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Abstract

This study explores the associations of Psychological Capital consisting of self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience) and Burnout of nonprofit leaders in the Participation in Standards for Excellence® Institute training program (“Standards for Excellence”) and Compliance with Standards for Excellence. Data were collected from 119 executive directors in Oklahoma, Alabama, and Maryland through a one-time online survey. In addition, other independent variables of Grit, Perceived Support for Innovation and Learning, Resistance to Change, Flourishing, and Perceived External Prestige were examined for their relationship to Participation in Standards for Excellence and Compliance with Standards for Excellence.

Using analysis of covariance, levels of Psychological Capital and Burnout were not found to be statistically significant in those who had Participated in Standards for Excellence from those who had not. Secondly, as the level of the Psychological Capital increased for the executive directors, their level of Burnout decreased, (r = -.649, p < .01). Psychological Capital was shown to moderate Compliance with Standards for Excellence (β = .258, p < .01) while controlling for the variable of the size of the organization’s annual operating, though Burnout was not. What is clear from these results is that it is the size of the organization and the level of Psychological Capital that the executive director possesses that ultimately results in Compliance with the Standards for Excellence. Implications for future Standards for Excellence Institute training efforts of nonprofit leaders will be discussed.
Keywords: Psychological Capital, Burnout, Standards for Excellence, Executive Directors, regression, ancova, External Prestige, moderators
Chapter 1: Introduction

The United States has seen rapid growth in nonprofit organizations (“NPOs”) with over 60% being formed since 1990 (Hall, 2005; Hammack, 2006; National Center for Charitable Statistics, 2011). It does not appear that this trend is slowing any time soon, as there is an average of over 40,000 new nonprofits registering with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) each year, resulting in over 1.8 million on record (Guidestar, 2014). Nonprofits are dependent on funding from private foundations, government grants, and individuals to start, maintain, and expand their organizations. Despite this record growth in nonprofits, philanthropy giving to nonprofits has not kept up with the pace of the demand for services or with inflation (Lawrence, 2012). Nonprofits are faced with increased competition and fewer funding opportunities and are struggling to attract new and diversified funding. In addition they are challenged to keep current programs operative while also creating new programs to meet the changing community needs (Hudson, 2005; Norton, 2010). In this age of governmental grant cuts, streamlining of services, and increasing numbers of mergers, the strategies that nonprofits use to maintain or increase their effectiveness with restricted resources is an overriding concern (Boris, De Leon, Roeger, & Nikolova, 2010).

All of these difficulties and rising professionalism of the field have seen nonprofits scrambling to distinguish themselves from each other and to push for more measureable outcomes of programs and services to attract new and increased funding from donors (Lynch-Cerullo & Cooney, 2011; Epstein & McFarlan; Gill, 2010; Carman 2010). In addition to these external trials and influences, internally NPOs are often operating in a climate of increased staff burnout, equipment shortage, outdated
technology, and lack of qualified staff. Despite these sometimes overwhelming conditions, nonprofits are still expected to produce innovative, creative programming exhibiting their ability to problem solve in a timely fashion while utilizing available resources efficiently (Light, 2004; Gregory & Howard, 2009). What may help nonprofit executive directors (“ED”s) manage these complex issues is the building of their individual Psychological Capital. Psychological Capital consists of self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). Psychological Capital helps individuals build on who they know (social capital), what they already have (financial capital), based on what they already know (human capital), while challenging one to get ready for the future (hope) (Luthans & Youssef, 2007). This study examines the psychological capital in individuals’ relationship with training. It also researches its association with burnout and implementation of Standards for Excellence® (performance).

**Problem Statement**

Survey research continues to show a potential, large turnover of nonprofit executives, up to 65%, beginning in the next five years (Bell, Moyers, & Wolfred, 2006). What is driving that turnover, besides the impending retirement of the baby boomer leaders, is the relationship between the executive director and the board of directors (Halpern, 2006). Of the two thousand nonprofit executive directors who were surveyed in 2006, 34% reported that their predecessors were forced out of their jobs by the board of directors (Bell, et al). Board leadership, which has as one of its responsibilities supervising the executive director, often turns over every two or three years (BoardSource, 2012). The ED’s inability to adapt to a proposed organizational,
structural, functional, or reporting change at the behest of new board leadership is often a cause of derailment. How executive directors manage the continual rotation of board chairs and an inability to adapt to the direction of a new board president could be one of the keys to whether they derail or survive.

**Derailment and Turnover**

Leaders who cannot adapt to change run the risk of leaving their positions: either voluntarily, being derailed, or forced out. Van Velsor and Leslie (1995) identified leaders who derail as failing to build interpersonal relationships, meet business objectives, build and lead a team, and change or adapt during a transition. The need to adapt to the different personality styles encountered among board leadership, staff, funders, and others is a sobering reality for the nonprofit executive director (Joslyn, Berkshire, & Quotah, 2009). Olinske (2009) found that a poor relationship between the board of directors and the executive director was associated with an executive director’s disengagement and exhaustion, two of the leading characteristics of burnout. Burnout, in turn, can result in withdrawal behaviors or termination from an organization (Bakker, Demerouti, & Euwema, 2005). This failure rate is not unique to the nonprofit world. Hogan, Hogan, and Kaiser (2009) in their review of 12 studies over 25 years evaluating executives in business concluded: “two-thirds of existing managers are insufferable and at least half will eventually fail” (p. 5).

Derailment research has found both successful and derailed executives have many characteristics in common including: (1) intelligence, (2) high potential, (3) outstanding achievement, and (4) ambitiousness and willingness to sacrifice. Clearly these executives are primed to be successful, so what happens? De Meuse, Dai, and
Hallenbeck (2010) indicate what distinguishes failed executives from successful ones is: their inability and unwillingness to change; reliance on a narrow set of skills; defensiveness about failure; and attempting to blame others (emphasis added by author). The cost to the organization is substantial when executive directors derail or leave, with potential costs to the organization over 20 times the executive’s salary (in direct and indirect costs) (Wells, 2005). This can be compounded by the collateral effects to the organization such as loss of funding, key staff and/or volunteers, program failure, and poor morale (Finkin, 1991). For funders who invest in organizations, this loss of leadership (particularly if a leader is ousted) can be seen as a reason to be more circumspect in future funding for the organization, thus further compounding the fundraising issues for the subsequent executive director (Light, 2004).

Two-thirds of those surveyed from the Bell et al. study (2006) were in the position as an executive director for the first time, and over half of them had been in that position for less than four years. It could be assumed that these individuals, as newly appointed EDs, would stay in their position for a while, yet a third indicated they planned on leaving their current position in less than two years despite reportedly enjoying their jobs. The desire to serve or support a cause, which has brought many executive directors into the nonprofit world, is juxtapositioned with the expectations of boards who ask them to “function instead as aggressive entrepreneurs”, attracting clients who are able to pay for services while recruiting and maintaining viable relationships with donors (Salamon, 2012, p. 39). How executive directors balance these demands can affect not only their performance and desire to serve but can also shape their level of burnout. Clearly from this study it appears that many nonprofits are
at risk of burnout or derailment. What this study will examine is what can be done to lower those risks.

**Improving Performance and Lowering Burnout**

A study by Cohen and Gagin (2005) indicates skill-development training as a way to enhance performance and reduce burnout. Taking the recommendation of training further, Maslach (2001) argued that training helps to increase self-efficacy (one of the components of psychological capital), which in turn minimizes burnout. Research has shown that employees with high Psychological Capital have more positive feelings about the future and their ability to handle challenges on the job, which enhances job satisfaction and lowers their intentions to leave (Avey, Reichard, Luthans, & Mhatre, 2011 and Luthans, Avolio, Avey & Norman, 2007). Though training can help to relieve burnout, executive directors may feel time and money spent on staff development takes away from the organization being able to serve more clients (Siegel, Kappaz, & Dowell, 2006). Some funders have understood this quandary and been willing to help nonprofits by investing in training for leaders through capacity building efforts for nonprofits (Wing, 2004; Austin, Regan, Samples, Schwartz, & Carnochan, 2011; Dolan, 2002).

**Building Capacity of Nonprofit Organizations**

Building capacity, as defined by the Grantmakers for Effective Organizations, is “the ability of an organization to fulfill its mission through a blend of sound management, strong governance, and a persistent rededication to achieving results” (GEO-GEN, 2000, p.2). Wagner states, “What propels successful nonprofits to new levels of effectiveness is not any single initiative, but rather a deliberate program to enhance its capabilities at all levels, from its strategy to its systems and structure”
(p.103). Capacity building efforts for nonprofits can vary greatly. Types of capacity building range from grants given (for program, capacity, general operating, research and development, technical assistance, management assistance, technology, capital, and specialized staff); to skill set trainings (leadership development, fund development, strategic planning, board development, program development, implementation and evaluation, financial management, technology, human resources, governance, and communications both internal and external); to loans (for cash flow, working capital, business ventures, capital projects and program-related investments); to peer learning groups (learning circles, conferences/conventions, associations, task forces, discipline-specific learning, agency partnerships, and membership groups); to executive coaching, (both external and internal); to management assistance (either provided by foundation staff or a paid consultant hired and selected by the funding source or hired by the nonprofit).

Yet nonprofits are hindered in developing individual capacity building efforts by costs, lack of knowledge, and time. Capacity building grants are based on developing and maintaining strong relationships with funders. Loans also follow a strong donor relationship base but are usually reserved for organizations that have physical capital to leverage or are seen as having programming that lends itself to separate entrepreneurial business ventures. The most commonly available type of capacity building is training or management assistance, which is usually generalized training often offered through state or national association of nonprofits (Wagner, 2003).
Training as an Intervention

Increasingly nonprofit training is built around improving accountability of the nonprofit organizations to their stakeholders, constituents, and funders. One example of this type of accountability training program is the Standards for Excellence® Institute from the Maryland Association of Nonprofits. In addressing what constitutes competence among nonprofits, the Maryland Association of Nonprofit Organizations created guidance areas and 55 nonprofit operating standards known as the Standards for Excellence® in 1998. When nonprofit leaders are juggling so many demands from clients, boards, funders, and others, why should they bother to comply with accountability (“standards”) implementation? Studies by Tongel and Petresu (2004), Yetman and Yetman (2012), Sloan (2009), and Petrescu and Tongel (2006) show organizations that comply with standards are perceived by their peers to be high-performing organizations committed to excellence; provide more accurate financial reporting; and—what most nonprofits are interested in achieving—see an increase in financial support. But does participating in a capacity building training program, which emphasizes accountability such as Standards of Excellence, correlate with building psychological capital in the executive director and reducing burnout?

Purpose of the Study

The focus of this study was to examine 1) whether those who participate in Standards for Excellence Institute training have higher psychological capital than those who do not, and 2) whether higher Psychological Capital impacts the implementation of standards or performance. This research also analyzed the relationship between Psychological Capital and Burnout. While the business community has shown
correlations linking participation in training (following an adult learning model) lead to
an increase in Psychological Capital, research in the nonprofit community has been
limited. This study could also help investigate the validity of building methods for
increasing Psychological Capital into the training experience. In the literature review,
the effects of training on growing Psychological Capital and the specific consideration
of standards training will be discussed in more detail.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Introduction

What determines a great organization? Is it leadership, the organization capacity for growth and development, a combination of the two, or does one determine the other? What distinguishes successful leaders and the organizations they lead? This chapter will review current research on the history, definition, and impact of Psychological Capital on leadership; the building of Psychological Capital of leaders through a training intervention; and how a nonprofit capacity training program such as the Standards for Excellence may be used to lower the rate of burnout while increasing the capacity of the organization itself to succeed.

Challenges of Nonprofit Leadership

The TCC Group, formerly known as The Conservation Company, works with nonprofits, philanthropies, and corporate citizenship programs to provide evaluation, strategy, capacity-building, and grantmaking assistance. Their review of national, regional, and local capacity building initiatives found that “organizations that have strong ‘internal leadership’ (leaders who apply a mission-centered, focused, and inclusive approach to making decisions and inspire and motivate people to act upon them) and ‘leader vision’ (leaders who formulate and motivate others to pursue a clear vision) are significantly more sustainable than those that do not” (TCC Group; York, 2009, p. 3). Yukl and Mahsud (2010) indicate leaders (EDs) must be responsive to the changing circumstances in their organizations, particularly as it relates to the development of new funding sources, program innovation, rapid technology change, and demonstration of program results. However it is often lonely at the top for
nonprofit executive directors—management structure is small and not well supported—leaving executive directors to feel as if they are isolated in carrying the burden for change and success on their shoulders alone (Fischer & Beimers, 2009).

This isolation of leadership can inhibit feedback that might enhance change and growth. The characteristic that distinguishes effective (nonprofit) leaders is “the willingness and ability to learn new competencies in order to perform under first-time, tough, or different conditions” (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2000, p. 323). The need for nonprofit executive directors to grow, change, and adapt in response to their environment makes the importance of being an adaptable leader (learning agile) more evident (Ritchie & Eastwood, 2006; Norton, 2010). Psychological Capital has as its components self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience, which lends itself easily to a description of an adaptive or learning agile leader.

**Psychological Capital**

Psychological Capital emerged from the Positive Organizational Behavior (“POB”) movement that, in turn, was formed as a blend of the positive psychology movement, Bandura’s concept of self-efficacy, and the field of organizational behavior (OB). Organizational Behavior (OB) is the study of how people interact within an organization (Newstrom & Davis, 1993), while POB as first defined and conceptualized by Luthans (2002a) is “the study and application of positively-oriented human resource strengths and psychological capacities that can be measured, [adaptable to being] developed, and effectively managed for performance improvement in today’s workplace” (p. 59). POB (like positive psychology) is both an attempt to move away from the medical model of what is wrong with an individual and the identification of
human strengths that enable optimal functioning in the organization. POB draws more from psychological resources characterized by “state-like” components that are capable of being developed (such as self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience) rather than “trait-like” factors (which are more fixed or hard-wired in individuals such as personality or intelligence). The keys to positive organizational behavior, besides its positivity, is its insistence on measureable components and its bid for developing effective leaders and improving employee performance (Luthans, 2002b). To help visually explain how the psychological resources of POB are distinguished from Personality Theories and other “trait-like” factors (which have an effect on job performance), see Table 2 below. While personality theories tend to be not subject to change over time, in contrast, the characteristics of Psychological Capital are very malleable to change and subsequently lend themselves to be improved through resources such as training.

**Table 1: State vs. Traits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Changeable</th>
<th>State-Like</th>
<th>Trait-Like</th>
<th>Hard-Wired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td>Self-Efficacy (symbolizing, forethought, observation, self-regulation, and self-reflection)</td>
<td>Big Five Personality (conscientiousness, emotional stability, extroversion, agreeableness, openness to experience)</td>
<td>Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moods</td>
<td>Hope (goal-directed energy “agency” and planning to meet goals “pathways”)</td>
<td>Core Self-Evaluations (self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability)</td>
<td>Talent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors</td>
<td>Optimism (cognitive, emotional and motivational)</td>
<td>Positive Psychological Traits (character strengths, and virtues)</td>
<td>Inherited Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resiliency (patterns of positive adaptation in response to risk or adversity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological Capital (Hope, Self-Efficacy, Resiliency, and Optimism)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 has been adapted from Luthans, F. & Youssef, C. M. (2007).
POB and its approach to leadership continues to evolve. It has moved from the conceptual model of Positive Approach to Leadership (PAL) (Luthans, Luthans, Hodgetts, & Luthans, 2001) consisting of RICH components of Leadership Realistic optimism, Leadership emotional Intelligence, Leadership Confidence and Leadership Hope to CHOSE consisting of Confidence (self-efficacy), Hope, Optimism, Subjective well-being (or happiness) and Emotional intelligence (Luthans, 2002a). The dropping of emotional intelligence and the inclusion of resiliency (Luthans, 2002b) form the current configuration as Psychological Capital, known by its acronym as HERO, Hope, Efficacy, Resiliency, and Optimism. Luthans, Youssef, and Avolio (2007) define Psychological Capital as:

... an individual’s positive psychological state of development characterized by: (1) having confidence (self-efficacy) to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging tasks; (2) making a positive attribution (optimism) about succeeding now and in the future; (3) persevering toward goals and, when necessary, redirecting paths to goals (hope) in order to succeed; and (4) when beset by problems and adversity, sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond (resilience) to attain success (p. 3).

Each of the components that make up Psychological Capital will be explored individually before discussion of research relating to Psychological Capital as a whole.
Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is defined as “one’s conviction (or confidence) about his or her abilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to successfully execute a specific task within a given context” (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998b, p. 66). Self-efficacy is comprised of three dimensions: magnitude, strength, and generality. **Magnitude** refers to the level of task difficulty and the belief in oneself to succeed at the task. **Strength** is how positive the person feels about one’s ability to accomplish the task. The higher the strength, the more likely it will be for them to be successful. The third dimension of **generality** refers to the extent that the self-efficacy of an individual on completing specific tasks is generalized to an overall feeling of competence. If the generality dimension is high, one may see oneself as organized, capable, and able to take on goals that stretch one’s limits, or if this dimension is low, they may struggle with taking on new tasks and prefer working with familiar tasks or problems (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998a).

Self-efficacy has been widely studied as a construct that improves work-related performances such as adaptability, coping, creativity, managerial performance, skill acquisition, and task complexity. Conversely, self-efficacy is not exclusively a positive attribute. Too much self-efficacy can lead to over-confidence and increased risk-taking and heightened failures. Too little can immobilize an individual in trying new ideas or make them resistant to change. Low self-efficacy of individuals has been associated with depression, anxiety, helplessness, and burnout (failure) while high self-efficacy in individuals can increase motivation, effort, and persistence (success), so the possession of high or low Psychological Capital can also be the cause for success or failure of an
individual (Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008; Breso, Schaufeli, & Salanova, 2011; and Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998a).

The nonprofit world represents an interesting microcosm of how individuals and organizations succeed. An interesting question can be asked: why is it, with similar organizations, does one organization thrive while the other dies? Bandura would suggest it has to do with the self-efficacy of the leadership and staff who, in turn, work with increasing the self-efficacy of clients, which ultimately helps them to change (1998). Building self-efficacy does not just refer to clients, EDs must also assure funders not only of the worthiness of their mission and their organization’s capability of achieving it, but of the efficaciousness of their gift, and that it can and will make a difference. Funders are not immune from their own insecurities, and low levels of self-efficacy can affect an ability to make a meaningful contribution, i.e., when a funder’s self-efficacy is low, this often translates into a small initial gift to an agency to test the success of a granting partnership before investing larger dollars into an organization (Orosz, 2000).

Hope

Hope is defined as “a positive motivational state that is based on an interactively derived sense of successful (1) agency and (2) pathways” (Snyder, Irving, & Anderson, 1991, p. 287). Hope as developed by Snyder, et al., is not the mythical “let’s hope for the best” kind of thinking but a specific goal-directed initiative (known as “agency”) and planning opportunities (“pathways”) to meet a goal. Individuals with high hope as described by Snyder (2002) are a cornucopia of achievers who excel in academics, athletics, physical health, and psychological adjustment. They accomplish this from a
consequential framework of setting goals and achieving them. Snyder et al (1991) differentiate between those with high-hope in how they approach life: those with high hope are emboldened by first time accomplishments; sustained efforts needed to get to goals; or expansion of a goal from an original plan, while those with low hope are often defeated by obstacles in their path, have limited ability to think of alternative plans, or are stuck in a heightened awareness of the problem, often perceived (incorrectly) as insurmountable. High-hope individuals see obstacles as challenges to conquer, temporary blocks to get around, or a complication that must be confronted and managed.

Hope allows individuals to achieve their goals through sheer willpower (“agency”) while the formulization of alternative paths (“pathways”) is critical to any difficulties or struggles that may be encountered (Youssef & Luthans, 2007; Luthans & Jensen, 2002). Snyder (2002) further describes low hope individuals as those that struggle with negative emotions that feed their insecurities, resulting in negative thought play and diversion from tasks at hand. He equates the inability of those with attention deficit disorder to stay on task as examples of low-hope individuals. High-hope individuals, on the other hand, are the maze detectives, able to discern alternative routes when confronted with an obstacle in their way. Individuals with high hope often are also optimistic (Snyder, Rand, & Sigmon, 2005).

Snyder (2002) differentiates hope from optimism as not just distancing oneself from negative outcomes (as in optimism) but also the intentional directing toward a goal path. Further, Snyder discriminates self-efficacy from hope as assuming a person can perform necessary actions in a particular prescribed setting (a responsive action).
whereas hope theory emphasizes the individual initiating (and continuing) toward a self-prescribed goal. For both children and adults, possible causes of loss of hope can be the result of abuse, neglect, domestic violence, traumatic events, and catastrophic illness.

However, Snyder (2002) does not recognize false hope as a possible premise or alternative to hope but rather an illusion or mental deficit. He sees the incongruence and regards false hope and hope as mutually exclusive. Those with high-hope set goal expectations based on obtainable goals not illusions (false hope), which is not to say they are always easy. Individuals with high hope stretch themselves to achieve results. Because the definition of high hope includes a precursor to developing alternative paths if obstructed, it does not manifest itself in bad planning that would be another indicator of false hope. How does hope strengthen the model of Psychological Capital?

Youssef and Luthans’ (2007) research on positive psychological capacities and work-related outcomes yields some interesting results. Measuring the relationship between the positive organizational behaviors of hope, optimism, and resilience to job performance (along with job satisfaction, work happiness, and organizational commitment) yielded significant positive relationships of hope, optimism, and resilience to job satisfaction and work happiness. Only hope showed a relationship to job performance, while both hope and resilience were correlated to organizational commitment. The concept of hope, therefore, is easily identifiable to most nonprofit executive directors. It is probably what drove them into nonprofit work—the hope they could make a difference—whether that was in the life of an individual, a family, or a community. The pathway(s) to how “I” make that difference is the ultimate challenge
for executive directors, staff, and board and requires more than just being optimistic about a potential outcome.

**Optimism**

“Optimism is making a positive attribution about succeeding now and in the future” (Luthans, 2007, p. 3). Optimism can have a positive effect in a number of areas of one’s life: work (Seligman & Schulman, 1986; Schulman, 1999), education (Yates, 2002), athletic performance (Gould, Dieffenbach, & Moffett, 2002), politics (Zullow & Seligman, 1990) and health (Matthews, Raikkonen, Sutton-Tyrell, & Kuller, 2004). Optimism is an explanatory style that everything will work out due to one’s confidence and persistence rather than accepting what is perceived as impending doom that is representative of a pessimist (Luthans & Youssef, 2007).

However, being optimistic at all costs, often defined as *unrealistic optimism*, can also be detrimental. It can lead to one continuing to pursue a course of action that is not realistic or beneficial, leading to poor outcomes (Hmielecki & Baron, 2009). While optimism is often described as a personality trait in academic literature, there has been success in retraining pessimists to be more optimistic, suggesting it can also be “state-like” (Carver, Scheier, & Segerstrom, 2010, Brunwasser, Gillham, & Kim, 2009, and Seligman, Ernst, Gillham, Reivich, & Linkins, 2009). When trying to bridge the gap between unrealistic optimism and realistic pessimism, Forgeard and Seligman (2012) offer the term, *flexible optimism*, defined by being “mostly optimistic, tempered with small doses of realistic pessimism when needed” (p. 115). Optimists, like those who are resilient, try to actively solve problems rather than running away from them (Segerstrom & Nes, 2006).
Optimism in nonprofit organizations is often reflected in their mission statement. Is their mission statement a stretch goal that appears within their reach, or is it an unrealistic goal that may not be met within their lifetime? The realistic or flexible optimist may set a high goal as a mission statement, but they will also possess a strategic plan that carefully maps out their way to success (Seligman, 1991). How easily they adjust to changes in direction of a plan is an indication of an individual’s resiliency.

**Resiliency**

Resiliency is “the capacity to rebound or bounce back from adversity, conflict, failure, or even positive events, progress, and increased responsibility” (Luthans, 2002b, p. 702). Individuals who are described as resilient are not just able to recover from catastrophic events but also hold strong values and beliefs which they are able to sustain while adapting to unexpected situations. Resiliency is a proactive approach that views problems as challenges and obstacles as opportunities (Luthans & Youssef, 2007). Resiliency was first studied at some length in the 1960s regarding childrens’ ability to succeed despite their circumstances of birth or environment (Masten & Reed, 2005). While resiliency studies of children still abound, literature is moving away from the trauma-recovery focus of resiliency to a broader focus concerning the ability of an individual to recover from any setback.

How to build resilient leaders who not only thrive but survive has also been the focus of research theorists and management practitioners outside of the nonprofit world, because resilience, like the other components of Psychological Capital, is seen as developable through training interventions (Youssef & Luthans, 2007; Waite &
Richardson, 2004, Luthans, 2002a; Luthans & Youssef, 2004). Resilience, however, is not for the faint of heart; “resilient people . . . face reality with staunchness, make meaning of hardship . . . and improvise solutions from thin air.” (Coutu, 2002, p. 55). Nonprofit executive directors often find themselves having to readjust whether it is from the failure of a grant request, redesigning a program to produce better results, or replacing a valued staff, volunteer, or board member. How they react, whether it is to be challenged by the opportunity or burdened by the problem, is reflective of their resiliency.

**Psychological Capital and Employee Attitudes, Behavior, and Performance**

Since its introduction in 2002, Psychological Capital has been tested for its relationship to employee attitudes, behaviors, and performance (Luthans, Avey, Avolio, & Peterson, 2010). Psychological Capital is usually presented in survey format of 24 questions (though a shorter version is now available) in a six-item Likert response ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). Luthans, Avolio, Avey, and Norman’s (2007) research on Psychological Capital, testing the model with both students and employees, indicated the overall Psychological Capital measure was a better predictor than individual scales across both samples. This study was also the first to test Psychological Capital for predicting job satisfaction and affective organizational commitment, two concepts highly correlated with intent to stay among an organization’s employees. Psychological Capital provided a unique variance beyond the other measures of conscientiousness, extraversion, and core self-evaluations.
In a meta-analysis of over 51 studies (12,567 participants) published by Avey, Reichard, Luthans, and Mhatre (2011), Psychological Capital’s impact on employee attitudes, behaviors, and performance shows that Psychological Capital increases job satisfaction and psychological well-being at work with a strong positive correlation while providing a moderately positive correlation with organizational commitment. Psychological Capital delivered moderately negative correlations with employee cynicism, turnover intentions, and employee stress and anxiety as illustrated in Figure I. Psychological Capital was also moderately positively correlated to organizational citizenship behaviors and performance while moderately negatively correlated with employee deviance. In addition, the undesirable employee behavior of deviance was avoided if leaders possessed higher Psychological Capital. Twenty-eight percent of the variance in positive outcomes and 24% decrease in negative outcomes were attributable to Psychological Capital.

**Figure 1: Psychological Capital's Impact on Work Attitudes, Behaviors, and Performance**

![Figure 1 diagram](image)

Figure I, reprinted with permission, Avey, Reichard, Luthans & Mhatre (2011), p. 140.
In five studies connecting Psychological Capital to employee performance, the results showed that Psychological Capital has a significant positive relationship to performance, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Psychological Capital also fully mediated the relationship between a supportive climate and employee performance (Luthans, Norman, Avolio, & Avey, 2008). In addition, Psychological Capital of the employee is moderately positively related to the employee’s manager positive performance evaluation and sales performance, while it is moderately negatively related to cynicism, intentions to quit, and strongly negatively correlated with counterproductive work behaviors (Avey, Nimnicht & Pigeon, 2010). Avey, Luthans, and Youssef (2010) discovered it moderately positively related to individual organizational citizenship behaviors and strongly positively correlated to organizational citizenship behaviors. Psychological Capital was discovered to descend over time directionally in a matched effect with both the supervisor-rated and sales-results performance. The same study also indicated a positive relationship between a leader’s Psychological Capital and the followers’ Psychological Capital and their subsequent performance, as well as revealing a negative relationship between problem complexity and follower Psychological Capital (Peterson, Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, & Zhang, 2011). McMurray, Pirola-Merlo, Saros, and Islam (2010) showed in their study of a nonprofit that transformational leadership accounted for 35% of the variance in an employee’s Psychological Capital, 60% in Organizational Climate, and 12% in Employee Commitment. Psychological Capital has also presented as strongly positively correlated to transformational leadership and authenticity, moderately positively
correlated with effectiveness and moderately negatively correlated with laissez-faire leadership (Toor & Ofori, 2010).

How Psychological Capital impacts positive organizational change was described in a study by Avey, Wernsing, and Luthans (2008), finding Psychological Capital and positive emotions reduced feelings of cynicism and deviance in working adults. This study also noted that employees with higher Psychological Capital were more likely to possess positive emotions and demonstrate organizational citizenship behavior to a greater degree than those with low Psychological Capital. An increase in organizational citizenship behavior is linked to less cynicism and deviant behaviors by employees, which can positively affect the implementation of organizational change (Stanley, Meyer, & Topolntsky, 2005).

While most of the literature concerning Psychological Capital is through self-reported survey results, in an interesting departure from strictly self-report research, Peterson, Balthazard, Waldman, and Thatcher (2008) discovered that the brains of optimistic, hopeful, confident, and resilient leaders really are different. Low Psychological Capital leaders showed more activity in the right frontal cortex and the right amygdala, which is associated with pessimistic outlooks and behaviors, difficulty showing and interpreting emotions, along with avoidance in social activities. This type of brain activity is also typical of those at risk of depression. Those low in Psychological Capital also demonstrated apathy and low motivation during the task of visioning as part of the research study. In contrast high Psychological Capital individuals showed more activity in the left prefrontal cortex, which is responsible for planning complex cognitive behavior, personality expression, decision making, and
moderating social behavior (Davis & Palladino, 1995). The basic activity of this region of the brain is considered to be orchestration of thoughts and actions in accordance with internal goals (encompassing many of the components of Psychological Capital). Psychological Capital has now been shown to make physical changes in the brain, manifest in successful leaders and organizations, and is malleable and trainable. It has been targeted in training efforts for businesses and corporations to improve production, well-being, and organizational commitment of staff. It can be said increasing Psychological Capital has potential merit in reducing turnover and burnout among nonprofit executive directors.

**Burnout**

Maslach and Jackson (1986) define burnout as consisting of emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Although burnout originally included low self-efficacy, empirical studies have since dropped lack of self-efficacy from the definition because it did not seem to play an integral role in the syndrome (Breso, Schaufeli, & Salanova, 2011). While it was deleted from the definition, low self-efficacy has been shown to be positively correlated to burnout (Miller & Seltzer, 1991; Schwarzer & Hallum, 2008; Newton, Khanna, & Thompson, 2008; Breso, Schaufeli, & Salanova, 2011; Consiglio, Borgogni, Alesandri, and Schaufeli, 2013; Cheung, Tang, & Tang, 2011). Avey, Luthans & Jensen (2009) found that Psychological Capital is a resource in reducing employee stress and turnover. Psychological Capital also significantly reduced stress symptoms, intentions to quit, and job search behaviors. Psychological Capital, organizational training, and burnout are all derived from Social Cognitive Theory and it is through this lens that the current study concerns itself.
Social Cognitive Theory Lens

“Social cognitive theory provides a conceptual framework for clarifying the psychological mechanisms through which social-structural factors are linked to organizational performance” (Wood & Bandura, 1989, p. 380). In Social Cognitive Theory, people are not considered influenced exclusively by internal driving forces or external pressures but instead operate within a trifecta model of individual psychosocial functioning of behavior (previous successful or unsuccessful experiences), cognition (need for achievement), and environment (perceived consequences). While this theory is often presented visually as a triangulated model, it is not meant to be representative of an equilateral triangle because each factor may ebb and flow in relationship to the other.

These interacting factors manifest themselves through five human capabilities: symbolizing (i.e., executive directors using a mnemonic device such as visualizing a shoe to remember the name of a funder, Mr. Shoeman); forethought (i.e., executive director planning how to take a controversial issue before the board, anticipating consequences, and determining probable outcomes); observational (i.e., a new executive director observing successful peers performance while being aware of the benefits and risks of their actions); self-regulatory (i.e., executive director constantly monitoring their progress towards their own goals and making corrective action when needed); and self-reflective (i.e., executive director taking the time to analyze what went right and what went wrong with their plan and subsequent course of actions) (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998a).

Forethought and self-regulatory factors are suggestive of Hope Theory with its agency (goal setting) and pathways (plans) measures. Resilience appears to identify
with *self-reflective*, which requires analyzation prior to planning the next move.

*Flexible optimism* provides an outlook that may at times be *symbolic*, reminiscent of *Social Cognitive Theory*. Like all aspects of psychological capital, self-efficacy is increased through *observation* and mastery experiences (via a training experience), matching another component of *Social Cognitive Theory*.

**Improving Psychological Capital through Training**

A criticism of leadership training programs for nonprofits has been that they lack: “time for self-reflection (*resilience*) and building self-awareness (*self-efficacy*); requirements of individualized learning objectives and self-development plans (*hope*); and allowing for growth and development in real time (clearly defining applicability and benefits of learning transfer to the job (*optimism*))” (Genis, 2008, *this author* emphasis, p. 1). Since inclusion of components into what constitutes psychological capital is based on the ability to be developed or improved by individuals, Psychological Capital lends itself to being developed within a training program. Combs, Luthans, and Griffith (2009) suggest that persons with higher levels of Psychological Capital exhibit greater motivation in a learning intervention, which translates into greater transfer of learning to the work setting. Training helps provide a path to enhance employee skills and knowledge and to prepare them for the future demands of their job and organizational needs (Arthur Jr., Bennett Jr., Edens, & Bell, 2003; “Venture Philanthropy Partners,” 2001). Researchers over the years have designed recommendations on how to build each of the concepts of self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience within individuals.
Bandura (1998) recommends that in order to increase self-efficacy (in order of importance): one should attempt to master experiences that require perseverance and the need to learn something new; engage in vicarious learning to demonstrate successful attitudes and behaviors (if the model being observed is similar in age, sex, physical characteristics, education, status, experience); have someone believe in your abilities, which helps but is not as effective as the aforementioned responses; and the least is the physiological and psychological responses of feeling healthy and positive. Hart and Silka (1994) effectively used these methods to build self-efficacy with women through participation in a ropes course. These researchers saw an increase in the women’s willingness to take risks and solve problems as a team, and it gave them the opportunity to practice assertive leadership. To build hope, Snyder (2000) and Luthans and Jensen (2002) endorse setting goals that are specific and challenging (but not insurmountable) including target numbers and completion dates. Break goals into manageable pieces so as to enable small successes to be celebrated along the way toward the larger goal. Develop a contingency plan that is well thought out, including an action plan. Enjoy the process of working toward goals (not just focusing solely on the final achievement). Be persistent in facing obstacles along the path (seeing them as challenges to rise above), being prepared to find alternative plans if the first path to the goal is blocked, and acknowledging when goals need to be altered for success. Marques, Lopez, and Pais-Ribeiro (2009) saw this effectively done with a five-week hope-based intervention program working with middle school students. At the conclusion students who participated in the intervention had statistically significant increases in hope, life satisfaction, and self-worth. Remarkably, these results were also
sustained in follow-up testing 18 months later. Schulman (1999) offers these guidelines for increasing optimism: *be aware of self-doubt* and negative self-talk when provided with a challenge; *examine the myth of the negative self-talk*; and *replace the negative with positive affirmations* of true skills. This is admittedly the most difficult challenge, to cast aside doubts and previous failures and look instead for previous successes that remind one of the potential to succeed in the future. Peters, Flink, Boersma, and Linton (2010) found that a short instruction in positive future thinking can temporarily increase optimism. Improving resilience as suggested by Reivich and Shatte (2002), one needs to *recognize when one is slipping into negativity and pessimism*; *checking one’s perspective about a problem* for accuracy; *looking for alternative solutions*; and *remaining calm* and focused rather than allowing emotion or stress to rule.

All of these methods require some degree of introspection and self-awareness, but it is difficult for most individuals to see themselves as others do. As an example, one of the ways to help open a leader’s eyes to behaviors, attitudes, or interactions that may be blocking one’s success is to obtain an executive coach who can provide that objective feedback. Another way to help provide insight could be through a peer-learning group that is formally managed and directed by a trained facilitator (Grant, Curtayne, & Burton, 2009).

**Training Employees is Big Business**

Outcomes from training efforts in the nonprofit world remain largely anecdotal of a few individual leaders or organizational successes and based on participant satisfaction (“reaction criteria”) of individual sessions rather than what they learned (“learning criteria”), changes in behaviors at work (“behavior criteria”), or relating how
they implemented using the training in their work (“results criteria” or “training transfer”) (Arthur, Bennett, Edens, & Bell, 2003). In contrast, training of America’s workers is big revenue for businesses and corporations. According to the American Society for Training and Development’s study, U. S. corporations spent an average of $1,182 per learner in 2011, which roughly translates to $156.3 billion dollars being invested in training (2012). Despite this large investment, corporations and organizations struggle with knowing what makes training effective and how learned skills are transferred into better performance back on the job. Examining the “transferability” of skills from training to work has led to a number of studies around this issue. Blume, Ford, Baldwin, and Huang (2010) define transferability as being comprised of two components:

*generalization*—the extent to which the knowledge and skill acquired in a learning setting are applied to different settings, people and/or situations from those trained, and *maintenance*—the extent to which changes that result from a learning experience persist over time (p. 1067).

In the for-profit world, transfer of training is measured in a number of ways, including continued use of skills once back on the job, improvement in work performance, and demonstrated success of the lessons learned within the context and at the conclusion of training. In a study using meta-analysis, Sitzmann and Ely (2011) found that the self-regulation constructs of goal level (hope), persistence (resilience), effort, and self-efficacy had the strongest effects on learning. Seventeen percent of the variance in learning was due to these four constructs when controlling for cognitive ability and pre-training knowledge reinforcing the value of Psychological Capital in
learning. The research of Blume, et al. (2010) found in their meta-analysis of transfer of training that *open skills training* (such as leadership skills) is moderately correlated with the predictor constructs of pre-training self-efficacy (motivation), and work environment (supervisory support and autonomy). Adult learning characteristics and practices such as “instructor guidance and feedback, learner reflection and critical thinking, real world relevance and immediate applicability, and the use of performance standards” also lead to higher transfer of learning (Dunst, Trivette, & Hamby, 2010, p. 106).

While this leadership training with pre- and post-results is quite common in the business world, it is not as prevalent in the nonprofit world. Unlike their business counterparts, nonprofits are often reliant on funders to grant funding for training and development rather than from an internal revenue stream. Siegel, Kappaz, and Dowell (2006) note their belief that funders must invest in professional development for nonprofit organization staff, not only to increase outcomes within organizations but strengthen the sector as a whole. Genis (2008) advances that recommendation and stresses that capacity building programs should be emphasizing leadership creating solutions not just management of problems. The goal of capacity building training from the funders’ perspective is to create leaders who are honest, decisive, and adaptable, working in organizations that are innovative and resilient, which is reminiscent of the description and definition of a leader with high Psychological Capital (Light, 2005). If Psychological Capital offers all these wonderful attributes and opportunities, what could possibly go wrong?
Limitations of Psychological Capital

While there has not been disparagement of Psychological Capital, per se, the condemnations of the positive psychology movement are abundant, with consistent remarks and sometimes very personal criticism (particularly critical of positive psychology’s leader, Martin Seligman). Lazarus (2003) and Held (2004) abhor the singular focus on positive psychology (leaving out the study of anything negative) and chastise Seligman for not doing a better job researching humanistic psychology before he denounces it as “pop psychology” ungrounded in scientific study. Signifying the interest in this topic, the Lazarus’ critique in 2003 produced no less than 14 articles in response. In fact, Held, Lazarus, and later Wright and Quick (2009), along with Hackman (2009) all share common concerns of positive psychology, likening it to the pop psychology movement that Seligman disdained. These researchers cite the widespread use of cross-sectional research (rather than the preferred use of longitudinal studies), weak evidence of causality, and over-reliance on self-reported data. Both Lazarus and Held accuse Seligman of not seeing the dualities of some emotions such as coping, stress, and anger to be both positive and negative. The lack of ability to identify the discrete variables of emotion rather than dimensional ones in cross-sectional research is also a concern of Lazarus, Wright, and Quick. For the most part, even the supporters of the positive psychology movement agree with Lazarus’ criticisms of methodology, urging patience as more research continues to be produced and they move toward longitudinal studies (Csikszentmihalyi, 2003; Diener, 2003; Folkman & Moskowitz, 2003; Lyubomirsky & Abbe, 2003; Peterson & Park, 2003; Rand & Snyder, 2003; Seligman & Pawelski, 2003; Tennen & Affleck, 2003). On the other
hand these same positive psychology supporters take issue with Lazarus’ accusation that the positive psychology movement coins all research done by other than “positive psychologists” as negative. These authors argue that they are merely offering balance to the field of psychology in what has been overwhelmingly a study of what is “wrong with you” rather than what is “right with you”.

**Emphasis on Individuals rather than Organizations**

There is too much emphasis on individuals and not enough on organizations according to Hackman (2009). What Hackman appears to do in his attack is to lump all positive research under the same umbrella, failing to understand the difference between Positive Organizational Scholarship (“POS”), which *does* study organizations, and Positive Organizational Behavior, which is the study of individuals’ behavior. Hackman continues, saying that sometimes just thinking positively is not enough; sometimes people need real tools to help them to adapt so they might learn and grow as an individual and adjust to whatever problem may befall them. Other critics, such as Fineman (2006) and Slife and Richardson (2008) suggest that positive psychologists are out of touch with the values and framework of a modern, capitalist society. Rather than offering “a deterministic, totalizing picture of the positive person, who realizes his or her self in values of individual resilience, fair play, and kindness”, the positive psychologists should look at situational variances in optimal positivity that are affected by culture, history, and physical surroundings (Fineman, p. 274). Fineman also adds that the study of positive psychology lends itself more to exploration in the qualitative world of inquiry rather than the quantitative area, though qualitative research revolved around positive psychology is extremely limited.
The validity of the Psychological Capital scale has also been called into question. Psychological Capital was developed utilizing existing scales of its components that varied by number of items as well as the Likert scale intervals. Some items of each scale were modified or eliminated to create the existing Psychological Capital scale (Luthans, Youssef, and Avolio, 2007). Yet, there is also an assumption that the four components of Psychological Capital each contribute equally to the model (Dawkins, Martin, Scott, and Sanderson, 2013). There have been a limited number of studies examining the multiple and interrelated dependence of each factor in the model, leaving the model itself open for further analysis and examination.

**Psychological Capital—A Western Cultural Phenomenon**

In addition, it is argued that working in the emotional world (whether effusing positive or negative emotions) is primarily a western cultural phenomenon (which prides itself on individual accomplishment) rather than a more eastern philosophy (of collective effort), which rewards emotional restraint and thereby limits its generalizability across cultures (Fineman, 2006; Slife & Richardson, 2008; Christopher, Richardson, & Slife, 2008). McDonald and O’Callaghan (2008) agree that rather than providing a value-free model of human behavior that positive psychology claims, it is instead “underpinned by a philosophy based on responsibility, moderation, and work ethic, all essential values for the effective operation of a neo-liberal economy” (p. 138). Seligman and Pawelski (2003) counter that the study of positive psychology is not just what “white, middle-aged intellectuals” are concerned with, but even those in dire circumstances, such as civil war or poverty like Rwanda and Calcutta, are also involved
with “achieving strength, virtue, and happiness” (Biswas-Diener & Diener, 2001, p. 162).

**Expansion of Psychological Capital Research**

Luthans, who is known for his studies on Psychological Capital, has acknowledged these broader-based criticisms of positive psychology and, as such, has made efforts to address these concerns in his research. Luthans (and others) have used control group experimental designs using both self-report and implicit Psychological Capital measures and have expanded beyond business organizations to include health organizations, military, prison, and small business settings. There has also been a significant increase in the amount of testing of Psychological Capital in international settings. Researchers are also exploring use of the Psychological Capital measure in evaluating relationships, general health, and well-being. In his development of a Psychological Capital intervention training program, Luthans has seen a 2% to 5% increase in Psychological Capital after a training intervention that was statistically significant when compared to a randomly assigned control group. Luthans has stated his intention to proceed with a mixed-methods analysis in future studies along with qualitative inquiries to supplement the quantitative studies already completed (2012). While Psychological Capital is being seen as a possible training intervention to improve morale, organizational support, and production, the type of training intervention that has dominated the nonprofit training agenda for the last several years is providing accountability to funders and the community-at-large through outcome measurements.
Nonprofit Accountability

Pressures for nonprofits to comply with accountability (outcomes) is often directed downward from boards of directors, donors, foundations, and governments and upward from clients, community, and internal responsibilities toward mission, leaving the nonprofit executive director and staff in the middle scrambling to meet each constituent’s expectations. Compliance regulation often manifests in the areas of finances, governance, performance, and mission. With increased scrutiny by donors (both public and private), more nonprofits are pursuing certification in their particular fields, often proscribed by a funding source, internal organizational pressure (such as from the board of directors) or to differentiate themselves from their peers (Sasse & Trahan, 2006, and Hendricks, Plantz, and Pritchard, 2008). Ebrahim (2010) cites four components of accountability: transparency or making information easily available to the public; answerability, which requires clear communication of the thinking behind decisions that are made by an organization so it is open to being questioned; compliance through active monitoring and evaluation combined with transparency in reporting; and enforcement of sanctions when there is failure under any of the three previous areas. Why is it important for an organization to seek certification or endorsement from a qualifying agency?

Perception of Competence Matters

Aaker, Vohs, and Mogilner (2010) found in their study that perceived competence mattered when participants were given a choice between choosing to purchase products from a nonprofit organization versus a for-profit organization. The participants, on the whole, were more likely to choose the for-profit company. The
subjects in the study saw the for-profit company as more competent in delivering a quality product because of their reputation (or consumer endorsement). While subjects judged nonprofits higher on traits such as kindness and generosity, they perceived for-profits to be more efficient and effective. Recognition of a nonprofits’ good works did not translate into confidence in their competence. However, when the nonprofits were provided with a strong endorsement, the consumers were more likely to buy from a nonprofit rather than a for-profit due to the “combination of perceived warmth and competence” (Aaker et al, p. 230). Perception of competence matters in an industrialized society built around goods and commodities, but does it also matter to other types of economies?

**World Growth of Accountability for Nonprofits**

Standardization of nonprofits is spreading throughout the world. Gugerty, Sidel, and Bies (2010) list over 300 efforts worldwide to measure accountability in nonprofits through self-regulation such as in Africa and Cambodia, where collective action (bringing together nonprofit representatives) to develop standards is in part to stave off the threat of government regulation. In China, accountability that leads to regulation is being driven by private philanthropy, while across Europe and the UK it exists as more self-regulation than a government-driven model.

**Theories behind accountability standards**

It could be argued that accountability standards has developed from two components of the competing values framework: 1) the internal process model, focused on measurements, documentation, and information management and 2) the open systems model, relying on innovation and adaptation to achieve external recognition.
(Rojas, 2000). It also appears to draw from institutional isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983), which states that organizational changes are made as a result of political or social expectations (coercive); mimicking another organization’s success (mimetic); and the rise of professionalism within the field of nonprofit work (normative) (Slatten, Guidry, and Austin, 2011). Coercive Institutional Theory is derived from institutional isomorphism and refers to the pressure an organization places on a funding recipient organization to comply with rules, procedures, or standards. In the nonprofit world, it may manifest as being compelled into providing a budget in a particular format to a private foundation or directed to obtain certification in a specific field or area to receive funding (Orosz, 2000).

Verbruggen, Christiaens, and Milis (2011) argue that resource dependence theory and coercive institutional theory are what drives industry accreditation and standards creation (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). Resource Dependency Theory states that pressures from funding agencies (in the case of nonprofits: foundation, individual donors, and the government) and uncertain finances impact compliance with standards particularly if the agency is reliant on one or two benefactors. In fact, Verbruggen, et al. (2011) found in their study of Belgian nonprofits that those who were dependent on government grants and other financial institutions were more likely to comply with and present quality financial records including audits than the institutions that relied primarily on donations from the general public and were less likely to comply with maintaining adequate financial records. Watt Geer (2009), in her dissertation research of 156 nonprofits located in southwestern Pennsylvania, found that the greater the degree of perceived pressure from legal and funding sources and potential for financial
rewards, the greater the degree of compliance with standards. This research also found that organizations with board membership of less than 12 had significantly lower levels of compliance with meeting expectations of financial competence. While a variety of theories exist to explain accountability standards and their use for and by nonprofits, that is not the focus of this study.

### Accountability Challenges

While more government funders are demanding agencies become certified in their area of expertise, there are a number of independent national nonprofit certification and evaluation programs including the Better Business Bureau’s Wise Giving Alliance, the American Institute of Philanthropy, Charity Navigator, and the Standards for Excellence Institute from the Maryland Association of Nonprofits (National Council of Nonprofit Associations, a N. H. S. A., 2005). Research completed by Bailis and Sokatch (2006) reiterates that in order for organizations to pursue standards, they will need to devote significant time, staff, and possibly financial resource which is no small task for organizations that already see themselves strapped for time and money. Other challenges that often impede implementation include the need for more training of staff, ongoing support (and costs) from the accrediting agency, and the actual accountability that accompanies standards implementation (Frabutt & Remick, 2010). Slatten’s (2012) study of 248 executive directors who were members of the Louisiana Association of Nonprofit Organizations (LANO) suggests that perceived usefulness (how accountability compliance benefits the agency) significantly contributed to an organization’s willingness to adopt standards, along with perceived access to resources that would help with implementation. In addition, a
positive attitude of the executive director significantly added a behavioral intent to comply with standards.

In a four-year follow-up survey with nonprofits completing Standards for Excellence® in Maryland in 2003, data showed improvement in the number of agencies relying on their mission statement to develop programming; more involvement by boards in organizational operations (improvement on reviewing financial performance; more involvement in supervising the executive director and in the development of the organization’s mission statement); publication of annual reports; and more nonprofits are publishing financial statements (A. C. Madsen, personal communication, 4-7-2013). The area where the Maryland nonprofits were still challenged was in implementation of conflict of interest statements, with only 49% having policies in place (though this shows improvement of 42% from the previous survey). The focus of this study is on the national program started by Maryland called the Standards for Excellence Institute, which has been adopted in several states.

**The Standards for Excellence® Institute**

Unlike other accountability initiatives, Standards for Excellence was not developed from the business community (BBB Wise Giving Alliance) or started by an individual (American Institute of Philanthropy, “AIP” now “Charity Watch”) or primarily funded by one donor (Charity Navigator). In contrast, Standards for Excellence was born out of a desire by nonprofit representatives to set self-regulation standards at high competence levels so that donors and other nonprofit organizations would be able to recognize that a “seal of approval” indicated an organization was well run with quality programs. Standards focus on eight guidance areas: mission and
program; governance; conflict of interest; human resources; financial and legal; transparency; fundraising; public affairs and public policy along with the 55 individual standards of operations (a complete list of standards is included in Appendix B). The Standards for Excellence course is a customized, in-depth, four-part clinic series designed to help nonprofits implement the eight principles and the 55 standards that are included as part of the program. Class sizes vary at each location, ranging from an average of 10 participants to as many as 50.

The development of Standards for Excellence® was initially funded in 1995 by a $100,000 grant from the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation. Nine years later in 2004, the Carnegie Foundation and Atlantic Philanthropies (along with other funding partners) helped to launch the national replication project (Mendel, 2005). Since then they have expanded with replication partners in eight states (and one national religious institution) which are responsible for providing the Standards for Excellence® training within their state or constituency, see Table 2 below.

Table 2: Standards for Excellence® Replication Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Replication Partner</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama Association of Nonprofits</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arc of the United States</td>
<td>D.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Nonprofit Excellence in Colorado Springs</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Alliance for Nonprofit Advancement</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Leadership on Church Management (Catholic)</td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma Center for Nonprofits</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania Association of Nonprofit Organizations</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia Community Development Hub</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled from StandardsofExcellenceinstitute.org
There is some minor variance in the standards from state to state based on what the local replication agency wants to emphasize. An example is from the Pennsylvania Association of Nonprofit Organizations (PANO) which added a section to the Standards for Excellence® Code that did not exist in the original code. The following was added to the “Conduct of the Board” section,

The board should have a rigorous development process that outlines clear performance expectations for board members and ensures accountability for performance. To ensure that the board remains vital and that it represents the constituencies necessary to make it most effective, the board should establish mechanisms for recruitment of new members and succession planning which could include limitation of the number of consecutive terms a board member may serve (PANO, 2013).

What does it mean to participate in Standards for Excellence? Will the participants feel their agency is more highly regarded (Perceived External Prestige) as result of that participation confirming some previous research studies? Does the participation in Standards for Excellence training result in greater adherence to the standards themselves reflecting higher levels of Grit? The research so far, as previously discussed, is mixed in this area. While there is not any research currently linking participation in Standards for Excellence training with increase in Psychological Capital, the research literature would suggest that if Standards for Excellence training followed an adult learning model approach to training, we would indeed see an increase in Psychological Capital at the conclusion of training. But what do we know about the
individual psyche of participants? Is it possible that those with higher Psychological Capital are more likely to participate in Standards for Excellence? Are the participants less likely to be Resistant to Change as the research would suggest? Psychological Capital and Perceived Organizational Support (for Innovation) have been highly correlated in other studies, is that also true for those participating in Standards for Excellence training? Does Standards for Excellence provide the reduction in levels of Burnout that other training programs have found? All of these questions are ripe for exploration in this research.

**Summary and Evaluation---Implications for Nonprofits**

Nonprofit executive directors are certainly not immune from turnover and burnout that plagues the business community. While there is empirical evidence that turnover and burnout is reduced in leaders in the business world by training and improving Psychological Capital, the evidence is sparse for the nonprofit community. This author could only find one study that explored Psychological Capital and nonprofit organizations. McMurray, Pirola-Merlo, Saros, and Islam (2010) conducted an exploratory study of a large religious nonprofit organization and found strong positive relationships between employee’s perceptions of organizational climate, well-being, employee commitment, and Psychological Capital. The field is wide open for additional empirical findings studying the relationship of these concepts and nonprofit executive leaders.
Research Questions

Given that training is seen as increasing Psychological Capital and reducing burnout, and a high Psychological Capital is positively related to job performance, the research questions derived from the review of literature are:

Q1: What is the relationship between Psychological Capital and executive directors who have taken the Standards for Excellence training than those who do not, after controlling for grit, resistance to change, and perceived support for innovation and training?

Q2: What is the relationship between burnout and executive directors who participate in Standards for Excellence training from those who have not after controlling for grit, resistance to change, and perceived support for innovation and training?

Q3: Does higher Psychological Capital and lower burnout mean that implementation of standards is more likely?

The following hypotheses concern the impact of Standards for Excellence® training on psychological capital and burnout of nonprofit executive directors:

$H_1$: Levels of Psychological Capital will differ among executive directors who have taken the Standards for Excellence training from those who have not after controlling for grit, resistance to change, and perceived support for innovation and training.

$H_2$: Levels of burnout will differ among executive directors who have participated in the Standards for Excellence training from those who have not
after controlling for grit, resistance to change, and perceived support for
innovation and training.

The following hypothesis concerns the relationship between Psychological
Capital and burnout:

*H3: High Psychological Capital of executive directors will be associated with
lower burnout.*

The following hypotheses concern the impact of psychological capital and
burnout on implementation of Standards for Excellence.

*H4: There will be a statistically significant relationship between Psychological Capital
and executive directors who have implemented the Standards for Excellence after
controlling for grit, resistance to change, and perceived support for innovation and
training.*

*H5: There will be a statistically significant relationship between burnout and executive
directors who have implemented the Standards for Excellence after controlling for grit,
resistance to change, and perceived support for innovation and training.*
Chapter Three: Methodology

Subjects

This research design consists of comparison of Psychological Capital and burnout of nonprofit executive directors who have enrolled in Standards for Excellence and those who have not. Selection of the participants was based on a convenience sample of the members of three state-wide nonprofit organizations that provided Standards for Excellence training located in Oklahoma, Alabama, and Maryland. Each organization sent to their membership lists an invitation to participate that contained both participants and nonparticipants of Standards for Excellence training. These original recipients were a blend of executive directors, program directors, development directors, and board members. However, for purposes of this study, only the executive directors responses were analyzed.

Procedure

Participants were given an on-line examination to test for Flourishing (well-being), Individual Identification with the organization, Perceived External Prestige, Perceived Organizational Support for Innovation and Learning, Psychological Capital, Burnout, Resistance to Change, and Grit. The surveys were administered on a one-time basis. Besides the variables listed above, demographic data was also obtained on age, race, education level and sex of the participant, length in position, title of position, operating expenses of the organization and type of organization focus, the indication of Participation in Standards for Excellence training, and the self-assessment of Standards Compliance. If the participant indicated participation in Standards for Excellence training, it triggered additional questions concerning where and when the training took
place, the content of the training, the perceived interaction level of the training, and the time frame of when the participant felt they will be in 100% compliance with standards.

**Program Components**

The Standards for Excellence® is a customized in-depth, four-part clinic series designed to help nonprofits implement the eight principles and 55 standards of the program. The principles and standards for the program (at the time of publication) may be found in Appendix B. The *Standards for Excellence* training focuses on improving leadership competency in visioning, managing, planning, adhering to, and evaluating Standards for Excellence® by introducing a series of specific skills sets to guide leadership within the organization (Austin, Regan, Samples, Schwartz, & Carnochan, 2011; TCC Group, 2011; TCC Group, 2007).

**Measurements**

**Psychological Capital**

The *Psychological Capital Scale* combines selected items from previous scales developed for Hope, Self-Efficacy, Resiliency, and Optimism into one scale. The original scale was 24-items, but a newer scale of only 12-items has been released with comparable reliability scores (α > .70) as tested by Avey, Avolio, and Luthans (2011). The 12-item version has four items representing hope (including both “pathways” and “agency”), three items each measuring efficacy and resiliency, and two items demonstrating optimism (Avey, et al). Example items are: “I feel confident analyzing a long-term problem to find a solution” and “There are lots of ways around any problem”. These questions are presented in a six-item Likert response ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree”. The reliability measure for this sample was α = .82.
Flourishing

The **Flourishing Scale** (formerly known as psychological well-being) was developed to measure social-psychological prosperity. The scale includes several items on social relationships targeting basic human needs such as “need for competence, relatedness and self-acceptance” (Diener, et al., 2010, p. 143). Well-being is comprised of eudaimonic well-being (sense of fulfillment and striving for personal growth) and hedonic well-being (happiness and pleasure) (Culbertson, Fullagar, & Mills, 2010). While Psychological Capital has shown a positive correlation with both types of well-being, this measure is based on eudaimonic well-being. There are eight items based on a Likert scale from 1-7 from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. Sample items include: “I lead a purposeful and meaningful life” and “I am competent and capable in the activities that are important to me”. This scale’s internal reliability as reported by Diener et al was ($\alpha = .87$). The reliability for this sample was $\alpha = .88$.

**Perceived External Organization Prestige**

The **Perceived External Prestige Scale** has shown to both result in higher employee commitment and job satisfaction with lower intent to leave (Carmeli & Freund, 2009, p. 236) and as a mediator of organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Herrbach, Mignonac, & Gatignon, 2004, p. 1390). This scale had been previously adapted from Mael and Ashforth’s (1992) organizational prestige scale and has eight items with a five-point Likert scale. Sample questions are: “People in my community think highly of my organization” and “It is considered prestigious in my community to be an employee of my organization”. Carmeli and Freund stated internal reliability of ($\alpha = .86$). The reliability for this sample was $\alpha = .83$. 
Standards for Excellence® Implementation

The Standards for Excellence® program currently has an eight-page Self-Assessment Checklist that has been reduced to 16 questions to accommodate this study. The 16 items are presented in a four-point Likert scale (1=No, not begun to 4 = Yes, completed). Internal consistency reliability for the scale was $\alpha = .86$. Sample items include: “Our organization collects input and feedback from a variety of sources, such as board, staff, community members, funders, and other stakeholders. This input is inclusive of a broad range of views and perspectives and plays an integral role in our decision-making process” and “Our organization has a regular system for assessing opportunities for improvement of our services, program, and internal processes in order to best serve our constituents”. The purpose of using the reduced form of questions will inform the study in overall Standards for Excellence® compliance, though it is not the purpose of the current study to measure individual item compliance.

Burnout

The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI) (Demerouti, Bakker, Vardakou, & Kantas, 2003) will be used to assess exhaustion and disengagement, classic symptoms of burnout. The OLBI has 16 items presented in a four-point Likert scale (1=Strongly Agree to 4=Strongly Disagree). Demerouti, et al. informed internal consistency reliability for the overall burnout scale was .90. The reliability for this sample was .86. Eight items measure disengagement. A representative example of the eight disengagement items asks the respondent if “I always find new and interesting aspects in my work”. For the disengagement scale, Demerouti, et al. reported internal reliability of $(\alpha = .78)$. The reliability for this sample was $\alpha = .71$. 
There are eight items which measure exhaustion. A representative example of the exhaustion items asks the respondent if “There are days when I feel tired before I arrive at work”. This particular item is reverse-scored. Demerouti et al, found internal consistency reliability for the exhaustion scale was .88. The reliability for this sample was $\alpha = .84$.

**Controls**

**Resistance to Change**

The Standards for Excellence® training model for nonprofit organizations relies on the assumption of an organization or individual’s willingness to change. One of the leading researchers in the field of nonprofit organizations, the TCC Group out of California, often contract with private foundations to provide research on nonprofit organizations. The TCC Group (2007) has indicated, in particular, the Readiness (resistance) to Change Scale is imperative in evaluating whether to include an individual in a training program and avoid a waste of time, talent, and money. The challenge is how one distinguishes organizational leaders who are willing to change from those who are participating more from fear of potentially displeasing a funder. It is hoped the readiness to change scale will alleviate this conundrum. Individuals within an organization often respond to change in different ways. Those resistant to change are usually the early standouts, but one could also recognize “early adopters” of change working with the “connectors” (networkers), expanding the change to the “sustainers” who reinforce and institutionalize the changes made (Rogers, 1995).

Oreg (2003) developed a Resistance to Change Scale which could be used to identify those individuals who could benefit from a training program (stated $\alpha = .91$ for
the total resistance to change score). Examples of these questions are: “I generally consider changes to be a negative thing” and “If I were informed that there’s going to be significant change regarding the way things are done at work, I would probably feel stressed” (Oreg, 2003, p. 684). The reliability for this sample was \( \alpha = .85 \).

**Grit**

GRIT as defined by Seligman combines self-discipline, practice, and effort. While self-discipline and IQ are not significantly correlated with each other, self-discipline out-performs IQ for predicting academic success by the “factor of two” (2011, p. 116). Seligman refers to GRIT as an extreme trait of self-discipline. It results from high diligence and heavy pursuit toward a goal. The *Short Grit Scale* is an eight-question, five-item Likert scale ranging from “Very much like me” to “Not like me at all” (Duckworth & Quinn, 2009). Sample items include: “New ideas and projects sometimes distract me from previous ones”, which is reverse scored, and “I am a hard worker”. Duckworth & Quinn indicated internal consistency of items was \( \alpha = .77 \). The reliability for this sample was \( \alpha = .74 \).

**Perceived Organizational Support**

Employees with high Perceived Organizational Support have been shown to be more committed to an organization and work with greater effort on supporting the organization’s goals and objectives and to help with employee retention (Eisenberger, 2012). Because this study is both concerned with whether perceived organizational support affects the learning and implementation outcomes of the Standards for Excellence® training, the scale for *Perceived Support for Organizational Learning and Innovation Scale* will be used (Neves & Eisenberger, 2012). This scale is nine
questions in a five-item Likert range from “Not at all” to “A great extent”. This scale will be modified in a branch effect depending whether the participant is an executive director or a member of staff (or volunteer or board). It is a series of self-report questions for the executive director of the organization, while all others will be reporting on the executive director’s role in providing perceived organizational support as it applies to innovation. For example, if it is the executive director completing the questionnaire, one of questions will read: “Our ability to function creatively is respected by the board leadership”, while if it is staff or board, the question will read: “Our ability to function creatively is respected by the executive director”. Another sample question (that will require no changes) is, “This organization can be described as flexible and continually adapting to change”. Neves and Eisenberger specified the alpha reliability for this scale was .92. The reliability for this sample was .83.

Outcomes

Short-term outcomes such as enriched Psychological Capital, Flourishing, Perceived External Organizational Prestige, and Burnout can all be measured through a survey format. Longer-term outcomes such as full implementation of Standards for Excellence, increasing effectiveness, reduced turnover of staff, and improving financial performance usually require more of a collective response of many people within the organization. For example, reduced turnover of staff and volunteers is not usually seen right away when an organization is working through change. Part of the change process might actually increase the turnover temporarily as staff is realigned to mission and performance. This outcome is usually measured by reviewing the organization’s turnover over a period of years rather than months. Because of the time limitations of
this study, long-term outcomes will not be considered as part of this research with the exception of where the participant is in the implementation of Standards for Excellence at the time of the survey.

**Design and Analysis**

This research controlled for *Readiness to Change*, *Grit*, and *Perceived Organizational Support for Innovation and Learning*, along with collecting demographics on the age and sex of participant, position within the organization, length in position, educational background and size of the organization and minimally identifying information. Survey testing was a one point-in-time online test. For hypotheses one and two, the dependent variables were *Psychological Capital* and *Burnout* testing the relationship with the independent variable of *Participation in Standards for Excellence Institute* replicating previous studies looking at the relationship between *Psychological Capital* and *Burnout* and training (Combs, Luthans & Griffith, 2009; Cohen & Gagin, 2005). An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was computed for hypotheses one and two to look at the relationship between the dependent variables of *Psychological Capital* and *Burnout* to the independent variable of *Participation in Standards for Excellence Institute* while controlling for *Grit*, *Perceived Organizational Support for Organizational Learning and Innovation*, and *Readiness to Change*. Additional independent variables that were measured were *Flourishing* and *Perceived External Organizational Prestige*. To test hypothesis three, a correlation matrix was run to analyze the relationship between *Psychological Capital* and *Burnout*. Based on previous research studying the relationship of the following variables to job performance and turnover intentions, the independent variables of *Psychological*
Capital, Burnout, Flourishing, and Perceived External Organizational Prestige were analyzed to test their ability to explain the variance in the dependent variable of Standards Implementation for hypothesis four and five (Avey, Luthans, & Youssef, 2010; Mor Barak, Levin, Nissly, & Lane, 2006; Wood & de Menezes, 2011; Herrbach, Mignonac, & Gatignon, 2004). A hierarchical linear regression (HLR), and multiple moderated regression (MMR) statistical analyses were calculated examining the effect of the independent variables of Psychological Capital, Burnout, Flourishing, External Organizational Prestige, on the dependent variable of Standards Implementation while controlling for Grit, Perceived Organizational Support for Organizational Learning and Innovation, and Readiness to Change.
Chapter Four: Results

Purpose of Study

This study explored the effects of Standards for Excellence® Institute training program (“standards”) on Psychological Capital (“Psychological Capital” consisting of self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience) of nonprofit leaders. Data were collected from nonprofit leaders and participants in Oklahoma, Alabama, and Maryland where some of the Standards for Excellence Institute trainings are offered. This study compared the Psychological Capital of those who have participated in the Standards for Excellence Institute from those who have not and hypothesized that those who have participated in Standards for Excellence training would report higher Psychological Capital. Secondly, it was conjectured that those who subsequently adopted and incorporated the Standards for Excellence into their organization’s mode of operations would have higher Psychological Capital and lower burnout. This study offers insight into the viability of Psychological Capital being developed through a training program such as Standards for Excellence. With a very limited amount of research on Psychological Capital and nonprofit leadership, this study offers additional understanding of the relationship.

Completed Study

There were 270 participants who visited the on-line survey link. Four declined to participate. Of the 266 who started the on-line survey, 64 individuals did not complete the survey. Of those who completed, 119 were executive directors, 22 board members, 2 consultants, 2 volunteers, and 57 staff members. In order to control for the variety of subjects participating, the homogenous sub-sample of executive directors was
used. In addition to the demographic controls for age, sex, educational level, and the organization’s operating expense; *Resistance to Change*, *Grit*, and *Perceived Organizational Support for Organizational Learning and Innovation* were included. All of the controls except for *Grit* have previously been shown to have strong correlations with psychological capital and burnout, so they were used in HMR and MMR to rule out other possible influencing variables (Neves & Eisenberger, 2012; Li, Shu, Lie, Guoyuan, & Lei, 2013; Salles, Cohen, & Mueller, 2014; and Kan & Parry, 2004).

**Demographics**

Respondents were 84% female and 16% male. The majority of the respondents worked for human service organizations. Of those who took the survey, 53% indicated they had participated in Standards for Excellence training and 47% stated they had not. Of those who had completed Standards for Excellence training, 28% anticipated they would be in compliance with standards six months from now, 23% indicated compliance 12 months from now, 5% said 18 months from now, 2% marked 24 months from now, 17% were not sure, and 4% indicated they were already compliant with standards. Of the participants who had taken Standards for Excellence, 87% took them in Oklahoma, 11% in Alabama, and 2% in Maryland. All participants were asked about specific standards to indicate their compliance; 15% indicated they were in low compliance with standards, 72% indicated they were in moderate compliance with standards, and 13% indicated they were in high compliance with standards. Further demographic results may be found in Table 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>73.7 %</td>
<td>86.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>5.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>5.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>10.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>5.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>36.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masters Level</td>
<td>47.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Degree</td>
<td>5.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctorate Level</td>
<td>5.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>5.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>21.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6 years</td>
<td>10.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-10 years</td>
<td>21.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>42.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Operating</td>
<td>Less than $150K</td>
<td>21.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$151K to $300K</td>
<td>26.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$301K to $800K</td>
<td>15.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$801K to $5M</td>
<td>21.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5.1M to $10M</td>
<td>10.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over $10M</td>
<td>5.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Type</td>
<td>Arts/Humanities/Cultural</td>
<td>5.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>21.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health/Mental Health</td>
<td>15.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education and Research</td>
<td>15.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment/Animals</td>
<td>5.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public/Societal Benefit</td>
<td>10.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>15.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth Development</td>
<td>5.3 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Testing Hypotheses**

To test hypothesis one and two, an ANCOVA was computed for each dependent variable. Then correlations were run on all variables, including the controls to examine the relationship of the variables to each other for hypothesis three. For hypothesis four and five, a hierarchical linear regression model was conducted next to further explore the relationship of the independent variables to each dependent variable. Finally, a moderated multiple regression analysis was run to determine if Standards for Excellence Implementation could be predicted from the independent variables of...
Psychological Capital, and Burnout. The null hypotheses tested were that $R^2$ was equal to 0 and that the regression coefficients (i.e. the slopes) were equal to 0.

The data were screened for missing data and violation of assumptions of linearity, normality, independence, homogeneity of variance, and multicollinearity prior to analysis. For linearity, review of the partial scatterplots was conducted to examine whether the display points fell in a random display with an absolute value of 2. The assumption of normality was tested by examining the unstandardized residuals along with the S-W test for normality, skewness, and kurtosis. Boxplots, Q-Q plots and histograms were also reviewed. Casewise diagnostics such as Mahalanobis distance, Cook’s distance, DfBeta values, and centered leverage values were also checked for cases of undue influence by independent variables. The independence of the data was checked by examining the studentized residuals against the values of the independent variables along with the studentized residuals against the predicted values. The Durbin-Watson statistic was also analyzed to evaluate for additional errors.

Homogeneity of variance was checked by examining the display of points in the scatterplots, looking for the spread of residuals to be consistent over the range of values of the independent variables. Finally, multicollinearity was considered by examining the tolerance levels (results greater than .10 with the variance inflation factor less than 10 which would suggest that multicollinearity was not an issue) and the eigenvalues for the predictors for their close proximity to 0. If eigenvalues were found to approximate 0, an additional regression analysis was completed of the independent variables with those enumerated eigenvalues to examine the multiple R square. If those values were close to
1 (or greater than .9) the evidence suggested that multicollinearity is an issue. There was limited missing data.

**Hypothesis One: Analysis of Covariance of Psychological Capital**

An ANCOVA was conducted to determine if Psychological Capital among those who Participated in Standards for Excellence from those who did not while controlling for Grit, Resistance to Change, and Perceived Support for Innovation and Learning. Independence of observations was confirmed by review of the scatterplot of residuals against the levels of the independent variable of Participation in Standards for Excellence. The display of points around 0 appeared to be random, further indicating the assumption of independence had been met. According to Levene’s test, the homogeneity of variance assumption was satisfied, \[ F(1,98) = 1.777, p = .186 \].

The assumption of normality was tested from the examination of the residuals. While the skewness (-.727) and kurtosis (.568) met reasonable assumptions of normality, the S-W test for normality (SW = .956, df = 100, p = .002) did not. The Q-Q plot and the histogram suggested normality was reasonable, but the boxplot indicated the presence of two outliers. In general, there is evidence that normality has been met.

Linearity of the dependent variable with each of the covariates was tested with scatterplots, both overall and by group of the independent variable. Overall, the scatterplot suggested a positive linear relationship, and this was more evident in those who had taken Standards for Excellence from those who had not. Independence of the covariates and the independent variable was confirmed by an independent t test which examined the mean difference on the covariates of Grit, Resistance to Change, and Perceived Support for Innovation and Learning by the independent variable of
Participation in Standards for Excellence. The results were not statistically significant for all three: Grit \( t(109) = -1.103, p = .272 \); Resistance to Change \( t(109) = 1.054, p = .294 \); and Perceived Support for Innovation and Learning \( t(108) = .428, p = .670 \) which corroborates the independence of the covariates and the independent variable. There was not a mean difference in Grit, Resistance to Change, and Perceived Support for Innovation and Learning based on whether they Participated in Standards for Excellence or not. Homogeneity of regression slopes reported earlier as evidence for linearity was confirmed by a nonstatistically significant interaction of Grit, Resistance to Change, and Perceived Support for Innovation and Learning by Participation in Standards for Excellence, \( F(1,98) = 1.777, p = .186 \).

The results of the ANCOVA suggest a statistically significant effect of the covariates, Grit, Resistance to Change, and Perceived Support for Innovation and Learning on the dependent variable of Psychological Capital (see table 4 for results). There was not a statistically significant difference between Psychological Capital and Participation in Standards for Excellence, with meaningless effect size and low power (partial \( \eta^2_{\text{standards}} = .023 \), observed power = .318). The observed power indicates whether the test is powerful enough to detect mean differences if they really exist. Power of .318 indicates the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis if it is really false is about 32\%, low power. When controls were removed, Participation in Standards for Excellence met the standards for statistical significance with Psychological Capital, \( F_{\text{standards}} = 3.83; \) df = 1,110; \( p = .050 \), though, again, with meaningless effect size and moderate power (partial \( \eta^2_{\text{standards}} = .034 \), observed power =
There is still almost a 50% chance of rejecting the null hypothesis if it is really false.

Table 4: ANCOVA with Psychological Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent and Control Variables</th>
<th>Psychological Capital-DV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grit*</td>
<td>F (1, 94) = 14.90, p = .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to Change*</td>
<td>F (1, 94) = 20.28, p = .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation*</td>
<td>F (1, 94) = 26.031, p = .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Standards for Excellence</td>
<td>F(1, 94) = 2.256, p = .136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Control Variables

Since low power may be indicative of sample size, further post-hoc analyses were run utilizing the G*Power statistical analysis program to determine the effect of the sample size needed for the main effects and/or interactions given an estimated effect size f, alpha level, desired power, numerator degrees of freedom, number of groups, and the number of covariates. Using the a priori power post hoc analysis, the current partial $n^2$, the desired minimum power level of .80 and given $\alpha = .05$ allowed us to compute the sample size needed to obtain statistically significant results. The analysis revealed that sample size was indeed an issue in obtaining a statistically significant result of Participating in Standards for Excellence affecting Psychological Capital. This study’s current sample size is 110, and G*Power revealed the total sample size would need to be 225 for the results to be statistically significant $F(1, 220) = 3.88, p = .05$. Therefore, sample size is definitely affecting the possibility of having statistically significant results.

**Hypothesis Two: Analysis of Covariance of Burnout**

To examine the relationship of Participating in Standards for Excellence on Burnout while controlling for Grit, Resistance to Change, and Perceived Support for Innovation and Learning, an ANCOVA was conducted. Independence of observations
was confirmed by review of the scatterplot of residuals against the levels of the independent variable of Participation in Standards for Excellence. The display of points around 0 appeared to be random, further indicating the assumption of independence had been met. According to Levene’s test, the homogeneity of variance assumption was satisfied \( F(1,97) = 1.149, p = .287 \). The assumption of normality was tested from the examination of the residuals. The skewness (.098) and kurtosis (-.508) met reasonable assumptions of normality within the range of absolute value of 2.0, as did the S-W test for normality (SW = .989, df = 99, p = .629). The Q-Q plot, the histogram, and the boxplot all suggested normality was reasonable and provided evidence that normality had been met.

Linearity of the dependent variable with each of the covariates was tested with scatterplots, both overall and by group of the independent variable. Overall, the scatterplot suggested a positive linear relationship, and this was more evident in those who had taken Standards for Excellence from those who had not. Independence of the covariates and the independent variable was confirmed by an independent t test which examined the mean difference on the covariates of Grit, Resistance to Change, and Perceived Support for Innovation and Learning by the independent variable of Participation in Standards for Excellence. The results were not statistically significant for all three: Grit \( t(109) = -1.103, p = .272 \); Resistance to Change \( t(109) = 1.054, p = .294 \); and Perceived Support for Innovation and Learning \( t(108) = .428, p = .670 \), which corroborates the independence of the covariates and the independent variable. There was not a mean difference in Grit, Resistance to Change, and Perceived Support for Innovation and Learning based on whether they Participated in Standards for
Excellence or not. Homogeneity of regression slopes reported earlier as evidence for linearity was confirmed by a nonstatistically significant interaction of Grit, Resistance to Change, and Perceived Support for Innovation and Learning by Participation in Standards for Excellence, \( F(2,92) = 2.145, p = .123 \).

The results of the ANCOVA suggest a statistically significant effect of the covariates, Resistance to Change, and Perceived Support for Innovation and Learning on the dependent variable of Burnout (see table 5 for results). There was not a statistically significant difference between Burnout and Grit or Participation in Standards for Excellence, with meaningless effect size and low power (partial \( n^2 \) standards = .013, observed power = .193). The observed power indicates whether the test is powerful enough to detect mean differences if they really exist. Power of .193 indicates the probability of rejecting the null hypothesis if it is really false is about 19%, low power. When controls were removed, Participation in Standards for Excellence still did not meet the standards for statistical significance with Burnout, \( F_{\text{standards}} = .021; \text{df} = 1,108; p = .884 \), with no effect size and low power (partial \( n^2 \) standards = .000, observed power = .052). There is a 5% chance of rejecting the null hypothesis if it is really false, very low power. With the F value, effect size, and low power, it was not necessary to run further post-analysis.

Table 5: ANCOVA with Burnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent and Control Variables</th>
<th>Burnout-DV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grit*</td>
<td>( F(1, 94) = 3.636, p = .060 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance to Change*</td>
<td>( F(1, 94) = 20.37, p = .000 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation*</td>
<td>( F(1, 94) = 15.732, p = .000 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Standards for Excellence</td>
<td>( F(1, 94) = 1.206, p = .275 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Control Variables
Hypothesis Three: Correlation Matrix

Prior to running of all other analyses, a correlation matrix was analyzed to test for strong correlations between independent variables (which might affect the analysis and interpretation of the MMR score). The $\alpha$ scores (internal consistency reliability) for each scale for the total sample are shown on the diagonal and meet the minimum standard of $\geq$ to .70 (Nunnally, 1978). The mean and standard deviations are also provided in Table 6.

**Table 6: Correlation Matrix for Total Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Burnout</td>
<td>29.95</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Compliance</td>
<td>57.87</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>-.245*</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Resistance</td>
<td>43.19</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>.395**</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Grit</td>
<td>31.78</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>-.379**</td>
<td>.326**</td>
<td>-.319**</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Innovation</td>
<td>38.28</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>-.474**</td>
<td>.270**</td>
<td>-.333**</td>
<td>.401**</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Flourishing</td>
<td>51.96</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>-.439**</td>
<td>.309**</td>
<td>-.325**</td>
<td>.441**</td>
<td>.655**</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Psychological</td>
<td>62.13</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>-.649**</td>
<td>.346**</td>
<td>-.399**</td>
<td>.529**</td>
<td>.518**</td>
<td>.595**</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Prestige</td>
<td>33.56</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>-.404**</td>
<td>.591**</td>
<td>-.290**</td>
<td>.430**</td>
<td>.508**</td>
<td>.566**</td>
<td>.472**</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Stds.Taken</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Tenure</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.244*</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.192*</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.208*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Operating</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>-.130</td>
<td>.427**</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.203*</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.373**</td>
<td>.223*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale reliability scores are shown on the diagonal.

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Psychological Capital shows strong negative correlation with burnout $(r = - .649, p < .01)$ and satisfies Hypothesis 3 of this study. In addition, Psychological Capital shows strong positive correlations with Grit $(r = .529, p < .01)$, Perceived Support for Innovation and Learning $(r = .518, p < .01)$, and Flourishing $(r = .595, p <$
Moderate positive correlations were shown with Standards Compliance ($r = .346, p < .01$), and Perceived External Prestige ($r = .472, p < .01$). A moderate negative correlation was found between Psychological Capital and Resistance to Change ($r = -.399, p < .01$). A small positive correlation shows between Psychological Capital and the size of the Operating Expense Amount for the organization ($r = .203, p < .05$).

Cohen suggests correlations be examined in terms of effect size (1988). A minimal or small effect is when $r = .10$, a medium or moderate effect is $r = .30$, and a large or strong effect is when $r = .50$.

In addition to the strong negative correlation with Psychological Capital already noted, Burnout also has moderate negative correlations with Grit ($r = -.379, p < .01$), Perceived Support for Innovation and Learning ($r = -.474, p < .01$), Flourishing ($r = -.439, p < .01$), and Perceived External Prestige ($r = -.404, p < .01$). Burnout has a small negative correlation with Standards Compliance ($r = -.245, p < .05$). Compliance with Standards show strong positive correlations with Perceived External Prestige ($r = .591, p < .01$) while showing moderate positive correlations with the size of the Operating Expense Amount for the organization ($r = .427, p < .01$), Psychological Capital ($r = .346, p < .01$), Flourishing ($r = .309, p < .01$) and Grit ($r = .326, p < .01$). Small positive correlations were found between Compliance with Standards and Tenure of the individual within their organization ($r = .244, p < .05$) as well as between Tenure and Perceived Support for Innovation and Training ($r = .270, p < .01$). There were not any statistically significant correlations between Participating in Standards of Excellence and the other variables.
Then the database was split by those who had Participated in Standards for Excellence and those who had not. The α scores (internal consistency reliability) for each scale for the total sample are shown on the diagonal and meet the minimum standard of \( \geq .70 \) (Nunnally, 1978). The mean and standard deviations are also provided in Table 7.

| Table 7: Correlation Matrix based on Participation in Standards for Excellence |
|---------------------------------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
|                                 | Mean | SD  | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   |
| 1. Burnout                      | 29.86/30.3 | .596/6.41 | .87/86 | -277/ | .87/84 |
| 2. Compliance                   | 58.24/57.58 | 6.00/-216 | .87/84 | -226/ | .87/73 |
| 3. Resistance                   | 44.13/42.30 | 8.67/5.98 | .56/86 | .01/86 |
| 4. Grit                         | 31.36/35.5 | 3.96/-337** | .273* | .298** | .76/73 |
| 5. Innovation                   | 38.49/38.10 | 3.93/-369** | .095/ | .226/ | .384** |
| 6. Flourishing                  | 51.90/52.02 | 3.50/-325* | .309/ | .323/ | .434** | .643** |
| 7. Psychological Capital        | 60.98/63.15 | 6.12/5.62 | .649** | .362** | .239/ | .539** | .553** | .589** | .646** |
| 8. Prestige                     | 33.67/33.46 | 4.70/-355** | .663** | .192/ | .517/ | .311/ | .483/ | .392/ |
| 9. Tenure                       | 3.91/3.63 | 1.23/-345** | .525** | .385** | .343** | .643/ | .639** | .580** | .85/81 |
| 10. Annual Operating            | 3.11/3.35 | 1.70/-221/ | .464** | .108/ | .311/ | .17/ | .254/ | .231/ | .469** | .208/ |
Moving across the table from top to bottom and left to right; the first noticeable difference in correlations shows up in the analysis of the relationship between *Burnout* and *Resistance to Change*. For those who have not taken standards, this relationship is not statistically significant \((r = .196, p > .05)\), but for those who have taken standards, this relationship shows a strong positive correlation \((r = .564, p < .01)\). Next the relationship between *Grit* and *Standards Compliance* is a stronger relationship and a higher statistical significance for those who have not *Participated in Standards for Excellence* \((r = .410, p < .01)\) than those who have \((r = .273, p < .05)\). Those not taking Standards for Excellence show no statistical significance between *Grit* and *Resistance to Change* \((r = .235, p > .05)\) while those who have do \((r = -.398, p < .05)\). *Innovation’s* relationships with other variables are strikingly different between those who have *Participated in Standards for Excellence* (P) and those who have not (N): *Innovation* to *Burnout* \([(r = -.540, p < .05) P, vs. (r = -.369, p < .01) N]\), to *Standards Compliance* \([(r = .380, p < .01) P, vs. (r = .095, p > .05) N]\), to *Resistance to Change* \([(r = -.415, p < .01) P, vs. (r = -.226, p > .05) N]\), *Grit* \([(r = .439, p < .01) P, vs. (r = .384, p < .01) N]\), to *Psychological Capital* \([(r = .589, p < .01) P, vs. (r = .487, p < .01) N]\), to *External Prestige* \([(r = .643, p < .05) P, (r = .311, p < .05) N]\) indicating stronger relationships.

In looking at the correlations for *Psychological Capital*, three stand out (besides Innovation that has already been addressed): the relationship with *Resistance to Change* \([(r = -.536, p < .01) P, vs. (r = -.236, p > .05) N]\), *Grit* \([(r = .553, p < .01) P, (r = .489, p < .01) N]\), and *External Prestige* \([(r = .580, p < .01) P, (r = .392, p < .01) N]\). *Tenure* within the organization’s relationship with other variables is not statistically significant for those who have participated in Standards for Excellence except in *Standards*. 
Compliance, \((r = .262, p < .05)\) while for those who have not taken Standards for Excellence, Tenure is statistically significant with Grit, \((r = .347, p < .05)\), Flourishing \((r = .368, p < .01)\), Psychological Capital \((r = .376, p < .01)\), and External Prestige \((r = .359, p < .01)\). To further examine the relationship between the dependent variables of Psychological Capital and Burnout with the independent variable of Participation in Standards for Excellence, an ANCOVA analysis was completed.

**Hypotheses Four and Five: Multiple Moderator Regression Analysis**

In testing significance between the independent variables and Standards Compliance, first all variables were mean centered to accommodate the variety in the individual scale measurements as recommended by Aiken and West (1991). This was followed by running an HLR. It produced some interesting results, so it was followed by the Multiple Moderator Regression Analysis (MMR) to test for any predictor results. The inclusion of only one of the demographic variables (Operating Expense Amount) was statistically significant to predicting Standards Compliance, \((\beta = .433, p < .001)\) while no other controls had any effect. In the second model, the independent variable of Psychological Capital \((\beta = .258, p < .01)\) was a significant predictor of Standards Compliance. In the third model, Burnout \((\beta = -.013, p > .05)\) was not a significant predictor of Standards Compliance (Table 8). It appears the assumption of independence may have been violated upon review of the plot of studentized residuals against X value (IV Psychological Capital) along with the tests of normality and the mahalanobis distance, all suggesting the existence of outliers that may have exerted undue influence on the model (confirmed by the box and whisker graph of unstandardized residuals). However Cook’s distance, which measures the influence of
individual cases, is .193 significantly under 1; if it had been over one, that would cause concern about undue influence. The centered leverage value is also less than .20 (CL = .150), suggesting there are no problems with cases that are exerting undue influence. The DFBETA values that provide another indication of influence were all under the absolute value of 2.0. Checking the diagnostic plot of Cook’s distance against centered leverage values did not identify influential cases (cases with leverage of .50 or above and Cook’s distance of 1.0 or greater). There was no evidence of multicollinearity issues. All other reasonable assumptions were met.

Table 8: Results of MMR of Psychological Capital and Burnout on Compliance with Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors:</th>
<th>Step 1: Controls to DV</th>
<th>Step 2: Psychological Capital (IV)</th>
<th>Step 3: Burnout (IV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DV = Standards Compliance</td>
<td>DV = Standards Compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Operating</td>
<td>.433***</td>
<td>.396***</td>
<td>.396***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td>.258*</td>
<td>.249*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>21.708***</td>
<td>15.734***</td>
<td>10.381***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔF</td>
<td>21.708***</td>
<td>8.116**</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.387</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% CI</td>
<td>.753-.2.020</td>
<td>.006-.506</td>
<td>-.244-.219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001. Effects reported are standardized Betas.

The results of the MMR suggest that a significant proportion of the total variation in Compliance with Standards for Excellence was predicted by Psychological Capital while controlling for the organization’s Annual Operating Expenses, \( F(2, 93) = 15.734, p < .001 \). This indicates that Psychological Capital moderates the results of
Compliance with Standards for Excellence over and above the effects of Annual Operating Expense on Compliance with Standards for Excellence. Additionally the following was discovered:

1. For Psychological Capital, the unstandardized partial slope (.265) and standardized partial slope (.258) were statistically significantly different from 0 ($t = 2.849$, df = 95, $p < .01$); indicating with every one standard deviation (“SD”) increase in Psychological Capital, Compliance with Standards of Excellence will increase by approximately 1/4 of one SD when controlling for Annual Operating Expense.

2. The Confidence Interval (CI) around the unstandardized partial slopes do not include 0 (Psychological Capital total, .080, .450) further confirming this variable is statistically significant predictor of Compliance with Standards for Excellence.

3. The intercept (or average Compliance with Standards for Excellence when Psychological Capital is 0) was 52.941, statistically different from 0 ($t = 44.005$, df = 95, $p < .001$).

4. $R^2$ indicates that approximately 25% of the variation in Compliance with Standards for Excellence was predicted by Psychological Capital when controlling for the organization’s Annual Operating Expenses.

   Interpreted according to Cohen (1998), this suggests the strength of the relationship had a small effect on Compliance with Standards for Excellence.
Chapter Five: Discussion

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of Psychological Capital and Burnout to Participating in Standards for Excellence and Compliance with Standards. A review of the literature suggested that those Participating in Standards for Excellence training would have higher Psychological Capital and lower Burnout. In addition, Compliance with Standards for Excellence would be greater in those with higher Psychological Capital and lower Burnout.

Conclusion Related to Hypotheses

Using the analytic technique of ANCOVA, \( H_1: \) Levels of psychological capital will differ among executive directors who have taken the Standards for Excellence training from those who have not after controlling for grit, resistance to change, and perceived support for innovation and training was not found to indicate statistically significant differences in Psychological Capital between Executive Directors who have Participated in Standards for Excellence from those who have not (\( F_{\text{standards}} = 2.256; \text{df} = 1.94; p = .136 \)). However, the post hoc analysis of power indicated that by doubling the size of the sample, a statistically significant result could be found. Because the effect size was still small and prior high levels of Psychological Capital cannot be ruled out, this does not suggest that Psychological Capital has a relationship with Standards for Excellence training and could use further study.

ANCOVA was also used to test \( H_2: \) Levels of burnout will differ among executive directors who have participated in the Standards for Excellence training from those who have not after controlling for grit, resistance to change, and perceived
support for innovation and training which also did not show statistically significant differences in Burnout from those who have Participated in Standards for Excellence from those who have not (F_{standards} = 1.206; df = 1.94; p = .275). For both H1 and H2, results indicated the controls Grit, Resistance to Change, and Perceived Support for Innovation and Training were statistically significant. Hypotheses One and Two were not supported.

**H3:** High psychological capital of executive directors will be associated with lower burnout was supported in the correlation matrix and indicated that, as the level of the Psychological Capital increased for the executive directors, their level of Burnout decreased (r = - .649, p < .01). MMR was used to examine **H4:** There will be a statistically significant relationship between psychological capital and executive directors who have implemented the Standards for Excellence after controlling for grit, resistance to change, and perceived support for innovation and training and **H5:** There will be a statistically significant relationship between burnout and executive directors who have implemented the Standards for Excellence after controlling for grit, resistance to change, and perceived support for innovation and training exploring Psychological Capital and Burnout being statistically significant to the implementation or Compliance with Standards for Excellence. While H4 was partially supported, indicating Psychological Capital was a statistically significant moderator of Compliance with Standards for Excellence when controlling for size of the Annual Operating Expenses by the additional improvement in the standardized beta score (β = .258, p < .01), the control variables of Grit, Resistance to Change, and Perceived Support for Innovation and Training did not moderate Compliance with Standards for Excellence.
H5: There will be a statistically significant relationship between burnout and executive directors who have implemented the Standards for Excellence after controlling for grit, resistance to change, and perceived support for innovation and training was not supported ($\beta = -0.13, p > .05$). What is clear from these results is that it is the size of the organization and the executive director’s Psychological Capital that ultimately moderates the results in Compliance with the Standards for Excellence. What suggestions are there for incorporating what we learned in this study?

**Implications for Nonprofits**

Based on the literature review, nonprofits with high levels of turnover and Burnout would be wise to take advantage of training opportunities for leadership and staff that may increase Psychological Capital and lower Burnout. Is Standards for Excellence, as determined by this study, the vehicle to make that happen? Maybe, but it would only be with some clear adjustments in curriculum as indicated in the following section. What is important to note is training of staff that builds self-efficacy, enhances hope, raises optimism, and supports resilience does offer means to lower burnout (Salanova, Llorens, & Schaufeli, 2011; Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007; Peterson & Luthans, 2003; and Luthans, Avey, Avolio, Norman, & Combs, 2006).

Consideration should be given to include training as a requirement of operating a functioning and innovative corporation, rather than thinking of training as an auxiliary component of an organization’s budget. However, while Psychological Capital clearly shows promise in several areas of research relating to leadership, training and organization performance, it is not being offered by this author as a panacea for all leadership development.
Perceived External Prestige (“Prestige”) was found to be positively correlated with Psychological Capital, indicating that as one’s score increases in Psychological Capital, it also improves in Prestige. Perceived External Prestige has been associated with lower turnover or Burnout and improved performance in previous studies, and the current study reinforces that finding (Carmeli & Freund, 2009; Herrbach, Mignonac & Gatignon, 2007; and Carmeli, 2005). Since this research indicates strong positive correlations between Prestige and Standards Compliance, it follows that those who have higher levels of Prestige and Compliance with Standards for Excellence may also show improved performance, though that is subject to further research testing as indicated in the suggestions that follow.

Implications for Policy and Practice of Standards for Excellence

What seems to separate the leaders who can readily translate and adopt what they learn in training from those who do not are higher levels of Psychological Capital (Combs, Luthans, & Griffith, 2009). To achieve Compliance with the Standards for Excellence, nonprofit leaders must take what they learn in standards training (learning motivation) and translate it into actions once they return to their agencies (learning transfer). As suggested by Boyce (2011), Psychological Capital levels during standards training could be improved by the utilization of training vignettes or case studies, which would stimulate discussion of possible barriers to execution of the Standards for Excellence (such as resistant staff or board members). Led by a trained facilitator, small groups could discuss promising solutions to overcoming obstacles to implementation, which would then be shared with the training group as a whole. These exercises could improve self-efficacy through a mastery experience, provide optimism...
for possible solutions, lay the ground work for hope pathways, and strategize alternative solutions to help build resilience. The improvement of Psychological Capital relies on a highly interactive, adult-learning model of learning that includes introduction of the topic; illustration or demonstration of concepts and methods; time for practicing of what was learned within the training environment; a realistic evaluation of where one stands in adoption and adaptation of the new material learned; reflection on what steps must be taken to implement or transfer the training once back in the workplace; and the demonstration of understanding and mastering the concepts learned (Dunst, Trivett & Hamby, 2010). While 60% of those who had Participated in Standards for Excellence indicated the content presented was moderate to highly interactive, the remaining 40% indicate room for improvement in developing more of an adult-learning model to presenting Standards for Excellence. Since we know that training transfer is key to performance back on the job, what does it mean for Standards for Excellence implementation?

Expansion of the Standards for Excellence Model

The Standards for Excellence program is supported in seven states and one religious institution and has substantial room for growth if it wants to become a national model. The current number of eight principles and 55 standards (with more coming) can be cumbersome to smaller organizations to complete, though they are the very organizations that would benefit most by compliance (Watts Geer, 2009; and Bailis & Sokatch, 2006). Presently, Standards for Excellence (as offered by Standards for Excellence partners) may be spread out over a period of months or may be offered in an intense two day workshop but it does not work in its current form to increase
Psychological Capital. While the intense, compacted presentation of Standards for Excellence is presented as a cost and time-saving measure for nonprofits, the knowledge-centered training environment model (as it is currently presented) has not shown to be as effective for motivating participants to learn (Gegenfurtner, 2011). In addition, the truncated time does not allow participants to reflect and master the concepts presented. A tiered level initiative that allows for reflection and follow-up (with a time-limited deadline) to comply with the appropriate portion of Standards for Excellence after each segment would permit the building of small successes that could be parlayed into bigger successes as each section is completed. This plan would mirror the development of self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience (Psychological Capital) giving executive directors the personal fuel to take on the next level of standards, particularly if Standards for Excellence training was presented from the spectrum of working from the easiest to the most difficult implementation levels. This approach would necessitate the spreading out of Standards for Excellence training segments to allow time for compliance and would present it as building initiative toward full compliance. Psychological Capital was shown to moderate Compliance with Standards for Excellence and also showed a statistically moderate positive correlation with both Standards Compliance, (r = .346, p < .01) and Perceived External Prestige, (r = .472, p < .01) and as such, efforts that would increase Psychological Capital through the Standards for Excellence training would seem to be worth the effort. It is important to comment that the sample size of 119 was small and, as Aguinis suggests, that can make the detection of a moderating variable more difficult, so the fact that Psychological
Capital was found to moderate Standards for Excellence Compliance is significant (2004).

To take advantage of the strong correlation between Psychological Capital and Perceived External Prestige, the benefits of Complying with Standards for Excellence should be more widely touted both within and outside the Standards for Excellence initiative and its partners. Other ancillary measures that could be researched include financial indicators of success and program outcomes, comparing those who have complied with Standards for Excellence from those who have not. If the results indicate a higher level of financial performance and improved program results for those who have complied, it further solidifies Standards for Excellence as having the ability to raise an organization’s competence and External Prestige. To attract needed funding, organizations and their funders also need to value Compliance with Standards for Excellence as a way to raise the performance (competence) bar for all nonprofits (Aaker, Vohs, and Mogilner, 2010). While this research provides a window into what motivates executive directors to respond to accountability measures (Psychological Capital), it is ripe for further exploration.

Implications to Research for Psychological Capital

These findings provide much needed insight into training (Standards for Excellence) and performance of nonprofit leaders (Compliance with Standards for Excellence) that are not as frequently studied as their counterparts in for-profit businesses. The correlation results from this research reinforces previous business studies linking high Psychological Capital, Flourishing (well-being), and Perceived Support for Innovation and Learning with lower Burnout and Resistance to Change,
shows a previously unstudied strong positive correlation between Psychological Capital and Grit. Grit has previously been shown to have high correlations with students’ performance in school, so future research of Psychological Capital should include school children to examine the possible interdependability of Psychological Capital and Grit on a student’s success. In addition, expanding the study of Grit beyond the classroom and its relationship with Psychological Capital in adults’ success is also warranted. Although Psychological Capital was found to have a moderator effect on Compliance with Standards, retesting of Psychological Capital with a larger sample size is warranted. As stated earlier, the low power result on the relationship between Psychological Capital and Participating in Standards for Excellence indicates the need to expand the sample size for this group. Despite Psychological Capital’s strong positive correlations with Grit ($r = .529, p < .01$) and Innovation ($r = .518, p < .01$), neither of these variables were indicated as statistically significant controls or moderators of Participation in Standards for Excellence.

In contrast to a recent study by Beal, Stavros, and Cole showing Resistance to Change moderating the effect of Psychological Capital (on organizational citizenship behavior), Resistance to Change in this study had no effect on moderating the Psychological Capital’s impact on Participation in Standards for Excellence (2013). This is in spite of the moderately significant relationship between Psychological Capital and Resistance to Change ($r = -.399, p < .01$). This research also offers new information on relationships with Psychological Capital (Grit, Participation in, and Compliance with Standards for Excellence), reinforces others (Burnout, Flourishing,
Perceived Support for Innovation and Learning), and provides some contrasting information on Resistance to Change’s effect on moderating Psychological Capital.

**Limitations and Future Research**

This study has seven limitations within its design. This was a one-time, self-reported survey of multiple existing psycho-behavioral scales including a new scale determining whether an agency had complied with Standards for Excellence. As a self-reported survey, we did not have the benefit of corroborating any of the answers. As an example, no independent means of investigation of Standards Compliance were instigated or intended to be part of this study to corroborate the self-reported assessment of progress toward Standards for Excellence implementation. Secondly, the Psychological Capital scale used was an abbreviated scale consisting of 12 items so the individual testing of the constructs included in measuring Psychological Capital could not be completed. Thirdly, a convenience sample was used of leaders on the mailing lists of three statewide nonprofit associations in Oklahoma, Alabama, and Maryland, and as such, has limited generalizability to other nonprofit organizations and their executive directors. Also, this research is only the second study known (at the time of this publication) to examine the Psychological Capital of nonprofit executive directors and performance, and as such, should be expanded to a wider field of nonprofit leadership. Next, some results may have been affected by the size of the sample. A larger pool of participants (greater than 120; Aguinis, 2004) may find that Burnout is indeed a moderator of Compliance with Standards for Excellence and could also affect the significance of Participating in Standards for Excellence on Psychological Capital.
Fifth, time limitations prevented a pre- and post-test design of Participation in Standards for Excellence Training’s effect on individuals’ Psychological Capital and Burnout (test-retest reliability). We do not know whether those who Participated in Standards for Excellence’s Psychological Capital were affected by the training itself or whether they already had a high level of Psychological Capital since no pre-post-testing was done, but we do know that those who Participated in Standards for Excellence had higher Psychological Capital than those who did not. If some of the suggestions for increasing Psychological Capital into Standards for Excellence Training could be implemented, it would be interesting to see if they would, in fact, support previous studies indicating training could improve Psychological Capital (Peterson, Luthans, Avolio, Walumbwa, & Zhang, 2011). Sixth, first-time findings, such as the positive relationship between Grit and Psychological Capital, demonstrate a need for further study by researchers to examine if this was a one-time occurrence with this particular population or if it can be replicated with similar or divergent populations. Finally, as a one point-in-time test, we cannot determine if the responses are affected by passage of time as would be suggested by the state vs. trait characteristics of Psychological Capital, but a follow-up study with multiple points in time would help in that determination. Addressing the limitations of this study as outlined provides recommendations for future research, which could benefit not only the nonprofit community but the broader business world as well.
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Appendix B: Standards for Excellence® Code

Preamble

America’s nonprofit sector is committed to public service. Hard at work in communities across the state, nonprofit organizations are serving and meeting the needs of our citizens and strengthening our communities.

The success of nonprofit organizations depends upon public confidence and broad public support. Nonprofits are supported by individuals, corporations and foundations through charitable contributions and volunteer efforts; by government through contracts and grants; by consumers through purchases and fees; and by the general public through state and federal tax laws.

The Standards for Excellence Institute is committed to bolstering public confidence in and support for the nonprofit sector. Therefore, the Standards for Excellence Institute has developed these Standards for Excellence® (Standards) to promote ethical practices and accountability in nonprofit organizations across the state.

Nonprofit organizations must comply with applicable local, state, and federal laws. These Standards build on that foundation, and go a step further. Based on fundamental values - such as honesty, integrity, fairness, respect, trust, compassion, responsibility, and accountability - these Standards describe how nonprofits should act to be ethical and be accountable in their program operations, governance, human resources, financial management and fundraising. Eight (8) Guiding Principles are provided, along with fifty-five (55) Standards - more detailed performance benchmarks that will enable nonprofits to strengthen their operations.

Mission & Program

The Standards for Excellence Institute is committed to these Standards and all Maryland Nonprofits' members are required to pledge their commitment to the Guiding Principles. Members are supported in their efforts to implement the Standards through training and technical assistance provided by Maryland Nonprofits, as well as through a voluntary self-regulatory program by which organizations are evaluated based on their compliance with the performance indicators. In addition, Maryland Nonprofits invites non-member nonprofits to subscribe to these Standards.

The Standards for Excellence® are intended to describe how the most well managed and responsibly governed organizations should, and do, operate. They provide benchmarks to determine how well an organization is fulfilling its obligations to those who benefit from its programs, to contributors, and to the public. Nonprofits are founded for the public good and operate to accomplish a stated purpose through specific program activities. A nonprofit should have a well-defined mission, and its programs should effectively and efficiently work toward achieving that mission. Nonprofits have an obligation to ensure program effectiveness and to devote the resources of the organization to achieving its stated purpose.

A. Mission

(1) A nonprofit should have a mission statement that is a formal statement of the organization’s purpose as defined and approved by the board of directors. The organization's activities should be consistent with its stated purpose.
B. Organizational Evaluation

(1) A nonprofit should periodically revisit its mission (e.g., every 3 to 5 years) to determine if the need for its programs continues to exist. The organization should evaluate whether the mission needs to be modified to reflect societal changes, its current programs should be revised or discontinued, or new programs need to be developed.

C. Program Evaluation

(1) A nonprofit should have defined, cost-effective procedures for evaluating, both qualitatively and quantitatively, its programs and projects in relation to its mission. These procedures should address programmatic efficiency and effectiveness, the relationship of these impacts to the cost of achieving them, and the outcomes for program participants. Evaluations should include input from program participants.

(2) Evaluations should be candid, be used to strengthen the effectiveness of the organization and, when necessary, be used to make programmatic changes.

D. Program Service

(1) In rendering its programs or services, a nonprofit should act with the utmost professionalism and treat persons served with respect. Where appropriate, a nonprofit should have policies in place that protect the confidentiality of personal information and should provide a grievance procedure to address complaints. Nonprofits should regularly monitor the satisfaction of program participants.

Governing Body

Nonprofits are governed by an elected, volunteer board of directors that should consist of individuals who are committed to the mission of the organization. An effective nonprofit board should determine the mission of the organization, establish management policies and procedures, assure that adequate human resources (volunteer or paid staff) and financial resources (earned income, government contracts and grants, and charitable contributions) are available, and actively monitor the organization's management, financial and programmatic performance.

A. Board Responsibilities

(1) The board should engage in long-term and short-term planning activities as necessary to determine the mission of the organization, to define specific goals and objectives related to the mission, and to evaluate the success of the organization's programs toward achieving the mission.

(2) The board should establish policies for the effective management of the organization, including financial and, where applicable, personnel policies.

(3) The board should annually approve the organization's budget and periodically should assess the organization's financial performance in relation to the budget. As part of the annual budget process, the board should review the percentages of the organization's resources spent on program, administration, and fundraising. The full board should also approve the findings of the organization’s annual audit and management letter and plan to implement the recommendations of the management letter.

(4) The full board or some designated committee of the board should hire the executive director, set the executive's compensation, and evaluate the director's performance at least annually. In cases where a designated committee performs this responsibility, details should be reported to the full board.

(5) The board should periodically review the appropriateness of the overall compensation structure of the organization.
B. Board Composition

(1) The board should be composed of individuals who are personally committed to the mission of the organization and possess the specific skills needed to accomplish the mission.

(2) Where an employee of the organization is a voting member of the board, the circumstances must insure that the employee will not be in a position to exercise undue influence.

(3) The board should have no fewer than five (5) unrelated directors. Seven (7) or more directors are preferable.

(4) To ensure adequate rotation of officers and board members, an organization should limit the number of consecutive terms that a board member can serve.

(5) Board membership should reflect the diversity of the communities served by the organization.

(6) Board members should serve without compensation for their service as board members. Board members may be only reimbursed for expenses directly related to carrying out their board service.

C. Conduct of the Board

(1) The board is responsible for its own operations, including the education, training and development of board members, periodic (i.e., at least every two years) evaluation of its own performance, and where appropriate, the selection of new board members. New board members should receive an introduction to the Standards for Excellence.

(2) The board should establish stated expectations for board members, including expectations for participation in fundraising activities, committee service, and program activities.

(3) The board should meet as frequently as is needed to fully and adequately conduct the business of the organization. At a minimum, the board should meet four (4) times a year.

(4) The organization should have written policies that address attendance and participation of board members at board meetings. These policies should include a process to address noncompliance.

(5) Written meeting minutes reflecting the actions of the board, including reports of board committees when acting in the place of the board, should be maintained and distributed to board and committee members.

Conflicts of Interest

Nonprofit board and staff members should act in the best interest of the organization, rather than in furtherance of personal interests or the interests of third parties. A nonprofit should have policies in place, and should routinely and systematically implement those policies, to prevent actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest.

A. Conflict of Interest Policy

(1) Nonprofits should have a written conflict of interest policy. The policy should be applicable to board members and staff, and volunteers who have significant independent decision making authority regarding the resources of the organization. The policy should identify the types of conduct or transactions that raise conflict of interest concerns, should set forth procedures for disclosure of actual or potential conflicts, and should provide for review of individual transactions by the uninvolved members of the board of directors.

B. Conflict of Interest Statements

(1) Nonprofits should provide board members, staff and volunteers with a conflict of interest statement that summarizes the key elements of the organization's conflict of interest policy. The conflict of interest statement should
provide space for the board member, employee or volunteer to disclose any known financial interest that the individual, or a member of the individual's immediate family, has in any business entity which transacts business with the organization. The statement should be provided to and signed by board members, staff, and volunteers, both at the time of the individual's initial affiliation with the organization and at least annually thereafter.

**Human Resources**

A nonprofit's relationship to its employees and volunteers are fundamental to its ability to achieve its mission. Volunteers occupy a special place in nonprofit organizations, serving in governance, administrative and programmatic capacities. An organization's human resource policies should address both paid employees and volunteers, and should be fair, establish clear expectations, and provide for meaningful and effective performance evaluation.

**A. Personnel Policies**

(1) A nonprofit should have written personnel policies and procedures, approved by the board of directors, governing the work and actions of all employees and volunteers of the organization. In addition to covering basic elements of the employment relationship (e.g. working conditions, employee benefits, vacation and sick leave), the policies should address employee evaluation, supervision, hiring and firing, grievance procedures, employee growth and development, confidentiality of employee, client and organization records and information. A nonprofit should periodically review its personnel policies.

(2) With respect to volunteers, the organization's policies and procedures should also address initial assessment or screening, assignment to and training for appropriate work responsibilities, ongoing supervision and evaluation, and opportunities for advancement.

**B. Employee Performance Evaluation**

(1) Organizations should have a system in place for regular written evaluation of employees by their respective supervisors, which should take place at least annually.

**C. Employee Orientation**

(1) New employees of the organization should receive an orientation, which includes review of the organization's personnel policies and procedures, position description, and an introduction to the Standards for Excellence. Employees should be provided with a copy of the personnel policies and these Standards, and should acknowledge receipt in writing.

**Finance & Legal**

Nonprofits must practice sound financial management and comply with a diverse array of legal and regulatory requirements. A nonprofit's financial system should assure that accurate financial records are kept and that the organization's financial resources are used in furtherance of the organization's charitable purposes. Organizations should conduct periodic reviews to address regulatory and liability concerns.

**A. Financial Accountability**

(1) A nonprofit should operate in accordance with an annual budget that has been approved by the board of directors.

(2) A nonprofit should create and maintain financial reports on a timely basis that accurately reflect the financial activity of the organization. Internal financial statements should be prepared at least quarterly, should be provided to the board of directors, and should identify and explain any material variation between actual and budgeted revenues and expenses.

(3) For nonprofits with annual revenue in excess of $500,000, the financial reports should be subject to audit by a Certified Public Accountant.
(4) Organizations should provide employees, board members and volunteers a confidential means to report suspected financial impropriety or misuse of organizational resources and should have in place a policy prohibiting retaliation against persons reporting improprieties.

(5) Organizations should have written financial policies adequate for the size and complexity of their organization governing: (a) investment of the assets of the organization (b) internal control procedures, (c) purchasing practices, and (d) unrestricted current net assets. A nonprofit should periodically review its financial policies.

B. Legal Compliance and Accountability

(1) Nonprofits must be aware of and comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws. This may include, but is not limited to, the following activities: complying with laws and regulations related to fundraising, licensing, financial accountability, document retention and destruction, human resources, lobbying and political advocacy, and taxation.

(2) Organizations should periodically assess the need for insurance coverage in light of the nature and extent of the organization's activities and its financial capacity. A decision to forego general liability insurance coverage or Directors and Officers liability insurance coverage shall only be made by the board of directors and shall be reflected in the minutes for the meeting at which the decision was made.

(3) Nonprofits should periodically conduct an internal review of the organization's compliance with known existing legal, regulatory and financial reporting requirements and should provide a summary of the results of the review to members of the board of directors.

Openness

Nonprofits are private corporations that operate for public purposes with public support. As such, they should provide the public with information about their mission, program activities, and finances. A nonprofit should also be accessible and responsive to members of the public who express interest in the affairs of the organization.

A. Annual Report

(1) Nonprofits should prepare, and make available annually to the public, information about the organization's mission, program activities, and basic audited (if applicable) financial data. Basic financial data should, at a minimum, include a summary statement of activities and a summary statement of financial position. The report should also identify the names of the organization's board of directors and management staff.

B. Public Access

(1) Nonprofits should provide members of the public who express an interest in the affairs of the organization with a meaningful opportunity to communicate with an appropriate representative of the organization.

(2) Nonprofits should have at least one staff member who is responsible for assuring that the organization is complying with both the letter and the spirit of federal and state laws that require disclosure of information to members of the public.

Fundraising

Charitable fundraising provides an important source of financial support for the work of most nonprofit organizations. An organization's fundraising program should be maintained on a foundation of truthfulness and responsible stewardship. Its fundraising policies should be consistent with its mission, compatible with its organizational capacity, and respectful of the interests of donors and prospective donors.
**A. Fundraising Activities**

(1) A nonprofit's fundraising costs should be reasonable over time. On average, over a five year period, a nonprofit should realize revenue from fundraising and other development activities that are at least three times the amount spent on conducting them. Organizations whose fundraising ratio is less than 3:1 should demonstrate that they are making steady progress toward achieving this goal, or should be able to justify why a 3:1 ratio is not appropriate for their organization.

(2) Solicitation and promotional materials should be accurate and truthful and should correctly identify the organization, its mission, and the intended use of the solicited funds.

(3) All statements made by the nonprofit in its fundraising appeals about the use of a contribution should be honored.

(4) Nonprofits must honor the known intentions of a donor regarding the use of donated funds.

**B. Donor Relationships and Privacy**

(1) Nonprofits should respect the privacy of donors and safeguard the confidentiality of information that a donor reasonably would expect to be private.

(2) Nonprofits should provide donors an opportunity to state that they prefer to remain anonymous and that their name, the amount of their gift, or other information not be publicly released.

(3) Nonprofits should provide donors an opportunity to have their names removed from any mailing lists which are sold, rented, or exchanged.

(4) Nonprofits should honor requests by a donor to curtail repeated mailings or telephone solicitations from in-house lists.

(5) Solicitations should be free from undue influence or excessive pressure, and should be respectful of the needs and interests of the donor or potential donor.

**C. Acceptance of Gifts**

(1) An organization should have policies in place to govern the acceptance and disposition of charitable gifts that are received in the course of its regular fundraising activities. These policies should include procedures to determine any limits on individuals or entities from which the organization will accept a gift, the purposes for which donations will be accepted, the type of property which will be accepted, and whether to accept an unusual or unanticipated gift in light of the organization's mission and organizational capacity.

**D. Employment of Fundraising Personnel**

(1) Fundraising personnel, including both employees and independent consultants, should not be compensated based on a percentage of the amount raised or other commission formula.

(2) When using the services of a paid professional fundraising consultant, organizations should only use the services of professional solicitors and fundraising consultants who are properly registered with the Office of the Secretary of State of Maryland.

(3) Organizations should exercise control over any staff, volunteers, consultants, contractors, other organizations, or businesses that are known to be soliciting contributions on behalf of the organization.
Public Affairs & Public Policy

Nonprofits provide an important vehicle through which individuals organize and work together to improve their communities. Nonprofits should represent the interests of the people they serve through public education and public policy advocacy, as well as by encouraging board members, staff, volunteers and constituents to participate in the public affairs of the community.

A. Public Policy Advocacy

(1) Nonprofits should have a written policy on advocacy defining the process by which the organization determines positions on specific issues.

B. Public Education

(1) Nonprofits should assure that any educational information provided to the media or distributed to the public is factually accurate and provides sufficient contextual information to be understood.

C. Promoting Public Participation

(1) Nonprofits engaged in promoting public participation in community affairs shall be diligent in assuring that the activities of the organization are strictly nonpartisan.
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Appendix C: Organizational Self-Assessment Checklist

1. Mission and Program

Mission
Board approves and periodically reviews mission statement determining if it is consistent with the organization’s stated purpose.

Program Evaluation
_____All programs are evaluated in relation to the mission which is used to strengthen and guide the organization in making programmatic changes.

Program Service
_____Organization acts with professionalism and treats program participants with respect.

II. Governing Body

Board Responsibilities
_____Board engages in long term and short term planning, establishing policies for effective management, assesses the organization’s financial performance in relation to the budget, along with annually evaluating the executive director and setting the executive’s compensation.

Board Composition
_____Board members possess specific skills needed to accomplish the mission, reflecting the diversity of the community served, and are personally committed to the organization to serve without compensation under standardized term limits establishing, at a minimum, a five member board.

Conduct of the Board
_____The Board educates trains and develops board members providing written expectations of attendance, participation and financial support to the organization, meets a minimum of four times a year, and documents meetings in written distributed minutes.
III. Conflict of Interest

**Conflict of Interest Policy and Conflict of Interest Statement**

Have a board approved conflict of interest policy that is applicable to all members of the organization and a conflict of interest statement which allows for disclosure of financial interests which is signed annually by staff, volunteers and board members.

IV. Human Resources

**Personnel Policies**

Board approves personnel policies governing working conditions, vacations, sick leave, employee benefits, supervision, hiring and firing, grievance procedures, growth and development, and confidentiality of employee records along with policies governing volunteers (if applicable).

V. Financial and Legal Issues

**Financial Accountability**

Organization operates within board-approved budget, prepares quarterly internal financial statements which provide budget comparative figures, annually contracts for an audit (if revenue in excess of $300,000), and has organizational policies regarding whistleblower protection, asset investments, internal control procedures, purchasing practices and handling of unrestricted current net assets.

**Legal Compliance and Accountability**

Organization complies with federal, state, and local laws; purchase of general liability and Directors’ and Officers’ liability insurance; and has a document destruction/retention policy.

VI. Openness

**Annual Report**

An annual report is made available to the public which includes a mission statement, program activities, financial summary, along with board and staff members’ names.

**Public Access**

There is an opportunity for members of the public to communicate with an organization representative who responsibility is to assure the organization complies with state and federal disclosure laws.

VII. Fundraising

**Fundraising Activities**

Fundraising costs are not more than a third of the revenue generated; promotional materials are accurate and truthful; and donors’ intent on gifts is honored.
**Donor Relationships and Privacy**

We respect the privacy of donors and safeguard confidentiality of donor information allowing donors to remain anonymous if they desire; allow donors names to be removed from any mailing list; honor donors preferred method of contact or limitations on said contact; and assure solicitations are free from undue influence or excessive pressure.

**Acceptance of Gifts**

Board creates and approves acceptance of a gifts policy, governing limits on individuals or entities from which the organization will accept a gift; the purposes for which donations will be accepted; and whether to accept unusual or unexpected gifts.

**Fundraisers**

Fundraising personnel are not compensated on percentage or commission; outside fundraising consultants hired are registered with applicable federal, state, and local agencies; and solicitations by any staff, volunteers, consultants, contractors, other organizations, or businesses are controlled by the organization.

**VIII. Public Affairs and Public Policy**

An Advocacy policy exists that has been approved by the board; insuring educational materials that are distributed are factually accurate; and public participation promotions are strictly nonpartisan.
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