Augsburg University
Idun

Theses and Graduate Projects

2014

Comparing Leadership Practices in Internationally Focused Non-Profit Organizations

Vincent C. Haen

Follow this and additional works at: https://idun.augsburg.edu/etd

Part of the Leadership Studies Commons

Augsburg College
Lindell Library
Minneapolis, MN 55454

COMPARING LEADERSHIP PRACTICES IN INTERNATIONALLY FOCUSED NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

VINCENT C. HAEN

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirement for the degree of
Master of Arts in Leadership

AUGSBURG COLLEGE
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

2014

Thesis
Haen
2014

MASTER OF ARTS IN LEADERSHIP

AUGSBURG COLLEGE

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

This is to certify that the Non-thesis Project of

Vincent C. Haen

has been approved by the Review Committee for the Non-thesis Project requirement for the Master of Arts in Leadership degree

9/19/2014

Date Completed

Joseph M. Volker

Adviser, Joseph Volker, Ph.D.

Magdeline Aargard

Reader, Magdeline Aargard, Ph.D.

Dedication

For Dad: always a good example, always there for me, for us.

Acknowledgements

A big thank you to everyone that my along my way. This includes Augsburg faculty and staff, family, and friends who have offered advice or given their support throughout the time I have spent focusing on this project. No need to guess: If you have to think about whether that is you, then it is. Thank you!

With that, a special thank you goes to my adviser, Joe, for his patience and understanding the whole way through.

Abstract

Comparing Leadership Practices in

Internationally Focused Non-Profit Organizations

Vincent C. Haen

September 19, 2014

Non-thesis (ML597) Project

This study examines the effective leadership practices in non-profit international organizations. A review of the literature identifies common leadership practices. An in-depth case study examines effective leadership practices in one successful non-profit organization. This will show consistency between the review of the literature and the in-depth case studies. Effective leadership practices have been identified as: systems for engaging others, long term leadership practices, and creative collaboration.

Table of Contents

Comparing Leadership Practices in

Internationally Focused Non-Profit Organizations

The intention of this paper is to examine effective leadership practices in internationally focused nonprofit organizations. Knowledge gained from this type of research can aid internationally focused nonprofits in their mission. They can take this knowledge and become more effective in the leadership of their organizations, leading to greater impact in of their work in areas of the world that need it.

A note on definitions: For the purpose of this paper the term *international nonprofit* will be used in place of Non Governmental Organization or NGO. The paper will make comparisons between U.S. domestic nonprofits and nonprofits with an international focus where over 50% of their work is abroad. Given the broad definition of nonprofits, some may work in overlapping areas between domestic and international. Continuing with the term international nonprofit rather than using two terms is a simplification.

Within the field of nonprofits there are often not a lot of resources spent on creating better practices. Little is given to self improvement of the organization as the funders of nonprofits expect resources to be spent on specific projects; The same set of expectations, if not more austere, would be applied to internationally focused nonprofit organizations due to limits on resources. Research, therefore, can be hard to find. While there a is literature on higher level leadership practices in business, less literature exists on domestic U.S. nonprofits and less still when searching for internationally focused nonprofit organizations.

There is a difficulty in creating comparisons in the broad landscape of nonprofits with an international focus. Each nonprofit that might be studied is unique and works in unique circumstances, creating a large number of variables. As will be seen in the methodology, effort was put into finding organizations that have had similar missions and impact.

The paper will be organized into four sections, starting with a review of the literature. Second, the methodology section will describe the process for selecting and creating interview for comparisons. Following that will be a results section outlining and categorizing the findings of the interview as well as a discussion section, which will compare the results with what was found in the literature review.

Literature Review

This review includes investigative, qualitative case studies that identify effective leadership practices of international and domestically focused nonprofit organizations. This includes a variety of methodologies investigating leadership practices associated with the success of nonprofit organizations. Similarities and contrasting points will be reviewed.

Crutchfield and McLeod Grant

Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) investigated best leadership practices for nonprofit organizations. Specifically, they identified practices implemented by the organization leaders that are meant to provide both foundational guidelines and a way forward for the organization to create positive, lasting change in the world. The authors created comparisons in order to identify what common leadership practices, incorporated at a fundamental level, causes certain nonprofits to excel at creating intended change in accordance to their mission. The intention of the study was to find these basic guiding principles and not merely analyze various organizations' day to day management of operations. It should be noted that McLeod Grant is a single person with an unhyphenated surname.

The researchers designed their methodology to account for the fact that finding direct comparisons between nonprofits can prove difficult. This difficulty is that once the variety of nonprofits in their visions and missions, diverse models of funding, governance, and administration, and the context of the situation where they apply themselves in the world, each can be seen as being unique. Nonprofits do not have a uniform output with which to make a direct and simple comparison. In contrast, for profit institutions can generally use net profit as a main point of comparison.

Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) worked to find the guiding leadership principles of successful nonprofits in a four step process. The process started with a decision to focus on all United States based nonprofit organizations. They then refined a list of potential subjects through criteria and peer selection. 2,790 nonprofits organizations passed the initial selection method. The authors, through the rest of their process, narrowed their list to 12 comparable organizations that were representative of the variety of nonprofits that fit within the framework of the study. The process of selecting organizations for study is described below.

The authors were systematic and comprehensive in identifying target nonprofit organizations for their study. A survey was created to find which organizations were well known for fulfilling their missions. The survey was administered to members of the community familiar with nonprofits. These were the organizations that were looked at more closely. After creating an initial sample of organizations, the authors compiled information on each in order to make a comparison. The final stage in their process was analyzing the data in order to determine specific effective leadership practices. Following will be a detailed examination of this process followed by a discussion on the methods and outcomes of the study done by Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008).

Creating a comparison. While one nonprofit may be seeking to aid families through hardship by delivering perishable food items to them, a second may be advocating for the rights of a specific minority in the U.S., while a third may be seeking high quality teachers to boost the quality of urban schools. The three different outputs measuring their success are: efficiency of food delivery, effectiveness of advocacy, and number of teachers placed. These outputs are not parallel and therefore difficult to compare. At the same time, quantifying effect of food delivery has on helping low-income families, the impact of advocating for policies that benefit minorities, or the exact effects of populating teaching positions on the quality of schools is difficult at best.

This is all in contrast to the for-profit world, where comparison of fiscal net profit is both a possibility and valuable indicator, and where the numerous businesses that exist provide a better chance of finding comparable organizations.

Defining high impact. The methodology created for their research addresses these difficulties. The first part in creating this methodology was to decide which nonprofit organizations could be considered *high impact*. High impact organizations were defined as organizations that achieve substantial and sustained results at the national or international level, Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008). The authors defined substantial impact as having concrete outputs in people served, products produced, or direct influence on policy. Also included in the definition of substantial impact was whether an outcome of the organization's work created systems that made significant impact in the industry or effective processes that could be adopted by other groups. They defined sustained as maintaining their impact for at least ten years. Finding what organizations that fit this definition was the next step.

Important to their research was the need to find organizations that were similar enough for comparison, and reflected the definition of high impact. In order to narrow all the organizations to ones similar enough to be used for comparison, additional criteria were used in addition to the definition of high impact. This was necessary due to the broad range of nonprofits as a category. The researchers' goal was to find 12 organizations for leadership practices comparison. Following is the criteria the authors added to find a set of like nonprofits for the intended comparison. They considered organizations that:

- Impacted the national or international level, or both, and therefore excluded nonprofits who only had an effect at the local level;
- Originated in the United States;

- Were founded after 1965 and before 1994 to show a comparable scaling impact;
- Were all registered as 501(c)3 organizations—a government category that shows the organization has a tax exempt status;
- Were not a religious or member serving organization or social club;
- Raised most of their funding annually—eliminating wealthy organizations and grant making organizations from the comparison. (Crutchfield and McLeod Grant, 2008)

The authors had originally included domestically based nonprofit organizations with an emphasis abroad in their study. In order to create a broad yet parallel sampling of organizations they focused on domestic organizations. This allowed them to manage fewer variables.

National peer survey. In order to identify specific nonprofits several steps were taken. The authors created and administered a survey to 2,790 nonprofit leader-peers. The survey solicited their nomination of organizations with high impact. The survey was conducted by email and asked non-profit leaders to list up to five U.S. based nonprofit organizations that achieved the most significant impact during the last 30 years. The peer leaders were also asked to offer an explanation of why the organizations were picked as well as to exclude their own organization from nomination. The nonprofit leaders were identified with these sources: The Chronicle of Philanthropy, Guidestar, Ashoka, Echoing Green, Draper-Richards, New Profit, Roberts Enterprise Development Fund, Schwab Foundation Skoll Foundation, Venture Philanthropy Partners, and *Fast Company* magazine.

Additional steps. Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) added additional organizations to insure a diverse group. Some of these included organizations in: arts and culture, advocacy including civil rights, education, environment, health, housing and economic development, international relief and development, and youth development. The authors recognized in the initial output of the peer survey that the arts and culture category was underrepresented. Additional nonprofit leaders were identified from the arts community to compensate for the lack of feedback received in the arts category. An additional 300 surveys were sent to arts community organizations. The results from these were brought into the main body of results from the peer survey.

From the total nominations through the emailed survey, the authors vetted each organization in order to insure each was an authentic nonprofit organization and to filter out those that did not fit their criteria. At this point, the authors worried that brand awareness may have swayed the results and came up with a process to insure that it was high impact organizations that were making the cut and not organizations that were being recognized for other reasons that may have made them popular among leader peers.

The authors created an additional step in order to bring together expert consultant raters who have, as a whole, broad knowledge of the social nonprofit world to determine which organizations truly matched the definition of high impact. These consultant raters represented each of the nine areas of nonprofits. Each expert gave their own input one on one with the authors on the outputs of the email survey results as the authors used the Delphi Method to order the various opinions.

The Delphi method structures a conversation among experts by having a group of people give an opinion on a subject. Each participant in the group does not at first know what opinions are given by others. This anonymity negates bias inherent in hearing other opinions first and then tending, subconsciously or through politeness, to conform to prior opinions. To bypass this sort of bias, results of the first round of opinion statement in a group are shared only in subsequent rounds. This allows for the group to move to consensus by taking into account more authentic original statements made by others in the group.

This process narrowed the pool of potential subject organizations to 35. The pool of organizations for potential was then further narrowed down. This was done while insuring a representation of the variety of diverse nonprofit types by adding one additional step. The goal was to have representation of a variety of organizations based on: type of organization, size of budget, issue area focused on, geographical distribution, and diversity of leadership.

This screening, done with input from the expert raters that had been used earlier on with the Delphi profile, yielded the final sample of high impact organizations. Listed in Table 1, The High Impact Organizations of Crutchfield and McLeod Grant, are the names of the 12 organizations that were identified through this process.

Comparison of the 12 high impact organizations. Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) created case summaries of each organization through a research and interview process in order to draw out what effective leadership practices the 12 organizations shared. The case summary for each organization was used to make comparisons between organizations.

Initial background research. Initial research was done to find all the public information on each organization in order to give insight and background on each organization for the interview and for their written conclusions. Research was carried out by graduate level students whose work was overseen by the authors. Background research was found through a variety of public data sources, including news media, annual reports, and websites. A case study of each organization was made for review before interviews were conducted.

In depth interviews. Interviews were then conducted in order to identify key leadership practices as perceived by top tier leaders in each organization. The intent of the interviews was to find first hand information from each organization's executives and top tier leadership on how they came to have and sustain the results of a high-impact organization. The interviews were done on site at the home of the organization being studied. Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) followed a predetermined set of questions to interview, on average, 10 senior leaders, board members, or staff members within each organization.

Open ended questions were used in the interviews, allowing a format that enabled subjects to share more openly about their organizations. The questions were guidelines for a conversation aimed at understanding the leadership practices of the organization. They had a set of 40 questions on the background, outcomes, strategy, leadership, finances, and operations of the organizations to guide their interview. The entire list of questions used by Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) is included in Appendix A, Case Study Interview Questions.

Internal data and case summaries. Following the interviews, both financial and organizational internal data was requested from each of the 12 organizations. This included information on each organization's growth and expansion. Comparisons to nonprofit industry benchmarks were done in order to highlight interesting points about each organization.

The authors then summarized all the data thus far. This was done by creating a case summary for each organization. These summaries were then coded so that similar leadership practices or related information could be readily seen between the case studies. The coding system allowed the authors to summarize, and ultimately compare, leadership practices. Once the information is ordered for comparison, the authors continue with the analysis of the information.

Analysis of the compiled information. The authors analyzed the data with the intent of identifying the leadership practices held in common among the 12 case summaries of the organizations known for being high-impact. As common leadership practices emerged, they insured validity of the practices with an iterative process. This process used the information compiled on each organization to compare emerging leadership practices as they were collected from the interviews in order to insure the information was consistent. They also insured that each identified practice within an organization showed it had led to the organization to being high impact.

As leadership practices emerged, Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) first checked to see whether they were shared by all the organizations. In order to qualify as a shared leadership practice a practice needed to be shared through 10 of the 12 organizations to be defined by the authors as a leadership practice consistent enough within the organizations to be considered. Use of coded case files allowed the authors to note where there was overlap in the leadership practices and where there was not. A number of emerging leadership practices not shared among the ten organizations were no longer considered.

At this point the identified leadership practices were more clearly defined. The authors engaged thought-leaders from the nonprofit world to further scrutinize the leadership practices. This gave validity to the process. They asked these thought leaders to aid them in understanding whether each practice was integral to the effectiveness of high impact organizations.

The six leadership practices of Crutchfield and McLeod Grant. The researchers identified the most significant recurring themes as their six leadership practices of high impact organizations. The six leadership practices are listed in Table 2, Leadership Practices of Crutchfield & McLeod Grant. The six leadership practices are the output of the processes Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) used to identify high impact organizations and to understand the methods that made them so. This section will focus on better understanding these outputs. It will include giving an example of each to help clarify the leadership practice is, as well as some discussion on the practice.

Practice 1: Advocate and serve. Nonprofits may start out focusing on either advocacy or services as a way to improve the lives of their end-customers, but high impact nonprofits eventually find they gain leverage for those they work for by entering into both. The knowledge of how to be effective at a practical level of work gave them the ability to advocate for more applicable legislation. One example of this would be Self-Help. The service of the organization Self-Help was offering housing loans for those that could not gain a loan through a conventional lender due to their economic status. They became established and effective at this service. They later added advocacy to their mission, as they came to be knowledgeable in their field of service. Self-Help, then, advocated against predatory lending procedures. They found they had gained contacts in the industry during their years of focusing on service that helped them in their capacity to advocate. As they became known for advocating against bad lending practices, they were also able to work to insure the worst elements of the industry were known to lawmakers. Therefore they were doing a greater good while building their organizational intelligence on the industry, all while continuing to help people get approved for good loans.

At the same time, the findings of Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) highlighted that organizational diligence and follow through are naturally reinforced processes within organizations working to advocate for legislation. In the case of the organization Self-Help, synergy between their capacity to serve and to advocate emerged. This organization was a good example of how nonprofit organizations can become grow in effectiveness of mission by adding a complementary capacity in advocacy or direct service.

Practice 2: Make markets work. Nonprofits should take advantage of and work with

Augsburg College Library

existing market forces and realities of the marketplace in order to leverage them in relation to their mission. The authors state several ways this could be done. The first is charging for a product or service related to their work in a way that builds an income stream to help cover operating costs. A second example is by partnering with businesses looking to heighten their corporate responsibility, often while cutting costs by becoming more environmentally sustainable or socially conscious as an organization.

The Environmental Defense Fund worked with chain restaurants to show them how they could invent practices to reduce waste and save money at the same time. Their goal was to help the chain economically—in the end it was through a market driven approach. Environmental Defense then took these best practices to other chains; forwarding their mission of reducing waste by showing other fast food chains how to save money in doing so.

Environmental Defense Fund uses market driven tactics and technologies from previous corporate partnerships. They consult on behalf of corporate partners to make them both greener and more cost effective. Once they have learned new practices they show the techniques to other entities. In doing this, the Environmental Defense Fund used natural market forces, cost effectiveness, to promote their own mission of reducing waste and pollution.

Possible benefits of corporate partnerships to a nonprofit can be: less dependence on financial contributions outside the organization, heightened fiscal discipline within the organization, or gaining the any prestige that comes from smart pairing with for-profit partners. These benefits should be looked at despite the fact that nonprofits are often cautious about working with businesses. Nevertheless, Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) suggest nonprofits should partner with businesses in a way that complements the objectives of both partners.

Practice 3: Inspire evangelists. Nonprofit Evangelists can, and should, be recruited to help achieve the mission of the organization. Nonprofits often create partnerships with volunteers, but volunteers are often short term help. Evangelists are defined here as not just volunteers, but long term advocates who believe strongly in the values and mission of an organization. Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) suggest that organizations can create systems to encourage volunteers to stay involved and become informed to the point of becoming inspired and committed long term *evangelists*, volunteers who feel a connection to the organization's mission and therefore want to take part in the organization's works over the longer term. They may become advocates, sharing with others the good intentions and follow through of the organization. The authors also state that volunteers can also potentially apply their own skills (and donations) toward the goals of a nonprofit they believe in as volunteers in any organization, but perhaps with greater and longer term dedication.

An example they used was how Habitat for Humanity encourages evangelism by asking inspired volunteers to go back to their church congregations to share their experiences. The evangelists therefore encourage and recruit more volunteers to help with the work of building houses, perpetuating the mission of Habitat for Humanity.

Practice 4: Nurture nonprofit networks. Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) explain that highly successful nonprofits do not see each other as competition. In fact, they work to intentionally network with one another. In doing so, they work together and share resources and ideas. Such organizations realize the benefits of organizations similar to themselves attaining similar or complementary goals in the same community or industry. They aren't competing with each other for profit; After all, they only measuring their success in their mission to help others. This enrichment builds trust and relationships among nonprofits so that their cooperative efforts may grow into continuous long term mutual benefits. Because many nonprofits work where resources are scarce, such cooperation can help alleviate resource gaps.

One example is the Exploratorium. The authors point out how the Exploratorium's strategy worked to help people spread innovation. The Exploratorium focused on science base innovations. They made themselves a hub for ideas and a resource for similar organizations—freely giving away program ideas. While there is no monetary return for their emphasis on sharing ideas, they became a hub for networking and a catalyst for new ideas in their field. Exploratorium's sharing of ideas helps a variety of similar organizations in different regions advance their mission in creative science education initiatives.

Practice 5: Master the art of adaptation. The authors observe that high impact organizations are able to be nimble and adapt quickly. Organizations also allowing experimentation ways to enact their work created a continuous culture of innovation within an organization. They can also learn how to change tactics in order to take advantage of changing conditions. This is the ability to not get stuck in a bureaucratic quagmire that disallows change. It is the ability to try new things and to put to use what works best in an organization. Further, it is the ability to repeat this process in order to improve as an organization.

An example is the organization Share Our Strength (SOS), an organization that is working to alleviate hunger in America. They started with direct mailings to high-end restaurants and chefs as a fundraiser. The results were than expected. Later, SOS gave themselves permission to experiment with fundraising beyond the direct mailing to individuals in their local food industry they started with. They incorporated the restaurants and chefs, inviting them to participate in an event entitled *Taste of the Nation*, inviting other donors to the event. SOS had a plan to ask their partners in the food industry for donations to fight hunger. But, they took in a far greater amount of donations when they asked their partners to lend their skills to a culinary based fundraiser.

Share Our Strength gave themselves permission to try new things. Once they found a group of people that would be passionate about their mission through sharing their own skills, they continued to adapt this pattern and their organization to something that would be most effective . They were able to be flexible, and adapt to their situation to better work towards their mission, and continue to maintain their ability to adapt.

Practice 6: Share leadership. Nonprofits will be better at sustaining a high impact if they share and develop leadership inside their organization. A distribution of responsibility and decision making capability allows for an organization to be much more flexible in relation to its growth and needs. It also helps the organization to develop more leaders, testing them for future opportunities, from within an organization.

Nonprofit organizations may have gotten where they are by having a strong leader at the helm. Continuing with a strong central leader model may lead to uncertainty about making decisions without cycling everything through that one leader. Giving up control and granting freedom to others to make decisions is a key step to encouraging the development of leaders.

Simply sharing more responsibility through the organization may help in this regard. Giving decision making capability and the trust that needs to go with it to individuals through a variety of levels of an organization is one way to do this. Another, starting at a high level so that the executive can share functions, is instituting a Corporate Operating Officer. Either strategy allows for the empowerment of a broader group of decision makers. Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) point out that sharing authority allows for a stronger nonprofit. This often includes sharing with a wider network of volunteers and board members. Putting this into practice develops second level leaders, insuring they have the necessary experience to benefit the future of the organization when they take on larger leadership roles.

Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) point out that the nonprofit, and political think tank The Heritage Foundation has had success with sharing leadership. Heritage uses a system for sharing leadership through their organization, including having seven vice-presidents and two leaders at the top of the organization that share the helm. The organization also has a highly engaged board, and leaders empowered through the organization, lending to having lots of possible leaders that feel ownership in the organization and readily move up to a higher tier of leadership if needed.

Discussion and conclusion. Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) establish what really goes into creating a highly successful nonprofit organization to the degree that they challenge common beliefs on what it takes to make a nonprofit organization excel. The authors point out that leaders that have an orientation to not just look at the internal. High impact leaders do not only take into account management practices inside the organization, but always reaching outside the organization. Working outside the organization allows for the ability to draw strength from the community, from the end users who benefit directly from the organization's mission, and from outside organizations.

The authors point out that many of the practices that ended up being part of the final six chosen focus outside the organization. The practices of Make Markets Work and Nurture Nonprofit Networks underscore this point. This may be surprising to any who read their book looking for a direct approach for their own nonprofit to increase their impact.

Many of the practices seem indirect. Instead of suggesting putting more resources to the core of your mission, for example, the practice Inspire Evangelists appears, showing how building relationships around the organization is important. A focus on relationship building is a recurring theme throughout the six practices. The more an organization looks to create partners and take on new ideas, the longer the reach and their mission.

Though some of the twelve organizations they studied in depth may have come to have some sort of international association, Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) had decided not to focus on internationally focused nonprofits. This leads to the opportunity of the current study which will look into how leadership practices may be similar or different when compared to the practices of other organizations—through the lens of various studies.

The methodology used to identify nonprofits for the study necessarily evolved as the authors worked out which organizations best fit their definition of high impact. Many qualitative approaches evolve as they progress to their goal. The complexity of the sampling methodology was necessarily so. The authors needed to create their own definition of what a high impact nonprofit actually was before using that definition to narrow down the myriad amount of nonprofits for comparison. Their method of using a peer survey in conjunction with research and their personally created definition combined to ensure a broad variety of nonprofits fit the criteria. At the same time their process insured aspects such as brand popularity were balanced against the tendencies of a peer survey.

Crutchfield (2008) identified these best leadership practices with broad applicability to nonprofits. The leadership practices identified by Crutchfield and McLeod Grant are ultimately recommendable to other nonprofits. These practices showed, through their methodology, what makes high impact organizations distinguished as high impact organizations as well as beneficial to society. Their hope was that other organizations may see these practices as potential best practices to take on in their own organizations or at least practices to learn from them as they adapt them in their own way to their own unique situation.

Consideration needs to be given to the fact that this is an industry where little research has been done on leadership practices. Indeed, this study sheds a lot of light on nonprofit leadership practices, but is confined by the limitations of a qualitative study. More study including quantitative initiatives would provide a much needed overview of the impact of leadership practices in nonprofits.

These leadership practices, are meant to provide a helpful tool for nonprofits. Studies of leadership practices help us find and learn how to look for effective leadership practices in the nonprofit world. Their ideas for comparing nonprofits through a peer survey helped show the usefulness of a common definition for *high impact* nonprofits that became, for their study, a common denominator to look for when defining highly successful organizations. This could be a useful tool for future researchers to apply in their studies.

Alvord, Brown, and Letts

Alvord, Brown, and Letts (2002) conducted a qualitative investigation of best leadership practices by looking at seven organizations known to be successful in social entrepreneurship on behalf of the people in need throughout different parts of the world. They wanted to know what leadership characteristics, innovations, and organizational choices made each of these nonprofits successful. Their purpose was ultimately to identify patterns of success in each of these organizations and make comparisons between these patterns. The authors used the following criteria for choosing organizations:

- Are widely regarded as successful examples of social entrepreneurship on behalf of poor and marginalized communities.
- Come from diverse regions, including Asia, Africa, Latin America, and North America.

- Have been described in available literature sufficiently to answer our key questions.
- Have exhibited at least some potential for catalyzing transformations in the social contexts within which they have been implemented. (Alvord, Brown, and Letts, 2002)

That being the criteria the authors put forth for their study, they found seven suitable organizations. A listing of these seven organizations and there area of focus is found in Table 3, Organizations Observed by Alvord, Brown, and Letts.

After identifying the organizations, the authors worked to identify processes in place, assets put to use, and where there were emphases on learning in the organizations. These specifics framed the leadership practices that may have helped each organization be successful. In order to identify the practices, they used information from a variety of resources as well as interviews with members of the organizations that had firsthand accounts of the work of the organizations.

Patterns in how these organizations innovated, led, organized, and impacted larger systems during times of sustained growth were sought out. Alvord, Brown, and Letts (2002) then created a system of matrixes in order to carry out a side by side comparison of practices they thought may be similar. Seeking patterns and then applying this sort of matrix allowed for a comparative analysis between organizations that shared the single trait of working internationally, but could be very disparate in mission and focus. They then synthesized the patterns seen into several distinct leadership practices they saw made the seven organizations successful.

The nine leadership practices of Alvord, Brown, and Letts. Ultimately, Alvord, Brown, and Letts (2002) developed nine hypotheses about how leadership practices contribute to successful and socially entrepreneurial international nonprofit organizations. A summary of these leadership practices can be found in Table 4, Leadership Practices of Alvord, Brown, and Letts. Here we will look into each practice in order to show how it works. This will be done by using the examples of the organizations Alvord, Brown, and Letts (2002) used to identify the practices in the first place (again, found in Table 3).

Practice one: Integrate a core pattern of innovation. In this first hypothesis, Alvord, Brown, and Letts (2002) suggest successful international nonprofits choose innovative strategies for their organization. They suggest that organizations that intentionally focus skill sets within their organization create intended outputs. The authors put the various strategies found into three categories. The three possible categories were: building the capacity of groups, dissemination of bundled innovations, and movement building.

Building capacity. The building of capacity is defined as the empowering of groups to help them reach their goals, doing more for themselves in some way and taking care of their own interests. BRAC and Six-S helped other groups grow their own efforts through connecting to resources and networking between similar groups.

Dissemination of bundled innovations. Dissemination of bundled innovations is defined as a way to bring innovations to those who need it by preparing them in a way that is affordable, understandable, and easy to distribute. For instance, Grameen brought banking to the poor, and Puebla gave poor famers access to better agricultural technology. Both packaged an innovation in order to distribute it.

Movement building. Movement building is the empowerment of grassroots organizations through education and networking in order to allow them to stand up for their rights against otherwise more powerful institutions. SEWA and Highlander work to support peoples' movements. SEWA worked to protect vendors against police corruption while Highlander had worked for the American Civil rights movement by educating protestors.

The authors used these three categories when explaining the rest of the practices they suggested for international nonprofit leadership practices.

Practice two: Mobilize existing assets of marginalized groups. The second practice is mobilizing existing assets of marginalized groups. The authors point out that all but one of the seven organizations studied rated highly in this category while all gave high priority to assets that marginalized groups could bring to the table. All the organizations studied local marginalized groups carefully before working with them as local partners in collaborative efforts towards the goals of those groups. This practice emphasizes the need to understand and utilize the preexisting resources of the group you intend to work with.

Organizations that intentionally focused on this strategy did so in very different ways. BRAC emphasized organizing locally with poor groups to work along with them to improve local services. The hope was to involve local individuals affected by the situation they are so that they can relieve the stresses of resettlement and poverty together. Grameen helps small groups participate more effectively in their local economies.

Highlander helps grassroots groups learn to organize themselves to be more effective in influencing other actors and political forces. In each of the examples, the organizations studied by the authors were working with groups already involved in their respective communities. The groups had services, were involved in the economy, or were already working to organize themselves. The organizations each worked to support these pre existing initiatives, thereby empowering the groups by building on work already in place. The groups strengthened their positions in the community, gaining clout by pursing their interests.

Practice three: Emphasize continuous learning. This practice focuses on a continuation of teaching and learning in order to have members of the organization gaining new skills to improve performance overall and for the long term. Membership in an organization is defined for the authors' purposes as a broad category including staff, volunteers, and those served by the organization. An example of an organization that is continually focused on learning is the SEWA, which focuses on helping self-employed women. They helped these women expand their political organization knowledge and learn skills to more effectively organize.

Another organization, BRAC, embraced a commitment to continual learning as well. BRAC demonstrated this early on in its history. They used on the job and classroom efforts. Continuous learning enables any organization's staff or the members of the organization a staff serves, to become more adaptable and more effective in their area of effort.

Practice four: Bridging diverse stakeholders. This practice is the ability to merge the efforts of a variety of stakeholders. A stakeholder is defined broadly as anyone who can benefit from the works of the organization. This may include farmers or vendors in the developing world, elite donors from their home countries or abroad, and local government. The stakeholders can be direct beneficiaries or entities working to create changes in a specific community.

The founders of Six-S have disparate backgrounds—one is from France, another from Burkina Faso. They found ways to overcome cultural differences and work together. They leveraged this experience in creating goals for their nonprofit. Six-S worked to better the lives of women and provide more services to the poor. The experience they gained by having worked through cultural differences themselves gave them a basis for bringing together fairly disparate groups. They brought together village members, members of the neighboring villages, donors, and local governments. Each separate group owned different views on solutions. Yet, each group began to have a collective view and work to toward shared goals. Six-S was able to nurture effective teamwork between participant members that would have otherwise continued to have more disparate priorities. The authors also noted that organizations that did not invest in fostering cooperation and understanding between diverse types of stakeholders early on tended to have continued difficulty incorporating cooperative efforts.

Practice five: Adaptive leadership capacity. Successful organizations have leaders with continually expanding visions that push their organizations to adapt promptly to changing circumstances. Internationally focused nonprofits work in a dynamic, ever-changing world that makes continual adaptation necessary. The practice also highlights how a focus on leadership succession reinforces the process of innovating in a continuing legacy of timely evolution.

This practice can be done in a variety of ways. BRAC is one example of doing this in they had great success creating systems that aid villages over a long term. The way BRAC applied themselves to ensure education, health services and microlending institutions were working well in partner villages. They went about this we was to continually adapt to the needs of those they served by using close relationships with communities in order to understand the dynamic, evolving situation that those they served lived in.

Another example is SEWA. SEWA had relationships with politicians established over decades. This proximity to political figures gave them the insight they needed to aid people by helping them learn how to stay informed on key political issues. For both examples, a long term commitment along with an ability to understand and adapt to changing circumstances were helpful to the success of the organizations.

Practice six: Organization growth to expand coverage. This leadership practice focuses on the expansion of operations. Impact can be grown in a variety of ways: through growth of their organization, creating alliances with client groups, or having the ability to deliver technical assistance to client groups. These various initiatives can vary considerably from organization to organization. Some, such as Six-S and Puebla, partner with locals who see the benefits of helping to expand program activities. Highlander shared technical expertise to larger movements. The practice also covers the fact that an organization's expanded impact necessitates investment in infrastructure including monitoring and evaluation systems, management, and staff development. For this aspect of the practice, SEWA shows how it has focused heavily on staff development and management systems needed for large agencies. All these organizations used a suitable strategy of their choosing in order to expand their work's reach by developing their staff while ensuring organization continues to meet its needs.

Practice seven: External relations prioritized. This leadership practice is about building capacity. It refers to the ability of an organization to expand efforts while focused on the health of preexisting local efforts that are. These local efforts are other organizations that are closely coordinated with, but still separate from, high impact organizations. These external elements may be resource providers or manufacturers, those distributing resources, or grassroots allies in efforts to build a movement. This practice allows for different ways to expand the organization's mission and to build in organizational capacity.

For example, Grameen expanded their own capacity to work in Bangladesh through alliances with other organizations. Connections with other organizations in Bangladesh evolved into contacts that aided in expanding their services into new communities. Plan Puebla built external relationships with private donors and governments. The donors aided in developing Puebla's packaged solutions for areas where they would expand operations. Puebla's relationships focusing on government policy helped them deliver packaged resources to new regions.

In another example, Highlander built relationships with organizations that created organized grassroots movements within the background of larger social movements. Highlander became the education component to these grassroots efforts. This structure allowed Highlander the ability to expand their practices where they were appreciated and needed.

Practice eight: Scaling up strategy. This leadership practice indicates how important it is to plan for the necessary growth needs of an organization. This can help the organization better match the demand for its service. Three areas of focus are taken into account: capacity building, package distribution, and movement building.

In capacity building for this practice the focus is on local concerns along with local resources to address the concerns. Greenbelt supported others who were working to protect *green belts* of land in Kenya and other parts of Africa. They developed sets of activities that boosted client groups' capacity to do their work. Greenbelt was then able to scale up delivery of programs to serve larger groups.

With package distribution, scaling up includes expanding to new populations and areas through local partners, some of whom they may take on as staff. Grameen provides an example of this by creating credit-banks in new areas in order to expand efforts of providing micro-loans to village residents. Puebla does this by improving the maize technology available to subsistence farmers without affecting the rest of the village. They do this by enlisting the help of locals that adjust their strategy to work with the needs of the village. Both organizations recruited and benefitted from local help so that they could deliver their service into new areas.

With movement building for this practice, expansion is a function of the organization's efforts to work with local initiatives in a support role. A supporting role, that is, without becoming part of the peoples movement. This support could take a number of forms, depending on the expertise of the organization.

SEWA supported their partners, peoples' movements, by advocating for them and explaining how to leverage influence to reshape the policies of government from the village level to the national level. These partnerships allowed them to support the efforts of a peoples' movement by integrating the efforts of policy focused third parties. This allowed them to be supportive by sharing knowledge of the area and expertise in networking with other committed organizations. They were able to support and not become a central part of any movement. .

Practice nine: Transformation leverage. This leadership practice covers using social transformation to leverage an organizations intended impact on a situation. The leadership practice suggests that organizations look to take advantage of dynamic social norms in the areas they work in order to insure that the social transformation they aim for is achieved in a way that works best for the involved communities. This leveraging can be done in different ways corresponding to the type of organization and the context of the place they are working in. The practice is broken into sub-categories dependent on the type of organization: capacity building, package distribution, and movement building.

Grameen focused initially on microlending. After becoming well established with microlending in some areas, they then took advantage of the networks and the momentum created from the success they were having. They put their energies into being supporters to other microlenders in hopes of aiding millions of impoverished entrepreneurs.

To do this, BRAC worked to create more capacity and therefore autonomy to women living below the poverty line. The intent was to give them the empowerment needed to build a livelihood and take the initiative in solving local problems.

Highlander focused on educational interventions to empower local protesters struggling with adversaries who were well entrenched in the local political power structures. This allowed Highlander to use their education component to add elements of positive transformation such as teaching nonviolent protest methods to the organizations they supported. This helped the organizations Highlander supported to be better prepared for challenges ahead of them.

Discussion and conclusion. The limitations of the Alvord, Brown, and Letts (2002) study are pointed out by the authors themselves. They focused on only the comparison of previously published case studies. This was done to avoid the cost of international travel, while maintaining the study by allowing the comparison of organizations from different parts of the globe. They tell how the use of case studies, while showing patterns that may not have come about with a more direct comparison, makes it hard to compare data in a completely objective, unambiguous manner.

Another limitation was that, despite having a broad geographical basis, the study's focus was rather narrow. Various effects of the politics in each country represented were not compared. Also, the political environment, such as whether an unfriendly regime in the nonprofit's host country may have affected how resources, such as up front financing, were attributed in the case study organizations.

Barber and Bowie

Barber and Bowie (2008) reviewed leadership practices of Non Governmental Organizations (international nonprofits) based in developed countries. They investigated organizations in a variety of countries. Like Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008), Barber and Bowie desired to identify effective leadership practices for nonprofit organizations, and . Like Alvord Brown and Letts, they had an international focus. Their international focus helps facilitate a comparison of organizations with an international focus.

In this article, the authors began by presenting observations on the current issues in international aid and development. These included a decline of support from Western nations, questions of accountability, and the need for consistency in operations funding. They made suggestions based on their own experiences to improve leadership practices that could resolve these issues. Table 5, The Six Leadership Practices of Barber and Bowie, lists these author identified suggestions as, “prescriptions that can lead to international nonprofit effectiveness” (Barber and Bowie, 2008).

Discussion and conclusion. Barber and Bowie (2008) did not conduct an empirical study. Rather, they drew conclusions based on their experiences, as well as material published by other authors. They did this in order to share their knowledge of internationally focused nonprofits so that such organizations may work more effectively in their missions.

The authors’ suggestions give insight into how organizations might prioritization the distribution of resources. Related to the distribution of available resources, the authors show the complexities of working in the international sphere. This point is emphasized both in their writing and prescriptions.

Collins

Collins (2001) made a comparison between for profit businesses, comparing what he termed great and great businesses. The author did this to show general leadership practices used by great organization as they transition into a period of high and sustained growth relative to still *good*, but less outstanding organizations. Collins (2005) also created an application of effective leadership practices for nonprofit organizations. In this section, we will first outline how Collins (2001) chose businesses to compare. Then, we will look at how comparisons were made extrapolated into a set of leadership practices for business. After that, we will also examine the

Collins' (2005) work where he recommends leadership practices to nonprofit organizations.

Defining great. The first step is to define what constitutes a great or a good organization. Great businesses, for the sake of this comparison, were organizations that:

- Outperformed the general market for a period of 15 years;
- Showed a performance increase relative to the business's own industry as well as to the general market;
- Was not a startup as it has been operating at least 25 years prior to the transition and has been publicly traded at least 10 years before any noted transition;
- Had an identifiable transition point that occurred before 1985, enabling enough data to have been produced for study.;
- The business needed to be its own organization at the time of selection and needed to show this by appearing in the 1995 Fortune 500 rankings;
- Showed an upward trend in stock returns at the time of selection. (Collins, 2001)

Finding companies for comparison. Having defined *great*, and in order to identify the right organizations, Collins continued to narrow down which organizations should be looked into as breakaway great organizations. In the process, he found *good* organizations that did not fit his definition of *great* for to create a baseline. They were businesses that were historically comparable in the same industry.

These businesses were good still good enough for comparison. Good businesses met the same criteria as great organizations with two exceptions. One exception was that their performance was no better than 1.25 times the general stock market relative to comparable great organization during the same time frame. The second was that they were not required to show an upward trend in stock returns.

Great companies. Collins (2001) began by considering all companies from decadal listings of *Fortune* 500 companies that were U.S. based, starting with 1965. Using the ratings of Fortune magazine insured that businesses were publicly traded, and consistent, and well established. More uniform reporting methods could only be found when focusing on a set of U.S. businesses.

126 companies were selected from an initial 1,435. This was done by using the University of Chicago Center for Research in Security Prices' data. The data was used to calculate which companies had above average returns preceded by average or less than average returns. Specifically, Collins looked at this information from 1965 to 1995 with consideration to the amount of data available for younger organizations.

From 126 companies, 19 companies were selected. This was done using elimination criteria from the University of Chicago Center for Research in Securities Pricing. The criteria included the level of performance through a specific time period in order to prove the great organization sustained its above average performance while being well established as average before that. The criteria also insured that the organizations:

- Did not experience a sudden shift to greatness, rather, it happened as a gradual rise relative to the general market;
- Were not merely transitioning from a downward trend to an upward trend;
- Had not lost momentum after the point of transition;
- Were not a *Disney* company, a great company fallen on hard times before rising again;
- Was not an outcome of a merger or acquisition—it must be a standalone company. (Collins, 2001)

From the remaining 19 companies, 11 companies were selected. This selection was made in order to insure companies made a transition from good to great not only relative to the general market, but also relative to the company's own industry. This distinction was investigated by looking into University of Chicago Center for Research in Securities Pricing data. A composite was made of companies in a specific industry. Any business that did not show a transition to greatness relative to their industry was eliminated from the study. Heinz and General Mills were examples of companies that made great shifts compared to the stock market, but not in comparison to the average of their industry in the time of the noted transition.

Good companies. Companies were then selected as comparisons to the great companies. The following criteria were used to find candidates for the good companies comparable to great companies:

- Had similar products and services;
- Same basic size;
- Similar founding era;
- Before the point of transition, stock returns fit roughly the same pattern;
- At the point of transition, company was more successful with a stronger market position and better reputation than the good-to-great;
- After the point of transition, company was less successful than the good-to-great while maintaining a comparable line of business. (Collins, 2001)

A rating was given to each of the candidates to show how well each fit the criteria. The most befitting the criteria was selected as the good organization for the study.

Comparing great to good. This process led to an outcome of eleven great companies being compared alongside eleven comparison companies categorized as good. This comparison can be found as Table 6, Good and Great Company Comparisons of Collins.

Collins then used a two step data collection process. This first step included an in depth interview with CEO and other leaders in the businesses. The second part of the process was combining a variety of information about the organization's performance.

Collecting information. A dossier was created for each of the organizations from:

- Articles in periodicals
- Internal publications
- Books about the industry, company, or company leaders
- Sources from business schools or the industry
- Annual reports and other materiel from the company. (Collins, 2001)

Information for each organization was then systematically coded into a master document chronologically and within the following categories:

- Organizational material: such as policies and procedures, and ownership structure
- Social factors: as cultural practices, stories, and group dynamics
- Business strategies: the primary elements of the company's strategy
- Market and competition: aspects of the companies competitive and external environment
- Leadership: interesting data on leadership succession
- Products and services
- Locations and Physical settings: how plants and offices are laid out
- Use of Technology, application and investment of informational technology
- Vision, core values, purpose, and audacious goals: how did they play a role in success or become diluted?
- Transition activities during the era of transition for the good to great company, or in factors of decline for the simply good companies. (Collins, 2001)

There was also an investigation of the financials of each company. The intent was to gather raw income data for a decade preceding and succeeding the period of transition for the great and in the same era for the comparison company.

Interviews. Six to ten interviews were conducted with senior management from the period of transition from each of the good to great companies. The interviews were transcribed and synthesized by the research team, which then performed a content analysis on the findings. Twenty open ended questions were used in the interviews, three examples of questions were:

- What do you see as the top five factors that contributed to or caused the upward shift in performance during the [ten years before and after the transition]?
- Did the company make a conscious decision to initiate a major change or transition during this time frame?
- Can you think of one particularly powerful example…from your experience or observation that… exemplifies the essence of the shift from good to great? (Collins, 2001, pp. 239 – 241)

Analysis, the comparison by Collins. The analysis and comparison involved several steps to an overall process. When possible, the processes yielded quantifiable variables for comparison. The following is an initial step, a list of tests, *units*, according to Collins (2001). Each unit was created with the intention of using the data collected on the organizations in order to understand how the identified businesses focused on various organizational issues.

- Acquisitions and Divestitures: Worked to understand the role of acquisitions and divestment at the transition point of a company.
- Industry Performance Analysis: Made a comparison of the company being looked into against the industry that company operated in.

- Executive Churn Analysis: Looked at the change in the executive team over time, before and after the point of transition.
- CEO Analysis: Did a qualitative analysis of management and leadership styles of CEOs.
- Executive Compensation: Made a comparison of executive compensation across the companies.
- Role of Layoffs: Looked at whether layoffs as a way to improve performance.
- Corporate Ownership Analysis: Made observations as to whether differences in corporate ownership made a difference in the companies studied.
- Media Hype Analysis: Observed what difference the media could have made in the reputation of the company, and how that may have affected how the company was viewed.
- Technology Analysis: Looked at how much was invested in technology in the company and how new ways to use the technology may have been created in the company.

  (Collins, 2001, pp. 241-247)

Further, a number of other less detailed analyses were used. Again, this was using the same data set. These included:

- The use of bold corporate moves,
- Evolutionary versus revolutionary corporate process,
- Executive class versus egalitarianism,
- Causes of decline in once-great comparison companies,
- Three-circle analysis that fit with core values and purpose,
- Length of buildup period before breakthrough,
- Timing of the Hedgehog Concept with breakthrough date,

- Core business versus Hedgehog Concept analysis,
- Succession analysis and success rate of successors,
- Role of leadership in the decline of once-great comparison companies. (Collins, 2001, pp. 247-248)

With the completion of the analysis, and the incorporating of the information into a set of recommended leadership practices, Collins (2001), created eight practices that distinguished great organizations from merely good organizations. The eight leadership practices follow in Table 7, Collins' Eight Leadership Practices for the Business Sector.

Collin's five leadership practices for the nonprofit sector. Collins adapted his thinking to the nonprofit sector. He created and published a monograph follow up, a new chapter to his Good to Great (Collins, 2001). In this monograph, Collins (2005), adapted the effective leadership practices he had found for businesses to be useful to the nonprofit sector. In the latter book, Collins takes many of the same ideas, transcribes the ideas, and translates business language as needed. His hope was to make the ideas useful to the nonprofit sector. These leadership practices for nonprofit organizations are listed in Table 8, Collins' Five Leadership Practices for the Social Sector. Collins (2005) chooses service oriented organizations that demonstrate the practices in use. In the following subsections, the leadership practices will be described and an example given.

Leadership practice 1, Defining great. For service oriented organizations, it is important to understand and find a way to measure what performance creates intended impact. This is in contrast to businesses that can merely look at their financial returns to show how their business is doing. Nonprofit organizations examine how effective they are at delivering their mission, focusing on their intended organizational output. While this can prove difficult for some types of organizations, Collins (2005) shows how it can be done.

The Cleveland City Orchestra found a way to define their output that did not have to do with monetary balance. They asked questions surrounding their orchestral work that might be indicators. Some of the questions were:

> Are we getting more standing ovations? Are we expanding the range of what we can plan with perfection? … Are we invited to the most prestigious festivals In Europe? Are tickets in greater demand, not just in Cleveland, but when we play in New York? … Do composers increasingly seek to have their work debuted at Cleveland?
>
> (Collins, 2005, p. 7)

The questions had to do with the art created by orchestras, and didn't have to do with focusing on simply raising their income (though they did). The Cleveland Orchestra found ways to measure their impact without looking at monetary indicators.

Leadership practice 2, Level 5 leadership. Collins (2005) found that, in addition to his original prescription of having a strong drive for the organization and its mission another layer needs taken into account; Nonprofit leaders need to work and influence systems where they have little direct power. Nonprofit leaders need, therefore to be skilled in persuasion because others in their organizations often have the power to choose whether to follow.

An example of this is the Girls Scouts of America. The Girl Scouts of America had a vision. They wanted to create awards for girls that reflected competency in areas that were not gender role driven. Their leader created these badges while communicating the point that modern girls are independent, and should be encouraged to think for themselves.

With the vision created, leaders at the national level had difficulty demanding that the idea be implemented due to the power structure of their organizations. Independent Girl Scout

Councils below the national level were able make individual decisions of this sort for their programs. However, the use of a vision to create a path that others could more easily follow along with a supporting argument for why it should be followed allowed for the possibility of shared agreement. Emphasis on both the importance of the new vision and plan allowed for the idea to be spread through their organization.

When the time came for the case to be presented, most independent local Girl Scout organizations willingly followed the new plan. This model of diffuse power structure is often shared with other nonprofit organizations. While Selling ideas like these can be a hurdle. The author points out that it can be overcome by a strong, persuasive leader.

Leadership practice 3, First who, then what. Recruiting the right people to your organization is important. In nonprofits, this means finding people who want to be a part of a greater social solution and believe in a cause, since wages are generally lower in this sector. One example is how one school used tenure as a reward for individuals who really stood out as great teachers. Tenure was not given out for number of years served, as is traditionally done, where mediocre, great, and poor teachers could gain the award in a few years at work. Changing the structure to use tenure as a reward for highly effective teachers, the school was able to attract and retain driven teachers by using tenure as an award because more mediocre individuals were not motivated to stay at the institution.

Leadership practice 4, The hedgehog concept. This concept is about focusing an organization's key strengths. It says organizations should stick to not only what they are passionate about and what they can excel at. Collins (2005) believes that an organization should have an economic engine aligned with its mission and that an economic engine should be one of the key foci. The difficulty is that since nonprofit sector organizations are not motivated by monetary profit, their stakeholders are not striving for monetary output, and the outputs cannot be characterized in an amount of profit An Indiana organization called the Center for the Homeless found that relying solely on government funds was not a reliable and responsible way to fund their organization. They instead shared their passion and story with their and donor base in order to increase their funding sourced. Further, the opportunity to share their passion fit better with the other circles of the hedgehog concept

Leadership practice 5, turning the flywheel. This practice outlines how great effort put into seemingly small tasks can add up when building up nonprofit success. Successfully execution of steps towards the vision will create a momentum in the organization. This momentum, the continuous work of focused nonprofits, creates paths to success and finding new paths can be important. For nonprofit organizations, the idea of working to a goal and attaining it as seen by others is important capital. The organization must build momentum to motivate and excite their members because people who are invested in an organization are crucial to the success of its mission.

This sort of capital is leveraged by the Red Cross. Recognition and trust built up in their brand allow donors to feel comfortable giving through them for disaster relief. The Red Cross built this important reputation in increments over time by proving to the public and to government entities that they will put resources given to them into the job they promise to do.

Discussion and conclusion. The change from business to nonprofit of leadership practices from Collins (2001) to Collins (2005) works well. It is methodical and well thought out. Overall, the transposition creates value and gives direction for nonprofit organizations. The outputs are a transposition of Collins' (2001) original work. There is utility in the work as a starting place for organizations wanting to use well thought through and accepted standards for nonprofit organizations. In the end, though, these leadership practices are empirically untested.

A study of nonprofits that follows the path Collins (2005) laid out but as an in depth actual comparison between nonprofits would be very valuable for the nonprofit industry. Such a study would be useful if it could be done with the thoroughness and integrity as was done in the businesses study. Especially if such a study could give further insight into what leadership practices can help them better achieve their mission. This would be a challenge to set up, however, given an ever elusive (for nonprofits) quantifiable methodology.

Kotter

In a well known work on leadership, Kotter (1996) summarizes eight practices necessary to accomplish change in an organization. He describes the difficulty of change efforts and how organizations need to give careful attention to the details of the effort or else it will fail, wasting resources and creating confusion. Various personal experiences of Kotter's years in consulting are the basis for the eight leadership practices he establishes. He is an experienced organization and leadership consultant. Kotter's model lacks empirical evidence. He did not take steps to test the validity of his eight step process. Still, his experience with organizational change in a broad range of organization is a good starting point.

Kotter (1996) is important because he examines the complexities of working toward change in an organization. His work is also important because it is often referenced and popular among business leaders and consultants. For the current study, it will be important to make comparisons between the similarities in the work of Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) especially as their study focuses on how to make nonprofits effective while Kotter (1996) focuses on the sometimes inflexible culture of businesses. Both works share a similarity in identifying effective leadership practices.

The eight points of Kotter's for leadership practices for businesses. Table 9, The Eight Leadership Practices of Kotter for Change in Organizations, describes the steps in the Kotter (1996) change process. He recommends these steps for organizations looking to effectively adapt and be a more competitive business.

Discussion and conclusion. Kotter's analysis, while valuable, was a reflective process and not intentional empirical research. The leadership practices provide an experiential and qualitative point of view, all from Kotter's experiences as a consultant. Unlike the recommendations of the nonprofit leaders and of Collins (2001), the points Kotter (1996) suggests need to be taken in the order presented in order to be effective. Taking them out of order would actually slow the intended change by adding confusion to the situation. Also of interest, both Collins (2001) and Kotter (1996), despite starting with a business orientation, show considerable overlap with the nonprofit focused and research based Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) work, despite their focus on for-profit business.

Discussion of the Literature Review

The literature covers a variety of business, nonprofit, and international nonprofit leadership practices. The previous research identifies effective leadership practices as: continuous learning, being mindful of your organization's effects, clarification of mission, networking, and using markets in favor of your organization. Many leadership practices can be seen to overlap within the organizations explored throughout the literature review. Some of the practices listed are particularly interesting, they are more unique to nonprofit or international situations, and therefore make the most valuable comparisons.

Charting leadership practice similarities. Kotter and Collins show that bringing leadership practices from the business world to the nonprofit world is reasonable. There were also leadership practices that showed up through the literature review that had an emphasis on nonprofit work specifically, both domestically and internationally. This layer of leadership attributes are necessary for helping nonprofits as well as nonprofits with an international focus respond to issues unique to them. A synthesis of practices, showing what practices are seen by the investigator to overlap can be seen in Table 10, Overview and Overlapping Leadership Practices.

Distinction between stakeholder types. The common leadership practices often focus on the development of individuals involved with the organization. The literature generally divides these individuals into two groups, those internal to the organization, usually the organization's staff and management, and those external to the core organizational staff. Both groups have a stake in the success of the organization and its mission.

The first and second practices are *Create and follow through of mission and vision* and *Emphasize mission with program beneficiaries*. Between these two, the former is an internal practice insuring vision and mission is created by and communicated to the entire internal staff. External practices emphasize beneficiaries, those who are meant to gain by the practices of the organization, should also incorporate the importance of the mission and vision of the organization.

The third and fourth practices are given a similar differentiation. The third practice is, *Possess the necessary knowledge, skills, and empowerment to do the job*, which selected authors show it to be an internal practice, applicable to the staff and management of an organization. The fourth practice, *Emphasize knowledge and skill building with donors and volunteers* is meant for those two groups so as to be distinguished by authors so that these two parties are seen as less internal than the aforementioned staff and management.

Practices with much overlapping between studies. A good deal of congruency between the various authors can be seen. Many practices are universal to any organizing and strategizing efforts. It should be noted that the authors were aiming at universality. The leadership practices are often worded in generic ways that works for a variety of organizations. Nevertheless, agreement appears to exist, notably in three areas—across all the authors in two of those.

Two types of education. The third practice shows the importance of continually building the knowledge and skills of organization members. All five authors seem to see it as an important investment for the future of organizations, something better organizations are always driving at. The second practice reinforces this point. Although it did not surface in Crutchfield and McLeod Grant, it did in the international nonprofit studies. Perhaps this is because there is a strong return on investment when working with end beneficiaries through education in developing nations.

Building skills and educating staff members is important. This importance shows through in the report categorized in two ways, one focused on the internal organization (staff members), and one focused on the external (board members and volunteers). With the two separate categories, continual education appears extremely important for both internal and external members of the organization.

Mindful, holistic thinking of effects and outcomes. Another important practice is being mindful of the effects of their actions. Many leadership materials point out that they need to be aware of and compensate for unintended consequences that are effects of their organization's actions. Stories of nonprofit failures highlight the importance of being mindful to these effects. One story that recurs is a women's group who built on barren, cheap land. Trees were donated to them to make the land more valuable through beautification, controlling erosion, and eventually to harvest valuable wood. Each sapling donated was planted upside down. The locals were rightfully afraid that those in power would seize the land should it become valuable enough to catch their attention. The upside-down trees became a sort of symbol of the struggle in the situation, the donors hadn't thought through the consequences of their donation.

Practices with less overlap between the authors. The chart also highlights differences between the authors. There may be less disagreement between leadership practices recommendation than it seems. The leadership practices may not conflict with one another as much as the situation can call for different leadership practices. Differences in application may be the reason that some leadership practices look different. Different context in different places and situations may require different leadership practices. This may show there are no universal answers in leadership practice applications and it may account for greater variety.

There are a few points of interest that would add an extra dimension to the studies if explored, for instance, whether the authors would agree with practices from other lists. Whether those practices were considered but missed the cut when authors narrowed down their list of top practices would also be good to know. Finally, would the authors understand each other's chosen practices as universal? It would be interesting to know if practices not on one list would still be agreeable to the other authors, if they are understood to be universal principles by the authors, or if they just missed the cut when the authors narrowed down their list of top practices.

Two points on vision and mission. An example of the last point is Crutchfield and McLeod Grant's not choosing to emphasize outputs on mission and vision. They would have an understanding of contemporary organizations including Kotter's vision and mission emphasis. Indeed, they might understand his emphasis on vision and mission as a good protocol for any successful organization. They may simply not have highlighted it as a leadership practice of successful organizations simply because they saw it as a process that could not be avoided. It is because Crutchfield and McLeod Grant see it as normative protocol that they would not have highlighted it as a leadership practice that made some organizations stand out. Indeed, vision and mission would often be seen by those authors as important in contemporary organizations. More research may show whether this is a foundational step in working organizationally that is understood to be part of all nonprofits. Or, research may show mission and vision to be an underemphasized leadership practice and therefore recommended to organizations who could take advantage of it.

Networking. One interesting point is that an emphasis on networking was used in the nonprofit focused papers. Nonprofits being perennially cash-strapped and often focused on a single strength might gain naturally in overall effectiveness through cooperation that networking can facilitate. It may be that those writing specifically on nonprofits see the nonprofits as needing versatility that can be found through shared resources and knowledge gained through networking. In the literature where networking is not mentioned, it may be still implied as a general business practice.

Funders deserve to see their donations used in a responsible manner. They would like to see efficiency and effectiveness in how their donations are used while at the same time nonprofits internationally and domestically want to accomplish their missions. Therefore, the more research into leadership practices and the situations they apply the better. Each study in this literature review yields valuable information, but also makes clear that there is a need to continue learning about leadership practices and testing them through a variety of methodologies. The nonprofit world doesn't lend itself well to quantitative studies, so thoughtful qualitative research is needed as well.

Using market forces. The use of economic forces to create self-sufficiency or partnerships, synthesized leadership practice 6, is common to both Collins and Crutchfield and McLeod Grant. It is the least shared leadership practice. It is surprising that more of the authors hadn't listed this in some way as many international nonprofits depend on some aspect of marketing to fund themselves. Some nonprofits will see this practice more as a necessity or as regular operations than as a leadership practice.

Current context. In the context a dynamic, changing world some nonprofit and international nonprofit leadership practices facilitate adaptation. At the same time, nonprofits can change for the worse with the context of dynamic change. An interesting example is how Grameen Bank adapted the use of microloans to be used with primarily impoverished women as loan recipients. Once this idea was adapted to a for profit model, overly zealous collection policies were put into place. The pressures to repay and consequences of not paying loans became too great and came to be seen as harming the population meant to be aided; Suicides due to these pressures were reported. Consequently the microcredit industry now carries a stigma. Grameen and all other micro-loan organizations were asked to leave India for this reason,

Another current issue involves organizations advocating for change in society. The leadership practices that have been recommended through the literature review to organizations often advocate for change in the organization. That aspect is acceptable. International nonprofits, however, can be seen as catalysts for change in countries that are not ready or not willing to accept the change. This could be seen as another internal to external split among practices where those looking to create change outside the organization can be more controversial. This lends to the mindfulness aspect that organizations could adapt in reference to what outcomes they work to create, and what priority they give to that work relative to the situations where they work.

Conclusion of the Literature Review and Next Steps

A good deal can be learned from the authors and how they looked at their experiences or at the organizations they studied. An overall strength of the literature review is the case studies that show for comparison the multiple types of successful nonprofit organizations. Of course, learning from the experiences of others can be important. It may be hard to deduce whose experiences are most important to prioritize. This makes synthesis studies more important, as a way to give thought to what leadership practices (and other priorities) should be adapted by and prioritized by an organization. As well, more can be studied on how business oriented leadership practices can or cannot successfully transfer into the nonprofit world and on to the world of internationally focused nonprofits.

There was little in the literature that focused on a rigorous examination of what practices tend to lead to success. The literature cited tends to focus on case studies and conjecture. In the realm of nonprofits and especially internationally focused nonprofits, there is a great deal of room for more research.

Methodology

The methodology for the study was built on the model created by previous researchers, Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008), who had focused on domestic nonprofits. The reason for using their study as a basis is because it is the best research currently available on nonprofit leadership practices and has a methodology that can be applied to internationally focused organizations as well. The intent of this current study is to learn about the organizational leadership practices of one domestic nonprofit with efforts focused internationally by interviewing one of their top tier leaders.

Further, leadership practices identified in the interview are compared to leadership practices of other organizations. The findings point to variance between leadership practices found in other studies that also focus on organizations known for being able to achieve impact in their mission. The study is intended to validate the findings of the literature review. A more general intent is to advance the understanding of effective leadership practices in nonprofit organizations with an international focus.

Recruitment Through Peer Selection

An organization appropriate for the intended interview was sought out. A peer selection process was used to select the leader to be interviewed for a case study. A process was created to find a local, internationally focused nonprofit known for having a sustained and positive impact in their area of focus. Four experts in the Twin Cities nonprofit sector were identified as leaders that were active and knowledgeable among local nonprofits. Each of these individuals was approached by the investigator in order to request their participation in the study. They were given a brief overview of the study at this time, to explain both the study and how their involvement as peer selectors would be useful to it.

The peers were asked to identify up to seven internationally focused nonprofit organizations based locally and known for having a positive impact on their mission, their area of focus. These peer nominators were selected because they were individuals knowledgeable about Minnesota nonprofits and nonprofits that may work internationally. Each has a background in academics or in nonprofit work, or both. The text of the letter asking for the participation of peer nominators can be found in Appendix B, Letter Inviting Potential Peer Nominators into Selection Process.

Identifying the Organization for Study

The following criteria were used in the peer nomination process to find an ideal organization to create a case study through an in-depth interview. The process as a script for the peer nominators is included in Appendix C, Peer Nomination Process Letter. The process as written out was meant to be done by email or as an in person interview. The peers were asked to nominate organizations that met the following criteria:

- Known for being effective in their mission.
- Known for having a high impact on their client base over the last 20 years.
- Based in Minnesota.
- Known to have at least half of their end beneficiaries living outside of the United States.
- When they worked for any organization excluded for the purpose of this survey.

There were two reasons for using these criteria. First, the criteria were used to guide peer nominators into creating an easily comparable, more homogenous, set for comparison. Second, it was to follow a methodology after that was used by Crutchfield and McLeod Grant (2008) to find effective organizational and leadership practices.

The nomination process for an organization that fit the criteria was then begun. After going through the peer nomination process, one organization consistently ranked higher than the others. Indeed, that organization was ranked first by two of the four peer nominators and was then selected as the primary organization for further investigation.

Data Collection Procedures

That organization selected and became the potential case study interview. They were then asked to participate and to select from within their organization a leader that would represent the organization well in an interview. The hope was that one of their top tier leaders (Presidents, Vice-Presidents, and Board Chairs) would be interested in being interviewed, as it was generally understood that their top executive may not feel they had time for interviews. First, the organization was sent a letter telling them they had been selected, with notes on the selection process. This letter also invited them to select a top tier leader to be interviewed. This letter can be seen in Appendix D, Letter Inviting Case Study Organization into Study. The identified organization executive was quick to say yes to the interview.

Once identified, the individual who would represent this organization became for the purposes of this study the case study leader. A second letter did several things. It invited the case study leader to be interviewed, introduced the investigator, explained the interview process, and included the consent form for the interview and recording. This letter to the case study leader to be interviewed can be seen in Appendix E. That letter included example questions to help the case study leader to better understand the intent of the interview. A copy of the confidentiality agreement used for this study, was also included in this correspondence so that the Case Study Leader could review the ahead of time. A copy of this agreement can be found in Appendix F, Confidentiality Agreement.

Interview Process

The interview was face to face at the office space or other space and at a time convenient to the case study leader. A blank copy of the consent form concerning the interview and recording of the interview (Appendix F) was reviewed and signed ahead of the interview by the case study leader. The interview questions (Appendix A) focused on fifteen open ended questions with anticipated follow up questions. The questions were aimed at identifying organizational leadership practices that positively affect the mission of the organization. The questions were meant to be guidelines, points to cover where the intent overall was to make the interview more conversational. The interview lasted just over 50 minutes. The questions were open ended in order to help the interviewer lead the conversation toward finding the basis of the organizational practices. The electronic recording of the interview facilitated the analysis and interpretation of the data.

Before of the interview, the questions that would be used were practiced. Those identified for the part of practice interview with the investigator were part of the procedure were individuals connected to Augsburg College who had connections to nonprofits and a good imagination to answer as nonprofit leader with an international aspect. The questions were read, answers were given, and a check of the recording process made.

For the actual interview, the recorded data was transcribed into a password protected word processing document while giving new names to the participants and organizations. After insuring quality of the transcript, the digital device file was deleted. The investigator categorized the organizational and leadership practices from the interview. This was done by reading and interpreting the transcribed document. Leadership practices that appeared to the investigator or were seen as especially important by the case study leader were highlighted.

Highlighted sections were then compared to see if there was overlap with one another and if they could be categorized as separate themes. Categorizing these general themes was the first step to gathering all relevant information. The investigator then highlighted areas into their appropriate theme before summarizing that theme as a leadership practice.

As the themes developed it was determined, at times with aid from the case study leader, whether the various themes were more than management practices. This was done by asking if the practices were overarching in scope and leading the organization in a certain direction rather than prescribing management practices. The organizations' practices were then compared to the outcomes of the studies highlighted in the literature review of this research.

Ethical Issues

Steps were taken to minimize the possibility of either the organization or the case study leader from being identified. This was done to minimize attribution of any information sensitive to the organization that may have come out during the interview. A pseudonym for both the case study leader and their organization were steps used to minimize the chances of recognition of the case study leader and the organization by readers. The study underwent oversight through a review process done by the Internal Review Board of Augsburg College.

Results

A total of thirteen leadership practices were identified from the interview. They are in two groups. The first group includes three practices known to be used in the organization over the tenure of previous executives. This first set leadership practices are seen by the subject to have contributed to the long term success of the organization as foundational principles. A second group of leadership practices includes nine leadership practices that have been instituted in the last three years. Both sets of leadership practices from the case study organization will be described in the following sections.

Foundational Leadership Practices

The subject identified practices historically supporting the impact of the organization. Use of these practices by the organization through its history contributed to early success. These practices also helped the organization become what it is today, known for sustaining impact in its area of service. There may be more practices used by the organization over the same time frame, but these three historic practices are the unique to the subject's organization. Table 11, Three Historic Leadership Practices of the Organization, shows these historical leadership practices with a brief explanation of each practice.

Historic practice 1: Engaging mission. The organization benefited from having a clearly defined mission. The mission lines up with the work done by the organization, allowing it to be quickly understood and taken to heart by others, including potential volunteers and staff. Clear The alignment and with values, wanting to help others in this case, often makes people want to help get involved. This enables field staff to be highly engaged when they could see a direct and positive impact on who they were dealing with. Coupled with the fact that individuals working in this type of organization can readily view the outputs of their work allows for heightened engagement of the organization's workforce.

Viewing the effects of one's own efforts in helping others directly, an individual can readily see the effects of their outputs. The subject stated that a clear orientation to mission "had the ability to produce deep resonance with folks that are engaged in the field. ... When you are dealing with people at *really* the edges of suffering and conflict … it translates very rapidly into positive feedback" (Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012). That is, an individual in this situation can see and positive benefit to their own action in the situation directly. Seeing a direct positive benefit will make it easier for most individuals to understand why they are engaging, organizationally and as an individual, with their work.

Historic practice 2: Aligning efforts, outcomes, and donations. Alignment is insuring efforts involved in the organization are consistent with the outcomes the organization works for. An organization's goals and objectives need to be consistent with its mission. Similarly, an organization needs to strive to insure that the actual work being done remains consistent with the desired outcomes striven towards. Further, donations need to consistently be seen to reinforce a consistency towards these predetermined outcomes.

Nonprofits, especially, may be prone to being hindered by inconsistencies. The reason is that a new donor may have ideas for what the organization should be doing. They may attribute a donation that is connected to an additional project that has conditions that could change decisions already made or better made by others on sight. Donations given with conditions that diverge from the intended outcomes may hinder the overall project or mission. Additional outcomes may move organizational energy away from originally intended outcomes. Organizations that are dependent to any degree on donations may benefit from continually moving towards well defined goals in order to attract future donors focused on the same goals.

Showing donors how readily goals are achieved may lead to more donations. Consistency in achieving mission and goals when working internationally grow an organization's reputation with government entities and end beneficiaries.

Avoiding donations that would add abrupt changes to mission or objectives may diffuse the organization's potential. Aligning efforts and outcomes with donations is done to insure that various funders understand and support the outcomes and fund the proper efforts to get to the outcomes without altering the scale of the projects. This allows the organization to maintain focus on important project specifics.

Cultivating relations with core donors specific to their interest in seeing positive direct outcomes in crisis situations has been a key component of the organization. A key component of this, according to the case study organization, is through keeping staff in key countries throughout the world, giving the organization more direct understanding and therefore more delivering aid. This knowledge gained through such field staff is a direct line of communication to donor individuals or groups. They, in turn, can be educated to understand how focused donation reinforcing and not diverging from the needs of end beneficiaries can help create a greater positive effect in situations.

Once donations and efforts are more focused through good education and communication the case study organization can focuses on maintaining an operational capacity. Other groups may see that the results of their donations are amplified when working with an effective organization rather than on their own

In the case study organization, a core group of individuals donate significant amounts and choose to do it through this organization, as well as government organizations such as USAID and the UN. The subject said that there is a small core of individuals who regularly donate because they "want to make a difference in those kinds of environments: the tsunami, the Haiti earthquake, the Darfur crisis.... So, they are already predisposed to be aligned with the mission they want to see happen and the practical outcome. They want to see something tangible happen. And that's what [this Nonprofit]'s role is: the operational agency. ... You can position our programs for that and they provide regular income to the organization" (Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012). Having these donators aligned through education with the mission ahead of time ends up being a cost effective investment in time for the case study organization.

Establishing camps or getting emergency supplies to a crisis situation has a clear outcome. The donors appreciate how they can be involved with this outcome. Benefits can be yielded from organizational focus on alignment of project needs and donations. An organization showing continuous, visible, positive outcomes will be better provided with regular donations. A consistent income stream dedicated to specific projects can be what insures their success.

Historic practice 3: Personal connections made through work. Individuals connected to the organization through work tend to maintain a connection to that organization. The work done and the values that show through during the time spent connected with an organization have potential to resonate with volunteers, donors, and staffers. This can create connections that will last beyond the initial relationship built between the organization and an individual.

Anyone working for or volunteering for the organization may make a personal connection during their contact with end beneficiaries. These individuals will see their efforts as aligned with the values of the structure of the organization they are volunteering for, the structure that allows their volunteer efforts to come to fruition. Volunteers and donors will gain a connection to their work as well as a better sense of the importance and value of the organization.

The bond created with current volunteers or donors to the work and outcomes will make them prone to being involved with efforts in the future. The subject pointed out that such individuals will be inspired by an organization's values if the organization's values line up with their own. The subject went on to say that, "a person can connect to [the organization]. So, we often have a volunteer that will go out and work in a camp and will come back and in five years will keep supporting us" (Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012). Volunteer efforts, then, beget more volunteer efforts. When volunteers, during time spend with an organization, can see it as being authentic as they work toward their mission, they will be more likely to work with the organization in the future.

A related way individuals can understand the outcomes of an organization's efforts is to be a direct observer. Volunteers can experience exposure to situations such as a crisis where the organization is working to apply its resources to aid others. The volunteer in this situation is a direct witness and possibly a key factor in the organizations effort. The volunteer can then understand, firsthand, how the organization applies itself in these sorts of situations.

After being such direct witnesses, individuals are likely to be interested in getting involved with the organization because of the impact of those efforts. In this case, being able to view the efforts of the organization begets future volunteer efforts. In either case, the organization can be seen as continually showcasing its works thereby showing individuals how their personal efforts can support the organization's mission.

Current Leadership Practices

Several newer leadership practices identified in the interview are practices being instituted by the leadership organization's executive who was fairly new to the position. These newer leadership practices intended to affect the impact level of the organization. They are meant to build on and compliment the core practices already in place. The hope, according to the subject, is to continually put into place effective practices that help the organization keep up with the dynamics of a changing world. An overview of these current leadership practices will be described in Table 12, Nine Current Leadership Practices of the Organization.

Current practice 1: New models and ideas. The goal of the organization is to create a culture of continual adaptability and to always be aware of models that may show new and more effective ways of doing things. Models, here, implies alternate systems, probably borrowed from innovative organizations or even other industries. They may be delivery services adapted from a for profit company that has little in common with the implementing organization. Or, it may be a model of customer service best practices adopted from a nonprofit working nearby in the same overseas country.

The intent is to create an organization continually adaptable to the times, when many organizations in the same sector hold to models from the last century.

This organization seeks unconventional ways of doing things to make itself more effective. It looks for hidden, but potentially useful and complementary models, "I'm constantly reviewing business models of other entities, trying to see how their business model can be twisted to do something for us. … How could you take … the principles of Subway and deploy them in clinic work in Congo" (Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012).

Current practice 2: Value all involved. Historically, development organizations working in the developing world have come to the situation with some degree of arrogance coupled with a sense of obligation. They didn't see the full value of the people they were working to aid. The subject interviewed suggests that in order to effectively aid others, the reverse needs to be true.

He suggests not just seeing those being helped as equals, but rather that all human beings involved in your organization or being helped by your organization should be treated with reverence. As well, they should be included in the processes the organization is working on so that they are controlling their own path to a better future. This necessitates reframing of how developing world populations are seen: one must go from seeing them as people who need aid and have trouble helping themselves, to a group of individuals who can add tremendous value to their situation. This changing of views doesn't alter some basic tenants of aid in the developing world; a well must still be dug where it is needed. But, owning this mentality as an organization creates a more positive view that sets the stage for positive engagement and incorporation of efforts with the population being served. In turn, the population served will be more prone to carry out a sense of agency in line with their needs.

The subject, in the following quote, points out that this creates another level of how people are seen in the areas they are working, beyond just a group of people who need a service provided them that had not been provided before:

> We're just saying that old school delivery of social service is just not enough anymore. Digging [them] a well is just not enough anymore. You have to build them a well. But, we just reconceived of the value [of individuals, of end beneficiaries]. (Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012)

A well may need to be dug, but for whom? And, if the people the well is being dug for are seen as sacred and necessarily involved, how would the project have been done differently? The project may have included more people in the planning because as they were seen to matter, to be valued. With the involvement of the additional planners, the well may have been dug in a different place so that it gave more value to the community. By reconceiving value he means seeing others with reverence and respect.

With the addition of this level of value towards end beneficiaries, the view of the work done by the organization changes. This was done in the subject's organization by learning to view others differently. The subject claims that this new view changes how the organization does things. An organization that takes on this sense of reverence in regards to all individuals worked for may see things as

> …a bit more beautiful, and a bit more thoughtful, and a bit more reverential, if you're dealing with human beings lives, you move into the cathedral category. You make it stain glassed. You don't just build a roof. You paint it this amazing way. You don't just create the minimum, you make it expansive. (Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012)

Moving from arrogance to a sense of reverence allows an organization to see others and then engage others differently. The higher level of engagement can lead to a higher value of outcomes in the work done.

In the case of Somalia, the organization has worked hard to reframe how the local (Twin City region) Somali population is seen. Further, they were made a partner in aiding the Somali population in East Africa.

> So, for example … we're helping the Somali community here [change] the narrative in the U.S. about being Somali. Where everyone thinks of Terrorists and pirates… we're showing a whole different view. It's not full of images that normally instill great fear in Americans done in a way that's just so nice. … We turned around and said, 'Why don't you reframe this, what if they are actually an

> amazing group of people that tend to trust and to give and what if they are actually the greatest asset that Somalia has. … It has worked. And, it has been 100% true. We don't know this other group that people talk about all the time. People we know are dynamic, entrepreneurial, giving, \$110 million they gave back to their country last year. … All we did was just reframe the problem, look at a new perspective. (Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012)

Current practice 3: Create opportunities for involvement. This practice has to do with how donors and volunteers are viewed in the organization. The change is from a more historical volunteer role where they are expected them to fall in line with the identity of the organization as relative outsiders. The new role is of volunteers is to them to contribute their own ideas to the organization as an integral part of it. This is implemented by keeping paths open to allow anyone who would like the ability to contribute ideas to the organization. This allows people to be engaged and part of a solution where they can feel connected to others looking for solutions to the same issues. This is a paradigm shift for nonprofits working to engage volunteers. In the past, nonprofits have volunteers engage in a specific way or to a specific, prescribed goal. The shift, here, is towards making one's own organization inviting to outsiders who are ready to be engaged in a creative or new manner that they have come up with to advance the goals of the nonprofit. Volunteers, hopefully, may come to see the organization that helps them create their solution.

This is implemented at the organization by ensuring doors are kept open for everyone with an idea of how any situation the organization is or could be involved with could be improved.

> Anyone that rings up and wants to meet with me meets with me within two

> weeks.... I'm eagerly sitting there, waiting for people to walk in.... So, what we talk about here is it's no longer about windows it's about doorways. Everyone can contribute, wants to contribute. Rather than telling them what they can give or what they can't give.... My door is the closest staff person to the reception and the lift for this specific strategic purpose.... This notion that people matter and that I can contribute and that there is a community of people and feel like me and actually resonate with me and will actually then multiply my world to make what I think even more powerful and linked and actually richer. (Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012)

The organization of the case study leader has an ongoing initiative in Somalia. This came about because the local Somali community approached the case study leader's organization. It was ideas developed from the local Somali community that led to his organization founding a large Somali initiative. The case study organization provided the structure, resources, and complimentary connections to the ideas, initiative, and connections these Somalis could offer the situation.

Working in conjunction with the Somali community gave the Somalis what they wanted and helped the subject's organization create a new initiative. Inviting this community into the nonprofit allowed the nonprofit to expand on its mission. Being ready and open to working with others in this way could help nonprofits expand their missions in unexpected ways.

Current practice 4: Incorporate strengths. Find ways to bring together the strengths of a variety of individuals to work in close connection and for the good of an initiative led by the nonprofit. Incorporating different ways of encouraging and rewarding people's efforts is important. But the practice does not end there, it also attempts to empower volunteers to make an impact any way they can, whether that is through a popular artist or a child's poem. The case study organization will be the conduit to making their efforts matter to the situation

In our interview, the case study leader pointed out how the internet could be seen as an analogy for how a nonprofit makes connections between people and ideas. Specifically, the idea of social networking was used. The case study leader suggested a nonprofit could work to make connections between individuals who have similar interests in helping a part of the world that needs them. Their ideas can be scaled up through the nonprofit's capabilities and resources. The nonprofit becomes the facilitator and connector for peoples' abilities to help each other and initiatives of their choosing.

A solution may have many parts and those parts may not be predictable. The case study leader suggests that a nonprofit such as his can create a framework through which individuals can apply their talents in many ways. The nonprofit organization makes itself the conduit connecting individuals' talents to the world's crisis or development situations.

Following the analogy of social networking and the internet, the nonprofit becomes the framework and structure while volunteers become the content providers. The nonprofit takes the place of a "social networking website" where people interact. The organization maintains the structure to encourage interactions. Resources (including their staff, use of the real internet) are employed to make sure that the right ideas and people get connected. The content that populates this structure comes next.

> A variety of people become connected through the organization, people with a broad array of ideas and backgrounds who find common cause amidst one or more of the causes of the nonprofit. With the nonprofit insuring they are connected, they can band around

> and idea and do their best to come up with solutions and ways to fundraise for those solutions. Their ideas on solutions and fundraising become the content. (Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012)

While the more traditional model of nonprofits had struggled to come up with the solutions on their own before working to sell the idea to funders, the case study organization is working to focus on creating a catalyst structure. Within that structure, new ideas and initiatives from a variety of individuals may come to fruition. The nonprofit can help facilitate collaboration between even disparate ideas or distant individuals that would like to work on a project without knowing how to apply themselves.

They work to allow a sort of crowd sourcing; using the framework of their staff connectors, their network, and their know-how to add to the idea after having brought the idea in from outside their organization. Volunteers are, pursuing the analogy of social networking, the content creators on the network. They put to use the structure that a nonprofit can provide. The role of the nonprofit is to be ready for and capable of facilitating the content.

Nonprofits often operate on tight resource margins, giving them the capacity to only do so much, "You can only put so much time onto constantly updating your content" (Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012), but that can be altered with this different framework. Volunteers from the world at large, however, may have an endless stream of energy and ideas. These volunteers may be able to use the nonprofit's resources to bring their energies to bear on a particular social issue. A savvy nonprofit may help provide the structure, connections, and resources to should they be inviting of and ready to harness volunteer passions. In creating and maintaining a framework that can incorporate ideas of others—a valued volunteer using the framework provided can be readily engaged in the larger effort the structure created by the organization is aimed at. Once engaged, their valuable ideas and efforts can be cultivated and brought to fruition.

This practice correlates to the previous one. Once opportunities for involvement (practice three) are opened up, incorporates strengths (this section's practice) then these new initiatives can synergistically combine the resources available through the organization. That is what this practice builds on. The Twin Cities Somali groups that had approached the subject's organization about getting involved are one example of "content": talent and energies that the organization is ready to incorporate into its structure to help them be a catalyst for good ideas that impact situations in the world positively.

> An added bonus is [that] the framework can be maintained so as to insure those adding value, content, in the framework interact, focus, and motivate one another. Everyone can get involved in building content. And, then that *stuff* then leads to *interactions*. And, that they are actually the key to scale is to give them the ability to generate content themselves and then to create activity rather than content as a viral character that brings more and more people into your network. (Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012)

The nonprofit, ready to provide a structure for volunteer energies and ideas, can also act as the connector. Individuals with similar may benefit from working together. They can share details about ideas that help boost one another's initiatives. Ideas with complementary components may find one another through the nonprofit which may become the focal point of these ideas—the person who wants to help dig water wells finds the person who has experience finding water in an area because the organization had the resources and insight to find these individuals and get them talking. This level of engagement, the subject argues, is far more gratifying than merely donating money. Together all these points can be empowering to donors and volunteers.

Current practice 5: Designing great plans. Take advantage of well thought through plans that incorporate the needs of the end beneficiaries and explain things well to all involved along the way. Well designed plans can pay off in a number of ways; Even sell themselves to potential collaborators and donors. To do so, they need to be streamlined and intuitive. Yet, they need to incorporate the viewpoints of a variety of those investing efforts in the endeavor. The plan will sell the idea and intent of an objective or strategy.

When a plan is designed well it uses "processes around empathy, insight, ideation, and prototyping," (Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012) so that the plan will resonate with donors, implementers, and volunteers. When a project plan can be shown to have necessary and relevant thought and detail the plan will sell itself. The case study organization once developed a plan with the intent of bringing it to leaders of an expatriate East African community in England, to sell the idea to them.

A project plan was created with the intent of being designed well for all those involved. While presenting the plan "we can show them the product, and they look up at us: tears in their eyes. All of them…we're on board [in] ten minutes." (Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012). In this case, the target audience's reaction shows how well designed the plan was, in tune and meaningful to the audience as well. The plan was intuitive, relevant, understandable, comprehensive, and helpful for recruiting individuals who needed to be brought on board.

Current practice 6: Use market forces. Create systems that give beneficiaries choice in the services they use. The world works on the economic principles of choice and supply and demand. Creating a service without options would not be as useful as creating one that allows people options. Put resources and choices in the hands of those rebuilding their lives rather than rationing out limited options. "When you look at using market forces, we're driving that right now. We're engaging in entrepreneurial responses," (Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012) states the subject. A mix of traditional non-profit ideals with for-profit consumer driven approaches will help people to get services they need. For example, a nonprofit can help insure women get lower cost health care by providing a voucher that the women can use at any of a variety of clinics. The voucher lowers the cost, allowing the women to have better access to health care but the choice to go to whatever clinics fits their particular needs.

The case study leader's organization looks to local services for women in the Congo. Insurance cards, vouchers, were created for them to use at local clinics. The women were able to choose what clinic they go to, what services and location best suited them. A system was set up where the women could choose amidst pre existing and new options, allowing market forces to work. Recipients of the vouchers could then more readily get what they needed out of the situation. Local businesses then competed to provide services to match the medical needs of the women. The natural forces of the market helped insure the women got a higher quality of needed services.

Current practice 7: Co-creation.

Seek partnerships that can complement the knowledge and capability of the organization in order to find new and inventive ways of building capacity at the program or organizational level. Other nonprofits often were not considered by the case study organization. They did not fit this notion because they offered few new or complementary aspects; They are too close in practice to the original organization.

That leaves many types of organizations where integrating efforts together with them, probably on a program level, can lead the case study organization to innovative ways of doing things. Generally speaking, organizations with complementary practices and complementary knowledge are what are sought out.

> We actually don't try to network across nonprofits. We think nonprofits are as boring as can be. What I don't know is how does a design agency look at this; How does an environmental group look? Now, that's a nonprofit I'd make an in with… completely out of my space. Our view is that you need to get different heads in the room who have shared value and then you co-create together, complementarily. Or, even, we would like the *craziest* things [where] you can't even see a connection, but they have shared values. The key is shared values. (Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012)

The one thing that is needed to make the relationship work between two organizations is shared values and similar goals.

Often, organizations look so different that connections aren't immediately visible. Even so, finding a reason to work together can lead to the sharing of talents and ideas later on. And, that is expected. The case study leader points out that as organizations begin to work together; You wait for something amazing to happen. He suggests there are lots of co-creation possibilities which is lead to things that are innovative and beyond the norm.

The following story exemplifies what the case study leader's organization comes to expect from itself and its work with other organizations. The case study leader talked about a Disney movie in order to illustrate this point. In the story Mr. Incredible, a superman-like character that happens to lives in a suburban environment, neighbors and all. Something he does shows the high degree of expectation in what is to come out of collaborative environments:

> *The Incredibles*? There is a scene in the movie where the guy comes home and he crunches his car and looks back and there is a little kid on a tricycle who looks up at him. ... And, then, later on in movie he pulls up in his car again and the little kid is sitting there.... And, Mr. Incredible says, 'Why are you here?' ... And, the little kid says, 'I don't know, I'm just waiting for something amazing to happen.' That's our sort of approach with this co-creation. When we get a different view on the ruined car, like waiting for something amazing to happen, yeah? When we got the Somali community together, we're like him, waiting for something amazing to happen. (Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012)

Current practice 8: Moral compass. Create a moral compass in the organization and expectations so that organizational choices and solutions to challenges will be consistent with those standards. It is important that staff members, and the organization as a whole, stay on track. It is important to realize the significance of keeping a balanced approach in the nonprofit sector.

> The currency of a nonprofit in many ways lies in its reputation. People see the outputs of your programs and projects as well as how you work to attain these outputs. Others in and out of the country will judge what you attain and how you attain it. Being viewed in this fishbowl-situation affects how volunteers, donors, governments see you, cooperate with you, and decide to work with you. "I think moral compass is important because I believe that's the space we live in. That's our marketplace." (Case Study Leader,

personal communication, June, 2012)

These views on the moral compass leadership practice can also encapsulate how others are engaged with on an individual, less systemic level. Values lined up in efforts to help others can have a powerful impact on organizations and the individuals that make them up. Aside from the value of an organization's reputation, the subject refers to other rewards of this being mindful of the organizations moral compass:

> I believe that the greatest aspiration of every human being is to give. That's actually the full expression of humanness, is the act of giving. You give because it's wonderful to give. And, what greater thing could you do in your life than actually make a difference in someone else's life. And, the amazing thing about the universe is that if you do that, actually you'll find your life amazingly better off. And, this is what it is to be a human being anyway. And, that's, you know, true that. (Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012)

Matching the moral compass and other organizational values with the values of individuals involved with the organization can be useful. It helps potential volunteers and donors to fully engage with the organization because they become invested after understanding the overlap between the organizations values and their own. Engaging positively through the organization can be transformative, and its effects are applied in goals, objectives, and daily operations. positive effects can reverberate throughout organizations.

Current practice 9: Remove staff hurdles.

Insure staff members are able to follow through by giving them clear expectations for their work. These expectations should be given to them ahead of time. Further, management should see that part of their job is doing away with hurdles, intentional and unintentional. Hurdles are part of the organization's structure and get in the way of employees doing their job well. Management should make sure employees have the resources they need to do the job remove any dysfunction in the organization.

Some organizations look only to effectiveness in their managers and allow bad bosses as long as they are. In the interviewed subject's organization, managers are expected to be to both be effective in their work and personable. Their interactions with personnel are expected to reflect the values of the organization. Managers are expected to treat others well.

> Make sure everybody's pretty clear about what you expect from them. Make sure they have the basic resources to do it. And, remove all the dysfunctions that make life crazy for people. And, nonprofits, and public companies, and government probably are the three worst at just having deep and profound dysfunctions that are terribly frustrating to people. But, in nonprofits, it is sometimes very hard to see that connection. And, so we allow dysfunction a lot longer than we should. (Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012)

Discussion

This section compares observations of the in depth case study and the findings of Crutchfield and McLeod Grant. As well, comparisons are made with other points of the literature review. Three general themes emerge as consistent between the literature review and the in-depth case study. Finally, the limitations of the research will be discussed.

Observations

In both the literature review and the in depth case study, several similarities can be found. Notably, there are three patterns that emerge. The following three leadership practices amount to primary themes identified in the literature review and in the in-depth case study: 1) Systems for engaging others, 2) Long term leadership practices, and 3) Creative collaboration.

Theme 1: Systems for engaging others. Several of the practices show how sharing efforts, incorporating ideas, and working with others are important practices. This could happen at all levels of organizational work. Each additional level helps create or strengthen an organizational culture inviting of the type of ideas that increase understanding of and commitment to goals.

Allowing for the sharing of ideas may have an additional benefit of project buy in by individuals invited to be involved. As ideas are shared and worked into a plan, a foundation for a culture of collaboration is built. The weaving of these various levels can leave the project stronger than it would be otherwise.

Once organizations align their knowledge, contacts, and processes they can become a catalyst for new efforts. This is an important part of making the efforts of others a part of their organization's efforts. It expands the base of volunteers that feel like a part of the organization. The organization can focus on taking these new ideas and connections and adding their own organizational resources and connections in order to bring ideas to fruition. Also, adapting the ideas of a variety of individuals helps the organization stay flexible and open to new ideas.

Theme 2: Long term leadership practices. Many organizations are focused on making measurable, viewable changes in the short term that can be easily seen by stakeholders and investors of any sort. The case study leader discussed how it is important to generate input from the community, often and over time, without an immediate output.

This has to do with organizational development: a continuous emphasis on developing relationships, new and old, in the community, and being on the watch for new ideas, big and small, that could be developed into a process or strategy for helping others. The organization made investing in the future a constant focus. It was always on the lookout for input from others and always worked to be flexible in making changes to incorporate new ideas.

Theme 3: Creative collaboration. Several of the leadership practices show how sharing efforts, incorporating ideas, and working with others are important practices. This can be seen at a variety of levels, from working with foreign organizations, to working with the individuals being aided abroad, to being inviting of neighbors near an organization's stateside home base. In order to increase organizational capacity it is often important to seek partners that have organizational specialties different from your own.

Some of the leadership practices investigated show how the organization in the case study is constantly looking for new contributions. The case study organization, for example, sees any contribution, idea, effort, donation, or material support, as important. They work hard to keep their doors open to people with skills of any level, and ideas they would like to share. Executives make a commitment to meet with anyone who asks within two weeks.

Some of the language used by the case study leader expressed a viewpoint intentionally different from historical views of the intended beneficiaries of aid organizations. They avoided historical language along the lines of being paternal and how the less fortunate need aid and to be built in the aid giver's image. The language often used by the case study leader is oriented toward seeing the potential in everyone, and in seeing the end beneficiaries, those who may benefit from his organization's mission, as full and equal partners in the process.

The case study leader explained how the thoughts and opinions of the end beneficiaries would be incorporated from the beginning. The way he did so was important. It was that the language used to represent these individuals was intended to give a sense of reverence to all involved—ensuring the importance of all stakeholders in a situation, especially including the end beneficiaries. .

The language is useful in reframing how the beneficiaries are viewed as not merely benefitting from the work of a nonprofit, but can also be seen as valued, active, self-advocating participants. When seen this way, they can add value to the whole chain of events that may be a nonprofit's work that affects them, guiding the process to be more relevant, more long lasting, and more integral into their live of the end beneficiaries. The attention to language helps secure a paradigm change which helps to prioritize all points of view in a situation. The emphasis on language may counterbalance engrained paternalistic models with an authoritative, top down style that have been part of nonprofit development work in the past (Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012).

The three leadership practices listed above methodically build on how people work in the organization and how people are invested in the organization. Consistently matching expectations set up by an organization's mission, along with gaining, building, and empowering teams is an important investment. These investments reflect back to Table 10, the synthesis of the literature review. The leadership practices of the case study leader take into account investing in people, insuring a high level of quality in the organization, and creating innovative, workable solutions. These are forward looking practices that increase the capacity and insure a quality organization. A list of them can be found in Comparison to the Literature Review, Table 13.

Consistencies

There are several areas of agreement between the results of the interview and the synthesized results of the literature review.

Removing barriers to staff. Staff will be effective if they are able to do their job. Many barriers can impede their progress; Gaps in training, access, and ability to make decisions could slow progress of intended work outcomes. An effect of training gaps can lead to a slower pace. A spiraling inefficiency can fester if tasks dependent on other tasks are not completed in a timely manner. This can have a negative effect on the morale of employees and beneficiaries.

This resembles the "shared leadership" aspect in Collins (2001) where leadership is less consolidated in one individual. This allows for others to make decisions in alignment with the organization. Decision making is more efficient when every decision made does not have to be reviewed by a single figure. This barrier may be most important in organizations removed from the location where help is needed. They require assistance from elements of their own organization that works closely with locals and therefore have the information on hand to make decisions in a timely manner.

Despite modern communications, the need to make important, on the ground decisions to drive results may be difficult at times. It is the on the ground staff that is in position to communicate with key leaders or government officials in the region. Communication between these groups can lead to faster decisions that line up with the mission being carried out more readily. Employees who are in the field can potentially be in an advantageous position to make decisions on behalf of the organization. Yet, they need to know that they are empowered to do so.

Use market forces. Using the economic forces in a region can be a powerful tool in two ways. Using these forces can take the form of giving impoverished people the ability to choose how their needs are met through the market place. An organization can also use economic forces selling goods or services for to add a profit engine to their work.

To illustrate the first point, recall the previous example of clinic vouchers given to individuals for their medical needs. The system allowed beneficiaries to choose a clinic based on their needs; the distance, travel, and quality of the clinic. This allows for previously existing clinics to compete to take care of the needs of the beneficiaries as well as giving beneficiaries the added choice. This is opposed to working against market forces where the local medical industry could be undermined by newer non-domestically funded efforts.

A second way to take advantage of market forces is to create self-sufficiency by encouraging the creation of goods and services that can be sold locally. Advantages include giving some level of self sufficiency in funding local programs. It may also provide some level of income for those involved–boosting the economic outlook of some individuals. This builds the self-sufficiency of individuals aided by this sort of organization. An additional effect may be a measurable boost to the local economy.

An example of this second way would be to encourage groups of impoverished individuals to start a business together. Their selling of wares may help them gain some economic viability by having a new, personal, income stream. Further, should the creation of what they sell or where they sell it be a building provided to them by a nonprofit, their renting the space used would lessen overall program costs to that nonprofit.

Educate donors and volunteers. Leaders need to ensure that donors and volunteers have the knowledge necessary to do their job. An important part of both the outcomes of the literature review was an alignment of program intentions with the financial inputs into the organization. An effective practice is to educate donors to ensure they understand the intent of the organization and a particular mission and how they can render support.

Ensuring donors and volunteers are educated on the necessary points can work against the tendency of supporters to create their own emphases that may divert resources from the intended mission of the organization or any specific project being done. This tendency may cause divergence from the intended mission, the one that the end beneficiaries had given input on, or may impose a burden of dealing with side projects alongside original intents.

The initial intent of the mission can therefore be slowed, diverted, watered down, or even jeopardized. The expectations of end beneficiaries and other stakeholders may become misaligned with the initial mission focus. When there is alignment, donors understanding how their efforts can support current ideas.

Similarities and Differences

Leadership Practices from the Literature Review when compared to the outcomes of the Leader interview show a good deal of overlap. More or less overlap could be seen depending on the interpretation of an organization's practices and how they are worded. Following are several bullet lists preceded by an explanation, all in relation to the information found in the aforementioned Table 13.

Strong associations. First is a list of strong associations between what was found in the literature and what was categorized from the interview with the case study leader. Here are three strong associations:

- Removing Staff Barriers
- Use Market Forces
- Educate Donors and Volunteers

Weak associations. From the information from the literature review in comparison to the case study, there can also be found sets of leadership practices with weak associations. These sets of practices showed a less definite link:

- The Engaging Mission and Alignment with Vision
- Designing Great Plans
- Co-Creation and Network Throughout Various Levels

No associations, from the case study. Interpretations may vary. But, the investigator saw no association from these points of the case study in the literature review:

- New Models and Ideas
- Create Opportunities for Involvement
- Value Individuals Highly
- Incorporate Strengths
- Creating Personal Connections
- Moral Compass

No associations, from the literature review summary. These practices from the literature review showed no association with what was found in the case study:

- Network Through Various Levels
- Mindful, Holistic Thinking of Effects and Outcomes

- Emphasize Mission with Program Beneficiaries

Explanation. With further comparison, more practices could be found to show no association or an arguably small amount of association. This shows that there will be no absolutes in shared behaviors leading to the success of organizations, only tendencies. Many organizations that share the same practices may prove successful. At the same time, different organizations take on different practices and apply them in unique ways. Similar practices may be given different terminology, or similarly worded practices may have a radically different interpretation in two different organizations. The prominence of one practice relative to another would depend on interpretation within a given methodology.

Different leadership practices can lead to success within different organizations. The varieties of practices need to match a specific organization's culture and situation. It is important for organizations to have a consciousness and intentionality about what leadership practices are put into effect in their organization. Being intentional about these practices may also lead them to seek out what best practices are seen to exist in their field. Being intentional about leadership practices can also lead organizations to best work out which they should prioritize, and what practices may best synergize with another, in order to maximize the return on investment. The strong associations are clearly present in both the literature review summary, and the case study, and are shown above. Weak associations show a less prominent link between leadership practices found in the literature review summary and the case study. Would there have been the capacity to do more interviews, to create more case studies, more connections may be seen.

Conclusions

Working to readily integrate volunteers into an organization's effort may not be an entirely new concept. However, the case study leader's organization works to find innovative ways to do this. This finding enterprising ways to support those offering ideas, efforts, donations, or materials on the behalf of others by using an organization as a conduit for volunteer efforts may be a glimpse into the future for some nonprofit organizations, international or otherwise.

This emphasis on integration of volunteer efforts was a consistent theme the case study organization benefitted from. The importance they gave to this and their implementation strategy differentiated this case study organization leadership practice from similar practices found in the literature review.

Although other organizations work to incorporate volunteer efforts, how this leadership practice was emphasized by the case study organization made it unique relative to the organizations in the literature review. The organization works to have an appropriate structure in place to bring these various contributions to where they will be useful in advancing an accepted mission. It shows how the organization strives to involve itself in continually renewing its efforts to discover what is practical and effective, yet future oriented.

A common theme in the leadership practices throughout the literature review and the case study interview is the giving of high importance to the creation of the best possible structures in organizations, structure that works to utilize contributions of others or of the organization's own capacity to fruition. Leadership practices of this sort work to gradually gain capacity an organization. The creative application of this idea that will be interesting to see in the future leadership practices of international nonprofits.

Limitations of the current research. The case study leader's organization is probably unique in many ways and may be an outlier in some aspects. The intention was to find an organization that was a good representative of a high impact organization in the internationally focused nonprofit industry, And, that it would therefore be good at fulfilling their mission as defined in the beginning of this study. To make this happen, a peer nomination process was used. The use of a peer nomination process was put into place to help increase the validity of the study. The peer nominators' picks showed a clear consensus. This consensus increased the odds that the organization studied represents a successful nonprofit organization. This process helped insure a leader of a successful nonprofit was found. Practices found within that organization, then, are more apt to be valid.

There are limitations to qualitative research in intensive case studies such as this. These general limitations may include the following points:

- Research bias is more apt to happen due to investigator point of view.
- Lack of time available to categorize voluminous amounts of details.
- Generalizations case by case can be problematic.
- Interview responses can be influenced by the interviewer.
- Creating a broad enough sample size is difficult.
- The study did not use multiple raters.
- There is less, though growing, acceptance of qualitative research.

Creating several in depth case studies for comparison was considered as an option to mitigate these issues, but increased the expense of the project and time to completion. As well, more in-depth data collection, akin to the depth and breadth of the Crutchfield and McLeod Grant study, was beyond the resource capability of this study. A specific difficulty would be the time needed to find organizations that use comparatively similar leadership practices to make a comparison of their outputs.

Further Discussion. Using peer nominators with knowledge of the international nonprofit world to be the main piece of a process to deduce which organization would become the case study organization increased the validity of this study. Also, comparing and integrating data from several pieces of research literature to the in-depth case study, added validity. Similar findings between the various case studies and the interview showed agreement on the importance of those leadership practices. It was most appropriate to use a qualitative approach at early stages of research on this topic.

While a larger scale study could be idealized, it should be seen that a random assignment of a multitude of nonprofit organizations employing a variety of leadership practices against standardized outputs would not be practical or ethical. The fact that a successful non-profit leader identified many of the same or similar leadership practices gives some validity to the original Crutchfield and McLeod Grant research.

Having a second, or even multiple in depth case studies for comparison would also have added strength to the study. Further, the clarification and interpretation of the data was completed by the author. Having multiple judges would have strengthened the conclusion.

Suggestions for future research. Others can now take any results and move forward with leadership research on international non-profit organization. Showing causality between the leadership practices identified in their research and nonprofit success would require more resources to develop a large study. A larger study and perhaps even simply including a larger number of case studies would provide interesting results.

In this study, interpretation of the data was not subjected to multiple raters. Having one rater (the investigator) identify themes from the interview data has its drawbacks. Lack of resources and time prevented the use of multiple raters. In future studies, multiple raters could be used, as this would increase the value of leadership practices identified. It would also create a more robust outcome if raters with a variety of backgrounds could be included in the process. Diversifying the range of study would show interesting results. Different backgrounds that could be included are nonprofit leaders, clients, employees, and NGO sets that show a breadth of experiences. As well, comparison of aspects of for-profit leadership could help contribute to a rich understanding of leadership practices in international and domestic nonprofit organizations.

Reference List

Alvord, S. H., Brown, D. L., & Letts, C. W. (Sep, 2004). Social entrepreneurship and societal transformation: An exploratory study. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 40*(3), 260-282.

Barber, M. & Bowie, C. (Nov, 2008). How international NGOs could do less harm and more good. *Development in Practice, 18(6),* 748-754. http://www.jstor.org/stable/27751981

Collins, J. C. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap–and others don't.* New York, NY: Harper Business.

Collins, J. C. (2005). *Good to great and the social sectors: A monograph to accompany good to great.* Boulder, Colorado: J. Collins.

Crutchfield, L. R., & Grant, H. McLeod. (2008). *Forces for good : the six practices of high-impact nonprofits.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kotter, John P. (1996). *Leading Change.* New York: Harvard Business School Press.

McLeod Grant, H. & Crutchfield, L. (2007). *Creating high-impact nonprofits.* Stanford Social Innovation Review 5(4), 32-42.

Table 1

The High Impact Organizations of Crutchfield and McLeod Grant

Organization	Area of focus	How seen as impacting their area of service
America's Second Harvest	Food distribution	Distributes food to needy through a nationwide network of distributors. Increases awareness in public policy on hunger.
Center on Budget and Policy Priorities	Policy advocacy	Researches policy and uses debates (over budget and tax policies) to advocate for the needs of low income Americans.
City Year	Service work for college graduates	Encourages service, leadership, and entrepreneurship in urban communities with both a national and worldwide focus.
Environmental Defense	Environmental protection through policy	Protects the environmental rights of future generations using lasting, supported, science based solutions.
The Exploratorium	Innovative teaching museum	Creates displays that make people curious about the world around them.
Habitat for Humanity	Christian housing ministry	Eliminate homelessness by creating shelter and consciousness.
The Heritage Foundation	Conservative think tank	Formulates and promotes public policies.
National Council of La Raza	Hispanic civil rights and advocacy	Advocates improving opportunities for Hispanic Americans.
Self-Help	Direct money lending	Helps people improve their economic position; Advocates for policy changes.
Share Our Strength	Service work for skilled individuals	Professionally inspires sharing of strengths to help end hunger, prioritizing ending childhood hunger.
Teach for America	Teaching placement for college graduates	Recent college graduates commit two years to teach in urban and rural public schools. Places college grads in hard to fill teaching positions.
YouthBuild USA	Youth community building initiatives	Coordinates low-income young adults eliminate poverty by rebuilding communities with others.

(Crutchfield & McLeod Grant, 2008, pp. 254-28)

Table 2

Leadership Practices of Crutchfield and McLeod Grant

#	Practice title	Leadership practice explained
1	Advocate and Serve	Organizations gain energy and insight by combining both advocacy and services to their end-customers, but also to advocate for those individuals.
2	Make Markets Work	Take advantage of market forces either by: (a) adding services that can be charged for and still aid the mission while decreasing dependence on traditional charity or (b) creating partnerships where a business use the nonprofits knowledge or service to increase its profit.
3	Inspire Evangelists	Perpetuate a support network of volunteers and donors to take up their cause.
4	Nurture Nonprofit Networks	Create networks of nonprofit organizations to support, not compete, with each other.
5	Master the Art of Adaptation	Be flexible in accordance to the needs of the situation.
6	Share Leadership	Allow a distribution of leadership opportunities throughout a nonprofit's membership.

(Crutchfield & McLeod Grant, 2008)

Table 3

Organizations Observed by Alvord, Brown, and Letts

Organization	Area of focus	How seen as impacting their area of service
Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC)	Rural development and poverty alleviation	• Maintains systematic approaches in education, health services, and microcredit. • Changed attitudes towards women and oppressed groups. • Has worked in 60,000 villages.
The Grameen Bank (Grameen)	Microcredit for poor women	• Gives microloans where small groups provide guarantees instead of collateral. • Gives economic empowerment of women in return. • Millions of small scale borrowers through the world.
The Green Belt Movement (Green Belt)	Environmental protection movements in Africa	• Raises environmental consciousness through education and discourse. • Mobilizes grassroots efforts and creates awareness and focusing on social, economic, political justice, and environmental issues.
The Highlander Research Education Center (Highlander)	Advocate of democratic participation	• Supports grassroots organizations worldwide. • Involved in eliminating poverty and promoting democracy through research and adult education. • Encourages problem solving at a local level.
Plan Puebla (Puebla)	Supports small farmers	• Focuses on need of tens of thousands of small scale subsistence farmers. • Starting in Mexico and adopted as part of Mexican government programs as well extending work into South America.

The Self-Employed Women's Association (SEWA)	Supports labor and women's organizations	• Creates unions of informal sector workers worldwide. • Has helped 315,000 women become union members. • Provides training and research for members as well as services (like banking) that would be otherwise unavailable.
Se Servit de la Saison Seche en Savane et au Sahel (Six-S)	Develops villages in west of Africa	• Village elders approve projects after first developing capacity for money and management for local projects. • Aids in networking and effective use of resources.

(Alvord, Brown, and Letts, 2002, pp. 6-8)

Table 4

Leadership Practices of Alvord, Brown, and Letts

#	Leadership practice	Explanation by category
1	Integrate a pattern of innovation	Take on a strategy that is effective and original in its application—a tool or process to distribute ideas or materials, build capacity of the aided population, or build local people movements that address issues with those in power.
2	Mobilize existing assets of marginalized groups	Involve innovations that mobilize existing assets of marginalized groups to improve lives.
3	Emphasize continuous learning	Initiatives emphasize systematic learning by individuals and by the organization, if they operate on a large scale.
4	Bridging diverse stakeholders	Have founding leaders should have a capacity to work with and build bridges among very diverse stakeholders.
5	Long-term adaptive capacity	Have leadership that is characterized as having long-term commitment to the initiative and capacity to catalyze adaptation to emerging contextual challenges.
6	Operational Organization	Expand operations through organizational growth such as program coverage, organizing alliances with clients, or giving technical assistance to other organizations while investing in staffing and staff development to match the growth.
7	External Relations Prioritized	Have an external relations style corresponding to the form of social entrepreneurship taken.
8	Scaling Up Strategy	Have strategies for scaling up corresponding to the form of social entrepreneurship taken.
9	Transformation Leverage	Have a focus on social transformation leverage and impact corresponding to the form of social entrepreneurship taken.

(Alvord, Brown, and Letts, 2002, pp. 10-21)

Table 5

The Six Leadership Practices of Barber and Bowie

#	Leadership Practice	Explanation
1	Good donorship	• Educate those funding the international nonprofit on best practices to ensure financial support and oversight that do less harm and more good.
2	Working together	• Seek partnership with government of nation worked in through association of international nonprofits. • Incorporate development of others' including that of the United Nations development efforts. • Aid government entities to develop useful legislation.
3	Be predictable with activities	• Keep funding levels predictable in order to avoid disruption of operations by having board members with direct communication access to donors.
4	Paying national staff	• Continually train nationals to do their job as adopting salary standards for workers trained to do their jobs as set by international nonprofits with United Nation guidelines. • Deal with negotiation of salaries between international entities including the U.N. and unrealistic salaries related to any government cronyism.
5	Building national capacity	• While many international nonprofits have goals of setting up then integrating a service into a country they work in, few achieve this goal. • Commissions should be created to better empower people in areas worked in.
6	Donor visits and reports	• Types of "aid tourism" should be viewed with caution. • Donor visits should be regulated and they should be sure they are not incurring an extra burden on the international nonprofit or their community with their touring and reporting requirements.

(Barber and Bowie, 2008)

Table 6

Good and Great Company Comparisons of Collins

Great company	Industry of great company	Comparison good companies
Abbot	Medical products	Upjohn
Circuit City	Retail specialty	Silo
Fannie Mae	Savings and Loan	Great Western
Gillette	Cosmetics	Warner-Lambert
Kimberly Clark	Household products	Scott Paper
Kroger	Retail food chains	A&P
Nucor	Steel	Bethlehem Steel
Phillip Morris	Tobacco	R. J. Reynolds
Pitney Bowes	Computer systems	Addressograph
Walgreens	Retail drugstores	Eckerd
Wells Fargo	Regional banking	Bank of America

(Collins, 2001)

Table 7

Collins' Eight Leadership Practices for the Business Sector

#	Leadership practice	Explanation
1	Level Five Leadership	Leaders have a great dedication to their organization and energy for the organization's mission. While ambitious when it comes to their organization, they are humble themselves.
2	First Who Then What	A prioritization of getting motivated, high quality people to work with first and foremost.
3	Confront The Brutal Facts	Keep the faith in overcoming adversity while being pragmatic about the reality of the situation to be faced along the way.
4	The Hedgehog Concept	Guide key decisions with a framework of what the organization is best at, passionate about, and what drives the resource (economic) engine.
5	A Culture of Discipline	Have people be free to work within a framework in a disciplined way, guided by their responsibilities.
6	The Flywheel	Keep relentlessly focused on the small decisions and works that gradually build up momentum.
7	Clock Building, Not Time Telling	Organize within the business to create momentum and stimulate progress; Do not depend on leadership charisma.
8	Preserve the Core and Stimulate Progress	Have a set of timeless core values with a core reason for being. At the same time, have a relentless drive for change and progress that includes audacious goals.

(Collins, 2001)

Table 8

Collins' Five Leadership Practices for the Social Sector

#	Leadership Practice	Explanation
1	Defining "Great"	Organizations gain energy and insight by combining both advocacy and services to their end-customers, but also to advocate for those individuals.
2	Level Five Leadership	Getting things done within a diffuse power structure.
3	First Who, then What	Getting the right people on the bus within social sector constraints.
4	The Hedgehog Concept	Rethinking the Economic Engine without a Profit Motive.
5	Turning the Flywheel	Building Momentum by Building the Brand.

(Collins, 2005)

Table 9

The Eight Leadership Practices of Kotter for Change in Organizations

#	Leadership practice	Explanation
1	Establish a sense of urgency	• Be pragmatic in understanding impending potential crises as well as opportunities and the realities of the market worked in.
2	Creating the guiding coalition	• Assemble a team that owns the potential and the authority to make envisioned change take place. • Encourage the team to work together.
3	Developing a vision and strategy	• Insure there is a shared vision to direct the effort. • Develop strategies to achieve that vision.
4	Communicating the change vision	• Use a variety of ways to portray the vision to other aspects of the company. • Use example of a guiding coalition to show new ways of doing things.
5	Empowering employees for broad-based action	• Empower individuals in the organization to work towards the envisioned change. • Encourage innovation and new ideas that aid the vision. • Remove obstacles to the vision.
6	Generating short-term wins	• Plan and create visible short term gains toward vision. • Reward individuals who are key players in these gains.
7	Consolidating gains and producing more change	• Piece together improvements as they are made. • Push for more changes using built up credibility to change systems, structures, and policies. • Hire and develop personnel that can implement the vision. • Keep the project reinvigorated with new projects and agents of change.
8	Anchoring new approaches in the culture	• Institutionalize new ways of thinking in the organization. • Show connection between new behaviors and success of the organization.

(Kotter, 1996)

Table 10

Overview and Overlapping Leadership Practices

#	Leadership practice	Crutchfield & McLeod Grant	Alvord Brown & Letts	Barber & Bowie	Collin s	Kotter
1	Create and follow through of mission and vision (an internal practice).		•		•	•
2	Emphasize mission with program beneficiaries (a more external practice).		•	•	•	
3	Possess the necessary knowledge, skills, and empowerment to do the job (a more internal practice).	•	•	•	•	•
4	Emphasize knowledge and skill building with donors and volunteers (an external practice).	•	•	•	•	
5	Use economic forces to create self-sufficiency or partnerships.	•			•	
6	Network throughout various levels.	•	•	•		
7	Think in mindful, holistic way in how the inputs, including expansion, impact outcomes	•	•	•	•	•

Note: The chart ultimately shows a synthesis of the leadership practices in the studies reviewed. Various authors' leadership practices are grouped into seven categories.

Table 11

Three Historic Leadership Practices of the Organization

#	Practice title	Leadership practice explained
1	Engaging mission	• Clear orientation to mission • Field staff create direct impact in mission areas
2	Aligning fundraising and program outcomes	• Practical outcomes lined up with expectations • In turn, provide regular income
3	Creating personal connections	• Values show through in the nature of the work • Ensures long term connections with volunteers and donors

(Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012)

Table 12

Nine Current Leadership Practices of the Organization

#	Practice title	Leadership practice explained
1	New models and ideas	• Seek out and adopt new models • Create a culture of continual adaptation
2	Value individuals highly	• Give reverence to every individual you work alongside • From the start, empower end users to create a better future
3	Create opportunities for involvement	• Volunteers can always share their ideas • Make it so volunteers can easily get involved
4	Incorporate strengths	• Incorporate ideas and efforts volunteers would like to bring to a given situation • Make it so their ideas can best help the situation
5	Designing great plans	• Make plans user friendly and easy to communicate • Ensure the plans are sensitive to the needs of end beneficiaries
6	Use market forces	• Give beneficiaries choice in the services they use • Allow choices available in the market to compete for beneficiary vouchers
7	Co-creation	• Seek complementary partnerships with other organizations • Work to complement organizational strengths
8	Moral compass	• Adhere to ethical standards • Attend to how organization is perceived by donors and partners
9	Remove staff hurdles	• Give staff clear expectations • Clear hurdles to staff success • Expectation to work well with others

(Case Study Leader, personal communication, June, 2012)

Table 13

Comparison to the Literature Review

#	Leadership practices identified in the literature review	Leadership practices identified in the case study
1	Create and follow through of mission and vision (an internal practice)	Prioritized a consistent, visible mission and vision leading to higher initiative , morale
2	Emphasize mission with program beneficiaries (a more external practice)	Benefited from aligning of mission and values
3	Possess the necessary knowledge, skills, and empowerment to do the job (a more internal practice)	Cleared obstacles from staff success
4	Emphasize knowledge and skill building with donors and volunteers (an external practice)	Be inviting to all who would like to be involved, put their strengths to use
5	Use economic forces to create self-sufficiency or partnerships	Created systems where beneficiaries have choice of best services available
6	Network throughout various levels	Co-created with complementary organizations in the field
7	Think in mindful, holistic way in how the inputs, including expansion, impact outcomes	Mind ethical standards and how outcomes would be viewed with people controlling own paths using well designed plans sensitive to all involved

Appendix A

Case Study Interview Questions

1. When you first founded or joined your organization, what was your big vision? How close to realizing that are you today?
2. What do you see as your organization's most significant *outcomes or impact?*
3. What are your goals for scaling out your impact further in the next five to ten years?
4. What would you say are the top five factors that have contributed to your organization's success at scaling out its impact to such a significant level?
5. Considering the factors that you listed above, how would you rank those factors?
6. How did your organization make key decisions around growth and scaling impact?
7. How did your organization manage the need to raise operating funds year to year while continuing to pursue your long term vision and make investments for the future?
8. Please describe an instance in which your organization tried to advance its impact but failed.
9. What would you say are the primary factors that distinguish your organization from others?
10. How would you characterize your own leadership style, and what do you see as your strengths and weaknesses, both at founding and currently (if different)?
11. Are there any questions you wished we had asked, but did not?
12. Mission, Vision, and Strategy: What does the organization do and how does it do it?
13. Mission and Vision Statements: What are they?
14. Founding History: Who started the organization and why?
15. Business Model: What is the organization's business model?

16. Strategy: How does the organization execute its strengths and weaknesses?

17. Customers/End Beneficiaries: Who is the target market the organization aims to serve?

18. Impact, Outcomes: How does the organization think about its own impact?

19. General: What is the organization's "theory of change"?

20. Measurement/Evaluation: How does the organization measure the impact it is having?

21. Organization, Structure: How is the nonprofit organized?

22. Sites/Affiliates: What is the overall size/scope of the organization?

23. Structure: What is the current organizational structure?

24. Growth: Was the original model designed "to scale" or was this an afterthought?

25. Staff/HR: How many staff work for the organization, and where are they based?

26. What are salary ranges, turnover rates, and general policies?

27. Culture: How does the organization characterize and/or manage its culture?

28. Leadership: What role has leadership played in this organization?

29. Founder/Executive: How many executives has the organization had?

30. Senior Management: What are important management positions and turnover?

31. Governance: How many board members does the organization have? What is the board's role?

32. Budget, Financing: How does the organization support its work?

33. Budget: How has the organization grown financially–inflection points?

34. Sources of Funding: How does the organization support its activities?

35. Program, Operations: What does the organization do?

36. Activities/Programs: What are the most important program areas?

37. Operations/Program: Are there any critical processes?

38. Systems/Information Technology: How deliberate is this organization about its systems and processes?
39. Marketing: To whom do they communicate? How and through what channels?
40. Media/Communications: How deliberate is the organization about its PR/ communications strategy?

(Crutchfield & McLeod Grant, 2008, pp.241-244)

Appendix B

Letter Inviting Potential Peer Nominators into Selection Process

Dear [name of potential peer nominator],

My name is Vincent Haen and I am a student at Augsburg College working on a research project to fulfill a final project requirement for a Masters in Leadership. The project I am working on is aimed at finding best organizational practices for nonprofits that are based in Minnesota that have a good deal of their work focused abroad. You were selected as a potential participant through a process peer nominations.

I would like to set up an interview with yourself or one of the top tier leaders from your organization. The interview should take approximately 45 minutes to an hour and I am happy to meet you where and when convenient.

I would set up a meeting at a time and place of mutual convenience. I can be reached at [investigator's email]. Should you prefer to contact me by phone, please call me at [investigator's phone number].

I truly appreciate your time and energy in considering my proposal. It will contribute greatly to my personal and professional development. I hope that the work will also be a beneficial contribution to your field.

I look forward to hearing from you,

Vincent Haen

Appendix C

Peer Nomination Process Letter

Dear [name of peer nominator],

My name is Vincent Haen and I am a graduate student at Augsburg College conducting a peer survey to find nonprofit organizations that are based in Minnesota but whose work emphasis is mostly abroad. I am working with Professor Joe Volker of Augsburg College as my adviser. The reason for collecting this information is to be able to interview organizations that recur on selectors' lists. Those that do will be organizations known for their success through their practices. Interviews with those organizations aid in the understanding of best overarching practices in among nonprofits known for good practices in their specific circumstances. The research will help summarize these best practices.

I hope you consider helping. The short survey follows.

Please do the following. Nominate up to seven nonprofit organizations that match the following criteria:

- Organizations known for being effective in their mission
- Organizations known for having a significant impact on their client base, and end beneficiaries, over the last 20 years.
- Organizations based in Minnesota.
- Organizations known to have at least half of their end beneficiaries living outside of the United States.
- Please exclude your own organization for the purpose of this survey.

Once you have the five to seven organizations in mind, please give each a rating, listing them in order from the most impactful on your list to the least impacting on your list. Finally, please give a short (one paragraph) explanation of why each choice made it to the list.

I would appreciate it if you could email me your list at [investigator's email]. Your thoughts, in the list, will contribute to my work and I hope that my work, in turn, will be a beneficial contribution to your field. I will email participants a copy of the results of the study.

Thanks for your time,

Vincent Haen

Appendix D

Letter Inviting Case Study Organization into Study

Dear [name of organization],

My name is Vincent Haen and I am a student at Augsburg College working on a research project to fulfill a final project requirement for a Masters in Leadership. For my final project, I intend to interview select organizations to understand specific leadership practice employed to help the organization do well with their mission.

[Your organization] was selected as a potential participant through a process peer nominations. Nominations were solicited from among Minnesota based nonprofits with an emphasis on international work.

I would like to set up an interview with yourself or one of the top tier leaders (Executive Officer, President, Chair, COO, or the like) from your organization. The interview should take approximately 45 minutes to an hour and I am happy to meet you where and when convenient.

I was hoping the recipient of this email could contact me in order to help me understand the best way to identify an individual who might be able to help with an interview. After the person to be interviewed might be identified, I would set up a meeting and at a time and place of mutual convenience.

I can be reached at [investigator's email]. Should you prefer to contact me by phone, please call me at [investigator's phone number].

I truly appreciate your time and energy. I will have a more thorough letter asking for an interview once the individual is identified. This will contribute greatly to my personal and professional development. I hope that the work will also be a beneficial contribution to your field.

Appendix E

Letter to Case Study Leader

For those reading this ahead of the interview, this interview outline is intended to be free flowing with the interviewer intuiting follow ups. The following questions are, then, starting points and should be an indicator of follow up questions there may be. The outline of the interview follows: [emphasis per original]

Thanks for agreeing to the interview. I want to talk about the leadership practices of your organization. Before we begin, for the record, have you read, understood, and signed the consent form presented to you for this study?

For each of the following questions, I would like us to consider the leadership practices rather than managerial and operations practices. As you answer the questions, please focus on the overarching leadership practices have created the direction and culture that sets the pace and direction for your organization.

1. What leadership practices contribute to the success of your success?
2. How has your focus on mission and vision helped your work in an international sphere?
    a. Has this emphasis aided in bringing together efforts outside your staff such as board members, volunteers, and beneficiaries incorporated into your efforts?
    b. How have you emphasized mission and vision of your organization to your employees? What about donors and volunteers?
3. How do you empower your staff? How has this been beneficial?
    a. How may this empowerment been done through education and professional development?
    b. How may you have incorporated this empowerment into empowering board

members, volunteers, and beneficiaries?

c. How is leadership shared within your organization?

4. Does your organization incorporate any market driven approaches?
    a. Outside of grants and donations, what are ways, if any, that your organization uses for funding?
5. How has networking with other organizations helped in your mission?
    a. Has networking with more home based organizations or with organizations in the field been more beneficial?
    b. What types of organizations do you tend to cooperate with?
6. How much does your organization look ahead to long term impacts of your efforts? How does this looking ahead affect your decision making process?
7. Besides what we have already talked about, are there other leadership practices you would highlight as being helpful useful in your organization gaining and maintain impact? (McLeod Grant & Crutchfield, 2007)

That concludes the interview. Thank you.

Appendix F

Confidentiality Agreement

You are invited to participate in a research study identifying best organizational practices for U.S. based nonprofits working abroad. You were nominated as a potential participant by peers having some basis of knowledge in the world of international nonprofits. Please read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

This study is being conducted by me, Vincent Haen, as part of my Masters in Leadership program at Augsburg College. My Adviser is Professor Joseph Volker.

Background Information:

The purpose of the study is to identify effective organizational and leadership practices that, on application, help nonprofit organizations with an international focus achieve their mission.

Procedures:

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to a 45 minute to an hour long recorded interview at a location and time convenient for you. The types of questions that will be asked will concern the best practice of your organization, such as, "What organizational practices have been implemented to create substantial and sustained results in your organization". The recording is meant to maintain accuracy of the raw data. Names of individuals and organizations will be changed to protect anonymity.

Risks and Benefits:

This study presents minimal risks. Subjects will be asked to give their judgment about management practices that have contributed to their success as an organization.

The benefit to the participants will be the sharing of practices through published research so that others in the nonprofit and non-governmental community can compare these practices against their current and other practices in hopes of more efficiently achieving their mission, whatever that may be.

Confidentiality:

The records of this study will be kept confidential. This will be done by having the primary researcher be the only one to see any raw data. Subsequent viewer, the adviser, will see data that will have the individual's and organization's names changed or removed.

Audio recordings will be made to insure accuracy of the information gathered in the interview. This and all other raw data will be kept in a locked file under my direct supervision. The recordings and other raw data (notes) will be destroyed after a federally mandated period of three years that it needs to be kept. The date of destroying or erasing this data will be January 30, 2012. If the research is terminated before completion of the project, all data and recordings will be destroyed at that time.

The results will be presented in a colloquium and a published copy of the final product will be kept at the Lindell Library at Augsburg College. Should further reports be published based on information gathered from your interview, the practice of changing organization and individual names and identifiers will continue. While I will make every effort to ensure confidentiality, anonymity cannot be guaranteed due to the small number to be studied.

Voluntary Nature of the Study:

Your decision whether to participate will not affect your current and future relations with Augsburg College, the researcher, and other cooperating institutions that will be identified through the course of the study. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships. Further, if there is a lack of comfort with any of the questions you are asked during the interview, you have the right to pass on any without penalty.

Contacts and Questions:

The researcher conducting this study is Vincent Haen. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you may contact me at [investigator's email], or my cell phone number [investigator's phone number]. My adviser is Dr. Joseph Volker. His email is [adviser's email], his office number is [adviser's phone number]. An extra copy of the consent form is included with this initial sending of this consent form.

Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information or have had it read to me. I have received answers to questions asked. I consent to participate in the study.

Signature ____ Date____________

I consent to be audio recorded:

Signature ____ Date____________

I consent to allow use of my direct quotations in the published thesis document.

Signature ____ Date____________

Signature of Investigator ______________________________ Date____________