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1. Introduction

Leadership is a vast area of study, even when focusing on the nonprofit sector. There is an ever growing collection of thought and research on the topic of leadership. The Ontario Nonprofit Network (ONN), itself a product of leadership from within the sector about a decade ago, sees the effectiveness of future nonprofit leadership as critical to its policy priority of shaping a sectoral labour force strategy (McIsaac, Park & Toupin, 2013). ONN’s first research on leadership identified the need to explore more fully the kind of leadership that will be required to meet the demands on the nonprofit sector in the next 15-20 years. In that regard, what core leadership competencies will be required to meet these challenges? This review of the literature was the first step in ONN’s project to explore that question and needed leadership development strategies for discussion with sector leaders and others over the coming months.

2. Scope and approach

This research was undertaken in January-February 2017 with a focus on more recent theoretical and empirical literature on leadership in the nonprofit sector.

A scan was conducted of abstracts in academic journals on leadership, management, and management education between 2010 and 2017 to identify titles for further review. Most of the journals were American, but two were Canadian and five covered international literature including the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand.

Key word searches using the terms “nonprofit”, “leadership”, “leadership competencies”, “leadership in (and) the future”, “leadership education”, and some related terms were also applied to these journals for the 2010-2017 period. A similar keyword search was employed for the 2010-2017 period in a search of the Canadian Business and Current Affairs Database.

While time and resource constraints limited the search period to the more recent literature, the literature reviews within articles identified for study led the researchers to additional important work in theory and research prior to 2010, including seminal material in the 1980s as the nonprofit management field began to emerge.
In addition to the academic literature, the researchers received some guidance from ONN and members of the Advisory Group to this project to investigate grey literature and websites related to the subject of leadership in the nonprofit sector and leadership competencies.

3. Leadership definitions and conceptual frameworks

The literature is relatively consistent and straightforward on the definition of leadership in general and as it applies to the nonprofit sector. Carlson and Schneiter (2011) summarizing Doe (2008) define leadership as a “process by which one person influences the thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors of others. Leaders set a direction for the rest of us; they help us see what lies ahead, they help us visualize what we might achieve; they encourage us and inspire us” (p. 330). Carlson and Schneiter also specify that “leadership is not necessarily confined to the person hired for a position of authority. Any person in a nonprofit can and should be a leader within his or her position and given authority” (2011, p. 331).

While there may be reasonable consensus on a basic definition of leadership, there is wide variation in what constitutes leadership. It has been described in different ways in the literature (Born, 1999):

- Trait-based leadership - leadership as evident in the behaviours, characteristics, and qualities of a person (Yukl, 1998 as cited in Born, 1999)
- Relational leadership - leadership as defined by the relationships that the leader develops and engages in (Kouzes & Posner, 1995 as cited in Born, 1999)
- Value-based leadership - leadership related to the kind or type of person who is inspirational to their followers, sometimes referred to as “servant leadership” (DePree, 1989 as cited in Born, 1999)
- Transformational leadership - a process whereby leadership emerges to inspire growth and change (Clemmer, 1995 as cited in Born, 1999).
Over time, leadership has evolved from identifying specific skills and what leaders did, to looking at their behaviours, to emphasizing relationships in addition to skills and behaviours.

The literature increasingly describes leadership in terms of knowledge, skills, behaviours and individual attributes (sometimes referred to as personal characteristics or traits) that are required for effective performance in an organization (Hurd & Buschbom, 2010). The literature also speaks of leadership competencies, or more currently “capabilities” (Bish & Becker, 2016). It is understood that leadership can be developed and learned, it is often shared, and that it is a process that is influenced by relationships.

The literature review has highlighted the absence of a common understanding of ‘competency’ and the lack of a framework for understanding leadership competencies. Some authors and researchers generate models and leadership approaches that are comprehensive and include 70 or more competencies related to skills, behaviours, attributes, and knowledge, while others focus on an aspect of leadership and develop a handful of competencies related to that area, such as collaborative leadership. The result is that it is very challenging to consolidate and integrate the findings into a comprehensible and practically useful construct.

This literature review will use the following definition of nonprofit leadership competency: the skills, knowledge, abilities or behavioural characteristics required for a leadership role or position in the nonprofit sector in Ontario.

Since a focus on nonprofit management started to emerge in the 1970s, there have been attempts to construct conceptual frameworks for understanding leadership competencies or capabilities in a way that distinguishes broad sets or categories of competencies in relation to each other, while also allowing delineation of specific competencies under each category. Since the early stages, the nonprofit literature on management skills has been closely aligned with good business management practices as evidenced in the private sector.

Heimovics and Herman’s conceptualization in a seminal paper in 1989 became a model that many have drawn and built on since. Based on research with senior CEOs and nonprofit board members inquiring about what “behaviours and skills” differentiated more from less successful performance, they adapted two major general management theories from the 1980s to the nonprofit sector’s context, “contingency” theory and resource dependence theory. Heimovics and Herman concluded that the role of the nonprofit manager (leader) varied, depending on the stability of the nonprofit organization’s resource base, and that the leadership role and attendant skills/behaviours were related to access to financial resources. If resources were unstable, there were demands on the manager to
perform an internally focused role to manage organizational staff and an externally focused role, in conjunction with the nonprofit board, to operate successfully in the environment. If resources were relatively stable, the manager would assume different roles vis-à-vis staff internally and organizational leadership externally, emphasizing different sets of skills. The attendant competencies in terms of specific skills and behaviours for the differentiated roles are indicated in Figure 1 below.

**FIGURE 1. COMPETENCIES DIFFERENTIATED BY INTERNAL-EXTERNAL LEADERSHIP ROLES AND STABILITY OF RESOURCE BASE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioural Competencies- Relatively Unstable Resource Base</th>
<th>Behavioural Competencies- Relatively Stable Resource Base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal: Staff-Related</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Developer Role</td>
<td>Service Provider Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Show consideration</td>
<td>● Coordinate flow of good information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Provide help</td>
<td>● Ensure structures &amp; controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Resolve differences</td>
<td>● Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Resource development</td>
<td>● Resource development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creativity Boundary Spanner Role</th>
<th>Strategic Planner Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Anticipating change</td>
<td>● Set high standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Envisioning innovation</td>
<td>● Emphasize accomplishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Acquiring resources</td>
<td>● Shape shared vision &amp; common goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Heimovics & Herman, 1989)
This approach was different than other efforts to define leadership based on types of leadership such as “transformational, transactional, and servant leadership” and identifying related personal characteristics or traits (Bass, 1985 as reviewed in Lutz Allen, Smith & DaSilva, 2013). Heimovics and Herman highlighted the importance of the environment and “situational” leadership, and the requirement for different sets of behaviour based competencies or capabilities for different organizational conditions (Hoefer, 2011; Lord et al., 2001 as cited in Sarros, Cooper & Santora, 2010).

This construct of the nonprofit organization operating in a constantly changing environment, with unstable resources, and engaged in diverse and complex relationships with multiple internal and external stakeholders was further developed by subsequent theorists.

Over time, the articulation of leadership based on the stability/instability of the resource base was replaced by the recognition of the different internal and external demands on leadership. This internal and external focus has remained fairly consistent in more recent conceptualizations of leadership and required competencies. Hoefer (2011) consolidated the work of several researchers including later research by Heimovics and Herman (2005) to create a four quadrant framework that identified 50 specific job skills under two broad leadership competency areas – “task-oriented skills” and “people-oriented skills”. These two dimensions were differentiated further by a focus on the internal organizational operation and on the external environment. Figure 2 illustrates Hoefer’s construct, offering several examples of specific job skills for each quadrant.

**FIGURE 2. LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES DIFFERENTIATED BY TASK AND PEOPLE-ORIENTATION AND INTERNAL-EXTERNAL FOCUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internally focused leaders</th>
<th>Externally focused leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quadrant I: Task-oriented skills (15, including following):</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quadrant III: Task-oriented skills (9, including following):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Budgeting</td>
<td>● Knowledge of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Program development</td>
<td>● Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Personnel management</td>
<td>● Agency policy area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Decision-making</td>
<td>● Leveraging resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quadrant II: People-oriented skills (12, including following):</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quadrant IV: People oriented skills (14, including following):</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yet another framework for conceptualizing competencies in nonprofit leadership builds on Yukl's (2012) taxonomy on general leadership "capabilities". Yukl posits four meta-categories as shown in Figure 3, suggesting that “Task-oriented” knowledge and capabilities and “Relations-oriented” capabilities are inward directed on the operations and functioning of the organization.

"Change-oriented” knowledge and capabilities and the “External” meta-category capabilities relate to the organization’s engagement with its environment. Bish and Becker (2016) explored the applicability of this framework with 21 managers across three levels of nonprofit organizations in Australia. Their findings suggest modification of Yukl’s leadership capabilities’ framework for nonprofit organizations as indicated by the italicized additions in Figure 3, including the addition of two leadership meta-categories.

This study reinforced the recognition that management capabilities are not positionally fixed in senior leaders or executives, but are needed at all levels of the organization, noting that "middle managers and frontline managers play a role here, translating and articulating their interpretation of the vision for the team," (Bish & Becker, 2016, p. 454).
FIGURE 3. LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES BY META-CATEGORIES OF KNOWLEDGE AND CAPABILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task-oriented:</th>
<th>Change-oriented:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Clarifying</td>
<td>● Advocating change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Planning</td>
<td>● Envisioning change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Monitoring operations</td>
<td>● Encouraging innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Problem-solving</td>
<td>● Facilitate collective learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Implementing policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Managing projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Handling organizational politics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relations-oriented:</th>
<th>External-oriented:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Supporting</td>
<td>● Networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Developing</td>
<td>● External monitoring (esp. senior manager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Recognizing</td>
<td>● Representing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Empowering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Relating skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Managing conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Managing stakeholder diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Knowledge &amp; Experience:</th>
<th>Nonprofit-oriented:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Self-awareness</td>
<td>● Committed to sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Strategic thinking</td>
<td>● Committed to mission/values of organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Discipline knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Bish and Becker, 2016)

Discussion of competencies or capabilities in the preceding frameworks tends to emphasize the "skills, behaviours, attributes" aspects of effective leadership. It is natural to expect successful leaders to have a grasp of the policy and practice issues in their particular fields and of good management practices and operational methods. A study comparing Canadian and Australian nonprofits and focusing just on the "knowledge needs" of the sector generated a schematic representation in this competency area similar to the preceding conceptual frameworks emphasizing skills and behaviours (Rathi, Given & Forcier, 2016). The researchers differentiated "knowledge management" in nonprofits in terms of both internal and external functioning, and shaped by both fixed conditions (e.g. geography of the nonprofit location, regulatory frameworks for operation), and experiential factors (interactions externally with the community and other actors and internally with board members and employees).
As reproduced in Figure 4 below, Rathi et al. (2016) offer an integrated portrayal of the knowledge management needs of the nonprofit, showing five major knowledge categories within which there are 29 sub-categories. Effective nonprofit leaders are expected to have command of these knowledge management areas. Further, the authors emphasize the importance of “internal marketing” in nonprofits— that is that they “commit to engaging staff/volunteers on either professional or organizational levels or a combination to build trust, personal relevance, and satisfaction to support and drive knowledge.” (Rathi et al., 2016, p. 25).

**FIGURE 4. SCHEMATIC DIFFERENTIATING LEADERSHIP COMPETENCY AREAS IN NONPROFIT KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT**

![Figure 4](image)

(Reproduced from Rathi et al., 2016)

Environmental uncertainty and instability is requiring greater levels of collaboration and collective work among nonprofits. Combining capacities and resources and sharing the work to achieve common goals, build social capital and enhance community resilience. Research, undertaken in the public sector, has teased out specific leadership skills for successful cross-organizational collaboration. Between 2009 and 2011, the University Network for Collaborative Governance worked on a set of collaborative competencies for public managers. Morse and Stephens (2012) report on a number of other public sector initiatives working on identifying collaborative competencies. They consolidate
findings on collaborative competencies in terms of attributes, skills and behaviours and organize them by stages in the collaborative process as shown in Figure 5.

**FIGURE 5. COLLABORATIVE COMPETENCIES- THEMES FROM THE LITERATURE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Initiation</th>
<th>Deliberation</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Issue analysis</td>
<td>● Stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>● Group facilitation</td>
<td>● Developing action plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Environmental assessment</td>
<td>● Political/community organizing</td>
<td>● Team-building &amp; group dynamics</td>
<td>● Designing governance structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Stakeholder identification</td>
<td>● Building social capital</td>
<td>● Listening</td>
<td>● Public engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Strategic thinking</td>
<td>● Process design</td>
<td>● Consensus building</td>
<td>● Network management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Interest-based negotiation</td>
<td>● Conflict resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Performance evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meta-categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative mind-set</th>
<th>Openness and risk-taking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passion for creating public value</td>
<td>Sense of mutuality and connectedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems thinking</td>
<td>Humility or measured ego</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Morse & Stephens, 2012, Table 2, p. 572)
While the approach to defining competencies varied, the review of nonprofit leadership frameworks identified a number of consistencies or similarities:

- A multiplicity of stakeholders both internally (employees, boards, members, volunteers) and externally (services to clients/constituencies, accountabilities to public and private funders and donors, relations with allies and competitors in the field of practice, profile to the general public) within which leaders are challenged to skilfully manage a complex set of relationships.

- Recognition that leadership need not be positionally-fixed at the executive level given the nature of nonprofit work, and that supporting leadership development within the nonprofit demands a certain level of awareness and developmental capability in senior leaders.

- The particular set of competencies required in nonprofit leadership may depend on “situational” variables such as size, stage of development, stability/security of the resource base, etc.

- Competent management of nonprofits may not differ significantly from management of a for-profit or public organization, but there is recognition that effective nonprofit leadership does require commitment to the values and mission of the organization and of the unique role and purpose of the nonprofit sector.

### 4. Consolidation of leadership competencies from the literature

The preceding conceptual frameworks are helpful as an orientation to leadership and leadership competencies in the nonprofit sector. Within the project’s time and resource limits, the literature reviewed offers additional approaches to identifying nonprofit leadership skills and capabilities based on their varying emphasis on knowledge, skills, behaviours and/or personal attributes.

In an attempt to consolidate the wide-ranging discussion on nonprofit leadership and leadership competencies, the findings have been organized into five main (or key) areas. Appendix I provides detail on whether and how the literature addresses these areas.
**Personal Attributes** - This area emphasizes the personal attributes and qualities of the nonprofit leader that grounds her/his ability to succeed in mission-driven work. It reflects the need to manage a complexity of relationships in a multi-stakeholder environment and achieve results. In that regard, the literature identifies personal leadership characteristics, such as the following:

- Ethical
- Integrity and respect
- Values-driven/commitment to cause/mission
- Trustworthiness
- Self-awareness/empathy
- Self-confidence
- Reliable
- Resilient

**Internal Leadership and Management** - This leadership area focuses on the need to command the respect and support of board members, staff and volunteers to be effective. The leader is the organization’s principal figure and must mobilize and guide the human resource base to achieve results and fulfill the mission. In that regard, the literature identifies a range of “relationship competencies” required of the nonprofit leader, including:

- Inspirational and motivational behaviours
- Interpersonal relations skills
- Empowering practices (sharing leadership)
- Participatory planning and decision-making
- Team-building and supporting
- Problem-solving and conflict resolving skills
- Culturally inclusive and respectful

Executive and senior leadership in nonprofit organizations must also have a set of “management competencies” for success, especially in the context of funding constraints and more stringent accountability demands. In relation to the organization’s governance and operational functioning, designated leadership positions within the nonprofit organization must exercise capabilities in the following:

- Financial budgeting and reporting
- Decision-making
- Human resource assessment and evaluation
- Performance measurement
- Strategic planning
- Use of technology
- Crisis management

**External Impact** - Other literature suggests that nonprofit leadership will be increasingly challenged by changing demographics and environmental complexity to perform effectively and achieve organizational goals. This orientation suggests that nonprofit leaders will need skills and capacities in the following areas:

- Adaptability/flexibility
- Goal-driven/strategic
- Analysis (opportunities and threats)
- Collaboration/networking
- Facilitating/enabling
- Negotiating
- Representing nonprofit value
- Knowledge of policy and field of service

**Future and Change Orientation** - In a diverse, complex and changing world, nonprofit leaders will need to be adaptive, resilient and highly anticipatory to both threats and opportunities. This orientation includes competencies in the following areas:

- Envisioning change/anticipatory
- Environmental and trend analysis
- Systems-thinking and strategic planning

The literature also identifies some particular competencies for the nonprofit leader driven to create change and social impact, including:

- Innovation
- Creativity
- Initiative
- Entrepreneurial
- Advocacy
Figure 6 shows how the leadership competency areas, consolidated from the literature review findings, relate to the environment and sets of multiple stakeholders both internally and externally that the non-profit leader engages.

**FIGURE 6. LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES IN RELATION TO MULTIPLE NONPROFIT STAKEHOLDERS**
5. Dynamic context for future nonprofit leadership

The literature highlights many social, economic, political and technological challenges for the future nonprofit sector and its leadership. This section provides an overview of the forces that have already begun to test leadership capabilities.

- **Economic conditions** offer little hope for restoration of traditional sources of public and private funding, certainly not in terms of long-term, stable core funding commitments (McIsaac et al., 2013; Clutterbuck & Howarth, 2007).
- **Performance expectations** and the demand for measurable results from multiple stakeholders will not abate (Kelly et al., 2011). The pressure to achieve greater efficiencies and to show results with the resources available will remain high (Pyke & Murphy, 2007).
- **Conservative political forces** will continue to reduce the role of government, which in turn will raise expectations and demands on the nonprofit sector to produce greater social benefits (Maxwell, 2010).
- **Demographic trends** including an aging population, changing expectations of Generation X and millennials, and the growing diversity of the population will drive change in the sector’s labour force and have implications for nonprofit leadership (McIsaac, Park, & Toupin, 2013).
- **Broader societal forces**, such as increasing inequality and growing urbanization which will reduce community capacity in rural communities, will have implications for leadership (McIsaac et al., 2013, Maxwell, 2010; Pyke & Murphy, 2007).
- **Technology** will be a major factor shaping future leadership of nonprofit organizations. Not only does it have implications for greater operational efficiencies in collecting and managing critical data, but it also will be increasingly marshalled for value-creation, profile-building, and revenue generation (McCorman, 2017; McIsaac et al., 2013; Saxton, 2012; Struthers, 2012; Maxwell, 2010). Access to the latest technology could be an issue for many parts of the under-resourced nonprofit sector and this could have an impact on the sector’s ability to attract the next generation of leadership raised on technology and social media (Maxwell, 2010). Technology will also have an impact on the structure and leadership of nonprofits, as virtual teams and dispersed organizations challenge traditional structures and approaches (Ziek & Smulowitz, 2012).
- **Continuing “blurring of boundaries”** between the nonprofit, for-profit, and public sector, was noted in several studies (Hannum et al.; Struthers, 2012; Jaworski, 2012). It has created new space for nonprofit and for-profit organizations to compete and collaborate (Jaworski, 2012). In the face of blurred boundaries, the nonprofit sector will have to more clearly and precisely define its public
value as a "powerful, independent and respected voice" that can meet emerging needs and solve problems (Slocock, 2014). DeHoog (2015) notes that nonprofits must clearly maintain their distinctive mission focused value proposition in collaborative initiatives to distinguish themselves from the profit orientation of businesses and the accountability focus of public sector organizations.

- Another phenomenon of "blurring boundaries" is social entrepreneurship led by innovators able to produce social value with a financial return (HR Council & CFC, 2015; Jones & Donmoyer, 2015; Light, 2006). Although a clear and precise theoretical construct for social entrepreneurship is still being developed, it is understood to incorporate innovative solutions to social needs or problems that generate sustaining financial returns (Jones & Donmoyer, 2015; Andersson, 2011). It includes both an innovation and an entrepreneurship component. Jones and Donmoyer (2015) note that, although social entrepreneurs are often seen as "individualistic and mavericks . . . antithetical to management", they are committed to "large scale sustainable social change" with "pattern-breaking ideas", which the authors contend would be beneficial to incorporate into nonprofit organizations and nonprofit education programs.

- The changing nature of employment and increased prevalence of precarious jobs is a challenge that the sector needs to address to ensure that there are opportunities to develop leadership in nonprofit organizations (Mclsaac et al., 2013, Maxwell, 2010; Pyke & Murphy, 2007). Some argue that a broad understanding of the sector’s role and value may be taking hold and could help attract new talent. LeRoux and Feeney (2013) find that "recent college graduates are less inclined toward government service, indicating a preference for nonprofit work." They cite a Panetta Institute survey where 58% of college graduates indicate that "Working for a nonprofit" is a “form of public service”, while only 29% thought that "Working for government" the same. Others note that there may be renewed interest in the sector, the result has been the creation of new organizations to reflect the unique interest of the founder rather than a decision to join and contribute to an existing nonprofit organization.

There appears to be a good understanding in the sector of these challenges and opportunities and of the need for nonprofit leadership to be prepared for a turbulent and uncertain future. Mclsaac et al. (2013) report that ONN survey respondents understand the changes that they are facing and are increasingly aware of the need to reframe and strengthen the sector’s narrative, to build sector capacity and effectiveness in areas such as governance, partnership building and human resource development. In terms of skills development needed in the nonprofit workforce, ONN survey respondents identified a number of emerging priorities in line with changes underway in the environment:
Struthers reports similar findings from a series of roundtables with nonprofit leaders on capacity-building conducted by the PricewaterhouseCoopers Canada Foundation (McAlpine & Temple, 2011 in Struthers, 2012), identifying the following developments and opportunities:

- Demographic shifts are bringing young people into the sector
- A rising interest in civic engagement and volunteerism
- Technological advances enable the sector to have a broader reach into the community
- Networks form that enable new ways of working together
- A blurring of boundaries between the nonprofit and for-profit sectors
- Increasing public scrutiny and demand for accountability and transparency
- New ways of thinking and models for achieving systemic change through large scale longer-term, multi-stakeholder initiatives.

Other studies reinforce these perceptions in the sector. Hannum et al. (2011) report on the opportunities and challenges emerging from two research projects based on surveys of leaders in the nonprofit sector. The participants acknowledge that changing technologies compel nonprofits to change the type of work they do and how they do it. They report working more often for collective impact through partnerships, collaborations, networks, and mergers since high value impacts are difficult to achieve by organizations on their own (Hannum et al., 2011).
Recently, the Centre for Creative Leadership (CCL) conducted several studies on the leadership skills needed in the future, including a survey of over 2,200 leaders from 24 organizations in three countries. The four most important future skills identified were inspiring commitment, leading employees, strategic planning, and change management (Centre for Creative Leadership, 2015).

Highlights of the results of another CCL survey reinforced those findings. Survey respondents indicate that having a strategic perspective, exercising participative management, and being a quick learner are currently important skills and will remain important in the future. The majority of respondents also indicated that nonprofit leadership is currently weak in the following skill areas identified as very important now and in the future:

- Change management
- Inspiring commitment
- Taking initiative
- Building collaborative relationships
- Leading employees
- Strategic planning

(CCL, 2015)

Additional findings came from national conversations with young professionals hosted by the HR Council and Community Foundations of Canada in 2015 on what the sector would look like in 2040. The 2040 foresight discussion identified that more people would become entrepreneurs and work remotely based on short-term contract relationships with organizations. This has implications for the structure of nonprofit organizations, how future workers would connect to these organizations and for future leadership (HR Council, 2015). The discussions highlighted the importance of cooperation and collaboration, disruption and innovation, and the need to shift human resource and leadership to a future vision of the sector that is based on abundance and what can be achieved rather from the current scarcity perspective. It also led to a questioning of traditional education, with the suggestion that education and experience would be assessed differently in the future, perhaps based on competencies (HR Council, 2015). Twelve recommendations were presented to build talent and develop leadership in the sector.
6. Implications for nonprofit leadership in the future

What are the implications of these findings for leadership competencies required in the nonprofit sector for success in the future? Research suggests that nonprofit leadership will be challenged by a dynamic and changing environment that will put more emphasis on “leadership” oriented change and social impact, balanced with firm “management” of organizational operations (Crawford, 2010).

The literature is fairly clear that the status quo will not be an option in the future. The changing dynamics both internally within nonprofit organizations and externally in the broader environment will compel the leadership to adapt, develop and grow for success and impact.

Leaders need to develop more open, flexible and connected organizational models based on diversity that support shared decision making, and exchange of information and ideas.

Less traditional, hierarchical organizational forms pursuing their singular missions will have to give way to more open, flexible, and connected structural/organizational models to manage the instability and uncertain conditions of the future. Thinking and research on nonprofit leadership for the future increasingly points to sharing decision-making within the organization, creating team-building and team-work opportunities, and supporting employees in their own leadership development (McCambridge, 2017; Lamb, 2014; Crutchfield & McLeod, 2012; Saxton, 2012). Nonprofit leaders will need to create more participatory work processes and to structure relations internally in less hierarchical and more collaborative ways (Saxton, 2012). Encouraging and promoting horizontal relationships within the organization versus vertical, command-and-control models will be emphasized.

At the same time, there is the expectation that executive and senior leaders have a grasp of major trends and issues affecting the organization and can provide the information and connections that enable their subordinates to perform effectively (McCambridge, 2017; Lamb, 2014).

With respect to the workforce, ethno-cultural diversity is unquestionably a major consideration and is seen as a benefit in terms of both the high education and skill levels that newcomers often bring to the workplace, and the opportunity to provide culturally sensitive and responsive service to more diverse communities with a more diverse human resource base.
Rowold et al. (2014) reinforce the importance of “a positive and mutually trusting relationship between a leader and his subordinates”, called “Leader-Member Exchange” (LMX), and suggests employee job satisfaction as a measure of leadership effectiveness. Comparing LMX to five other leadership constructs, Rowold et al. conclude that for both for-profits and nonprofits, LMX produced the most job satisfaction, followed by “transformational leadership” (value-based inspirational vision), and “initiating structure” (assigning/structuring work to subordinates).

Routhieaux (2015) argues that “shared”, “connective”, “distributed” leadership within a nonprofit makes it “better positioned for sustainability” (p. 144). Referencing Hickman’s work on leading organizations (2010), Routhieaux states that “teams and organizations that use shared leadership have been shown to better serve client needs, improve innovation and creativity, adapt to change more quickly and effectively, and navigate the ebbs and flows of turbulent environments more proactively and effectively.”

Routhieaux (2015) holds further that younger nonprofit professionals expect to be involved in decisions and that the shift towards collaborative decision making will have implications for nonprofit operations and leadership. He makes a compelling case for senior managers to intentionally shift their nonprofit mindset to “use the term leadership more broadly” and to incorporate the shared leadership commitment into recruitment and hiring policies and practices, training, job descriptions, and accountability and performance systems.

Recruiting, managing and developing people will continue to be a key aspect of future nonprofit leadership.

The attraction of the next generation of leaders into the nonprofit world is challenged by the lower wage levels in the sector, a more serious barrier to entry for youth graduating with high levels of university debt (Clutterbuck & Howarth, 2007). Given the precarious work that characterizes the sector, leaders will be challenged to attract new recruits (Van Ymeren, Lalonde (2015); McIsaac, Park, Toupin, 2015).

One study of 630 employees in nonprofit and for-profit organizations found that they equally valued financial security, but the nonprofit workers reported a better fit between their personal values and the organization’s values and were more highly motivated by personally meaningful and impactful work (DeCoorman, De Geiter, Pepermans & Jegers, 2009). There is evidence that college graduates value nonprofit work as a form of public service (LeRoux & Feeney, 2013). A major survey in 2006 of 30,000
post-secondary students from 143 colleges and universities across Canada found that among the choice of 20 industries in the private and public sectors for starting their careers, the nonprofit sector was competitive, falling in the mid-range (Pooley, 2006). Another survey of American and Canadian students in 2006 “found top characteristics on wish lists for ideal future employers include a progressive work environment, high ethical standards, innovation and social responsibility” (Pooley, 2006).

Nonprofit leaders will increasingly be required to communicate the public value of the sector, as well as the personal benefit of engaging with nonprofit organizations through volunteerism or work.

Branding and telling compelling stories about the sector will be important in maintaining and enhancing public trust and support. Engaging with employees and volunteers will be particularly important considerations for attracting and retaining millennials. Reviewing R. Alsop’s book on the millennial generation (The Trophy Kids Grow Up), Long (2010) summarizes the author’s claim that because of the nature of their upbringing, millennial employees will expect much personal attention, frequent performance feedback, understanding, empathetic supervision, fast promotions, flexible work schedules, and work opportunities that allow multi-tasking and the high use of technology.

Resilience is a key quality for future nonprofit leaders.

Struthers (2012) cites work from Harvard University that affirms the need for resilient leadership to show how their nonprofit organizations create public value and demonstrate strong operational capabilities. She links this quality to collaboration and networking skills. Ledesma (2014) cites multiple studies since the late 1990s, that describe the variables “that characterize resilience and thriving . . . [including] positive self-esteem, hardiness, strong coping skills, a sense of coherence, self-efficacy, optimism, strong social resources, adaptability, risk-taking, low fear of failure, determination, perseverance, and a high tolerance of uncertainty” (p. 1). Ledesma summarizes Howard and Irving’s finding (2013) that leadership is developed and shaped through “active engagement in hardship or obstacle… [and] that by overcoming obstacles, a person builds a competency to successfully deal with and bounce back from adversity” (pp. 5-6).
Technology will both enable and shape future nonprofit leadership.

Technology will shape the structure and leadership of nonprofit organizations. Saxton (2012) describes a participatory revolution within nonprofits and McCambridge (2017) argues that positional leadership will be less important and that future leadership will be based on trust and credibility and will involve bridging, connecting and curation functions. Direction and goal setting, communication, motivating, empowering, and facilitating are among the competencies identified by Ziek & Smulowitz (2012) for virtual team leadership. Similarly, other authors have identified commitment and trust, and knowledge management and transfer as important to the virtual organization of the future (Joshi, 2009; Hajro & Pudelko, 2010 in Ziek & Smulowitz, 2012). Lamb (2014) talks about shared leadership, where authority is broadly distributed within the organization.

There will also be implications for the type of work that nonprofits do and the competencies needed to facilitate, interpret and use the data. Sample (2017) advises that “data scientist” will be a top nonprofit job of the future with a focus on data, collecting, using and disseminating metrics and information to support learning, understanding and decision-making. This suggests that the nonprofit leader of the future will also need analytic competencies.

Leaders must have self-awareness and emotional intelligence.

They must have these with respect to managing interpersonal relationships. Lane and Wallis noted that the nonprofit leader must make decisions that manage the expectations of external stakeholders and those of the internal organization (as referenced in Hess & Bacigalupo, 2013). “Managing and balancing these interests is the basis of emotional intelligence in decision-making” (Hess & Bacigalupo, 2013 pp. 205-206). Saxton (2012) notes that more self-aware, empathetic, adaptive leaders will also recognize the need to create more participatory work processes and to structure relations internally in less hierarchical and more collaborative ways.
Increasingly, sector leaders see collaboration and networking strategies for collective impact as key to the sector’s future success.

Millesen (2014) reports on a panel of nonprofit experts that concluded that the future nonprofit sector leader will need to be a “facilitator of collective intelligence,” since complex social problems will call for multi-sectoral responses. In her review of literature on multi-sectoral (private-public-nonprofit) collaborations and leadership skills, DeHoog (2015) asserts that “organizational silos, boundaries, and hierarchies are becoming more and more obsolete in the face of rapidly changing environments in an increasingly global society” (pp.401-402).

Making change, taking initiative, and building collaborative relationships outside the organization are important for leadership of social change.

Studying 13 high impact nonprofit organizations, Crutchfield and McLeod-Grant (2012) reinforce their previous findings that high impact nonprofits, both large and small, work collaboratively to achieve collective impact. Nonprofits engaged in collaborations and partnerships build cross-organizational relationships, nurture networks, and frame a compelling narrative about their joined missions. They experiment with innovation, reflect, evaluate and learn together, and, if necessary, engage in the marketplace in non-traditional ways (e.g. social enterprise activity) for sustainability (Crutchfield & McLeod-Grant, 2012).

Nonprofit leaders are increasingly seen as social entrepreneurs.

Andersson (2011) describes nonprofit leaders as change agents in the nonprofit world and as needing competencies of a “nonprofit entrepreneur” or innovator to succeed.

Although social entrepreneurs are more often seen as highly individualistic leaders in the private sector with personal social missions, Light (2006) traces the literature’s discussion of social entrepreneurship in the nonprofit sector from as early as the late 1980s. In the last decade or more, social entrepreneurs have become recognized as a new type of leader and “changemaker”, and there is now study of how to incorporate “entrepreneurial” skill development into management education
programs (Mirabella & Young, 2012). Light describes these as:

“Management skills for successful entrepreneurship, including the ability to activate the public, raise capital, negotiate results, and manage the difficult transitions involving the scale up to full maturity... Social skills can be taught, as can entrepreneurial behaviours. So can financial and managerial skills such as fund raising, results-based evaluation, continuous improvement, and strategic planning”

(pp. 28-29)

Mirabella and Young (2012) studied curricula and management education programs for social entrepreneurship and, adding to a previous framework by Young and Grinsfelder (2011) determined there were five skills sets – market skills, political skills, philanthropic skills, generic management skills and leadership skills including governance, organizational development and behaviour, sustainability, and innovation (Mirabella & Young, 2012, pp. 57).

7. Conclusion

Since becoming a focus in management studies in the 1970-80s, nonprofit leadership has received a good deal of attention in both theory and research. Initially subject to explanation in terms of personal traits and characteristics particular to the missions of the not-for-profit sector, nonprofit leadership has now become more integrated into the general management study of leadership, although it is still recognized as distinct within the field.

Despite the focus on leadership and nonprofit leadership in particular, there remains a question of what "core" competencies are particularly critical for the success of leadership in the nonprofit sector. The general study of leadership itself has evolved from a concentration on leadership types and styles to a focus on competencies, broadly defined as "knowledge, skills, behaviours and attributes", and leadership in the nonprofit sector has been subject to the same investigation. As this review of the nonprofit leadership literature has shown, there are many frameworks proposed for this study and not
a great deal of consistency in what is clearly defined as a competency or how to classify and order different levels of competencies into coherent categories.

Conceptual frameworks for leadership in the nonprofit sector reflect some similarities that are helpful starting points in the search for core competencies. All recognize the complex set of relationships with multiple stakeholders internally and externally that the nonprofit leader is challenged to manage. The mission-driven work to create social or public value is also commonly reflected in nonprofit competency frameworks. More recent writing emphasizes how increasingly important it is for nonprofit leaders to clearly define and communicate their organization’s value proposition to the community. Exercising value-based leadership while maintaining organizational viability under usually constrained financial conditions, however, also demands strong management capabilities.

The literature also describes the implications for nonprofit leadership of the many societal trends and forces for change heading into the future. The nonprofit sector is heavily human resource intensive and attracting younger workers and future leaders will demand sensitivity to their interests and needs. Less hierarchical and more supportive and developmental management models emphasizing participative processes, teamwork and shared decision-making will nurture the next generation of nonprofit leaders. As well, the coming years will present even greater opportunities to welcome and engage newcomers into the sector, many arriving with skills and education that will enrich the nonprofit human resource capacity. Leaders will need to design and implement management and support systems that facilitate the integration and development of this new potential.
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### APPENDIX
LITERATURE REVIEW OF NONPROFIT LEADERSHIP ACROSS FIVE AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonprofit Leadership Competencies Literature</th>
<th>Personal attribute</th>
<th>Internal leadership and management</th>
<th>External impact</th>
<th>Future-directed orientation</th>
<th>Change-orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McCambridge, 2017</td>
<td>✔✔✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bish &amp; Becker, 2016</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland et al., 2016</td>
<td>✔✔✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraemer, 2016</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie, 2015</td>
<td>✔✔✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeHoog, 2015</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie, 2015</td>
<td>✔✔✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattes, 2015</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell, 2015</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamb, 2014</td>
<td>✔ ✔✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ledesma, 2014</td>
<td>✔✔✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowold et al, 2014</td>
<td>✔✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slocock, 2014</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor et al, 2014</td>
<td>✔✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hess et al., 2013</td>
<td>✔✔✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Checkmark 1</td>
<td>Checkmark 2</td>
<td>Checkmark 3</td>
<td>Checkmark 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapila, 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutz et al., 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crutchfield et al., 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillan &amp; McLaren, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirabella &amp; Young, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morse &amp; Stephens, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struthers, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang &amp; Ashcroft, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziek &amp; Smulowitz, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander et al., 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andersson, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson &amp; Scheiter, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannum et al., 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linzey, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temkin, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford, 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell, 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paton &amp; Brewster, 2008¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ As summarized in McMillan & McLaren, 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chambers et al., 2007&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshi &amp; Lazaova, 2005&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light, 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGuire, 2006&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cormack &amp; Stanton, 2003&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay, 1996&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACOSVO, 2015</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada, 2015</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford, 2010</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD, n.d.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACEVO, 2012</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>2</sup> As summarized in McMillan & McLaren, 2012
<sup>3</sup> As summarized in Ziek & Smulowitz, 2012
<sup>4</sup> As summarized in DeHoog, 2015
<sup>5</sup> As summarized in McMillan & McLaren, 2012
<sup>6</sup> As summarized in McMillan & McLaren, 2012
ACEVO. (2012). Tools: A leadership framework for third sector CEOs leading public service-providing organisations. Association of Chief Executives of Voluntary Organisations. p.141-142. Retrieved from: https://www.google.ca/url?sa=t&amp;rct=j&amp;q=&esrc=s&amp;source=web&amp;cd=1&amp;ved=0ahUKEwiMuPDtoHSAhXk34MKHYVIgMAQ0QFggeMAA&amp;url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.acevo.org.uk%2Fsites%2Fdefault%2Ffiles%2FPart%25204_Appraising%2520the%2520CEO%2520%252BBPAGES%2520141-143%252055D.pdf&amp;usg=AFQjCNRhpW3V7BypQA52yqqr64PVQRemoq&amp;sig2=6G2ccEoCJE_rlRU318qxmA
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