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ABSTRACT

Leadership Behaviors Needed by Executive Directors of Nonprofit Victim Support Organizations

by Timothy S. Hunt

Purpose: The purpose of this mixed methods study was to determine how nonprofit victim support organization leaders rate the impact of the 10 Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory (TLSi) domains on their effectiveness. In addition, it was the purpose to discover how nonprofit victim support organization leaders describe the impact of each TLSi domain on their effectiveness.

Methodology: The participants in this study were executive directors of private, nonprofit victim support organizations across the Pacific Northwest region of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho. All participated in an online quantitative survey where they rated their agreement with statements about the impact of the 10 TLSi domains on their effectiveness as a leader using a six-point Likert scale. Then, 12 interview participants, selected at random, described the impact of each domain on their leadership effectiveness during online interviews. Survey results and interview transcripts were analyzed and reviewed for themes and trends.

Findings: Major findings included identification of the top TLSi domains having an impact on leader effectiveness, the importance of building relationships both internal and external to the organization, and the enigma of political intelligence with respect to the executive director role.

Conclusions: Based on the findings from this study, it was concluded that Collaboration, Problem Solving and Decision Making, and Communication are the TLSi domains that
have the greatest impact on leader effectiveness. It was also concluded that building internal and external relationships is key to being an effective nonprofit victim support organization leader. Furthermore, executive directors need more than the 10 TLSi domains to sustain their effectiveness as a leader.

**Recommendations:** It is recommended that the results of this study be used as a model of leadership traits associated with effective nonprofit victim support organization leaders. The model could serve as criteria for seeking out and hiring executive directors for a wide range of victim support agencies. The model could also be used as a guide for executive directors and aspiring executive directors seeking a path for development and improvement.
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Implication for Action 1

Conclusion 1: Collaboration, Problem Solving and Decision Making, and Communication are the TLSi Domains that have the Greatest Impact on Leader Effectiveness.

Expected Findings

The TLSi Domains that have the Greatest Impact on Leader Effectiveness are:

1. Communication
2. Problem solving and decision making
3. Collaboration
4. Creativity and sustained innovation
5. Visionary leadership
6. Diversity
7. Team building
8. Character and integrity
9. Political intelligence
10. Personal and interpersonal skills

Note that the TLSi Domains that have the Greatest Impact on Leader Effectiveness may vary by the type of leader or organization. For instance, leaders in the for-profit sector may prioritize financial management and cost control, while leaders in the nonprofit sector may prioritize program delivery and public relations. Additionally, leaders at different levels of the organization may prioritize different TLSi Domains. For example, top executives may prioritize strategy and vision, while middle managers may prioritize operational effectiveness and team management.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Analyzing violent crime in the United States between 1960 and 2014, Golinko and Qian (2018) showed that the violent crime rate, in contrast to the increasing population, took a turn and steadily decreased beginning in the early 1990s. In direct contrast, there has been an increase in the frequency of publicized violent acts. Between 1982-2012, there were 70 mass shootings in the United States with almost half taking place after 2006 (Lowe & Galea, 2017). In 2018, there were 68 well-publicized deaths from mass shootings in the United States, but there were also 12,509 not so publicized gun-related deaths in all (Berkowitz, Lu, & Alcantara, 2019). A documented history of violent crime ranging from homicides in the 1300s in Europe (Roth et al., 2008) to the mass shootings of modern-day United States (Lowe & Galea, 2017) establishes that along with the violence, there are always victims – direct victims and an often even larger group of indirect victims.

In the United States, 50% of Americans still get their news from television, but 68% of adults get at least some of their news from social media (Shearer & Matsa, 2018). Additionally, “Fully 95% of teens have access to a smartphone and 45% say they are online almost constantly” (Anderson & Jiang, 2018, p. 1). Violence is prevalent in the lives of every citizen who has access to the news, and with multimedia, the news and its impact are instantaneous. With increased access to the media comes a potential increased risk of mental health issues. “Less is known about the psychological effects of mass shootings on indirectly exposed populations; however, there is evidence that such events lead to at least short-term increases in fears and declines in perceived safety” (Lowe & Galea, 2017, p. 62). For all victims, direct and indirect, Bryce et al. (2016) adds, “As a
result of their experiences, [victims] are at risk of developing trauma symptoms (e.g., avoidance behaviors, negative moods), which can subsequently lead to problems such as substance abuse, poor emotional regulation, and increased risk of psychiatric disorders” (p. 240). An increase in the number of impacted victims of violent crime combined with the trauma incurred by victims makes for a compelling argument that there is a commensurate need for victim support services.

Victim support organizations provide a variety of services including emotional support, advice during the criminal justice process, and referrals to other services or agencies (Bryce et al., 2016). Because these services can be expensive and because many victims needing help can’t afford to pay for their services (Guo, 2012), nonprofits providing free services are present in communities throughout the country. Additionally, leaders of victim support organizations must also be concerned for the mental health of their workers (Barrington & Shakespeare-Finch, 2014). Secondary traumatic stress (STS) and compassion fatigue (CF) are common among people who work with trauma victims and if left unchecked, can lead to emotional and physical burnout (Konistan, 2016).

Keeping nonprofit organizations sustainable and adaptable to an ever-changing community and economy requires a solid foundation in business management skills (Nen, 2015; York, 2018). Keeping nonprofit employees engaged, productive, and retained requires a set of leadership skills tailored to a typically passionate and volunteer workforce (Drucker, 1990; Freeborough & Patterson, 2015; Herman, 2005). Add to the leader’s role the task of managing CF (Barrington & Shakespeare-Finch, 2014) and the
job description for an executive director of a nonprofit victim support services organization becomes rather complex.

**Background**

In 2018, there were 1.21 million violent crimes in the United States (Statista, 2020b). At the time of their study, Meindl and Ivy (2017) reported that mass shootings take place every 12.5 days. But it is not just mass shootings that have a traumatic impact. According to Santilli et al. (2017), there are over 30,000 people in the United States that die each year from injuries related to firearms. Violence appears to be an irrevocable part of the human condition. Combined with the instantaneous world stage of mass media, large and public violent acts are becoming more and more common, so much so that they can mask the less public, but much more frequent daily acts of violent crime.

**History of Violent Crime**

Violent crime statistics have only been collected with any consistency since the 1960s (Roth et al., 2008). Prior to that, data on violent crime was collected with no standard for quality and mostly by public agencies. But in the 1970s, researchers reconstructed the history of violent crime through the analysis of documents such as court records, coroners’ reports, police records, and newspapers (Roth et al., 2008). This *Historical Violence Database* as it is called, contains modern and pre-modern violent crime statistics and is now used by modern researchers to validate their assumptions about how economics, industry, and politics correlate to violent crime rates.

**Role of Mass Communication in Violent Crime**

Mass media is prevalent in the lives of the vast majority of U.S. citizens. There are approximately 214 million Facebook users (Statista, 2018a) and another 68 million
Twitter users (Statista, 2018b) in the United States. To add to that, according to Grieco (2017), 26% of U.S. adults are getting their news from more than one social media site. When a story goes viral, it can reach an extremely large number of people quickly.

Through modern multimedia communication, more people than ever are exposed to violent crime (McGinty, Webster, & Barry, 2013) and are subsequently at risk from posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and depression (Lowe & Galea, 2017). Although more research is needed around the psychological impact of mass trauma events on indirectly exposed populations, evidence suggests that people not directly involved in the incident still experience increased fear and a decreased sense of safety after an event, at least in the short term (Lowe & Galea, 2017). To reinforce that fear, there is evidence that after a mass shooting, there will be another violent event within the next two weeks (Meindl & Ivy, 2017). More people suffering from PTSD, depression, or just general fear increases the need for more public education about what it means to be a victim and the services that are available for support.

Mass Shootings

At the forefront of publicized violence is the relatively recent surge of mass shootings. The term mass shooting has multiple definitions. As defined by Blair and Martaindale (2013), a mass shooting is an event that “involves one or more persons engaged in killing or attempting to kill multiple people in an area (or areas) occupied by multiple unrelated individuals” (p. 3). The Mother Jones news organization uses the simpler and broader definition of “events that were senseless, random, or at least public in nature” (as cited in Blair & Martaindale, 2013, p. 62). Regardless of the definition,
mass shootings can reach a global audience instantaneously through live news coverage and social media technologies.

**Trauma Related to Violent Crime**

Violent crime has a lasting impact on everyone that experiences it – some are affected more than others. It can be traumatic and lead to lifelong damage. Crime statistics generally only reflect the direct victims. They do not reflect the families, friends, community members, and first responders who are indirectly affected by the events. “The accumulated research suggests that direct and indirect exposures to violence have a similar set of risk factors and associated behavioral problems” (Zimmerman & Posick, 2016, p. 178).

Exposure to assaultive violence, or learning that someone you care for has been exposed, is associated with an increase of mental health issues (Lowe & Galea, 2017). For those with exposure to higher levels of violence, studies show that they have a greater chance of developing mental health problems (Weisburd et al., 2018). And, according to Bryce et al. (2016), a significant number of violent crime victims do not engage with available support services which increases their chance of suffering from PTSD. Of note, Bryce et al. (2016) report that there is a gap in the research with respect to a detailed qualitative study about why people do not engage with victim support services. This is an opportunity for future research but it is also important information for leaders of victim support agencies to consider when designing how to best serve their communities. Considering the number of people exposed to violent crime, and the mental health issues they could be suffering from, it is easy to conclude that there is a commensurate need for victim support services.
**Victim Support**

Victim support services go beyond mental and physical health support. There are legal fees, out of pocket expenses, loss of income, the burdens of court appearance, and property damage (Baroni, 2018). A study by Huang (2018) concluded that tailored services with personalized counseling is the most effective approach to helping victims through the healing process. As most people are not prepared for the burdens of being a victim, they can benefit from the help of experts. Moreover, because many victims are from low-income families (Guo, 2012), nonprofit organizations that provide free services are often their best, if not the only option. An additional byproduct of using nonprofits is that their very presence helps to reduce crime. In a longitudinal study by Sharkey, Torrats-Espinosa, and Takyar (2017), it was concluded that the more nonprofit organizations present in a community, the greater the reduction in crime.

Local nonprofit victim service centers are a hub for a network of victim support services, but most people are unaware of their existence. Bryce et al. (2016) highlight how building relationships between local law enforcement agencies and victim support centers increases the chance that victims will pursue support. Since victims typically do not anticipate needing support services, they seldom know where to go for help, and since law enforcement is typically involved in violent crime, an informed law enforcement officer could be the best linkage between the victim and their needed help. The responsibility of informing law enforcement and the community about victim services falls on the executive director of the nonprofit agency.
Managing Stress and Compassion Fatigue

Managing a nonprofit business and leading nonprofit workers are standard skillsets required by any leader of a nonprofit organization (York, 2018), but managing compassion fatigue is unique to those organizations who provide services to the physically and emotionally traumatized (Barrington & Shakespeare-Finch, 2014).

A study by Klein, Riggenbach-Hays, Sollenberger, Harney, and McGarvey (2018) revealed that there are positive and negative effects associated with providing support to traumatized victims – compassion satisfaction keeps workers coming back while compassion fatigue often leads to burnout. A study by Kiley et al. (2018) reported similar characteristics among mental health workers who are exposed to clients with traumatic experiences, as did Barrington and Shakespeare-Finch (2014) with their study of clinicians who support refugees seeking asylum from traumatic environments. A study by Noullet, Lating, Kirkhart, Dewey, and Everly (2018) looked at pastoral care as another field at risk where the clergy often respond to traumatic events as crisis interventionalists.

All of these studies show fields of work at risk of CF, but they also show that when self-care training is introduced, the workers become more resilient and are better able to cope with the stress of their work (Barrington & Shakespeare-Finch, 2014; Kiley et al., 2018; Klein et al., 2018; Noullet et al., 2018). Based on these conclusions, leaders of nonprofit victim support organizations need to understand, and be able to manage, compassion fatigue.
Nonprofit Leadership Behaviors

In addition to managing compassion fatigue, leaders of nonprofit victim support centers need skills in managing a nonprofit business (Moreland, 2013; Renard & Snelgar, 2016; York, 2018) and leading nonprofit workers (Freeborough & Patterson, 2015; Larick & White, 2012; Lutz Allen, Smith, & Da Silva, 2013; Rowold, Borgmann, & Bormann, 2014). What doesn’t appear to exist in the literature is research on how leaders of nonprofit victim support organizations are handling the need to deal with all of these areas at once.

Nonprofit employees are more highly engaged when their leaders practice transformational leadership (Freeborough & Patterson, 2015). One approach for exploring the leadership behaviors needed by a nonprofit leader is to use the Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory (TLSi). The TLSi is a 360-degree feedback inventory created by Larick and White (2012) that provides an evaluation around 80 skills that describe the competencies of successful transformational leaders. Based on the Johari window adapted from Joseph Luft and Harrington Ingham, the TLSi describes how the leader perceives themselves and how the world around them perceives them. The inventory is organized around 10 domains:

- Character/Integrity
- Collaboration
- Communication
- Creativity and Sustained Innovation
- Diversity
- Personal/Interpersonal Skills
• Political Intelligence
• Problem Solving/Decision Making
• Team Building
• Visionary Leadership

Statement of the Research Problem

There were over 1.2 million violent crimes reported in the United States in 2017 (Statista, 2019b), but only those with newsworthy characteristics, such as a high number of victims, shootings at schools, or when the shooter is a young, ideological middle eastern, reach mainstream media (Silva & Capellan, 2017). Mass shootings garner much of the media attention (Meindl & Ivy, 2017) but they only contribute to a small portion of direct victims. That said, mass shootings and other newsworthy events have the potential to reach a significantly larger number of indirect victims, especially through social media (Shearer & Matsa, 2018). Research suggests that behavioral health risk factors are similar for both direct and indirect victims (Zimmerman & Posick, 2016). Bottom line, whether it be murder, robbery, rape, or aggravated assault, the negative effects from violent crime are far reaching beyond the violent act itself.

Almost counter-intuitive to what is communicated in the media is the fact that the violent crime rate has steadily decreased since 1990, that is until the last few years (Statista, 2019a). Although some research shows a decline in violent crime in the United States, there has been an increase in the frequency of publicized violent acts resulting in a larger population of direct and indirect victims at risk from the associated trauma (Golinko & Qian, 2018; Sharkey et al., 2017; Zimmerman & Posick, 2016). The risks can include PTSD, depression, fear, avoidance behaviors, negative moods, and a reduced
sense of safety (Bryce et al., 2016; Lowe & Galea, 2017). In addition to the intangible losses, victims can also suffer tangible losses such as property loss or damage, legal fees, loss of a loved one, or loss of income (Baroni, 2018). With the multitude of typically unpredictable factors affecting the lives of victims, there comes a commensurate need for a variety of victim support services. And, since many victims are financially incapable of paying for their needed support (Guo, 2012), free services from local nonprofit victim support organizations can be their only alternative.

Victim support nonprofits have the traditional challenges of all nonprofits including leading a passion-driven workforce and effectively managing nonprofit resources (Herman, 2005; York, 2018), but they also have the challenge of managing the wellbeing of the victim advocates who absorb the often horrific stories of their clients, provide empathetic solutions, and then go about their personal life like none of it happened (Barrington & Shakespeare-Finch, 2014). Compassion fatigue, as it is often called, “encompasses aspects of burnout as well as secondary traumatic stress” (Barrington & Shakespeare-Finch, 2014, p. 686). The responsibility of keeping a balance between all three areas: (a) workforce, (b) resources, and (c) compassion fatigue, falls on the senior leader of the organization, typically the executive director.

There is a gap in the literature on the skills and competencies needed by nonprofit victim support organization leaders to be effective. Although there is extensive literature on nonprofit leadership traits (Freeborough & Patterson, 2015; Leon, 2016; Lutz Allen et al., 2013; Renard & Snelgar, 2016; Rowold et al., 2014), literature on how to run a nonprofit business (Drucker, 1990; Herman, 2005; Nen, 2015; York, 2018), and literature on the management of compassion fatigue (Barrington & Shakespeare-Finch, 2014; Kiley
et al., 2018; Klein et al., 2018; Noullet et al., 2018), there appears to be no research on nonprofit leaders who need to balance all three. A study on this topic, as Stewart and Kuenzi (2018) have noted in their study of nonprofit career paths, has the potential to produce a list of behaviors that any board of directors could use to hire their executive director, or any aspiring executive director could use to develop their leadership skills.

According to York (2018), leadership with a clear vision and an inclusive, mission-centered focus is critical to any nonprofit’s sustainability. In a victim support organization, the pool of viable leadership candidates is significantly reduced by the additional need for empathy and the ability to manage worker mental health and overall wellbeing. Because there is a great demand for leaders who can successfully run these unique organizations that are so vital to their communities, there is clearly a need to research the behaviors that have an impact on nonprofit victim support organization leader effectiveness.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to determine how nonprofit victim support organization leaders rate the impact of the 10 TLSi domains on their effectiveness. In addition, it was the purpose to discover how nonprofit victim support organization leaders describe the impact of each TLSi domain on their effectiveness.

**Research Questions**

The research was guided by the following research questions:

1. How do leaders of nonprofit victim support organizations rate the impact of the different TLSi domains on their effectiveness?
2. How do leaders of nonprofit victim support organizations describe the impact of the different TLSi domains on their effectiveness?

**Significance of the Problem**

Regardless of the increasing or decreasing rate of violent crime in the United States, there are still over a million violent acts reported each year (Statista, 2020b) and each of those acts leaves in its wake any number of directly and indirectly traumatized victims (Baum, Rahav, & Sharon, 2014; Huang, 2018; Konistan, 2016; Lowe & Galea, 2017; Zimmerman & Posick, 2016). Most of those victims would benefit from some form of support be it legal, financial, administrative, or counseling (Baroni, 2018). And, due to reasons still requiring additional research (Bryce et al., 2016), many of those people are either unaware of, or resistant to pursuing, their much needed help. This includes educated professionals like police, fire, and medical first responders (Haecher, 2017; Konistan, 2016). Subsequently, there is a great need for victim support services, and education about those services, throughout the country.

A search of the Office for Victims of Crime (2020a) returned over 2,500 records for private, nonprofit victim support agencies registered in the United States at the time of this study. These offices are a mixture of elderly support, child advocacy, victim education, hospice, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, mental health agencies, rape crisis, shelters, and victim service agencies. The range of services provided by these organizations includes counseling, criminal justice support, assistance in filing claims, legal advocacy, mental health services, and referrals to other services and agencies. Common to all of these organizations are the typical business requirements for managing a nonprofit (Drucker, 1990; Herman, 2005; York, 2018) and the unique leadership
challenges associated with managing a passion-driven and largely volunteer workforce (Davis, 2018; Flint, 2017; Freeborough & Patterson, 2015; Renard & Snelgar, 2016).

What makes these organizations special is the addition of the worker’s “exposure to clients’ traumatic experiences [that can lead to] elevated stress” (Kiley et al., 2018, p. 33). This elevated stress is frequently referred to as burnout, vicarious trauma, STS, or CF (Barrington & Shakespeare-Finch, 2014; Kiley et al., 2018).

There is an abundance of research about the leadership traits that make nonprofit leaders successful (Davis, 2018; Flint, 2017; Freeborough & Patterson, 2015; Renard & Snelgar, 2016). There is extensive literature that outlines the management skills needed to effectively manage nonprofit organizations (Drucker, 1990; Herman, 2005; York, 2018). And, there are increasingly more studies on the need to manage well-being and compassion fatigue for workers exposed to traumatized victims (Barrington & Shakespeare-Finch, 2014; Kiley et al., 2018). What is lacking in the existing literature is targeted research on what makes leaders of the more than 2,500 nonprofit victim support organizations effective. This study will contribute to the gap in the literature by examining the impact that transformational leadership skills have on nonprofit victim support organization leader effectiveness.

In their study on failed leadership, Barnes and Spangenburg (2018) concluded that “continued and more extensive research is still necessary for defining the distinctions between those that should and should not be chosen to lead our organizations into the future” (p. 52). The results of this study may serve to establish a model of leadership traits associated with effective nonprofit victim support organization leaders. When established, the model could serve as criteria for seeking out and hiring executive
directors for the wide range of agencies already mentioned. The model could also be used in nonprofit leadership seminars or higher education curricula, or as a guide for aspiring executive directors seeking a professional development path. Additionally, professional organizations such as the National Counsel of Nonprofits, the TCC Group, or nonprofitready.org, could use the model to help nonprofit organizations, start, grow, and excel.

**Definitions**

The following are definitions of key terms relevant to the study, as well as operational definitions specific to the study:

*Compassion fatigue (CF).* For the purposes of this study, CF is used synonymously with secondary traumatic stress, vicarious trauma, empathic stress, and secondary victimization.

*Crime.* An act punishable as a felony, gross misdemeanor, or misdemeanor under the laws of this state or equivalent federal or local law (Declaration of Rights, WA Const. art. I, § 35).

*Direct victim.* People assaulted by criminal acts (Huang, 2018).

*Director.* Unless otherwise specified, the term director is considered synonymous with executive director.

*Executive Director.* The senior leader in charge of the organization being studied.

*Indirect victim.* Family members or others traumatically affected by the criminally assaulted or killed (Huang, 2018).

*Leader.* Except when used in reference to other author’s work, the term leader is considered synonymous with executive director.
Survivor. A spouse or domestic partner, child, parent, legal guardian, sibling, or grandparent of a victim of crime (Declaration of Rights, WA Const. art. I, § 35).

Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory (TLSi). A 360-degree survey that assesses an individual’s transformational leadership ability across ten domains and 80 skills and then provides the user with a holistic analysis of their performance.

Trauma responders. For the purposes of this study, the term trauma responders includes any profession that supports traumatized victims including first responders, clergy, healthcare workers, 9-1-1 telecommunicators, and victim advocates.

Victim support or advocacy. Services provided to victims of crime including, but not limited to, mental health, emotional support, advice during the criminal justice process, and referrals to other services or agencies (Barrington & Shakespeare-Finch, 2014; Bryce et al., 2016).

Victim. A person against whom a crime has been committed or the representative of a person against whom a crime has been committed (Declaration of Rights, WA Const. art. I, § 35).

Violent crime. Offenses classified as murder, robbery, rape, and aggravated assault (Department of Justice, 2019).

**Delimitations**

Delimitations clarify the boundaries of a study as set by the researcher (Roberts, 2010). The delimitations of this study include the following:

- Only nonprofit victim support organizations were included in this study.
- Only nonprofit victim support organizations within the states of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho were included in this study.
• If a nonprofit was associated with a large organization like a hospital, healthcare system, or government agency, they were not included in the study.

• Only executive directors from organizations in the target population were included in the study.

• Due to a need to consider cultural influence when designing effective interventions for indigenous peoples (Manson, 2020), which is outside the scope of this study, Native American victim support organizations were not included.

**Organization of the Study**

This study is presented in five chapters. Chapter I provides the overview and background, and introduces the research problem, the purpose statement, and the research questions. Chapter II provides an analysis of relative literature in leadership and victim support services. Chapter III describes the research design, methodology, data collection, instrument and procedures, and population and sample of the study. Chapter IV provides an analysis of the data and discussion of the findings. Chapter V summarizes the study, offers conclusions, outlines implications of the study, and recommends future areas of study.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Leadership is a key factor in the success of any organization (Bennis, 2009). But not every leadership style works for every type of organization. In the world of nonprofits, leadership is especially crucial because the people who work and volunteer with nonprofits are generally inspired and motivated by a cause (Drucker, 1990). Employees of a for-profit business can be just as inspired by the company’s mission and vision but they are much less likely than a nonprofit volunteer to walk away when dissatisfied – they still need a paycheck. Introduce to the equation a nonprofit whose sole purpose is to serve victims who have been traumatized by violent crime and the ability to manage compassion fatigue is added to the list of necessary skills (Kiley et al., 2018; Killian, Hernandez-Wolfe, Engstrom, & Gangsei, 2017; Klein et al., 2018; Noullet et al., 2018).

Nonprofit victim support organizations are a necessity in the United States (Office for Victims of Crime, 2020b). Services such as mental health or legal system advocacy are often out of reach financially for the victims of crime (Guo, 2012), especially since a violent crime trauma inflicted on one family member or friend can reverberate throughout the entire family and extended social network (Zimmerman & Posick, 2016). And because our social networks can reach across the globe with the ability to instantaneously share a traumatic event in living color, the risk of imposing unhealthy levels of stress on countless others is significant.

Violence appears to be an unalterable part of society (Roth et al., 2008). And in the wake of violent crime, there are always victims – some who are impacted directly and many others who are impacted indirectly. Most victims will need some type of physical,
emotional, or legal support (Huang, 2018; Lowe & Galea, 2017). For those that can’t afford to pay for that support, the free services provided by nonprofit victim support organizations may be their only hope. And to ensure that those free services are always available, those organizations need strong, effective leadership to keep their people motivated and productive, and their organizations viable.

**Violent Crime**

*Violent crime*, as defined by the U.S. Department of Justice (2019), are offenses classified as murder, robbery, rape, and aggravated assault. In 2018, there were 1.2 million violent crimes reported in the United States (Statista, 2020b). That is actually a slightly smaller number overall (about 52,000 or 4% less) than what was reported in 2016. That said, 10 of the top 25 worst mass shootings (by number of victims) since 1982 occurred between 2016 and 2019 (Statista, 2020a). Before the internet and social media, the impact of these events would have been somewhat isolated to the direct victims, their families, and their communities. But because of the nearly instantaneous global reach of today’s social media, these types of events have a far wider trauma-related impact on a significantly larger group of indirect victims.

**History of Violent Crime**

*The Historical Violence Database* (HVD) was a collaborative research project by Roth et al. (2008). Their data spans homicides from the year 1633 in early New England to homicides in Los Angeles County in the 1800s to homicides across the United States in the early 2000s. The HVD provides a common location for the storage and analysis of violent crime, something that did not exist before the HVD, so that researchers can better understand violence and the social and economic impact it has on society. One of the
challenges of analyzing the history of violent crime is the varying ways that differing agencies categorize and report violent crime. Garton and Niemi (2019), analyzing crime data from Chicago during the period of 2007 to 2016, showed that databases such as the Uniform Crime Report and the National Crime Victimization Survey differed in how they reported their data. “Any conclusions about multi-year trends observable in the data do not necessarily correspond to multi-year trends in crime, but they may have to do with trends in crime reporting” (Garton & Niemi, 2019, p. 2). This further justifies the need for a singular collection point. To help mitigate this factor, Roth et al. (2008) have archived their data with the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) and the Bureau of Justice Statistics, as well as posting it on their HVD website in hopes of providing valid data that can be used by crime trend modelers like Garton and Niemi, by public leaders and policy makers, and by the general public. By understanding the history of violent crime, researchers can better predict the impact of potential interventions to mitigate violence or identify methods to better support the victims of violent crime. Use of the HVD along with continuing research on violent crime has also validated that with violent acts there are always victims.

Types of Violent Crime

The Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Uniform Crime Report (UCR) lists violent crimes as “those offenses that involve force or threat of force” (Department of Justice, 2019, p. 1). There are four offenses under the UCR’s heading of violent crime: (a) murder, (b) robbery, (c) rape, and (d) aggravated assault (Department of Justice, 2019). The Department of Justice (2019) defines murder as the willful killing of another human being, robbery as taking anything of value from another person by force or threat of
force, rape as a [sexual act] without the consent of the victim, and aggravated assault as an unlawful attack on another person with the intent of inflicting severe bodily injury. In 2018, there were 16,214 murders, 101,151 reported rape cases, 282,061 reported robberies, and 807,410 reported aggravated assault cases in the United States (Statista, 2020b). All of these crimes have the potential to leave their victims, their victim’s families, and their victim’s communities severely traumatized, especially with respect to the children (Hanson et al., 2001; Santilli et al., 2017; Yoon, Steigerwald, Holmes, & Perzynski, 2016).

**Impact of Mass Media on Violent Crime**

In a study of teens in the United States (ages 13-17), Anderson and Jiang (2018) reported that 95% of teens either possess or have access to a smart phone, a 22% increase from three years earlier, and nearly half of those teens are online almost constantly. When asked if social media had an impact on the lives of teens today, 31% reported a positive impact, 24% reported a negative impact, and 45% said the impact was neither negative nor positive. Of those that reported a positive impact, connecting with family and friends was the number one reason for their answer followed by easier access to news and information. Of those that reported a negative impact, bullying and rumor spreading was the number one answer followed by harms relationships and lack of in-person contact. And although it was a low number, 4% said that social media causes mental health issues in today’s teens.

For adults, Perrin and Anderson (2019) reported that 69% of U.S. adults use Facebook and 73% use YouTube, although young adults prefer Instagram and Snapchat. Of the Facebook users, three quarters are online daily with about half online several times
a day. Additionally, 68% of U.S. adults get at least some news from social media with about four-in-ten getting their news from Facebook (Gramlich, 2019; Shearer & Matsa, 2018). “Convenience” is cited as the most common benefit.

One of the byproducts of media reporting after an event like a mass shooting is the development of public bias towards a particular group or political agenda. McGinty, Webster, and Barry (2013) showed how opinions can shift based on slightly different news article content. Using three sample groups, the researchers provided each group with the same story about a mass shooting by a man with a history of serious mental illness. Story 1 was about the mass shooting. Story 2 was about the mass shooting and gun restrictions for persons with serious mental illness. Story 3 was about the mass shooting and a ban on high-capacity magazines. A fourth control group was not given a story. All four groups were given the same survey and the results were clear. All groups that read an article expressed greater support than the control group for both gun restrictions for persons with serious mental illness and a ban on high-capacity magazines. The ability of the media to influence public opinion was validated. Additionally, McGinty et al. showed that the media stories exacerbated the already negative public opinion about persons with serious mental illness creating a heightened sense of fear and alertness. Of note, the authors expressed a limitation that it was unclear how long these opinions and perceptions would last.

“Mass shooting episodes… have received substantial media coverage and captured public attention” (Lowe & Galea, 2017, p. 62) and publicizing such events in the media, according to Meindl and Ivy (2017), has perpetuated copycat versions of these types of violent crimes. The term “copycat crime” is used by the media as well as
academia to describe a crime committed based on an imitation of another crime viewed in the media (Helfgott, 2015). In support of that definition, there is research that suggests copycat crime is common among criminals with 25% reporting that media or popular culture played a part in their crimes (Helfgott, 2015). Meindl and Ivy (2017) offer that a “contagion effect” could influence perpetrators of mass shootings. Like the copycat effect, behaviors viewed in the media can become “contagious” similar to how a disease could spread except the contagion models the outcome of someone else’s behaviors. Contagion behaviors have been documented in such cases as airplane hijackings and suicides. There is also evidence of an increased likelihood of another event occurring within two weeks following a mass shooting. The researchers go on to say that contagion theory does not explain why a person commits a mass shooting, it only suggests that a similar event could take place soon after a trigger event. An example of copycat shooting was cited as follows:

Columbine School Shooting (1999) — The Columbine incident, and news coverage of the event, itself inspired copycats including a school shooting in Toronto, Canada by a 14 year-old diagnosed with conduct disorder and said to be bordering on the threshold of a diagnosis of psychopathy who was fixated on the Columbine shootings. (Helfgott, 2015, p. 60)

Technology has had a profound effect on social interaction, the nature of relationships, and subsequently, the dynamics of criminal behavior. Similar to pop-culture events such as flash mob wedding proposals or over-the-top ways of asking your date to the prom, technology almost seems to be inspiring the next perpetrator of a violent crime to one-up the last one.
Mass Shootings

Between 1982 and 2019, the top 25 worst mass shootings in the United States resulted in 460 fatalities and 992 injuries (Statista, 2020a). The lowest number of fatalities was nine while the worst was in Las Vegas in 2017 when a shooter killed 58 concert-goers and injured 546 more. Zooming in on the list, in 2015 alone, there were 332 shootings in the United States where four or more people were killed at one time (Santilli et al., 2017). Figure 1 shows the steadily increasing trend of fatalities from the 25 worst mass shootings in the United States between 1982 and December 11, 2019.

![Figure 1. Trend of U.S. Mass Shootings Between 1982 and 2019](https://www.statista.com/statistics/476101/worst-mass-shootings-in-the-us/)

Because the injuries in Las Vegas were so significant in comparison to the other shootings, Figure 2 is included with the 2017 injuries removed to provide a better contrast of the remaining numbers. Although Golinko and Qian (2018) showed that the
violent crime rate has been steadily decreasing since the early 1990s, data clearly shows a steadily increasing trend of fatalities from mass shootings. Combined with the outreach capability of mass media, large, publicized violent events are putting an increasingly larger group of indirect victims at risk of trauma-related issues.

Figure 2. Trend of U.S. Mass Shootings Between 1982 and 2019 (2017 injuries removed). The number of injured people in these shootings is also provided with the exception of the 2017 injuries. They were removed to provide a better contrast of the remaining numbers. Adapted from “Number of victims of the worst mass shootings in the United States between 1982 and December 2019,” by Statista, 2020. Retrieved from https://www.statista.com/statistics/476101/worst-mass-shootings-in-the-us/

Table 1 identifies the fatalities and injuries for the top 25 worst mass shootings in the United States between 1982 and 2019.
Table 1

Number of Victims of the Worst Mass Shootings in the United States between 1982 and December 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass Shooting</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
<th>Injured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas Strip massacre (Las Vegas, Nevada, 2017)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando nightclub massacre (Orlando, Florida, 2016)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech massacre (Blacksburg, Virginia, 2007)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Hook Elementary massacre (Newtown, Connecticut, 2012)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas First Baptist Church massacre (Sutherland Springs, Texas, 2017)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luby's massacre (Killeen, Texas, 1991)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Ysidro McDonald's massacre (San Ysidro, California, 1984)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Paso Walmart mass shooting (El Paso, Texas, 2019)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School shooting (Parkland, Florida, 2018)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Postal Service shooting (Edmond, Oklahoma, 1986)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bernardino mass shooting (San Bernardino, California, 2015)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binghamton shootings (Binghamton, New York, 2009)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Hood massacre (Fort Hood, Texas, 2009)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbine High School massacre (Littleton, Colorado, 1999)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach municipal building shooting (Virginia Beach, Virginia, 2019)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thousand Oaks nightclub shooting (Thousand Oaks, California, 2018)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Navy Yard shooting (Washington, D.C., 2013)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora theater shooting (Aurora, Colorado, 2012)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree of Life synagogue shooting (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 2018)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sante Fe High School shooting (Sante Fe, Texas, 2018)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Lake massacre (Red Lake, Minnesota, 2005)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMAC massacre (Jacksonville, Florida, 1990)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton entertainment district shooting (Dayton, Ohio, 2019)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta day trading spree killings (Atlanta, Georgia, 1999)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Gravure shooting (Louisville, Kentucky, 1989)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>460</strong></td>
<td><strong>992</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This table shows the number of victims of the worst mass shootings in the United States between 1982 and December 11, 2019. Shown are the 25 mass shootings with the highest number of fatalities. The number of injured people in these shootings is also provided. Adapted from “Number of victims of the worst mass shootings in the United States between 1982 and December 2019,” by Statista, 2020. Retrieved from https://www.statista.com/statistics/476101/worst-mass-shootings-in-the-us/
Victims of Violent Crime

There are two major categories of victims in the literature: direct victims and indirect victims. Direct victims are people who were assaulted by criminal acts while indirect victims are family members or others traumatically affected by the criminally assaulted or killed (Huang, 2018). Considering that there were over 1.2 million violent crimes in the United States in 2018 (Statista, 2020b) and therefore over 1.2 million direct victims of violent crime, and taking into consideration the extent by which modern day media touches lives, the number of indirect victims goes far beyond the means of countability.

Trauma-Related Mental Health Issues

Weisburd et al. (2018) studied the relationship between mental health issues and geographic location. They broke down the locations into three categories: (a) hot spots (for violent crime), (b) cool spots, and (c) cold spots. The result was a direct correlation between the level of violence in the community and the mental health of the community’s inhabitants. Specifically, post-traumatic stress (PTS) symptoms were 85% greater in violent crime hot spots than they were in areas with little crime. Yoon, Steigerwald, Holmes, and Perzynski (2016) studied 2,000 children, ages 8-15, who were either witnesses of violence and/or victims of violence. Their results showed that greater levels of witnessing violence directly correlated to greater levels of PTS symptoms and further victimization. Additionally, Yoon et al. showed that “higher levels of witnessing violence were strongly correlated with higher levels of violence victimization in the home” (p. 75). In contrast, Zimmerman and Posick (2016) found in their study of 1,900 youths in Chicago that those who witnessed a significant amount of violence were
unlikely to be personally victimized. With that, there may be an opportunity for further research on the subject of witnessing violence and personal victimization. What is clear in the literature is that witnessing violence and being personally victimized has a significant impact on the mental health of those involved.

**Unanticipated Impact of Violent Crime on Victims**

If a victim of violent crime is injured, it is easy to make the connection that the victim might need medical treatment. It is also easy to make the connection that being the victim of a violent crime is a traumatic event and that mental health services might also be needed to help the victim recover. What if the victim is the main source of income for the household and can’t work because of their injuries? What if the victim loses expensive personal property or their property gets damaged during the crime? What if the perpetrator is caught and prosecuted for their crime, does the victim need a lawyer? Do they have rights in court? Can they have their voice heard by the judicial system? Or what if they are close family or friends with the victim and the legal system fails to recognize them as victims as well? They may still be traumatized none the less and “unaddressed crime victim trauma is a significant driver of subsequent victimization and future crime perpetration by those victimized” (Baroni, 2018, p. 103). Victims have rights but most people are unaware of those rights unless they have been a victim, and even then, usually only if they have been counseled by a victim advocate.

**Victim Support Services**

In 1984, Congress passed the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) establishing the Office for Victims of Crime (2020b) and creating the Crime Victims Fund that “provides funds to states for victim assistance and compensation programs that offer support and
services to those affected by violent crimes” (p. 1). In 2004, the Crime Victim Rights Act was passed authorizing programs to help victims assert and get enforcement of their rights (Office for Victims of Crime, 2020b). Some of those rights include reasonable protection from the accused, notification of any public proceedings relative to their case, access to those proceedings, and the right to be heard with respect to sentencing or release of the perpetrator by whom they were victimized. Although these rights are a matter of public record, navigating the process to exercise these rights is much easier with the assistance of a trained victim advocate.

Types of Victim Services

The Office for Victims of Crime (2020a) hosts an online resource entitled Directory of Crime Victim Services. This database houses a list of victim support organizations from around the world. Anyone with internet access can view the list and search for an organization in their geographic location that can meet their support needs. The list includes support for victims of sexual assault, aggravated battery, arson, domestic violence, DUI/DWI crashes, property crime, elder abuse, gang violence, hate crime, and human trafficking. The list also includes organizations that provide financial assistance, legal advocacy, safe shelter, and mental health services. The organizations are a mixture of government, military, Native American, international, and private nonprofit organizations.

Nonprofit Victim Support Organizations

Guo (2012) conducted a study of the characteristics of people who use the assistance of nonprofits. The results showed that households in rural areas, that were in poverty, that had a history of failing to pay utility bills and rent or mortgage payments,
and that participated in public assistance programs were more likely to use nonprofit assistance. Guo also showed that those with a college education were more likely to use nonprofit assistance than those with a high school diploma. Of those that did not receive assistance, some figured out another way to resolve their hardship while others either didn’t have transportation or they simply did not know where to get help, a finding later confirmed by Zaykowski (2014).

Higher crime rates used to be attributed with larger cities but research conducted by Chang, Kim, and Jeon (2019) shows that the largest cities with an increasing population have a corresponding decreasing violent crime rate. In contrast, cities that are slightly smaller are retaining a more linear population to crime rate ratio. Chang et al. (2019) cite numerous mitigating factors that are potentially influencing these results, but for this study, what is significant is that there can be a perception in both cases that there is a reduced need for victim support and a corresponding reduced justification for funding. That perception would be misleading. Jacoby (2018) showed that increases in governmental funding is associated with an overall decrease in violent and property crime rates. Nonprofit victim support organizations across the country are designed to provide assistance for all victims of violent crime, but they are especially suited to support those who can’t afford other options because nonprofits typically provide their services for free. Remove or even reduce the government funding and victim support services are significantly impacted.

In direct reflection of the need, there are over 2,500 private, nonprofit victim support agencies across the United States according to the Office for Victims of Crime (Office for Victims of Crime, 2020a). These organizations collectively provide a wide
range of victim services. Some labeled Crime Victim Service Centers (CVSC) will work with anyone who identifies as a victim while others will focus on one or two specialty areas such as sexual assault or domestic violence. What is common to all of these organizations is that they require leadership with a unique combination of skills to be viable and effective.

**Victim Support Organization Leaders**

The responsibility of leading a nonprofit victim support organization falls on the executive director (the leader). The victim support organization leader has the typical challenges of managing the nonprofit business. They also have the typical nonprofit challenges of leading a passion-driven and largely volunteer workforce. What is different about the victim support leader is the mission – every client that walks through the door has experienced some type of trauma. That in itself requires a unique set of skills, but it doesn’t stop there. The victim support leader also has to manage the well-being of the staff members who are required to support their clients while deflecting the trauma as it attempts to permeate their lives.

**Managing Nonprofits**

The unique challenge of managing a nonprofit business is that it is not viewed as a business by many. It is, rather, an organization created with the intention of changing human lives for the better (Drucker, 1990), and therefore, the perception is that it does not need to be managed like a business. Drucker (1990) points out that it’s just the opposite. “[Those that work in work in nonprofits] know that they need to learn how to use management as their tool lest they be overwhelmed by it” (Drucker, 1990, p. xv). Without management processes, they realize that their mission is at risk.
Managing a victim support organization includes the standard management functions of planning, organizing, motivating, and controlling (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996). The added functions required by a nonprofit leader include grant writing and maintenance, donor health, and community relations (Herman, 2005). The victim support organization leader adds to that inter-agency cooperation (law enforcement and victim advocate resources) and managing within the law (victim’s rights) (Office for Victims of Crime, 2020c). These functions reflect the science of management, but it takes the art form of leadership to complete the effective leader equation.

**Leading Nonprofits**

Possibly the most famous quote about the difference between leadership and management is that by Warren Bennis in his book *On Becoming a Leader* and it reads, “The manager does things right; the leader does the right things” (Bennis, 2009, p. 42). Bennis (2009) proposed that leaders master the context of their environment while managers surrender to it. Another way to capture the essence of what Bennis was saying might be that managers see the task at hand while leaders see the vision for the future. With nonprofits, the challenge for leaders is to fully understand all dimensions of their role, balancing the necessary management functions of running the business, navigating the dynamic surroundings of political and economic pressures, and all the while never losing focus on the mission or the future.

The term leader by default mandates a two-person relationship because to be a leader, there must be a follower (Rost, 1998). According to Rost (1998), the same goes for a manager but with a twist. The leader has an influence relationship with a follower with the goal of achieving real change with a mutual purpose, while the manager has an
authority relationship with a subordinate to coordinate activities to produce a product or service. Both relationships are crucial to the success of any organization but they are different enough that if used interchangeably without discrimination, the risk of failing to influence value-added behaviors from followers is significantly increased.

**Leader relations.** Relationships are vital to an effective nonprofit and one of the key political relationships that exists for a nonprofit leader is with the members of the board of directors. York (2018) identified that one of the key elements of an effective and sustainable nonprofit is joint support of the organization’s mission and vision as communicated by both the executive director and the board. “Organizations that have strong ‘internal leadership’ and ‘leader vision’ are significantly more sustainable than those that do not” (York, 2018, p. 3). Legal and hierarchical position over nonprofit leaders typically resides with the board but the executive director often has more knowledge, expertise, vested interest in the mission, and more access to tactical information. “The true test of a relationship is not that it can solve problems but that it can function despite problems” (Drucker, 1990, p. 159). Without a strong relationship between board members and the executive director, a joint voice may not come across as credible. Another vital relationship for an executive director is that with the nonprofit’s community. The community can be unforgiving to an organization that breaks its trust and it can also provide great rewards for exceptional service. Additionally, a nonprofit’s volunteers typically come from the community that surrounds it (Drucker, 1990). In an exceptional nonprofit, its volunteers become an effective means of passing the word and building a strong reputation. Unfortunately (or fortunately), the same is true for an ineffective organization.
Leading nonprofit workers. When leading and retaining nonprofit workers, Flint (2017) found that a good place for the leader to begin is to ensure that the work they are doing has meaning for themselves, personally and professionally. Nonprofit workers are typically driven by passion and subsequently need to feel that their work is meaningful. “Meaning comes from a place of feeling significant and making a contribution” (Flint, 2017, p. 21). Meaning contributes to one’s self-identity – it provides a sense of purpose. Once the leader understands the meaning of their work on a personal level, then they can guide their followers to discover the same. Flint found that exemplary nonprofit leaders use elements of character, vision, relationships, wisdom, and inspiration to help create meaning, with character being the foundation for the rest. Character helps to build trust and trust is foundational to any team (Lencioni, 2002). Flint also found that vision was critical to creating meaning. A shared vision, and shared meaning, amongst nonprofit leaders and workers can drive improved employee engagement and subsequent productivity.

Leading nonprofit volunteers. Leading and motivating nonprofit volunteers comes with challenges unlike for-profit workers. First, volunteers typically work for free meaning that their motivation is intrinsic and personal, and that they could walk away with only an emotional burden, not a fiscal one. An example of this is a study conducted on the Red Cross where volunteers participated in the highly satisfying act of helping disaster victims, but because of poor management practices, volunteers became dissatisfied and suffered from fatigue and volunteer burnout (Smith & Grove, 2017). To help tailor volunteer activities to each individual and therefore reduce the risk of burnout, leaders can identify what kind of volunteer each person is. Thomas, Rathmann, and
McGarty (2017) conducted a study on victim support volunteerism and determined that there are two types of volunteers: nominal supporters and active supporters. Nominal supporters believe in the mission but are more so sympathizers than active participants. They are more likely to donate money than time. Active supporters, as the name implies, are more actively engaged and are more likely to donate their time and energy to the cause. Active supporters may also be less likely to burnout as fast as their nominal supporter counterparts. With this information, a nonprofit leader could better manage these volunteers in a manner suitable to their personal motives.

**Managing victim support worker well-being.** The well-being of an organization’s workers has a significant impact on the effectiveness of the services they provide. Clients of a nonprofit victim support organization have all experienced trauma to varying degrees. The most common categories of violence supported by these agencies include: (a) sexual assault, (b) domestic violence, (c) robbery, (d) aggravated assault and murder (Office for Victims of Crime, 2020b). That trauma can be transferred to even the most experienced service provider. One group of researchers in their study involving service providers of traumatized victims, captured the concept as follows:

Vicarious trauma, empathic stress, secondary traumatic stress, burnout, and compassion fatigue are concepts that identify the toxic processes experienced by trauma therapists and explain how these therapists may develop negative outcomes as a result of their work with trauma survivors. (Killian et al., 2017, p. 23)

Another researcher, Goold (2010), noted that the term compassion fatigue is used somewhat generically in reference to any kind of vicarious trauma or secondary traumatic
stress. For the purposes of this study, CF is used synonymously with STS, vicarious trauma, empathic stress, and secondary victimization.

CF affects trauma responders of all kinds and can “result in decreased concentration and productivity, increased use of sick days, and high turnover rates” (Klein et al., 2018, p. 882). Noullet et al. (2018) found that clergy were significantly impacted by victims seeking support after the September 11 terrorist attacks and reported emotional troubles, secondary trauma, and burnout. Klein et al. (2018) found that healthcare workers who were frequently exposed to the continual loss of patients were at a high risk of CF. Kiley et al. (2018) studied mental health workers who were a high risk of elevated stress due to their work supporting their clients’ traumatic experiences. Even teachers are at risk as they deal with the trauma sometimes experienced by their students.

Not all victim trauma responders have a negative reaction to their clients’ trauma. Some have a positive response. Goold (2010) found that 9-1-1 telecommunicators had higher levels of compassion satisfaction than they did CF. Goold identifies compassion satisfaction as a trauma worker’s ability to visualize the value and positive outcome of the service they are providing and turn a negative situation into a positive sense of happiness. Killian, Hernandez-Wolfe, Engstrom, and Gangsei (2017) studied vicarious resilience where a provider’s exposure to a patient’s resilience during recovery can lead to growth and compassion satisfaction in the provider. Several of these studies also found that vicarious resilience and compassion satisfaction can be increased using techniques like crisis intervention training, guided imagery, coaching, and self-care (Kiley et al., 2018; Killian et al., 2017; Klein et al., 2018; Noullet et al., 2018). Armed
with this understanding, leaders of victim support organizations can better support the well-being of their workers.

**Theoretical Framework**

Leadership is about relationships. The descriptions of leader-follower relationships contained in the literature range from the simple to the complex, but they all have one thing in common – they focus on the leader’s ability to influence the follower. An effective leader learns to navigate the humanistic dynamics of relationships using a variety of tools and approaches (Hickman, 1998). Those in leadership positions that do not take to heart the nature of a positive and collaborative leader-follower relationship, and perhaps pursue leadership positions as an opportunity for personalized power, can threaten the mission of the organization by creating a negative and counterproductive work environment (Barnes & Spangenburg, 2018).

The most common question asked me by nonprofit executives is: What are the qualities of a leader? The question seems to assume that leadership is something you can learn in a charm school. But it also assumes that leadership by itself is enough, that it’s an end. And that’s misleadership. The leader who basically focuses on himself or herself is going to mislead. (Drucker, 1990, p. 3)

The question is then, what leadership characteristics are needed to effectively lead a nonprofit organization, especially one that supports victims of violent crime?

**Leadership Theories**

The important elements of leadership found in the literature are often packaged into different leadership theories or styles. Many enjoy wide acceptance and longevity of support while others are challenged for their validity and applicability. The great man
theory introduced by Carlyle in 1841 basically stated that great men were born, not
developed and that history is based on their accomplishments (Mouton, 2019). This is
somewhat controversial by today’s standards because it ignores the accomplishments of
most men and all women. Servant leadership speaks to two extreme types of leaders:
those that are servants first and those that are leaders first (Greenleaf, 1991). The test for
the servant leader is if those that are served experience positive growth and become
servant leaders themselves. Servant leadership is widely known but difficult to apply
consistently without a disciplined sense of humility. Situational leadership is a model
based on the leader’s ability to effectively assess a follower’s confidence and competence
to perform a specific task and then determine and apply the leadership approach with the
best chance of optimizing the follower’s chances of achieving their goal (Blanchard,
Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 2013; P. Hersey, 1992; P. Hersey et al., 1996). Since this model is
based on the task at hand, the leader will often use different approaches with the same
follower depending on the task that needs to be accomplished. In 1978, James
MacGregor Burns published *Transactional and Transforming Leadership* in where he
describes leadership as “leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent
the values and the motivations… of both leaders and followers” (Burns, 1998, p. 133).
Burns (1998) goes on to say that there are two ways to accomplish this. The first he calls
*transactional* leadership. With transactional leadership, there is an exchange of valued
items between the leader and follower. But once the exchange is complete, there is no
sense of obligation for the relationship to continue. The other way to accomplish the goal
is through *transforming* leadership. With transforming leadership, the relationship may
begin under similar circumstances as the transactional exchange but the result produces
an elevated moral commitment between the leader and the led where both find
themselves transformed. It is in this transforming leadership where we find the basis for
present day transformational leadership.

**Transformational Leadership**

In 1985, Bass formally introduced the full range of leadership model (Bass, 1985). Included within the full range framework were the highly effective transformational leadership (TL), the highly ineffective laissez-faire (LF) leadership, and transactional leadership which fell, in terms of effectiveness, somewhere between TL and LF. After his initial release, Bass partnered Bruce Avolio and others to refine his work. They also produced the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ) to assess the factors of leadership behavior contained within the model (Bass & Avolio, 1990).

TL is recognizable by the leader’s ability to “motivate others to do more than they originally intended and often even more than they thought possible” (Bass & Avolio, 1998, p. 136). Transformational leaders accomplish this by using one or more of the Four I’s: (a) idealized influence (achieving follower admiration through being a good role model), (b) inspirational motivation (inspiring followers by providing meaningful and challenging work), (c) intellectual stimulation (promoting innovation and creativity), and (d) individualized consideration (coaching and mentoring on an individual level). In contrast to TL, the LF leadership style is the “avoidance or absence of leadership” (Bass & Avolio, 1998, p. 137) and is the most ineffective of the three styles. In between TL and LF falls transactional leadership which is based on an exchange, typically reward for performance. In transactional leadership, without the reward, performance cannot be
expected. With transformational leadership, rewards are borne internally out of a moral bond with the leader. Transactional rewards are appreciated, but not needed.

**Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory**

Research conducted by Freeborough and Patterson (2015) found a strong positive correlation between nonprofit leaders who employ transformational leadership and the employee engagement of their nonprofit workforce. Their study suggests that hiring managers need to focus more on hiring leaders who show a record of demonstrated transformational leadership skills and that current employees should be upskilled in transformational leadership. As with the MLQ, the TLSi is an assessment of transformational leadership skills and can be used to assist leaders of all kinds, not just nonprofits, in evaluating their effectiveness as a transformational leader. Dr. Keith Larick and Dr. Patricia White from Brandman University created the TLSi to provide students in the Organizational Leadership program a way to evaluate their own transformational leadership traits (Yossef, 2016).

Founded in the works of theorists John Kouzes, Barry Posner, Ken Wilber, and John Kotter (Yossef, 2016), the TLSi instrument has 10 domains with eight transformational skill areas each providing 80 skill areas in all for a comprehensive analysis of the leader’s effectiveness (Larick & White, 2012). Additionally, the TLSi is a 360-degree feedback survey based on the Johari Window. The Johari Window is based on the premise that open communication is crucial to effective leadership (Little, 2005). Larick and White (2012) explain that the Johari Window is divided into four quadrants: (a) what is known to self and known to others, (b) what is known to self but unknown to
others, (c) what is unknown to self but known to others, and (d) what is unknown to self and unknown to others (see Figure 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Known to Self</th>
<th>Known to Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Known to Others</td>
<td>Unknown to Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown to Self</td>
<td>Unknown to Self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known to Others</td>
<td>Unknown to Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.** Johari Window. This chart shows the four quadrants of the Johari Window, a model introduced by Joseph Luft and Harry Ingham. Adapted from “Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory TLSi,” by K. Larick and P. C. White (2012). Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.brandman.edu/

According to Little (2005), the leader is most productive when information is known by self and others – open two-way communication. Little also warns that operating in any of the other three models leaves the leader at risk of having blindspots or possibly damaging the trust relationship with followers if choosing to withhold information that others would find valuable. Bottom line, with the ability of the TLSi to compartmentalize the perspectives of four different feedback groups and then compare that feedback to a self-evaluation, the participant gains a complete picture of their leadership style.

For this study, the TLSi is not used as a 360-degree survey. Instead, the leaders are the only ones surveyed and they are only asked to rate and describe the impact that each of the 10 TLSi domains has on the leader’s effectiveness (see Appendix A and Appendix B). The 10 domains are as follows.

**Character/integrity.** Transformational leaders “engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (Burns, 1998, p. 134). Transformational leaders are admired and emulated for their integrity and ability to build trust into an organization (Bass & Avolio, 1998).
**Collaboration.** The 10 domains of the TLSi are not independent of each other and no more so than with collaboration. Two of the more common threads through the domains are building relationships and building trust. Lencioni (2002) in describing the five dysfunctions of a team, identifies absence of trust as the first dysfunction which leads to fear of conflict (and engaging) which leads to lack of commitment. Tie in dysfunctions in the other nine TLSi domains and true collaboration is highly unlikely to exist. The transformational leader uses their skills in all 10 domains to bring together a group of individuals, and through thoughtful and intentional relationship building, “motivates [their] colleagues and followers to look beyond their own interests toward those that will benefit the group” (Bass & Avolio, 1998, p. 136).

**Communication.** “Seek first to understand, then to be understood” (Covey, 1989, p. 235). Conversations can be like competitions where each player is waiting for the other to take a breath so that they can jump in and give their opinion. Through the building of strong relationships, the transformational leader clearly communicates a vision but then encourages ideas from followers to help achieve their goals together (Bass & Avolio, 1998). By listening to understand, the leader shows respect for the follower’s position and gains buy-in for the final solution.

**Creativity and sustained innovation.** Transformational leaders have a direct impact on an organization’s psychological climate for creativity (Lutz Allen et al., 2013). The more the leader demonstrates the behaviors of transformational leadership, the more likely the followers will perceive that their organization is willing to change and be supportive of creative ideas. “Creativity is like crabgrass – it springs back with the simplest bit of care” (Cameron, 2016, p. 227).
Diversity. “The goal of social justice is full and equal participation of all groups in a society that is mutually shaped to meet their needs” (Bell, 2013, p. 21). Diversity in the workplace struggles to be separate from diversity in society. As the demographics of the workforce in the United States continue to shift (getting older, more racially diverse), so do the diversity challenges at work (Brimhall, 2019). An increasingly diverse workforce can and should lead to positive outcomes for organizations but it has also led to increased employee conflict and turnover. A study by Brimhall (2019) found that transformational leadership had a positive impact on creating an inclusive climate in the workplace. The transformational leader recognizes the challenges of diversity and levels the playing field for all members of their organization so as to empower the ideas and inputs that when used synergistically, can catapult an organization to the next level.

Personal/interpersonal skills. Transformational leaders “genuinely and openly value people as individuals” (Crowley, 2011, p. xii). They see their followers’ strengths and then dream alongside them about how much more they could become. They build confidence in their followers by encouraging them to take on challenges and to not be afraid of failing. And they cap it off by honoring not only their achievements, but their efforts as well.

Political intelligence. Socialized power and the ability to have a positive influence on the outcomes of an organization begins with a foundation of trust. Trust is built up through integrity (doing and meaning what you say), through caring about people in actions, not just words, and by being dependable, reliable, and approachable (White, Harvey, & Fox, 2016). The transformational leader recognizes that building trust relationships is not easy and that it is different with each individual. Everyone has
differing interests and motivations and the politically intelligent leader recognizes that
and then expertly navigates the field of needs.

**Problem solving/decision making.** In any organization, there is always someone
in a higher position of power – everyone has a boss. If the work climate is such that
workers always feel their boss looming over their heads, maybe micromanaging their
actions, the worker struggles to take complete ownership of their decisions (Block, 1987).
The transformational leader uses approaches such as situational leadership (Blanchard et
al., 2013) to give individualized consideration (one of the Four-I’s) to the needs of the
follower, empowering them to make decisions and solve problems as appropriate for the
task at hand. When the leader is consistent with their transformational approach, the
follower can develop what Block (1987) calls an entrepreneurial spirit. This
empowerment leads the follower to choose greatness, courage, and autonomy over
bureaucracy.

**Team building.** Team building is not a one-time event. It is, rather, “a recurrent
and ongoing process of analysis and remediation” (Harvey & Drolet, 2006, p. 13).
Transformational leaders build an organization’s potential by building up the people’s
potential to shine (Freeborough & Patterson, 2015). They liberate teams to excel through
consistent and persistent masterful delegation and motivation.

**Visionary leadership.** “There is no more powerful engine driving an organization
toward excellence and long-range success than an attractive, worthwhile, and achievable
vision of the future, widely shared” (Nanus, 1995, p. 3). The transformational leader has
the ability to translate vision into reality. Visionary leaders see the path to the future and
pave the way for their followers to propel their organization forward.
Summary

This chapter explored the factors supporting research on the behaviors that contribute to nonprofit victim support organization leader effectiveness. It began with the history and types of violent crime as well as the trauma-related impact that mass media and mass shootings are having on society. Victim support services and service organizations were explored which led to a focused look at nonprofit leadership and a special focus on leading nonprofit victim support organizations. Finally, this chapter reviewed different leadership theories including transformational leadership and then identified the 10 domains of the TLSi as the theoretical framework for this study.

A synthesis matrix was used to align the cited literature with the key variables of this study (see Appendix C). The researcher discovered a gap in the research with respect to the leadership behaviors needed by executive directors of nonprofit victim support organizations which validates the need for this study. The researcher also discovered that there is evidence that transformational leadership has a positive impact on the effectiveness of nonprofit leaders (Brimhall, 2019; Freeborough & Patterson, 2015) which validates the use of the TLSi as a framework for this study. The review of literature also identified a gap in the research with respect to a detailed qualitative study about why people do not engage with victim support services (Bryce et al., 2016) which is outside the scope of this study. Additionally, there is a need for more research around the psychological impact of mass trauma events on populations indirectly exposed to violent crime (Lowe & Galea, 2017) which is also outside the scope of this study.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Overview

This chapter outlines the methodology used to study the leadership behaviors needed by executive directors of nonprofit victim support organizations. The chapter begins by restating the purpose and research questions for the study, followed by a description of the research design. From there, population and sample are addressed as well as the methods for collecting and analyzing the data. The chapter concludes with the study’s limitations and an overall summary of the methodology. Prior to proceeding with this mixed method design study, approval for the study was granted from Brandman University’s Institutional Review Board (BUIRB) (see Appendix D). Researcher’s National Institutes of Health certificate is located in Appendix E.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to determine how nonprofit victim support organization leaders rate the impact of the 10 TLSi domains on their effectiveness. In addition, it was the purpose to discover how nonprofit victim support organization leaders describe the impact of each TLSi domain on their effectiveness.

Research Questions

The research was guided by the following research questions:

1. How do leaders of nonprofit victim support organizations rate the impact of the different TLSi domains on their effectiveness?

2. How do leaders of nonprofit victim support organizations describe the impact of the different TLSi domains on their effectiveness?
Research Design

This study was a mixed method study. It used both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods to provide a more complete investigation (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). With mixed method designs, the researcher typically chooses between three design approaches: (a) explanatory, (c) exploratory, and (d) triangulation designs (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). For this study, the triangulation design approach was selected.

The explanatory mixed method design begins with quantitative data collection and is then followed by a qualitative data collection process that helps to expand on, clarify, or explain the quantitative findings (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). With this approach, the findings are heavily weighted to the quantitative data. With the exploratory design, qualitative data collection takes place before quantitative data collection (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). This approach works well when the researcher needs to collect ideas and perspectives from a few people in order to develop the larger, quantitative data collection instrument. Finally, the triangulation design collects both quantitative and qualitative data simultaneously, and is used “when the strengths of one method offset the weaknesses of the other” (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010, p. 26). The triangulation design approach was selected for this study to exploit the benefits of both the framework of the TLSi (Larick & White, 2012) and the experiences and perspectives of nonprofit victim support organization leaders.

Quantitative Research Design

For the quantitative portion of the study, a nonexperimental descriptive design was used (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). The nonexperimental research design was
chosen over experimental because the researcher did not intervene with or affect the experience of the subjects in any way, which is a main tenet of the experimental approach (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). The descriptive design provides a characterization of the situation as it exists – a snapshot in time if you will. Nonexperimental comparative would have been an option if the differences between two or more groups were being compared, but for this study, only one group was being described (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). Additionally, nonexperimental correlational would have been an option if the study was seeking to measure the degree of relationship between two or more phenomena, but for this study, no relationships were being assessed (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010).

**Qualitative Research Design**

For the qualitative portion of the study, the phenomenological qualitative inquiry framework was chosen (Patton, 2015). This approach looks at the lived experience of the participants in a way that cannot be captured in a quantitative survey. Phenomenological inquiry captures the essence of the subject’s experience not only by capturing what they experience, but by capturing how they experience and describe it. An alternative methodology considered was the heuristic inquiry framework, a form of phenomenological inquiry where the focus is on intense human experience from the point of view of the researcher, but the researcher in this study does not have the requisite personal experience or intense interest in the study required for the approach (Patton, 2015).
Population

According to McMillan and Schumacher (2010), “A population is a group of elements or cases, whether individuals, objects, or events, that conform to specific criteria and to which we intend to generalize the result of the research” (p. 129). The population for this study included all private, nonprofit victim support organizations in the United States that were registered with the Office for Victims of Crime with the following exclusions:

- Organizations associated with a large organization like a hospital or healthcare system were not included due to the potential disparity in leadership behaviors needed at the executive director level of these organizations.
- Organizations associated with a government or law enforcement agency were not included due to the potential disparity in leadership behaviors needed at the executive director level of these organizations.
- Due to a need to consider cultural influence when designing effective interventions for indigenous peoples (Manson, 2020), which is outside the scope of this study, Native American victim support organizations were not included.

In all, the Office for Victims of Crime (2020a) reported 2,508 qualifying organizations at the time of this study. These organizations were a mixture of elderly support, sexual assault advocacy, child advocacy, victim education, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, mental health agencies, rape crisis support, domestic violence advocacy, shelters, and crime victim service centers.
Target Population

McMillan and Schumacher (2010) consider the population and the target population somewhat synonymous. Creswell (2014) takes it a step further and narrows the scope of the target population to the group within the population from which the actual sample is selected. And since conducting a nationwide study is generally not feasible due to resource constraints, a sampling approach was chosen. For this study, the target population was the 147 private, nonprofit victim support organizations from the population residing in the Pacific Northwest region of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.

Sample

The sample, according to McMillan and Schumacher (2010), is the group of individuals from whom data are collected. Or as Patten (2014) put it, “the group in which researchers are ultimately interested” (p. 55). The sample selection strategy for this study was cluster sampling. With cluster sampling, convenient, naturally occurring groups are identified within the population, such as neighborhoods or regions, and then individuals are randomly selected from each group to participate (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). Cluster sampling offers the researcher the flexibility to expand the size of the cluster to include a sufficient number of participants for the study while also setting limits to prevent the sample size from becoming unmanageable. In this study, the criteria for selecting the sample of executive directors were as follows:

- Only organizations from Washington, Oregon, and Idaho were eligible to participate.
- All executive directors from eligible organizations were allowed to participate in the survey portion of the study.
Only executive directors who participated in the survey and also expressed interest in participating in the interviews were included in the pool of interview candidates.

**Quantitative Sampling**

The target population started with 147 organizations, all located in the Pacific Northwest region of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho. After eliminating organizations for various reasons such as discovering that they were affiliated with a larger hospital or government agency, being unable to confirm a direct email address to the executive director, or the organization simply declined to participate, the researcher was able to confirm a valid email address for the executive directors from 88 of those organizations. The researcher then invited 100% of those directors to participate in the survey portion of the study. A final question asking the respondent to agree to a follow-up interview was asked as a part of the survey.

**Qualitative Sampling**

All leaders that participated in the survey were eligible to participate in the interviews. Of those who participated, 15 indicated a willingness to be interviewed. Of those 15, three withdrew leaving 12 effectively chosen at random to participate in the interview portion of the study.

**Sample Selection Process**

1. The population was identified by searching the Office for Victims of Crime (2020a) database for all private, nonprofit victim support organizations located in the United States. The list was then pared down by excluding all organizations obviously associated with hospitals or health care systems,
government or law enforcement agencies, and Native American communities. The result was 2,508 organizations in the United States.

2. The target population was identified by filtering the population list for organizations residing in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho. The result was 147 organizations.

3. The quantitative sample was identified by confirming the email address for the executive director from each organization listed in the target population. After further elimination of organizations for various reasons such as discovering that they were affiliated with a larger hospital or government agency, being unable to confirm a direct email address to the executive director, or the organization simply declined to participate, email addresses were confirmed for 88 executive directors, 100% of which were invited to participate in the survey.

4. A final question on the survey asked if the leader was willing to participate in a follow-up interview. Of the 88 leaders invited to participate in the survey, 28 completed the survey and 15 indicated a willingness to participate in the interviews.

5. The original qualitative sample design was to use a random number generator to select the final 12 participants for interviews, but after three of the 15 interview respondents withdrew, only 12 remained negating the need for a random drawing. All 12 participated in the interview portion of the study.
6. Participants were provided with an Informed Consent (see Appendix F), a Letter of Invitation (see Appendix G), a Permission to Record the Interview form (see Appendix H), and the Participant Bill of Rights (see Appendix I).

**Instrumentation**

This study used a mixed method design. The researcher collected data from the target population of nonprofit victim support leaders using two approaches. The first was a survey sent to 100% of the identifiable executive directors in the target population. The second was a series of interviews with 12 of the leaders selected at random.

**Quantitative Instrument**

The researcher began with the 10 domains of the TLSi (Larick & White, 2012) as a framework to create the survey instrument. From there, 20 questions were formed, two for each of the 10 domains. The questions were tied directly to the purpose statement and research questions by asking the participant to rate the impact of each of the 10 domains on their effectiveness as a leader of a victim support organization. Participants were required to choose one of six possible responses arranged along a 6-point Likert scale. The 6-point Likert scale was chosen over the 4-point scale because it increases the sensitivity of user selection and it tends to produce a more normal distribution (Leung, 2011). Also, the neutral option was omitted to force the respondent to make a choice and to avoid a tendency toward center. Each question was offered in the form of a statement about one of the 10 domains. The response choices were Strongly Agree, Agree, Somewhat Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Somewhat Disagree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. The responses from all participants were analyzed to determine if any
domains emerged as significant. A copy of the survey questions is contained in Appendix J.

**Qualitative Instrument**

Just as with the quantitative instrument, the researcher began with the 10 domains of the TLSi (Larick & White, 2012) as a framework to create the interview instrument. From there, 10 open-ended questions were formed, one for each of the 10 domains. The questions were tied directly to the purpose statement and research questions by asking the participant to describe the impact of each of the 10 domains on their effectiveness as a leader of a victim support organization. Virtual interviews were scheduled for one hour with each participant using Zoom online teleconferencing software. A minimum of one hour between interviews was reserved for completing notes and transitioning to the next interview. The responses from all participants were analyzed to determine if any domains emerged as significant. A copy of the interview questions is contained in Appendix K.

**Reliability**

According to McMillan and Schumacher (2010), the term reliability means “the extent to which the results are similar over different forms of the same instrument or occasions of data collection” (p. 179). In other words, reliability is the extent to which the instruments are free from errors.

**Quantitative reliability.** As the survey questions for the quantitative data collection portion of this study were based on the 10 domains of the TLSi, reliability of the survey instrument was established through the supporting documentation for the TLSi found throughout this study. Development of the TLSi relied on the research of
numerous others whose focus was on the individual domains (Zardo, 2015). After extensive research of the literature, Larick and White (2012) created a holistic framework where the 10 domains were representative of an effective transformational leader.

Another researcher conducted a pilot prior to conducting their study using the TLSi and found that “the individual items within in each domain were correlated with the overall domain, demonstrating stability of the instrument” (Yossef, 2016, p. 62). According to Zardo (2015), “item to domain correlations are all moderate or strong relationships (448 or higher)” (p. 48). “Results of the domain item average comparisons to the overall rating reflected a correlation coefficient of 0.7 of higher” (Yossef, 2016, p. 62).

**Qualitative reliability.** In qualitative inquiry, “the researcher is the instrument” (Patton, 2015, p. 22). Therefore, reliability is dependent, to a great extent, on the skill and competence of the researcher. The inquirer must exhibit a level of rigor that produces consistent results. That rigor includes being situationally aware of potential biases and environmental influences from one interview to the next. Bottom line, the credibility of the inquirer will determine the credibility of the study. “For better or worse, the trustworthiness of the data is tied directly to the trustworthiness of those who collect and analyze the data” (Patton, 2015, p. 706).

**Field test.** For this study, the researcher used two researcher-developed instruments. The first is the quantitative survey structured around the 10 domains of the TLSi. The second is the question guide for the follow-on interviews, also structured around the 10 domains of the TLSi. To assure reliability, mitigate potential researcher bias, and to capture and fix any errors that might exist, the researcher conducted field tests for both instruments with experienced executive directors of nonprofit victim
support organizations who were not study participants. After receiving feedback from the participants, the researcher adjusted the questions and delivery as appropriate.

Validity

According to McMillan and Schumacher (2010), “the term validity means the degree to which scientific explanations of phenomena match reality” (p. 104). In other words, validity is the truthfulness of the findings with respect to the realities of the world. In this study, the validity of the instruments used were strengthened through triangulation between quantitative and qualitative measures.

Quantitative validity. The TLSi has been administered as a 360-degree survey to thousands of graduate doctoral students, school superintendents, law enforcement, healthcare, and business respondents (P. White, personal communication, June 19, 2020). The TLSi follows the Johari Window model introduced by Joseph Luft and Harry Ingham (Luft & Ingham, 1984). The model provides a framework for categorizing information that is exchanged between two or more people. Segmented into four quadrants, the information is either known by self and by others, known by self but not by others, known by others but not by self, or known by neither self nor others. Based on extensive literature review, the authors of the TLSi believe that “the ten elements [of the TLSi] provide a holistic framework for understanding the nature of leadership” (as cited in Yossef, 2016, p. 60). As the survey questions for the quantitative data collection portion of this study were based on the ten domains of the TLSi, validity of the survey content was established through the supporting documentation for the TLSi found throughout this study.
**Qualitative validity.** As it is with reliability, validity in qualitative inquiry is also dependent, to a great extent, on the competence of the researcher, but with validity, credibility of the participants is just as important (Patton, 2015). In this study, interviews were conducted with a random subgroup of participants who completed the survey in order to triangulate the responses between the two data collection methods which “strengthens a study” (Patton, 2015, p. 316) and improves validity according to Patton.

**Interview question development matrix.** As a validity measure, the researcher used an IQDM designed to directly align the interview questions with the research questions and variables of the study. The use of the IQDM assures validity in that the data gathered directly addresses the research questions and variables of the study.

**Data Collection**

Before any data for this study was collected, the researcher received approval from the BUIRB to conduct this research. All participants’ rights and privacy were respected and protected throughout this study.

**Quantitative Data Collection**

Quantitative data were collected by means of electronic survey using Survey Monkey. The purpose of the survey was to answer Research Question 1 of this study. All identifiable candidates in the target population were contacted by email to participate in this study. The email included the Letter of Invitation, the Informed Consent form, the Research Participant’s Bill of Rights, and a link to the survey. The candidates were informed that the survey should take no more than 10-15 minutes to complete. After the survey was closed, the researcher exported the results from Survey Monkey for analysis in Microsoft Excel.
Qualitative Data Collection

Qualitative data were collected by means of virtual interviews using Zoom teleconferencing. The purpose of the interviews was to answer Research Question 2 of this study. The final question of the quantitative survey asked the respondent to agree to a follow-up interview. Of the 28 survey respondents, 15 agreed to participate in the survey. Of those 15, three withdrew leaving 12 survey participants. The original design was to select participants using a random number generator but since natural attrition resulted in a pool of exactly 12 participants, no further selection was necessary. Each participant received an email with instructions that included available time slots to choose from for their interview, a handout for use during the interview describing the 10 TLSi domains (see Appendix L), and an Audio Release form. The email also asked the participant to review the Informed Consent Form that they received in their first email. Each interview was recorded using the Zoom record function and supplemental notes were taken by the researcher.

Data Analysis

Using the mixed methods research design, the researcher collected both quantitative and qualitative data. The quantitative data were collected before the qualitative data were collected. The quantitative data was the results from the researcher-developed survey while the qualitative data was the transcripts from the post-survey interviews.

Quantitative Data Analysis

The two types of quantitative data analysis included in this study are descriptive analysis and inferential analysis (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). Descriptive analysis
describes the one or many attributes that characterize the data such as mean, median, mode, or frequency distribution. Inferential analysis is where the researcher makes inferences or predictions about the results of the descriptive analysis with respect to similarities between the sample and the greater population.

**Descriptive analysis.** Results from the quantitative survey were analyzed to determine the frequency distribution for each of the 10 TLSi domains across the six optional responses. From there, trends were noted and documented.

**Inferential analysis.** After the data tables was populated and analyzed for trends, an Analysis of Variance Test (ANOVA) was performed to determine if there was a significant difference between the means for each of the 10 domains. The researcher reviewed the data for any domains that emerged as having or not having an impact on leader effectiveness.

**Qualitative Data Analysis**

After the quantitative data analysis was complete, the researcher analyzed the qualitative data from the interviews. The researcher recorded all interviews and produced a transcript for each interview using the Zoom recording transcription feature. The analysis process was as follows:

- Each interview transcript was coded to identify themes, patterns, and similarities using NVivo.
- Common themes were identified and similar codes were grouped under those themes.
- The codes were placed into a matrix to facilitate frequency analysis.
A two-person coder approach was used to assure reliability in the interpretation of the data and to assure researcher bias in interpretation was minimized. The researcher and a colleague, both skilled at qualitative coding, conducted all coding together as a team.

Limitations

Limitations, referred to by Roberts (2010) as the weaknesses of the study, are the areas that the researcher typically has no control over. As with all studies, this study has limitations that the reader needs to consider before generalizing the results.

One major limitation is the fact that survey data was only collected from leaders of victim support organizations in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho. With a study population that spans the United States, only collecting data from the Pacific Northwest region could impact the ability of generalizing the results to the rest of the country.

A significant limitation is that data collection took place amidst the COVID-19 pandemic. Normal operations were impacted in every organization presenting leaders with challenges that they had never before experienced. Although a benefit could be that every leader had a common example of a challenging leadership scenario, the fact remains that the uniqueness of the pandemic could skew the results and should be considered before generalizing.

Another limitation stems from the different types of organizations in the study. Organizations in the population consisted of a mixture of elderly support, sexual assault advocacy, child advocacy, victim education, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, mental health agencies, rape crisis support, domestic violence advocacy, shelters, and crime victim service centers. As the list of study candidates was reduced, first by geographical
location, and then by the ability or desire to participate, and finally by a random selection to determine the interview participants, not all types of organizations were represented in the data.

A third limitation is the size of the organizations studied. Although the researcher took steps to limit the sample organizations to smaller, independently lead organizations, there was still an uncontrollable variance in the number staff members that the leader was responsible for. That variance could impact the generalizability of the study results.

Yet another limitation is that data was only collected from the leaders of the victim support organizations. The perspectives of other stakeholders such as board members or key subordinates were not included in the study.

Finally, the researcher’s ability to effectively collect and analyze survey data or to conduct interviews and effectively, and consistently, interpret that data is a limitation. Unintentional researcher bias or insufficient data collection skills could impact the results of the study.

Summary

For this study, the mixed method triangulation design approach was used. For the quantitative portion of the study, a nonexperimental descriptive design was used and for the qualitative portion, the phenomenological qualitative inquiry framework was chosen. Both qualitative and quantitative approaches were used to properly rate and describe the impact of the ten different domains of the TLSi on nonprofit victim support organization leader effectiveness (permission to use the TLSi is located in Appendix M).

The chapter began by restating the purpose and research questions for the study, followed by a description of the research design. From there, population and sample
were addressed as well as the methods for collecting and analyzing the data, and
limitations. Next, Chapter IV will report on the findings from the research while Chapter
V will cover the significance of the findings, the researcher’s conclusions,
recommendations for action, and any recommended future research.
CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH, DATA COLLECTION, AND FINDINGS

Chapter IV begins with a review of the study’s purpose statement, research questions, population, sample, and methodology. Next, this chapter describes both the quantitative and qualitative data collected. The 10 domains of the TLSi were used as the framework for both the quantitative data collection survey and the qualitative data collection interviews. The data collected from the survey addresses Research Question 1 while the data collected from the interviews addresses Research Question 2.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to determine how nonprofit victim support organization leaders rate the impact of the 10 TLSi domains on their effectiveness. In addition, it was the purpose to discover how nonprofit victim support organization leaders describe the impact of each TLSi domain on their effectiveness.

**Research Questions**

The research was guided by the following research questions:

1. How do leaders of nonprofit victim support organizations rate the impact of the different TLSi domains on their effectiveness?
2. How do leaders of nonprofit victim support organizations describe the impact of the different TLSi domains on their effectiveness?

**Research Methods and Data Collection Procedures**

This study followed the triangulation design approach where both quantitative and qualitative data were collected simultaneously to exploit the benefits of both the framework of the TLSi and the experiences and perspectives of nonprofit victim support organization leaders. In this design, quantitative data were collected from an electronic
survey while the phenomenological qualitative inquiry framework was used to capture the lived experiences of the participants during the interviews. During the survey, respondents were offered the opportunity to participate in the qualitative interview portion of the study. Those that volunteered were entered into a pool of potential interview candidates. The survey was administered via Survey Monkey, and before participants could begin the survey, they were required to read and provide their consent to participate in the study.

The 10 domains of the TLSi were rated by the survey participants as to the impact each had on that leader’s effectiveness. Then the interview participants were asked to describe the impact that each TLSi domain had on their effectiveness as a leader. Statistical analysis of the survey data was compared and contrasted with the theme frequency analysis of the interview data to help determine which domains may or may not have emerged as having a significant impact on the leader’s effectiveness.

**Population**

The population for this study included all private, nonprofit victim support organizations in the United States that were registered with the Office for Victims of Crime with the following exclusions:

- Organizations associated with a large organization like a hospital or healthcare system were not included due to the potential disparity in leadership behaviors needed at the executive director level of these organizations.

- Organizations associated with a government or law enforcement agency were not included due to the potential disparity in leadership behaviors needed at the executive director level of these organizations.
• Due to a need to consider cultural influence when designing effective interventions for indigenous peoples (Manson, 2020), which is outside the scope of this study, Native American victim support organizations were not included.

In all, the Office for Victims of Crime reported 2,508 qualifying organizations at the time of this study (Office for Victims of Crime, 2020a). These organizations were a mixture of elderly support, sexual assault advocacy, child advocacy, victim education, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, mental health agencies, rape crisis support, domestic violence advocacy, shelters, and crime victim service centers.

**Sample**

To make the population more manageable for this study, cluster sampling was used to narrow the focus down to the Pacific Northwest region. The result was a target population of 147 private, nonprofit victim support organizations from the states of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho. From there, direct email addresses for each executive director were needed to extend invitations to participate in the survey. After eliminating organizations or executive directors for various reasons such as being unable to confirm a direct email address to the executive director, or the organization simply declining to participate, the researcher was able to confirm a valid email address for 88 executive directors from organizations within the target population. In the end, 28 directors responded to the survey (31.8% response rate) and 15 volunteered to be interviewed, from which 12 were actually interviewed.
Demographic Data

This mixed methods study included 28 participants for the quantitative portion of the study and 12 participants for the qualitative portion of the study. All participants were, at the time of this study, serving as executive director for an eligible organization in the states of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho. During the survey, all participants were asked, “How many years have you spent as an executive director of a nonprofit victim support organization?” Their response options included less than 2, 2-5, 5-10, and 10 or more years. Table 2 shows the demographic distribution for the survey participants and Table 3 shows the demographic distribution for the interview participants. Of note, the distribution of responses appears to be proportionally similar between the survey group and the interview group.

Additionally, survey participants were asked, “How many years has your current organization been serving its community?” Response options included less than 5, 5-10, and 10 or more years. Every participant, 100%, reported that their organization had been serving their community for 10 or more years. Also notable is that 100% of the survey participants were female, a point easily acceptable as it became apparent during this study that the overwhelming predominance of workers in the nonprofit victim support field are women.
Table 2

Study Demographics for Quantitative Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Number of Years as an Executive Director of a Nonprofit Victim Support Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 5</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 7</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 8</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 9</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 10</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 11</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 12</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 13</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 14</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 15</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 20</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 21</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 24</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 26</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Study Demographics for Qualitative Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Less than 2</th>
<th>2-5</th>
<th>5-10</th>
<th>10 or More</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25%</strong></td>
<td><strong>33%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>42%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presentation and Analysis of Data

The findings in this study were a result of quantitative data analysis from 28 survey participants as well as qualitative data analysis from 12 approximately one-hour interviews. After analyzing the data, statistical data were reported for Research Question 1 and theme frequency data were reported for Research Question 2. The following sections report the data based on research question.

Findings for Research Question 1

Research Question 1 asked: How do leaders of nonprofit victim support organizations rate the impact of the different TLSi domains on their effectiveness?

The TLSi is a 360-degree feedback inventory created by Larick and White (2012) that provides an evaluation around 80 skills (10 domains with eight skills each) that describe the competencies of successful transformational leaders. The survey instrument
included 20 questions and used a six-point Likert scale that facilitated the level of agreement the participant had with the statement made in each question. There were two questions for each domain. One of the questions made use of the domain’s title in its inquiry while the other made use of the domain’s description (Table 4 identifies the question pairs for each domain).

Table 4

*Question Pairs for Each Domain*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Number</th>
<th>Domain Title</th>
<th>Questions Using Title</th>
<th>Questions Using Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Character and Integrity</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Creativity and Sustained Innovation</td>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>Q4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Q15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Personal and Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>Q6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Political Intelligence</td>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>Q17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Problem Solving and Decision Making</td>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>Q8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Q19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>Q10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data reported from the 28 participants includes mean and standard deviation for responses from each of the 20 questions. Standard deviation describes the variability or the amount that a result varies from others in a group (Patten, 2014). The smaller the standard deviation, the smaller the variance and the more representative a single response is of the rest of the group. Table 5 reports the mean and standard deviation for each of the 20 questions and their respective TLSi domains.
Table 5

Survey Question Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>Domain Title</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Character and Integrity</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Creativity and Sustained Innovation</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Personal and Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Political Intelligence</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Problem Solving and Decision Making</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Character and Integrity</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Creativity and Sustained Innovation</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Personal and Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Political Intelligence</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Problem Solving and Decision Making</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.62</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When examining the range of means from the 20 questions, they ranged from 5.00 (SD = 1.02) to 5.96 (SD = 0.19) with an overall mean of 5.67 (SD = 0.62). The questions and associated domains rated the highest were Question 2 – Collaboration \((M = 5.96)\), Question 1 – Character and Integrity \((M = 5.89)\), Question 3 – Communication \((M = 5.89)\), and Question 8 – Problem Solving and Decision Making \((M = 5.89)\). The items rated the lowest were Question 17 – Political Intelligence \((M = 5.32)\), Question 10 – Visionary Leadership \((M = 5.29)\), and Question 7 – Political Intelligence \((M = 5.00)\).

When evaluating the consistency of the responses between questions, standard deviations for each of the 20 questions were considered. The questions and associated
domains with the least variance included Question 2 – *Collaboration* (SD = 0.19), Question 1 – *Character and Integrity* (SD = 0.31), Question 3 – *Communication* (SD = 0.31), and Question 8 – *Problem Solving and Decision Making* (SD = 0.31). Questions showing the greatest variance were Question 10 – *Visionary Leadership* (SD = 0.76), Question 17 – *Political Intelligence* (SD = 0.86), and Question 7 – *Political Intelligence* (SD = 1.02).

A closer look at the means of the 20 questions and their corresponding variances (SD) revealed patterns and trends between the different questions, and subsequently the associated domains, that sparked further potential implications. For example, both questions for *Problem Solving and Decision Making* (Q8, Q18), *Character and Integrity* (Q1, Q11), and *Communication* (Q3, Q13) fell above the overall mean of 5.67 and below the median variance of 0.533. As such, there was a consistency of responses indicating that these domains are fairly highly rated. Conversely, both questions for *Creativity and Sustained Innovation* (Q4, Q14) and *Political Intelligence* (Q7, Q17) fell below the overall mean of 5.67 indicating that these domains are rated fairly low in comparison albeit with less consistency since the variances for these two domains were greater than that of the higher rated domains.

When examining the responses from the 20 questions using one factor analysis of variance (ANOVA), additional information about the differences between questions was revealed. One factor, or one-way ANOVA is used if more than two sample means are compared on one independent variable (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). Instead of performing an individual t-test for every sample pair in the group, ANOVA enables the researcher to test all pair combinations in the group at one time and with the ability to
make more accurate probability statements than individual t-tests provide. In this study, ANOVA provided an overall p-value of 1.23E-10 which is less than 0.01 meaning that the null hypothesis is rejected and that at least two of the means are different.

Because ANOVA only revealed that a difference existed between two or more of the means but did not reveal which means were different, a post hoc comparison was conducted to understand where the differences resided. Since this study used two questions per domain in the survey, an analysis of the question pairs for each domain was needed to determine if responses for that domain were consistent between the two questions associated with that domain. Table 6 contains the results of the post hoc analysis of the responses from the 20 questions in the survey.

Review of the data revealed that results from two of the question pairs were statistically significant and therefore the individual questions within each pair were treated as independent of each other in support of their respective domains. The results for the other eight paired questions were not statistically significant and therefore the null hypothesis was not rejected indicating that the means were statistically equal and that both questions within each question pair could be considered in tandem for statements in support of their respective domains.
### Table 6

**Post Hoc Analysis: p-values for Pairwise t-tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Q17</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q19</th>
<th>Q14</th>
<th>Q15</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q16</th>
<th>Q5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>.0693</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>.0411</td>
<td>.8201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>.1728</td>
<td>.2558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>.1728</td>
<td>.2558</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>.0007</td>
<td>.1118</td>
<td>.1728</td>
<td>.8201</td>
<td>.8201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.86E-05</td>
<td>.0233</td>
<td>.0411</td>
<td>.3632</td>
<td>.3632</td>
<td>.4952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.62E-06</td>
<td>.0065</td>
<td>.0126</td>
<td>.1728</td>
<td>.1728</td>
<td>.2558</td>
<td>.6493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.62E-06</td>
<td>.0065</td>
<td>.0126</td>
<td>.1728</td>
<td>.1728</td>
<td>.2558</td>
<td>.6493</td>
<td>.10000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.29E-06</td>
<td>.0032</td>
<td>.0065</td>
<td>.1118</td>
<td>.1118</td>
<td>.1728</td>
<td>.4952</td>
<td>.8201</td>
<td>.8201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.29E-06</td>
<td>.0032</td>
<td>.0065</td>
<td>.1118</td>
<td>.1118</td>
<td>.1728</td>
<td>.4952</td>
<td>.8201</td>
<td>.8201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.29E-06</td>
<td>.0032</td>
<td>.0065</td>
<td>.1118</td>
<td>.1118</td>
<td>.1728</td>
<td>.4952</td>
<td>.8201</td>
<td>.8201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.29E-06</td>
<td>.0032</td>
<td>.0065</td>
<td>.1118</td>
<td>.1118</td>
<td>.1728</td>
<td>.4952</td>
<td>.8201</td>
<td>.8201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.39E-07</td>
<td>.0007</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>.0411</td>
<td>.0411</td>
<td>.0693</td>
<td>.2558</td>
<td>.4952</td>
<td>.4952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.39E-07</td>
<td>.0007</td>
<td>.0015</td>
<td>.0411</td>
<td>.0411</td>
<td>.0693</td>
<td>.2558</td>
<td>.4952</td>
<td>.4952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.26E-08</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.0007</td>
<td>.0233</td>
<td>.0233</td>
<td>.0411</td>
<td>.1728</td>
<td>.3632</td>
<td>.3632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.11E-08</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.0126</td>
<td>.0126</td>
<td>.0233</td>
<td>.1118</td>
<td>.2558</td>
<td>.2558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.11E-08</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.0126</td>
<td>.0126</td>
<td>.0233</td>
<td>.1118</td>
<td>.2558</td>
<td>.2558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.11E-08</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.0126</td>
<td>.0126</td>
<td>.0233</td>
<td>.1118</td>
<td>.2558</td>
<td>.2558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.57E-09</td>
<td>1.83E-05</td>
<td>4.86E-05</td>
<td>.0032</td>
<td>.0032</td>
<td>.0065</td>
<td>.0411</td>
<td>.1118</td>
<td>.1118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Row and column headers are question numbers and associated mean. Boxes mark the intersection of the question pairs for each domain.

Table 7 summarizes the results from Table 6 showing which question pairs were statistically significant and which were not.
Table 7

Analysis of Domain Question Pairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Number</th>
<th>Domain Title</th>
<th>Question Pairs</th>
<th>Pairwise p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Character and Integrity</td>
<td>Q1, Q11</td>
<td>0.8201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Q2, Q12</td>
<td>0.3632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Q3, Q13</td>
<td>0.3632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Creativity and Sustained Innovation</td>
<td>Q4, Q14</td>
<td>0.8201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Q5, Q15</td>
<td>0.4952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Personal and Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>Q6, Q16</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Political Intelligence</td>
<td>Q7, Q17</td>
<td>0.0411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Problem Solving and Decision Making</td>
<td>Q8, Q18</td>
<td>0.6493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>Q9, Q19</td>
<td>0.1118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>Q10, Q20</td>
<td>0.0032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Pairwise p-values for Political Intelligence and Visionary Leadership question pairs were less than 0.05 making them both statistically significant. All other question pair p-values were greater than 0.05 resulting in the null hypothesis being accepted.

Knowing the question pair p-values from Table 6 along with the mean ratings and variance rankings in Table 5, allows the individual results within each question pair to be combined into a single result representing a specific domain. From there, the domains can be rank-ordered. Table 8 shows the 10 TLSi domains sorted by combined means (high to low). Combined variances are included for comparison. Note: Since Political Intelligence and Visionary Leadership had statistically significant pairwise p-values, their combined results were not considered supportive of their respective domains.

The domains with the four highest combined mean scores also had the lowest combined variances. The results are reinforced by the high and low ranking observations already made. For example, Collaboration, which has the highest combined mean ($M = 11.79$) also had the highest single question mean ($Q2, M = 5.96$) and lowest single question variance ($Q2, SD = 0.19$). Character and Integrity, Problem Solving and Decision Making, and Communication, which ranked 2, 3, and 4 for both combined mean...
and combined variance, tied for the second highest single question mean \((M = 5.89)\) and second lowest single question variance \((SD = 0.31)\). As an observation, if pairwise p-values are disregarded and only means and variances are considered, Political Intelligence comes in last with the lowest combined mean \((M = 10.32)\) and the highest combined variance \((SD = 1.88)\). This result is consistent with the previous observation that Political Intelligence had the lowest single question mean \((M = 5.0)\) and the highest single question variance \((SD = 1.02)\).

Table 8

*Question Pair Combined Means and Variances*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain Ranking</th>
<th>Domain Title</th>
<th>Question Pairs</th>
<th>Combined Mean</th>
<th>Combined SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Q2, Q12</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Character and Integrity</td>
<td>Q1, Q11</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Problem Solving and Decision Making</td>
<td>Q8, Q18</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Q3, Q13</td>
<td>11.64</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Personal and Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>Q6, Q16</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Q5, Q15</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>Q9, Q19</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>Q10, Q20</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Creativity and Sustained Innovation</td>
<td>Q4, Q14</td>
<td>11.04</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Political Intelligence</td>
<td>Q7, Q17</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Visionary Leadership and Political Intelligence had statistically significant pairwise p-values so combined results were not considered supportive of their respective domains.

**Findings for Research Question 2**

Research Question 2: *How do leaders of nonprofit victim support organizations describe the impact of the ten different TLSi domains on their effectiveness?*

The researcher collected and analyzed data from 12 executive directors of nonprofit victim support organizations to capture how they described the impact of each TLSi domain on their effectiveness as a leader. Data was collected through semi-
structured interviews using an interview protocol aligned with the 10 TLSi domains and Research Question 2 via a Qualitative Interview Question Development Matrix.

Interviews were conducted online using the Zoom teleconferencing application and audio was captured using the Zoom transcription feature. After thoroughly reviewing each transcript, each participant was provided a copy for review and in return provided approval in writing for their transcript to be used in the study. The researcher and a colleague skilled in qualitative analysis techniques then coded the transcripts with NVivo software using the following sentence to ensure that emerging themes were aligned with the research question: “The domain example given impacted the leader’s effectiveness by __________.” The researcher and the colleague coded 100% of the transcripts together to ensure data reliability. All themes, patterns, and frequency counts were confirmed by both parties.

Analysis of theme frequency resulted in a rank order of the 10 TLSi domains as the major themes with an additional 42 sub-themes and six outlier themes (see Appendix N for a matrix of all themes and sub-themes). The frequency counts for the major themes ranged from 22 to 56. All 12 participants contributed to eight of the 10 major themes while 11 participants contributed to the remaining two themes. Table 9 shows the 10 major themes by frequency from highest to lowest, noting the number of executive directors (n) who contributed.
Table 9

Themes, Frequency Counts, and Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving and Decision Making</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Intelligence</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character and Integrity</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and Sustained Innovation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. (n = 12)*

During the interviews, participants were asked 11 questions, 10 that focused on each of the 10 different TLSi domains and a final question that asked, “What else, if anything, has had a significant impact on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization?” Clarification was given to the participant that this would be something that they had not yet shared. Although responses may have been given under the heading of a specific domain, all responses were coded with respect to the domain that was most appropriate. If a response appeared significant and it did not fit in one of the 10 domains, it was placed in an outlier category for possible consideration during analysis. The following are descriptions of the themes enhanced with direct quotes from the participants. Since the major themes share the same title as the 10 TLSi domains, the terms *theme* and *domain* may be used interchangeably.

**Communication.** Communication broke out as the theme with the highest frequency with 56. All 12 participants contributed to this theme. Sub-themes included
communication skills and styles as well as relationships with staff members, board members, donors, and politicians.

With respect to communication skills, executive director (ED) 1 stated, “I'm convinced that my ability to communicate with donors, with the board, with the staff, and with clients has been paramount to me still being here and being successful.” ED 3 shared, “you have to be a storyteller and a visionary and then you have to be able to put it all together to keep people engaged.” Speaking to transparency of communication, ED 5 shared, “It's not always about communicating all of the good stuff. It's communicating the bad or the disappointing information too because if you're not communicating, at least within our organization, people are going to go to a place of automatic negative assumptions.” ED 7 pointed out that it’s also about self-assessment and improvement, “I know I could do a better job at maintaining, staying consistent, and not, you know, talking about 12 different things at once.” ED 9 shared the same perspective, “I feel that I've seen the growth in myself around communication. It’s something I think we always need to work on and challenge ourselves with.” ED 11 summed it up well with their comment, “Because really, at the end of the day, people just want to be heard and communicated with. Even if they don't like what the answer is.”

Finally, ED 8 shared that communication is just as important to the business as it is to the people in the business, “We just wrapped up a [large dollar amount] capital campaign. And that required a lot of really important communications in order to realize that goal.”

**Problem solving and decision making.** This theme had the second highest Frequency with 52. All 12 participants contributed to this theme. Sub-themes included
decision quality (the predominant sub-theme with a frequency of 34), empowering staff, conflict resolution, and getting an outside perspective.

ED 3 captured the essence of decision quality conveyed by most participants with this comment:

I don't have all the answers. And sometimes I just have to fake it till I make it because that's what I was taught coming into leadership years ago. But something I've learned that makes it so much easier to handle that little tidbit of information, not having all the answers, is to collaborate with others on your team or others in your professional network, talk things out, include them when possible in the decision making and problem solving, and the answer will come so much faster.

ED 4 captured the value of time when it comes to quality decisions:

I think that those times when we, or I, have been able to be in a place where I just have time to be set aside and talk to different people and look at different ideas, and have the time and the ability to synthesize that and bring it back for further discussion and dig deeper, we've been able to make big shifts in our program.

ED 5 shared about the challenges of making a quality decision when you are new to the role:

And I would definitely say because I was new to the role, I ended up kind of navigating between a place of suffering from imposter syndrome. Thinking, I am not equipped to make this decision. I need to go to source A and source B and source C, and see what they advise I do. And then, you know, assess from this group and assess from that group before I make a decision when in truth, the
agency needed me to make a decision in real time and just with the best knowledge I had access to in that moment.

ED 10 offered a perspective on empowering staff to be the decision makers, “I try to give my staff as much leeway as possible in problem solving because they are the ones who are having the most direct contact on a daily basis with individuals and families that come through our doors.” ED 10 captured a well-being component to this strategy, “I don't have to be the be-all for every problem that comes to the door. As matter of fact, if I took that perspective, I would have burned out a long time ago.”

ED 6 spoke to conflict resolution, clearly identifying a strategy but also identifying an opportunity for improvement:

I need to invite disagreement a little bit more. I need to say it's okay to disagree with me. And so, I think that's just a reality check that I walk into every once in a while, when I find myself in conversations where not a lot of ideas are being expressed, that I say ‘really, disagree with me. Let's debate about this. Come up with an opinion, whether you have it or not, like, let's challenge this idea some and work through it.’

ED 9 also shared, “I don't really like conflict, but I don't run from it. I feel like, okay, it might be a little draining, but we have to work through it and get people's input and sometimes set our judgment aside.”

Finally, ED 1 spoke to the value of getting an outside perspective, specifically the clients in this case but certainly a concept applicable to other outside groups. “If you can also get your clients involved in helping make decisions, you're going to get a perspective that you might not have ever thought of because you don't live where they live.”
Collaboration. This theme had a frequency of 42. Again, all 12 participants contributed to this theme. The sub-themes included internal, external, and board collaboration.

The data indicated that as an executive director of a nonprofit victim support organization, collaboration is a key skill that must part of the ED’s tool box. As ED 8 stated, “If I wasn't able to collaborate, our organization wouldn't be where it's at today because we require support from many levels in our community.” ED 1 also shared that “building those trusting relationships in the community are really important because other agencies need us sometimes and sometimes, we need them.” Many of the organizations in the target population for this study are in rural areas and small towns which brings, as they shared, unique challenges to collaboration that maybe a larger city might not have to deal with. ED 12 gave a description of some of those challenges:

The fact that we're in a really small area and that there aren't very many service providers around here, we have to be able to collaborate with everyone who's here. And so that means that even, you know, even if you might have personal conflicts or maybe you don't necessarily get along with that person, you still have to work with them because there's no alternative.

Another inherent challenge with running a victim support agency is working with law enforcement agencies. As ED 11 stated:

We actually have a really tenuous relationship with law enforcement and the district attorney's office here. And that is related largely to, I think, our mandate as advocates and us needing to keep confidentiality about our clients. And I think sometimes that's very hard for other agencies, especially in law enforcement, to
understand because it would make their jobs easier if we could just tell them everything that survivors tell us.

The data revealed that the executive director not only has to be able to collaborate with external agencies, they also have to be able to skillfully enable collaboration inside the organization. ED 3 shared (speaking about when collaboration was going well), “We worked to make sure that everyone felt like they were valued and respected mainly because I've learned over the years, just from watching other people, from taking courses, personally, professionally, academically, the importance of it.” ED 5 offered this about the impact of collaboration, “I don't think you can operate a well-functioning nonprofit if you're centralizing all major work and decision making to just an executive director.” ED 6 spoke to the value of establishing a culture of collaboration, “I find that, just the culture that has been fostered many years before I was its leader, really leads itself to people talking out problems with one another, working through things together.” And finally, ED 12 summed it up well by saying, “I think, for anyone, collaboration is the foundation of any organization, whether you're collaborating with employees or with other orgs.”

**Political intelligence.** This theme had a frequency of 41. Again, all 12 participants contributed to this theme. The sub-themes included politician relations, outside group relations, agency awareness, client relations, and board and staff relations.

The concept of political intelligence tended to inspire people to talk about their relationships with politicians. As those relationships can be both powerful and risky for a nonprofit victim support organization leader, the perspectives shared painted a fairly well-rounded picture. For example, ED 1 shared how those relationships are helpful, “We have been successful because we have political connections and we have
representatives locally, state and nationally that really know our work intimately because we built those relationships over the years.” ED 5 shared how finding an ear in the political world is important to maintaining support for clients:

As an executive director of a sexual assault program, I can be a really loud megaphone in some of those more political spheres… My role is to really synthesize what we see on the ground level with our survivors and trends in sexual violence. What we see is barriers to survivors accessing services. What we see are challenges to continuing to support people who are doing the work.

ED 8 takes a more conservative approach, “Being more politically connected or involved can sometimes create problems with your ability to collaborate with other groups and I tend to leave this to organizations that are statewide and don't have to worry about those local connections.” And, as ED 3 shared, some leaders felt that it is just better to avoid political situations at all, “With this organization, we can't engage in anything that is even, that could be viewed as lobbying. So, I steer very clear of that.”

When politicians were removed from the equation and the focus shifted to political relationships with other agencies, community groups, donors, etc., executive directors consistently expressed how important those relationships were. For example, ED 3 shared an approach they use prior to speaking to a new community group, “Before I ever go speak to any group, I research the group. I want to know as much as I can about them.” ED 1 shared the power of strong relationships with donors when the organization is in trouble, “I called our top donor and said, I need to come to your house and I need to tell you about this issue that's going on and I left that meeting with [the money we
needed].” ED 11 shared a political intelligence awareness moment relative to the ED’s relationship with local law enforcement:

I remember coming to the small town. We have so much crossover with law enforcement, for example, and the DA’s office, that I suddenly realized that I shouldn't drive five miles over the speed limit, because it would be really embarrassing if one of those people pulled me over.

ED 7 captured how being politically intelligent takes some work on the part of the ED:

It's knowing what those nuances are about timing, the people, the networks, and knowing all the scuttlebutt that's going on behind the scenes, not only with appointees or with people in power at the county, but also with my community partners like knowing when to reach out to them and who, you know, and I have a lot of trusted people in the community, like how to navigate those pieces.

ED 9 summed up well the impact of political intelligence on leader effectiveness:

It's important, I think, for staff to understand, and it's really important, even in small communities like where we are now, that we understand that how we work with law enforcement, how we work with prosecution, how we work with even defense. The ethics involved, the transparency. Yet, our dedication to our confidentiality of our clients and the work that we do, all of these things mesh and come together and we have to utilize it for good, for the whole of the organization and our mission… which is to serve the people that we serve. So ultimately, it has to benefit them.

**Personal and interpersonal skills.** This theme had a frequency of 40 and was one of two themes that only had 11 of the 12 participants contribute. Sub-themes
included internal relations with staff and board, and external relations with clients and outside agencies. A sub-theme of people skills also emerged.

Participants tended to speak to relations with their staff members first when describing the impact of personal and interpersonal skills on their leadership. ED 2 captured the general consensus well sharing that “People want to know that you can be approached and that you can be nice but you can still be a good leader.” ED 2 went on to define that relationship further:

I have people who tell me, Oh, well, you're just too nice as a boss. And I said there's a difference between being nice and being kind. You can be kind and firm but you don't have to be nice and just walked over.

ED 3 reinforced the impact of building both professional and personal relationships:

I think that has helped build a lot of trust and create a safe space over the years where folks feel like they can come to me and talk to me. And it's important to me to be that way professionally, but yet personally as well. I try not to be two different people, you know, one in office and one out for the most part.

ED 9 shared that it isn’t always easy building relationships and motivating people especially when differing personality types are involved:

I think I have been better at motivating certain types of people… people that were more like myself, are more internally motivated… and a harder time motivating people that are externally motivated or that don't feel that same personal drive.

ED 9 goes on to say:

I definitely have to work at being more encouraging at times. I'm pretty good. I'm pretty good at it. But I, again, because I expect people to be internally
motivated, I need to remember to praise and connect and take the time to encourage.

ED 1 offered a solution to stressful times… if all else fails, bake:

Another thing I do is I bake a lot. In our shelter during COVID, those shelter staff don't get a break. They show up every day. And so, I just like to show up with treats for them, just as a way to say thank you. And people feel really cared for by cookies.

Developing personal relations with key people outside the organization is just as important for an executive director as the inside relations. ED 8 shared a strategy that has proved productive for many years:

If we get any donations of [a significant amount] or more, I'm going to follow up with these people and invite them to lunch. And so, I did. And this was back in 1990… it was two women independently of each other who made these donations. And I followed up with them and had lunch. And I still have really good relationships with both of them and they are our two largest lifetime donors, one of them donating [a lot of money] to our capital campaign.

ED 10 reflected on the accumulation of valuable relationships over the years:

I started thinking about the number of prosecutors I'd worked with, the number of chiefs I've worked with, the number of sheriffs I've worked with, the number of staff people I've worked with. I mean, you just, you know, the number of judges I've been able to develop relationships with. You just start looking at that and it's afforded me to be able to create relationships in amazing places. And then even be able to sustain those relationships.
ED 11 shared how those outside relationships can become a two-way street:

And then I think also, just with, not internally, but with outside partner organizations, people call me up all the time and asked me for stuff or ask how they can help or funders also seem to reach out to me which is helpful.

Having people skills in general emerged as a sub-theme. ED 5 offered, “You have to demonstrate those same abilities to empathize with your staff and with your board. The same way that as an advocate, you would need to with your clients.” ED 6 offered:

By virtue of being a nonprofit victim service organization you're going to draw people who have high emotional intelligence all around you. And if you don't have it, they will know you are a phony, and they will call you out on it.

ED 7 pointed out when talking about the impact of people skills, that it’s all about building trust. “I think the interpersonal work goes back to trust. And we know that, I know that when we have familiarity and relationships, we can do better work and the people we're working with can trust us.” To sum it all up in possibly one of the best quotes in the study, ED 12 captured well the impact that personal and interpersonal skills have on leader effectiveness:

You can start the day as the executive director, and by the end of it you might be the social worker, you might be the outreach person, you might be the counselor to your staff who just went through something terrible. So, having the ability to be able to relate to people, whether they're your staff or the people that you're serving, is really, really important.
**Team building.** This theme had a frequency of 39 and was the second of two themes where only 11 of the 12 participants contributed. Sub-themes included bringing groups together, empowerment, team dynamics, and conflict management.

The most overt challenge that emerged in this theme was the impact on team dynamics amidst the COVID-19 environment. None of the leaders had experienced anything like it before and were forced to tap into all of their resources to keep their services up and running. ED 1 shared:

I had to figure out a different way to build teams, team spirit or team cohesiveness or whatever you want to label it, as with a staff that was now 100% virtual versus a staff that was 100%, you know, in the office.

ED 11 captured the challenge of a virtual environment as well:

It's a lot easier to build a team and to keep a team together when they're all in the same space. It is less easy to do that when they are all in different places and working remotely and trying to figure out technology and also trying out like how to actually do their jobs in a completely different way.

Another challenge to team dynamics that emerged was turnover of personnel. As ED 6 noted, “There's been a lot of change in the team after a period of a ton of stability. There were a bunch of new people on the team.” ED 9 uses a team building tool that helps team members better understand their personal nuances when it comes to communicating. That tool helps them whenever someone new joins the team:

[ED 9 speaking about the tool] If we get a new team member, we always do it again so that we can look again at the whole… How do we communicate? How do we collaborate? How do we resolve conflict? How do we become most
effective and forward the mission of our organization and the community through our shared goals?

ED 10 shared a different approach to try and build strong team dynamics:

One way I try to determine who's going to be a part of our team is through utilizing them in volunteer positions first. I like to watch that mesh. And I like that mesh to be as natural as possible. And I've had quite a bit of success in that. I've had more success in that strategy than just hiring.

Another challenge to team dynamics that emerged was the bad seed effect. ED 11 captured well why this is so important in a victim support organization:

Especially in this work that is so emotionally charged, if your team doesn't work well together, then it makes the job really hard. It seems like a funny thing to say but… I mean, people need to be able to trust each other, to know that they have each other's backs and that they're not just going to be left on their own.

ED 3 elaborated on the negative impact that a bad seed can have on a team:

If you have bad seeds on your team, that has the power of bringing the entire operation down. If you bring people to the team that are not collaborative, or that are toxic, or you allow people to become toxic, maybe they're burned out, maybe they're just miserable and hit it for the first six months, who knows. It will spread like a virus in an organization.

Continuing, ED 3 shared an experience where drastic measures were called for. The ED was brought in to save an organization from the downward spiral it was on:

So, I found the loudest voice in that group and I fired her. I cut the head right off the snake. And then had a couple of others start to test me a little bit more and
then just sort of spread the negativity to other more impressionable staff, and I let them go too.

All executive directors that shared an experience of letting an employee go expressed that it was always difficult and it was always the last course of action. ED 10 shared a strategy they use to hopefully keep from ever getting to that point:

I always try to encourage everybody to have ownership in whatever we're doing, whatever we're developing, whatever we're providing on the front side. Not just come in and say, Okay, this is what we're now going to do. Again, it comes back to when you've invested, you've helped create, and then you get to see the outcome of your product, I think you feel better about it, rather than somebody just coming in and saying, here, do this. Here's your new standard operations procedure. Do this.

Along those same lines, ED 8 shared, “I don't micromanage my staff teams. That's been really important so that they are able to do their work.” ED 6 took it a step further sharing:

When we're talking about developing leaders within the organization, helping people in direct service positions take on new responsibilities, one of the things that we try to raise up as one of the benefits of it is not only do you get like a little feather in your cap on your resume because you lead a project, but also you get to learn from other people.

ED 4 shared how their community working group is empowering staff members and bringing value to the team. “The people at work are charged up about it. They like being a part of an effective group and, you know, sparks their creativity and makes nice pieces
of work happen.” ED 1 also had a strategy for empowering their people and bringing groups together:

So, we just set up ways that we can cross over, people can learn from each other, programs have crossover, cross pollination, and then we do activities that just help support people feeling like they're not just part of one team at [our organization] they're part of the overall agency as well.

ED 12 brought it all together with this final comment:

The ability to create teams is something that, again going back to the other characteristics, if you have those characteristics, then you should be able to help lead your staff to a place where they feel like they're all playing for the same team.

**Character and integrity.** This theme had a frequency of 34. All 12 participants contributed to this theme. Sub-themes included leader integrity (the predominant sub-theme with 18), organizational integrity, accountability, staff integrity, and values alignment.

Leader integrity emerged as the most prominent sub-theme here with 11 out of 12 participants contributing comments. ED 2 provided a comment that starts this theme well:

I think that it has a huge impact on the organization and my leadership. I don't know that a person could actually lead without having character and integrity. You have to be able to have your staff trust who you are and trust what your mission is for the organization.
ED 3 echoed the importance of character and integrity:

As the leader of a nonprofit, you have an entire organization looking to you to set the pace for the culture and the organizational health. I don't want to say that it's everything to have to be a person of good character and integrity as the leader, but it's a huge portion of it.

ED 5 offered, “You have to be able to be a person of integrity, to be a person of high character, to ensure that you're actually upholding those responsibilities to the utmost of your ability.” ED 7 continues that thought with the premise, “If your team doesn't trust you and if the community at large doesn't trust you, then it's really hard to do this already really hard work.”

Maintaining character and integrity as a leader of a victim support organization is not always easy. ED 8 shared a story where an employee was involved in a public incident and the ED was faced with the difficult decision of letting the employee go:

One of the [employee’s] parents was on our board and a major donor, like at that time one of our top donors. And so, of course, I mean, that shows, I think, integrity for sure that you are walking your talk, that if we had kept this young [person] employed, which some people might have felt they had to because the parent was a major donor. But we lost the parent as a board member and a donor because of the decision.

Another executive director, ED 8, shared a difficult experience with a board from a previous organization that left a permanent impression, demonstrating that character and integrity is important at all levels of the organization:
I'm from [another city] and I feel that, I mean, it was a negative experience, but it was negative because I felt like the lack of character and the lack of integrity of people that I trusted, and then seeing kind of the true colors of the dog eat dog world of big money nonprofits.

ED 1 reinforced the issue shared by ED8 with this comment, “Without integrity from the top, then you're going to lose support from everybody underneath you.”

In a victim support organization, character and integrity is clearly important at the staff level as well. As ED 2 shared, “Because we deal with lots of people who are in crisis, it makes it very important that all of your staff also has the character and integrity, that they have those qualities as well.” ED 6 spoke to creating an environment where making mistakes was okay as well, given the stressful nature of the job, “I want my teammates to feel like making mistakes and learning from our challenges are a regular part of how we do work.” ED 7 added to the value of creating a mistake-safe atmosphere, “When I make a mistake, I'm going to call myself out on it. I'm going to take responsibility. I'm going to look people in the eye and say, ‘oh my god, I'm so sorry.’”

Sometimes, the most difficult situations with staff is not being able to be fully transparent with them. For instance, ED 1 shared how it can be a tricky balance how much information you share when an employee is let go, “Integrity dictates that you never share your side of the story because A, it would break confidentiality for that staff you let go, but also it's just not the right thing to do.”

From an organizational perspective, a single decision by an ED can establish a reputation that the organization can have to carry for years. ED 5 shared a story where
their annual fundraising event was scheduled to take place just as the Governor released the first wave of COVID-19 group gathering restrictions. And although their event fell just under the restrictions, the ED instinctively knew that something wasn’t right. Torn between getting the funding needed to keep their clients safe and keeping the attendees safe, the ED chose to cancel the event:

I ended up making a final call that was absolutely the safest call to make. And while it was disappointing on the financial front, I think it garnered a lot of trust from our staff. I think it garnered a lot of trust by other people who were supposed to attend the event because they saw that we were looking at human safety over a bottom line. And I'm glad that I did that.

To sum up the responses, character and integrity clearly has an impact on leader effectiveness. As ED 6 stated, “This is about leading by example.” And ED 9 may have said it best:

I feel it's very important to let your character and integrity shine through in whatever you're doing. And I think it's important to try to build that in the team that you supervise. I'm more interested in being a leader than a manager.

Diversity. This theme had a frequency of 32. All 12 participants contributed. Sub-themes included staff diversity, board diversity, and fostering diversity.

A common trend that emerged in this theme was that the makeup of staff and board needed to reflect the demographics of the client-base that they serve. As ED 5 pointed out, “You have to [make sure] that how the organization is staffed, how it recruits for its volunteers and staff, even the board that makes up its governing body, is not consisting of just a homogenous pool.” ED 2 shared, “We want to have staff that looks
like the community that we serve.” ED 4 also pointed out that having a diverse staff makes the environment feel safer, “So we have a pretty diverse staff for such a small staff, which makes us look very, because it's true right, gives us the appearance of safety for people of color.”

But it is not always easy. As ED 6 pointed out, building a diverse staff is often dependent on the available labor pool, “I live in a pretty homogenous community to say, man, you know, I just don't have enough people of color, working on staff.” ED 6 also pointed out that “Sometimes the contract or accreditation requirements that we have make it difficult for people to meet the educational standards to work with us.” That the predominant labor pool are people “that have been historically disenfranchised, are poor and so, were discriminated against.” ED 6 also stated that there is more that their organization can do to support these people. Bottom line, as ED 12 stated, “Diversity is key, not just in making sure that you're serving diverse populations, but also making sure that your staff are reflecting the populations that you're serving.”

Fostering diversity is another trend that emerged from this theme. ED 1 shared a very structured approach to fostering diversity in their organization:

So, a couple of the things as a leader that I've established that we do that have been very helpful is we have a racial and social justice committee that meets twice a month on paid staff time and their whole job is to come up with learnings and educational opportunities and trainings that we really can talk through. What it means to be a racially and socially just organization. And then we have a white caucus and a BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, People of Color) caucus. Both meet
twice a month as well, on paid time. So, there's a lot of options for staff to learn and grow within the, through the lens of diversity.

ED 5, recognizing that their organization had an opportunity for improvement in the area of diversity, chose to empower the staff to find a solution:

I turned to our whole staff and I said ‘we're going to throw out our typical all staff agenda. We're going to have just an all staff check in. I want to open up the floor for a well-managed and facilitated discussion where, to an extent, we put our positions aside and we're here as shared professional peers. And I want to hear what can we do better and what would you like to see us do.’

Although ED 5 saw some success with that approach, there was also a negative side-effect. As some of the staff were less experienced, they interpreted their charter as having greater authority than it did. Post-evaluation, ED 5 self-assessed, “I maybe did not clearly articulate what those teams’ expectations would be about, how much they would be able to directly influence decisions at the policy level or decisions about personnel matters.”

ED 3 made another point that emerged as significant when it comes to diversity of staff and board – don’t be blinded by demographics and lose sight of the skill set your organization needs. “You want diversity, whether it's on your staff, your board, what have you. But you want to be responsible and meaningful when you're making those connections. You don't just put someone in that position because they tick a box.”

**Visionary leadership.** This theme had the second lowest frequency at 23. All 12 participants contributed to this theme. There were no sub-themes that emerged.
Visionary leadership was deemed important by every participant, but there were only a few tangible examples that they shared. Most of the comments were tactical in nature. For example, ED 12 offered that “The key thing in creating a vision that people want to follow and move towards, is giving them a seat at the table.” ED 9 stated that visionary leadership is “One of those things that I think is sort of an ongoing thing that you do in small and big ways.” ED 7 expanded on that same thought:

[Visionary leadership] is like primary prevention work. This has to happen in tiny… this is like taking your vitamins every day. This has to happen a little bit every day in all the things that were said before this. It happens in all of those places, happens in my character, creativity, diversity, all those different things are part of visionary leadership.

For ED 2, visionary leadership is also closer to the daily tasks:

Even the vision of what I want my organization to be and how I want the people who are doing the hard work to be supportive and be recognized for their hard work is really important to me. And I want to make sure that I can create buy-in and I can get people to understand that.

ED 3 linked the vision to the daily plan as well, but also to the strategic, long range plan:

A big part of being a leader in a nonprofit, in that space, is being a visionary. Being able to say, hey guys, this is what our mission is. Remember, this is what our purpose is. And you need to be that person that connects the purpose with the day to day. You need to be able to align that. That’s all part of your strategic plan, which is a huge part of being an ED. This stuff’s all connected.
ED 5 shared that they were hired as the executive director for their ability to communicate the organization’s vision. “When anybody asks me, you know, what do you visualize for your organization. I could go on for a long time, both, you know, large visions, large ideas to small ones. But all of that ties into our mission.” ED 1 was also hired partly because of proven experience as a visionary leader:

I do call myself a visionary leader in that in the different nonprofit sights I’ve run, I always have a vision, like my vision at [my current org] when I got there was that all spaces will be beautiful and provide dignity for our clients. And so that has resulted in, you know, three separate [extensive fundraising] campaigns and I will be retiring with all of our spaces being absolutely beautiful.

ED 1 also made a point about the importance of self-awareness and how and ED needs a vision to pursue to be effective. “If I wasn't retiring, I’d probably be leaving [my current org] anyway because I've met my vision, right. And then you want somebody else to come in there with their vision.”

According to ED 11, visionary leadership is important but it needs to be balanced with effective management skills:

I think the thing that goes along with visionary leadership is also knowing that you can't do it all today. Like, even though, like right now, all of the needs exist and you want to fix them all. Like, right now, if you try and do that, you will crush yourself and everything around you. And that's not helpful.

Finally, a common response was that vision has to be shared by all members of the organization: ED, staff, and board. But ED 4 shared that getting their board to engage in a vision is not always easy:
I would say if I could figure out how to get our board engaged on being forward thinking and looking at a vision and really what our position is, that would be a benefit to the entire agency. And then help us to do better at engaging some of the outliers in the community, people that we haven't really been able to connect with.

**Creativity and sustained innovation.** This theme had the lowest frequency at 22. All 12 participants contributed to this theme. Sub-themes included creativity, leveraging resources, risk taking, and sustainment.

Being creative in a nonprofit is a must according to the data. But being creative in a nonprofit that relies heavily on restricted funding (funding that has specific requirements attached) can get an organization in trouble if they are not careful. ED 11 stated that “As a nonprofit victim service agency, we always have to be creative in order to actually be able to provide the best possible services to folks given the resources that exist.” ED 4 added from the perspective of a small, rural agency:

> I think you have to have permission to be creative and that's one of the things that is possible in a small domestic violence or a small nonprofit agency. You just have a little bit more freedom because there are fewer layers of say bureaucracy to muddle through.

ED 4 goes to offer that this year (2020) has brought with it unique challenges when it comes to being creative, “I think one of the things that concerns me about this year and our COVID restrictions, that it's really digging into people's creativity and that a lot of us are stagnating, and that is worrisome.” ED 7 echoed that sentiment about operating in the COVID environment:
We have to be creative within that space. We have had to be creative about how we're, you know, interacting with survivors, to continue the good work we're doing, and keeping people employed in a time when people are working from home.

Still, there were creative examples offered. ED 1 believes strongly that “the arts and beauty make a difference and help people heal” and has worked hard creating that type of environment for their clients. ED 11 shared a story about how they were able to meet the special needs of a particular client using creativity, “I think on the service delivery level, like the creativity sometimes gets a little weird. So, you can see where if there’s no housing available then you think of like camping or tents or something.” And ED 9 capitalized on personal skills to stay creative, “So, I like grant writing. I like coming up with cool ideas. I've done that for you know 30 years so I'm pretty excited about it.”

A trend that emerged when talking about the impact of creativity and sustained innovation on leader effectiveness was leveraging resources. ED 2 shared a story about how during COVID they had to quickly devise a system for continued virtual operations:

I don't want to say that it’s impressive, but you know when you have 15 to 16 people that you have to deploy a laptop to, figure out all that is involved in that, like a numbering system and who checks out what to who and getting all the programs loaded, learning how to use Teams and being able to interact via Teams because our systems are Microsoft-based. It’s a huge thing to have to do in a pretty short amount of time.
ED 5 offered that they were not the greatest at being creative but also demonstrated in their description that empowering others to be creative is just as, if not more effective:

I will be honest creativity is not my strong suit. So, this is an area where I have had to lean on our board quite a bit, because it has an ability, right, to leverage multiple different skill sets and abilities and personalities to address issues or concerns, and kind of borrow their creative and innovative ideas to help address, you know, issues with the agency or just to create more productive ways in actualizing some of our visions for the agency.

ED 12 echoed that same perspective, “So, I wouldn't describe myself as a very creative person, but I have the ability to recognize that and so I surround myself with creative people.” ED 1 pointed out one of the pitfalls of resource management during tough times, “I think it's really important as leaders of victim services organizations that we don't slide into scarcity thinking. You know, there's not enough. You know, I'm not enough. We're not doing enough. Like all that just leads to a negative spiral.”

Risk taking is an integral part of being creative according to the participants. ED 3 shared, “Responsible risk taking is, I think, important to growing a nonprofit, period.” ED 8 shared:

We're one of the leading organizations in our field in the state and possibly nationally… because of my willingness to, you know, think outside the box a little bit and take risk and try some new things and not always necessarily know that they will work out.
And ED 9 shared how valuable it can be to develop risk taking skills:

I think my whole career has been about this. Responsible risk taking, yes. Harnessing potential of human capital, yes. Especially through my creation of prevention programs, through trying to take small amounts of money and make a big impact in the community.

According to the participants, not everybody can manage creativity. ED 8 offered, “There are some people that have the big ideas, but they can't make anything happen. Fortunately for me, I'm able to do both.” With that said, ED 7 threw out this caution to consider:

You have to recognize when the agency's ready to handle creativity. So, I could come up with a gazillion ideas and write them down on a napkin and come in and throw them at people and it will blow their minds. Or I could save my napkins and bring them in when the agency's ready for those things.

Summary

This chapter focused on the data and findings regarding the two research questions guiding this study. Based on single question answers, the TLSi domains that were rated the highest were Collaboration, Character and Integrity, and Communication. The domains that were rated the lowest were Political Intelligence and Visionary Leadership. The domains with the least amount of variance were again Collaboration, Character and Integrity, and Communication plus Problem Solving and Decision Making. The domains with the greatest amount of variance were again Visionary Leadership and Political Intelligence.
When reviewing the results based on combined question pairs (combining means and variances for the two questions aligning to a single domain), Collaboration, Character and Integrity, Problem Solving and Decision Making, and Communication had a consistency of responses that supported the highest ratings. Conversely, the combined results for Creativity and Sustained Innovation and Political Intelligence drew support for the lowest ratings. Additionally, post hoc analysis of the question pairs revealed that two of the question pairs, Political Intelligence and Visionary Leadership, were statistically different from each other. Therefore, the individual questions within each pair were treated as independent of each other in support of their respective domains. Results from all other questions pairs were not statistically significant and therefore both questions could be used in support of their respective domains.

The final part of this chapter examined the perceptions of executive directors from nonprofit victim support organizations with respect to the impact that each of the 10 TLSi domains had on their effectiveness as a leader. Through 12 semi-structured interviews, the researcher discovered multiple themes in the data. The top two major themes based on frequency were Communication and Problem Solving and Decision Making. The bottom two themes were Visionary Leadership and Creativity and Sustained Innovation.

Chapter V discusses the findings in more detail. It focuses on major findings, unexpected findings, conclusions, implication for action, and recommendations for future research. Lastly, the chapter concludes with remarks and reflections.
CHAPTER V: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter V begins with a review of the study’s purpose statement, research questions, methods, population, and sample. The remainder of the chapter describes the major findings, unexpected findings, conclusions based on those findings, and implications for actions based on the conclusions. This chapter concludes with recommendations for future research and final remarks.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to determine how nonprofit victim support organization leaders rate the impact of the 10 TLSi domains on their effectiveness. In addition, it was the purpose to discover how nonprofit victim support organization leaders describe the impact of each TLSi domain on their effectiveness.

Research Questions

The research was guided by the following research questions:

1. How do leaders of nonprofit victim support organizations rate the impact of the different TLSi domains on their effectiveness?
2. How do leaders of nonprofit victim support organizations describe the impact of the different TLSi domains on their effectiveness?

Research Methods

This mixed methods study was conducted to understand the impact that the 10 TLSi domains have on nonprofit victim support organization leader effectiveness. Both quantitative and qualitative approaches were used so that one approach could offset any weakness in the other. This study followed the triangulation design approach where quantitative data were collected to discretely rate the 10 domains and qualitative data
were collected in order to produce a richer, deeper understanding of the results. In this design, quantitative data were collected from 28 participants in an electronic survey, 12 of which were then chosen at random to participate in interviews.

**Population**

The population for this study included all private, nonprofit victim support organizations in the United States that were registered with the Office for Victims of Crime with the following exclusions:

- Organizations associated with a large organization like a hospital or healthcare system were not included due to the potential disparity in leadership behaviors needed at the executive director level of these organizations.

- Organizations associated with a government or law enforcement agency were not included due to the potential disparity in leadership behaviors needed at the executive director level of these organizations.

- Due to a need to consider cultural influence when designing effective interventions for indigenous peoples (Manson, 2020), which is outside the scope of this study, Native American victim support organizations were not included.

In all, the Office for Victims of Crime reported 2,508 qualifying organizations at the time of this study (Office for Victims of Crime, 2020a). These organizations were a mixture of elderly support, sexual assault advocacy, child advocacy, victim education, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, mental health agencies, rape crisis support, domestic violence advocacy, shelters, and crime victim service centers.
Sample

To make the population more manageable for this study, cluster sampling was used to narrow the focus down to the Pacific Northwest region. The result was a target population of 147 private, nonprofit victim support organizations from the states of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho. From there, direct email addresses for each executive director were needed to extend invitations to participate in the survey. After eliminating organizations or executive directors for various reasons such as being unable to confirm a direct email address to the executive director, or the organization simply declining to participate, the researcher was able to confirm a valid email address for 88 executive directors from organizations within the target population. In the end, 28 directors responded to the survey (31.8% response rate) and 15 volunteered to be interviewed, from which 12 were chosen at random.

Major Findings

Several major findings were discovered during this study. These major findings gave insight to the creation of conclusions, which in turn led to the generation of implications for action. The following are assertions made by this researcher.

Top Four TLSi Domains Impacting Leader Effectiveness

The following major finding is a culmination of the analysis of the data gathered for both Research Questions 1 and 2. In this study, although all 10 TLSi domains were viewed as important, four TLSi domains were identified as having the greatest impact on nonprofit victim support organization leader effectiveness. Based on combined question pair scores, these four domains ranked the highest and had the least amount of variance as rated by the participants. The top four domains are as follows:
1. Collaboration ($M = 11.79, SD = 0.74$)
2. Character and Integrity ($M = 11.75, SD = 0.67$)
3. Problem Solving and Decision Making ($M = 11.71, SD = 0.79$)
4. Communication ($M = 11.64, SD = 0.83$)

**Collaboration.** This domain ranked the highest not only because it had the highest combined mean score and second lowest combined variance, it also had the highest single question mean score and the lowest single question variance. Additionally, it ranked third in total theme frequency with 42 and the second largest sub-theme overall, *External Collaboration* (24).

**Character and integrity.** This domain had the second highest combined mean score and the lowest combined variance. It also tied for the second highest single question mean score and the second lowest single question variance. What was unique with this domain when compared to the other three domains in the top four was that it was the only domain that did not rank in the top four total theme frequencies. *Character and Integrity* ranked seventh in total theme frequencies with 34. The largest sub-theme, *Leader Integrity*, had greater than 50% of the codes at 18.

**Problem solving and decision making.** This domain had the third highest combined mean score and the third lowest combined variance. It too tied for the second highest single question mean score and the second lowest single question variance. Additionally, it ranked second in total theme frequency with 52 and had the largest sub-theme overall, *Decision Quality* with 34.

**Communication.** This domain had the fourth highest combined mean score and the fourth lowest combined variance. It tied as well for the second highest single
question mean score and the second lowest single question variance. Additionally, it ranked first in total theme frequency with 56. And although no individual sub-theme emerged as the largest, five of the sub-themes shared the term relations (staff relations, board relations, etc.). If added together, those five sub-themes make up 50% of the codes with a frequency of 28.

**Relationships Across the Domains**

This major finding was determined through synthesis of information from the analysis of data gathered for Research Question 2. The term relations appears in 14 different sub-theme titles across three domains, Communication, Political Intelligence, and Personal and Interpersonal Skills for a total theme frequency of 94 out of 381 (25%). All relations sub-themes can be rolled up into two larger groups, internal relations and external relations. The internal relations group includes Staff relations and Board relations. The external relations group includes Community relations, Donor relations, Political relations, Politician relations, Outside relations, and Client relations. The sub-theme frequency for the internal relations group is 41 while the sub-theme frequency for the external relations group is 53.

The data clearly shows three different outcomes. Communication is described more frequently as having an impact on internal relations more so than external relations. Political Intelligence is described more frequently as having an impact on external relations more so than internal relations. And Personal and Interpersonal Skills is described with a frequency that tends toward center although internal relations is slightly higher than external relations. Additionally, when internal relations is broken down, Staff relations (32) are described three times more often than Board relations (9).
Table 10 shows the distribution of internal and external group frequencies across the three relevant domains.

Table 10

*Internal and External Relations Frequencies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Internal Relations</th>
<th>External Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Intelligence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Enigma of Political Intelligence**

Further analysis of the data from Research Questions 1 and 2 revealed that *Political Intelligence* had conflicting results when looking at both quantitative and qualitative data. When reviewing survey data, *Political Intelligence* came in last in the rankings of the 10 domains. The domain had the lowest combined mean ($M = 10.32$), the highest combined variance (SD = 1.88), the lowest single question mean ($M = 5.0$), and the highest single question variance (SD = 1.02). *Political Intelligence* was also one of the two domains whose question pairs were statistically different (pairwise p-value $= 0.0411$) establishing independence between the two questions. Based on this information alone, a statement could be made that *Political Intelligence* has the least amount of impact on leader effectiveness. But, as stated earlier, this study used a mixed methods triangulation approach so that one method could offset potential weaknesses of the other. In the case of *Political Intelligence*, the total qualitative theme frequency of 41 was fourth overall. And because the domain came in only one point below *Collaboration* (42), it could reasonably be said that *Political Intelligence* tied for third overall in total theme frequency which is contradictory to the last place quantitative data results.
Additionally, when the relevant sub-themes, Politician relations (15), Outside relations (14), and Client relations (3), are rolled up into a single external relations group, Political Intelligence ends up with the second largest sub-theme overall at 32.

**Unexpected Findings**

Two unexpected findings were discovered from this research, Visionary Leadership ranked near the bottom of the domain list with respect to impact on leader effectiveness and leaders defined their own effective attributes and skills.

**Visionary Leadership Ranked Near the Bottom of The Domain List with Respect to Impact on Leader Effectiveness**

Visionary Leadership tied for the next to lowest combined mean \( M = 11.04 \) and had the eighth highest combined variance (SD = 1.28). It also had the second lowest single question mean \( M = 5.29 \), and the eighth highest single question variance (SD = 0.76). Visionary Leadership was also one of the two domains whose question pairs were statistically independent of each other (pairwise p-value = 0.0032). Unlike Political Intelligence, Visionary Leadership was virtually tied for last in overall theme frequency with 23, only one more than last place Creativity and Sustained Innovation with 22. Visionary Leadership was also the only domain with no sub-themes that emerged during analysis.

Looking at the qualitative data for Visionary Leadership, all 12 participants gave descriptions but only four of the executive directors described leading some form of large-scale transformational vision – taking the organization to new levels. The other eight directors gave descriptions of what could be considered as more transactional, facilitating or aligning the day to day workings to the mission or vision statement of the
organization. This could be the reason for the lower frequency since most of the participants described Visionary Leadership as kind of blended into the daily routine. According to ED 7, “This [visionary leadership] has to happen a little bit every day… in all of those places, happens in my character, creativity, diversity, all those different things are part of visionary leadership.” ED 6 shared, “When I think about creating vision… sometimes it’s continuing to remind people of how the work they’re doing fits in or doesn’t fit into our strategic plan.” And ED 9 described Visionary Leadership as, “one of those things that I think is sort of an ongoing thing that you do in small and big ways.” All of the executive directors expressed that Visionary Leadership is important, even critical to leader effectiveness. They may have just found it difficult to describe in a measurable way.

**Leaders Defined Their Own Effective Attributes and Skills**

There were several attributes and skills associated with effective leaders that emerged from this research. This unexpected finding was discovered during the analysis of qualitative data. As mentioned in Chapter IV, qualitative responses that appeared significant but did not fit into one of the 10 domains, were placed in an outlier category for possible consideration during analysis. The largest sub-theme frequency in the outlier category was Attributes with 16. Further analysis of this sub-theme inspired a review of all sub-themes for any related trends. The result was the following collective list of attributes and skills from all 12 ED’s that were perceived as impacting their effectiveness as a leader (in no particular order).

- Loving the work
- Being curious about the field of work
• Ability to inspire others
• Caring about the outcome
• Believing in the beauty and strength of relationships especially with people whose relationships have been destroyed by an abuser
• Tireless commitment
• Consistency
• Not making a lot of waves or demanding attention
• Ability to have really good boundaries
• Being a visionary and innovator – a risk taker
• Fundraising skills
• Desire to make a difference in the world
• Being approachable
• Emotionally intelligent
• Being able to talk and work with anybody
• Being calm in times of crisis
• Ability to figure out puzzles
• Being an authentic listener
• Being a clear and concise communicator
• Encouraging open communication
• Being a storyteller
• Proficient at communicating with technology
• Skilled writer, especially with grants
• Being empathic, sensitive to the needs of others
• Being adaptable

• Remembering that you are dealing with human beings

Conclusions

This study examined the impact that each of the 10 TLSi domains had on nonprofit victim support organization leader effectiveness. Based on the major and unexpected findings, this study produced four conclusions. The conclusions are supported by the findings of this study and the literature.

Conclusion 1: Collaboration, Problem Solving and Decision Making, and Communication are the TLSi Domains that have the Greatest Impact on Leader Effectiveness

Based on the findings of this study, considering the top domain rankings from both survey and interview data analysis, it was concluded that Collaboration, Problem Solving and Decision Making, and Communication are the three TLSi domains that are most impactful on nonprofit victim support organization leader effectiveness. As Freeborough and Patterson (2015) suggested in their study, nonprofit leaders need to show a demonstrated record of transformational leadership skills. Although the data in this study reflected that all 10 TLSi domains are important, if determining what characteristics to seek in a leader for a nonprofit victim support organization, skills in these three domains should take priority. Additionally, the ability to collaborate both inside and outside the organization, to use techniques for improving decision quality, and to have a blend of communication skills and styles available, are all necessary for sustained leader effectiveness. Character and Integrity also ranked in the top four domains but was consistently described more as an integral element to all the other
domains rather than a discrete skill. As Bass and Avolio (1998) pointed out, integrity and
the ability to build trust are given characteristics one would seek for any leadership role.

**Conclusion 2: Building Relationships is Key to Being an Effective Nonprofit Victim Support Organization Leader**

Given the finding that relationship building was a theme that emerged across multiple domains and made up 25% of all theme frequencies, it was concluded that in order for leaders of nonprofit victim support organizations to be effective, they must be skilled in building relationships both internal and external to the organization. Relationship building emerged as a clear subset of *Communication, Political Intelligence, and Personal and Interpersonal Skills*, but the skillset is easily associated with all 10 TLSi domains as transformational leadership skills are people skills first. According to Bass and Avolio (1998), the transformational leader builds trust by listening effectively, recognizing individual differences, and “[seeing] the individual as a whole person” (p. 137). Additionally, understanding your audience is crucial to choosing the right skillset to use when building relationships. For example, political intelligence skills emerged as more useful when dealing with people external to the organization and basic communication skills emerged as more useful when dealing with staff members.

**Conclusion 3: Most Leaders Shy Away from the Term Political Intelligence but Not its Importance**

Based on the findings that *Political Intelligence* was rated least important in comparison to the other domains but described more often than most as having an impact on leader effectiveness, it was concluded that leaders either misunderstood the term political intelligence and/or did not clearly associate the term with actions that they
clearly deem important. In the book *The Politically Intelligent Leader* (White et al., 2016), the authors define politics as using power with and through people both inside and outside the organization. The leaders in this study consistently disassociated themselves with any action related to power and politics. Their responses were more in line with the author’s definition of the politically intelligent leader, “one who uses a moral compass to lead the organization in the right direction while considering the wants, needs, values, motivations, and emotions of followers and stakeholders” (White et al., 2016, p. 3). These two definitions, perceptions if you will, could prevent an uninformed executive director from realizing their true potential as a politically intelligent leader. Fortunately, as the authors point out, this is a learnable skill.

**Conclusion 4: Executive Directors Need More than the 10 TLSi Domains to Sustain their Effectiveness as a Leader**

Based on the finding that leaders identified multiple attributes and skills impacting their effectiveness that fell outside the scope of the 10 TLSi domains and yet still complimented them, it was concluded that these attributes and skills should be included in any model identifying the traits and characteristics of an effective nonprofit victim support organization leader. This list of attributes includes items like loving the work and having a desire to make a difference in the world which are important items for this group of leaders but are not the typical characteristics found on a resume when seeking a new executive director. This list is not all inclusive or absolute but, when combined with the other findings in this study, it helps paint a wholistic picture of the type of leader that will be effective in the role as executive director of a nonprofit victim support organization. As Hickman (1998) conveyed, an effective leader learns to
navigate the humanistic dynamics of relationships using a variety of tools and approaches.

**Implications for Action**

The findings and conclusions from this study inspired the following implications for action. These recommendations are directed to any board of directors responsible for hiring or evaluating an executive director of a nonprofit victim support organization, any executive director seeking self-evaluation and self-improvement, and any aspiring leader seeking a personal and professional development path to the position of executive director in a nonprofit victim support organization.

**Implication for Action 1**

Based on the finding of the top ranked domains, the conclusion that the top three domains with the greatest impact on leader effectiveness are *Collaboration, Problem Solving and Decision Making*, and *Communication*, and the conclusion that relationships internal and external to organization are important, it is recommended that any board of directors responsible for hiring an executive director of a nonprofit victim support organization consider implementing an observation or probation period where the potential candidate can be observed interacting with others and demonstrating these key characteristics. This could be as simple as having the candidate volunteer with the organization for a period of time possibly shadowing the outgoing leader or working directly with the staff at an event or in the execution of daily routines. At the end of that period, staff members, board members, and even key stakeholders could provide assessments of the candidate’s performance.
In addition to consideration during the hiring process, these key characteristics should also be considered during any periodic performance evaluation process. The questions below are based on the findings of this study and are provided as a guideline to enhance the hiring or evaluation process:

- Give an example of how you have built a culture of trusting relationships with staff and board members internal to your current or former organization.
- Give an example of how you have built trusting relationships with partner agencies and key stakeholders external to your current or former organization.
- Give an example of using creative problem solving and decision making internal to your current or former organization.
- Give an example of using creative problem solving and decision making with partner agencies and key stakeholders external to your current or former organization.
- Give an example of techniques you used to improve the quality of decisions made internal to your current or former organization.
- Give an example of techniques you used to improve the quality of decisions made with partner agencies and key stakeholders external to your current or former organization.
- Give an example of how you created an environment of open communication internal to your current or former organization.
- Give an example of how you created an environment of open communication with partner agencies and key stakeholders external to your current or former organization.
Implication for Action 2

Based on the findings in this study, the conclusion that the top three domains with the greatest impact on leader effectiveness are Collaboration, Problem Solving and Decision Making, and Communication, and the conclusion that executive directors of nonprofit victim support organizations need more than the 10 TLSi domains to sustain their effectiveness as a leader, it is recommended that any sitting or aspiring executive director seek out a mentor or accountability buddy for a year (or longer) who provides thoughtful and constructive feedback about growth in each of the critical skills and attributes listed below. Then, a feedback tool such as the 360-degree TLSi or the MLQ could be administered pre and post to measure growth in transformational leadership skills.

It is also recommended that leaders, recognizing their own strengths and weaknesses in the list below, engage with business consultants (pro bono when possible) who are experts at facilitating organizational growth. Having an outside perspective is helpful in seeing challenges and opportunities that are often masked by the day to day happenings of the organization. Additionally, having an outside facilitator frees the leader of those extra responsibilities during development events enabling them to be more engaged in the process as a participant rather than a facilitator.

The following list of skills and attributes are based on the findings of this study and should be used as a guide for personal or professional self-evaluation and/or self-improvement:

- Create an environment of open communication and free flow of ideas without fear of demeaning responses or repercussion
• Build a culture of trusting relationships with staff, board, clients, community, partner agencies, donors, and political influencers
• Collaborate effectively internally with staff and board, and externally with partner agencies and key stakeholders
• Use targeted techniques to improve the quality of decisions made internally with staff and board, and externally with partner agencies and key stakeholders
• Be consistent
• Be curious about the field of work
• Care about client and business outcomes
• Inspire others
• Create safe, respectful, and productive boundaries
• Understand the pros and cons of being a visionary and innovator – a risk taker
• Develop fundraising skills
• Be approachable
• Develop emotional intelligence
• Develop political intelligence
• Be calm in times of crisis
• Be an authentic listener
• Be a clear and concise communicator
• Be a storyteller
• Develop your ability to talk and work with anybody
• Be proficient at communicating with technology
• Develop your writing skills, especially with grants
• Be sensitive to the needs of others, empathic
• Be adaptable
• Enjoy the wonder of figuring out puzzles
• Believe in the beauty and strength of relationships especially with people whose relationships have been destroyed by an abuser
• Find your tireless commitment
• Protect and preserve your integrity
• Love the work and have a desire to make a difference in the world
• Remember that you are dealing with human beings

**Implication for Action 3**

Based on the finding and conclusion that there is a disparity between the term political intelligence and the actual importance of the domain as described in this study, it is recommended that board members, executive directors, and aspiring executive directors of nonprofit victim support organizations seek professional development in the area of political intelligence. There is a risk of missing out on the value of this particular set of skills especially when dealing with external partner agencies, key stakeholders, and political influencers. Recommend engaging with a consultant who is an expert in enhancing a leader’s political intelligence. There are also books available like *Organizational Power Politics* by Fairholm (2009) and *The Politically Intelligent Leader* by White et al., (2016) as well as seminars and presentations.
Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the findings and limitations of this study and the review of literature, the researcher recommends further research in the following areas:

- Since there was a finding and conclusion in this study that executive directors of nonprofit victim support organizations need more than the 10 TLSi domains to sustain their effectiveness as a leader, it is recommended that this study be replicated but with the framework of the additional skills and attributes identified by the participants of this study.

- Since there was a finding and conclusion in this study that there is a disparity between the term political intelligence and importance of political intelligence as described in the study, it is recommended that this study be replicated but with the framework of The Politically Intelligent Leader (White et al., 2016).

- Since the leaders in this study consistently disassociated themselves with any action related to power and politics, yet described activities that were political in nature as having an impact on their effectiveness, it is recommended that a study be conducted on the use of power in its different forms by leaders in non-profit organizations.

- As there was a need to consider cultural influence when designing effective interventions for indigenous peoples (Manson, 2020), which is outside the scope of this study, Native American victim support organizations were not included. It is recommended that this study be replicated but on the target population of Native American victim support organizations.
• As the target population for this study was limited to the region of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, it is recommended that this study be replicated in the Midwest and Eastern regions to confirm that the results are generalizable nationwide.

• As the target population for this study was limited to smaller, private nonprofit victim support organizations, it is recommended that this study be replicated for larger organizations like hospitals, healthcare systems, or government agencies to see if there is any disparity in leadership behaviors needed at the executive director level of these organizations.

• As this study was limited to the perspectives of executive directors of nonprofit victim support organizations, it is recommended that this study be replicated but using a 360-degree survey around the executive director to include key subordinates and board members.

• Due to overwhelming evidence in the literature surrounding the need to manage compassion fatigue in victim support organizations and because this study was limited to focusing on the impact of the 10 TLSi domains on leader effectiveness, it is recommended that a study be conducted with a focus on the impact of compassion fatigue in nonprofit victim support organizations.

• During this study, it became apparent that the overwhelming predominance of workers in the nonprofit victim support field are women. It is recommended that a study be conducted on why men do not apply for positions in the field more often.
Since the overwhelming predominance of workers in the nonprofit victim support field appear to be female, and because 100% of the interview participants in this study were female, it is recommended that this study be replicated but with a population sample that is 100% male to compare results to the female perspective from this study.

**Concluding Remarks and Reflections**

The researcher for this study was fortunate to have had the opportunity to volunteer as a business consultant working closely with the executive director, staff, and board of a nonprofit victim support organization. Observing firsthand the challenges experienced by victim support workers led to the topic chosen for this study.

Victim support workers are heroes. Day in and day out they run towards the fire of traumatic events that affect the lives of millions of people each year. And at those times when victims and their families are overwhelmed by those unexpected events, victim support workers are there to help people who never knew that they would need help before that day, get through the process and begin healing.

Based on the results of this study, it is clear that victim support workers need and deserve specialized leadership in the role of executive director. The hope is that the results of this study will help to identify the best and most important characteristics of all the leaders who participated in the study so that moving forward boards know better what to look for when hiring or evaluating an executive director and current or aspiring executive directors have a clearer path for development and improvement.
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## Quantitative Survey Question Development Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1 – How do leaders of nonprofit victim support organizations rate the impact of the ten different TLSi domains on their effectiveness?</td>
<td>Choose one of the following responses to each of the statements below: Strongly Agree, Agree, Somewhat Agree, Somewhat Disagree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree.</td>
<td>Source – Larick and White, “Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory,” 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SQ1 – Character and integrity have a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

SQ2 – Building a culture of trusting relationships that support critical and creative problem solving has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

SQ3 – My ability to communicate has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

SQ4 – Developing a culture of divergent thinking and responsible risk taking has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

SQ5 – My openness to diversity has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.
SQ6 – Demonstrating high emotional intelligence has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

SQ7 – My political intelligence has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

SQ8 – Creating an environment that enables everyone to contribute productively has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

SQ9 – My ability to build teams has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

SQ10 – Mobilizing stakeholders to ethically align our organization to the future has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

SQ11 – Fostering trust in an organization where members know themselves while respecting and understanding others has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

SQ12 – My ability to collaborate has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.
SQ13 – Supporting the exchange of ideas, solutions, and problems inside and outside the organization has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

SQ14 – My ability to create and be innovative has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

SQ15 – Integrating individual strengths and cultural differences has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

SQ16 – My personal and inter-personal skills have a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

SQ17 – Generating influence to ethically advance the organization’s vision and mission has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

SQ18 – My problem solving and decision-making skills have a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.
SQ19 – Building collaborative interactions and encouraging constructive conflict have a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

SQ20 – My ability to develop and enlist others in an organizational vision has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

Notes:

1. Each research question must be addressed.
2. Survey questions should tie directly to a research question.
3. Each survey question should have a source/rationale for asking it that ties directly to the purpose and research questions of the study so the information acquired addresses the purpose and research questions.
## Qualitative Interview Question Development Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| RQ2 – How do leaders of nonprofit victim support organizations describe the impact of the ten different TLSi domains on their effectiveness? | IQ1 – Please describe the impact of your character and integrity on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.  
  a. Please give an example of a time that this occurred.  
IQ2 – Please describe the impact of your ability to collaborate on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.  
  a. Please give an example of a time that this occurred.  
IQ3 – Please describe the impact of your ability to communicate on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.  
  a. Please give an example of a time that this occurred.  
IQ4 – Please describe the impact of your ability to create and be innovative on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.  
  a. Please give an example of a time that this occurred.  
IQ5 – Please describe the impact of your openness to diversity on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization. | Source – Larick and White, “Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory,” 2012 |
a. Please give an example of a time that this occurred.

IQ6 – Please describe the impact of your personal and inter-personal skills on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.
a. Please give an example of a time that this occurred.

IQ7 – Please describe the impact of your political intelligence on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.
a. Please give an example of a time that this occurred.

IQ8 – Please describe the impact of your problem solving and decision-making skill on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.
a. Please give an example of a time that this occurred.

IQ9 – Please describe the impact of your ability to build teams on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.
a. Please give an example of a time that this occurred.

IQ10 – Please describe the impact of your ability to develop and enlist others in an organizational vision on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.
a. Please give an example of a time that this occurred.

Notes:

1. Each research question must be addressed.
2. Interview questions should tie directly to a research question.
3. Each interview question should have a source/rationale for asking it that ties directly to the purpose and research questions of the study so the information acquired addresses the purpose and research questions.
**APPENDIX C**

**Synthesis Matrix**

**Research Study Title:** Leadership Behaviors Needed by Executive Directors of Nonprofit Victim Support Organizations

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to determine how nonprofit victim support organization leaders rate the impact of the 10 TLSi domains on their effectiveness. In addition, it was the purpose to discover how nonprofit victim support organization leaders describe the impact of each TLSi domain on their effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anderson and Jiang (2018)</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barnes and Spangenburg (2018)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baroni (2018)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrington and Shakespeare-Finch (2014)</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass (1985)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass and Avolio (1990)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass and Avolio (1998)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baum, Rahav, and Sharon (2014)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell (2013)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennis (2009)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkowitz, Lu, and Alcantara (2019)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair and Martaindale (2013)</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanchard, Zigarmi, and Zigarmi (2013)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block (1987)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brimhall (2019)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns (1998)</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron (2016)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang, Kim, and Jeon (2019)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covey (1989)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowley (2011)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis (2018)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice (2019)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drucker (1990)</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint (2017)</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeborough and Patterson (2015)</td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garton and Niemi (2019)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golinko and Qian (2018)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goold (2010)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gramlich (2019)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenleaf (1991)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grieco (2017)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guo (2012)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haecher (2017)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson, Saunders, Kilpatrick, Resnick, Crouch, and Duncan (2001)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey and Drolet</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helfgott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hickman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacoby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiley, Sehgal, Neth, Dolata, Pike, Spilsbury, Albert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killian, Hernandez-Wolfe, Engstrom, and Gangsei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klein, Riggenbach-Hays, Sollenberger, Harney, and McGarvey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konistan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larick and White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lencioni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowe and Galea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luft and Ingham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutz Allen, Smith, and Da Silva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGinty, Webster, and Barry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meindl and Ivy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noullet, Lating, Kirkhart, Dewey, and Everly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office for Victims of Crime (2020a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office for Victims of Crime (2020b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office for Victims of Crime (2020c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perrin and Anderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renard and Snelgar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roth, Eckberg, Dayton, Wheeler, Watkinson, Haberman, and Denham (2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowold, Borgmann, and Bormann (2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santilli, O'Connor Duffany, Carroll-Scott, Thomas, Greene, Arora, Agnoli, Gan, Ickovics (2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharkey, Torrats-Espinosa, and Takyar (2017)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shearer and Matsa (2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silva and Capellan (2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith and Grove (2017)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statista (2018a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statista (2018b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statista (2019a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statista (2019b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statista (2020a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statista (2020b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart and Kuenzi (2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas, Rathmann, and McGarty (2017)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weisburd, Cave, Nelson, White, Haviland, Ready, Lawton, and Sikkema (2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Harvey, and Fox (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoon, Steigerwald, Holmes, and Perzynski (2016)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York (2018)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yossef (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zardo (2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaykowski (2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmerman and Posick (2016)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Informed Consent

BRANDMAN UNIVERSITY
16355 LAGUNA CANYON ROAD
IRVINE, CA  92618

RESEARCH STUDY TITLE: Leadership Behaviors Needed by Executive Directors of Nonprofit Victim Support Organizations

RESPONSIBLE INVESTIGATOR: Timothy S. Hunt, Doctoral Candidate

TITLE OF CONSENT FORM: Consent to Participate in Research

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY: This study is being conducted for a dissertation for the Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership program at Brandman University. The purpose of this mixed methods study is to determine how nonprofit victim support organization leaders rate the impact of the 10 TLSi domains on their effectiveness. In addition, it is the purpose to discover how nonprofit victim support organization leaders describe the impact of each TLSi domain on their effectiveness.

PROCEDURES: In participating in this research study, I agree to partake in an online survey, and if I so elect during the survey and if I am selected by random drawing, I agree to partake in an audio-recorded, semi-structured interview. The interview will take place virtually using the Zoom teleconferencing system and will take approximately one hour. During the interview, I will be asked a series of questions designed to allow me to describe the impact each TLSi domain has on my effectiveness as a leader of a nonprofit victim support organization. I will be provided a handout describing each domain prior to the interview.

I understand that:

a) The possible risks or discomforts associated with this research are minimal. The survey questions are innocuous and only ask for a rating on a Likert scale with respect to the impact that each of the ten TLSi domains has on leader effectiveness. As for the interview, it may be inconvenient to spend 60 minutes in the interview. However, the interview session will be held virtually to avoid participants being in the same physical proximity with the researcher. This will help ensure the health and safety of all involved. Also, the interview will be conducted at a time that best supports the participant’s schedule.

b) I will not be compensated for my participation in this study. The results of this study may serve to establish a model of leadership traits associated with effective nonprofit victim support organization leaders. When established, the model could serve as criteria for seeking out and hiring executive directors for a wide range of victim support agencies. The model could also be used in nonprofit leadership seminars or higher education curricula, or as a guide for aspiring executive directors seeking a professional development path. Additionally, professional organizations such as the National Counsel of Nonprofits, the TCC Group, or nonprofitready.org, could use the model to help nonprofit organizations, start, grow, and excel. The findings and recommendations from this study will be made available to all participants.
c) Any questions I have concerning my participation in this study will be answered by Timothy S. Hunt, Brandman University Doctoral Candidate. I understand that Mr. Hunt may be contacted by phone at [redacted] or email at [redacted]. The dissertation chairperson may also answer questions: Dr. Phil Pendley at pendley@brandman.edu.

d) I may refuse to participate or withdraw from this study at any time without any negative consequences. Also, the investigator may stop the study at any time.

e) The interview portion of the study will be audio-recorded, and the recordings will not be used beyond the scope of this project. Audio recordings will be used to transcribe the interviews. Once the interviews are transcribed, the audio and interview transcripts will be kept for a minimum of five years by the investigator in a secure location.

f) No information that identifies me will be released without my separate consent and that all identifiable information will be protected to the limits allowed by law. If the study design or the use of the data is to be changed, I will be informed and my consent re-obtained. If I have any questions, comments, or concerns about the study or the informed consent process, I may write or call the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Brandman University, 16355 Laguna Canyon Road, Irvine, CA 92618, (949) 341-7641. I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this form and the Research Participant’s Bill of Rights.

I have read the above and understand it and hereby voluntarily consent to the procedure(s) set forth.

________________________________________________________________________
Signature of Participant or Responsible Party Date

________________________________________________________________________
Signature of Witness (if appropriate) Date

________________________________________________________________________
Signature of Principal Investigator Date
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APPENDIX G

Letter of Invitation – Email Version

Subject: Leadership Behaviors Needed by Executive Directors of Nonprofit Victim Support Organizations

Greetings Prospective Study Participant!

You are invited to participate in a study to determine the impact that Transformational Leadership Skills have on nonprofit victim support organization leader effectiveness. The main investigator of this study is Timothy S. Hunt, a Doctoral Candidate in Brandman University’s Doctor of Education in Organizational Leadership program. You were chosen to participate in this study because you are an executive director of a nonprofit victim support organization. The online survey should only require about 10-15 minutes of your time. Participation is entirely voluntary so you may withdraw from the study at any time with no negative consequences.

Survey link: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/VictimSupportLeader

PURPOSE: The purpose of this mixed methods study is to determine the impact that the ten domains of the Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory (TLSI) have on nonprofit victim support organization leader effectiveness.

PROCEDURES: If you decide to participate in the study, you will use the link above to complete the online survey. You will be asked to acknowledge that you have received and understand the Informed Consent Form and the Research Participant's Bill of Rights (both attached to this email) so please review them before you begin.

At the end of the survey, you will be offered the opportunity to participate in the interview portion of the study. If you elect to participate in the interview and you are selected during the random drawing, the researcher will interview you virtually using the Zoom teleconferencing system. During the interview, you will be asked a series of questions designed to allow you to describe the impact each TLSi domain has on your effectiveness as a leader. You will be provided a handout with descriptions of each domain prior to the interview.

RISKS, INCONVENIENCES, AND DISCOMFORTS: There are minimal risks to your participation in this research study. The survey questions are innocuous and only ask for a rating on a Likert scale with respect to the impact that each of the ten TLSi domains has on leader effectiveness. As for the interview, it may be inconvenient to spend 60 minutes in the interview. However, the interview session will be held virtually to avoid participants being in the same physical proximity with the researcher. This will help ensure the health and safety of all involved. Also, the interview will be conducted at a time that best supports the participant’s schedule.
POTENTIAL BENEFITS: The results of this study may serve to establish a model of leadership traits associated with effective nonprofit victim support organization leaders. When established, the model could serve as criteria for seeking out and hiring executive directors for a wide range of victim support agencies. The model could also be used in nonprofit leadership seminars or higher education curricula, or as a guide for aspiring executive directors seeking a professional development path. Additionally, professional organizations such as the National Council of Nonprofits, the TCC Group, or nonprofitready.org, could use the model to help nonprofit organizations, start, grow, and excel. The findings and recommendations from this study will be made available to all participants.

ANONYMITY: Records of information that you provide for the research study, and any personal information you provide, will not be linked in any way. It will not be possible to identify you as the person who provided any specific information for the study.

You are encouraged to ask questions, at any time, that will help you understand how this study will be performed and/or how it will affect you. You may contact me at [redacted] or by email at hunt3602@mail.brandman.edu. You can also contact Dr. Phil Pendley by email at pendley@brandman.edu. If you have any further questions or concerns about this study or your rights as a study participant, you may write or call the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Brandman University, 16355 Laguna Canyon Road, Irvine, CA 92618, (949) 341-7641.

Respectfully,

Timothy S. Hunt
Doctoral Candidate, Brandman University
APPENDIX H

Permission to Record the Interview

RESEARCH STUDY TITLE: Leadership Behaviors Needed by Executive Directors of Nonprofit Victim Support Organizations

BRANDMAN UNIVERSITY
16355 LAGUNA CANYON ROAD
IRVINE, CA  92618

I authorize Timothy S. Hunt, Brandman University Doctoral Candidate, to record my voice. I give Brandman University and all persons or entities associated with this research study permission or authority to use this recording for activities associated with this research study.

I understand that the recording will be used for transcription purposes and the information obtained during the interview may be published in a journal/dissertation or presented at meetings/presentations.

I will be consulted about the use of the audio recordings for any purpose other than those listed above. Additionally, I waive any right to royalties or other compensation arising correlated to the use of information obtained from the recording.

By signing this form, I acknowledge that I have completely read and fully understand the above release and agree to the outlined terms. I hereby release all claims against any person or organization utilizing this material.

_________________________________________  _______________
Signature of Participant or Responsible Party  Date
APPENDIX I

Research Participant’s Bill of Rights

BRANDMAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Research Participant’s Bill of Rights

Any person who is requested to consent to participate as a subject in an experiment, or who is requested to consent on behalf of another, has the following rights:

1. To be told what the study is attempting to discover.
2. To be told what will happen in the study and whether any of the procedures, drugs or devices are different from what would be used in standard practice.
3. To be told about the risks, side effects or discomforts of the things that may happen to him/her.
4. To be told if he/she can expect any benefit from participating and, if so, what the benefits might be.
5. To be told what other choices he/she has and how they may be better or worse than being in the study.
6. To be allowed to ask any questions concerning the study both before agreeing to be involved and during the study.
7. To be told what sort of medical treatment is available if any complications arise.
8. To refuse to participate at all before or after the study is started without any adverse effects.
9. To receive a copy of the signed and dated consent form.
10. To be free of pressures when considering whether he/she wishes to agree to be in the study.

If at any time you have questions regarding a research study, you should ask the researchers to answer them. You also may contact the Brandman University Institutional Review Board, which is concerned with the protection of volunteers in research projects. The Brandman University Institutional Review Board may be contacted either by telephoning the Office of Academic Affairs at (949) 341-9937 or by writing to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Brandman University, 16355 Laguna Canyon Road, Irvine, CA, 92618.

Brandman University IRB Adopted November 2013
APPENDIX J

Survey Questions

Instructions: Rate how much you agree with each of the statements below regarding the impact that each of the ten TLSi domains has on your effectiveness as a nonprofit victim support organization leader.

Demographic Questions

1. How many years have you spent as an executive director of a nonprofit victim support organization? [2-5; 5-10; 10 or more; less than 2]

2. How many years has your current organization been serving its community? [5-10; 10 or more; less than 5]

TLSi Domain Questions

1. Character and integrity have a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

2. Building a culture of trusting relationships that support critical and creative problem solving has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

3. My ability to communicate has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

4. Developing a culture of divergent thinking and responsible risk taking has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.
5. My openness to diversity has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

Strongly Disagree     Disagree     Somewhat Disagree     Somewhat Agree     Agree     Strongly Agree
1-------------------2-------------------3-------------------4-------------------5-------------------6

6. Demonstrating high emotional intelligence has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

Strongly Disagree     Disagree     Somewhat Disagree     Somewhat Agree     Agree     Strongly Agree
1-------------------2-------------------3-------------------4-------------------5-------------------6

7. My political intelligence has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

Strongly Disagree     Disagree     Somewhat Disagree     Somewhat Agree     Agree     Strongly Agree
1-------------------2-------------------3-------------------4-------------------5-------------------6

8. Creating an environment that enables everyone to contribute productively has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

Strongly Disagree     Disagree     Somewhat Disagree     Somewhat Agree     Agree     Strongly Agree
1-------------------2-------------------3-------------------4-------------------5-------------------6

9. My ability to build teams has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

Strongly Disagree     Disagree     Somewhat Disagree     Somewhat Agree     Agree     Strongly Agree
1-------------------2-------------------3-------------------4-------------------5-------------------6

10. Mobilizing stakeholders to ethically align our organization to the future has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

Strongly Disagree     Disagree     Somewhat Disagree     Somewhat Agree     Agree     Strongly Agree
1-------------------2-------------------3-------------------4-------------------5-------------------6

11. Fostering trust in an organization where members know themselves while respecting and understanding others has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

Strongly Disagree     Disagree     Somewhat Disagree     Somewhat Agree     Agree     Strongly Agree
1-------------------2-------------------3-------------------4-------------------5-------------------6
12. My ability to collaborate has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Somewhat Disagree  Somewhat Agree  Agree  Strongly Agree
1-----------------2-------------------3---------------------4------------------------5-----------------6

13. Supporting the exchange of ideas, solutions, and problems inside and outside the organization has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Somewhat Disagree  Somewhat Agree  Agree  Strongly Agree
1-----------------2-------------------3---------------------4------------------------5-----------------6

14. My ability to create and be innovative has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Somewhat Disagree  Somewhat Agree  Agree  Strongly Agree
1-----------------2-------------------3---------------------4------------------------5-----------------6

15. Integrating individual strengths and cultural differences has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Somewhat Disagree  Somewhat Agree  Agree  Strongly Agree
1-----------------2-------------------3---------------------4------------------------5-----------------6

16. My personal and inter-personal skills have a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Somewhat Disagree  Somewhat Agree  Agree  Strongly Agree
1-----------------2-------------------3---------------------4------------------------5-----------------6

17. Generating influence to ethically advance the organization’s vision and mission has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Somewhat Disagree  Somewhat Agree  Agree  Strongly Agree
1-----------------2-------------------3---------------------4------------------------5-----------------6

18. My problem solving and decision-making skills have a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Somewhat Disagree  Somewhat Agree  Agree  Strongly Agree
1-----------------2-------------------3---------------------4------------------------5-----------------6
19. Building collaborative interactions and encouraging constructive conflict have a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. My ability to develop and enlist others in an organizational vision has a significant impact on my effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interview Option**

1. I am interested in participating in the interview portion of this study. [yes; no]

If you answered yes, please enter your email address here [text field]. If you prefer not to associate your email with your answers in this survey, you can email the researcher, Timothy Hunt, at [redacted]. Note in the email that you are interested in participating in the interview process.
APPENDIX K

Interview Protocol

Interviewer: Timothy S. Hunt

Interview time planned: Approximately 1 hour

Interview place: Online with Zoom Teleconferencing Software

Recording: Zoom record function

Introductions:
Introduce ourselves to one another.

Opening Statement: [Interviewer states:] Thank you for taking time to meet with me and agreeing to participate in this interview. To review, the purpose of this study is to determine how nonprofit victim support organization leaders rate the impact of the ten Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory (TLSi) domains on their effectiveness, which was the survey portion of the study. In addition, the purpose is to discover how nonprofit victim support organization leaders describe the impact of each TLSi domain on their effectiveness, which is the interview portion of the study. The questions I will ask are written to elicit this information and to provide you an opportunity to share any personal stories and experiences you have had, at your discretion, throughout this interview. Also, your identity will remain anonymous so I encourage you to be open and honest for the purposes of this research study.

Interview Agenda: [Interviewer states:] I anticipate this interview will take about an hour today. As a review of the process leading up to this interview, you indicated your interest to participate at the end of the survey. You were contacted by email and provided an informed consent form that outlined the interview process and the condition of complete anonymity for this study. We will begin with reviewing the Letter of Invitation, Informed Consent Form, the Participant’s Bill of Rights, and the Audio Release Form. For the record, I have an email from you on file signifying that you have read the Informed Consent and agree to its contents, and also that you have read and agree to Audio Release Form. Next, I will begin the audio recorders and ask a list of questions related to the purpose of the study. I have provided you a handout in advance describing each of the ten TLSi domains. Feel free to use that for clarification at any time. I may take notes as the interview is being recorded. If you are uncomfortable with me taking notes, please let me know and I will only continue with the audio recording of the interview. Finally, I will stop the recorder and conclude our interview session. After your interview is transcribed, you will receive a copy of the complete transcripts to check for accuracy prior to the data being analyzed. Please remember that anytime during this process you have the right to stop the interview. If at any time you do not understand the questions being asked, please do not hesitate to ask for clarification. Are there any questions or concerns before we begin with the questions?
Content Questions: As a reminder, the purpose of the interview portion of this mixed method study is to discover how leaders of nonprofit victim support organizations describe the impact of each TLSi domain on their effectiveness. If you need clarification on any of the domains, simply refer to the handout provided or ask and I will provide clarification for you during the question for that domain.

1. **Character and Integrity** – Please describe the impact of your character and integrity on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.
   - Please give an example of a time that this occurred.

2. **Collaboration** – Please describe the impact of your ability to collaborate on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.
   - Please give an example of a time that this occurred.

3. **Communication** – Please describe the impact of your ability to communicate on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.
   - Please give an example of a time that this occurred.

4. **Creativity and Sustained Innovation** – Please describe the impact of your ability to create and be innovative on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.
   - Please give an example of a time that this occurred.

5. **Diversity** – Please describe the impact of your openness to diversity on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.
   - Please give an example of a time that this occurred.

6. **Personal and Interpersonal Skills** – Please describe the impact of your personal and inter-personal skills on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.
   - Please give an example of a time that this occurred.

7. **Political Intelligence** – Please describe the impact of your political intelligence on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.
   - Please give an example of a time that this occurred.

8. **Problem Solving and Decision Making** – Please describe the impact of your problem solving and decision-making skill on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.
   - Please give an example of a time that this occurred.

9. **Team Building** – Please describe the impact of your ability to build teams on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.
   - Please give an example of a time that this occurred.
10. **Visionary Leadership** – Please describe the impact of your ability to develop and enlist others in an organizational vision on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization.
   - Please give an example of a time that this occurred.

11. What else, if anything, has had a significant impact on your effectiveness as the leader of a nonprofit victim support organization? This would be something that you have not yet shared.
## APPENDIX L

### Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory– The 10 Domains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Character and Integrity</td>
<td>Fostering trust in the organization by creating an emotional intelligent organization whose members know themselves and know how to deal respectfully and understand others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Building a culture of trusting relationships and purposeful involvement that supports critical and creative problem solving and decision making through effective communication and conflict resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Leaders that support open communication through the exchange of ideas, solutions, and problems inside and outside the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and Sustained Innovation</td>
<td>Developing a culture of divergent thinking and responsible risk taking that harnesses the potential of available human capital to transform the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Integrate the strengths that individual and cultural differences contribute to create an organization that is equitable, respectful, and morally accountable in a global society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>Leaders that are approachable, likeable, and demonstrate high emotional intelligence in motivating others toward excellence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Intelligence</td>
<td>Generating organizational influence to ethically advocate for causes and changes that will advance the organization’s vision and mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving and Decision Making</td>
<td>Creates an environment that enables everyone to contribute productively through understanding and appreciation of differences and focus on the mission of the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>Creating an effective team by instilling a cooperative atmosphere, building collaborative interactions, and encouraging constructive conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>Creating a vision of the future as an ethical agent of change, who mobilizes stakeholders to transform the organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX M

Permission to Use the Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory

This will serve as permission for you to use the Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory (TLSi) created by Dr. Keith Larick and Dr. Patricia White, to collect data for your Dissertation research. A study of “Leadership Behaviors Needed by Executive Directors of Nonprofit Victim Support Organizations.” This authorization will extend from June 20, 2020 to September 30, 2020.

No portion of the TLSi is to be reproduced

Copyright © 2012 by Keith Larick & Patricia White

All rights reserved. No part of this survey may be reproduced or used in any manner without permission of the copyright owners.

Technical Information for Transformative Leadership Skills Inventory Validity is based on the purpose of the instrument and the extent to which it achieves that purpose. Face validity, how credible the assessment is on the part of the raters, and content validity, the extent to which the assessment covers the subject comprehensively, are two measures of validity commonly used (Jones, 1996). In the case of the Transformative Leadership Survey Inventory (TLSi), validity was established through the use of literature reviews, use of content (domain) experts, and an instrument pilot with feedback.

Face validity was established by drawing the ten domains from a synthesis of the literature on transformative leadership practices. Using a matrix of research findings, key attributes occurring in the literature which supported each domain were identified. Inventory items were then drafted to align with the authors’ conclusions of the central attributes.

Content validity was established during the process of creating domain-aligned item. Items were evaluated by experts in each domain field. As needed, items were reworded or replaced according to expert recommendation. Qualitative feedback was collected during a pilot of the instrument and items were reworded when confusion precluded a response to a particular item.

Establishing reliability for the Transformative Leadership Survey Inventory (TLSi) entailed measuring the instrument for stability, consistency and comparability (Jones, 1996). Overall reliability of the inventory was confirmed using a Split-half test of reliability resulting in a coefficient of 0.985.

The second comparison focused on the stability of each of the sets of eight items as a predictor of the entire transformative domain. Each domain was examined by correlating the mean domain rating for the eight items with the overall domain rating. Nine of the ten domains had correlations over 0.80 and the remaining domain’s correlation exceeded 0.75. “Coefficients in this range are considered good for group prediction purposes” (Gay, 1987). All coefficients fell into this range, demonstrating stability of the instrument.
## APPENDIX N

### Matrix of Qualitative Themes and Sub-themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1 – Character and Integrity</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 – Leader integrity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 – Organizational integrity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 – Accountability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 – Staff integrity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 – Values alignment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2 – Collaboration</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 – External collaboration</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 – Internal collaboration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 – Board collaboration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D3 – Communication</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 – Communication skills</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 – Listening skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 – Staff relations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 – Communication styles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 – Board relations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 – Community relations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 – Donor relations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 – Political relations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D4 – Creativity and Sustained Innovation</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 – Creativity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 – Leveraging resources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 – Risk taking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 – Sustainment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D5 – Diversity</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 – Staff diversity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 – Fostering diversity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 – Board diversity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D6 – Personal and Interpersonal Skills</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 – Staff relations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 – Outside relations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 – People skills</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 – Board relations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>Client relations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7</td>
<td>Political Intelligence</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Politician relations</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside group relations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agency awareness</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client relations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board relations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff relations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8</td>
<td>Problem Solving and Decision Making</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision quality</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowering staff</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outside perspective</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9</td>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bringing groups together</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team dynamics</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict management</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11</td>
<td>Outliers</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attributes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having a mentor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trauma informed care</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victim Services Expertise</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing experience</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonprofit experience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (n = 12)