Understanding nonprofit professionalization:
Common concepts and new directions for research

Amanda J. Stewart
School of Public Affairs, American University
PhD Candidate, Department of Public Administration and Policy

Professionalization is a widely used concept that has multiple definitions and elements, which has constrained its systematic study across different fields of practice. With the nonprofit sector's reliance on unpaid volunteers, the professionalization of the nonprofit workforce has not been consistently theorized and operationalized. Without a common conceptual base, it is difficult to untangle clear implications of professionalization for research and practice of nonprofit management. This paper utilizes a broad literature survey of professionalization to identify key elements of the concept, including the rise of associations, standards and norms, business practices, training and professional development, and the shift from volunteer to paid staff. The paper concludes with propositions about how these elements of nonprofit professionalism relate to significant shifts in the sector, including heightened emphasis on performance, increased leadership autonomy, and greater levels of instrumental logic.

Professionalization has swept through the nonprofit sector and transformed it from its origins. For what was once the voluntary sector, many of the nonprofit sector's organizations are now staffed by paid professionals holding specialized expertise and advanced degrees and guided by standards and norms of professional associations. From what Wilensky (1964) referred to as the "professionalization of everyone," a professional class has diffused across the public, profit, and nonprofit sectors and seemingly, blurred sector boundaries. Specific to the nonprofit sector, a professional class of nonprofit managers has emerged with its own unique professionalized characteristics. Given the nonprofit sector's roots in voluntarism and civil society, understanding the diffusion of professionalism in the nonprofit sector is warranted. This paper presents a systematic literature review of the professionalization research, to identify elements and outcomes specific to nonprofit professionalization to form propositions for future research.

With roots far removed from professionalism, the nonprofit sector has origins "as an expression of religious and aesthetic values" (Galambos, 1993, p. 87), and has historically leveraged the human capital of unpaid workers who serve out of a religious or civic responsibility (Van Til, 1988). Nonprofits, or private charities, have proudly fulfilled their role as a conduit of charity and an expression of civic good, commonly acting as a partner alongside public agencies, while maintaining their distinct qualities and services (Clemens, 2010;. Salamon, 1995). Yet, several catalysts have prompted the nonprofit sector to professionalize.

Isomorphic pressures influenced other sectors, including the nonprofit sector, to adopt more business-like, expert-influenced operations and structures (Brinkerhoff & Brinkerhoff, 2002; DiMaggio & Anheier, 1990; Hwang & Powell, 2009). Following Wilson's (1886) call for business-like behaviors in the public sector, the Progressive Reform movement launched the age of the expert with professionals filling public sector bureaucracies (Durant, 2010).

Professionalism was accompanied by a value added perception - a perception that a professional or a professionalized organization was both more accountable and legitimate. Nonprofits also viewed professionalization as an opportunity to bolster their capacity, so that they could be more responsive to need and appear more legitimate among governmental and other partners for the provision of services (Brinkerhoff & Brinkerhoff, 2002; Clemens, 2010; Smith & Lipsky, 1993; Wallis & Dollery, 2006). Resource pressures have also compelled nonprofits to professionalize so that they remained competitive with their public and for-profit peers and maintained accountability to the need they were intended to serve (Bezjian, Holmstrom, & Kipley, 2009; Hwang & Powell, 2009; Salamon, 2003). Further, professionalization of the nonprofit sector has been self-propelling as professionals attract other professionals, contributing to the sector's increasingly professionalized and rationalized work behaviors (DiMaggio & Anheier, 1990).

Scholars and practitioners in the nonprofit sector are concerned about the shifts of the sector away from its voluntary roots to a professionalized status, and the existing research on professionalization is both inconclusive and insufficient in addressing these concerns. While professionalization has brought "symbolic assurances of expertise" to the sector (Smith & Lipsky, 1993, p. 84), nonprofit organizations have also been more susceptible to new "institutional pressures and expectations" (Hwang & Powell, 2009, p. 290). Frumkin (2002) characterized the nonprofit sector as having both "expressive" (i.e. expression of values and service ideals) and "instrumental" (i.e. performance and outcome oriented) elements, and the professionalization of the nonprofit sector signals a dominance of the instrumental over the expressive. In this imbalance, questions remain about what is gained and what is lost in the professionalization of the nonprofit sector (Hodges & Durant, 1989; Skocpol, 2003).

A shortcoming of the existing professionalization research that makes it challenging to decipher clear implications for nonprofit practice and future research is the inconsistent use of the concept of professionalization (Gordon, 2008; Schneider, 2004). Getting a clearer picture of this term is important, because definitions are more than words as they inform perspectives, guide empirical inquiry, and influence interpretation. In this paper, the field of research is surveyed in order to identify elements and outcomes of professionalization that can be applied to the nonprofit sector, to both discuss the current status and inform future directions. Drawing from this existing research, elements and outcomes of professionalization are identified and discussed in their relation to the nonprofit sector. These elements and outcomes are then connected to form research propositions for the professionalization of the nonprofit sector.

Systematic Review of Professionalization Research

In its initial use in the academic literature, "profession" was reserved to reference specific occupational groups, such as doctors, lawyers, clergy or teachers (Carr-Saunders & Wilson, 1886; Flexner, 2001), but early definitions sought to broaden the usefulness of the concept in understanding the workforce and related dynamics (Abbott, 1988; Flexner, 2001; Vollmer and Mills, 1966; Wilensky, 1964). These early definitions are raised here because the journal articles of this literature review emerged from this body of research. While these definitions shared a common interest in explaining the same term, they contained multiple, differing elements, and the disagreement among these scholars highlights the confusion surrounding its application in the research that followed. For example, several of these definitions included overlapping features, but there are also differences among them about what is considered core to professionalization (Flexner, 2001; Vollmer and Mills, 1966; Wilensky, 1964). None of these definitions makes it clear what a threshold for professionalization is (i.e. if all features have to be

present) or how a feature such as jurisdictions or control over an area of work would be defined in actuality (Abbott, 1988; Vollmer and Mills, 1966). The ambiguous nature and disagreement among these core definitions foretells the confusion among the professionalization research that followed. To untangle a clear concept and measure of professionalization that will be useful to nonprofit research, a systematic literature review was implemented and is described in the following section.

Developing the Literature Sample

To focus the literature review on concepts and empirical measures of professionalization, the literature survey was limited to journal articles. "Professionalization" and "professionalism" were used as keywords in the search of the general broader literature, and two stages of literature searches were used.[1] In the first stage, journals from the research fields of nonprofit organizations, public administration, business, and sociology were surveyed. Following Stone, Bigelow and Crittenden's (1999) meta-analysis of nonprofit strategic management studies, the search focused on the highly-ranked journals in those fields, and identified the top three journals from each field using Google Scholar analytics and SJR rankings.[2,3] In the second stage, Web of Science was searched using the same keywords so that other highly cited articles outside of these four fields could be identified, and the top 100 articles from this search were reviewed for their pertinence to the literature review.[4]

[1] Initially this literature survey also included the key word: managerialism, but it quickly became apparent that there was a clear distinction in the literature between managerialism and professionalism (see: Butler Jr (1973), Jarl, Fredriksson, and Persson (2012).

[2] http://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=top_venues&hl=en and http://www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php

[3] With the exception of the field of business, these rankings had agreement on the top journals. In sum, thirteen journals in total were searched in this first stage, resulting in 3,379 journal citations.

[4] http://thomsonreuters.com/web-of-science/

In total, 3,479 articles were screened as part of this literature review to identify articles that included either a definition and/or measure of professionalization. While many articles talked broadly about professionalization or referred to the concept as part of their discussion, articles were not included in the final sample for this analysis unless they had a clear definition or measure of the concept. This review narrowed the number of relevant articles to 78, and articles were coded for their methodological orientation, treatment of professionalization, key research question, and findings. The articles were sorted into two classifications: 78 that defined professionalization or professionalism and 51 that included an operationalized measure of professionalization in an empirical analysis. Refer to Table 1 for a summary of this final sample across the various research fields.

[Insert Table 1 Here]

Identifying Common Elements of Definitions and Measures

To identify the elements of professionalization in the literature sample, an inductive process was used to code each definition and measure. Each article was reviewed to identify how they characterized the features of professionalization, and these features were then grouped into categories, described in Table 2 as "elements" of professionalization. For example, an article describing the compensation of staff as a qualifier for professionalization were grouped into paid staff or a description of training, education, expertise, or knowledge was grouped into training and education, and so forth. Accordingly, seven elements of professionalization were identified among the literature reviewed. These elements are listed in Table 2 along with their total count among this literature sample, a description as a definition or measure; and references for the citing literature.

[Insert Table 2 Here]

While a few of the elements were used more often than others, such as membership in a professional group or education/training, no element dominates among the categories. Some research utilized multi-faceted measures or indexes (R. H. Hall, 1968; Snizek, 1972; Wilensky, 1964), but other research used a singular element (Haley-Lock & Kruzich, 2008; Mizruchi et al., 2006). On average among the research articles, definitions or measures focused on two of the features suggesting that professionalization has varying levels of complexity and meaning depending on the source. Looking closer at these elements, they are arrayed along a spectrum of tangible to intangible indicators, simplistic to multifaceted with units of analysis ranging from individual to organizational characteristics. By the very nature of being intangible, some of these elements are more challenging to operationalize. For example, attitudes of feeling autonomy or professional commitment pose a steeper methodological challenge than the sheer number of paid staff in an organization. Other more tangible factors, like memberships in a professional organization or level of education are comparatively easier to operationalize in a research study. Further, professionalization implies a process with a unit of analysis at a collective or organizational level, but many of the measures are taken from the individual level at one point in time, such as level of education.

Implications of Professionalization for the Nonprofit Sector

Beyond the elements of professionalization that were studied, the literature was next reviewed for how the concept was studied. The outcomes of professionalization generally focused on the effects of professionalization on performance and the independence or autonomy that is gained from professionalization. These outcomes of professionalization are general to the public, profit and nonprofit sectors. Specific to the nonprofit sector and in order to understand

what is lost from professionalization referencing the voluntary and community roots of the sector, the balance between the expressive and instrumental logics will also be discussed.

Relating Performance to Professionalization

Performance is a complex concept with drivers existing at many levels. Among this research sample, professionalization has been treated as having a positive relationship to performance in that there are efficiency and efficacy gains through the professionalization of a workforce or organization. In this area of the professionalization research, performance has been explored by examining the efficiency of processes and the effectiveness of attaining outcomes. In examining organizational processes, studies have emphasized that professionalization is associated with personnel commitment (Bartol, 1979; Damanpour, 1991; Leonardi, Jackson, & Diwan, 2009), and more effective organizational and management strategies (Bell, 1966; Brewer & Walker, 2010; Jarl, Fredriksson, & Persson, 2012; King, 2000; Mosley, 2011; Nicholson-Crotty & Miller, 2012; Reingold & Liu, 2009; Sabet & Klingner, 1993; Schneider, 2004; Squire, 2007; Torres, 1988). Connecting professionalization to outcomes, the unit of analysis has been explored at both personal and organizational levels. At an organizational level, professionalization has been linked to the service quality characteristics (Andersen & Jakobsen, 2011; Bartol, 1979; Chackerian, 1974; Currie, Koteyko, & Nerlich, 2009; Doh, 2013; Mosley, 2011); customer satisfaction (Andersen & Jakobsen, 2011); funding success (Suárez, 2011); and organizational competency and credibility among stakeholders (Lamothe & Lamothe, 2012; Tonon, 2008; Wang & Berman, 2001). At a personal level, professionalization has been linked to personnel matters, including employee satisfaction (Blegen, 1993); accountability and responsibility (Dunn & Legge, 2001); promotion (DiPrete, 1987; Goldner & Ritti, 1967); and turnover intent (Bartol, 1979). The existing research poses a research landscape rich with

possibility for examining more closely professionalization's performance implications for the nonprofit sector.

Garnering Executive Leadership Autonomy through Professionalization

The literature of professionalization has a reoccurring theme of the independence and autonomy gained through expertise and competency (Abbott, 1988). The professionalization research has discussed how professionals elicit a perception of accountability and legitimacy (Lounsbury, 2002; Souitaris, Zerbinati, & Liu, 2012). Extending this discussion to nonprofit executives has practical and research implications. For example, research has investigated if professional autonomy leads to performance innovations, which has implications for nonprofit executives and other nonprofit professionals (Bhatti, Olsen, & Pedersen, 2011; Currie et al., 2009; Sabet & Klingner, 1993; Teodoro, 2010). Beyond the executive level, professionalization has contributed to a standardization of work processes (Galaskiewicz, 1985; Marshall & Suárez, 2013; Miller, Glick, Wang, & Huber, 1991; Noordegraaf & Van Der Meulen, 2008). For example, an area of focus in this professionalization research is how organizational structure and processes, including collaboration, bureaucratization and rationalization, emerge from dynamics of professionalization (Blau, Heydebrand, & Stauffer, 1966; Faunce & Clelland, 1967; Haga, Graen, & Dansereau, 1974; Hall, 1968; Hwang & Powell, 2009; Montagna, 1968; Schermerhorn Jr, 1976; Staggenborg, 1988; Warren, 1968). While professionalization appears to have brought independence and autonomy to the upper ranks of organizations, it appears to have brought increased worker control to the lower ranks.

Shifting to an Instrumental Logic

With the voluntary and community roots of the nonprofit sector, the shifting balance between expressive and instrumental logics introduced by professionalization is important to

understand. Whereas an expressive logic is concerned with the personal values expressed through nonprofit service, an instrumental logic is focused on organizational performance and outcomes of these services (Frumkin, 2002). Mason (1996) challenged that the expressive nature of the nonprofit sector should not be overlooked in favor of an instrumental logic, but professionalization effectively shifts this balance for the nonprofit sector. Professionalization is oriented towards more of an instrumental logic as expertise and competency are valued over mission-oriented service ideals that an expressive logic represents. In order to understand the future direction of a professionalized nonprofit sector, this shifting balance between expressive and instrumental logics generated by professionalization must be first understood. Also, while the existing professionalization literature addresses the service ethic of professionals and professionalized organizations (Butler Jr, 1973; Hwang & Powell, 2009; Montagna, 1968; Saxberg & Slocum, 1968; Tonon, 2008), this literature does not adequately answer to who or what this service is directed. For example, a professional is inherently balancing service to their own personal goals, the goals of their organization, and the goals of their profession. Thus, beyond just understanding the implications of professionalization's shift towards an instrumental over an expressive logic, nonprofit research should further explore to what end the service orientation of a nonprofit professional is directed.

Developing Propositions for Future Research

When Wilensky wrote his classic in 1964 his title raised the question: "The professionalization of everyone?" suggesting that professional status needed to be justified and investigated. The preceding discussion reviewed existing professionalization research to identify main features of the concept: professional membership and organizations; norms, standards, and attitudes; education and training; organizational and management strategies; and paid staff. These elements represent what constitutes professionalization from both a research and practical perspective. Taking these

elements together with the outcomes of professionalization that were identified as pertinent to the nonprofit sector – performance, executive autonomy and instrumental logic – the professionalization of the nonprofit sector will now be revisited and propositions for research will be developed. Table 3 summarizes these elements and outcomes of professionalization for the nonprofit sector and related propositions for research.

[Insert Table 3 Here]

Professional Membership and Associations

Given the diversity of the nonprofit sector, many professional groups are represented among the nonprofit workforce. Among these workers are doctors, social workers, lawyers, educators and other professions whose professional credentials do not limit them to one sector of service. For example, a doctor can be employed in the public, private or nonprofit sector, and similarly for the other aforementioned professions. Thus, membership in a professional group is not specific to one sector, and by their very membership in a professional group, professionals are granted credibility across sectors. Given the increased accountability pressures faced by the nonprofit sector, it is worthy to explore this interconnection between professional membership and legitimacy granted to the professional.

Professional associations connect professionals into organized groups that serve collaborative purposes along with standardization objectives. For example, professional associations host regular meetings for gathering members together, create leadership structures for establishing professional standards, and generate profession-specific communications, such as journals or newsletters. These associations help support the identity and diffusion of norms and standards among a professional group. A professional association helps create a reference

group for a professional, and in doing so, provides a benchmark or comparison for performance both in the collective sense as well as by the connections formed among individual professionals.

Professional groups, both their very presence and the power of control they yield over their members, are expected to be related to performance. A professional holding allegiance to both an organization and a professional group will have higher expectations of their performance, because they feel responsibility to themselves, their organization of employment, and their professional identity. For this first proposition, research should explore the dynamics of professional identity and group affiliation and performance implications.

Proposition 1: The presence and power of professional groups in the nonprofit sector will lead to a higher emphasis on performance.

The Institution of Norms and Standards

Norms and standards are used professionally to create uniformity of work processes and service delivery across professionals and organizations. Just as the private sector is oriented to profit generation and the public sector is oriented towards public service, the nonprofit sector does have a norm of mission orientation. Yet the diversity of the sector and its various professional groups prevent further diffusion of norms across nonprofit organizations. Similarly, standards are unique to specific sub-sectors of the nonprofit sector as service delivery in the nonprofit sector includes such diversity as artistic performances, group therapy and legal services. Unique to specific subsectors, accreditation bodies, such as the Council on Accreditation, offer service standards, such as residential group treatment in the human service sub-sector.

Professionals and organizations operating in reference to clear norm expectations and standards have a framework implementation and operation of their nonprofit services. Norms

and standards are accepted for their "tried and true" nature in that they have been implemented before, offer an inherent best practice, and provide benchmarks or references for performance. Further, norms and standards should translate into efficiency and effectiveness as they provide a clear mandate and structure for accomplishing nonprofit goals. Operating from professional norms and standards offers assurances of predictability and self-governance, which can be translated into efficiency and credibility in a professional position or organization. Accordingly, the next proposition connects professional norms and standards to performance efficiency and effectiveness.

Proposition 2: *The institution of professional norms will be associated with a greater focus by nonprofit organizations on efficiency and effectiveness.*

The Increase of Education and Training

While education and training is a widely-discussed element of professionalization, a survey of nonprofit executives by Suárez (2011) found that 51% had an advanced degree and 25% had a management related degree. These findings, while a limited sample, may indicate that the nonprofit workforce may not commonly uphold this aspect of professionalization. Beyond higher education, nonprofit resources are often strapped for non-essential spending allocations, and accordingly, professional development and staff training line-items are commonly cut in the first phase of budget cutbacks. Yet, specialized training, such as professional development program, is critical for a profession's development and maintenance. Education and training programs can serve as a credentialing process for the professional as they gain specialized skills and knowledge. While nonprofit boards are responsible for oversight of the nonprofit executive, the executive's education and training provide assurances of management skills and programmatic expertise, which may grant greater independence to the

executive. Accordingly, the following proposition is made that connects the education and training level of the executive to the degree of autonomy they experience in their leadership capacity.

Proposition 3: *An increase in executive education and training will be associated with greater levels of leadership autonomy.*

The Introduction and Increasing Use of Business Practices

As described earlier, nonprofit organizations are adopting business-like practices. These practices are commonly adopted as a nonprofit's answer to isomorphic pressures and needing capacity to manage complex operations. Described in the literature as rationalization or bureaucratization, nonprofits seek to gain capacity for performance through the implementation of structures, policies, and procedures. Nonprofit organizations have varying use of these rationalized practices based on organizational objectives and characteristics. For example, larger organizations might mimic their public and profit sector peers as they operate complete with an executive management team, hierarchical structure, and a strategic plan. Smaller organizations might adopt piece-meal aspects of a business model, such as policies and procedures that govern daily operations. Whereas executive leadership is expected to gain independence through professionalization, the staff they manage may be more constrained through the trickle down of strict structures, governing policies, and standard procedures. Understanding how the institutionalization of business practices affect nonprofit sector staff will help explain what is lost as well as what is gained through professionalization. Thus, the following proposition is proposed to assess how rationalized and bureaucratized practices of nonprofit organization affect implementing staff.

Proposition 4: The introduction of business processes in nonprofit organizations will be associated with higher levels of worker control.

The Shift from Volunteer to Paid Staff

A core question of professionalization in the nonprofit sector that demands a response is how has the transition from a volunteer to paid workforce transformed the very nature of the voluntary sector. There are inherent trade-offs in this shift of nonprofit workforce composition as paid and volunteer staff fulfill different organizational objectives and serve from different motivations. For example, paid staff are more equipped to lend capacity to specialized programmatic services, but volunteer staff help engage core stakeholders and potentially build a donor base. Volunteers are typically short-term in nature, require significant oversight and support, and commonly have service or altruistic motivations. By comparison, paid staff have longer tenures with the organization, are more accountable to organizational objectives, and have a variety of motivations, ranging from service to compensation and job security. Driven by accountability and a performance orientation, the transition to primarily paid staff in the nonprofit sector has marked a shift away from the expressive orientation of the voluntary sector. Research in the nonprofit sector has linked the level of pay to motivation of employees for nonprofit sector work (Bassous, 2013; Ben-Ner, Ren, Paulson, 2010), but this research has focused on the level of compensation rather than the more general transition from unpaid to paid workforce, and it has not sufficiently explored these hypotheses within the nonprofit sector, instead looking at differences between sector. Thus, research on the sector's shift to a paid workforce and the implications of a dominant instrumental rationale is warranted and framed in the following proposition.

Proposition 5: A shift from voluntary to paid employment will be associated with the rise of the instrumental logic of the nonprofit sector.

Conclusion

The spread of professionalization is rife with implications for the nonprofit sector, as it shifts the very nature of the sector from its voluntary roots to being staffed by paid professionals, equipped with specialized skills, training, and professional standards. This paper has systematically sorted through existing professionalization research to identify common elements of the concept. Further, since previous research has failed to provide satisfactory answers on the individual and combined effects of elements of professionalization in the nonprofit sector, these elements were used to frame outcomes of professionalization and develop propositions for future research. In closing, the following discussion will be two-fold: underscore that professionalization cannot be treated in the nonprofit sector as a "one-size-fits-all" concept and motivate future research of professionalization to employ the concept more consistently.

The outcomes and elements of professionalization will vary according to the subsector, organizational and personal differences found among the nonprofit sector. The nonprofit subsector will prompt higher significance among certain elements. For example, sub-sectors heavily reliant on specific professional groups, such as medial or legal professionals, will be more affected by the influence of professional groups. Other sub-sectors rooted in civic engagement or faith communities, such as neighborhood centers or food pantries, may feel more strongly the shift from an expressive to instrumental logic as paid staff take on programmatic responsibilities from volunteers. In short, the power of each of the professionalization elements is expected to vary by sub-sector in the nonprofit sector.

At an organizational level, characteristics, such as age, size, and financial composition, will influence variation among professionalization elements and outcomes. For example, adopting professionalization elements, such as standards or business practices, may be a function of a funding requirement from the government. Alternatively, older organizations may adopt professionalization elements as a factor of their maturing operations, and large nonprofits may have professionalized staff and structures for capacity that equips them to manage the size and breadth of their nonprofit operations. Here again, variation is expected across organizations as characteristics of the nonprofit will influence the elements they adopt of professionalization and in turn, how their mission and operations are shaped by this shifting orientation.

Variation among professionalization elements and outcomes is also expected at the personal level of the nonprofit sector. Personal characteristics, including demographics, experience and educational background, should be considered in any study of professionalization in the nonprofit sector. For example, generational differences between exiting baby boomer and rising millennial executives may impact nonprofit organizations and the sector as a whole as each generation has distinct influences, motivations, and orientations (Kunreuther, Kim & Rodriquez, 2009). Also, among the nonprofit workforce is an emerging nonprofit managerial profession demarked by position, rank, experience, and often specialized training. This nonprofit management professional group is specialized in experience and orientation to the nonprofit sector and will have differences from a professional coming from a group outside of the nonprofit sector. Another difference may be found among the educational background of the nonprofit professional. For example, education and training programs specific to the nonprofit sector emerged in the 1970s and 1980s, and these specialized education programs signal that the skills necessary for management and leadership in the nonprofit sector are thought to be different

from what other sectors require (King, 2004; O'Neill, 2007; O'Neill & Young, 1988; Young, 1999). The educational background of professionals should be a factor considered in nonprofit professionalization studies to understand how outcomes are influenced by the professional's educational and training orientation. Appreciating the context of sub-sector, organization and person is critical to understanding how professionalization has spread across and influenced the nonprofit sector.

Commenting more generally to the study of professionalization across sectors and academic fields, the results of this paper's systematic literature review also suggest that there may be some "terminological confusion" surrounding professionalization. By applying the concept more consistently and judicially, the research would be strengthened, and accordingly, its contribution to theory and practice. As Vollmer and Mills (1966) attempted to sort out, professionalization, professionalism and professional are distinct terms and concepts, and this literature review highlighted the challenge of applying these terms correctly and consistently. Further adding to this confusion are other related organizational and occupational concepts, such as rationalization (referring to organizational business practices, i.e. Weber's rational bureaucracy) and managerialism (referring to manager practices and influences, which are distinct in meaning, intent, and measure). Specific to the nonprofit sector, professionalization has been used commonly to reflect the transition of the sector from its voluntary roots to its widespread usage of paid staff. But perhaps this terminology needs to be used more judiciously so that professionalization is reserved for the fullness of professionalization elements raised in this discussion, and not simply the payroll status of a nonprofit's personnel.

References

Abbott, A. D. (1988). *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Alexander, J. (2000). Adaptive strategies of nonprofit human service organizations in an era of devolution and new public management. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 10*(3), 287-287-303.

Andersen, L. B., & Jakobsen, M. (2011). Does owndership matter for the provision of professionalized services? HIP Operations at publicly and privately owned clinics in Denmark *Public Administration, 89*(3), 956-974.

Ashworth, R., Boyne, G., & Delbridge, R. (2009). Escape from the iron cage? Organizational change and isomorphic pressures in the public sector. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 19*(1), 165-187.

Bartol, K. M. (1979). Professionalism as a predictor of organizational commitment, role stress and turnover: A multidimensional approach. *Academy of Management Journal, 22*(4), 815-821.

Bassous, M. (2013). What are the Factors that Affect Worker Motivation in Faith-Based Nonprofit Organizations?. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 1-27.

Bell, G. D. (1966). Predictability of work demands and professionalization as determinants of workers' discretion. *Academy of Management Journal, 9*(1), 20-28.

Ben-Ner, A., Ren, T., & Paulson, D. F. (2010). A sectoral comparison of wage levels and wage inequality in human services industries. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*.

Bezjian, J., Holmstrom, W., & Kipley, D. (2009). Creating not-for-profit organizational legitimacy during periods of economic constraints and diminishing donor resources. *Business Renaissance Quarterly, 4*(4), 49-67.

Bhatti, Y., Olsen, A. L., & Pedersen, L. H. (2011). Administrative professionals and the diffusion of innovations: The case of citizen service centres *Public Administration, 89*(2), 577-594.

Blau, P. M., Heydebrand, W. V., & Stauffer, R. E. (1966). The structure of small bureaucracies. *American Sociological Review, 31*(2), 179-191.

Blegen, M. A. (1993). Nurses' job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of related variables. *Nursing Research, 42*(1), 36-41.

Bock, E. W. (1967). The female clergy: A case of professional marginality. *American Journal of Sociology, 72*(5), 531-539.

Brewer, G. A., & Walker, R. M. (2010). Explaining variation in perceptions of red tap: A professionalism-marketization model. *Public Administration, 88*(2), 418-438.

Brinkerhoff, D., & Brinkerhoff, J. (2002). Government-nonprofit relations in comparative perspective *Public Administration and Development, 22*(1), 3-18.

Brown, John L., & Schneck, Rodney. (1979). A structural comparison between Canadian and American industrial organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24*(1), 24-47.

Butler Jr, A. G. (1973). Project management: A study in organizational conflict. *Academy of Management Journal, 16*(1), 84-101.

Carr-Saunders, A. M., & Wilson, P. A. (1933). *The professions*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Chackerian, R. (1974). Police professionalism and citizen evaluations: A preliminary look. *Public Administration Review, 34*(2), 141-148.

Chattopadhyay, Prithviraj, Finn, Carmel, & Ashkanasy, Neal M. (2010). Affective responses to professional dissimilarity: A matter of status *Academy of Management Journal, 53*(4), 808-826.

Christofilopoulou, Pwkevy. (1992). Professionalism and public policy making in Greece: The influence of engineers in the local government reforms *Public Administration, 70*(1), 99-118.

Clemens, E. (2010). In the shadow of the New Deal: Reconfiguring the roles of government and charity, 1928-1940. In E. Clemens & D. Guthrie (Eds.), *Politics and partnerships: The role of voluntary associations in America's political past and present*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Cooper, D. J., & Robson, K. (2006). Accounting, professions and regulation: Locating the sites of professionalization. *Accounting, Organizations and Society, 31*(4), 415-444.

Currie, G., Koteyko, N., & Nerlich, B. (2009). The dynamics of professions and development of new roles in public service organizations: The case of modern matrons in the English NHS. *Public Administration, 87*(2), 295-311.

Damanpour, F. (1991). Organizational innovation: A meta-analysis of effects of determinants and moderators [Article]. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*(3), 555-590.

Daniel, C., & Rose, B. J. (1991). Blending professionalism and political acuity: Empirical support for an emerging ideal. *Public Administration Review, 51*(5), 438-441.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Anheier, H. K. (1990). The sociology of nonprofit organizations and sectors. *Annual Review of Sociology, 16*(1), 137-159.

DiPrete, T. A. (1987). The professionalization of administration and equal employment opportunity in the U. S. federal government. *American Journal of Sociology, 93*(1), 119-140.

Ding, Waverly W. (2011). The impact of founders' professional-education background on the adoption of open science by for-profit biotechnology firms. *Management Science, 57*(2), 257-273.

Doh, S. (2013). Social capital, economic development, and the quality of government: How interaction between social capital and economic development affects the quality of government. *Public Administration*.

Dunn, D. D., & Legge, J. S., Jr. (2001). U.S. local government managers and the complexity of responsibility and accountability in democratic governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART, 11*(1), 73-88.

Durant, R. F. (2010). A heritage made our own. In R. F. Durant (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of American Bureaucracy* (pp. 3-22). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eesley, Charles E., Hsu, David H., & Roberts, Edward B. (2013). The contingent effects of top management teams on venture performance: Aligning founding team composition with innovation strategy and commercialization environment. *Strategic Management Journal*.

Eimicke, W. B. (1974). Professionalism and participation: Compatible means to improved social services? *Public Administration Review, 34*(4), 409-414.

Faunce, W. A., & Clelland, D. A. (1967). Professionalization and stratification patterns in an industrial community. *American Journal of Sociology, 72*(4), 341-350.

Ferlie, E., Fitzgerald, L., Wood, M., & Hawkins, C. (2005). The nonspread of innovations: The mediating role of professionals. [Article]. *Academy of Management Journal, 48*(1), 117-134.

Fitza, M., Matusik, S. F., & Mosakowski, E. (2009). Do VCs matter? the importance of owners on performance variance in start-up firms. *Strategic Management Journal, 30*(4), 387-404.
Flexner, A. (2001). Is Social Work a Profession? *Research on Social Work Practice, 11*(2), 152-165.
Foote, N. (1953). The professionalization of labor in detroit. *American Journal of Sociology, 58*(4), 371-380.
Fourcade, M. (2006). The construction of a global profession: The transnationalization of economics. *American Journal of Sociology, 112*(1), 145-194.
Fox, J. W., & Vonk, J. A. (1973). Comments on "Hall's professionalism scale: An empirical reassessment". *American Sociological Review, 38*(3), 392-395.
Frumkin, P. (2002). *On being nonprofit : a conceptual and policy primer*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
Fulmer, R. M., Gibbs, P. A., & Goldsmith, M. (2000). Developing leaders: How winning companies keep On winning. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 42*(1), 49-59.
Galambos, L. (1993). Nonprofit organizations and the emergence of America's corporate commonwealth in the twentieth century. In D. C. Hammack & D. R. Young (Eds.), *Nonprofit Organizations in a Market Economy: Understanding New Roles, Issues, and Trends* (1st ed., pp. 82-104). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
Galaskiewicz, Joseph. (1985). Professional Networks and the Institutionalization of a Single Mind Set. *American Sociological Review, 50*(5), 639-658.
Goldner, F. H., & Ritti, R. R. (1967). Professionalization as career immobility. *American Journal of Sociology, 72*(5), 489-502.
Gordon, D. C. (2008). French NGOs in the global era: Professionalization "without borders"? *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 19*(4), 372-394.
Haga, W. J., Graen, G., & Dansereau, F., Jr. (1974). Professionalism and role making in a service organization: A longitudinal investigation. *American Sociological Review, 39*(1), 122-133.
Hahn, A. B., & Raley, G. A. (1998). Youth development: On the path toward professionalization. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 8*(4), 387-402.
Haley-Lock, A., & Kruzich, J. (2008). Serving workers in the human services: The roles of organizational ownership, chain affiliation, and professional leadership in frontline job benefits. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 37*(3), 443-467.
Hall, R. H. (1968). Professionalization and bureaucratization. *American Sociological Review, 33*(1), 92-104.
Hellmann, T., & Puri, M. (2002). Venture capital and the professionalization of start-up firms: Empirical evidence. *The Journal of Finance, 57*(1), 169-197.
Hodges, D., & Durant, R. (1989). The professional state revisited: Twixt Scylla and Charybdis. *Public Administration Review, 49*(5), 474-485.
Hrebiniak, L. G. (1976). Size and staff professionalization. *Academy of Management Journal, 19*(4), 662-669.
Hwang, H., & Powell, W. (2009). The rationalization of charity: The influences of professionalism in the nonprofit sector. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 54*(2), 268-298.

Jarl, M., Fredriksson, A., & Persson, S. (2012). New public management in public education: A catalysis for the professionalization of Swedish school principals *Public Administration, 90*(2), 429-444.

Jauch, Lawrence R., Glueck, William F., & Osborn, Richard N. (1978). Organizational loyalty, professional commitment, and academic research productivity. *Academy of Management Journal, 21*(1), 84-92.

Jonsson, Stefan, & Regnér, Patrick. (2009). Normative barriers to imitation: Social complexity of core competences in a mutual fund industry. *Strategic Management Journal, 30*(5), 517-536.

King, J. D. (2000). Changes in professionalism in US state legislatures. *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, 327-343.

King, N. (2004). Social capital and nonprofit leaders. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 14*(4): 471-486.

Kunreuther, F., Kim, H., & Rodriguez, R. (2009). *Working across generations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lamothe, M., & Lamothe, S. (2012). To trust or not to trust? What matters in local government-vendor relationships? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 22*(4), 867-892.

Leonardi, P. M., Jackson, M. H., & Diwan, A. (2009). The enactment-externalization dialectic: Rationalization and the persistence of counterproductive technology design practices in student engineering. *Academy of Management Journal, 52*(2), 400-420.

Lounsbury, M. (2002). Institutional transformation and status mobility: The professionalization of the field of finance. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*(1), 255-266.

Lundström, T. (2001). Child protection, voluntary organizations, and the public sector in Sweden. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 12*(4), 355-371.

Marshall, J. H., & Suárez, D. (2013). The flow of management practices: An analysis of NGO monitoring and evaluation eynamics. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*.

Mason, D. (1996). *Leading and managing the expressive dimension.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, C. C., Glick, W. H., Wang, Y.-d., & Huber, G. P. (1991). Understanding technology-structure relationships: Theory development and meta-analytic theory testing. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*(2), 370-399.

Miller, G. A. (1967). Professionals in bureaucracy: Alienation among industrial scientists and engineers. *American Sociological Review, 32*(5), 755-768.

Mizruchi, M. S., Stearns, L. B., & Marquis, C. (2006). The conditional nature of embeddedness: A study of borrowing by large U.S. firms, 1973-1994. *American Sociological Review, 71*(2), 310-333.

Montagna, P. D. (1968). Professionalization and bureaucratization in large professional organizations. *American Journal of Sociology, 74*(2), 138-145.

Mosley, J. E. (2011). Institutionalization, Privatization, and Political Opportunity: What Tactical Choices Reveal About the Policy Advocacy of Human Service Nonprofits. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 40*(3), 435-457.

Mosley, J. E., Maronick, Matthew P., & Katz, Hagai. (2012). How organizational characteristics affect the adaptive tactics used by human service nonprofit managers confronting financial uncertainty. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership, 22*(3), 281-303.

Neuse, S. M. (1978). Professionalism and authority: Women in public service. *Public Administration Review, 38*(5), 436-441.
Nicholson-Crotty, J., & Miller, S. M. (2012). Bureaucratic effectiveness and influence in the legislature. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART, 22*(2), 347-371.
Noordegraaf, M., & Van Der Meulen, M. (2008). Professional power play: Organizing management in health care. *Public Administration, 86*(4), 1055-1069.
Noordegraaf, M., Van Der Steen, M., & Van Twist, M. (2013). Fragmented or connective professionalism? Strategies for professionalizing the work of strategists and other organizational professionals. *Public Administration*.
O'Neill, M. (2007). The future of nonprofit management education. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 36*(4): 169-176.
O'Neill, M., & Young, D. (1988). *Educating managers of nonprofit organizations*. New York: Praeger.
O'Reilly, C. A., Parlette, G. N., & Bloom, J. R. (1980). Perceptual measures of task characteristics: The biasing effects of differing frames of reference and job attitudes. *Academy of Management Journal, 23*(1), 118-131.
Reingold, D., & Liu, H. (2009). Do poverty attitudes of social service agency directors influence organizational behavior? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 38*(2), 307-332.
Sabet, M. G., & Klingner, D. (1993). Exploring the impact of professionalism on administrative innovation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 3*(2), 252-266.
Salamon, L. (1995). *Partners in public service: Government-nonprofit relations in the modern welfare state*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Salamon, L. (2003). *The resilient sector : the state of nonprofit America*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
Saxberg, B. O., & Slocum, J. J. W. (1968). The management of scientific manpower. [Article]. *Management Science, 14*(8), B-473-B-489.
Schermerhorn Jr, J. R. (1976). Openness to interorganizational dooperation: A study of hospital administrators. *Academy of Management Journal, 19*(2), 225-236.
Schneider, M. (2004). Performance management by culture in the National Labor Relations Board's Division of Judges and the German Labor Courts of Appeal. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 14*(1), 19-32.
Skocpol, T. (2003). *Diminished democracy: From membership to management in American civic life*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
Smith, S. R., & Lipsky, M. (1993). *Nonprofits for hire: The welfare state in the age of contracting*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
Snell, S. A., & Dean, J. J. W. (1994). Strategic compensation for integrated manufacturing: The moderating effects of job and organizational inertia. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*(5), 1109-1140.
Snizek, W. E. (1972). Hall's professionalism scale: An empirical reassessment. *American Sociological Review, 37*(1), 109-114.
Stone, M., Bigelow, B., & Crittendon, V. (1999). Research on strategic management in nonprofit organizations: Synthesis, analysis, and future directions. Administration & Society, 31(3), 378-423.
Souitaris, V., Zerbinati, S., & Liu, G. (2012). Which iron cage? Endo- and exoisomorphism in corporate venture capital programs. *Academy of Management Journal, 55*(2), 477-505.

Squire, P. (2007). Measuring state legislative professionalism: The Squire Index revisited. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly, 7*(2), 211-227.
Staggenborg, S. (1988). The consequences of professionalization and formalization in the pro-choice movement. *American Sociological Review, 53*(4), 585-605.
Suarez, D. F. (2010). Street credentials and management backgrounds: Careers of nonprofit executives in an evolving sector. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 39*(4), 696-716.
Suárez, D. F. (2011). Collaboration and professionalization: The contours of public sector funding for nonprofit organizations. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 21*(2), 307-326.
Suarez, D. F. (2009). Street credentials and management backgrounds: Careers of nonprofit executives in an evolving sector. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*.
Teodoro, M. P. (2010). Contingent professionalism: Bureaucratic mobility and the adoption of water conservation rates. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART, 20*(2), 437-459.
Tonon, J. M. (2008). The costs of speaking truth to power: How professionalism facilitates credible communication. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART, 18*(2), 275-295.
Torres, D. L. (1988). Professionalism, variation, and organizational survival. *American Sociological Review, 53*(3), 380-394.
Van Til, J. (1988). *Mapping the third sector: Voluntarism in a changing social economy*. New York, NY: Foundation Center.
Vollmer, H. M., & Mills, D. L. (1965). Some comments on "The professionalization of everyone?". *American Journal of Sociology, 70*(4), 480-481.
Vollmer, H. M., & Mills, D. L. (1966). *Professionalization*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.,: Prentice-Hall.
Wallis, J., & Dollery, B. (2006). Revitalizing the contribution non-profit organizations can make to the provision of human services. *International Journal of Social Economics, 33*(7), 491-491.
Wang, X., & Berman, E. (2001). Hypotheses about performance measurement in counties: Findings from a survey. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART, 11*(3), 403-427.
Warren, D. I. (1968). Power, visibility, and conformity in formal organizations. *American Sociological Review, 33*(6), 951-970.
Weissert, C. S. (2001). Reluctant partners: The role of preferences, incentives, and monitoring in program compliance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART, 11*(4), 435-453.
Wilensky, H. L. (1964). The professionalization of everyone? *American Journal of Sociology, 70*(2), 137-158.
Wilensky, H. L., & Ladinsky, Jack. (1967). From religious community to occupational group: Structural assimilation among professors, lawyers, and engineers. *American Sociological Review, 32*(4), 541-561.
Wilson, Woodrow. (1886). *The study of public administration*.
Young, D. (1999). Nonprofit management studies in the United States: Current developments and future prospects. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 5*(1): 13-23.

Table 1: Summary of Final Sample (n=78) among Fields

Field	Included a Definition	Empirical Analysis
Nonprofit	9	5
Public Administration	25	14
Business	21	14
Sociology	18	14
Other	5	4
Total	**78**	**51**

Table 2: Common Definitions and Measures identified from Professionalization Literature Review

	Element	Definition Element	Select Definition References	Measure Element	Select Measure References
1a	Membership in a Professional Group N=42	Identification or membership in an occupational group	Bartol, 1979; Brown & Schneck, 1979; Chattopadhyay, Finn, & Ashkanasy, 2010; Christofilopoulou, 1992; Cooper & Robson, 2006; DiPrete, 1987; Eesley, Hsu, & Roberts, 2013; Ferlie, Fitzgerald, Wood, & Hawkins, 2005; Fourcade, 2006; Jonsson & Regnér, 2009; Mizruchi, Stearns, & Marquis, 2006; Teodoro, 2010; Wilensky & Ladinsky, 1967	Person is member of a professional group or organizational structure includes professional groups N=26	Blegen, 1993; Currie, Koteyko, & Nerlich, 2009; Hrebiniak, 1976; Hwang & Powell, 2009; Mizruchi et al., 2006; Noordegraaf & Van Der Meulen, 2008; Torres, 1988
1b	Professional Organization N=12	Establishment or involvement in a professional organization, which may govern codes of ethics, procedures, norms, standards, or publications specific to an occupational group	Ashworth et al., 2009; Bartol, 1979; Brewer & Walker, 2010; Butler Jr, 1973; Daniel & Rose, 1991; Foote, 1953; Fulmer, Gibbs, & Goldsmith, 2000; Hahn & Raley, 1998; Lounsbury, 2002; Noordegraaf & Van Der Meulen, 2008; Noordegraaf et al., 2013; Schneider, 2004	Professional association exists and membership activities include conferences, committees, journals N=16	Ferlie et al., 2005; Haga, Graen, & Dansereau, 1974; Lounsbury, 2002; Neuse, 1978; O'Reilly, Parlette, & Bloom, 1980; Schermerhorn Jr, 1976; Teodoro, 2010
2a	Norms or Standards N=28	Reliance on standards, expertise or knowledge related to a specific occupational group	Ashworth, Boyne, & Delbridge, 2009; Bartol, 1979; Chackerian, 1974; Cooper & Robson, 2006; Hahn & Raley, 1998; Hrebiniak, 1976; Schneider, 2004	Professional norms or standard exist or enforced for occupational group N=13	Bartol, 1979; Leonardi, Jackson, & Diwan, 2009; Sabet & Klingner, 1993
2b	Attitude and Service Orientation N=16	Commitment to professional autonomy and service	Bartol, 1979; Blegen, 1993; Butler Jr, 1973; Eimicke, 1974; Jauch, Glueck, & Osborn, 1978Montagna, 1968; Schneider, 2004; Tonon, 2008	Feeling of professional commitment or autonomy N=9	R. H. Hall, 1968; Snizek, 1972; Souitaris, Zerbinati, & Liu, 2012
3	Education or Training N=47	Specialized education or training, resulting in competencies and professional power	Chackerian, 1974; Daniel & Rose, 1991; Ding, 2011; Foote, 1953; Goldner & Ritti, 1967; Haley-Lock & Kruzich, 2008; Hwang & Powell, 2009; Lundström, 2001; G. A. Miller, 1967; Reingold & Liu, 2009; Torres, 1988; Noordegraaf, Van Der Steen, & Van Twist, 2013 Wang & Berman, 2001; Warren, 1968; Wilensky, 1964	Level of education or training N=16	Bell, 1966; Bock, 1967; Montagna, 1968
4	Organizational or Managerial Practices N=35	Formalized management structures and procedures	Fitza, Matusik, & Mosakowski, 2009; Hellmann & Puri, 2002; Marshall & Suárez, 2013; Mosley, Maronick, & Katz, 2012; Squire, 2007; Weissert, 2001	Policies, procedures, or management structures are used in organization N=15	Alexander, 2000; Hellmann & Puri, 2002; King, 2000; Squire, 2007
5	Paid Staff N=12	Paid or salaried staff	Lundström, 2001; Marshall & Suárez, 2013; Snell & Dean, 1994; Squire, 2007;	Staffed by paid personnel N=7	Hwang & Powell, 2009; Nicholson-Crotty & Miller, 2012; Squire, 2007; Suarez, 2010

Table 3: Elements, Outcomes, and Research Propositions of Nonprofit Professionalization

<table>
<tr><th>ELEMENTS</th><th>OUTCOMES</th></tr>
<tr><td>1. The Presence of Professional Membership and Associations</td><td>1. Emphasis to Performance</td></tr>
<tr><td>3. The Institution of Norms and Standards</td><td rowspan="2">2. Executive Autonomy</td></tr>
<tr><td>4. The Increase of Education and Training</td></tr>
<tr><td>5. The Introduction and Increasing Use of Business Practices</td><td rowspan="2">3. Dominance of Instrumental Logic</td></tr>
<tr><td>6. The Shift from Volunteer to Paid Staff</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="2">PROPOSITIONS</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">P1: The presence and power of professional groups in the nonprofit sector will lead to a higher emphasis on performance.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">P2: The institution of professional norms will be associated with a greater focus by nonprofit organizations on efficiency and effectiveness.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">P3: An increase in executive education and training will be associated with greater levels of leadership autonomy.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">P4: The introduction of business processes in nonprofit organizations will be associated with higher levels of worker control.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">P5: A shift from voluntary to paid employment will be associated with the rise of in the instrumental logic of the nonprofit sector.</td></tr>
</table>