University of HUDDERSFIELD

University of Huddersfield Repository

Low, Christopher

When good turns to bad: An examination of governance failure in a not-for-profit enterprise

Original Citation

Low, Christopher (2008) When good turns to bad: An examination of governance failure in a not-for-profit enterprise. In: Corporate Governance and Business Ethics Conference, June 2008, Witten, Germany. (Unpublished)

This version is available at https://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/11927/

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/

When good turns to bad: An examination of governance failure in a not-for-profit enterprise

Dr Chris Low
University of Huddersfield Business School,
UK

Objectives

- To compare NFP and FP both theoretically and practically

- To analyse the assumption that not-for-profits (NFP) are unlikely to exhibit the unethical governance behaviour seen in for-profits (FP)

Governance theory: For-profits

- Shareholding model dominates (Letza et al 2004)
- Agency is the major challenge (Monks and Minow 2008)
- NFP theory less concerned with agency due to absence of shareholders (Dunn and Riley 2004) but increasingly aware of agency problem (Hayden 2006)

Governance theory: Not-for-profits

- Stakeholding model dominates (Abzug and Galaskiewicz 2001)
- Stakeholder involvement is the major challenge (Iecovich 2005)
- FP less concerned about involvement but diversity of board membership has become an issue (Grosvold et al 2007; Higgs 2003)

Case study: ABC

- NFP company established in 2000 in Huddersfield, UK
- Provided creative arts activities for young people behaving anti-socially:- music technology, break dancing and drama
- Transferable skills, confidence and motivation
- Initial focus - Afro-Caribbean young people, then white and Asian
- Community ownership with a lock on assets:

'If on the winding up or dissolution of the Co-operative any of its assets remain to be disposed of, these assets…shall be transferred instead to some other…non-profit organisation(s)'

Case study: ABC continued

- By 2001 ABC had premises - recording and dance studios, training rooms, office space
- Staff members recruited from among local artists, musicians and dancers providing positive role models
- Annual turnover growth - £38,000 in 2002 to around £300,000 in 2004
- Won a regional award in 2004 for being ‘On the Up’
- By January 2006 the organisation was in voluntary liquidation

Agency failure

- Music industry trading arm
- Two dedicated staff members
- After two years, no income
- Acceptable in terms of risk-taking,
  - NFP have to balance social mission with sustainability through trading
  - Board were guilty of error but not unethical practice

Stakeholder involvement

- Employees were restricted from membership and hence election to the board:

4. All employees on taking up employment with the Co-operative…shall be admitted to Membership of the Co-operative, except that the Co-operative in General Meetings may by majority vote decide to exclude from the Membership:

  – *newly appointed employees during such **reasonable probationary period** as may be specified in their terms and conditions of employment*

Stakeholder involvement continued

- Employees challenged this restriction
- Won the right to membership
- Removed Managing (and Financial) Director
- In late 2005 had to instigate liquidation proceedings

Conclusion

- A link can be made between agency failure and a desire by the board to restrict stakeholder involvement

- Governance in these two sectors may exhibit very similar behaviours in certain circumstances

Further research

- Governance failure in NFPs
- Using a combined theoretical base
- Requires a greater synthesis of literatures (see e.g. Miller-Millesen 2003) to develop the beginnings of the framework that is offered in this paper

Presentation references

Abzug, R. and Galaskiewicz, J. (2001), “Nonprofit boards: crucibles of expertise of symbols of local identities?, Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, Vol.30 No.1, pp.51-73

Dunn, A. and Riley, C.A. (2004), “Supporting the not-for-profit sector: the government’s review of charitable and social enterprise”, The Modern Law Review, Vol.67 No.4, pp.632-657

Grosvold, J., Brammer, S., Rayton, B. (2007), “Board diversity in the United Kingdom and Norway: an exploratory analysis”, Business Ethics: A European Review, Vol.16 No.4, pp.344-357

Hayden, E.W. (2006), “Governance failures also occur in the non-profit world”, International Journal of Business Governance and Ethics, Vol.2 Nos.1/2, pp.116-128

Higgs, D. (2003), “Review of the role and effectiveness of non-executive directors”, DTI HMSO, London

Iecovich, E. (2005), “The profile of board membership in Israeli voluntary organisations”, Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, Vol.16 No.2, pp.161-180

Letza, S., Sun, X. and Kirkbride, J. (2004), “Shareholding versus stakeholding: a critical review of corporate governance”, Corporate Governance, Vol.12 No.3, pp.242-262

Miller-Millesen, J.L. (2003), “Understanding the behaviour of nonprofit boards of directors: a theory-based approach”, Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, Vol.32 No.4, pp.521-547

Monks, R.A.G. and Minow, N. (2008), “Corporate Governance”, fourth edition, Blackwell, Oxford