Original Research

WALDEN UNIVERSITY

Developing Workforce Capability in Nonprofits Through Effective Leadership

Catherine Byrnes Smoyer, DBA
Walden University, Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States
  https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4089-7409

Rocky Dwyer, PhD, FCPA, FCMA
Walden University, Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States
  https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7929-976X

Janice K. Garfield, DBA
Walden University, Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States
  https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9532-4398

Brandon D. Simmons, DBA
Walden University, Minneapolis, Minnesota, United States
  https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8493-801X

Contact: rocky.dwyer@mail.waldenu.edu

Abstract

Leaders of nonprofit organizations in the United States must build workforce capabilities to meet increasing demands for services. This single-case study explored strategies nonprofit leaders used to build workforce capability to address increasing service demands. The conceptual lens for this study was the full-range leadership theory. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with senior executives of a single nonprofit organization located in the Midwestern region of the United States, which included internal organizational and workforce performance data, strategy plans, annual reports internal and external financial documents, and publicly available information. Four major themes related to building workforce capacity emerged from a thematic analysis of the data: (1) an emphasis on employee development, (2) the expansion of technology systems, (3) a concentration on developing a culture of autonomy and trust, and (4) the introduction of processes and measurements. The findings from this study might contribute to positive social change by providing nonprofit leaders with strategies and data to support a deeper understanding of how to effectively build workforce capability to address increasing service demands.

Recommended Citation

Introduction

The nonprofit sector is a crucial aspect of community social and economic welfare. Within the Unites States, services delivered through the nonprofit sector provide an additional layer of social and economic support (Despard, 2017). Services provided through the nonprofit sector augment services provided thorough governmental and private entities. Reliance on nongovernmental support services is increasing (Willems et al., 2016), placing additional pressure within the nonprofit sector to efficiently provide services to a variety of at-risk individuals. As need increases and resources are stretched to meet demand, nonprofit leaders are required to build workforce capability through internal resource development (Sanzo-Perez et al., 2017).

As the pressure to increase performance to meet demands intersects with limited resources, nonprofit leaders are challenged to build workforce capability. Leadership skills and capabilities are crucial for effective performance (Bish & Becker, 2016) and for developing internal strategies to build workforce capability. The culture within a nonprofit organization is typically mission centric. Leaders of nonprofit organizations must build a connection between the organizational mission and work performed. Working with minimal and inconsistent resources, leaders of nonprofit organizations are challenged to effectively deploy workforce capability to meet the organizational mission. Between 44% and 71% of nonprofit leaders are unable to improve performance, leadership skills, and service delivery capabilities (Despard, 2016b). When nonprofit leaders lack the strategic leadership capability to address increasing service demands through workforce capability development, the organizational mission may go unfulfilled, leaving at-risk individuals without services.

Bass and Avolio's (2004) full-range leadership theory (FRLT) is the conceptual lens used to explore the strategies leaders use to build workforce capability within the nonprofit sector in an increasing service demand environment. Leadership is one of the mostly highly researched topics due to the impact leaders have on individual, group, and organizational performance (Ceri-Booms et al., 2017). Leaders influence organizational and individual behaviors that directly impact organizational success. Effective leaders use transformational and transactional leadership style behaviors (Asrar-ul-Haq & Kuchinke, 2016). Managing increasing service demands through building workforce capabilities is dependent on leaders with the capability to strategically lead (Schwarz et al., 2016) and to effectively motivate the workforce to accomplish goals (Prati & Karriker, 2018).

Research Question

Demands for nonprofit services have increased, challenging nonprofit leaders to build workforce capability through the development of internal resources (Sanzo-Perez et al., 2017). Since 41% to 71% of nonprofit leaders fail to improve capabilities in key areas of performance, including leader skills and service delivery (Despard, 2016a), the central research question for this study focused on the strategies that nonprofit leaders used to build workforce capability to address increasing service demands.

Methodology and Limitations

For this study, a qualitative method and case design and the Baldrige Excellence Framework (2017–2018) were used to explore and assess the strategies leaders used to address increasing service demands through building workforce capability. As noted by Terouhid and Ries (2016), the Baldrige Excellence Framework enables researchers to identify the performance excellence opportunities, resulting in improved delivery of services and improved organizational effectiveness and capabilities.

The targeted population for this study was comprised of nonprofit leaders, based in a nonprofit organization in the Midwestern region of the United States, who had depth, breath, and scope of experience in building workforce capability successfully. Participants from this nonprofit organization were selected based on their

executive leadership roles, organizational influence and control, their global responsibility over workforce decisions, and strategic development and implementation.

Limitations of this study include the participant sample size, the geographic location, and the nonprofit status of the organization. Since all qualitative designs have limitations, sweeping declarations regarding generalizability and conclusions are not possible (Marshall & Rossman, 2016).

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework used in this study was the full-range leadership theory (FRLT). Based on the work of Burns (1978), Bass and Avolio (1994) developed the FRLT model of full-range leadership. Within the FRLT, leadership attributes are classified into three categories: transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire leadership (Avolio, 1999). The behaviors of transformational and transactional leaders are typically effective in most circumstances. For example, transformational leaders use charisma to inspire followers to perform at their highest potential and transactional leaders use rewards to motivate followers to meet or exceed performance expectations (Katou, 2015). Laissez-faire leaders are typically considered to lack effective leadership behaviors. Laissez-fair leaders are disengaged, resulting in lowered follower performance (Arnold et al., 2015).

The multiple leadership behavior aspects of the FRLT provide a multifaceted lens to explore the research question related to this study. Leaders' use of transformational leadership and transactional leadership styles can influence the development and effectiveness of workforce capability. Antonakis and House (2014); Schwarz et al. (2016); Uzonwanne (2015); and van Vugt and Ronay (2014) noted that adaptable and skilled leadership with the ability to strategically lead a nonprofit organization is required to successfully manage building a needed workforce capability in an environment of increasing service demands.

Literature Review

The leader's role is central for organizational success, employee satisfaction, and employee sustainability. Ceri-Booms et al. (2017) observed that leadership is a frequently researched topic because of the impact leaders have on individuals, work teams, and organizational performance. Effective leaders encourage followers to achieve organizational goals (Prati & Karriker, 2018) and are compulsory for organizational growth (Maamari & Majdalani, 2017) and sustainability (Ei Toufaili, 2018). Leaders influence aspects of organizational behavior and individual behaviors that directly impact organizational success. Ineffective leaders impact organizational success as much as effective leaders, thereby illustrating the criticality of ensuring leaders have the knowledge, skills, and experience to lead. Leaders cultivate an influential connection with followers, creating an atmosphere of shared purpose and objectives (Schwarz, et al., 2016). Organizational performance is reliant on the capability of leaders and followers to autonomously and collaboratively perform their job functions. The inter-reliance of the leader–follower relationship is crucial to the successful completion of organizational objectives (Manning & Robertson, 2016), since leadership is a vital aspect in workforce and organizational achievement. Leaders take on differing leadership and followership roles within a work group to guide and drive objectives to successful attainment. Leader and follower responsibilities are multifaceted and need to be clearly defined, communicated, and performed to attain optimal efficacy. The skilled performance of both leader and follower responsibilities is required for ideal individual and organizational success (Manning & Robertson, 2016).

Full-Range Leadership Theory

Burns (1978) was the first to introduce the theories of transformational and transactional leadership. Seyal and Rahman (2014) posited that Bass (1985) used the work of Burns (1978) to conceptualize and deliberate on the characteristics of transformational and transactional leadership traits and behaviors. Bass and Avolio (1994)

built on the concepts of Burns (1978) to include an additional transformational behavior of inspirational motivation and transactional behavior of active management by exception. The FRLT consists of three general leadership styles: transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire leadership (Avolio, 1999). There are additional factors associated with transformational and transactional leadership. The additional factors of transformational leadership are idealized influence—attributed, idealized influence—behavior, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. The additional factors of transactional leadership are contingent reward, active management by exception, and passive management by exception.

The leadership characteristics articulated within the boundaries of the FRLT are a prevalent consideration of current research because of the multifaceted leadership behaviors presented within the theory. Researchers extensively explore leadership through FRLT because of the behavioral influence of leaders on followers (Dabke, 2016). The effects of leadership continue to be a topic of research and deliberation due to the level of influence leaders have on organizational and follower success and efficacy. Leadership style and behaviors are effective in relation to follower needs. The effectiveness of specific leadership styles and behaviors is reliant on various factors and transform as organizational circumstances change. Bass and Avolio (1994) maintained that a single leadership style is not adequate for effective leadership. Asrar-ul-Haq and Kuchinke (2016) agreed with the position of Bass and Avolio, affirming there is ample research supporting the position that effective leaders use transformational and transactional leadership behaviors. Yang (2015) and Breevaart and Bakker (2018) offered that no single leadership style is effective in all situations.

Leaders that practice transformational and transactional leadership behaviors positively influence follower work quality. Leaders using both transformational and transactional leadership styles meet follower needs, assist followers to attain goals, and guide followers in the performance of their job functions. High performing leaders work to determine the level of interaction and type of leadership behaviors that are most beneficial and provide the support and guidance needed for each follower to thrive (Salehzadeh, 2017). Leaders demonstrate transformational and transactional leadership behaviors that are effective and meet follower's lower- and higher-level needs (Chaimongkonrojna & Steane, 2015; Curtis, 2018; Oberfield, 2014; Quintana et al., 2015; Taylor, 2017). According to Chaimongkonrojna and Steane (2015), transformational leadership behaviors are positively correlated to a follower's capability to accomplish objectives, and transactional leadership behaviors are positively correlated to followers' capability to successfully complete duties. Leaders deploying transformational and transactional leadership attributes positively impact the quality of follower work.

In specific circumstances, transformational and transactional leaders are not effective, and less desirable leadership styles (such as laissez-faire), may be an appropriate style for a leader to use. Laissez-faire leaders are often understood to lack leadership (Wong & Giessner, 2018). In the right circumstances, laissez-faire leaders are effective (Yang, 2015). Laissez-faire leaders may be highly effective when followers need little support, interaction, or guidance. Zhang et al., (2017) noted that, in the absence of effective leadership, organizational objectives, goals, and performance suffer. Effective leaders are foundational to organizational success.

Transformational Leadership. Five factors are associated with transformational leadership: (1) idealized influence-attributed, (2) idealized influence-behavior, (3) inspirational motivation, (4) intellectual stimulation, and (5) individualized consideration (Oberfield, 2014). Transformational leaders are globally hailed as effective (Gozukara, 2016) and are able achieve results in a variety of environments and circumstances due to their ability to think adaptively (Afsar et al., 2017). Leaders demonstrating transformational leadership aptitudes gain trust through the creation of an environment where followers can thrive. Transformational leaders engage followers and provide alignment to how individual roles support the organizational mission and vision. Ma and Jiang (2018) identified that transformational leaders create an environment of shared vision, creating increased organizational productivity and growth. Followers are inspired to excel and meet goals and objectives through

shared organizational vision. Transformational leaders drive organizational culture, creativity, and innovation, and are change agents (Nguyen, et al., 2017; Pasha et al., 2017).

Transformational leaders have a positive influence over followers and enhance organizational performance. By focusing on their followers' needs, transformational leaders increase follower satisfaction and performance. Followers experience a lower level of burnout when working in an environment of transformational leadership (Hildenbrand et al., 2018). The perspective and experiences followers have influence the effectiveness of transformational leaders. Niessen et al. (2017) found that follower perception has a profound impact on the positive effects of transformational leaders. Trust is a key factor in a leader's success and effectiveness. To be effective, a leader must engender followers' trust in their leader's behaviors (Afsar & Masood, 2018). Contrary to most research, Hoch et al. (2018) challenged that transformational leaders may lack the depth of moral and ethical stands of leaders demonstrating authentic and servant leadership qualities.

The attributed behaviors of transformational leaders that help develop a relationship between the leader and follower is referred to as *charisma*. The interpersonal relationship between transformational leaders and followers influences followers' attitudes and behaviors (Campbell, 2018). The idealized influence behaviors of transformational leaders are perceived by followers as role model behaviors (Zineldin, 2017) and influence the behaviors of followers. Through inspirational motivation, transformational leaders motivate followers by creating a positive and inspiring vision of the future (Phaneuf et al., 2016). Transformational leaders use intellectual stimulation to analyze multifaceted problems (Khan et al., 2016) and assist followers to think and solve issues creatively. Transformational leaders demonstrating individualized consideration behaviors respect followers and value followers' skills and knowledge.

Transformational leaders successfully build trusted relationships with followers that result in follower growth and increased performance. Transformational leaders develop trusted relationships with followers that instill confidence within followers regarding their capability to perform job functions (Quintana et al., 2015). Followers thrive and perform to optimum capability when transformational leaders satisfy follower needs, provide meaning and value to work, and provide a supportive working environment (Niessen et al., 2017). Transformational leaders develop followers through a focus on individual growth and training opportunities (Allameh et al., 2015). Gathungu et al. (2015) stipulated that transformational leader behaviors are positively correlated to follower job satisfaction and commitment. Sahu et al. (2018) proposed that transformational leaders influence follower job behaviors and inspire followers to greater achievements. Transformational leaders create an environment where followers thrive and have the opportunity to develop skills.

Nonprofit leaders are increasingly challenged to produce results, meet stakeholder expectations, and deliver societal good (Lefroy & Tsarenko, 2014). The traits and behaviors of transformational leaders focus on producing organizational success through meeting follower needs. Followers' engagement, dedication, self-efficacy, optimism, and resilience are positively impacted by empowering leader behaviors (Park et al., 2017). Leaders that demonstrate transformational leadership behaviors empower followers and encourage innovative work activities (Afsar & Masood, 2018). Transformational leaders are empowering leaders who focus on developing followers and meeting their needs.

Transformational leaders drive organizational success through interactions with followers and influence of followers' behaviors and engagement. Transformational leaders impact organizational outcomes by influencing follower behaviors, commitment, and engagement, resulting in increased performance (Gathungu et al., 2015; Popli & Rizvi, 2016; Sahu et al., 2018). Transformational leaders deliver high organizational performance (Caillier & Sa, 2017) and encourage followers to strive for higher performance and increase follower alignment with organizational objectives. A key attribute of a transformational leader is the ability to assist in supporting

and facilitating organizational change (Kearns et al., 2015). Transformational leadership skills are beneficial when leading a nonprofit organization or facilitating organizational change.

Transactional Leadership. Transformational leaders influence followers through rewards for performance and enact a common leadership style found within organizations. The three factors of transactional leadership are contingent reward, active management by exception, and passive management by exception. As with transformational leaders, the needs and perspective of followers can impact the effectiveness of transactional leaders. The behaviors demonstrated by transactional leaders may reduce follower anxiety and stress and increase a feeling of security (Sharma & Pearsall, 2016). The effects of transactional leaders can be more positive than transformational leaders in creating an environment in which followers can succeed and thrive (Afsharai & Gibson, 2016). Transactional leaders inspire individual and organizational success through a process-oriented leadership style.

Transactional leaders use contingent reward to motivate followers to perform through a mutual understanding and agreement of reward for specific actions or results. Transactional leaders use contingent rewards to inspire followers to achieve results through the creation of shared values and a commitment to achieve organizational goals (Jacobsen & Anderson, 2017). Through active management by exception, transactional leaders continuously monitor follower performance (Sayadi, 2016), review follower work product, and provide immediate feedback through positive reinforcement and constructive criticism. Leaders who demonstrate passive management by exception behaviors intercede and communicate only when expectations are not met (Yahaya & Ebrahim, 2016), which is not an effective management tactic because followers look to leaders for guidance and support.

Transactional leaders focus on metrics, performance, and set clear expectations of the follower. The attributes of transactional leaders encourage high follower performance. Transactional leaders improve followers' general satisfaction, which is positively linked to follower performance (Taylor, 2017). Follower work performance, satisfaction, and teamwork are positive factors associated with transactional leaders (Jacobsen & Andersen, 2017). Transactional leaders communicate clear expectations, providing followers with a sense of security (Diebig et al., 2016). Through a leader's use of the transactional leadership, attributes of contingent reward, and management by exception, followers develop work capabilities (Taylor, 2017). Transactional leaders set clear follower performance expectations and reward followers for meeting or exceeding objectives.

Megheirkouni (2017) espoused the positive effect of transactional leaders on individual follower performance, and the use of both transformational and transactional leadership behaviors have an increased positive impact on follower performance. Followers receive timely and direct feedback from transactional leaders when expectations are not met. Followers are provided with positive and constructive feedback that assists them with growth and development. Transactional leaders provide clear boundaries, consistent monitoring of activities, and reward followers for performance within the prescribed boundaries (Zohar & Polachek, 2017). Understanding boundaries and expectations can help followers perform to maximum capability. Engelbrecht et al. (2017) challenged Zohar and Polachek (2017) and proposed that excessive monitoring and reward or punishment negatively affects follower trust and engagement. Transactional leaders who demonstrate a balance between autonomy, monitoring, and reward can effectively lead followers without creating a negative relationship.

Transactional leaders support organizational performance through a systematic approach of setting objectives and working with followers to achieve objectives. Soysa et al. (2016) asserted the importance of measurements within nonprofit organizations to valid performance, which is specifically important to donors and potential donors. Supporting the position of Soysa et al. (2016), Lee and Clerkin (2017) posited the criticality of measurement within nonprofit organizations, further stating measurements improve nonprofit organizational performance. Developing a consistent and measurable set of standards positively influences individual and organizational performance. Transactional leaders demonstrate a strong ability to measure performance, lead to

that performance, and hold followers accountable for performance. The transactional behavior factors of contingent reward and active management by exception are performance-related behaviors.

Laissez-Faire Leadership. Laissez-faire leaders typically display leadership behaviors that are less than desirable. Avolio (1999) indicated that laissez-faire leaders avoid interaction with followers and, as a result, demonstrate an unproductive leadership style. The lack of direction and leadership of laissez-faire leaders reduces follower performance (Samanta & Lamprakis, 2018), decreases follower engagement, and creates an atmosphere mistrust. Opposing conventional research, some researchers found that the behaviors related to the laissez-faire leadership style may be advantageous in specific environments and situations. Some followers require little supervision and may view laissez-faire leaders as empowering rather than neglectful (Wong & Giessnar, 2018).

Challenges to the Full-Range Leadership Theory. Some researchers challenged the FRLT, as well as the typical positive attributes of transformational and transactional leaders. Gozukara (2016) challenged the value of the FRLT on the foundation that the vague use of concepts such as charisma, transformation, and vision are unclear. Researchers found challenges and undesirable effects of transformational leadership behaviors. Transformational leaders may focus singularly on the follower and lack organizational acumen (Gozukara, 2016). Followers of transformational leaders may not actively develop and strengthen their own social network (Anderson & Sun, 2015), instead relying on the transformational leader. The ability to develop independent networks is a crucial aspect of follower and leader development. Transformational and transactional leadership behaviors may not positively influence followers. The perceptions of followers' affect leader behavior effectiveness (Lin et al., 2017).

Nonprofit Organizations. The importance and impact of nonprofit organizations within society is well documented. The differences between nonprofit organizations and for-profit organizations are primarily derived from the philanthropic value, service, and mission-driven motivation that exists within a nonprofit culture (Park et al., 2018). Boateng et al. (2016) found an increasing demand for the delivery of public goods and services delivered through the nonprofit sector. Between 2005 and 2015, the number of nonprofit organizations in the United States increased by 42% (Kim, 2015). Nonprofit organizational mission, vision, and values are a foundational force driving organizational strategic direction and motivating employees to perform. Leaders are responsible for aligning employee activities and with the organizational mission, vision, and values is a primary responsibility of leaders. Organizational performance is dependent upon the collective performance of individuals and leaders (Wang & Zeng, 2017).

Nonprofit Leaders. Leaders have a substantial influence on organizational results (Sierra & Banzato, 2016). Effective leadership is crucial to the achievement of the organizational mission and the use of resource capabilities within nonprofit organizations (Bryan, 2017). The rapid change and increased complexity within the nonprofit sector have increased the need for professional and effective leaders within the nonprofit sector. Leaders of nonprofit organizations must build a connection between the organizational mission and the work performed. Individuals elect to work within the nonprofit industry and for specific nonprofit organizations because they are drawn to the organizational mission and want to positively impact society (Townsend et al., 2017). Nonprofit leaders need to make a connection between performance expectations and the organizational mission.

Dobrai and Farkas (2016) noted professional nonprofit leaders develop and implement organizational strategies and effectively use tools and systems to assist in developing a market-focused organization. The need for professional nonprofit leaders is central to the continued growth and sustainability of the nonprofit sector. Leaders of nonprofit organizations are attracted to the industry and role because of the type of the service-centric work and the effect on the community. The experience and skills of professional leaders from other industries assist to develop organizational knowledge, increase performance, employee engagement, and change organizational culture (Thompson & Flynn, 2014). Professional nonprofit leaders develop and implement

organizational strategies through the effective use of tools and systems (Dobrai & Farkas, 2016). The development of leaders within the nonprofit industry is a continuing need.

Workforce Capability. Workforce capability affects employee engagement and organizational performance. Workforce capability is an individual's physical and intellectual ability to perform tasks (Wang & Zeng, 2017). The services provided through the nonprofit sector are vital to addressing increasing social service needs, requiring nonprofit organizational leaders to improve their capabilities (Sanzo et al., 2015). Building capability at all organizational levels encourages an environment where individuals can proactively adapt to changing and competitive environments (Guinot et al., 2016). Hiring and retaining skilled individuals who possess the capabilities to effectively perform their functions are central for organizational success. Workforce capabilities are important at all organizational levels, while strategic capabilities are crucial for leadership (Fu, 2015; Megheirkouni, 2016). Building workforce capabilities throughout the organization is imperative for workforce and organizational performance.

Findings/Analysis

Participants for this study consisted of executive leaders working in a nonprofit organization who have leadership experience and demonstrate the skills to effectively lead a nonprofit organization. The participants were leaders of a nonprofit homeless veterans' organization located in the Midwestern region of the United States. Participants were selected to ensure the depth and breadth of data needed to address the research question. The selected participants had executive-level leadership responsibilities that included accountability to make decisions impacting global workforces and goal strategies; the development of organizational service initiatives; and leading their organization at the highest level, which is a participant selection method noted by Saunders and Townsend (2016), who emphasized the importance of selecting participants who have the density and range of knowledge needed to obtain quality data.

A semistructured interview process and documentary data, which included historical chronicles, financial information, media data, and organizational performance data were used to gain depth, breath, and scope of data to ensure reliability and validity to support data saturation via methodological triangulation.

The Baldridge Excellence Framework (2017–2018) was used as the analysis tool for this study. The results indicate that a focus on employee development, technology system expansion, a culture of autonomy and trust, and the implementation and use of processes and measurements positively influence the development of workforce capability. This study provides two central contributions. First, is the contribution to business practice through the identification and insight into effective strategies leaders deploy to improve workforce capability and organizational efficiencies. Second is the contribution to social change including the connection between building workforce capability, organizational alignment, and fulfilling the organizational mission.

Discussion of Findings

Effective leadership within the nonprofit sector is crucial to long-term substantial success. Managing increasing service demands through building workforce capability is dependent on strong, effective leaders with the capability to strategically lead a nonprofit organization (Antonakis & House, 2014; Schwarz et al., 2016; Uzonwann, 2105; van Vugt & Ronay, 2104). Leaders have the responsibility to encourage and develop followers, so the followers gain the skills and expertise to perform their job functions and positively effect organizational outcomes. Effective leaders and followers are required to collectively achieve nonprofit organizational goals. The satisfactory performance of both leader and follower roles are needed for optimal individual and organizational

success (Manning & Robertson, 2016). Global organizational performance is dependent on the ability of leaders and followers to independently and collaboratively perform their job functions.

The organizational mission is central to the formation of all services, communication, decisions, activities, processes, and measurements. The leaders' singular focus of fulfilling the organizational mission of ending veteran homelessness within the state assists to align the workforce with performance. Workforce alignment with the organizational mission allowed for changes in culture, enhanced individual performance and capabilities, higher organizational performance, and the introduction of advanced processes, systems, and measurements with little resistance within the organization. These mission-focused results expand to partnering organizations. The leaders select community and government partners, grant and funding sources, and suppliers that support and align with the organizational mission.

The expansion of new process development began as new leadership took over management in 2016. Leaders recognized the need to develop system and procedural processes to meet new organizational direction and aggressive strategic objectives. Strategy development and implementation went from a hierarchical top-down approach to a holistic organizational effort. Workforce participation in the strategic planning process amplified trust for leadership and aligned the workforce with the organizational strategic direction. Workforce involvement in the implementation of the strategic initiatives further aligned the workforce, created an environment of autonomy, and encouraged a collaborative culture. Formal and informal open communication practices advanced the progression to an effective and mission-focused workforce.

Participants noted the use of specific procedural processes that were implemented to increase workforce capability and build workforce and organizational capacity. Workforce capability was addressed with the development and enhancement of human resource procedures, training opportunities, and a formal onboarding process. The implementation of technological systems within the human resources, operations, and case management processes positively impacted the workforce and client experiences. Technology solutions increased workforce capabilities and organizational efficiencies. As well, participants note the use of foundational development of effective procedural and technological processes, which enabled the various organizational leaders to meet short- and long-term strategic objectives.

Process and technology developments and enhancements are essential for the continued expansion of organizational and workforce capabilities. Through the continued refinement of human resources processes, there are added workforce benefits related to performance expectations, task clarity, and additional opportunities to develop capabilities. The continued advancement of technology systems and processes provides a solid foundation for improved and future efficiencies, which have the potential to enhance the workforce and client experiences.

Development of a formal succession planning process improved ongoing workforce capabilities through continued workforce development. Leaders can use the succession planning process to identify potential gaps in skills and knowledge, as well as protect against loss of productively in the event of personnel loss. An effective succession plan is particularly critical for executive-level leaders. Without proper preparation, the loss of executive leadership has the potential to derail organizational direction and strategy, thereby placing the achievement of the organizational mission at risk.

The infrastructure built by organizational leaders is designed to attain strategic objectives and is scalable as the organization matures and grows, which in turn supports sustainability. The organizational leaders purposefully and systematically built an organizational culture where the workforce is rewarded for actively participating in the development of new ideas, the implementation of plans, and for taking ownership of roles. A renewed emphasis on building workforce capabilities ignited deeper global commitment and passion from employees. Improved workforce engagement resulted in greater organizational alignment, positively affecting efficiencies, capabilities, and actions that directly align with the organizational mission. The expansion of external

partnerships and non-grant funding sources strengthens the organizational financial position and allows for more access to services by at-risk military veterans. Organizational leaders work effectively as an executive leadership team and are progressive thinkers, aligned as a leadership team, and use various leadership styles to successfully lead the organization.

The organizational leaders methodically addressed strategic plan objectives. As each of the organizational leaders continues to focus on developing processes to address identified strategic objectives, focusing on the development of new objectives that identify and manage emerging risks and opportunities continues to remain vital. Leaders self-identified the need to continue to improve and enhance organizational measurements and metrics. The implementation of technology solutions will enable leaders to continue to extend the type, level, and amount of data analyzed. Leaders are developing additional funding strategies and sources to supplement government grant funding that is the primary source of funding. Additional at-risk military veterans can be served through the development of varied funding sources. In the majority of cases, volunteers are only engaged in limited circumstances and are not significant contributors to organizational workforces. By taking steps to explore additional opportunities for their volunteer cadre, an enhanced level of participation could ease pressure on the paid workforce allowing for the development of additional workforce and organizational capability and capacity.

Conclusion

The results identified in this study may provide strategies and implementation practices that leaders of nonprofit organizations can use to build workforce capability and organizational effectiveness in an increasing service demand environment. The contributions to business practices include strategies and information learned to improve workforce capabilities, organizational efficiencies, volunteerism, and funding options. The contributions to social change include a clearer understanding of strategy development, workforce capability development, and organizational alignment that contributes to fulfilling the organizational mission and addressing demands for service, thereby creating a positive impact on the community through increased service to at-risk individuals.

It is recommended that future enhancements and implementation include a continued development of technological systems and processes, measurements and metrics, nongovernment funding sources, and volunteer opportunities. The ongoing development and refinement of effective strategy initiatives is crucial for the continued expansion of services, organizational effectiveness, partnership relationships, and development of workforce capabilities. Furthermore, our recommendations include the formation of a formal volunteer program that would relieve workforce pressure and assist in the timely delivery of housing and other services provided to at-risk military veterans.

Researchers reviewing this research, as well as those conducting similar research, may benefit from the strategies used by nonprofit leaders and recommendations provided to nonprofit leaders developing workforce capabilities in an environment of increasing demand for services. To take this research to the next step, it is recommended that future researchers use a different conceptual framework to explore the strategies nonprofit leaders use to build workforce capability to address increasing serve demands. An organizational performance conceptual framework could provide a different viewpoint on this topic. Conducting further case studies that include a more geographic diverse number of nonprofit organizations that serve dissimilar clients may provide additional data and perspective. Future researchers could also deepen the population sample to additional levels of management within the nonprofit organization. The results of this study, when disseminated within the academic and professional community, may provide useful information and strategies to effectively develop workforce capabilities.

References

Afsar, B., & Masood, M. (2018). Transformational leadership, creative self-efficacy, trust in supervisor, uncertainty avoidance, and innovative work behavior of nurses. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 54*(1)*,* 36–61. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886317711891

Afsar, B., Badir, Y. F., Saeed, B. B., & Hafeez, S. (2017). Transformational and transactional leadership and employee's entrepreneurial behavior in knowledge-intensive industries. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 28*(2)*,* 307–332. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1244893

Allameh, S. M., Pool, J. K., Kazemi, R. V., & Mostafavi, M. (2015). The impact of emotional intelligence on transformational leadership and leader effectiveness. *Latin American Journal of Management for Sustainable Development, 2*(1)*,* 83–93. https://doi.org/10.1504/LAJMSD.2015.067473

Anderson, M. H., & Sun, P. Y. T. (2015). The downside of transformational leadership when encouraging followers to network. *The Leadership Quarterly, 26*(5)*,* 790–801. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.05.002

Antonakis, J., & House, R. J. (2014). Instrumental leadership: Measurement and extension of transformational-transactional leadership theory. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(4)*,* 746–771. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.04.005

Arnold, K. A., Connelly, C. E., Walsh, M. M., & Ginnis, K. A. M. (2015). Leadership styles, emotion regulation, and burnout. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 20*(4)*,* 481–490. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039045

Asrar-ul-Haq, M., & Kuchinke, K. P. (2016). Impact of leadership styles on employees' attitude towards their leader and performance: Empirical evidence from Pakistani banks. *Future Business Journal, 2*(1)*,* 54–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fbj.2016.05.002

Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full leadership development: Building the vital forces in organizations.* SAGE

Baldrige Performance Excellence Program. (2021). *2021–2022 Baldrige Excellence Framework: Leadership and Management Practices for High Performance.* U.S. Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology. https://www.nist.gov/baldrige/publications/baldrige-excellence-framework/businessnonprofit

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance.* Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership.* SAGE Publications.

Bish, A., & Becker, K. (2016). Exploring expectations of nonprofit management capabilities. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 45*(3)*,* 437–457. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764015583313

Boateng, A., Akamavi, R. K., & Ndoro, G. (2016). Measuring performance of non-profit organisations: Evidence from large charities. *Business Ethics, 25*(1)*,* 59–74. https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12108

Breevaart, K., & Bakker, A. B. (2018). Daily job demands and employee work engagement: The role of daily transformational leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 23*(3)*,* 338–349. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000082

Bryan, T. K. (2017). Multilevel learning in nonprofit organizations: Exploring the individual, group, and organizational effects of a capacity building program. *Journal of Nonprofit Education and Leadership, 7*(2)*,* 91–109. https://doi.org/10.18666/JNEL-2017-V7-I2-7870

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* Free Press.

Caillier, J. G., & Sa, Y. (2017). Do transformational-oriented leadership and transactional-oriented leadership have an impact on whistle-blowing attitudes? A longitudinal examination conducted in US federal agencies. *Public Management Review, 19*(4)*,* 406–422. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2016.1177109

Campbell, J. W. (2018). Efficiency, incentives, and transformational leadership: Understanding collaboration preferences in the public sector. *Public Performance & Management Review, 41*(2)*,* 277–299. https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2017.1403332

Ceri-Booms, M., Curseu, P. L, & Oerlemans, L. A. G. (2017). Task and person-focused leadership behaviors and team performance: A meta-analysis. *Human Resource Management Review, 27*(1), 178–192. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2016.09.010

Chaimongkonrojna, T. & Steane, P. (2015). Effectiveness of full range leadership development among middle managers. *Journal of Management Development, 34*(9), 1161–1180. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-01-2014-0002

Curtis, G. J. (2018). Connecting influence tactics with full-range leadership styles. *Leadership & Organization Development, 39*(1)*,* 2–13. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-09-2016-0221

Dabke, D. (2016). Impact of leader's emotional intelligence and transformational behavior on perceived leadership effectiveness: A multiple source view. *Business Perspectives and Research, 4*(1), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/2278533715605433

Despard, M. R. (2016a). Strengthening evaluation in nonprofit human resource organizations: Results of a capacity-building experiment. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership and Governance, 40*(4)*,* 352–368. https://doi.org/10.1080/23303131.2016.1140101

Despard, M. R. (2016b). Challenges in implementing evidence-based practices and programs in nonprofit human service organizations. *Journal of Evidence-Informed Social Work, 13*(6), 505–522. https://doi.org/10.1080/23761407.2015.1086719

Despard, M. R. (2017). Can nonprofit capacity be measured? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 46*(3)*,* 607–626. https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764016661425

Diebig, M., Bormann, K. C., & Rowold, J. (2016). A double-edged sword: Relationship between full-range leadership behaviors and followers' hair cortisol level. *The Leadership Quarterly, 27*(4)*,* 684–696. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.04.001

Dobrai, K., & Farkas, F. (2016). Nonprofit organizations from the perspective of organizational development and their influence on professionalization. *Our Economy (Nase Gospodarstvo), 62*(2), 25–32. https://doi.org/10.1515/ngoe-2016-0009

Ei Toufaili, B. (2018). The influence of subjective factors on the development of the transformational style of leadership. *Revista de Management Comparat International, 19*(2)*,* 124–135. https://doi.org/10.24818/RMCI.2018.2.124

Engelbrecht, A. S., Heine, G., & Mahembe, B. (2017). Integrity, ethical leadership, trust and work engagement. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 38*(3)*,* 368–379. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-11-2015-0237

Fu, N. (2015). The role of relational resources in the knowledge management capability and innovation of professional service firms. *Human Relations, 68*(5)*,* 731–764. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726714543479

Gathungu, E. W. M., Iravo, M. A., & Namusonge, G. S. (2015). Transformational leadership and employee's commitment: Empirical review. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 20*(7), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-20720107

Gozukara, I. (2016). Leadership and managerial effectiveness in higher education. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences, 6*(1), 73–82. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARAFMS/v6-i1/1981

Guinot, J., Chiva, R., & Mallén, F. (2016). Linking altruism and organizational learning capability: A study from excellent human resources management organizations in Spain. *Journal of Business Ethics, 138*(2), 349–364. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2603-7

Hildenbrand, K., Sacramento, C. A., & Binnewies, C. (2018). Transformational leadership and burnout: The role of thriving and follower' openness to experience. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 23*(1), 31–43. https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000051

Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., & Wu, D. (2018). Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain variance above and beyond transformational leadership? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management, 44*(2), 501–529. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316665461

Jacobsen, C. B., & Andersen, L. B. (2017). Leading public service organizations: How to obtain high employee self-efficacy and organizational performance. *Public Management Review, 19*(2), 253–273. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2016.1153705

Katou, A. A. (2015). Transformational leadership and organisational performance: Three serially mediating mechanisms. *Employee Relations, 37*(3), 329–353. https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-05-2014-0056

Kearns, K. P., Livingston, J., Scherer, S., & McShane, L. (2015). Leadership skills as construed by nonprofit chief executives. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 36*(6), 712–727. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-11-2013-0143

Khan, Z. A., Nawaz, A., & Khan, I. U. (2016). Leadership theories and styles: A literature review. *Journal of Resources Development and Management, 16,* 1–7.

Kim, M. (2015). Socioeconomic diversity, political engagement, and the density of nonprofit organizations in U.S. counties. *American Review of Public Administration, 45*(4), 402–416. https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074013504616

Lee, C., & Clerkin, R. M. (2017). Exploring the use of outcome measurements in human service nonprofits: Combining agency, institutional, and organizational capacity perspectives. *Public Performance & Management Review, 40*(3), 601–624. https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2017.1295872

Lefroy, K., & Tsarenko, Y. (2014). Dependence and effectiveness in the nonprofit-corporate alliance: The mediating effect of objective achievement. *Journal of Business Research, 67*(9), 1959–1966. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.11.003

Lin, C.-S., Huang, P.-C., Chen, S.-J., & Huang, L.-C. (2017). Pseudo-transformational leadership is in the eyes of the subordinates. *Journal of Business Ethics, 141*(1), 179–190. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2739-5

Ma, X., & Jiang, W. (2018). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and employee creativity in entrepreneurial firms. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 54*(3), 302–324. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886318764346

Maamari, B. E., & Majdalani, J. F. (2017). Emotional intelligence, leadership style and organizational climate. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 25*(2), 327–435. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-04-2016-1010

Manning, T., & Robertson, B. (2016). A three-factor model of followership: Part 3—research on followership, a three factor followership framework and practical implications. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 48*(8), 400–408. https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-01-2016-0005

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2016). *Designing qualitative research* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Megheirkouni, M. (2016). Leadership behaviours and capabilities in Syria: An exploratory qualitative approach. *Journal of Management Development, 35*(5)*,* 636–662. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-02-2015-0022

Megheirkouni, M. (2017). Leadership styles and organizational learning in UK for-profit and non-profit sports organizations. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 25*(4)*,* 596–612. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-07-2016-1042

Nguyen, T. T., Mia, L., Winata, L., & Chong, V. K. (2017). Effect of transformational-leadership style and management control system on managerial performance. *Journal of Business Research, 70*(1)*,* 202–213. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.08.018

Niessen, C., Mader, I., Stride, C., & Jimmieson, N. L. (2017). Thriving when exhausted: The role of perceived transformational leadership. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 103*(B)*,* 41–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.07.012

Oberfield, Z. W. (2014). Public management in time: A longitudinal examination of the full range of leadership theory. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 24*(2), 407–429. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mus060

Park, J. G., Kim, J. S., Yoon, S. W., & Joo, B.-K. (2017). The effects of empowering leadership on psychological well-being and job engagement: The mediating role of psychological capital. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 38*(3)*,* 350–367. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-08-2015-0182

Park, S., Kim, J., Park, J., & Lim, D. H. (2018). Work engagement in nonprofit organizations: A conceptual model. *Human Resource Development Review, 17*(1)*,* 5–33. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484317750993

Pasha, O., Poister, T. H., Wright, B. E., & Thomas, J. C. (2017). Transformational leadership and mission valence of employees: The varying effects of organizational level. *Public Performance and Management Review, 40*(4)*,* 722–740. https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2017.1335220

Phaneuf, J. E., Boudrias, J. S., Rousseau, V., & Brunelle, E. (2016). Personality and transformational leadership: The moderating effect of organizational context. *Personality and Individual Differences, 102*(1)*,* 30–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.052

Popli, S., & Rizvi, I. A. (2016). Drivers of employee engagement: The role of leadership style. *Global Business Review, 17*(4)*,* 965–979. https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150916645701

Prati, L. M., & Karriker, J. H. (2018). Acting and performing: Influences of manager emotional intelligence. *Journal of Management Development, 37*(1)*,* 101–110. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-03-2017-0087

Quintana, T. A., Park, S., & Cabrera, Y. A. (2015). Assessing the effects of leadership styles on employees' outcomes in international luxury hotels. *Journal of Business Ethics, 129*(2)*,* 469–489. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2170-3

Sahu, S., Pathardikar, A., & Kumar, A. (2018). Transformational leadership and turnover: Mediating effects of employee engagement, employer branding, and psychological attachment. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 39*(1)*,* 82–99. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-12-2014-0243

Salehzadeh, R. (2017). Which types of leadership styles do followers prefer? A decision tree approach. *International Journal of Education Management, 31*(7)*,* 865–877. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-04-2016-0079

Samanta, I., & Lamprakis, A. (2018). Modern leadership types and outcomes: The case of Greek public sector. *Management: Journal of Contemporary Management Issues, 23*(1)*,* 173–191. https://doi.org/10.30924/mjcmi/2018.23.1.173

Sanzo, M. J., Álvarez, L. I., Rey, M., & Garcia, N. (2015). Business—nonprofit partnerships: A new form of collaboration in a corporate responsibility and social innovation context. *Service Business, 9*(3), 611–636. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11628-014-0242-1

Sanzo-Perez, M. J., Rey-García, M., & Álvarez-González, L. I. (2017). The impact of professionalization and partnerships on nonprofit productivity. *The Service Industries Journal, 37*(11-12), 783–799. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2017.1353976

Saunders, M. N. K., & Townsend, K. (2016). Reporting and justifying the number of interview participants in organization and workplace research. *British Journal of Management, 27*(4), 836–852. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12182

Sayadi, Y. (2016). The effect of dimensions of transformational, transactional, and non-leadership on the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of teachers in Iran. *Management in Education, 30*(2), 57–65. https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020615625363

Schwarz, G., Newman, A., Cooper, B., & Eva, N. (2016). Servant leadership and follower job performance: The mediating effect of public service motivation. *Public Administration, 94*(4), 1025–1041. https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12266

Seyal, A. H., & Rahman, M. N. A. (2014). Testing Bass and Avolio model of leadership in understanding ERP implementation among Bruneian SMEs. *Journal of Organizational Management Studies*, *2014*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.5171/2013.869927

Sharma, P. N., & Pearsall, M. J. (2016). Leading under adversity: Interactive effects of acute stressors and upper-level supportive leadership climate on lower-level supportive leadership climate. *The Leadership Quarterly, 27*(6), 856–858. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.08.003

Sierra, J. C. V., & Banzato, C. R. (2016). Implications of theory and research on strategic leadership: A critical review. *Revista Ibero-Americana de Estrategia, 15*(3), 119–131. https://doi.org/10.5585/riae.v15i3.2331

Soysa, I. B., Jayamaja, N. P., & Grigg, N. P. (2016). Operationalising performance measurement dimensions for the Australasian nonprofit healthcare sector. *The TQM Journal, 28*(6), 954–973. https://doi.org/10.1108/TQM-08-2015-0109

Taylor, J. (2017). Management of Australian water utilities: The significance of transactional and transformational leadership. *Australian Journal of Public Administration, 76*(1), 18–32. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8500.12200

Terouhid, S. A., & Ries, R. (2016). People capability: A strategic capability for enhancing organizational excellence of construction firms. *Journal of Modelling and Management, 11*(3), 811–841. https://doi.org/10.1108/JM2-04-2014-0028

Thompson, R. M., & Flynn, C. (2014). Inter-sector senior leader transitions: Experience and outcomes. *International Journal of Public Sector Management, 27*(1), 85–93. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-03-2012-0034

Townsend, K., McDonald, P., & Cathcart, A. (2017). Managing flexible work arrangements in small not-for-profit firms: The influence of organisational size, financial constraints and workforce characteristics. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 28*(14), 2085–2107. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1136671

Uzonwanne, F. (2015). Leadership styles and decision-making models among corporate leaders in non-profit organizations in North America. *Journal of Public Affairs, 15*(3), 287–299. https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.1530

van Vugt, M., & Ronay, R. (2014). The evolutionary psychology of leadership: Theory, review, and roadmap. *Organizational Psychology Review, 4*(1), 74–95. https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386613493635

Wang, X., & Zeng, Y. (2017). Organizational capability model: Toward improving organizational performance. *Journal of Integrated Design and Process Science, 21*(1)*,* 5–24. https://doi.org/10.3233/jid-2017-0005

Willems, J., Jegers, M., & Faulk, L. (2016). Organizational effectiveness reputation in the nonprofit sector. *Public Performance and Management Review, 39*(2)*,* 454–475. https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2015.1108802

Wong, S. I., & Giessner, S. R. (2018). The thin line between empowering and laissez-faire leadership: An expectancy-match perspective. *Journal of Management, 44*)(2)*,* 757–783. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315574597

Yahaya, R., & Ebrahim, F. (2016). Leadership styles and organizational commitment: Literature review. *Journal of Management Development, 35*(2), 190–216. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-01-2015-0004

Yang, I. (2015). Positive effects of laissez-faire leadership: Conceptual exploration. *Journal of Management Development, 34*(10)*,* 1246–1261. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-02-2015-0016

Zhang, L., Cao, T., & Wang, Y. (2017). The mediation role of leadership styles in integrated project collaboration: An emotional intelligence perspective. *International Journal of Project Management, 36*(2), 317–330. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2017.08.014

Zineldin, M. (2017). Transformational leadership behavior, emotions, and outcomes: Health psychology perspective in the workplace: *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health, 32*(1), 14–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/15555240.2016.1273782

Zohar, D., & Polachek, T. (2017). Using event-level data to test the effect of verbal leader behavior on follower leadership perceptions and job performance: A randomized field experiment. *Group and Organization Management, 42*(3)*,* 419–449. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601115619079