; high psychological participation (not low emotional exhaustion); positive views of nature of work; and strong humanist value perspectives (not collective).
3. Employees who responded more positively on operating procedure items are satisfied with their workload, feel less workload heaviness, and believe their workload allows them to do a good job.
4. Workers who have worked for their nonprofit agencies longer have lower perceptions of operating procedures.
5. The higher the workers’ household incomes, the lower their perceptions of operating procedures.
6. The only demographic predictor of how a worker views operating procedures is time with agency (the longer time, the lower perceptions).
7. A linear regression revealed that significant non-demographic predictors of perceptions of operating procedures include satisfaction with contingent rewards (the higher satisfaction, the greater

²⁷ Three of the four items of Spector’s (1985, pp. 709-711) operating procedures subscale were used in this study.

perceptions), emotional exhaustion (more exhaustion, lower perceptions), and workload heaviness (the less heaviness, the higher perceptions).

C. Psychological Participation

Psychological participation is the amount of influence that a person has on a company when it comes to influencing what goes on in their jobs, making job-related decisions, giving their opinions on job-related matters, and offering suggestions for improvement.

*Survey Items*²⁸ (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .909

1. "I have a great deal of influence on what goes on in my job."
2. "I can influence the decisions of my immediate superior regarding things about which I am concerned."
3. "My supervisor always asks my opinion when a problem comes up that involves my job."
4. "If I have a suggestion for improving the job or changing the work in some way, it is easy for me to get my ideas across to my superior."

Findings

The statistical mean for psychological participation is 5.37 (SD=1.56), which is fairly high. This suggests that the majority of employees feel psychologically engaged in their agencies. Other findings include the following:

1. Employees with high perceptions of psychological participation are more satisfied with their jobs, more willing to stay with their organizations, and plan to stay longer than those who have lower perceptions.
2. High perceptions of psychological participation also statistically correlate with the following: high mission attachment, public service motivation, organizational self esteem, and communication; high satisfaction with pay, benefits, and contingent rewards; high satisfaction with supervisor, peer trust, and coworkers; optimism around the availability of career advancement and promotion; low emotional exhaustion; positive views of nature of work and operating procedures; prior plans to work in the nonprofit sector; and strong humanist and collective value perspectives.
3. Employees with high perceptions of psychological participation are satisfied with their workloads and believe their workload allows them to do a good job.
4. Male employees seem to believe that they participate more (at least psychologically) than do females.
5. The most significant demographic predictors of psychological participation are gender (being male), position (administrative/management, M=6.00; drivers, M=5.42; clerical and administrative support, M=5.14; professional, M=4.91), and hours worked per week (more hours, less psychological participation).
6. A linear regression revealed that significant non-demographic predictors of psychological participation include organizational self esteem (more esteem, greater participation) and satisfaction with supervision (more satisfaction, more participation).

²⁸ Scale taken from Macy, G. (2006, p. 170).

Mean	SD	Correlations
5.37	1.56	(+) Career advancement** (-) Emotional exhaustion** (+) Collective value perspective** (-) Gender** (+) Communication** (-) Hours worked per week** (+) Coworkers** (+) Humanist value perspective** (+) Job satisfaction** (+) Length of plans to stay** (+) Mission attachment** (+) Nature of work** (+) Operating procedures** (+) Organizational self-esteem** (+) Pay, benefits, and rewards** (+) Peer trust** (+) Prior plans** (+) Promotion** (+) Public service motivation** (+) Satisfaction with supervision** (+) Willingness to stay** (+) Workload satisfaction** (+) Workload's influence on job**

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

D. Emotional Exhaustion

Emotional exhaustion is how much emotional energy a person puts into a company making him or her exhausted, drained, used up, burned out, frustrated, and fatigued. As expected, research has found links between emotional exhaustion and turnover intentions.

*Survey Items*²⁹ (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .907

1. "I feel completely drained from my work."
2. "I feel used up at the end of the workday."
3. "I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning."
4. "I feel burned out from my work."
5. "I feel frustrated by my job."
6. "I feel I'm working too hard on my job."
7. "I feel like I'm at the end of my rope."

Findings

The statistical mean for emotional exhaustion is 3.64 (SD=1.52), which is fairly neutral, but toward the "slightly disagree" side of the scale. Other findings include the following:

1. Employees with high emotional exhaustion are less satisfied with their jobs, more likely to leave their organizations, and will leave more quickly than those not emotionally exhausted.
2. Workers with more emotional exhaustion are more likely to have the following: low mission attachment, public service motivation, organizational self esteem, and communication; less satisfaction with pay, benefits, and contingent rewards; less satisfaction with supervision and lower perceptions of peer trust and coworkers; less optimism around the availability of career

²⁹ The emotional exhaustion scale from Kim & Lee (2007, p. 245) was used in this study with a slight word change in item one.

advancement and opportunities for promotion; lower psychological participation; negative views of nature of work; and weaker humanist and collective value perspectives.

3. Emotionally exhausted employees are unsatisfied with their workload and have difficulty believing their workload allows them to do a good job. They also feel their workloads are too heavy.
4. Workers who have more education, have spent more time with the agency, and/or work more hours per week are more emotionally exhausted.
5. The demographic predictors of emotional exhaustion are age (31-40, M=4.57; 21-20, M=3.67; 41-54, M=3.39; 55+, M=3.03; less than 21, M=2.68), educational level (the more education, the more exhausted), and hours worked per week (the more hours, the more exhausted).
6. A linear regression revealed that significant non-demographic predictors of emotional exhaustion include public service motivation (the more motivation, the less exhausted), communication (the better communication, the less exhausted), opportunities for career advancement (the more opportunities, the less exhausted), operating procedures (the better perceptions, the less exhausted), nature of work (the better perceptions, the less exhausted), and workload heaviness (the more heaviness, the more exhausted).

Mean	SD	Correlations	
3.64	1.52	(+) Education**	(-) Career advancement**
		(+) Hours worked per week**	(-) Collective value perspective**
		(+) Time with agency*	(-) Communication**
		(+) Workload heaviness**	(-) Coworkers**
			(-) Humanist value perspective**
			(-) Job satisfaction**
			(-) Length of plans to stay**
			(-) Mission attachment**
			(-) Nature of work**
			(-) Organizational self-esteem**
			(-) Pay, benefits, and rewards**
			(-) Peer trust*
			(-) Promotion**
			(-) Psychological participation**
			(-) Public service motivation**
			(-) Satisfaction with supervision**
			(-) Willingness to stay**
			(-) Workload satisfaction**
			(-) Workload's influence on job**

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

E. Nature of Work

Nature of work refers to the meaningfulness, enjoyment, and pride the employees have in their current jobs. As expected, this scale overlapped with items from other variable scales.

Survey Items³⁰ (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .905

1. "I like doing the things I do at work."
2. "I feel a sense of pride in doing my job."

³⁰ The nature of work scale from Spector (1985, pp. 709-711) was used in this study.

3. "My job is enjoyable."
4. "I sometimes feel my job is meaningless."

Findings

The statistical mean for nature of work is 5.72 (SD=1.39), which is fairly high. It means that the majority of employees like what they are doing and see meaning in their jobs. Other findings include the following:

1. Employees with high nature of work perceptions are more satisfied with their jobs, more willing to stay with their organizations, and plan to stay longer than those who have lower perceptions.
2. High perceptions of nature of work also statistically correlate with the following: high mission attachment, public service motivation, organizational self esteem, and communication; high satisfaction with pay, benefits, and contingent rewards; high satisfaction with supervisor, peer trust, and coworkers; optimism around the availability of career advancement and opportunities for promotion; high psychological participation and low emotional exhaustion; positive views of operating procedures; and strong humanist and collective value perspectives.
3. Employees with high perceptions of nature of work are also satisfied with their workload, believe their workload allows them to do a good job, and feel their workload is not too heavy.
4. Male workers with less education, less time with the agency, and/or have fewer work hours seem to have higher perceptions of nature of work. They see more meaning and enjoyment in what they do at work.
5. The significant demographic predictors of positive nature of work perceptions are gender (being male), time with agency (shorter, the better), and hours worked per week (the less, the better).
6. A linear regression revealed that significant non-demographic predictors of nature of work include communication (better communication, better work), opportunities for career advancement (more opportunities, better work), satisfaction with supervision (more satisfaction, better work), emotional exhaustion (more exhaustion, worse work), job satisfaction (more satisfaction, better work), and humanist and collective values (higher values, better work).

Mean	SD	Correlations
5.72	1.39	(+) Career advancement** (-) Education**
		(+) Collective value perspective** (-) Emotional exhaustion**
		(+) Communication** (-) Gender*
		(+) Coworkers** (-) Hours worked per week**
		(+) Humanist value perspective** (-) Time with agency**
		(+) Job satisfaction** (-) Workload heaviness**
		(+) Length of plans to stay**
		(+) Mission attachment**
		(+) Operating procedures**
		(+) Organizational self-esteem**
		(+) Pay, benefits, and rewards**
		(+) Peer trust**
		(+) Promotion**
		(+) Psychological participation**
		(+) Public service motivation**
		(+) Satisfaction with supervision**
		(+) Willingness to stay**
		(+) Workload satisfaction**
		(+) Workload's influence on job**

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

F. Prior Plans

The term *prior plans* refers to whether or not an employee planned to work in the nonprofit sector prior to nonprofit employment.

Survey Items (Scale 1-7)

“I have always planned on working in the nonprofit sector.”

Findings

The statistical mean for nature of work is 3.32 (SD=1.81), which suggests that many employees responded to this item either neutrally or with some level of disagreement. Hence, many of the employees did not plan on a career in the nonprofit sector. Other findings include the following:

1. Employees with prior plans to work at a nonprofit are more willing to stay with their organizations.
2. Employees with prior plans are more likely to have the following: higher mission attachment, public service motivation, organizational self esteem, and communication; higher satisfaction with contingent rewards (not pay or benefits); higher satisfaction with supervisor (not peer trust and coworkers); optimism around the availability of career advancement and opportunities for promotion; higher psychological participation; and stronger humanist and collective value perspectives.
3. Employees with prior plans can more clearly see their workload allows them to do a good job.
4. The only demographic predictor of prior plans is educational level. That is, more educated employees made prior plans to work in the nonprofit sector than those less educated.
5. A linear regression revealed that significant non-demographic predictors of prior plans include peer trust (more trust, prior plans), job satisfaction (more satisfaction, prior plans), and workload’s influence on job (more influence, prior plans).

Mean	SD	Correlations
3.32	1.81	(+) Career advancement*
		(+) Collective value perspective*
		(+) Communication*
		(+) Humanist value perspective**
		(+) Job satisfaction**
		(+) Mission attachment*
		(+) Organizational self-esteem**
		(+) Promotion**
		(+) Psychological participation**
		(+) Public service motivation**
		(+) Rewards*
		(+) Satisfaction with supervision*
		(+) Willingness to stay*
		(+) Workload’s influence on job**

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

Section VIII: Value Perspectives

This section reports the findings related to value perspectives. A *value* can be defined 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.”³¹ Values can be considered an individual’s worldview as they are based on the importance of an individual society and underlying social justice principles. The three perspectives explored in this study were humanist, collective, and individual. The relationship among employee values, management practices, and employee outcomes has been discussed. This study has helped clarify many of these relationships in the nonprofit sector.

A. Humanist Value Perspective

An individual who has the *humanist value perspective* is one who is typically self-expressive, seeks satisfaction and fulfillment, and is concerned with being self-actualized. Humanistic values focus on the nature of work being a means of self-expression and generally satisfying.³²

*Survey Items*³³ (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .567

1. “Work can be satisfying.”
2. “Work can be a means for self-expression.”
3. “Work can be organized to allow for human fulfillment.”

Findings

The statistical mean for having a humanist value perspective is 5.87 (SD=0.95), which is high. This suggests that the majority of employees have humanist values. Other findings include the following:

1. Employees with humanist values are more satisfied with their jobs, more willing to stay with their organizations, and plan to stay longer than those who are not humanist.
2. Employees with humanist values also have the following characteristics: high mission attachment, public service motivation, organizational self esteem, and communication; high satisfaction with pay, benefits, and contingent rewards; high satisfaction with supervisor, peer trust, and coworkers; optimism around the availability of career advancement and promotion; high psychological participation and low emotional exhaustion; positive views of nature of work and operating procedures; prior plans to work in the nonprofit sector; and strong collective value perspectives.
3. Employees with humanist values are also satisfied with their workloads and believe their workload allows them to do a good job.
4. Employees who have been with their agencies a shorter time have higher humanist perspectives.
5. The significant demographic predictors of a humanist value perspective are time with agency (more time, less humanist) and position (administrative and management, M=6.13; other, M=5.89; clerical and administrative support, M=5.87; drivers, M=5.71; professional, M=5.70).
6. A linear regression revealed that significant non-demographic predictors of humanist value perspectives include coworkers (better coworkers, more humanist) and a collective value perspective (more collective, more humanist).

³¹ Rokeach (1973, p. 5, as cited in Macy, 2006).

³² Macy (2006, p. 167).

³³ The Humanist values scale from Macy (2006, p. 170) was used in this study with item one slightly adapted.

Mean	SD	Correlations
5.87	0.95	(+) Career advancement** (-) Emotional exhaustion**
		(+) Collectivist value perspective** (-) Time with agency**
		(+) Communication**
		(+) Coworkers**
		(+) Job satisfaction**
		(+) Length of plans to stay*
		(+) Mission attachment**
		(+) Nature of work**
		(+) Operating procedures*
		(+) Organizational self-esteem**
		(+) Pay**, benefits*, and rewards**
		(+) Peer trust**
		(+) Prior plans*
		(+) Promotion**
		(+) Psychological participation**
		(+) Public service motivation**
		(+) Satisfaction with supervision**
		(+) Willingness to stay**
		(+) Workload satisfaction**
		(+) Workload's influence on job**

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

B. Collective Value Perspective

An individual with the *collective value perspective* is one who enjoys group cooperation and teamwork, equal reward, responsibility, and helpfulness. So, collectivism values group support and rewards that would be equal and would place less importance on individual differences and performance.³⁴

Survey Items³⁵ (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .784

1. "One's contribution to the group is the most important thing about work."
2. "One should take an active part in all group affairs."
3. "The group is the most important entity in any organization."

Findings

The statistical mean for the collective value perspective variable is 4.99 (SD=1.28), which sides on the agreement side of the Likert scale. This suggests that many nonprofit employees have collective values. Other findings include the following:

1. Employees with collective values are more satisfied with their jobs, more willing to stay with their organizations, and plan to stay longer than those who have lower perceptions.
2. Employees with collective values also have the following characteristics: high mission attachment, public service motivation, organizational self esteem, and communication; high satisfaction with pay and contingent rewards (not benefits); high satisfaction with supervisor, peer trust, and coworkers; optimism around the availability of career advancement and opportunities for promotion; high psychological participation and low emotional exhaustion; positive views of nature

³⁴ Macy (2006, p. 167).

³⁵ The Collective values scale from Macy (2006, p. 170) was used in this study.

of work (not operating procedures); prior plans to work in the nonprofit sector; and strong humanist value perspectives.

3. Employees with collective values are also satisfied with their workload, believe their workload allows them to do a good job, and do not believe their workloads are too heavy.
4. Employees who have less education, lower household incomes, work less hours per week, and/or have been with the agency a shorter time have higher collective perspectives.
5. Employees with the highest levels of collective value perspectives also tend to be Hispanic or other: (Hispanic, M=6.09; other, M=6.00, Pacific Islander, M=4.89; Caucasian, M=4.88).
6. The significant demographic predictors of a collective value perspective are education (the less, the better) and time with agency (the more time, the less collective).
7. A linear regression revealed that significant non-demographic predictors of collective value perspective include opportunities for promotion (more opportunities, more collective), nature of work (high perceptions, more collective), and humanist value perspective (more humanist, more collective).

Mean	SD	Correlations	
4.99	1.28	(+) Career advancement**	(-) Education**
		(+) Communication**	(-) Emotional exhaustion**
		(+) Coworkers**	(-) Hours worked per week**
		(+) Ethnicity*	(-) Household income**
		(+) Humanist value perspective**	(-) Time with agency**
		(+) Job satisfaction**	(-) Workload heaviness**
		(+) Length of plans to stay**	
		(+) Mission attachment**	
		(+) Nature of work**	
		(+) Organizational self-esteem**	
		(+) Pay and rewards**	
		(+) Peer trust*	
		(+) Prior plans*	
		(+) Promotion**	
		(+) Psychological participation**	
		(+) Public service motivation**	
		(+) Satisfaction with supervision**	
		(+) Willingness to stay**	
		(+) Workload satisfaction**	
		(+) Workload's influence on job**	

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

A. Individual Value Perspective

A worker with an *individual value perspective* is typically ambitious, values the interdependence of working relationships, and seeks pleasure. Value is placed on one's position, the differences between workers, and self-reliance.³⁶

*Survey Items*³⁷ (Scale 1-7)

Instrument reliability: alpha = .788

³⁶ Macy (2006, p. 167).

³⁷ The Individual values scale from Macy (2006, p. 170) was used in this study.

1. “One must avoid dependence on other people wherever possible.”
2. “Only those who depend on themselves get ahead in life.”
3. “One should live one’s own life independent of others as much as possible.”

Findings

The statistical mean for having an individual value perspective is 3.31 (SD=1.46), which is on the slightly disagree side of the Likert scale. It is the lowest score of the three value perspectives. Other findings include the following:

1. Employees with individualistic values do not plan to stay with their agencies.
2. Employees with individualistic values tend to be more satisfied with pay and do not trust their peers.
3. Individualist workers have less education, lower household incomes, work less hours, and/or believe their workloads are too heavy.
4. Individualistic employees appear to be employed in certain positions (drivers, M=4.69; others, M=3.93; clerical and administrative support, M=3.62; administrative and management, M=2.97; professional, M=2.81). In fact, the only significant demographic predictor of individualism is position.
5. A linear regression revealed that the only non-demographic significant predictor of individual value perspective is peer trust (the more trust, the less individualistic).

Mean	SD	Correlations	
3.31	1.46	(+) Pay*	(-) Education**
		(+) Position**	(-) Household income**
		(+) Workload heaviness*	(-) Peer trust**

* = significant correlation; ** = highly significant correlation

Section IX: Demographics

This section highlights some of the conclusions found in the results based on various demographics: gender, age, marital status, educational level, number of dependent children, time with agency, ethnicity, household income, position, how employees heard about their own positions, hours worked per week, and agency. These correlations and relationships were determined through use of a number of statistical tests including Pearson's correlations, one-way ANOVAs, and post hoc Tukey HD analyses.³⁸ It is important to note that studies have found that various demographic variables influence the "ease of movement" employees have in changing positions. For example, age and education influence external job availability, length of time with agency impacts turnover, number of children may decrease employee mobility, and so forth.³⁹ It is also important to note that these results are specifically based on the employees we surveyed and should not be generalized to the full nonprofit population.

1. Gender

- a) Males have higher levels of organizational self esteem than do females.
- b) Males are more satisfied with their pay and feel more rewarded (recognized and appreciated) than females.
- c) Males see more opportunities for promotion than do females.
- d) Males are more satisfied with their supervisors than are females.
- e) Males have higher perceptions of psychological participation than females.
- f) Males have higher perceptions of nature of work than do females.
- g) Males have higher levels of workload satisfaction than do females.
- h) Males are planning to stay longer at their current agencies than females.

2. Age

- a) Employees under 21 used the internet and other more than the newspaper when compared to older employees. More employees over the age of 21 found their positions posted in the paper more often than the internet or other when compared to those under 21.
- b) Older workers plan to stay longer with their agencies than younger employees.

3. Marital Status

- a) Single employees have significantly lower understandings of how their current workloads influence how well they do their jobs when compared to other marital status groups.

4. Educational Level

- a) Less educated workers have stronger mission attachments, higher levels of public service motivation, and higher perceptions of organizational self esteem.
- b) Less educated workers believe that communication within the agency is better than more educated employees.
- c) Less educated workers are more satisfied with pay and believe their efforts are rewarded and recognized (contingent rewards) more than educated employees.
- d) Less educated workers see more opportunities for career advancement.
- e) Less educated workers are more satisfied with their supervisors and enjoy their coworkers more than more educated employees.
- f) More educated workers are more emotionally exhausted.
- g) Less educated workers like and enjoy their jobs more than those who are more educated.
- h) Less educated workers have higher levels of job satisfaction.
- i) Less educated workers have higher collective and individual value perceptions.

³⁸ Decisions regarding the demographics to include were supported by a combination of all of the studies referenced in this report.

³⁹ Kim & Lee (2007).

- j) More educated workers feel their workloads are heavier, and they are also less satisfied with their current workloads.
- k) More educated workers are less likely to believe they will stay with their current agency.

5. Number of Dependent Children

- a) Workers with more dependent children have lower perceptions of organizational self esteem.
- b) Workers with fewer dependent children are more satisfied with pay.
- c) Workers with fewer dependent children are more satisfied with contingent rewards.
- d) Workers with fewer dependent children are more satisfied with their jobs.
- e) Workers with more dependent children are planning to stay with their current agency longer than those with less.
- f) Workers with more dependent children see a better job market for what they do than those with fewer children at home.

6. Time with Agency

- a) Workers who have been with the agency longer feel they are not recognized and appreciated as much as those who have been there a shorter time.
- b) Workers who have been with the agency for a shorter time believe they have more opportunities for promotion.
- c) Workers who have been with the agency a short time are more satisfied with their supervisors.
- d) Workers who have been with the agency longer are less satisfied with the organizational procedures.
- e) Workers who have been with the agency for longer have higher levels of emotional exhaustion than those who have been there a shorter time.
- f) Workers who have been with the agency less time find their jobs more enjoyable, take more pride in their work, and see more meaning in their jobs.
- g) Shorter tenure employees have higher humanist and collective value perspectives.
- h) Workers who have been with the agency longer believe they have heavier workloads, and they are less satisfied with their workloads.
- i) Workers who have been with their agency longer believe they will stay where they are for longer than those with shorter tenures at their current agency.

7. Ethnicity

- a) Pacific Islanders are significantly more dissatisfied with benefits than other ethnic groups.
- b) Hispanics or others have the highest levels of collective value perspectives.

8. Household Income

- a) All employees with annual household incomes of over \$100,000 heard about their positions by word of mouth, professional organizations, internal postings, and other. Half of the employees who heard about their positions by word of mouth have household incomes of between \$20,000 and \$40,000. No one with household incomes over \$80,000 heard about their position from the internet. Professional organizations were important sources of postings for employees with household incomes between \$20,000 and \$80,000.
- b) Workers who have higher household incomes are more satisfied with their benefits.
- c) Workers with lower household incomes have higher collective value perspectives.
- d) Workers with higher household incomes have lower individual value perspectives.
- e) Workers with higher household incomes feel their workloads are heavier, and workers with lower household incomes are more satisfied with their workloads.
- f) Workers with higher household income levels have plans to stay with the agency longer than those with lower incomes.

9. Position

- a) Drivers and clerical/administrative support are most satisfied with communication.
- b) Drivers have significantly lower satisfaction with benefits than other categories of positions.
- c) Administrators/managers and professionals are the least individualistic employees in these nonprofit agencies.
- d) Administrators/managers feel the heaviest workloads and drivers perceive the lightest workloads.

10. Hours Worked Per Week

- a) Full-time workers have lower levels of organizational self esteem, particularly when compared with those who work 20-29 hours per week.
- b) Full-time workers are less satisfied with the communication, particularly when compared with those who work less than 30 hours per week.
- c) Full-time workers are more satisfied with their benefits than part-time employees.
- d) Part-time workers feel more recognized and appreciated (contingent rewards).
- e) Full-time workers are less likely to see career opportunities and chances for promotion, particularly when compared with those who work between 20-29 hours per week.
- f) Part-time workers are more satisfied with their supervisors (when you compare those who work less than 30 hours per week with those who work over 40), have higher levels of peer trust, and enjoy and appreciate their coworkers more than full-time workers.
- g) Full-time workers feel lower levels of psychological participation when compared to those who work between 20-29 hours per week.
- h) Full-time workers are more emotionally exhausted than part-time employees.
- i) Part-time employees enjoy their jobs and believe they are meaningful (nature of work) more than full-time employees.
- j) Part-time employees are more satisfied with their jobs.
- k) Part-time employees who work 20-29 hours per week have higher collective and humanist value perceptions than those who work 40 or more hours each week.
- l) Full-time employees perceive heavier workloads and are less satisfied with the amount of work they do, particularly when compared to employees who work less than 30 hours per week.

11. Agency

- a) Employees from smaller agencies have higher mission attachment ($M=6.56$, smaller agencies; $M=6.16$, larger agencies), public service motivation ($M=5.80$; $M=5.39$), and organizational self esteem ($M=6.04$; $M=5.42$).
- b) Employees from smaller agencies are more satisfied with contingent rewards ($M=5.14$; $M=4.80$) and see more opportunities for career advancement ($M=5.44$; $M=5.05$).
- c) Employees from smaller agencies are more satisfied with their supervision ($M=6.05$; $M=5.40$), have higher perceptions of nature of work ($M=5.96$; $M=5.61$), are more humanistic ($M=6.15$; $M=5.75$), and feel heavier workloads ($M=3.31$; $M=2.93$).
- d) Employees from smaller agencies are more satisfied with their workloads ($M=5.09$; $M=4.71$) and are more willing to stay ($M=5.80$; $M=5.43$).

Section X: Past Volunteerism

This section highlights some basic findings from the one qualitative question on this survey:

“Please describe your past involvement with volunteerism (such as age you started doing service/volunteering, types of volunteerism efforts, types of organizations you worked with, etc.).”

Of the 186 employees who responded, 99 answered this question. Most (two-thirds) remembered starting volunteer work during their childhood and youth. Some even said they remember being a volunteer in their earliest memories of life. Others said they started around seven or eight when they began Cub Scouts and Girl Scouts. Some employees remembered active service beginning in their early adolescence with youth group service, Boy Scout service, middle and high school club or group service, and so forth. It is clear from their responses that the reasons many of the employees work for nonprofits today are linked to their positive experiences with volunteerism during their childhoods and youth. They were involved in types of service that they believed actually helped and benefited others. They saw their service (even as a child) meaningful. They liked the feeling they had when they did things to benefit those around them. Many mentioned how good they felt giving to others. It is clear from the responses that hiring new employees who have been involved and had positive experiences with volunteerism early in life would benefit the agency. It is more likely these employees will remain in the nonprofit sector longer than others. It would seem that those involved in volunteerism early in life would develop characteristics important to mission attachment and public service motivation even before being hired as a paid employee in the nonprofit sector. In fact, some of the quantitative data already presented provides some support for this assertion.

Some respondent quotations:

- “I have been involved in volunteerism since the age of about eight when I started Cub Scouts and have been involved ever since!”
- “I find it very satisfying to help children in any way I can.”
- “I started doing charitable work at age seven and have done some type of volunteer work ever since.”
- “I’ve done a lot of different types of volunteering with my family and church groups. In fact, I don’t really recall an age where I wasn’t involved in some type of volunteer work.”
- “I love this job so much that I try to do too much. I might need to retire early.”
- “When I was a youth I started volunteering to do service with high school clubs and United Way. This is where my enthusiasm for volunteerism began, and it continues today.”
- “Every volunteer or paid job I have had throughout the years has involved helping and serving people, which is important to me.”
- “I didn’t know you could get paid to do this kind of work until I got this job. I love it and will make a career of it.”
- “Many years ago I volunteered at an elementary school where I helped the class with spelling. This was very rewarding work for me and gave me a desire to do more.”
- “I began volunteering as a youth. I never knew you could actually have an income working for a nonprofit organization until I found this job.”
- “My life is fulfilled working here.”
- “I’m being paid for what I love.”

Past Volunteerism: This list includes a many of the items mentioned by the 99 respondents.

4H leadership	Justice center for children
Adopt a grandparent program	LDS family services
Americorps	LDS mission
Battered women's shelter	Leader for children and youth groups
Big Brother/Sister	Legal clinics
Blood donor	Library volunteer
Boy Scout service	Literacy efforts
Boys and Girls Club	Local care center
Building homes	Local politics
CARE volunteer	Mental health advocate
Caring for homeless animals	Mental health program volunteer
CASA volunteer	Mental health volunteer
Centers for people in crisis	Mentoring children
Centro Hispano	Mountainland Headstart
Charity organizations	Neighborhood clean up
Child care	Nonprofit agency volunteer
Church service	Nursing homes
Church service projects	Organizations for the blind
City volunteer	Parent's medical mission
City Youth Service programs	Political volunteer
Civic volunteerism	Poverty projects
College service leader	Probono legal work
College service projects	Professional boards for various not-for-profits
Community Health Connect	Programs to help youth
Community program board member	Project Read volunteer
Community programs, events, and efforts	PTA
Community service	Public school volunteer
Crisis Live	Recruiting other volunteers
Cub Scouts	Recycling center
Disabled home	Red Cross
Eagle projects (3)	Rest homes
Elementary school volunteer	School club or organization service projects
Food Bank	School service projects
Girl Scout service projects	Secretarial work for nonprofit
Head Start volunteer	Self-directed activism (mental health)
Health fairs	Senior centers
Helping children	Serving neighbors and relatives
Helping disabled adults, youth, and children	Shelters
Helping neighbors	Soup kitchens
Helping the sick	Special education
Helping/befriending the elderly	Special Olympics
Home owner associations	State hospitals
Homeless shelter	Student civic groups
Hospital volunteer	Sub for Santa
Hospital volunteer	Teaching
Human rights campaign	Translating
Humane Society	Tutoring programs
Humanitarian projects	United Way volunteer
International health-related service projects	Volunteer work with profession
Interpreting	Yard work for those who need help
	Youth group service

Appendix A: Nonprofit Employee Survey

Part A: Please read each statement and then circle the number that best represents your agreement or disagreement. One (1) equals strongly disagree and seven (7) equals strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
1. I am well aware of the direction and mission of this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Meaningful community service is very important to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. My knowledge and experience are valued in this agency.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Work assignments are often not fully explained.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. The programs and staff at my work unit support the mission of this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I am not afraid to “go to bat” for the rights of others even if it means I will be ridiculed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I can make a difference here.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I have a great deal of influence on what goes on in my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. I feel completely drained from my work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. I feel used up at the end of the workday.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. I like to work for this organization because I believe in its mission and values.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Making a difference in society means more to me than personal achievements.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. People here have faith in me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Communications seem good within this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. I have too much to do at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. I feel burned out from my work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. My contributions to the agency are appreciated.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. My work contributes to carrying out the mission of this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. I am prepared to make enormous sacrifices for the good of society.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. I am taken seriously around here.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. I can influence the decisions of my immediate superior regarding things about which I am concerned.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. I feel frustrated by my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. I feel like a valued and unique person around here.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. I am often reminded of daily events about how dependent we are on one another.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. I feel I’m working too hard on my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. My supervisor always asks my opinion when a problem comes up that involves my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. I feel like I’m at the end of my rope.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. If I have a suggestion for improving the job or changing the work in some way, it is easy for me to get my ideas across to my superior.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Part B: Read each statement and then circle the number that best represents your agreement or disagreement. One (1) equals strongly disagree and seven (7) equals strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree			
1. I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Fulfilling all my job responsibilities does improve my chances for promotion.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Raises are too few and far between.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. The benefit package we have is equitable.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. There are few rewards for those who work here.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I receive continued training to perform my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. I am respected and treated fairly by my supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Most of my coworkers can be relied upon to do as they say they will do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. I find I have to work harder at my job than I should because of the incompetence of people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. I am satisfied with the amount of support and guidance I receive from my supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. I have full confidence in the skills of my coworkers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. I enjoy my coworkers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. I am satisfied with the overall quality of the supervision I receive at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Most of my coworkers would do their jobs even if they were not supervised.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. I can rely on other workers not to make my job more difficult by careless work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. I like the people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Work can be satisfying.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. One's contribution to the group is the most important thing about work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. One must avoid dependence on other people wherever possible.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. Work can be a means for self-expression.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. One should take an active part in all group affairs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. Only those who depend on themselves get ahead in life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. Work can be organized to allow for human fulfillment.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. The group is the most important entity in any organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. One should live one's own life independent of others as much as possible.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Part C: Read each statement and then circle the number that best represents your agreement or disagreement. One (1) equals strongly disagree and seven (7) equals strongly agree.

	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree			
1. I like doing the things I do at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. My job is enjoyable.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I see a good job market for what I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I would leave this agency if offered the same job with another agency.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. In general, I do not like my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I plan to look for another job in the near future outside of the nonprofit sector.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I have always planned on working in the nonprofit sector.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. I am satisfied with the amount of work I'm expected to do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Considering everything, I am likely to continue to work for this agency.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Part D: Please circle, check, or write in the answer that best represents your feelings.

-
1. I feel my workload is....
 1=Never too heavy, 2=Seldom too heavy, 3=Sometimes too heavy,
 4=Often too heavy, 5=Almost always too heavy
-
2. How does the amount of work you are expected to do influence the way you do your job?
 1=It never allows me to do a good job
 2=It seldom allows me to do a good job
 3=It has no effect on how I do my job
 4=It usually allows me to do a good job
 5=It always allows me to do a good job
-
3. How much longer do you intend to stay in an employment relationship with your current organization?
 Less than 6 months
 Between 6 months and one year
 1-2 years
 3-4 years
 5 or more years
 I have no intention to leave
-
4. Please describe your past involvement with volunteerism (such as age you started doing service/volunteering, types of volunteerism efforts, types of organizations you worked with, etc.):
-
-
-
-
-
-

Demographics

Part E: Please put an X in the appropriate box. Your answers will be confidential; the information in this section will not be reported in a manner that individuals or small groups could be identified. Your agency will not see any surveys.

1. Gender:
 - Male
 - Female
2. Age Range:
 - less than 21
 - 21-30
 - 31-40
 - 41-54
 - 55+
3. Present Marital Status:
 - Single
 - Separated/Divorced
 - Widowed
 - Married
4. Highest Educational Level:
 - Attended some high school
 - High school diploma
 - Attended some college
 - Associate degree
 - Bachelor degree
 - Masters degree
 - Doctorate degree
5. Number of dependent children:
 - No children
 - 1 child
 - 2 children
 - 3 children
 - 4-5 children
 - 6 or more children
6. Length of time with agency:
 - 0-6 months
 - 7-11 months
 - 1-2 years
 - 3-5 years
 - 6-10 years
 - 11 or more years
7. Ethnicity
 - African American
 - Asian
 - Caucasian
 - Hispanic
 - Pacific Islander
 - Other
8. Total household income:
 - Less than 20,000 a year
 - Between 20,000-40,000 a year
 - Between 40,000-60,000 a year
 - Between 60,000-80,000 a year
 - Between 80,000-100,000 a year
 - Over 100,000 a year
9. Position in Agency:
 - Administrative/Management
 - Clerical/Administrative Support
 - Professional (teacher, caseworker, counselor, therapist, attorney, etc.)
 - Facilities/Custodial
 - Driver
 - Other: _____
10. How did you hear about your position?
 - Newspaper
 - Word of mouth
 - Professional associations
 - Internal posting
 - Internet
 - E-mail networks
 - Consultant
 - Other: _____
11. Hours worked per week:
 - Less than 20
 - 20-29
 - 30-39
 - 40 or more

Appendix B: Demographics

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Frequencies</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Variables</u>	<u>Frequencies</u>	<u>%</u>
<u>Gender</u>			<u>Ethnicity</u>		
Male	54	29.5	Asian	1	.5
Female	129	70.5	Caucasian	162	88.5
<u>Age</u>			Hispanic	11	6.0
Less than 21	13	7.1	Pacific Islander	3	1.6
21-30	79	43.4	Other	6	3.3
31-40	34	18.7	<u>Income in Household</u>		
41-54	33	18.1	Less than 20,000	40	21.9
55+	23	12.6	20,000-40,000	68	37.2
<u>Marital Status</u>			40,000-60,000	36	19.7
Single	57	31.0	60,000-80,000	26	14.2
Separated/Divorced	18	9.8	80,000-100,000	4	2.2
Widowed	4	2.2	Over 100,000	9	4.9
Married	106	57.1	<u>Current Position</u>		
<u>Education Completed</u>			Admin/Management	48	26.7
Some HS	1	.5	Clerical/Admin. Support	28	15.6
HS diploma	7	3.8	Professional	61	33.9
Attend some college	49	26.6	Driver	17	9.4
Associate degree	22	12.0	Other	25	13.9
Bachelor degree	69	37.5	<u>Heard about Position</u>		
Masters degree	32	17.4	Newspaper	23	12.6
Doctorate degree	4	2.2	Word of mouth	55	30.1
<u>Dependent Children</u>			Prof org	26	14.2
No children	110	59.8	Internal	9	4.9
1 child	27	14.7	Internet	29	15.8
2 children	18	9.8	E-mail networks	9	4.9
3 children	12	6.5	Other	32	17.5
4-5 children	13	7.1	<u>Hours Worked Per Week</u>		
6 or more children	3	1.6	Less than 20	22	12.0
<u>Tenure with Agency</u>			20-29	24	18.5
0-6 mos.	49	26.6	30-39	24	18.5
7-11 mos.	25	13.6	40 or more	94	51.1
1-2 years	41	22.3			
3-5 years	34	18.5			
6-10 years	18	9.6			
11 or more years	17	9.2			

Appendix C: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Benefits	177	1.00	7.00	4.46	1.47
Career advancement opportunities	184	1.00	7.00	5.17	1.46
Collective value perspective	181	1.33	7.00	4.99	1.28
Communication	184	1.00	7.00	4.73	1.57
Contingent rewards	180	1.00	7.00	4.90	1.47
Coworkers	181	1.50	7.00	6.21	0.93
Emotional exhaustion	178	1.00	7.00	3.64	1.52
Humanist value perspective	183	1.00	7.00	5.87	0.95
Individual value perspective	183	1.00	7.00	3.31	1.46
Job availability outlook	180	1.00	7.00	4.83	1.64
Job satisfaction	182	1.00	7.00	5.45	1.54
Length of plans to stay	183	1.00	6.00	3.52	1.75
Mission attachment	182	1.00	7.00	6.28	0.98
Nature of work	183	1.25	7.00	5.72	1.39
Operating procedures	176	1.67	6.33	4.16	0.99
Organizational self esteem	181	1.00	7.00	5.61	1.46
Pay	177	1.00	7.00	4.03	1.46
Peer trust	181	1.75	7.00	5.78	1.08
Prior plans	183	1.00	7.00	3.32	1.81
Promotion	175	1.00	7.00	3.87	1.50
Psychological participation	183	1.00	7.00	5.37	1.56
Public service motivation	184	1.40	7.00	5.51	0.95
Satisfaction with supervision	183	1.00	7.00	5.59	1.66
Willingness to stay	183	1.00	7.00	5.53	1.78
Workload heaviness	184	1.00	7.00	3.04	1.06
Workload satisfaction	183	1.00	7.00	4.83	1.80
Workload's influence on job	183	1.00	5.00	3.67	0.93

Appendix D: Primary Resources

Borzaga, C. & Tortia, E. (2006). Worker motivations, job satisfaction, and loyalty in public and nonprofit social services. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 35, 225-248.

Brown, W.A. & Yoshioka, C.F. (2003). Mission attachment and satisfaction as factors in employee retention. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 14, 5-18.

Collins, F., Lowensohn, S.H., McCallum, M.H. & Newmark, R.I. (1995). The relationship between budgetary management style and organizational commitment in a non-for-profit organization. *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, 7, 65-79.

Collins, S. (2007). Assessments as an employee selection tool. *The Health Care Manager*, 26, 213-217.

Inglis, S. & Cleave, S. (2006). A scale to assess board member motivations in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 17, 83-101.

Kim, S. E. & Lee, J. W. (2007). Is mission attachment and effective management tool for employee retention? an empirical analysis of a nonprofit human services agency. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 27, 227-248.

Land, D. L. (2003). Identifying strategic leadership practice motivators of nonprofit employee retention. Unpublished dissertation. University of Phoenix: Location.

Macy, G. (2006). Outcomes of values and participation in 'values-expressive' nonprofit agencies. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 7, 165-181. Retrieved September 4, 2007 from ABI/Inform Global database.

Mann, G. A. (2006). A motive to serve: Public service motivation in human resource management and the role of PSM in the nonprofit sector. *Public Personnel Management*, 35(1), 33.

Mayer, B. W., Fraccastoro, K. A. & McNary, L. D. (2007). The relationship among organizational-based self-esteem and various factors motivating volunteers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36, 327-340.

Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 13, 693-713.

Utah Nonprofits Association (2006). Report on the salary and benefits in Utah's charitable nonprofits 2006. Utah Nonprofits Association.