Literature in Support of the
Standards for NCA Accredited Chapter Members
A Bibliography

January 2022

Local Service.
Global Leadership.

National Children's Advocacy Center

210 Pratt Avenue, Huntsville, AL 35801
256-533-(KIDS) 5437 • nationalcac.org

Introduction

This bibliography covers research literature in support of the five standards for National Children's Alliance accreditation of State CAC chapters. The search of the literature was conducted by the National Children's Advocacy Center's Digital Information Librarian in late summer 2017 and was limited to empirical research and reports published 2000-2017. The searches were completed by utilizing numerous research journals devoted to nonprofit research, three databases to the research literature, the Child Abuse Library Online, and Google Scholar. Annotations were written by the Digital Information Librarian.

Organization

The standards are listed separately with citations and annotations listed in date descending order beneath each standard heading. A table of contents is provided for ease of location. Links are provided to all open access publications.

Disclaimer

Neither the National Children's Alliance nor the National Children's Advocacy Center claim that this bibliography is comprehensive. It is meant to be a thorough representation of the relevant research literature in support of the standards for state chapter accreditation.

Bibliography of the Literature in Support of the Standards for NCA Accredited Chapter Members

Organizational Capacity

Tacon, R., Walters, G., & Cornforth, C. (2017). Accountability in nonprofit governance: A process-based study. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *46*(4), 685-704.

Richard Tacon, PhD, is a lecturer in management in the Department of Management at Birkbeck, University of London where he earned his doctoral degree in management. Dr. Tacon's areas of research include social capital, social networks, corporate responsibility, and non-profit governance. Geoff Walters, PhD, is Senior Lecturer in management in the Department of Management at Birkbeck, University of London where he earned his doctoral degree in management. Dr. Walters' areas of research are corporate governance and board processes. Chris Cornforth, PhD, is Emeritus Professor of Organizational Governance and Management at the Open University Business School, Milton Keynes in London. Dr. Cornforth's research focuses on the governance and leadership of third sector organizations.

This research provides an empirical exploration of what happens when a nonprofit organization is highly dependent on a single source of funding. In order to address the main research question—how is accountability constructed and enacted within boards of nonprofit organizations that are very highly dependent on a single, public funder?—the researchers conducted a longitudinal case study of one nonprofit organization in the United Kingdom that is highly dependent on a single funder to examine how accountability is constructed and enacted, with a focus on the board.

Data were collected over a 16-month period from late 2011 to early 2013 through observation of 14 meetings including six board meetings and other committee meetings; eleven interviews with joint CEO's, the chair, committee members, independent directors, and staff members; and collection of 39 key documents including board agendas, board meeting minutes, committee reports and minutes, and balanced scorecards. The interviews and observations worked together to focus the researchers' attention on key accountability issues.

Findings revealed a number of interrelated processes concerning accountability that occurred during the period of research. First, the very high level of financial dependence on one main funder meant that the board had to spend a great deal of time enacting upward, instrumental accountability to the funder. This triggered certain accountability tensions within the organization. To try to manage these tensions, board members, led by the chair, sought to construct a broader sense of lateral and downward accountability. Although it seemed initially that all board members were constructing a similar form of accountability to "the sports," closer observation suggested that

different groups of board members were constructing this in subtly divergent ways. This, in turn, created further accountability tensions. The board also sought to enact these more expressive forms of accountability, alongside the upward, instrumental accountability they clearly enacted to the main funder. However, there were a number of issues that hampered, or subverted, their attempts to do so. Fundamentally, this left the board continually constructing, but struggling to enact, a broader sense of accountability.

The authors described four main implications from the study. First, the findings provide empirical support for theoretical accounts that stress multiple types of accountability (e.g., Christensen & Ebrahim, 2006; Ebrahim, 2003; Edwards & Hulme, 1996; Kearns, 1994; Knutsen & Brower, 2010). Second, the findings show how processes of constructing accountability can differ subtly and how people can "use" different constructions of accountability. It is further suggested that while these particular findings lend basic support to Knutsen and Brower's typology of expressive accountability—to (a) the community, (b) organizational mission and (c) patrons—they suggest that, in practice, the second and third types are more specific "forms" of the first. The third main implication concerned the challenges involved in enacting expressive accountability. The findings indicate that board members can enact upward accountability in a more intangible, processual way by "involving the funder" as a kind of "absent-but-crucial" participant in board discussions and decision-making processes by anticipating what the funder would want or allow. Second, when board members sought to enact downward accountability they exacerbated the tension between the different forms of downward and lateral accountability that different groups of board members constructed. The fourth main implication concerns the multitheoretical nature of nonprofit governance. In examining how board members constructed and sought to enact accountability, the analysis focused on the microprocesses of interaction within board meetings. This revealed that accountability was constructed and enacted through (a) board members questioning and challenging the CEOs, (b) board members (especially the independents) supporting and advising the CEOs, and (c) board members and the CEOs collectively discussing issues and exchanging expert opinions.

Fredette, C., Bradshaw, P., & Krause, H. (2016). From diversity to inclusion: A multimethod study of diverse governing groups. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 45*(1_suppl), 28S-51S.

Christophe Fredette, PhD, is Associate Professor of Management at the Odette School of Business, University of Windsor, Ontario. Dr. Fredette earned the Doctor of Philosophy in Business Administration, Organizational Studies at York University's Schulich School of Business. He is an active researcher in the nonprofit sector, where he focuses on Canadian nonprofit boards of directors and the role of power, diversity and inclusion in shaping change in organizational governance and governing effectiveness. Patricia Bradshw, PhD, is Dean of the Sobey School of Business at Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia. Dr. Bradshaw earned the doctorate in Organizational Behavior, Schulich School of Business at York University. Her research interests include the study of organizational power and politics, gender and nonprofit boards of directors. Heather Krause, a statistician, is Founder and Principal Data Scientist at Datassist Consulting firm. Ontario. Krause specializes in complex research problems for nonprofit and NGO organizations.

This research explores the dynamics of diversity and inclusion in the context of boards of directors in the nonprofit sector. The research combined qualitative and quantitative measures to explore social microprocesses of inclusion in diverse governing groups.

The qualitative component of the research involved semistructured interviews with key informants in the nonprofit sector. Using snowball sampling, 18 respondents were included based primarily on their long-standing leadership and experience with boards of directors in the nonprofit sector. Questions focused on the informant's personal experiences as a board member as well as their efforts to increase the participation of other diverse board members.

Functional inclusion emerged as goal-driven and purposeful inclusion of individuals identified from diverse or traditionally marginalized communities. Functional inclusion at the level of the board was described as inherently embedded in stakeholder views and was characterized by greater representation of diverse communities and deliberate efforts to modify the composition of the board through member selection. Functional inclusion, according to informants, supports a conscious and purposeful inclusion of people from diverse and traditionally marginalized communities for the benefit of the constituents served by the organization. Based on the thematic analysis of the interview transcripts, the authors came to define social inclusion as embeddedness in the social context and fabric of the board of directors based on relational bonds. Another theme from the interviews was that a strong and welcoming organizational culture was depicted as one way of increasing feelings of inclusion, thereby reducing detachment and turnover. A third theme revealed was that diversity brings growth and energy.

The authors conducted a survey of the Canadian nonprofit sector. 825 organizations were contacted based on their association with Imagine Canada; slightly more than 28% of the organizations responded by having a chief executive officer (CEO), executive director, or board chairperson (depending on organization structure) complete a lengthy questionnaire. This yielded a final sample of 234 organizations. Respondents were asked to provide information about the current demographic composition of their board. The boards' orientation to functional and social inclusion was also measured. Variables and measures included *diversity* (the ethno-cultural composition of the boards of directors, more specifically, the range of diversity reflected on the board based on ethnic origin and visible minority status), *functional and social exchange, board-level outcomes, board effectiveness, board cohesion, and board commitment*.

Findings reflected the continued challenges of diversity, where the impact of increasing diversity on board performance and viability is largely contingent on the boards' commitment to inclusion. Unlike previous research that has illustrated that the risk of performance decline and destructive conflict tend to increase in association with diversity (Jehn et al., 1999), findings of this study indicated that bringing inclusion into the foreground can be an important mechanism in reshaping the diversity–performance relationship within nonprofit boards of directors. Findings also indicated that that neither functional nor social approaches to inclusion alone are sufficient to allow governing groups to be truly inclusive. Boards need to consider diversity in terms of inclusion, with potential to influence the group in its entirety, not only transforming composition but also transforming cultural and structural parameters. Survey respondents shared an acute concern for the performance of the board and its mission but tempered this with how they contributed to shaping these activities. Blending functional and social approaches to inclusion is essential to achieving more transformative inclusion.

The researchers caution against instrumental motivations, wherein adding diversity is purposeful and deliberately undertaken for the explicit benefit of the organization. They explain that without a structural and cultural infrastructure to support greater inclusion, organizations put at risk all of the benefits the organization sought to gain from greater diversity in the first place. The authors conclude by suggesting that significant opportunities for meaningful change by shifting focus from diversity to inclusion, not just in the boardroom but well beyond by restoring balance in the conversation of diversity and inclusion away from an overreliance on social inclusion and processes such as team building and cross-cultural training to also formally embed inclusion in the work plans and ongoing practices of the board.

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Lee, Y. J. (2016). What encourages nonprofits' adoption of good governance policies?.
Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 27(1), 95-112.

Young-Joo Lee, PhD, is associate professor in public and nonprofit management at the University of Texas at Dallas. Lee earned the PhD in Public Administration at the University of Georgia. Dr. Lee's research interests include nonprofit management, governance, and inter-sectoral collaboration; volunteering and volunteer management; and public management.

This study examines how nonprofits' external environments and organizational characteristics explain their likelihood of having written policies for good governance. In existing nonprofit literature, the term governance generally refers to the operations of boards of directors, and scholars agree on the centrality and fundamentality of board governance in nonprofit accountability (Stone and Ostrower, 2007). One of the most significant developments that has influenced nonprofit governance in the United States is the passage of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX) in 2002. Although SOX requirements were for publicly traded companies, The Panel on the Nonprofit Sector has also issued guidelines for all nonprofit organizations that encourage them to adopt written policies for good governance from the SOX, including conflict of interest, document retention, and whistleblower protection. Good governance standards as written policies have important implications in nonprofit management, including: written rules shape organizational dynamics, the awareness of written policies on ethical behavior affects members' conduct, and written policies have a visibility and durability that make them distinctive elements of organizational governance. This study focused on a set of policies for good governance in SOX, including whistleblower protection policies, conflict of interest policies, document destruction policies, and processes for determining the compensation of organizations' top management officials.

The methodology utilized was examination of the 2010 Statistics of Income Sample (SOI) data, which include detailed financial information for a random sample of organizations that file IRS Form 990 or 990 EZ. The focus was limited to 501(c)(3) public charities that filed Form 990 for the 2010 tax year. These organizations account for the vast majority (95.21 percent) of the nonprofit organizations that filed Form 990 in that year. The study tested how a nonprofit's external environment and organizational characteristics predict the organization's likelihood of adopting good governance policies. The measures of a nonprofit organization's external environment, including state regulations regarding annual reporting and registration, funding from government grants, and metropolitan status. The measures of organizational characteristics, included the organization's governance structure, activity, size, and age. The four areas of good governance tested in the study are (1) whether an organization has a whistleblower protection policy; (2) whether it has two conflict of interest policies: the annual disclosure of covered persons policy and the regular monitoring and enforcement of conflicts of interest policy; (3) whether it has a document retention and destruction policy; and (4) whether it has an independent committee for CEO compensation.

The results indicate that the strongest and most consistent predictor of the adoption of the five good governance standards is organizational size. Organizations with more than a hundred paid employees are 3 to 10 percentage points more likely to adopt all five policies than organizations with fewer than a hundred employees. Findings also indicated that when an organization's revenue increases by 1 percent, it is 5.6 percentage points more likely to adopt whistleblower protection policies, 4 percentage points more likely to adopt an annual disclosure of covered persons policy, 4.3 percentage points more likely to regularly monitor and enforce conflicts of interest, 4.7 percentage points more likely to have a document destruction policy, and 4.4 percentage points more likely to have a CEO compensation policy. Results also showed that organizations with elected boards are more likely to have policies for whistleblower protection and conflicts of interests, but less likely to involve an independent committee in the review and approval of CEO compensation than are organizations with other forms of governing boards. Also indicated was that organizations located in metropolitan areas are more likely to have policies for whistleblower protection, annual disclosure of covered persons, regular monitoring, and CEO compensation.

The results of this study suggest that organizational governance structure is related to such mechanisms as protecting whistleblowers, preventing conflicts of interests, and establishing compensation processes for CEOs. The researcher stated that most notably, the results of the study show that an organization's size, as measured by its human and financial resources, is positively associated with the adoption of all five accountability policies. Financial resources, in particular, predict an organization's adoption of accountability policies in all of the areas examined. Lee also posited that the negative association between having an elected board and having an independent committee for CEO compensation may suggest that board members view the creation of a separate independent committee as unnecessary because they, having been elected by the members, believe that they can make compensation decisions fairly without establishing a separate committee.

Lee suggested that the results of the study suggest that the differences in organizational capacity to develop and implement good governance policies attribute to the gap in accountability policies. She further suggested that the results imply that nonprofit management education and training programs should incorporate good governance policies and best practices in their curriculum to promote improved understanding of such policies among current and prospective nonprofit staff and board members.

The researcher declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Marx, J., & Davis, C. (2012). Nonprofit governance: Improving performance in troubled economic times. *Administration in Social Work, 36*(1), 40-52.

Jerry Marx, PhD, is Associate Professor of Social Work in the Department of Social Work, University of New Hampshire. Marx earned the PhD at Boston College. Before earning his PhD, he served as Executive Director of a community-based agency in Portland, Maine. Dr. Marx's research focuses on social policy and administration with an emphasis on nonprofit management. Christie Davis, MA, is Director of the UNH Social Work Outreach Center at the University of New Hampshire. Davis earned a master's degree in social work from the University of New Hampshire.

The authors begin by noting that several challenges to nonprofit governance during difficult economic times have been demonstrated in the research literature. Among these challenges are: 1) executive directors of nonprofit agencies continue to deal with disengaged boards, boards that are burnt out and unenthusiastic, feuding board members seeking power and control, and overly compliant boards offering little or no direction to the agency, and 2) a major source of problems in nonprofit agencies is the conflicting conception of the division of labor between the board of directors and the executive director. Marx and Davis describe three models to help address the question, "When staff members are hired, who does what? (p. 41)".

In the "hierarchical" model of nonprofit governance (also called the "traditional" model, Carver & Carver, 1997), the board of directors defines the purpose of the agency in terms of its mission, vision, and values, and sets policy parameters for achieving this purpose. It is then the responsibility of the executive director to execute policy around key functional areas (fundraising, program development, staff development, etc.). Often within this model there is little formal evaluation of organizational outcomes except in the area of finances. The second model is the "policy governance" model (Carver & Carver, 1997). In this model, the board establishes and regularly reviews the purpose of the agency in terms of agency mission, vision, and values; it then holds the executive director accountable for achieving organizational outcomes in a legal, ethical, and prudent manner through a rigorous evaluation processes. A third model is the "partnership" model (Linnel, Radosevich, & Spack, 2002). Marx and Davis describe this model as one in which board of directors and executive director (and the rest of the staff) collaborate closely on both policy and operational management. There is no role or function for which either board or staff is exclusively responsible. All participate in establishing and reviewing the agency purpose (mission, vision, values). Everyone is held accountable for agency outcomes. Since there is no clearly, commonly accepted model of nonprofit governance, the authors sought to address the dilemma by documenting what nonprofit boards of directors and executive directors normally do in practice "in the real world" (p. 42).

The method for collecting this data was a self-administered questionnaire adapted from that used in the 2007 BoardSource survey, to obtain information from nonprofit executive directors in the study. During February and March 2009, a total of 114 executive directors representing a wide range of nonprofit fields and disciplines, completed the online survey. The questionnaire consisted of six sections: general information, board composition, board development, board structures, board performance, and oversight policies and practices.

More than half of the executive directors surveyed indicated that evaluations of board performance are conducted. Nearly a quarter of participants stated that board performance is evaluated "every 2–3 years." This was the most common time frame for those that do some sort of formal evaluation of board performance. However, almost half of respondents stated that they "never" conduct a formal, written evaluation of board performance. The executive directors surveyed indicated that on average 9.26 formal board meetings are held annually, each lasting approximately two hours in length. Respondents stated that at any given board meeting an average of 78.9% of board members are in attendance. Executive directors indicated that the structure of their respective boards includes a variety of sub-committees created for specific tasks and responsibilities. Findings also indicated that executive directors feel they are more involved in specific board tasks than board members, but generally most tasks are close to being equally shared. Half of the executive directors surveyed stated that every board member at their respective organization makes a personal financial contribution, while only approximately 7% of executive directors stated that none of their board members contribute financially

The results of this survey of executive directors of nonprofit agencies indicates that about two-thirds of nonprofits represented in this survey define their roles and responsibilities only "occasionally." The authors posit that this infrequency of role/responsibility clarification and self-evaluation by nonprofit boards may contribute to the previously described problems between executive directors and nonprofit boards. They also state that a source of role confusion stems from the fact that 50% of executive directors in this study set the agenda for board meetings entirely by themselves. Thus, it appears that executive directors are relied upon heavily by their boards for direction at least on a month-to-month basis at board meetings. However, the study's findings suggest that nonprofit organizations in this survey exhibited a shared responsibility on the part of the board and executive director for major governance responsibilities. Therefore, those in the study appeared most closely associated with the previously described "partnership" model of nonprofit governance. Although fundraising and the monitoring of organizational performance outcomes were also shared, nonprofit boards of directors in this sample tended to rely more on the executive director in carrying out these responsibilities.

Marx and Davis suggest four implications from the study results. First, they recommend that yearly reviews be conducted of the way a given nonprofit agency wishes to distribute roles and responsibilities among board members and the executive director. They also recommend that role

clarification should be included as part of the orientation and job descriptions for new board members each year. The second recommendation is that the chair of board subcommittees do a yearly review of "board versus staff" roles and responsibilities for their respective committees. Third, they recommend that if fundraising is to truly be a shared responsibility between the board and executive director and not primarily delegated to the executive director, then board members should be trained regarding the solicitation of perspective individual donors. Lastly, Marx and Davis recommend that due to the relatively heavy responsibility on executive directors for fundraising in this study, social work graduate education should consider requiring its macro/social administration students to take a course in nonprofit organizational development that includes significant content on fundraising

The researcher declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Bear, S., Rahman, N., & Post, C. (2010). The impact of board diversity and gender composition on corporate social responsibility and firm reputation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *97*(2), 207-221.

Stephen Bear is Assistant Professor of Management at Fairleigh Dickinson University. He earned the PhD at Pace University where he was a doctoral student at the time of this publication. His expertise and research are in mentoring, human resources and business ethics. Dr. Bear teaches courses in human resource management, organizational behavior, business ethics and career strategies. Noushi Rahman is Professor of Management Science at the Lubin School of Business at Pace University. Dr. Rahman earned the PhD in business at the City University of New York. Corrine Post is Associate Professor of Management at Lehigh University. She earned the PhD in Organizational Management at Rutgers University. Dr. Post's research interests center on gender and racial differences in individual work experiences and career trajectories, as well as on the effects of diversity on innovation and performance, including boards of directors.

This article examines how the diversity of board resources and the number of women on boards affect firms' corporate social responsibility (CSR) ratings, and then, how CSR influences corporate reputation. The researchers begin by examining previous literature that provides the basis for the study. The authors cite studies demonstrating that having more women on boards enhances firms' reputations. They also cite studies that have demonstrated a broad range of benefits associated with corporations' positive reputations. Lastly, they cite studies that have identified a wide range of factors that contribute to a positive reputation. They make the following assumption based on prior research: "With the increased public scrutiny around boards and corporate governance, one expects board composition to affect corporate reputation, especially when it comes to characteristics such as the diversity of board resources and board gender composition" (p. 207).

Literature in Support of the Standards for NCA Accredited Chapter Members

Five hypotheses were developed based upon the extant literature: 1) CSR strength ratings are positively associated with corporate reputation, 2) Diversity of director resources is positively associated with CSR strength ratings, 3) The number of women board members is positively associated with CSR strength ratings, 4) CSR strength ratings mediate the relationship between the diversity of board resources and corporate reputation, and 5) CSR strength ratings mediate the relationship between the number of women board members and corporate reputation.

Data for the dependent variable (corporate reputation) in the study were obtained from the *Fortune 2009 World's Most Admired Companies List* based on a survey published in March 2009 which covers 64 industries. The study sample was drawn from the health care industry. The mediator variables (institutional strength and technical strength) were obtained from the Kinder, Lydenberg, Domini (KLD) social ratings database. The two independent variables in the model were the diversity of director resources and the number of women on the board. Analyses of the data were conducted by first determining the relationship between the independent variables and the mediator variable (CSR ratings). Second, the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable (overall corporate reputation) was assessed.

Hypothesis one, CSR strength ratings are positively associated with corporate reputation, was supported. Hypothesis two, diversity of director resources is positively associated with CSR strength ratings, was not supported. Hypothesis three, the number of women board members is positively associated with CSR strength ratings, was supported. Hypothesis four, CSR strength ratings mediate the relationship between the diversity of board resources and corporate reputation, was not supported. The final hypothesis, CSR strength ratings mediate the relationship between the number of women board members and corporate reputation, was supported.

The researchers suggest both theoretical and managerial implications from these results. For theoretical consideration, they suggest that these results extend previous theory by demonstrating that the number of women on the board has a positive relationship with the strength ratings for CSR. They also suggest that the results confirm the positive impact of KLD strength ratings for corporate responsibility on overall reputation. They suggest that another contribution to theory is the finding that institutional strength and technical strength mediate the impact of women on the board on overall corporate reputation. The researchers divide the applied implications into those for boards and those for investors. They assert that for boards, the "positive impact of gender diversification is significant as having more female directors can enhance critical board processes including analysis and decision making" (p. 217). For investors, they suggest that this research provides an additional tool when assessing potential investments. This would come about due to board changes that may provide important signals to investors indicating the potential for improved reputation and financial performance.

Limitations of the study were twofold. The study sample was composed of large firms from the healthcare industry. The authors suggest future studies should include additional industries, as well as smaller sized firms. Lastly, they suggest that future research should examine how board processes change as the number of women increases.

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Bryson, J. M. (2010). The future of public and nonprofit strategic planning in the United States. *Public Administration Review, 70*, S255-S267.

John M. Bryson, PhD, is McKnight Presidential Professor of Planning and Public Affairs at the Hubert H. Humphrey School of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota. Bryson earned a PhD in urban and regional planning from the University of Wisconsin. His areas of research are leadership, strategic management, and the design of organizational and community change processes.

Bryson begins with a brief review of the types of entities successfully use strategic planning as well as the derived benefits. Among the types of entities listed as successful users are Nonprofit organizations providing public services. Benefits listed included promotion of strategic thinking, acting, and learning, improved decision making, enhanced organizational effectiveness, responsiveness, and resilience, improved organizational legitimacy, and direct benefits for the people involved.

Next, Bryson reviews definitions, functions, and approaches to strategic planning and management. He defines strategic planning as a "deliberative, disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what an organization (or other entity) is (its identity), what it does (its strategies and actions), and why it does it (mandates, mission, goals, and the creation of public value)" (p. S257). He distinguishes between planning and implementation, asserting that strategic planning, frame setting and guidance for subsequent decision making are prevalent, while in implementation, the focus is on sustained action within the constraints of mandates, mission, goals, and strategies, while being open to new learning that may affect the framework for action. He further posits that the functions served by strategic planning and implementation are complementary. Strategic planning involves reasonably deliberative and disciplined work around clarifying organizational purposes and the requirements and likely strategies for success. He states that although several distinctive approaches to strategic planning and implementation have been developed, there is no one-size-fits-all approach.

In the next section, the author provides some reasons behind why strategic planning has become standard practice. Historically, until the 1980's it was used almost exclusively in the private sector. During the 1980s, "a time of resource shortages and rising citizen activism, strategic planning helped senior managers make substantively, procedurally, politically, and administratively rational decisions" (p. S258). Municipal governments began to incorporate strategic planning with great success. These successes at the municipal level, as well as the desire to appear more "business-like," helped spur the use of strategic planning by nonprofit organizations, states, and the federal government. Bryson notes that a significant reason that strategic planning has become so prevalent is that numerous studies indicate that it works, and that it does so in a variety of situations.

In the next section, Bryson discusses strategic planning as practice, rather than just as theory. He sees the need for it to be widely understood as a managerial practice or set of practices— instead of a means to producing objects called "strategic plans" that somehow are meant to implement themselves. He discusses *practice theory* and its implications for putting plans into practice. He emphasizes that in the future the focus should be upon strategic planning as a practice, or set of interrelated practices, and not as an entity abstracted far from practice.

In the following section, Bryson puts forth several predictions about the future of strategic planning practice and research. From his view at the time of the writing (2010), he asserts that the need for strategic thinking, acting, and learning will increase throughout the decade to follow. He also states that although they may be called by other names, approaches or designs for strategic planning will continue to be generated. Related to this, he states that there will be pressure "for more inclusive approaches, both for intra- and interorganizational change efforts, along with greater knowledge of effective practices for doing so" (p. S261), and that subsequently, there will be need for the use of methods that integrate analysis and synthesis into strategic planning processes. Furthermore, Bryson indicates that as strategic planning becomes more integrated with other elements of strategic management, major attention will be focused on highlighting and resolving issues of alignment so that coherent, consistent, persuasive, and effective patterns are established across mission, policies, budgets, strategies, competencies, actions, and results. Lastly, he posits that a next phase for strategic planning and strategic management will be incorporating more directly ideas and practices for fostering organizational learning and knowledge management.

Conclusions drawn by the author include the belief that academics are increasingly providing more useful guidance for improving strategic planning practice, due in large part to their taking practice seriously as a topic for research and in developing methods for learning from vicarious experience. He further concludes that professional public affairs education also has an important role to play. Lastly, he affirms that an increased focus on the actual practice of strategic planning will help improve the field, particularly as academic knowledge affects issues of how to learn from and improve practice.

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Greenlee, J., Fischer, M., Gordon, T., & Keating, E. (2007). An investigation of fraud in nonprofit organizations: Occurrences and deterrents. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 36*(4), 676-694.

Janet Greenlee, PhD, who earned the doctoral degree in accounting at the University of Kentucky, is Professor Emeritus at the University of Dayton. Her research interests include the influence of accounting and other information on decisions in the nongovernmental and nonprofit sectors. Mary Fisher, PhD, is Professor of accounting in the college of Business and Technology at the University of Texas at Tyler. Dr. Fisher earned a PhD in accounting at the University of Connecticut. Among her research interests are financial accounting recognition; and reporting and nonprofit organization financial management. Teresa Gordon, PhD, is Professor Emeritus of accounting at the University of Idaho. Dr. Gordon earned the doctorate in accounting at the University of Houston. Her primary research interests center around the uses of accounting information in the decision making of nonprofit and governmental organizations and their donors. Elizabeth Keating, PhD, is Assistant Professor of Public Policy in the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. She earned her PhD in management from the Sloan School of Management at MIT.

The purpose of this research was to report on the types of fraud they identified in nonprofit organizations and the characteristics of both the victims and the perpetrators of the fraudulent activities. The researchers explained that at the time of writing, recent media reports suggest that the level of fraud might be extensive. They also site the fact that empirical research examining fraud had been conducted in the business sector (Carcello & Nagy, 2004; Sharma, 2004), with the little existing research into nonprofit sector fraud based on newspaper reports. Therefore, this research analyzed information on actual fraud cases reported by *Association of Certified Fraud Examiners* (ACFE) members.

The authors list four elements that must exist for fraud to be present: A statement is materially false, knowledge that the statement is false when made, a victim relies on the statement, and the victim suffers damages as a result of relying on the false statement. They explain that of the four types of fraud; occupational, consumer, insurance, and Medicare, this research would focus solely upon occupational fraud. More specifically, the focus would be upon *occupational fraud,* defined as "the use of one's occupation for personal enrichment through the deliberate misuse or misapplication of the employing organization's resources or assets" (Wells, 2005, p. 44), within nonprofit organizations. The researchers premised that similar to that of the business sector, fraud among nonprofit entities also may be on the rise. Furthermore, they point to previous research that

has suggested fraud may be easier to perpetrate in a nonprofit organization due to an atmosphere of trust, the difficulty in verifying certain revenue streams, weaker internal controls, lack of business and financial expertise, and reliance on volunteer boards are all contributory factors (Douglas & Mills, 2000).

The authors explained that since 1996, the ACFE has surveyed their members annually regarding the details of fraud cases that the ACFE members have investigated. The report utilized for purposes of this analysis was *ACFE's Report to the Nation on Occupational Fraud and Abuse* (2005) which focused on both internal and external fraud. Five hundred eight cases of occupational fraud, representing more than $761 million in losses, are studied in depth. This report focused primarily upon business organizations. Therefore, article uses the 2004 survey data provided by the ACFE to conduct a more in-depth examination of occupational fraud in the nonprofit sector. The instrument used by the ACFE collected data on six domains: cost of occupational fraud, methods used to commit fraud, methods used to detect fraud, characteristics of the organizations victimized by fraud, characteristics of the perpetrators of fraud, and legal outcomes of the fraud. There were 58 reported cases of occupational fraud occurring in nonprofit organizations.

The findings were reported by the six areas listed above. Perpetrators were all employees, managers, or executives of the victimized organization. The typical (median) fraud case was committed by a woman with no criminal record who earned less than $50,000 per year and had worked for the nonprofit for at least 3 years. The typical victim-organization employed less than 100 people and had been in operation for 30 years. 18.6% of the frauds involved collusion. The types of fraud fell under three major types: asset misappropriation, corruption, and financial statement fraud. Asset misappropriation which accounted for 97% of reported frauds, was the most common. The most common type of asset misappropriation involved cash, which may be conducted via skimming, larceny, or fraudulent disbursements. Corruption, the wrongful use of influence in a business transaction to procure benefits for one's self or others at the expense of one's employer, occurred in slightly more than 20% of the cases. The third type of fraud, use of fraudulent financial statements, occurred in three of the 58 cases. Although this type of fraud was least prevalent, "the median loss from the three cases of financial statement fraud, at $3 million, was 30 times greater than the median $100,000 loss from asset misappropriations" (p. 686). The median loss to organizations reporting corruption as part of the fraud was $189,400. For the question of how frauds were discovered, more than 43% of the frauds were detected by tips, with half of those coming from employees, whereas a quarter of the frauds were detected by the internal audit department. Interestingly, tips from vendors led to detection of the frauds with the greatest losses. Also, more than 22% of the reported frauds were caught by accident, whereas only 12% were found by the external auditor. The authors noted that although internal controls and internal and external audits were useful in identifying one third of the fraud cases, no reduction in the size of fraud losses for those nonprofit organizations that had internal or external audits was found. Consistent with previous literature (Fremont-Smith & Kosaras, 2003; Midkiff, 2004), was the fact

that nearly two thirds of the reported frauds were discovered as the result of tips or by accident. The findings on punishment indicated that seventy-two percent of the nonprofit frauds resulted in termination, but 7% resulted in no punishment. Large losses were more commonly referred for criminal prosecution. Of the cases resulting in criminal prosecution, 70% of the accused pled guilty or no contest and there were five acquittals.

The research team offered lessons learned and possible prevention strategies learned from this research. First, they refer to Albrecht, Howe, and Rommey (1984) who stated that although perpetrators are difficult to profile and fraud is difficult to predict, there are possible red flags to watch for. The main personal characteristic of perpetrators to watch for was high personal debts and living beyond one's means. The chief organizational characteristics were a lack of enforcement of clear lines of authority and proper procedures for authorization of transactions. Prevention strategies fell into three categories: protection, board membership, and audit committee. The researchers suggest that nonprofits should not wait until after a loss from fraud has occurred to invest in insurance or surety bonds. This usually requires that someone other than the treasurer reviews the monthly financial statements, while it also requires an annual audit. The authors suggest that improving the quality of the board may improve accountability and decrease fraud. According to the authors, "the board can help set the 'tone at the top' for ethical behavior by (a) providing a model for ethical behavior and (b) communicating expectations of ethical behavior for employees, particularly for employees unable to directly observe management behavior (p. 689). This is in line with best practices of a strong board of directors that, in turn, creates an audit committee to deter or detect financial mismanagement and other fraud. The audit committee should serve as the interface and link between the board and the independent auditor. In the current study, only 10% of the cases were detected by the annual external audit. Although the authors suggest prevention strategies such as background checks, periodic review of internal controls, and insurance and bonding for employees with access to cash, they stress that the most important strategy is the education of employees about the consequences of fraud.

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Herman, R. D., & Renz, D. O. (2000). Board practices of especially effective and less effective local nonprofit organizations. *The American Review of Public Administration, 30*(2), 146-160.

Robert D. Herman is a professor at the Cookingham Institute of Public Affairs of the Bloch School of Business and Public Administration, University of Missouri at Kansas City. David O. Renz is director of the Midwest Center for Nonprofit Leadership and associate professor at the Cookingham Institute of Public Affairs of the Bloch School of Business and Public

Administration, University of Missouri at Kansas City. Dr. Renz earned his PhD in organization theory and administration from the University of Minnesota. Renz's research focuses on the leadership and management of nonprofit and public service organizations, with emphasis on governance, the leadership of organizational innovation and transformational change and organizational effectiveness.

In this study, the researchers hypothesize that nonprofit organizations' effectiveness is related to the effectiveness of their boards of directors. They state that the prescriptive responsibilities that boards are expected to meet are based both in a legal requirement and on a moral assumption. In addition to these requirements is the interest in and promotion of the concept of nonprofit entrepreneurship. They assert that despite the impact of greater commercialization and the array other influences complicating nonprofit organization behavior boards continue to be called on for governance and leadership responsibilities including decisions about organizational missions, programs, financing, and the performance of its own work.

The authors provide a brief literature review reporting that previous work by Holland and colleagues to develop a board self-assessment instrument provided strong evidence that effective boards are related to effective organizations. They also report on previous research that found differences of judgment between the CEOs and board members of various boards' practices and effectiveness and of organizational effectiveness. Additionally, previous research by Herman and Rentz found that that the extent of certain board practices was correlated with the CEOs' judgment of board effectiveness but not with judgments by board members or funders. Furthermore, they also found that judgments of board effectiveness were strongly related to judgments of organizational effectiveness.

To test their hypothesis that nonprofit organizations' effectiveness is related to the effectiveness of their boards of directors, Herman and Rentz examined two types of nonprofit organizations in a large metropolitan area—those health and welfare service providers that receive allocations from the local United Way (46 organizations) and those organizations that provide services to persons with developmental disabilities (18 organizations). Data were collected on several variables: use of various prescribed board practices, objective organizational effectiveness criteria, judgments of the effectiveness of boards, judgments of the effectiveness of the organizations, and other organizational characteristics, such as age, total revenues, and strategies. They developed an objective organizational effectiveness criteria list through group meetings with executives, technical assistance providers, and funders. To measure board effectiveness judgments, they adapted the items in the *Self-Assessment for Nonprofit Governing Boards* developed by Slesinger. Subsequently, they developed a survey instrument to measure nonprofit organizational effectiveness. Financial data were collected from IRS Form 990, while data on such variables as organizational age and change management strategies were collected during interviews with chief executives.

The results showed that on average, the top 10 nonprofit organizations use 68% of the recommended board practices and that the bottom 10 use 56%. Although the difference is small, they found that "those practices that are used more frequently by the especially effective boards include (a) board self-evaluation, (b) written expectations about giving and soliciting contributions, and (c) the chief executive's role in board nominations" (p. 156). A second finding was that the top 10 organizations reported using 86% of the correct procedures, whereas the bottom 10 used 70%. Results also showed fairly strong support for the hypothesis that nonprofit organizational effectiveness, "whether conceived as a real property or as socially constructed judgment," is related to board effectiveness.

The researchers offered two conclusions about board effectiveness. The first conclusion which is supported by other research was that nonprofit organizational effectiveness is strongly related to board effectiveness. They also note that the reverse may be true, that organizational effectiveness may lead to board effectiveness. Similar to previous research, the second conclusion was that many boards do not fully meet their governance and management responsibilities. Lastly, Herman and Rentz assert, the results "justify and support the value of dissemination and adoption of many of the commonly recommended board practices. Furthermore, clear support exists for the value in board members' and chief executives' investments in enhancing the skills and practices that help boards to more effectively meet their responsibilities" (p. 158).

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Membership

Johansen, M., & LeRoux, K. (2013). Managerial networking in nonprofit organizations: The impact of networking on organizational and advocacy effectiveness. *Public Administration Review, 73*(2), 355-363.

Morgen Johansen, PhD, is assistant professor in the Public Administration Program and the Public Policy Center at the University of Hawaii. Dr. Johansen earned her PhD at Texas A & M university. Her current research focuses on the differences and similarities of public and nonprofit management, as well as the contexts that influence the impact of management on organizational performance. Kelly LeRoux, PhD, is Associate Professor and Director of Undergraduate Studies in the Department of Public Administration at the University of Illinois at Chicago. Her current research focuses on nonprofits' voter mobilization and political advocacy activities, as well as issues of nonprofit performance, accountability, and networking.

Johansen and Leroux begin with review of the literature emphasizing that research on public, private, and nonprofit organizations finds that managers can improve performance through networking. They cite literature supporting the notion that networking facilitates learning by

sharing explicit and tacit knowledge. They explain that most research on networking has focused on *formal* networking and thus, their emphasis upon looking at *informal* networking in nonprofit organizations that could reveal useful insights about the impact of managerial networking choices on nonprofit organizations. The researchers explore the impact of nonprofit managerial networking on nonprofit effectiveness by using a common way of measuring networking—managerial contact with multiple actors, such as other nonprofit agencies, local business groups, and government agencies, as well as the frequency of that contact. They assume that "all contact is the same and that more contact is better for performance" (p. 356). The authors used the Meier and O'Toole public management model, which links management activities of agencies to their performance. The model assumes that managerial networking enhances the ability of managers to navigate their environment.

Two basic questions were asked in this research: does managerial networking by nonprofit executives lead to increased organizational effectiveness? Second, does networking produce greater effectiveness in nonprofits' advocacy efforts? The data used in this analysis were from a larger project known as the *Meeting the Needs of America's Communities* study. This project surveyed nonprofit social service organizations in 16 U.S. metropolitan areas concerning the service roles and responsibilities of these organizations and about their relationships with other institutions in their communities. Surveys were administered by mail in three waves to 634 organizations during the summer of 2008. Most of the surveys were completed by executive directors of chief executive officers of the agencies, with a total of 314 surveys completed. The survey asked nonprofit executives for their perceptions of effectiveness on six different measures: making strategic decisions, increasing the organization's funding, raising public awareness of the organization's cause, meeting funders' performance expectations, responding timely to client complaints, and influencing governments' priorities or agenda. The two dependent variables examined were organizational effectiveness and advocacy effectiveness.

Regarding the effects of networking, the hypotheses that community networking has a positive and statistically significant effect on organizational effectiveness were partially supported. The hypothesis that   governance capacity and board diversity both have a positive and statistically significant effect on organizational effectiveness was supported. Results showed that the hypotheses regarding the effects of networking upon affects advocacy effectiveness. were partially supported because political networking by nonprofit executives was found to increase the effectiveness of the organization's advocacy efforts, while "managerial networking with local businesses, churches, and other nonprofits (community networking) had no statistically significant impact on advocacy effectiveness" (p. 361).

The findings were largely consistent with those of the previous empirical public management networking studies. First, that managerial networking benefits nonprofit organizations and second,

that different types of networking benefit different outcomes. Of significance was the finding that political networking increases advocacy effectiveness, and community networking increases general organizational effectiveness. Johansen and LeRoux conclude that since the study revealed that different types of networking benefit different types of performance outcomes, "managers of nonprofit organizations that do not receive any government funding or place policy and political matters lower on their list of organizational priorities will likely choose to invest less time in political networking and spend more time interacting with those who may be useful in helping the organization increase its general effectiveness" (361).

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Cross, R., Parker, A., Prusak, L., & Borgatti, S. P. (2001). Knowing what we know: Supporting knowledge creation and sharing in social networks. *Organizational Dynamics, 30*(2), 100-120.

Rob Cross, PhD, is an assistant professor at the McIntire School of Commerce at the University of Virginia. and a research fellow within IBM's Institute for Knowledge Management. Dr. Cross holds a doctorate from Boston University's school of management. He currently leads a stream of research for the Institute on social capital. Andrew Parker is an associate consultant with IBM's Institute for Knowledge Management. He is currently conducting social network research with 30 member-companies to develop insight into knowledge creation and sharing activities. He earned his M.Sc. from the London School of Economics. Larry Prusak is executive director of the Institute for Knowledge Management. He has extensive research and consulting experience, within the U.S. and internationally, in helping organizations leverage and optimize their information and knowledge resources. Steve Borgatti is an associate professor of organizational behavior at the Carroll School of Management, Boston College. He earned the PhD at the University of California at Irvine. His research is in the area of social network theory and methodology.

The researchers describe the issue of the importance of the relationships that people rely on to accomplish their work in an economy where collaboration and innovation are increasingly central to organizational effectiveness. They assert that improving efficiency and effectiveness in knowledge-intensive work demands more than new technologies—it requires attention to the ways that people seek out knowledge, and learn from and solve problems with other people in organizations. The research team began a project to determine means of improving employees' ability to create and share knowledge in important social networks. The first phase of the project was assessment of characteristics of relationships that 40 managers relied on for learning and knowledge sharing in important projects. The second phase was systematic employment of social network analysis to map these characteristics of relationships among strategically important networks of people in various organizations.

In the first phase of the research they interviewed 40 managers and asked them to reflect on a recent project that was important to their careers and indicate where they obtained information critical to the project's success. The mangers were also asked to identify and describe the relationships with the people most important to them in terms of information or knowledge acquired for that project. The managers "overwhelmingly" indicated that they received needed information from other people far more frequently than from impersonal sources such as their personal computer archives, the Internet or the organization's knowledge management database. Four factors were revealed as distinguishing effective from ineffective relationships: (1) knowing what another person knows and thus when to turn to them; (2) being able to gain timely access to that person; (3) willingness of the person sought out to engage in problem solving rather than dump information; and (4) a degree of safety in the relationship that promoted learning and creativity. They also indicated that the four factors were key characteristics of relationships that were effective for acquiring information, solving problems or learning.

In the next phase of the project, the researchers conducted a social network analysis of executives in the exploration and production division of a large petroleum organization. The group was in the midst of implementation of a distributed technology to help transfer knowledge across drilling initiatives and was also interested in assessing their ability as a group to create and share knowledge. Three important points emerged for this group in relation to sharing information and effectively using their collective expertise. First, the analysis identified mid-level managers who were critical of information flow within the group. The analysis also revealed the extent to which the entire network was disproportionately reliant on one person with a reputation for expertise and responsiveness that had resulted in his becoming a critical source for all sorts of information. Second, the analysis also helped to "identify highly peripheral people who essentially represented untapped expertise and thus underutilized resources for the group" (p. 106). Lastly, the social network analysis demonstrates the extent to which the production division had become separated from the overall network due to a recent physical move to a different floor of the building.

Four relational characteristics were identified for promotion of knowledge sharing in human networks: knowledge, access, engagement, and safety. The *knowledge* dimension relates to the fact that other people can only be useful in solving problems if we have awareness of their expertise. The *access* dimension as defined by the researchers, refers to ability to access what is known in a sufficiently timely manner. In other words, knowing someone "who knows something of relevance does little good if we cannot gain access to their thinking in a timely fashion" (p. 112). The *engagement* dimension refers to how improvement is made in engagement in problem solving, meaning how willing was the person sought for their knowledge willing to engage with the information seeker. The researchers emphasize that this was active teaching rather than just "dumping information on the seeker—a behavior that if developed among a network can improve the effectiveness with which people learn from each other" (p. 114). The *safety* dimension refers to promotion of safety in relationships. The authors reported that the managers interviewed in the

first phase of the research indicated that safe relationships offered certain advantages in problem solving because in safe relationships people were not overly concerned about admitting a lack of knowledge or expertise. Additionally, they found that the managers were more willing to take risks with their ideas and felt that this often contributed to more creative solutions.

In the final section of the paper, the authors offer suggestions for a combined network view. They suggest that management might choose to support knowledge creation and sharing by offering central people such things as: money for efforts that might stimulate knowledge flow in a group via face-to-face meetings, or to purchase technologies such as groupware. Other suggestions include providing cognitive and social space to allow room for both individual and collective creativity and bonding to occur, and executive focus such as rewarding or promoting network enabling people to both acknowledge their efforts and signal the importance of this kind of work to others within the organization.

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Lesser, E. L., & Storck, J. (2001). Communities of practice and organizational performance. *IBM Systems Journal, 40*(4), 831-841.

Eric L. Lesser is an executive consultant with the IBM Institute for Knowledge Management and a member of IBM's Knowledge and Content Management consulting practice. He earned his master's degree in business administration from the Goizueta School of Business at Emory University. Mr. Lesser is also a visiting instructor at Simmons College, Graduate School of Library and Information Science. His research interests include knowledge strategy, communities of practice, social capital, and the use of customer knowledge in organizations. John Storck, PhD, is an assistant professor of management information systems, teaching in the M.B.A. program and the Master of Science in Information Systems program at Boston University School of Management. His research activities focus on the nature of individual and group work in globally distributed organizations, with a particular emphasis on how communities of practice enhance knowledge diffusion and learning.

Lesser and Storck begin with a concise explanation of what is known as a community of practice (Cop). A CoP is a group whose members regularly engage in sharing and learning, based on their common interests and that regardless of the type of interaction (electronic, face-to-face) the traditional notion of a community of practice I that it emerges from a work-related or interest-related field and that its members voluntarily join. The authors assert that in some organizations, the communities themselves have been recognized as valuable organizational assets. They further state that acknowledgment of CoPs' affect upon performance is important in part because of "their potential to overcome the inherent problems of a slow-moving traditional hierarchy in a fast-

moving virtual economy. Communities also appear to be an effective way for organizations to handle unstructured problems and to share knowledge outside of the traditional structural boundaries" (p. 832). Hence, the authors hypothesize that the way through which communities are able to influence organizational performance is the development and maintenance of social capital among community members.

This influence is negotiated by developing connections among practitioners who may or may not be co-located, fostering relationships that build a sense of trust and mutual obligation, and creating a common language and context that can be shared by community members.

Lesser and Storck conducted a study of seven companies in which communities of practice were acknowledged to be creating value. They focused on critical questions, including, "What value do communities provide?" Between five and ten members of existing communities of practice within each company were interviewed regarding their perceptions of value at both an individual and organizational level. The authors then developed a "mind map," which in turn led to the categorization scheme used to review the interview transcripts.

Significant evidence was found to support the idea that CoPs represent an important vehicle for developing social capital in organizations. The three dimensions found for social capital were structural, relational, and cognitive. The study indicated four areas of organizational performance that were impacted by the ongoing activities of communities of practice. These areas were: "decreasing the learning curve of new employees, responding more rapidly to customer needs and inquiries, reducing rework and preventing 'reinvention of the wheel', and spawning new ideas for products and services" (p. 836). Results showed that one of the major reasons CoPs were seen as an important vehicle for innovating was their ability to create a safe environment where people felt comfortable with sharing challenges.

In the final section, the authors suggest three management activities that can influence the development of social capital within the organization. The first suggestion is to provide opportunities for individuals to make new connections. They suggest that this can be accomplished in both face-to-face events and by providing communities with technologies that can support both collaboration and expertise. The second suggestion is to allow time and space for relationship building among individuals because individual willingness to share knowledge requires additional time and effort. Lastly, they suggest that management should find ways to communicate the norms, culture, and language of the community and the organization. This requires development of a common set of norms, standards, and language that provide appropriate context for the community knowledge.

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Growth and Development

McGrath, S. A., Johnson, M., & Miller, M. H. (2012). The social ecological challenges of rural victim advocacy: An exploratory study. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *40*(5), 588-606.

Shelly McGrath is Assistant Professor in the Department of Criminal Justice at the University of Alabama in Birmingham. McGrath earned a PhD at Southern Illinois University. Her research interests include intimate partner violence, including patterns, the advocate experience for victims, and the availability of services for victims, especially in rural areas. Melencia Johnson was Assistant Professor of Sociology at Paine College at the time of this research. Johnson earned the PhD in sociology/criminology at Southern Illinois University. Her research interest is in victim advocacy. Michelle Hughes Miller is an Associate Professor in Women's and Gender Studies at the University of South Florida. Miller earned the PhD in sociology at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Her areas of research include discursive constructions of motherhood within law and policy and systemic responses to violence against women.

This exploratory study sought to determine if an ecological model would bring understanding to some of the challenges of rural victim advocacy work. The researchers presume that victim advocates work within a "nested ecological context distinct to rural areas that shapes the nature and work of rural victim advocacy" (p.589). They argue that victim advocates mediate issues affecting victims, their relationships, their communities, and the larger society. They consider two levels of nested ecology: macrosystem and exosystem. They look at both place and scale of the sociological factors that exist within rural domains, while adding the advocate-specific characteristics representative of the microsystem. The macrosystem level looks at such factors as a general acceptance of victim blaming, a lack of personal privacy, a predominance of conservative and patriarchal values, and high levels of poverty that are influenced by the rural place. The authors cite previous research that showed effects of these factors upon rural victims. At the exosystem level they examine access to social services and health services. They cite previous research showing that rural communities are often lacking mental as well as other health care, as well as the fact that and rural residents often consider traditional mental health services as stigmatizing. Thus, for victim advocates, this often means helping unwilling victims seek care from providers that may be geographically (or financially) unavailable.

To examine how these factors affect rural victim advocacy work, the researchers conducted telephone interviews with 25 IPV advocates working in shelters and justice agencies serving 16 rural and disadvantaged counties in the Mississippi Delta region. Two research questions guided the interviews: (a) How do advocates describe the ecological context of their rural communities?; (b) How do macrosystem and exosystem factors challenge the advocates' ability to do effective victim advocacy? The advocates were asked about the culture and the people of the area served. Respondents were asked how each ecological characteristic (unemployment rates, educational and

poverty levels, etc.) affected the levels of difficulty related to working with the clients. Qualitative data was also collected from open ended response questions.

The results indicate that both macrosystem and exosystem factors are often perceived by the advocates as issues that makes their advocacy work more difficult. The advocates were asked how well their advocacy training covered issues of rurality. While 24% of respondents reported that their training did not cover rural issues at all, 36% reported that the training addressed rural issues very well. The remaining 40%, thought their training somewhat covered issues of relevance to rural advocacy. Some several stated that they were not prepared for what to do when the resources their clients needed simply were not available within their service area. This is a problem endemic to rural advocacy work. Results for research question one—How do advocates describe the environment within which they work? highlight the importance of two overarching factors that were perceived by the respondents to exist within their macrowork environments: *significant economic disadvantage and traditional and individual cultural value orientations*. Furthermore, the data suggested that not only are such macrocultural factors present in the areas in which rural advocates work, but they are perceived to be highly visible in places with the greatest lack of necessary service provision. Results for research question two — How do macrosystem and exosystem factors challenge the advocates' ability to do effective victim advocacy? indicated that advocates find it most challenging, overall, "to deal with the macrostructural factors of economic disadvantage—poverty and unemployment—although they report significant difficult responding to the lack of privacy, victim blaming, and the attitude that people should take care of their own" (p. 602). Additionally, the lack of transportation and substance abuse treatment were perceived as the most difficult service deficiencies to broker. They also noted that lack of housing, job training, childcare, and inadequate police protection presented great challenges.

Although the study sample was small, the authors suggest that the ecological framework could be a valuable contribution to the understanding of rural victimization, given the important role advocates play in safety and support for victims. They suggest the need for further study.

This research was supported in part by the *Center for Rural Violence and Justice Studies* at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Walsh, W. A., & Mattingly, M. J. (2012). Understanding child abuse in rural and urban America: Risk factors and maltreatment substantiation. The Carsey Institute at the Scholars' Repository. Paper 170.

Wendy A. Walsh, PhD, is a research associate professor of sociology at the Crimes against Children Research Center and a Faculty Fellow at the Carsey School of Public Policy at the University of New Hampshire. Dr. Walsh earned a doctorate in sociology from the University of

New Hampshire. Her research includes studies on enhancing the community and criminal justice response to child abuse. Her work focuses on evaluating multidisciplinary responses to child abuse, such as research on Children's Advocacy Centers (CAC) with the National Children's Alliance. Beth Mattingly, PhD, is director of research on vulnerable families at the Carsey School of Public Policy. She manages Carsey's policy relevant work relating to family well-being. Mattingly earned the PhD in sociology from the University of Maryland. Her work at Carsey examines child poverty and how different family policies affect rural, suburban, and urban families and how growing up in poverty influences life outcomes. She is also a research consultant for the Stanford Center on Poverty and Inequality.

This issue brief examines outcomes of child maltreatment cases in rural versus urban places and identifies the characteristics associated with substantiation. The authors began by suggesting that although many studies have considered other factors associated with substantiation, few examine the practice of rural child welfare because data are often collected and distributed in ways that do not allow this level of geographic analysis.

They report that substantiation rates (based on the second National Survey of Child and Adolescent Well-Being (NSCAW II) across the United States are 25 percent. The data show that child abuse cases substantiated in rural and urban areas share many caregiver risk factors, such as drug and alcohol abuse, and multiple family stressors. Similarly, substantiation is equally likely across income levels; with approximately one-fourth of cases in each income level are substantiated. However, higher income families in rural areas have higher substantiation rates than do higher income families in urban areas. In the age comparison of substantiation rates, the data showed that younger children are significantly more likely to have substantiated reports than older children across both places. However, in the ages 11 and older children in rural places were more likely to have a report substantiated

In the next sections, they look at data comparing the types of child maltreatment substantiated in rural and urban areas. Walsh and Mattingly report that the types of child maltreatment substantiated are similar in rural and urban areas. The data are reported in table form and show that across both places about one-quarter of cases with supervisory neglect and a quarter of sexual abuse cases are substantiated. They also report a slightly higher substantiation rate in rural physical neglect cases over urban cases.

The next section compares caregiver risk factors and substantiation rates in urban and rural areas. In both rural and urban areas, as the number of caregiver risk factors increases, so does the likelihood of substantiation. Three similarities were found among urban and rural places. First, the data showed that about one-half of caregivers reported to CPS with drug abuse, alcohol abuse, or mental health problems had a substantiated child maltreatment report. Second, across both places about two in five caregivers had recent arrest or trouble meeting basic financial needs. Third, about

one third of caregivers across both places had low caregiver social support, history of domestic violence, prior substantiated report, high family stress, or a prior report to CPS. Despite these similarities across place, two significant differences were found. First, it was found that close to three-fourths of rural caregivers in situations of active domestic violence and caregivers with cognitive impairments had a case substantiated compared with 54 percent of urban caregivers. Second, while 85 percent of caregivers with cognitive impairments in rural areas have a report substantiated, 57 percent in urban areas with cognitive impairments had substantiated reports.

The authors offer some conclusions based on the findings. First, they suggest that agencies substantiate reports considered more serious, such as those with multiple family stressors across both urban and rural areas. Second, they assert that "despite the key role that substantiation plays in determining legal and service processes, it is not a perfect correlate of abuse. Many children with reports that are not substantiated have similar outcomes and long-term trajectories as children with substantiated reports" (p. 3). Third, improving access to social services for all families with a report to CPS in rural and urban areas could help alleviate some of these strains, however, these challenges are more pronounced in rural areas where transportation and distance are greater factors. Last, Walsh and Mattingly suggest that utilization of strategies such as telehealth technologies, videoconferencing, and web-based training courses to enhance the clinical skills of rural providers, and access to services for rural families could improve quality of services.

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Bubar, R., & Bundy-Fazioli, K. (2011). Unpacking race, culture, and class in Rural Alaska: Native and Non-Native multidisciplinary professionals' perceptions of child sexual abuse. *Journal of Ethnic & Cultural Diversity in Social Work*, *20*(1), 1-19.

Roe Bubar, JD, is a Native Studies Scholar and Associate Professor jointly appointed in the Department of Ethnic Studies and School of Social Work at Colorado State University. Bubar earned the JD at the University of Colorado. Her current research agenda considers intersectionality and sexual violence, health disparities, child maltreatment in tribal communities, and Native youth and STD/STI messaging. Kim Bundy-Fazioli, PhD is the founder of the Mindfulness Matter Institute at the University of California at San Diego School of Medicine. At the time of this article she was Associate Professor at Colorado State University. She earned the PhD in Social Welfare at State University of New York at Albany.

This study aimed to examine notions of class, culture, and race as they relate to multidisciplinary (MDT) professionals working in Native and non-Native rural Alaska communities. The exploratory study explores perceptions of Native and non-Native MDT professionals who were

involved in reports, investigations, and interventions in child sexual abuse cases in these communities. The authors begin with an introduction to the problem that describes professional legitimacy in some rural communities that can be influenced by "insider" and "outsider" status. They introduce the issue of power and privilege as it relates to race and class, relevant to dialogue for rural Alaska communities.

The literature review is divided into four sections: rural communities, Native communities, child sexual abuse, and MDTs. Significant findings in previous research include the challenges for rural Alaska communities in geographically remote areas concerning the coordination and adequate provision of professional services. Another significant finding in previous literature concerns the lack of state troopers living in and policing these rural communities. Another important finding for this research is the fact that Alaska Native children are disproportionately victimized by sexual abuse at a rate six times higher than the national average.

Data were collected in this study by interviews with 15 Native and non-Native MDT professionals from two rural Alaska communities. Both communities were served by CACs and MDTs serving large outlying areas of Native villages. Participants included eight non-Native and seven Native professionals from medical, prosecution, law enforcement, mental health, social services, victim advocacy, and Indian child welfare fields. Four main questions were asked of the participants. The questions were constructed to gather information about 1) perceptions of the difference between incidence of CSA in Native and non-Native children, 2) perceptions about specific issues related to CSA incidences as they relate to race, ethnicity, and culture, 3) perceptions of the role of the MDT, and 4) how the MDT approach assisted the community in their response to CSA.

Three major themes emerged from the interviews: incidences and reporting of CSA, cultural dissonance, and systemic issues. Some participants expressed confusion about the discrepancy between Native and non-Native reports and incidence, while other participants did no perceive these discrepancies. There was perception that there was overreporting of CSA in Native populations and this was an "accepted and known phenomenon" (p. 8). There was some difference in their beliefs in the reasons for this. Some perceived that the overreporting was due to the underreporting of non-Native cases. Others believed that there was just more attention on the Native cases. Some expressed the belief that community and cultural norms perpetuated underreporting of cases in non-Native communities. Power differences were also seen as present between Native and non-Native populations regarding socioeconomic status. Regarding the theme of cultural dissonance, the level was high across both communities and it manifested in different ways. The non-Native professionals were viewed by Natives as projecting a professional persona of "all knowing" while Natives perceived their ability to respond to the Native population as limited. Insider/outsider status was a prevalent theme. Natives possessed a "high level of indignity about the credibility of newly arrived outsiders" (p. 11). However, both groups of professionals expressed their belief that inclusion of Natives in CSA cases was important. Also, many agreed

that the ability to communicate to alleged victims and families in their Native language was beneficial to obtaining disclosures. The third them of systemic issues was discussed in terms of authoritative power of individuals making significant decisions affecting the lives of others. Some participants perceived the lack of education in the communities as a systemic issue. They believed the lack of education for the helping professions to be a systemic issue that was a disadvantage in responding in CSA cases.

The researchers concluded that there remained a need for education and training in cultural competence. They further suggested that engaging teams in open discussions about insider/outsider status might contribute to intergovernmental collaboration in CSA cases. Finally, they posited that this collaboration, as well as Alaska Native representation on MDTs is important for community ownership and decision making.

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Belanger, K., & Stone, W. (2008). The social service divide: Service availability and accessibility in rural versus urban counties and impact on child welfare outcomes. *Child Welfare*, *87*(4), 101-124.

Kathleen Belanger, PhD, LMSW-AP is Assistant Professor of Management at Stephen F. Austin State University, Nacogdoches, Texas. Dr. Belanger earned the doctorate in Social Work at the University of Houston. Warren Stone, PhD, is Professor at University of Arkansas at Little Rock. He earned the PhD in business at Virginia Commonwealth University. His research areas include business strategy and leadership.

Belanger and Stone address the issue of services to families in rural areas by stating that while previous studies have described the dearth of services in rural communities, little research has measured the impact of service availability and accessibility in rural communities on outcomes. Therefore, they described four purposes of the study, (1) to determine the availability and accessibility of social services for rural children and families, (2) to analyze the differences in service access between rural and urban counties, (3) to determine the impact of service availability and accessibility on outcomes for children, and (4) to advance the empirical study of rural issues.

The authors preface the study with definitions and characteristics of rural and urban areas such as poverty rates, transportation issues, and populations sizes. Four research questions guided the study: 1) Do fewer services exist in rural counties, 2) Are services equally available and accessible in rural vs. urban counties, 3) What are the accessibility issues, and 4) Do service availability and accessibility impact child welfare outcomes? The population for this study consisted of the state

public child welfare offices, located in each of a mid-south state's 75 counties (57 rural and 18 urban). A telephone survey was designed to elicit experienced worker perceptions of the existence and accessibility of each service rather than state records of services. Fifteen social services were examined including substance abuse treatment, mental health treatment, foster homes, residential treatment, day care, transportation, family preservation services, and domestic violence services. The dependent variables were percent of foster care reentries, percent of family reunifications, and percent of children in foster care with no more than two placements. The analysis sought to determine whether a combination of independent variables (services) exerted significant influence on the three dependent variables.

Statistically significant differences between urban and rural counties were found for the following services: substance abuse treatment for children and teens; residential treatment for children and teens; school social work; afterschool programs for youth; and tutoring, mentoring, and enrichment for children. Additionally, more than one-fourth of rural counties did not have the following services: substance abuse treatment for adults, afterschool programs for youth, family preservation, domestic violence services, and emergency financial or budgeting assistance. Accessibility varied widely for specific services in both urban and rural counties, yet urban counties had significantly higher availability/accessibility for all services combined, than rural counties. Barriers to service accessibility (fees, waiting lists, distance) also varied widely across services. The researchers analyzed correlations between all the variable to determine which independent variables were related to outcomes. The percent of children reunited with their families in less than one year was not found to be significantly related to any of the independent variables. The percent of foster care reentries was most strongly related to the accessibility of intensive family preservation services and the availability of afterschool programs. The percent of children in foster care with no more than two placements was most strongly related to the accessibility of substance abuse treatment for children and teens and mental health treatment for adults. The authors cautioned that "given the small number of counties studied, these findings should be considered purely exploratory, and a first step in identifying the impact of services on outcomes for children and families (p. 114).

Belanger and Stone listed two limitations to the study. First, the focus was upon one state and therefore, results cannot be generalized to other states, due to the differences in states' demographics, services, and administration. Second, a small number of counties were examined and thus, a larger sample may reveal data relationships that achieve a critical level of significance. Lastly, the authors suggested several questions for further study. Among them: If states are legally responsible for providing appropriate services to families before placement in foster care, are rural families without service availability not afforded equal protection? And, are rural families faced with termination of parental rights, when the same family in an urban setting could receive appropriate treatment and family reunification? This exploratory study provides a basis for further research into resource availability and accessibility for rural versus urban communities throughout the country and for rural practice solutions when resources are not available.

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Carroll, D. A., & Stater, K. J. (2008). Revenue diversification in nonprofit organizations: Does it lead to financial stability?. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 19*(4), 947-966.

Deborah A. Carroll, PhD, is currently Associate Professor and Director of the Center for Public & Nonprofit Management at University of Central Florida. Dr. Carroll earned the PhD in Public Administration & American Politics at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Her research focuses on management and policy issues of state and local governments, particularly related to taxation, revenue diversification, and urban economic development, as well as the interconnectedness of the public and nonprofit sectors and the implications for tax policy, nonprofit management and public service provision. Keely Jones Stater, PhD, earned a PhD in sociology from the University of Notre Dame. Dr. Stater is Manager of Research and Industry Intelligence at Public and Affordable Housing Research Corporation. With nearly fifteen years of social science research experience, Keely oversees PAHRC's research activities and data holdings.

This research investigates whether revenue diversification leads to greater stability in the revenue structures of nonprofit organizations. The authors begin with a review of nonprofit resource reliance. They explain that nonprofit organizations have been associated with resource dependency theory (Froelich, 1999; Hodge & Piccolo, 2005), in which survival is dependent upon the ability to both acquire and maintain resources. They further explain that the financial condition and stability of nonprofit organizations is quite dependent upon "effective financial management practices that reduce the volatility of the revenue portfolio and have the potential to increase the organization's equity" (p. 948). Because empirical research on the effect of revenue diversification on the volatility of revenue structures within nonprofit organizations is somewhat limited, the researchers examine the consequences of revenue diversification within nonprofit organizations.

The authors provide lengthy descriptions of *revenue diversification* and of the *fiscal environment of nonprofits*. They cite Tuckman and Chang (1991) who provide a set of measures often used to deconstruct the financial vulnerability of health and nonprofit organizations. The assumption is that organizations with vulnerability in consecutive time periods have a greater tendency to cut programs and are more likely to fail. Measures include equity or debt margin, administrative costs, diversification or concentration, operating margin, and asset size.

Data collection was conducted by examination of the Core Files compiled by the National Center for Charitable Statistics (NCCS), which consists of information from the 990 forms filed annually

with the IRS by nonprofit organization grossing over $25,000 in revenue. The analysis focuses only on data pertaining to operating incorporated public charities (501c3s) able to receive deductible contributions. The sample includes all 501c organizations that filed a 990 form in any year during the 1991–2003 time period. This resulted in data from data from 294,543 organizations. By using the Hirschman-Herfindahl Index (HHI) for measuring revenue diversification/concentration the researchers were able to examine the influence of organizational efficiency on revenue volatility by focusing on administrative and fundraising costs, as well as organizational growth potential as the amounts of fund balance and retained earnings. Also measured was a dichotomous variable to identify organizations with a majority (greater than 50%) of total revenue generated from donations as donative and to compare them to nonprofits in which the majority of total revenue consists of earned income from sales of goods, securities and investments, and fees for service.

Their findings include   the suggestion that organizations with more "diversified revenue portfolios have lower levels of revenue volatility over time, which implies that diversification is a viable strategy for organizational stability" (p. 962). They also found that the risks associated with nonprofit growth seem to be limited in terms of creating instability. Furthermore, organizations with greater growth potential as exhibited by levels of retained earnings and fund balances have less revenue volatility over time. They also found, similar to Froelich (1999), that donative organizations are more volatile over time, which suggests that organizations that rely mainly on contributions may be most at risk from resource dependency. The findings also suggest that factors such as urban location and state context influence revenue stability over time, supporting assertions that a nonprofit's financial health is partially dependent upon its external environment. Carroll and Stater assert that although they found diversification *does* lead to greater revenue stability, they also recognize that there may be nonfinancial trade-offs involved in becoming less reliant on any one group of consumers of nonprofit services.

The authors list three implications for nonprofit organizations. The first implication is that the "effect of diversification on reducing revenue volatility suggests that any loss of legitimacy tied to generating revenue from both earned income and contributions does not translate into less stability for nonprofits over time" (p. 964). Second, the researchers believe that since organizations that have more diversified portfolios are less volatile over time, diversification is an effective method for limiting the instability associated with dependence on any particular funding source. The final implication for nonprofit organizations is that those that rely mainly on contributions seem to experience greater levels of instability and thus may experience greater financial risk from resource dependency than do commercial or mixed nonprofits. Therefore, primarily donative organizations may profit by using diversification strategies and potentially increase their longevity in the process. Carroll and Stater call for further research that examines nonprofit context that is vital to understanding nonprofit funding and longevity. Additionally, they suggest that further exploration

of nonprofit financial stability should examine industry-specific variables, as well as the financial standing of the communities in which the organizations operate.

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Goździak, E., & MacDonnell, M. (2007). Closing the gaps: The need to improve identification and services to child victims of trafficking. *Human Organization*, *66*(2), 171-184.

Elzbieta M. Gozdziak is the Director of Research at the Institute for the Study of International Migration (ISIM) at Georgetown University and Editor of International Migration, a peer reviewed, scholarly journal devoted to research and policy analysis of contemporary issues affecting international migration. Margaret MacDonnell is with the Office of Children's Services at the Migration and Refugee Services program in the US Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) in Washington, DC.

This research utilized a case to examine the inadequacies and service gaps in the system established in the United States to care for child victims of trafficking. By way of background, they describe the situation under the Homeland Security Act (HSA) in which the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) has a specific mandate to ensure that the interests of the child are considered in decisions and actions related to the care and custody of an unaccompanied alien child. They argue that a major challenge of the ORR and the service-provider community is to ensure that secure, noninstitutionalized facilities are available for all unaccompanied children and that law enforcement personnel are aware of such facilities. The problem addressed in this study was the fact that the protocols for determining whether children brought to the ORR by DHS are victims of human trafficking are inconsistently applied. Therefore, a crucial piece of information is often missing when a placement decision is made, and a potentially trafficked child may not receive the screening and services she or he deserves.

The authors conducted a case study of a young girl brought to the United States from Honduras by a relative who then subsequently forced the child to work. The study of her case file revealed "both the inadequacies of the current system to properly identify trafficked children and points out the many gaps that still exist in the system of care established for trafficked children" (p. 173). System failures happened in at least nine points: the border, the police, the school system, in Child Protective Services, at immigration services, the Civil Rights Division of the DOJ, and the FBI.

The authors provide a lengthy and detailed description of what occurred in the life of the child over the next several years, as well as the system failures along the way. Eight years after the child's trafficking began, the authors engaged in discussions with representatives of national and

international nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), advocacy groups, agencies serving child survivors of trafficking, and researchers who confirmed that many of the cracks through which the girl fell were still present. From the case study and these discussions Goździak and MacDonnell made eleven recommendations regarding issues that need to be addressed. The recommendations include: simplifying and streamlining the system of accessing benefits for child victims of trafficking, increasing antitrafficking resources for law enforcement, especially at the border and other ports of entry, ORR facilities for undocumented children should be alerted to trafficking issues and the children in their care need to be screened appropriately for trafficking, provision of ongoing training of representatives of nongovernmental organizations and service providers, appointing a legal guardian as soon as possible after a child is identified as a possible victim of trafficking, and decreasing reliance on pro bono attorneys in favor of paid legal providers.

This case study was part of a larger research project on trafficked children funded by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), award # 2005-IJ-CX-0051.

Galaskiewicz, J., Bielefeld, W., & Dowell, M. (2006). Networks and organizational growth: A study of community based nonprofits. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *51*(3), 337-380.

Joseph Galaskiewicz, PhD, is Professor of Sociology and has a courtesy appointment in the School of Government and Public Policy at the University of Arizona. Dr. Galaskiewicz earned a PhD in Sociology from the University of Chicago. Wolfgang Bielefeld, PhD, is Professor Emeritus at Indiana University. He earned a doctorate in Sociology from the University of Minnesota. Myron Dowell is an independent consultant in Minneapolis.

The paper examined the effects of nonprofit organizations' network ties over time on growth. The findings contribute to the literature by suggesting that networks are more beneficial to organizations that depend more upon donations and gifts than on earned income. By way of introduction the authors assert that like many organizations, an important strategic decision for public charities is how much to engage other organizations and actors around them. They cite previous literature that has shown networks help donative nonprofits and harm commercial nonprofits. Based on this they assume that nonprofits that become more donative over time should strengthen their ties to prominent elites and other nonprofits and become more central in the network. They also cite numerous studies finding a direct positive effect of network ties on performance and access to information and materials. Other studies have found that networks can also weaken and compromise organizational boundaries because while they are useful for recruiting new people, employees and members can also use their ties to find new jobs. Lastly, research has found that nonprofits are likely to get different returns on their networks, depending on their resource dependence and the institutional logics associated with them. Thus, the goal of

this research was to understand growth and decline of community based nonprofit organizations, particularly public charities.

Galaskiewicz, Bielefeld, and Dowell developed four hypotheses based upon the literature and their assumptions. They first hypothesized that nonprofit organizations "that are used or supported by more urban elites or have cooperative ties to organizations that are prominent in information and resource exchange networks will enhance their status in the community over time" (p. 347). The second hypothesis was that donative nonprofits that have greater status should grow faster over time than donative nonprofits that have less status. Third, they hypothesized that ties to urban elites and other nonprofits would have little effect on the growth of donative nonprofits. The final hypothesis was that nonprofits that become more reliant on donations and/or volunteers over time would have more ties to local urban elites and prominent nonprofits, while those that become more dependent upon fees for service would have fewer ties. In order to test these hypotheses, the researchers used the growth and decline in expenditures of community-based nonprofit organizations and hierarchical growth curve models as the performance measure. Face-to-face interviews were also conducted with the chief executive or operating officer of 229 nonprofit organizations. The interviews were conducted in three waves over a several-year span.

First, it was found that nonprofit organizations in the study on average, grew over time. In testing the hypotheses, they found that organizations with ties to prominent actors in the interorganizational network and with ties to urban elites had higher status four and eight years later. Additionally, donative nonprofits that had better reputations among urban elites and nonprofit managers grew faster over time than those that had poorer reputations. Affiliation with organizations prominent in the network and local elites was found to enhance reputations for quality and fitness, but this also enabled donative nonprofits, to access funding, personnel, and other resources through other informal means, such as moral appeals, asking favors, or social exchange. The authors suggested that the "more important finding was that commercial nonprofits with fewer network ties grew at faster rates than commercial nonprofits with more elite ties and/or interorganizational ties" (p. 368). Results also supported the fourth hypotheses showing that the percent of funding from gifts/grants and the percent of employees/volunteers had no effect on network position, but organizations that became more dependent on fees/sales moved to the edge of the interorganizational network.

The researchers suggested that there were public policy implications of their findings. They posited that if government policies and well-meaning business leaders press nonprofits to rely more on fees and sales, two outcomes were possible. First, there would be few incentives to make connections with others in the community. Second, they expressed concern that commercial nonprofits might be less under the control of their communities and accountable only to themselves.

Bryson, J. M., Gibbons, M. J., & Shaye, G. (2001). Enterprise schemes for nonprofit survival, growth, and effectiveness. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, *11*(3), 271-288.

John M. Bryson is McKnight Presidential Professor of Planning and Public Affairs at the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities. Dr. Bryson earned the doctorate in public policy and administration at the University of Wisconsin. His research interests include strategic management of public and non-profit organizations, collaboration, and leadership. Michael J. Gibbons is president of The Banyan Tree Foundation in Washington, DC, and a former employee of Save the Children–U.S. Gary Shaye is vice president for international programs for Save the Children–U.S.

In this article, the authors discuss the need for nonprofits to have a *viable enterprise scheme* (VES) in order to survive, grow, prosper, and achieve its mission. They define a VES as "as a set of interrelated elements—a *system*—that demonstrates in a plausible and sensible way how the organization can produce things valued enough by its external environment to generate the resources needed for organizational survival, growth, and mission accomplishment" (p. 272). They suggest that the idea of the scheme is special in its insistence on the importance of core and distinctive competencies, competitive and collaborative advantages, and support and legitimacy. They further state that too often nonprofit organizations fail to give adequate attention to these areas with a subsequent negative impact on their strategic planning processes and plans.

In the next section of the paper, the authors discuss the components of a VES in detail. The seven components are: understanding social needs and stakeholders and their interests, pursuing a meaningful mission and fulfilling mandates, building and drawing on core and distinctive competencies, pursuing competitive and collaborative advantages, employing coherent and effective strategies and operations, producing desirable results and securing needed resources, and cultivating legitimacy and support.

In order to explicate the enterprise concept further, in the next section the authors provide an example from an organization that has undergone a major change effort. The organization went from a period of relative stability and incremental growth (from the 1950s through the late 1980s) to a period of dramatic and unsettling growth and change. They explain how the organization used the VES to survive and grow. Among the steps were the development of a characteristic community development-oriented image, a set of values, systems, structures, staffing patterns,

funding and fundraising schemes, and an organizational culture. Another step involved a local emphasis and focus exclusively on community and family meant that the agency's efforts would produce particular kinds of *desirable results.* The entire new enterprise scheme the agency deployed is presented in table form. The new scheme includes *competitive and collaborative advantages,* while *needed resources* for the scheme come from an increased number of donors, from different types of donors, and from becoming a partner with governments. Pursuing the new scheme also involved a different *understanding of social needs,* as well as developing additional *core and distinctive competencies.* The organization "had to develop expertise in (1) applying the new development methodologies, (2) playing an intermediary or catalytic role (3) responding to emergencies and children in conflict (4) affecting policymakers, and (5) becoming a complex bridge across funding streams, sectors, and modalities" (p. 284).

The researchers address some of the challenges and then provide suggestions for possible ways to address these challenges. They conclude with the assertion that a viable enterprise scheme represents a *dynamic* strategic plan that can serve numerous leadership and management purposes. They further conclude from the case study that the VES can help provide the framework for good management needed for successful innovation, provide a useful fundraising and marketing tool, and provide a convenient diagnostic tool for assessing whether a nonprofit organization is continuing to be linked effectively to its external environment in ways that are coherent and self-sustaining.

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. They state that the article represents their viewpoint and not the official view of CARE USA.

Foster-Fishman, P. G., Berkowitz, S. L., Lounsbury, D. W., Jacobson, S., & Allen, N. A. (2001). Building collaborative capacity in community coalitions: A review and integrative framework. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 29*(2), 241-261.

Pennie G. Foster-Fishman, PhD, is a professor in the Department of Psychology and a Senior Outreach Fellow in University Outreach and Engagement at Michigan State University. She received her PhD in organizational/community psychology from the University of Illinois at Chicago. Her research interests primarily emphasize systems change, particularly how organizational, inter-organizational, and community and state systems can improve to better meet the needs of children, youth, and families. Shelby L. Berkowitz, MA, earned the Masters in Community Psychology at Michigan State University. Dr. David W. Lounsbury completed a PhD at Michigan State University and a post-doctoral fellowship at Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center. He is Assistant Professor in the Department of Epidemiology & Population Health in the Einstein College of Medicine at Montefiore Medical Center. Stephanie Jacobson is a graduate

student in ecological community psychology at Michigan State University. Nicole E. Allen, PhD, earned the doctorate in Psychology from Michigan State University. She is Associate Head and Director of Graduate Studies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

The authors conducted a qualitative analysis of 80 articles, chapters, and practitioners' guides focused on collaboration and coalition functioning. The purpose was to develop an integrative framework of the core competencies and processes needed within collaborative bodies to facilitate their success. The review suggested that that coalitions need collaborative capacity at four critical levels: (a) within their members; (b) within their relationships; (c) within their organizational structure; and (d) within the programs they sponsor. The paper is broken down into the literature review findings in the four main areas of collaborative capacity listed above.

Findings indicated as critical elements of *member capacity* fell into three categories: *Core Skills and Knowledge, Building the Attitudes/Motivations for Collaborative Capacity,* and *Building Access to Member Capacity.* The core skills and knowledge indicated by the literature were ability to work collaboratively with others, ability to create and build effective programs, and ability to build an effective coalition infrastructure. The core attitudes for motivation derived from the literature were: holding positive attitudes about collaboration, holding positive attitudes about other stakeholders, and holding positive attitudes about self. The literature revealed that the skills and knowledge needed for access to member capacity were coalition support of member involvement and coalition building member capacity through technical support and identification of expertise.

The findings for *relational capacity* indicated by the literature fell into two categories: *creating positive internal relationships* and *creating positive external relationships.* Components of positive internal relationships were: development of a positive working climate, development of a shared vision, promotion of power sharing, and valuing diversity. Components of positive external relationships included: linking with organizational sectors unrepresented on coalition, engagement of community residents in planning and implementation processes, and connecting with other communities and coalitions targeting similar problems

Five major findings were indicated as critical elements of *organizational capacity*. These were effective leadership, formalized procedures, effective communication, sufficient resources (both human and financial), and continuous improvement orientation. The findings for critical elements of *programmatic capacity* indicated by the literature were: clear, focused programmatic objectives with realistic goals, being unique and innovative, and being ecologically valid.

The authors also present the finding is table form indicating *Strategies for Building Core Collaborative Capacities.* The strategies are listed under each of the four main capacities. Strategies include: understand current member capacity, valuing the diversity of member

Literature in Support of the Standards for NCA Accredited Chapter Members

competencies, fostering positive intergroup understanding, building diverse membership, building positive intergroup interactions, developing superordinate, shared goals, creating inclusive decision-making processes, proactively building leadership, formalizing roles/processes, promoting active communication, building financial resources, developing an outcome orientation, seeking community input, and developing innovative programs.

Finally, the researchers suggest that "in attempting to build collaborative capacity, researchers and practitioners need to be mindful that this capacity is greatly influenced by the larger community context" (p. 257). They also suggest that since the four capacity types are interdependent with each other, with shifts in one greatly affecting the others the type of capacity needed may shift with changes in coalition goals, membership, or context.

This project was partially funded by the Institute for Children, Youth, and Families at Michigan State University.

Training and Technical Assistance

Saunders, B. E. (2015). Expanding evidence-based practice to service planning in child welfare. *Child Maltreatment*, *20*(1), 20-22.

Benjamin E. Saunders, PhD, is Associate Director of the National Crime Victims Research and Treatment Center and Professor in the Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, at the Medical University of South Carolina. Dr. Saunders earned the doctorate in clinical social work from Florida State University. His research, training, and clinical interests include the initial and long-term impact of violence and abuse on children and adolescents; the epidemiology of trauma, violence, and abuse; treatment approaches for abused children and their families; and effective methods for implementing evidence supported interventions in community service agencies.

In this commentary, Saunders presents his view on the advantages of implementation of the (APSAC) Task Force on Evidence-Based Service Planning (EBSP) Guidelines in Child Welfare. He suggests that "the principles described in the report will have a major impact on how child welfare does its work" (p. 1). He provides brief descriptions of the key points of the guidelines and then pints to implications of ESBP for the child welfare workforce.

Saunders explains that the guidelines are more than just including a list of evidence-based interventions. The guidelines require advanced practice skills including such things as conducting sound assessments; identifying specific, measurable intervention goals directly related to the difficulties experienced by the family; using critical thinking to select the most effective interventions and trained service providers to meet these goals, and others. He further asserts that

reframing achieving better well-being as a primary approach to achieving long-term safety and permanence would be an important shift in focus for many child welfare agencies. Additionally, Saunders believes that adoption of the guidelines would require collaboration among all professionals involved in a case, awareness of each other's plans, and sensitivity to the full burden being placed on families. In the next section, Saunders discusses the ethical duty to ensure that mandated services are likely to be effective.

In the final section, Saunders lists some of the implications of ESBP for child welfare workers. Among these would be their need to be knowledgeable of common standards for judging intervention effectiveness, sufficient knowledge of EBIs relevant to their case population, and ability to identify trained providers in their community in order to make proper referrals. They will also need collaborative skills, as well as understanding of how to monitor progress and outcomes. Saunders poses the question of whether the child welfare system is prepared and has the resources to provide the capacity to implement the task force guidelines. Second, he asks "What are the needed steps to develop the knowledge and skills in the CWS workforce to implement EBSP?" (p. 2). Lastly, he suggests that full implementation of EBSP likely would require new resources for the CWS, as well as smaller which would mean the CWS would need additional caseworkers to serve the same number families. Saunders closes by suggesting that with stronger evidence for interventions that are effective and with increasing knowledge on how to disseminate them effectively, a rationale for the allocation of new resources to support implementation of the guidelines can be made.

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest or financial support with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Wherry, J. N., Huey, C. C., & Medford, E. A. (2015). A national survey of child advocacy center directors regarding knowledge of assessment, treatment referral, and training needs in physical and sexual abuse. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, *24*(3), 280-299.

Jeffrey N. Wherry, PhD, ABPP, is the director of the Research Institute at the Dallas Children's Advocacy Center. Wherry earned a PhD at the University of Southern Mississippi, and he earned the Diplomate in Clinical Psychology awarded by the American Board of Professional Psychology. His interests include assessment of abuse-related symptoms, training in evidence-based assessment, and PTSD in abused children. Cassandra C. Huey is a doctoral student at Texas Tech University. Her interests include child abuse, foster care, and cultural competency. Elizabeth A. Medford was a graduate student at Texas Tech University with interests in domestic violence, child abuse, and development.

The authors sought to examine the situation in children's advocacy centers in which directors often have no clinical background and yet, they are in a position of either hiring or entering into contractual agreements with clinicians in the community. Thus, the knowledge of the CAC directors was the target of the study, because they serve as gatekeepers for clinical programs developed under their supervision. The purpose of this study was to determine CAC directors' knowledge about five areas: (a) PTSD; (b) criteria for referring victims of abuse for treatment; (c) evidence-based treatments for sexually and physically abused children; (d) reliable, valid, and normed measures helpful in assessing abused children; and (e) training needs for staff.

To gather information on these topics the authors developed a survey based on previous literature and their experience with common assessment and treatment practices within CACs. The survey asked participants to identify PTSD symptoms from a list of common symptoms found in the literature. Next, they were asked to identify practices related to referrals and staffing at the local CAC. They were also asked to examine a list of common CSA treatments and to indicate whether the treatments were evidence-based. Next, they were asked questions about assessments of abuse-related symptoms. Lastly, the directors were given a list of four training priorities and asked to rank order the priority of their training needs. 264 participants responded to the survey, however the authors point out that there was a large percentage of missing data.

For PTSD, the participants correctly identified 64.26% of reexperiencing symptoms, 55.69% of avoidance symptoms, and 62.14% of arousal symptoms. 13.1% strongly disagreed, 36.9% disagreed, 14.8% were uncertain, 26.7% agreed, and 8.5% strongly agreed that there are adequate numbers of service providers/clinicians with experience in treating PTSD symptoms in their communities. Between 34% and 40% of the participants did not answer the questions regarding whether listed treatments were evidence-based. Many marked "uncertain". The authors interpretation was that as much as 76% of participants had insufficient knowledge to offer an opinion. When asked if there are adequate numbers of service providers/clinicians with experience in assessing PTSD symptoms in their communities, 12.6% strongly disagreed, 33.0% disagreed, 18.7% were uncertain, 30.2% agreed, and 5.5% strongly agreed. Participants listed training needs from one to five in priority. The highest priority for training was understanding which treatments are effective, followed by recognizing symptoms in maltreated children, understanding which measures are helpful in diagnosing common symptoms, self-care, and making referrals to clinicians.

In the discussion section, the researchers note several problematic areas. Among these are the number of non-EBPs that were identified as EBPs. They suggest that "this problem is compounded when considering the number of directors who did not respond to specific items (34-40%) about treatments and the consistently high number of respondents who were uncertain about whether the listed treatments are EBPs" (p. 293). Participants did identify TF-CBT consistently as an evidenced-based intervention. Results were both positive and negative with regard to assessment and referrals. The authors note that the identified training needs match well with the problematic

issues identified elsewhere in the study. The researchers offer suggestions based on these results. They suggest that the NCA might take a leadership role in training CAC directors by providing training at the national level and encouraging training initiatives at the regional and local levels. They review two training initiatives supported at local levels.

The study's limitations include, the fact that although the invitation to participate was sent to directors of CACs, it is unclear if all surveys were completed by directors. Another limitation listed is the number of directors who did not answer specific items or who answered some items with "uncertain". They further suggest that the study also may have been limited by the use of an untested survey. They suggest that perhaps the NCA might work with researchers to develop and survey tools with demonstrated reliability.

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Tavkar, P., & Hansen, D. J. (2011). Interventions for families victimized by child sexual abuse: Clinical issues and approaches for child advocacy center-based services. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *16*(3), 188-199.

Poonam Tavkar, PhD, graduated from the Clinical Psychology Training Program at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln in 2010. She is currently employed as a post-doctoral fellow at the University of Tennessee Health Science Center. David J. Hansen, PhD, Chair of the Department of Psychology at The University of Nebraska at Lincoln. His primary research area is child maltreatment (sexual abuse, physical abuse, neglect, and witnessing domestic violence), including factors related to identification and reporting, assessment and intervention with victims and families, and the correlates and consequences of maltreatment.

This paper adds to the literature a review of mental health interventions provided at Child Advocacy Centers along with recommendations for future research and clinical practice. A review of the literature documents the need for mental health services for victims and caregivers. The authors point to literature that discusses CACs as increasingly used as initial access sites for mental health services either through on-site care or referral. Considering these increased needs, this paper presents a review of various types of mental health interventions and modalities available; and second, a review of rationale and recommendations for dissemination of these interventions on site at CACs. The review and supporting literature begins with types of crisis interventions for victims, caregivers, and non-abused siblings. Second, review and supporting literature is provided for time-limited interventions for victims, caregivers, and non-abused siblings. A large portion is devoted to studies of efficacy of TF-CBT. Group interventions for victims, caregivers, and non-abused siblings are also reviewed. The authors assert that while many of the interventions are effective, there is often a need for long-term treatment. Literature cited supports the case that although group

treatment has been shown to provide many benefits, it may be insufficient in meeting each child's individual needs. The researchers note that literature supporting long-term effects such as anxiety, depression, and other more severe symptoms commonly associated with child sexual abuse for both victims and caregivers. They suggest the need for long-term treatments.

Following review of available interventions, the authors summarize Project SAFE (Sexual Abuse Family Education), a cognitive-behavioral treatment program established by David Hansen and team members in 1996 at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln. In 2000, Project SAFE was established at the CAC of Lincoln/Lancaster County. The project offers four interventions that are selected to meet victim and family needs. The Project SAFE intervention group treatment is a 12-week CBT for victims ages 7-18 and their caregivers. It utilizes a parallel design for youth and parent groups to meet separately. The second intervention in the program is group treatment designed for non-abused siblings. Developed in 2004, the SAFE Group Treatment for non-abused siblings (ages 7-18) is a 6-week, parallel group treatment that meets for 90 minutes each week. The authors note that there is a dearth of literature on treatment for siblings and therefore, a need for study of treatment efficacy. Project SAFE Crisis Intervention was developed in 2002 to provide a single crisis session to help with coping and immediate issues that arise following a disclosure. These sessions vary from one to three hours. The fourth intervention in Project SAFE is Brief Family Intervention, developed to provide short-term, one-hour sessions over three to four meetings. This treatment is individualized for families who are already taking advantage of group treatment, yet need more specific, individual treatment.

Tavkar and Hansen list benefits and treatment gains of the SAFE Program as 1) greater ability to begin care as soon as possible based on individual needs, 2) free multiple-session therapy, 3) education tailored to help prevent revictimization, 4) flexible scheduling for appointments, 5) addressing needs of non-abused siblings, and 6) child care for younger children. Project SAFE is continually monitored and assessed. The authors believe that considering the varied needs of persons needing mental health services on-site at CACs, Project SAFE may be a model program implementable throughout CACs. The final section of the paper provides recommendations. First, the authors suggest that CACs should continue to be used for initial access point for provision of services. Second, they suggest that the collaboration between mental health professionals at CACs and other agencies should be strengthened. Third, they assert that more research is needed to identify impact of CSA on non-offending caregivers and non-abused siblings. Finally, they suggest that more research is needed to better understand what outcomes may result from more effective treatment.

Aguinis, H., & Kraiger, K. (2009). Benefits of training and development for individuals and
    teams, organizations, and society. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *60*, 451-474.

Herman Aguinis, PhD, was Professor in the business school at the University of Colorado Denver, at the time of this publication. Dr. Aguinis earned the doctorate in industrial and organizational psychology from the University at Albany, State University of New York. His research is interdisciplinary and addresses the acquisition and deployment of talent in organizations and organizational research methods. Kurt Kraiger, PhD, is Professor of Industrial Organizational Psychology at Colorado State University. Dr. Kragier earned the doctorate at The Ohio State University. His research focuses on learning in ill-structured environments and identifying effective mentoring behaviors

This article provides a review of the training and development literature for the years 2000-2009. The authors reviewed about 600 articles, books, and chapters published in psychology as well as in related fields including human resource management, instructional design, human resource development, human factors, and knowledge management.

After a brief introduction, the first section describes benefits of training activities for individuals and teams as found in the literature. First, they cover benefits related to job performance and second, other types of benefits. The literature showed that the most effective training programs were those including both cognitive and interpersonal skills. The review also showed that "training not only may affect declarative knowledge or procedural knowledge, but also may enhance strategic knowledge, defined as knowing when to apply a specific knowledge or skill" (p. 454). Other training benefits documented in the literature were those for managers and leaders, as well as those related to performance is cross-cultural training, in which employees are trained to perform their jobs in a different culture and/or adjust psychologically to living in that culture. The review also showed the impact of training on outcomes other than job performance or on variables that serve as antecedents to job performance.

In the next section, Aguinis and Kraiger review the literature on the benefits of training for organizations. They summarize by stating that numerous studies have gathered support for the benefits of training for organizations as a whole. Among the benefits are improved organizational performance, as well as other outcomes that relate directly or indirectly to performance. In the following section covering benefits of training for society, the authors suggest that the literature "leads to the conclusion that training efforts produce improvements in the quality of the labor force, which in turn is one of the most important contributors to national economic growth" (p. 459). Furthermore, they state that the recognition of the benefits of training activities for society has prompted many countries around the world to adopt national policies that encourage the design and delivery of training programs at the national level.

In the next section, Aguinis and Kraiger review the literature in light of improving the effectiveness and impact of training. They discuss four major ways to accomplish this as designated in the research literature. The first of these is setting appropriate goals for training and ensuring that trainees are ready to participate by conducting a thorough needs assessment before training is

Literature in Support of the Standards for NCA Accredited Chapter Members

designed and delivered. Second, is training designed to engage learners in meaningful learning processes and delivery that utilizes novel technologies. The third component emphasized in the literature is training evaluation. The authors suggest that "how people react to training has continued to receive attention in the literature, particularly around the question of how best to use reactions for improving training design and delivery" (p. 464). Further, the literature shows that just as it is important to maximize training benefits, it is also important to document the benefits. The fourth component related to improving effectiveness and impact of training as found in the literature is the transfer of training or ensuring that the changes that take place during training are transferred back to the job environment. The research suggests the importance of considering interpersonal factors such as supervisory and peer support as moderators of the training transfer.

Finally, the authors provide conclusions and suggestions for further research. They offer the conclusion that organizations that are able to realize the benefits of training are able to move away from viewing the training function as an operational function to one that is value driven. They suggest that research is needed to understand the factors that facilitate a smooth cross-level transfer of benefits. They also suggest that additional research is needed to understand fully the range and impact moderators affecting transfer of training. Additionally, they emphasize the need for study of the factors that can accelerate the realization of the benefits of training.

The authors reported no biases that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

McCall, R. B. (2009). Evidence-based programming in the context of practice and policy. *Social Policy Report. 23*(3), 3-12.

Robert B. McCall received his doctorate from the University of Illinois and is currently Co-Director of the University of Pittsburgh Office of Child Development and Professor of Psychology. His research interests have included attention and memory in infants, developmental changes in mental performance, kinship similarities in IQ, play and imitation, design and analysis in developmental psychology, the dissemination of developmental research through the media, program evaluation, university-community partnerships, and policy.

This paper considers issues in how the process of creating and implementing evidence-based social and behavioral programming and policies (EBPs). The paper also considers and assesses how the process is often carried out, alternatives to the way evidence is summarized and brought to the process, factors in how communities attempt to use such knowledge to implement or create services, and how the general research enterprise could be broadened to be more helpful.

In the first section, McCall reviews the requirements for replicating proven programs. These include the requirement that programs must already have been created, evaluated, and found to

effectively prevent or treat the target problem. Second, programs need to be packaged and described in detail sufficient for others to faithfully replicate it. Third, local service providers must be willing and able to faithfully replicate the documented program. Fourth, replicating research-documented programs assumes they will produce benefits comparable to the original demonstration project.

Next, McCall discusses the literature on what is needed to declare a program to be evidence-based. He notes that this involves 1) the persuasiveness of the research that the program *can* produce the intended benefits under ideal and controlled conditions, 2) the extent to which the program *does* produce benefits, 3) estimation of effect size, 4) reasonable judgments identifying (if not evidence supporting) the crucial elements of the program necessary for its effectiveness, and 5) feasibility. McCall also suggests alternative approaches to declaring a program to be evidence-based, including use of communities of practice.

In the next section, the author discusses way of improving communities' capacities to create and implement EBPs. He also reviews literature on the gap between science and practice. McCall suggests that one approach to building community capacity is to involve research, practice, funding, policymaking, and opinion leaders in a collaborative planning process. Lastly, he proposes revising the research enterprise and integrating it with the community. He asserts that the "capacity of scholarship to improve the process, services, and community systems also needs improvement" (p. 10). In a review of the need for a science of practice and implementation he provides four areas to consider. These are: 1) the traditional and valued scientific paradigms are not likely to be applicable, 2) community-change initiatives place a strong emphasis on community involvement, community choice, and community building, 3) a uniform intervention is not likely to be appropriate if many facets of a community's system require change, and 4) actual change in communities in specific services and in community systems is more likely governed by political, ideological, or fiscal priorities than by research findings. To address these areas McCall suggests that "a new, or at least substantially revised, discipline of 'community science' is needed that will more effectively contribute to bridging research and scholarship on the one hand and community practice and policy on the other" (p. 15). He then provides a list of several of the components of such a science. In the final section, the author lists implications researchers, practitioners, and policymakers. He supports his suggestions with citations of previous literature. This paper builds upon previous research concerning EBPs.

The researcher declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Stevens, M., Liabo, K., Frost, S., & Roberts, H. (2005). Using research in practice: A research information service for social care practitioners. *Child & Family Social Work*, *10*(1), 67-75.

Madeleine Stevens was Research Officer at the Child Health Research and Policy Unit in the Institute of Health Services at City University of London at the time of this writing. Kristin Liabo was Research Fellow at the Child Health Research and Policy Unit in the Institute of Health Services at City University of London. Sarah Frost was Implementation Officer at Barnardo's Research and Development Unit in the UK. Helen Roberts was Professor of Child Health in the Research and Policy Unit in the Institute of Health Services at City University of London.

This article describes a pilot project aimed at providing research and research summaries to child welfare practitioners in the United Kingdom. The project derived in part from research findings which suggest that much research is not readily available to practitioners, is not useful, or even if useful, is not used. The authors review research concluding that the notion of research as influencing policy and practice through a linear process has been widely discredited.

Based on evidence from studies of research use, the What Works for Children (WWfC) was formed. The WWfC is an initiative which seeks to promote the use of good quality research evidence in social care practice with children. They developed the Research Information Service for practitioners with the goal of helping practitioners gain access to research in areas they themselves identify as important. The service answered practitioners research questions a total of 46 times during the pilot project, and reported that the biggest area of interest was education and children's behavior, followed by offending and social inclusion. They describe how they answered questions and developed research summaries of the research on particular topics.

Feedback on the service was collected via a feedback form. Feedback from practitioners was encouraging, and practitioners were pleased to have the service. They concluded that "the potential impact of the service could be enhanced if there were more detailed discussion between practitioners and the implementation officer before searches are carried out and summaries prepared" (p. 72). Conclusions were drawn from the study including the fact that for some topics, good quality research is absent, or not readily available to those who could make use of it. Second, it was also found that there is a poor fit between the evidence base and the kinds of research practitioners want. Third, it became apparent that practitioners want information that is readily translated to their own situation. The researchers suggested that piloting this service enabled them to consider whether addressing some of the barriers to using research evidence can increase research use in practice.

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Boud, D., & Middleton, H. (2003). Learning from others at work: Communities of practice and informal learning. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, *15*(5), 194-202.

At the time of this project, David Boud was Professor of Adult Education in the College of Education at the University of Technology, Sydney (UTS), Australia. Dr. Boud earned the PhD at Surrey. His research interests include in how people learn and what can be done to foster their learning. Heather Middleton was a Research Associate working with Professor Boud on a major research project "Uncovering learning at work".

Boud and Middleton state that their work investigates learning from others at work. They posit that two findings from previous research prompted the need for examining this topic. First, there have been suggestions that formal systematic learning is of lesser importance than informal learning. Second, it has been argued that the person who is nominally expected by organizations to foster learning in the workplace (usually a supervisor) may be unable to do so effectively because of the structural constraints of their role. With these issues in mind, the authors aimed to identify ways in which participants, within different workgroups in an organization, learn with and from others. They also looked at whether a framework of *communities of practice* is sufficient for discussions of informal learning at work.

The researchers conducted interviews and social network analysis as the primary instruments to elucidate subjective experiences of work and learning. The participants were members of four separate workgroups who were given semi-structured interview, lasting approximately 45 minutes. The interviews were used to identify general information on their role and their career trajectory, who were the primary sources of workplace information, and how challenges in their jobs were dealt with. The researchers also observed in the work sites seeking to understand and document the context of work and the nature of the activities in which participants engaged. The authors provide descriptions of the four workgroups and the activities in which they engage.

In the next section, the authors describe three significant areas of informal learning gleaned from the interviews. These were: mastery of organizational processes, negotiating relationships, and dealing with the atypical (issues with no set procedures). The authors note that the three areas also overlap. It was found that when needing information in the first area of learning, the workers' inclination was to draw initially on documentary sources and on those who could readily point to precedents. However, when it came to dealing with atypical situations or negotiation of relationships there are generally no documentary sources for reference. This was the point at which workers accessed both formal and informal networks. Another finding was that supervisors were not necessarily the contacts of first resort. The authors report that "workers in the sites examined tended in general to manage their learning needs to minimize their supervisors' involvement in their learning process except when they were clearly a part of the work flow" (p. 199).

In the final section of the report, Boud and Middleton discuss whether the four groups examined were *communities of practice* as described by Wenger's (1998) 14 indicators. They determined that the groups did not meet some of the 14 indicators that communities of practice had been formed. They briefly describe two other frameworks for learning at work that might be useful. The first one is Bernstein's (1990) construct of framing. In this construct, the framing of knowledge is strong when there is a distinct boundary between what may be transmitted and what may not be transmitted in a learning relationship. The second suggestion for considering the patterns of learning they observed was through activity theory in which Engeström (2001) drew attention to what he called horizontal or sideways learning and development in which problem solving occurs mostly through interactions among peers without resort to a conventional knowledge hierarchy.

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Lamb, M. E., Sternberg, K. J., Orbach, Y., Esplin, P. W., & Mitchell, S. (2002). Is ongoing feedback necessary to maintain the quality of investigative interviews with allegedly abused children?. *Applied Developmental Science*, *6*(1), 35-41.

Michael E. Lamb, PhD, is Professor and Head of the Department of Social and Developmental Psychology at University of Cambridge. His research focuses on forensic interviewing; non-parental childcare; parent-child relationships; and the development of psychological adjustment. The late Kathleen J. Sternberg, PhD, was a research psychologist and staff scientist at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, MD. Her research focused on applied issues related to children's development. Yael Orbach, PhD, is a researcher and staff scientist at the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and one of the developers of the NICHD interview protocol. Phillip W. Esplin, EdD, specializes in forensic psychology. He was a Senior Research Consultant with the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, the Child Witness Project, from 1989 through 2006. Suzanne Mitchell, MSW, is the Program Director at Salt Lake County Children's Justice Center in Utah.

The authors sited several studies which have found the value of narrative responses elicited using open-ended prompts rather than information elicited using more focused prompts. The researchers posit that the research-based recommendations replicated in these studies are "widely endorsed, but seldom followed". Additionally, earlier studies suggested that both the use of a detailed protocol and ongoing supervision and feedback were absolutely crucial to the quality of forensic interviews.

This study examined two sets of interviews. The first set of interviews was conducted using the NICHD protocol by experienced forensic investigators who received regular supervision and feedback on their interviews. The second set of interviews was conducted by the same investigators immediately following termination of the supervision-and-training regimen. Results included that the number and proportion of invitations declined significantly when supervision ended, while the proportion of option-posing and suggestive prompts increased. Results also showed that withdrawal of supervision was associated with a decline in the quality of information obtained from alleged victims, as well as a decline in the amount of information elicited.

The authors concluded that when supervision was removed, interviewers adhered less to best practice guidelines and thus affected their performance. Several previous studies (Lamb, Hershkowitz, Sternberg, Esplin, et al., 1996) and (Sternberg et al., 1996) showed similar results.

Awareness and Education

Kemshall, H., & Moulden, H. M. (2017). Communicating about child sexual abuse with the public: Learning the lessons from public awareness campaigns. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, *23*(2), 124-138.

Hazel Kemshall is Professor of Community and Criminal Justice in the School of Applied Social Sciences at De Montfort University. Her research interests are in risk assessment and management of offenders, effective work in multi-agency public protection, and implementing effective practice with high risk offenders. Heather M. Moulden, PhD, is Assistant Professor in the Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Neurosciences at McMaster University. Her areas of research include evaluation and rehabilitation of aggressive behavior, the etiology of sexual violence and its treatment, and effective forensic rehabilitation.

The publication reviews a number of important initiatives to public awareness campaigning on CSA from around the world and identifies common themes that can inform campaigning and prevention efforts. The authors begin with an introduction and overview of child sexual abuse including an introduction to the problem: that CSA is accepted as a major social problem, which is simultaneously poorly understood by both the public and decision-makers. This article examines how different approaches to public awareness campaigns have influenced attitudinal and behavior change in respect of CSA prevention.

The authors review the definitions of public awareness campaigns from across different disciplines and state, "public awareness can be defined as a campaign that uses: '…media, messaging, and an organised set of communication activities to generate specific outcomes in a large number of individuals and in a specific period of time' (Coffman, 2002, p. 2)". In the next section Kemshall and Moulden review early initiatives from the 1990's including *Stop it Now*! and *Zero Tolerance*.

They point out that *Stop it Now*! was instrumental in pioneering public awareness campaigns, surveying public attitudes to CSA. They also point out that this and other early efforts did clearly increase awareness of CSA as a social problem, but had no demonstrable impact on attitudes or actions. In a review of 21 CSA specific campaigns only two provided information for evaluation. The authors also suggest that the findings "illustrate the challenges in translating awareness into action, such as perceptions of stigma, lack of perceived relevance to consumers of the message, lack of engagement with the message and the medium by which it is conveyed, and reluctance coupled with uncertainty about what to do" (p. 5). Yet, they also suggest that these early campaigns began to reframe the understanding of CSA in both the UK and USA.

Next, the authors discuss the turn in public awareness campaigns during the mid-2000s from just explaining that the problem existed to solving the problem. Three areas were critical to this change: focus upon personal responsibility and the ability to take appropriate action; targeting of campaigns on specific groups and communities (sometimes through collaborative partnerships) in order to use resources more effectively; and focus prevention rather than reactive criminal justice responses. During that time is was also recognized that that CSA was not decreasing significantly, and programs targeting victims were largely ineffective. Thus, some programs began targeting perpetrators by using social marketing to encourage those to seek treatment.

The authors also describe the evolution to multi-faceted campaigns and the development of multi-layered systemic approaches. They review the *Enough Abuse* campaign in Massachusetts that implemented a comprehensive five-step program to combat CSA. The campaign had five phases of collaborative community action: (a) assessing, prioritizing, and planning; (b) implementing targeted action; (c) changing community conditions and systems; (d) achieving widespread change in behavior and risk factors; and (e) improving the population's health. It was reported that from 1990 through 2007 the number of substantiated reports of CSA in Massachusetts declined 69%. However, they caution that it is not possible to calculate how much of the decrease was a result of the prevention program.

To conclude, the authors assert that several questions remain unanswered. Two areas of research need attention. First, they posit that all campaigns should be required to have clearly delineated outcomes, including intermediate and ultimate behavior change, with both short and long-term follow-up. Second, several relevant research questions remain unanswered concerning both the efficacy of campaigns/program themselves, but also about the mechanisms of change. Kemshall and Moulden also note that framing of the social problem also emerged as an area relevant to the understanding of public campaigns and prevention. Lastly, the authors suggest that in the future, CSA prevention will not remain in public awareness campaigns, but rather in public *action* campaigns.

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Guo, C., & Saxton, G. D. (2017). Speaking and being heard: How nonprofit advocacy
  organizations gain attention on social media. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*,
  Online ahead of print. DOI:10.1177/0899764017713724

Chao Guo, PhD, is Associate Professor on Nonprofit Management in the School of Social Policy and Practice at the University of Pennsylvania. He earned his PhD in Public Administration from the University of Southern California. Chao's research interests focus on the intersection between nonprofit and voluntary action and government. Gregory D. Saxton, PhD, is Assistant Professor at York University, Toronto · Schulich School of Business. Dr. Saxton earned a PhD in accounting and political science. His research interests include the role and effects of technology, especially Big Data and social media on the flow of information to and from organizations.

Guo and Saxton sought to address a research gap existing in analyses of social media use by nonprofits. Prior research had a heavy focus on analyzing whether and how nonprofit advocacy organizations use social media, yet barely touched on the effectiveness of that social media usage. To address this gap their key research question was the following: How does an organization gain supporters' attention with its social media messages?

To answer the research question, they investigated the Twitter use of 145 nonprofit advocacy organizations. An explanatory model was developed for understanding why some advocacy organizations get attention on social media while others do not. The authors argued that that the extent to which an organization is "being heard" depends on 1) the size of the audience, 2) how much and how it speaks, and 3) what it says. They tested their hypotheses with a 12-month panel dataset that was collapsed by month and then organized the 219,915 tweets sent by the 145 organizations over the entire 12 months of 2013. Using *number of retweets* and *number of favorites* as measures of attention, they found that attention was positively associated with the size of an organization's network, its volume of speech (number of tweets sent), and how many "conversations" it joined. They also found interesting relationships between attention and various measures of an organization's targeting and connecting strategy. The number of retweets of others—a measure of connecting strategy—was found to be positively related to the number of retweets and negatively related to the number of favorites. The authors asserted that the results suggest a "user is more likely to favorite a tweet that has been targeted at them (a public reply message) or is original and/or visually stimulating, rather than a tweet that is simply a retweet of others" (p. 17).   They also suggested that nonprofit advocacy organizations should be aware that there are different types of tweets, that serve different purposes, and that generate different outcomes. Guo and Saxton suggested that an area strongly in need of future research is whether the attention gained by the organization leads to any tangible or intangible organizational outcome. Another area for future research noted was whether and to what extent this online attention generated by the organization can create a "real" impact.

Saxton, G. D., & Waters, R. D. (2014). What do stakeholders like on Facebook? Examining public reactions to nonprofit organizations' informational, promotional, and community-building messages. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *26*(3), 280-299.

Gregory D. Saxton, PhD, is Assistant Professor at York University, Toronto, Schulich School of Business. Dr. Saxton earned a PhD in accounting and political science. His research interests include the role and effects of technology, especially Big Data and social media on the flow of information to and from organizations. Richard D. Waters, PhD, is Associate Professor in the School of Management at the University of San Francisco. Waters earned a doctorate in mass communications at the University of Florida at Gainesville. His primary research interests are fundraising, stakeholder loyalty and relationship cultivation, and the use of new technologies in organizational communication efforts.

Saxton and Waters sought to address a critical gap in highlighting the importance of social media for both practitioners who are actively engaged in public relations and academics engaged in studying the effectiveness of public relations behaviors. The paper begins with an introduction and extensive literature review of three main areas: Online public relations and relationship management; social media and public relations; and social media and interactive organization. The researchers note from the review of the literature that little is known about how publics respond to the messages they receive. Three research questions were asked: 1) To which types of organizational messages are publics more likely to respond? 2) Which types of organizational messages elicit more engagement from the public? And 3) For which types of organizational messages do publics become advocates within their own social networks?

With the individual message as the unit of analysis, they focused on publics' liking, commenting, and sharing in response to these messages, while examining the real-time public reactions to different types of messages organizations are sending. They used the *Nonprofit Times* 100 list, the 100 largest noneducational nonprofit organizations in the United States based on total revenue as published by the *Nonprofit Times* annually. At the time of the study, 97 of the 100 organizations had Facebook pages. Python, a computer programming language, was used to download all organizational status updates, fan likes, comments, and shares, from the organizations' Facebook pages. Organizational messages were categorized by information sharing, fundraising and sales, events and promotions, call to action, and dialogue and community-building. Public reactions to these organizational messages were measured by the number of fan comments, the number of fan likes, and the number of fan shares associated with each message.

The findings revealed that the public is more likely to engage with organizations when they use community-building updates. Additionally, it was revealed that the public responds positively to all three types of message updates (information sharing, promotion and mobilization, and community building). The authors noted that as suggested by previous work (Taylor et al., 2001), the public prefers dialogue over information. The study results also revealed that "call-to-action messages—those with a clear goal of soliciting the public's help in lobbying, advocacy, or volunteering efforts—elicited the highest level of engagement from the public in terms of liking and the second highest in terms of commenting" (p. 294). Interestingly, although liking and commenting more on community-building and call-to-action updates, individuals were *more* likely to share one-way informational updates. They were *least* likely to share updates focusing on fundraising, event promotion, and dialogue and community-building.

Saxton and Waters concluded that the results suggest that the three behavioral indicators (the number of fan likes, comments, and shares), and the level to which publics are responsive to, as well as engaged by can be used to tap the effectiveness of organizations' social media messages. They also concluded that the results also highlight the importance of understanding organization–public relationships in social media through the messages the organizations and publics are sending, instead of just static features of social media such as the profile page.

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Lovejoy, K., & Saxton, G. D. (2012). Information, community, and action: How nonprofit organizations use social media. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *17*(3), 337-353.

At the time of this research, Kristen Lovejoy was a doctoral student at the University at Buffalo, SUNY. She completed her Masters in Communication and Leadership at Canisius College also in Buffalo. Her research interests include social media marketing, nonprofit organizations, and Galileo studies. Gregory D. Saxton was an Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication at the University at Buffalo, SUNY. His research interests are in organization-public relations, technology and management, and new media and organizational communication, concentrating on nonprofit organizations.

This study examined the Twitter utilization practices of the 100 largest nonprofit organizations in the United States in order to enhance understanding of the communicative functions microblogging serves for organizations. The authors asked the question: How are organizations using microblogging? The literature review is divided into three sections: new media as an organizational communication and stakeholder engagement vehicle; social media and organizational communication; and classifying social media messages. The study sought to answer

1) How are organizations using microblogging applications? 2) For what functions is organizational microblogging being employed? and 3) How do organizations vary in their reliance on the primary microblogging functions?

The research employed both tweet-level and organizational-level analyses of 100 nonprofit organizations' use of Twitter. Data was gathered on Twitter utilization by 73 nonprofit organizations for the month-long period from November 8th to December 7th, 2009. A classification scheme was developed by using previous individual-level social media coding schemes, prior blog classification studies (e.g., Macias et al., 2009), and the new media and stakeholder engagement literatures.

The twelve types of tweets that emerged from the coding process were grouped into three major functions: Information, Community, and Action. The information function covered tweets containing information about the organization's activities, highlights from events, or any other news, facts, reports or information relevant to an organization's stakeholders. There were two aspects to the community function: dialogue and community-building. The action function was the most tangible, asking followers to do something concrete to help the organization meet its objectives.

In the next phase of the study, the researchers examined organizations' relative reliance on the three main tweet functions—Information, Community, and Action. Results were displayed visually in a plot diagram. They found that only eight of the organizations were primarily "community builders", and only four were primarily "promoters and mobilizers". These findings were congruous with previous research that found that most organizations are not using social networking sites to their full dialogic, community-building potential.

This was the first study to analyze the content of nonprofit organizations' microblogging updates. It was also the first to classify social media messages by *organizations*, whether governmental, for-profit, or nonprofit. The findings led the authors to conclude that "dialogue may *not* be the key form of social media-based organizational communication" (p. 349). The results differ from prior research in what is the highest aim for social-networking-mediated organizational communication: dialogue. They suggest that organizations need to think about how Twitter can fit into the overall communication plan, as opposed to just thinking of tweeting as a trendy thing to do. They also suggest that the categories of messages described in the study may be generalized to other types of social media. Lastly, they suggest that although this study represents an important addition to the literatures on social media, on organizational communication, and on nonprofit organizations, future research would also benefit from looking at which types of nonprofits rely more heavily on information, community-building, and action-oriented messages.

Literature in Support of the Standards for NCA Accredited Chapter Members

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Balassiano, K., & Chandler, S. M. (2010). The emerging role of nonprofit associations in advocacy and public policy: Trends, issues, and prospects. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 39(*5), 946-955.

Katia Balassiano, PhD, earned the doctorate in Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. She is currently lecturing on land use and housing issues at the University of Hawaii's Department of Urban and Regional Planning. She has worked as a land use consultant and a planning and community development director. Susan M. Chandler earned the PhD in Public Administration at the University of California, Berkeley. She is a professor of public administration and director of the Social Sciences Public Policy Center. Previously she was the director of the State of Hawaii Department of Human Services and taught social work. She has published in the areas of child welfare, social policy, and public administration.

The purpose of this study was to review the emerging role and development of state and national associations of nonprofit organizations. The authors began by addressing the literature that explains the need to mobilize groups of individuals and/or resources to address a specific crisis or an emerging social problem. Thus, organizations with a common purpose are likely to form or join a federation of organizations such as a coalition, a collaborative, or an association. Young (2001) used the term *umbrella associations* to refer to nonprofit organizations whose members are themselves nonprofit organizations. The forms these associations take vary depending on intent, structure, mission, and purpose.

In order to examine the roles and levels of advocacy of a nonprofit umbrella organization the researchers employed two data collections techniques. First, primary data were collected during semistructured telephone interviews conducted with the executive staff of the National Association of Nonprofit Organizations (NCNA) and seven nonprofit associations.

Questions included such topics as the associations' strengths and successes, how associations decide to become involved in state issues related to the nonprofit sector/issues involving the clients served by local nonprofits, how associations come to agreement on the positions taken, the strains or challenges in keeping the association successful, and the future opportunities and threats for the associations. Secondary data were collected from the NCNA Web site and the Web sites of its 26-member associations. Data collected included the type of support associations provide to local nonprofits, the degree to which associations provide training on legislative processes and policy advocacy, get involved in legislative processes, and association priorities.

Literature in Support of the Standards for NCA Accredited Chapter Members

The researchers determined that that the state associations offer a wide array of services that benefit the members as well as build capacity for the sector. Data showed that twenty-four of the 26 State associations provide some type of training to their nonprofit members, 20 offer director and officer liability insurance, 17 offer discounts for office supplies and/or conference call services, 15 provide member directories and/or consultant/vendor directories, 14 provide funding alerts and 14 also provide unemployment insurance alternatives, 12 provide property liability insurance, 11 provide professional liability insurance, and 10 provide support with life insurance policies. Further, the data showed that 88% of the state associations (n = 21) reported that they had distributed materials to members of a state legislature and/or took a public position on a public issue. Twenty associations met with a member of a state legislative body, 19 joined a coalition working on a state policy issue, 18 hosted a community forum on a public policy issue, 17 met with a state executive official to discuss a piece of legislation, 15 issued press releases and/or coordinated grassroots advocacy campaign for their membership, 15 associations distributed materials to members of their Congressional delegation, and 11 met with a member of their Congressional delegation.

The authors concluded that the "state associations provide many resources on policy advocacy and are clearly a valuable source of information for nonprofits trying to make sense of changing legislative issues as well as a source for capacity building for policy advocacy" (p. 950). Additionally, the review of the NCNA "Policy Activities" Web page and links to association Web pages suggested that nonprofit associations engage in activities that further the interests of their members as well as those of their communities. The websites indicated that the activities of the umbrella association that primarily serve their members include capacity building, monitoring the accountability of government in terms of nonprofit-related legislation, lobbying assistance, the establishment of research-based policy priorities, and lobbying on behalf of nonprofit-specific issues. Website examination also revealed that all of the associations' sites were accessible and provided information to nonprofits and to nonmember community groups. Many sites also made this information accessible to the community at large. Lastly, all the associations provided services to their members that included capacity building through training, workshops, and conferences; group benefits such as insurance, workers compensation, and supplies; and policy advocacy and lobbying to promote state laws favorable to nonprofits. The telephone interviews revealed that almost all of the associations train their member nonprofits in the best practices of nonprofit management, assist them in understanding legislative procedures, and help them develop relationships with legislators, the media, and other key stakeholders. The associations "unanimously stated that the services provided by the NCNA have helped nonprofits with training, policy advocacy, and national conferences" (p. 953).

The authors concluded from the findings that the associations place a heavy emphasis on services that meet daily financial and organization needs. The researchers further concluded that due to their linkages to the NCNA, state associations have expanded their role not only to benefit their

constituents but in public policy advocacy. They found that proven strategies for organizational survival and sustainability were networking and collaboration for resource mobilization, service delivery, and policy advocacy. Balassiano and Chandler also concluded that these associations were designed not only to support nonprofit organizations and help build their capacity and develop expertise but also to enhance the sector's voice and influence in the policy-making arena.

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Cromer, L. D., & Goldsmith, R. E. (2010). Child sexual abuse myths: Attitudes, beliefs, and individual differences. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, *19*(6), 618-647.

Lisa DeMarni Cromer, PhD, is an associate professor in the Psychology Department of the University of Tulsa, in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Dr. Cromer earned the PhD at the University of Oregon. Her research interests include the bio/psycho/social outcomes of various forms of life stress, and the factors that promote resilience in the face of adversity. At the time of this publication, Rachel E. Goldsmith, PhD, was an assistant professor in the Department of Behavioral Sciences at Rush University Medical Center in Chicago. Dr. Goldsmith earned a PhD in Clinical Psychology at the University of Oregon. Her research program examines connections among contextual aspects of traumatic experiences, psychological and physical health difficulties, emotion regulation, and recovery processes.

This review provides available data regarding the prevalence for child sexual abuse myths, empirical research that refutes or confirms myth categories, and considerations of cultural contexts and implications. In the introductory section, the authors survey literature that support the reasons that CSA myths contribute to negative outcomes. Among the negative outcomes listed are diminishing awareness for CSA and the allocation of resources to prevent CSA and help victims, and affect upon legal processes and decisions, as juror attitudes and beliefs influence trial outcomes. Thus, the researchers state that identifying CSA myths is an important step in disseminating accurate information, providing appropriate support to victims following disclosure, and informing prevention and intervention efforts. Reviews of both the scholarly and popular literature are provided.

The method for identifying CSA myths was a Google search for the phrase "child sexual abuse myth". Of the 342 active links found, 24 links presented a list of what were deemed to be CSA myths. From these lists, a compilation of 119 "myth" statements was constructed. These statements were coded by four coders into five major categories: (a) myths related to the extent of harm CSA poses (b) myths that deny the existence of CSA or assert that it is extremely rare, (c) myths that

diffuse blame away from the perpetrator (d) myths that reflect perpetrator stereotypes, and e) stereotypes about abuse.

Cromer and Goldsmith then examine available data regarding each myth theme's prevalence, evaluate the veracity of the myths as compared with current empirical evidence, and consider potential implications. Implications include the   belief that CSA is not harmful emerges in the courtroom when judges are misinformed about the legitimacy of delayed disclosures and about the signs of abuse. Regarding stereotypes, the authors suggest that "more research is needed to understand the extent to which the public believes these stereotypes and whether they represent reality to some degree" (p. 634).

The authors then review cultural and cross-cultural considerations with respect to CSA myths. They discuss the fact that some individuals and organizations propose that adult sex with children is not harmful, and that although this is not mainstream thinking, it is possible that it could contribute to CSA myths among the general population. Following a review of literature on prevalence and other topics related to CSA globally, the authors   suggest that risk and protective factors for CSA in different cultures may influence its prevalence, strategies for prevention, and victims' paths to psychological recovery. In the concluding section, Cromer and Goldsmith suggest that CSA myths deny or justify the sexual exploitation of children and therefore comprise an important area of further study. They also suggest that cultural and social structures facilitating CSA need investigation. They further conclude that "for CSA prevention efforts to be successful, it is essential that they target not only what scholars believe are myths but also assess gaps in knowledge that need to be addressed among professionals and laypeople" (p. 638). Lastly, they assert that understanding these myths and promoting education regarding CSA and its effects are crucial aspects in preventing future cycles of understanding and misunderstandings.

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Waters, R. D., Burnett, E., Lamm, A., & Lucas, J. (2009). Engaging stakeholders through social networking: How nonprofit organizations are using Facebook. *Public Relations Review*, *35*(2), 102-106.

At the time of writing, Richard D. Waters, PhD, was Assistant Professor of Management at North Carolina State University. Waters earned the PhD in mass communications at the University of Florida. His research expertise includes public relations and strategic communication. Emily Burnett, M. S. specialized in analytics in the School of Public and International Affairs at North Carolina State University. Anna Lamm, MS, was Director of the Confucius Institute in the Office

of International Affairs at North Carolina State University. Jessica Lucas was also at North Carolina State University.

In this study, the researchers sought to examine how nonprofit social networking sites are being used by the organizations to advance organizations' missions and programs, as well as how they use Facebook to engage their stakeholders and foster relationship growth. In their review of the literature, the authors described three strategies used by nonprofits in using social media. The first strategy involves disclosure. This involves the provision of a detailed description of the organization and its history, including logos and visual cues to establish the connection, and list the individuals who are responsible for maintaining the social networking site profile. Second, the authors stressed that the site should be useful to stakeholders. Third, they stressed that interactivity plays an important role in developing relationships online with stakeholders.

Two research questions were posed: 1) How are nonprofit organizations incorporating relationship development strategies into their Facebook profiles? and 2) Does nonprofit typology influence how organizations influence their Facebook presence? To determine how nonprofit organizations were using Facebook, a content analysis of 275 randomly sampled legally incorporated nonprofit organizations' profiles was conducted. The sample of nonprofits in this study included 34 arts and humanities organizations, 50 educational organizations, 47 healthcare organizations, 39 human service organizations, 89 public/society benefit organizations, and 16 religious organizations.

To evaluate how nonprofits used Facebook the researchers created a codebook of 40 items expected to be present on nonprofit Facebook pages. The profiles were evaluated for the presence of items representing the three areas noted in the literature review: organizational disclosure, information dissemination, and involvement. For disclosure, the researchers determined whether the following items were present: a description of the organization's programs and services, an organizational history, the mission statement, the organization's Web site, the logo, and a listing of the administrators of the profile. Information dissemination was evaluated by determining whether links to news items, photographs, video and audio files, posted announcements, and links to press releases and campaign summaries were utilized. Involvement was measured by presence of methods to contact, donate, and volunteer for the organization along with the use of message boards, provision of an organizational calendar of events, and the presence of an e-commerce store. They also collected information about the organization's profile, such as the number of friends, the number of files, and how often the discussion boards were used.

Results showed that in the area of *disclosure* nearly all of the organizations listed the administrators of their Facebook profiles (97%) and provided a description of the organization (96%). However, while 81% of the organizations linked back to their Web site from their Facebook profile, and 71% used the organizational logo on Facebook, less than half of organizations provided the mission statement of the organization, and less than one-quarter provided a history of the organization. In the area of *information dissemination*, the most often used message dissemination strategy was

using the discussion boards on Facebook (74%). However, from among the remaining seven items measuring dissemination, only two – posting photographs (56%) and providing links to external news stories (54%) – were used by more than half of the sample. For the area of *involvement,* the organizations in the sample did not provide many methods for their supporters to become more involved in the organization. The most common strategy used to involve the supporters was providing e-mail addresses to organizational representatives. Less than half of the organizations in the sample implemented the additional strategies that were examined, including using the message boards, providing an outlet to make donations, listing current volunteer opportunities providing an organizational phone number, providing a calendar of events, and providing an e-commerce store on their profile. The second research question sought to determine if type of nonprofit used any of the specific strategies more than other types. Only three strategies showed any statistical significance. Message boards were used in greater proportions by arts/humanities, public/society benefit, and religious organizations. Video files were used more by public/society benefit, arts/humanities, and human services organizations. Fundraising on Facebook was used more by educational organizations and healthcare organizations.

The researchers offered discussion and conclusions about these results. First, though components of dissemination and involvement were used differently by the nonprofit subsectors, overall, they were largely ignored by the organizations. They suggested that nonprofits must begin making the relationship development efforts by getting volunteers involved in organizational activities and asking for social networking assistance. They stated that their findings match earlier studies on how public relations practitioners viewed the Internet and its impact on relationship building. They asserted that the nonprofits in this study provided links to external news stories yet "they failed to take advantage of other public relations opportunities" (p.105). They also suggested that whether it is providing a listing of events to become involved with or methods to contribute and volunteer, organizations must strive to make their sites more interactive. Lastly, the researchers suggested that as social networking become more ingrained in daily life, nonprofits will see a more diverse audience in terms of age, culture and socio-economic status. Thus, they will need to begin using more social networking applications to meet the growing needs and expectations of stakeholders.

The researchers declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Gormley Jr, W. T., & Cymrot, H. (2006). The strategic choices of child advocacy groups.
Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 35(1), 102-122.

William Gormley, Jr., PhD, is Professor of Public Policy and Co-director of the Center for Research on Children in the U.S. (CROCUS) at Georgetown University. Dr. Gormley earned a PhD in Political Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. His research interests

include government performance and how to measure it, functional and dysfunctional bureaucratic control mechanisms, and children and public policy. Helen Cymrot is a Center for Research on Children in the U.S. (CROCUS) Fellow and a graduate of Georgetown University's master's in Public Policy Program.

The purpose of this research was to assess the strategic choices of child advocacy groups active in state politics within the United States. The focus was upon child advocacy groups at the state level because this enabled the capture of fairly sharp differences in the groups' political environments from state to state. Gormley and Cymrot predicted that groups make some strategic choices based on the presence of enemies (or opponents), and other strategic choices based on the presence of friends (or allies). Previous literature discussed the relative importance of friends, enemies, and fence sitters as targets of lobbying groups. Groups tend to seek out sympathetic legislators when deciding whom to lobby (Denzau & Munger, 1986; Hall & Wayman, 1990; Hojnacki & Kimball, 1998). The authors posited that friends and enemies matter but for different strategic choices. They believed that the presence of friends encourages insider strategies and strategies that rely on persuasion, while the presence of enemies encourages outsider strategies and strategies that rely on constraint. Enemies matter for coalition building, and friends matter for public policy research.

In order to test their predictions, the researchers obtained data on the strategies and tactics of child advocacy groups active at the state level. The data were obtained through VOICES for America's Children, formerly known as the National Association of Child Advocates. VOICES had 59 affiliated groups in 44 states and the District of Columbia that were engaged in child advocacy at the state level. Representatives of 50 of the 59 groups agreed to telephone interviews during 2003-2004. Interviews asked about their top three issues for 2003. For each issue, they were asked about issue framing, strategies to influence public officials, strategies to influence citizens or voters, and coalition partners. More information was obtained about strategies and tactics by asking the executive directors to complete a brief questionnaire survey. The questionnaire focused on the allocation of time and effort between "insider" and "outsider" strategies, the frequency of use of particular strategies, coalition activity, mass media coverage, public policy research, and funding sources.

Contrary to the researchers' prediction, findings suggested that child advocacy groups were more likely to invest in insider strategies if they perceived there to be a larger number of opponents in their political environment. This held true for legislative testimony, meetings with legislators and/or legislative staff members, and meetings with governors and/or gubernatorial staff members, all of which were more likely if the number of opponents was larger. As the authors predicted, there was more use of outsider strategies when the number of opponents was higher. Also as the authors predicted, child advocacy groups were more likely to join a coalition with a business group, a religious group, or another nonprofit organization if they perceived there were a larger number of opponents, or when they faced a larger number of hostile interest groups. Additionally, as

Literature in Support of the Standards for NCA Accredited Chapter Members

predicted child advocacy groups were less likely to issue public policy reports in states where Republicans control the larger percentage of seats in the state House of Representatives. This was consistent with previous research (Hird, 2005) that found more support for policy analysis among Democratic state legislators than among Republicans. Lastly, child advocacy groups "were more likely to issue public policy research reports if they received a more substantial share of their funding from private foundations and government agencies, which tend to value public policy research" (p. 112).

Gromley and Cymrot offer several conclusions. First, they assert that similar to other public interest groups, child advocacy groups active in state politics have difficult choices to make, including consideration of insider strategies, outsider strategies, and coalition-building possibilities. The authors also offer questions for further research and for advocacy group consideration such as: Are child advocacy groups wise to pay such close attention to opponents in their political environment? Should they pay more attention to public opinion? Should they produce public policy reports regardless of whether private foundations and government agencies support them? The authors further suggest the need for more research on the effectiveness of public policy research.

The authors declared that The Foundation for Child Development provided financial support for this project to the Center for Research on Children in the U.S. (CROCUS) at Georgetown University. The authors declare sole responsibility for the contents of this report.