

COMPARING NGO LEADERS THROUGH ORGANIZATIONAL AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY: THE ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

László BALÁZS¹ 

ABSTRACT

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have an increasing role in the management and workings of society. For the past three decades, academic interest in NGOs has intensified in tandem with the increase of their number with regards to their workings, maintenance, net-works, and characteristics. This study aims to explore the characteristics of leadership in civil society from the perspective of organizational and social psychology. The main hypothesis of the study is that the leadership of specialized NGOs in the areas of organizational culture perception, emotional intelligence patterns, resilience and leadership style can be distinguished. A central question to this study remains whether leaders of NGOs who work in the sector of environmental protection show divergence in organizational and social psychological dimensions from the leaders of NGOs that work in the economic or cultural sphere. Sixty-one NGOs participated in this survey, representing six different scope of activity profiles. The results show that representatives of certain profiles show different organizational culture dimensions and values, and display unique emotional intelligence patterns. With regards to the deployment of leadership tools and style, leaders indicated cooperation and persuasion; and in case of resilience, study received on average high scores with leaders of all occupational areas. The study also identifies the characteristic features of NGOs working in environmental protection, of which above-average, altogether high scores of resilience stand out, besides low levels of self-confidence, self-realization, commitment to partners, interpersonal relationships, and flexibility compared to leaders of other NGOs.

Keywords: *Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs), Environmental Protection, Leadership, Emotional Intelligence, Organizational culture, Resilience*

ÖZET

Sivil toplum kuruluşları (STK'lar) toplumun yönetiminde ve işleyişinde artan bir role sahiptir. Son otuz yıldır, STK'lara olan akademik ilgi, çalışma, bakım, ağ işleri ve özellikleri bakımından sayılarının artmasıyla birlikte yoğunlaşmıştır. Bu çalışma sivil toplumdaki liderliğin özelliklerini örgütsel ve sosyal psikoloji perspektifinden incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu çalışma örgütsel kültür algısı, duygusal zeka

kalıpları, dayanıklılık ve liderlik tarzı alanlarında uzmanlaşmış STK'ların liderliğini ayırt edebilme hipotezini sınavacaktır. Bu çalışmanın temel sorusu, çevre koruma sektöründe çalışan STK liderlerinin ekonomik veya kültürel alanda çalışan STK liderlerinden örgütsel ve sosyal psikolojik boyutlarda farklılık gösterip göstermediğidir. Bu ankete, altı farklı faaliyet profili kapsamını temsil eden altmış bir STK katıldı. Sonuçlar, belirli profillerin temsilcilerinin farklı kurumsal kültür boyutları ve değerleri gösterdiğini ve benzersiz duygusal zeka kalıpları sergilediğini gösteriyor. Liderlik araçlarının ve tarzının kullanılmasıyla ilgili olarak, liderler işbirliği ve ikna etmeyi belirtmişlerdir; ve dayanıklılık durumunda, tüm meslek alanlarının liderlerinden ortalama olarak yüksek puanlar aldık. Ayrıca, bu çalışma düşük özgüven, kendini gerçekleştirme, ortaklara bağlılık, kişilerarası ilişkiler yanında ortalamanın üzerinde, toplamda yüksek direnç puanlarının öne çıktığı ve diğer STK liderlerine kıyasla esnek oldukları çevre koruma alanında çalışan STK'ların karakteristik özelliklerini belirlemiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları (STK), Çevre Koruma, Liderlik, Duygusal Zeka, Örgütsel Kültür, Dayanıklılık*

1. INTRODUCTION

The workings and maintenance of non-governmental organizations have been increasing significance in contemporary societies. For the last decades, Hungarian civil society has shown that they respond to a wide variety of social issues and complement governmental and economic sectors. Hungarian civil society is greatly reactive in a sense that it often reacts to an issue very promptly, despite stereotypes to the contrary. NGOs are important parts of social, political and economic life. They strengthen the social commitment of people and offer ways for people to take part in community life and communal activities. They contribute to general social well-being, and may possess considerable financial and material assets. NGOs invigorate the economy, and their significance of creating workplaces is growing (Lukács, 2007) as they contribute to the establishment of sustainable economy and environment.

By summarizing the function-based approaches to non-governmental organizations, Bartal (2004) explores NGOs on the basis of their functions and roles for society. Functionalist analyses highlight the social, economic and political roles of the civil sphere. In regard to social roles, Bartal highlights that NGOs are an important component of democratic societies: they stand for the right of free, autonomous actions, the goals of civil society, and pluralism. Through their innovations and initiatives, NGOs contribute to social change, to social integration, the decrease of social inequalities, the achievement of harmonious social life, and society's intellectual enrichment by strengthening civil awareness and tolerance. In their economic roles, NGOs have measurable performance in as employers and important institutions of redistribution. In their political roles, civil society influences and controls decision-making, and NGOs are important agents in well-functioning societies (Bartal, 2004: 24–25). NGOs

may contribute to the maintenance of diversity for the establishment of resilient ecological and social systems (Kerekes 2011: 10).

Nárai (2004) highlights the role of civil society in the protection and strengthening of democracy. Non-profit organizations² have great importance for the mobilization of society, and the articulation of social interests. They enable bottom-up organization, mobilization, and the presentation of social alternatives. Due to their great systemic and network embeddedness, they are able to streamline individual interests into social interests—the extensiveness of the civil sphere may serve as the barometer of the health and well-being of society (Kuti, 1998, Nárai, 2004). The role of NGOs for socialization is particularly relevant: by engaging with social issues that concern the community, individuals learn behavioral patterns that enable them to be “citizens, not servants” (Nárai, 2004: 621). NGOs have a great impact on the emergence of self-aware citizenry. They also have great integrative functions, as they strengthen the attachment of the individual to society, support the establishment of social capital, and enhance social structures. The civil sphere may actively influence politics: on the one hand, NGOs mediate between citizens and the government; on the other hand, they are able to identify and fulfill emergent social needs. In this regard, they act as innovators in social life. As intermediaries, they communicate between diverse social systems and sub-systems (Nárai 2004).

Kuldip (2014) summarizes the social roles of civil society in three main areas:

- On the one hand, non-governmental organizations enable the bottom-up *self-organization of society*. They allow citizens to voluntarily work together towards the establishment and promotion of social goals and values. They enhance the free expression of opinions, and promote problem solving across diverse issues such as the environment, health care, culture, art, education, etc. Civil society promotes pluralism and diversity.
- On the other hand, NGOs *constitute a third sector* besides government and for-profit industry. While the government focuses on the provision and protection of the common good, and industry focuses on production and growth, civil society represents *sustainability and social interests*. As such, it constitutes a balance between state and private sectors for the good of society.
- Third, civil society enables the production of social change that neither private, nor state sectors can produce. Civil organizations have introduced innumerable innovations in modern societies worldwide, which later were adopted by state and private sectors as good practices.

Through their development and evolution, NGOs have gone from mobilization for political purposes to the protection of social interest in environmentalism. As in governance, the adoption of western

² In this paper uses “non-profit organizations” and “non-governmental organization” synonymously.

relationships and strategic objectives is gaining priority. By today, NGOs that have a function of natural protection and environmental protection have become distinct categories. The former focus on the adoption of state tasks in the protection of natural habitats, while the special expertise of environmental organizations (energy, waste, toxic materials) act mostly as intermediaries between agricultural and state actors (Monostori, 2007: 29–30).

Along with the strengthening and growing importance of the civil sphere, we also see growing academic interest in its study, as evidenced by numerous international publications. Since the beginning of the 1990s, the study of non-governmental organizations has become increasingly interdisciplinary; in addition to the social and political embeddedness of organizations, research focused on the study of the social functions of the civil sphere (Bartal 2004). Along with these developments, and owing to the fact that civil organizations representing the common good have become important actors, studies of the transparency and accountability of civil organizations also emerged (Molnár & Farkas, 2005; Molnár, 2010). This demonstrates the fact that non-governmental organizations have extensive roles and impact on society. In addition to their mission, they may also fulfill several social roles that are inherent to its organizational structure. The organizational characteristics of an NGO are very different from those of profit-oriented industrial or state sectors.

Within the frameworks of this study, approaching the topic from the perspective of network science and organizational psychology, this study aims to present a descriptive study that focuses on the leaders of NGOs. The objective of this article is the organizational and social psychological analysis of leaders of civil society. Furthermore, it will identify the differences between NGOs of different profiles, and explore the characteristic features of environmental organizations in general. A central question is whether the leaders of environmental NGOs working toward sustainability display differences in organizational and social psychological dimensions from leaders who work for NGOs of economic and cultural profiles. It is important to mention that I know of no similar study in Hungary as of today that should target the organizational and social psychological study of civil society leadership. Before this paper presents its findings, the study will present the leadership features of civil organizations, with special attention to the differences between the leaders of for-profit and non-profit civil organizations.

2. LEADERSHIP AND THE LEADERS OF CIVIL ORGANIZATIONS

Leadership roles and their character have a great impact on every organization. Fulfillment of leadership roles is a great challenge to anyone in those positions. As it becomes evident from the nature of non-governmental organizations, and its difference from profit-oriented or state sectors, leaders of civil organizations need to have different skills for the successful management of that organization. Suffice it to think about the basic values of voluntariness, selflessness, and solidarity that govern non-

profit organizations. In the case of profit-oriented and state organizations, it is customary to organize leadership training for leaders, which aim to improve leadership tools, communication skills, and management mechanisms. In contrast, in non-profit, civil organizations we hardly find such leadership training programs in Hungary, contrary to other European or North American countries, where an entire industry has emerged around this sector. Next, this study will explore the characteristic features and roles of leadership in civil organizations.

Most studies that target the evaluation of leadership have been done at for-profit and state sector organizations, and have paid less attention to civil organizations. This happened in spite of the fact that these organizations work very differently, which necessarily results in different expectations of NGO leaders. Unlike state and for-profit organizations, NGOs face unique challenges by addressing social changes or groups whose problems are ignored, or only considered peripherally, by other organizations (Hailey 2000). Civil society leaders have to mobilize special resources, and lead organizations that are able to serve their communities sustainably. For this reason, NGO leaders have to work with limited resources for an extended period of time in uncertain and insecure political and economic conditions, in order to help, for example, the most deprived members of society, protect the environment, and fight for sustainability. A leader of an NGO has to face unique leadership challenges in order to fulfill the mission of the organization, and manage individual and organizational demands.

According to Frooman (1999), leadership plays an important role in the success of a civil organization. By analyzing leadership processes, Schermerhorn (2001) summarizes the tasks of leaders. These include the inspiration of the members of the organization to continue to work hard for the objectives of the non-governmental organization. The role of leaders is to plan directions, set goals, and mobilize resources for reaching those goals. It is also the leader's task to improve the commitment and enthusiasm of members in order that they may make the best of their skills and competences as the organization strives to reach its objectives.

Ebrahim (2003) finds that the management of civil society organizations differs from the management of organizations in the other two sectors. One of the main reasons for this difference is that the goals of these organizations are different, not to speak of the motivations of members in these organizations. Just like with for-profit and state sector organizations, the leadership of NGOs will have a great impact on the mission of the organization. And just like with any organization, the performance of civil society actors also depends on the members of the organization and their performance. Brundage and Koziel (2010) emphasizes that if an organizational culture and its climate prioritizes people, the maintenance of volunteers is also more successful. In order for the right organizational culture to develop in an organization, the deployment of values should start at the level of leadership. A leader must possess

the skills and knowledge for efficient work in the light of the idiosyncrasies of non-governmental organizations.

Pierog's empirical study (2013) stands out among Hungarian studies in this area, which focused on the organizational and leadership characteristics of NGOs. His work provides a general idea about the characteristic features of Hungarian civil organizations. According to his results, leaders found tasks that had to do with the management of the NGO most important. The order of Fayol functions reflected forecasting, planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling. Civil organizations are known for their leaders' high levels of motivation, their desire to help, and altruism. In their motivational tool kit, they considered psychological inspiration to be most important, which may be explained by the very structure and nature of the organization. Besides formal communication, informal communication gains greater importance in the organization. As part of the decision-making process, planning gains greater importance compared to the order or general leadership tasks. They plan for short-term mostly, and social objectives and financial considerations have a special importance.

The tasks and functions that Pierog assesses in his study overlap with the management functions of NGOs determined by Pavluska (2002): the organization of everyday activities, the procurement of human and general resources, acquisition, financial management, marketing, public relations, accounting and supervision. The management of the organization that is driven by classic functions comes from within. The principles of the organization insist that its objectives are relevant and valuable, which has to be accepted by everyone, and which is why it relies on traditional forms of resources such as individual charity, the generosity of the rich, and state subsidies. It focuses on its activity above all, which it shapes and develops according to its own principles, disregarding predictable consumer demand, which it can afford to do because, basically, it operates on the 'market of sellers (Pavluska, 2002: 5).

The overview of organizational and leadership features creates an organizational and operational framework that is often described with the words *resilient organization*, or *resilient leadership*. A common denominator to the diverse definitions of resilience is a sense of flexibility. As an individual characteristic feature, resilience plays a great role in one's ability to get by in life. The most salient feature of a resilient personality is that it is able to work efficiently in spite of stressful and unfavorable circumstances (Wolin & Wolin, 1993). This paper presents below, compares environmental civil organizations on the one hand; on the other hand, this study aims are to nuance the leadership properties of NGOs, and identify the social and organizational psychological features of non-governmental organizations.

3. METHODOLOGY

During this study, respondents were asked to fill out a questionnaire that they received online. They responded to the questionnaire anonymously. In addition to the organizational values represented

by the leader (the perception of organizational culture), the survey aimed to determine and identify leadership style, emotional intelligence patterns, and resilience. The following questionnaires were involved.

Situational leadership (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988): On the basis of the theories of Hersey and Blanchard, the questionnaire distinguished between four leadership styles. *Telling style* is characterized by strong task-, and weak relationship-orientedness: the leader assigns roles, and tells people what to do, how, and when. This leadership is characterized by forcefulness and orders. Subordinates are not allowed and not able to take control, because neither their abilities nor their self-confidence make it possible. *Selling style* is characterized by strong task- and relationship-orientedness: the leader is characterized by both controlling and supportive behavioral patterns. Subordinates would be willing, but are unable to execute required tasks. While they are properly motivated, they lack the necessary skills. *Participating style* is characterized by weak task, and strong relationship-orientedness. Both leader and follower participate in decision-making processes, and the most important task of the leader is to get the follower involved in decision making. To achieve this, they support communication and participative decision-making processes. Subordinates would be able to execute tasks their leader wants, but they are unwilling to do. *Delegating style* is characterized by weak task- and relationship-orientedness. The leader neither directs, nor supports. We could call this empowerment. Subordinates are able and willing to do what is expected of them.

Participants in the questionnaire survey were asked to react to 12 situations. From four behavioral patterns, they were asked to choose the one they feel closest to them. By ordering answers to leadership styles, paper receives the characteristic style of the participant based on highest score.

This study used the “competitive values” model as elaborated by Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) to define the type of culture of the institutions being studied. From the basic models by QUINN, there are well-defined roles in the *rule oriented* culture type. The basic expectation is to follow the rules. It is important to respect formal positions. This model is characterized by a high level of internal focus and controlling, and it results in order, predictability, stability and balance. Two important processes belong here; documentation and stabilization. Thus the two primary roles of the leader are observation and coordination. As a monitor, he knows what happens in the organization, and as a coordinator, he is expected to maintain the structure and ensure the operation of the whole organization. At the same time, in an *innovative* culture focus, is on creativity and risk undertaking. It is characterized by free information flow, teamwork and the continuous learning of the members. Members are not controlled but are given stimulus and inspiration. Outward orientation and control are not dominant. Its main strengths are adaptation skills and the ability to change. The two main roles of the leader are that of the innovator and the broker. The innovator is to recognize and promote necessary changes. The broker is to maintain

external legitimacy. In a *target oriented* culture, focus is on profit, productivity and efficiency. This organization highlights the clarification of tasks and the definition of targets. It is characterized by a high level of control and outward orientation. It is led by effectiveness, control and instructions. Two primary roles of the leader are that of the director and the producer. As a director, the leader formulates expectations; as a producer, he or she focuses on the tasks and the work, and inquires about and motivates the employees. In contrast, a *supportive* culture focuses on accord, cohesion, the role and importance of teamwork, and internal control. In this culture, the highlight is on human resources, possible individual development and commitment. This organizational culture monitors internal processes and is flexible at the same time. Two primary roles of the leader are that of the facilitator and the mentor. The facilitator is expected to promote joint efforts while the mentor to develop abilities and skills of members and to provide for training opportunities. The mentor helps to plan individual development of employees.

QUINN's questionnaire includes six groups of questions about the following:

- character and basic type of the organization,
- cohesive force of the organization,
- leader of the unit,
- atmosphere of the organization,
- evaluation of success,
- the leadership system.

Within each group of questions, there are four statements reflecting features of each culture. It is the task of the respondents to score statements according to how true they are for their own institutions. In each question, 100 scores can be distributed between the four answers. Values relating to each culture type can be derived from the average value of the scores of related answers.

Culture dimensions: Organizational culture is further refined in the 11 culture dimensions elaborated by Robbins (1993) as amended by Bakacsi (1996) which is based on the features determining feelings of the members towards the organizational culture.

Based on this theoretical framework, the questionnaire elaborated by Zoltán Kovács et al. (2005) characterizes organizations with 22 value pairs regarding especially the school environment. Two statement pairs are assigned to each dimension. Respondents can characterize the given culture by giving scores from 1 to 7 according to how much the given statement characterizes their own cultures. Thus, dominance of each value is characterized by the score. Results about the organization can be derived from the average of statements related to the given value dimension. The organization is characterized by the following key dimensions:



1. Identification with the position or the organization: Two extremes of this dimension represent identification with the whole organization or certain working groups or a position.
2. Focus on the individual or the group: Focus on individual or group targets. Individual focus is rather characterized by the support of freedom, independence, responsibility, while group focus by group targets.
3. Human orientation: Dimension of a task or relationship oriented leadership. It also characterizes the relationship of the leaders and the employees. To what extent are the leaders attentive to the consequences of the solution of organizational tasks on people?
4. Internal dependence or independence: It relates to the level of integration. It determines the independence of organizational units and the level of central coordination and centralization.
5. Strong or weak control: It relates to the level of regulation and the direct supervision of the control of the employees.
6. Risk taking or risk avoidance: It relates to the tolerance regarding uncertainty of the organization. How much risk taking and innovation is expected or supported, and how much uncertainty is tolerated?
7. Performance orientation: It is characteristic of the system of awards. How much the system of awards builds on performance and how much it takes other factors into account?
8. Conflict tolerance: It characterizes the leadership and the organization from the aspect of how much the open undertaking of disaccording views is allowed or encouraged.
9. Goal or means orientation: It is the characteristic of the leadership based on a focus on organizational results or the process of achieving the targets.
10. Open or closed system: It is the characteristic of the relationship of the organization and the environment. In this dimension, reacting skills to external changes of the organization or its absence appears.
11. Short or long term time orientation: It reflects the outlooks of the future planning of the organization.

Emotional intelligence: This paper used Bar-On's (2006) questionnaire. The emotional intelligence scale contains 121 statements. As many as five main factors are identified in the questions: interpersonal

and intrapersonal emotional intelligence, adapting, stress managing and general mood emotional intelligence. The five main factors include a lot of closely interrelated competences, skills and moderators. The respondent has to give scores from 1 to 5 for each statement according to how true they are for him. Results of each meta-factor are derived from the average of the relevant items. Values of the main factors are constituted by the average values of meta-factors.

Intrapersonal skills (self-conscience and self-expression)

- self-assurance: a determined expression of our emotions and ourselves;
- emotional self-conscience: understanding our emotions;
- self-esteem: being aware of understanding and accepting ourselves;
- independence: developing free emotions independent from others;
- self-realization: determining and realizing, actualizing potential targets.

Interpersonal skills (social awareness and interaction)

- empathy: conscious handling and understanding of how others feel themselves;
- social responsibility: emotional and social identification with other social groups;
- interpersonal relationship: mutually satisfying relationships.

Stress management

- stress management: an efficient and constructive handling of emotions;
- management of instinctive impulses / impulse control: an efficient and constructive controlling of emotions.

Adaptation skills

- testing reality: testing our emotions and finding their parallels with real thinking;
- flexibility: coping with changes, adaptation in everyday life;
- problem solving: efficient solving of problems in intrapersonal and interpersonal situations.

General mood (self-motivation)

- optimism: perceiving positive outlooks;
- happiness: a feeling of being generally satisfied with ourselves, others and life.

Resilience questionnaire (Járai, Vajda, Hargita, & Nagy, 2015): resilience comprises characteristics that enable the individual to adapt successfully in spite of a threatening environment, decreases the negative impacts of stress, and enables adaptive struggle in the face of changes. Besides, resilience also indicates the ability to return to normal functioning after overwhelming stress that the individual struggled with. The participants of the questionnaire survey scored statements from 0 to 4 depending on to

what degree they identified with them. We get the resilience value from the average of the answers given to the ten questions. The higher the value, the more resilient the individual.

3.1. Sample

Altogether 61 NGO leaders were involved in this study. The questionnaire was filled out online. This paper processed data in SPSS 13.0 for the Windows program package. Thirty-four of the participants were men, and 27 women. The organizations were registered in Budapest, Fejér, and Heves counties. Table 1. shows the age and leadership experience of participants. It is clear that elected leaders have occupied their position for a longer period of time (more than 9 years with 27 persons), and they are typically older (30 of them were over 60).

Table 1: The Age and Experience of Leaders in Civil Organizations

		How long have you been serving in your leadership position?						Total
		<= 4	5 - 8	9 - 12	13 - 17	18 - 21	21+	
Age of the participant	25-29	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
	30-34	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
	35-39	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
	40-44	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
	45-49	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
	50-54	3	0	3	0	0	0	6
	55-59	6	0	0	3	3	0	12
	60-64	9	0	0	3	2	0	14
	65-69	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
	70-74	0	0	3	3	0	5	11
75-79	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	
Total		31	3	6	9	5	7	61

This research grouped participating civil organizations according to their activities. Most of the sample consisted of NGOs with culture, information, and communication profiles (16 organizations), sport and leisure profiles (14 organizations), and environmentalism (11 organizations). In terms of membership in a given scope of activity, almost 60% of members belong with environmental, professional, economic, legal, sport and leisure activities. Table 2. shows this data in greater detail.

Table 2: Membership and Category of Civil Organizations

	Frequency	Organiza- tion (person)
Culture, information and communication profile	16	739
Sport and leisure profile	14	974
Environmentalism	11	1206
Health care and social welfare profile	9	808
Professional, economic, and legal profile	6	1137
Research profile	5	140
Overall:	61	5004

4. RESULTS

The study presented the results of the survey according to the groups on the basis of profile, and discussed the results of each construct separately.

4.1. The Identification of Organizational Values

For the identification of the value orientation of leaders, the paper compiled two questionnaires about organizational culture results of which are presented above. It was unable to identify the organizational culture of specific NGOs by asking leaders, while the value orientation of leaders in NGOs of similar profiles are well recognizable on the basis of the responses. Table 3 illustrates the data paper received by identifying competing models.

Table 3: The Culture-Orientedness of Leaders on The Basis of Quinn’s Competing Values Framework

	Supportive (%)	Innovative (%)	Rule oriented (%)	Goal oriented (%)
<i>Culture, information and communication (N=16)</i>				
Culture type	32,66	18,91	36,88	11,56
Leadership features	23,59	12,81	47,50	16,09
<i>Sport and leisure (N=14)</i>				
Culture type	61,19	12,92	16,49	9,41
Leadership features	43,21	11,07	27,32	18,39
<i>Environment (N=11)</i>				
Culture type	47,95	16,06	23,86	12,12
Leadership features	30,45	14,09	38,64	16,82
<i>Health care and social welfare (N=9)</i>				
Culture type	34,72	22,50	31,39	11,39
Leadership features	20,00	23,33	37,50	19,17
<i>Professional, economic, legal (N=6)</i>				
Culture type	30,28	35,00	22,22	12,50
Leadership features	25,00	25,00	38,33	11,67
<i>Research (N=5)</i>				
Culture type	21,50	43,17	17,00	18,33
Leadership features	16,50	50,50	18,00	15,00

The study analyzed the difference between groups with ANOVA inquiry too. This paper presents that there is significant difference between the perception of culture and leadership features, with the exception of goal-orientedness. It has a low score in every type of activity. The leaders of NGOs that work in the field of *culture, information and communication* perceived rule-oriented organizational culture and leadership style dominantly. The leaders of NGOs working in the area of *sport and leisure* perceived supportive organizational culture and leadership style dominantly. Leaders in NGOs, who that work in the fields of *environmentalism, health care and social welfare* indicated supportive organizational culture, while they characterized themselves dominantly by rule-orientedness. In case of NGOs working in *research, professional, economic and legal* profiles, study shows the relevance of innovative organizational culture and innovative leadership style in research activities. In order to better explore the organizational values, this study used the questionnaire of organizational culture dimensions. The results of this questionnaire are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: The Perception of Organizational Culture Dimensions By Leaders

	Identification with organization (1) or position (7)	Individual (1) or group (7) orientedness	Relationship (1) or task (7) orientedness	Internal dependence (1) or independence (7)	Strong (1) or weak control (7)	Riska taking (1) or risk avoidance (7)	Performance criteria (1) or other (7)	Conflict tolerance (1) or conflict avoidance (7)	Goal orientedness (1) or means orientedness (7)	Closed (1) or open system (7)	Short terms (1) or long term (7) time orientedness
Average values of entire sample (N=61)	4,56	4,23	2,64	4,16	3,78	2,02	3,61	2,38	5,17	5,58	4,46
Standard deviation	1,38	1,44	1,70	1,13	1,55	0,79	1,64	0,98	1,27	1,19	1,49
Culture, information and communication (N=16)											
Average	4,41	4,75	2,84	4,75	4,06	2,28	2,47	2,81	5,19	4,88	5,25
Standard deviation	1,10	0,75	1,99	0,98	1,44	0,68	1,09	1,35	1,15	1,35	1,52
Sport and leisure (N=14)											
Average	4,11	3,61	1,75	3,93	2,82	2,00	4,25	2,04	5,21	6,00	4,18
Standard deviation	2,10	1,64	0,61	1,11	1,31	0,83	1,54	0,24	0,93	0,83	1,30
Environmentalism (N=11)											
Average	4,23	4,00	2,41	3,82	3,27	2,68	4,64	2,68	5,27	5,18	3,27
Standard deviation	1,08	1,24	1,80	1,31	0,90	0,56	1,52	1,21	1,08	1,19	1,62
Health care and social welfare (N=9)											
Average	4,67	4,50	4,33	3,50	4,83	1,50	4,00	2,50	5,17	6,33	4,67
Standard deviation	0,50	0,75	1,75	1,15	1,64	0,75	1,30	0,43	1,75	0,66	0,90
Professional, economic, legal (N=6)											
Average	5,50	5,50	2,33	4,83	5,00	1,50	3,67	1,67	4,83	5,67	5,50
Standard deviation	1,34	1,95	1,29	0,93	1,95	0,45	2,29	0,26	2,21	1,37	0,77
Research (N=5)											
Average	5,70	2,80	2,30	4,00	3,30	1,30	2,40	1,90	5,20	6,10	3,70
Standard deviation	0,27	1,64	1,10	0,00	1,10	0,27	0,82	0,82	1,10	0,82	1,10

When interpreting the values of organizational culture dimensions, it is important to consider the degree of standard deviation that belongs to each value. In this case, this study considers it unified orientation if the standard deviation of any given value does not exceed 1,5, and that, compared to the average value, the degree of standard deviation makes the orientation of a given culture dimension meaningful. In other words, the degree of standard orientation is not greater than deviance from the

middle range (4)—highlighted in grey in the table. On the basis of this, paper may argue that in the case of NGOs, regardless of their profile, it encounter strong opinions in more than one dimensions, which help characterize the organizations in a unified manner. Regardless of activity scope, the organizational culture values indicated by NGO leaders may be summarized as follows. On the basis of leaders' responses, study may claim that

- The organizations in question tolerate uncertainty, and are willing to take risks.
- Accepting the challenges of conflicts and openness to the changes of the environment are considered valuable.
- The focus of leading is strongly on the means to achieve goals, as opposed to results.
- Organizational culture is characterized by openness to its environment.

There was no unified argument in the case of eight other dimensions, and it can also show divergences and differences according to the organizational profile. On the basis of scopes of activity, beyond general characteristics, study may conclude the following:

- *Culture, information and communication profile:* NGOs pursuing these scopes of activity accord recognition on the basis of performance criteria, and long-term planning had unanimous support.
- *Sport and Leisure:* NGOs pursuing these scopes of activity support transparent, direct communication, and an organizational culture that supports employees, including the strong, direct supervision of members. In other words, relationship-orientedness and strong internal control are strongly supported.
- *Environmnetalism.* For NGOs that pursue this profile, relationship-orientedness is a shared experience; leadership supports members through transparent and direct communication.
- *Health and social welfare.* NGOs pursuing this profile have leadership that strongly identifies with their activities; belonging to the organization is determined through professional identification.
- *Professional, economic and legal profile.* Leaders in NGOs of this profile support the members of their organization through transparent, direct communication; commitment to the organization happens along the lines of professional identification, and organizational operation is characterized by long-term planning. Profile-orientedness, relationship-orientedness, and long-term orientedness had unified support.

- In case of organizations with *research profile*, individual freedom, independence, and responsibility are highly supported; leadership supports members through transparent, direct communication, and recognition takes place according to performance criteria.

Concluding the results of organizational culture, this paper may argue that non-governmental organizations, while showing similarities in certain values, also differ in others depending on their profile. As a result of both typology and dimension analysis, paper can show the relevance of unique organizational culture values according to NGO profile that are distinctive.

4.2. Personal Characteristic Features

In addition to perceptions of organizational values and culture, this study also assessed leadership styles, and the resilience and emotional intelligence of leaders. This paper hypothesized that, besides organizational culture values, the research would also find a difference in individual characteristic features. This study will present research’s results by comparing them to averages and grouping organizations by their profile.

Leadership style

The questionnaire the paper used for the identification of leadership style features four leadership styles, following the theoretical background to the research. With each leadership style category, leaders get a point value based on which style they prefer to employ at work. Table 5 shows the average results of leaders belonging with NGOs of different profile.

Table 5: The Grouping, Average Values and Standard Deviation of Leadership Styles According To NGO Profile.

	Telling style leader	Selling style leader	Participating style leader	Delegating style leader
Culture, information and communication profile (N=16)	2,06	5,13	4,38	0,44
Standard deviation	1,69	2,13	1,82	0,73
Sport and leisure profile (N=14)	0,93	5,5	5,36	0,21
Standard deviation	1,21	1,79	1,60	0,80
Environmental profile (N=11)	1,27	5,55	4,18	1
Standard deviation	1,19	2,07	1,08	1,18
Health care and social welfare profile (N=9)	0,33	9,33	2,33	0
Standard deviation	0,50	1,80	1,32	0,00
Professional, economic and legal profile (N=6)	1,67	5,67	3,67	1
Standard deviation	0,52	1,03	1,37	0,00
Research profile (N=5)	1,8	3,4	6	0,8
Standard deviation	1,10	2,19	0,00	1,10

The idiosyncrasies of non-governmental organizations (see Balázs, 2019) may also explain the dominant presence of selling and participating style leadership on the basis of the responses of leaders. There was deviance from this in case of NGOs with a research profile: leaders opted for participating leadership style. The results based on organizational profile can be seen in the following:

- Among leaders of NGOs with *culture, information and communication* profile, nine persons scored highest for selling leadership style, and eight scored highest for participating leadership style, with three persons among them giving the same score for both styles.
- Among leaders of NGOs with *sport and leisure* profile, eight gave highest score for selling leadership style and seven gave highest score for participating leadership style—one person gave the same score for both styles.
- Among leaders of NGOs with *environmental* profile, seven gave highest score for selling leadership style, and six gave highest score for participating leadership style—two persons gave the same score for both styles.
- Leaders of NGOs with *health care and social welfare* profile gave their unanimous support for selling leadership style (nine persons).
- Similarly, among leaders of NGOs with *professional, economic and legal* profile, selling leadership style scored highest value, while two leaders scored the same for selling and participating leadership styles.
- With leaders of NGOs with a *research* profile, participating leadership style score highest with all five leaders.

These results confirm the results of international research focusing on the leadership of non-governmental organizations. They support the main concept of the leaders as supporters, where leaders support and serve subordinates, and not the other way around. Focus is on service, support and cooperation, thus motivating subordinates toward personal and professional improvement (Greenleaf 1977).

Emotional intelligence and resilience

Based on leadership styles and the relevant literature, study may argue that leaders of non-governmental organizations score high on resilience and emotional intelligence. In case of both measures, the higher value the respondent scored, the more he or she was characterized by that feature. Table 6 shows values in resilience and emotional intelligence.

Table 6: Emotional Intelligence and Resilience Values of Leaders (Maximum Values Are in Brackets)

	Resilience (4)	Confidence (30)	Self-awareness (35)	Self-respect (45)	Independence (35)	Self-realization (35)	Empathy (25)	Collective responsibility (45)	Interpersonal relationship (50)	Perception of reality (50)	Flexibility (40)	Problem solving (40)	Stress tolerance(45)	Impulsiveness control (45)	Optimism (40)	Happiness (45)
Mean (N=61)	3,19	22,02	27,85	36,57	24,87	29,52	20,10	37,38	39,44	38,98	29,48	32,44	31,46	31,54	29,97	35,18
%	80%	73%	80%	81%	71%	84%	80%	83%	79%	78%	74%	81%	70%	70%	75%	78%
Culture, information and communication (N=16)																
Mean	3,15	21,94	28,25	34,13	23,56	30,5	20,56	36,38	38,19	38,44	29,5	32,56	31,25	31,13	27,25	35,5
%	79%	73%	81%	76%	67%	87%	82%	81%	76%	77%	74%	81%	69%	69%	68%	79%
Sport and leisure (N=14)																
Mean	3,14	23,07	29,57	37,21	24,64	28,71	20,57	37,14	38,57	38,86	30,29	32,79	31,79	29,43	30,29	34,86
%	79%	77%	84%	83%	70%	82%	82%	83%	77%	78%	76%	82%	71%	65%	76%	77%
Environmentalism (N=11)																
Mean	3,24	19,55	28,27	37,45	24,45	31,36	20,64	40,18	41,82	39,45	28,18	32,27	31,00	29,45	31,36	36,91
%	81%	65%	81%	83%	70%	90%	83%	89%	84%	79%	70%	81%	69%	65%	78%	82%
Health care and social welfare (N=9)																
Mean	3,13	23,00	28,00	37,00	26,00	27,67	21,00	38,67	42,33	40,00	28,33	32,33	31,67	35,33	30,67	35,33
%	78%	77%	80%	82%	74%	79%	84%	86%	85%	80%	71%	81%	70%	79%	77%	79%
Professional, economic and legal (N=6)																
Mean	3,33	21,00	26,33	39,00	26,67	28,67	21,67	38,00	39,00	40,33	31,00	34,00	31,67	39,00	31,00	34,00
%	83%	70%	75%	87%	76%	82%	87%	84%	78%	81%	78%	85%	70%	87%	78%	76%
Research (N=5)																
Mean	3,32	24,2	22,4	37	26,4	29	12,6	32	36	36,6	30,2	29,8	31,6	27,6	32,2	32,4
%	83%	81%	64%	82%	75%	83%	50%	71%	72%	73%	76%	75%	70%	61%	81%	72%

Among the characteristic features of participants in this study, in case of resilience, NGO leaders scored average high values between 3,14-3,33 (79-83%). By way of comparison, study may mention a Hungarian study that was conducted among students, and showed a 2,8 value average result (70%) on the basis of a sample of 465 (Farkas & Orosz, 2015).

This study presents the results of emotional intelligence scores compared to the average of the whole sample on the basis of profile, highlighting the average low and average high values (indicated in grey in the table), and emphasizing the discrepancies between organizations of distinct profiles. It is important to add that, compared to the emotional intelligence patterns of teachers (N=572), on average civil society leaders have higher emotional intelligence values (Balázs, 2015).

- Leaders of NGOs with a profile of *culture, information and communication* differ negatively from the average in two factors: they scored the two lowest scores in confidence and independence.
- In NGOs with a profile of *sport and leisure*, leaders showed conspicuously high values in self-awareness compared to other leaders.
- In NGOs with a profile of *environmentalism*, leaders scored and average low in confidence; however, they scored conspicuously high in self-realization, collective responsibility, interpersonal relationships and flexibility.
- In NGOs with a profile of *health care and social welfare*, leaders differed from others in low levels of self-realization and high levels of interpersonal relationships.
- In NGOs with a profile of *professional, economic or legal activities*, leaders' confidence, perception of reality, and problem solving resulted in scores much higher than average.
- In NGOs with a profile of *research*, leaders typically display lower values of emotional intelligence. They scored highest average in one value: confidence.

The research results of leaders' personal characteristics also show that analyzing them along with their profile has relevant consequences. Results show that the leaders of NGOs of different profile may also be differentiated along individual characteristics. The paper must highlight leaders of NGOs with *research* profile and with *environmentalism* profile, as they display the most striking divergence.

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to explore the leaders of non-governmental organizations in terms of organizational and social psychological analysis, to identify the differences between NGOs of different profiles and to find the unique patterns of NGOs that work in environmentalism. My results show that leaders of NGOs with different profiles differ from each other in terms of organizational culture perception, as well as individual features. In terms of leadership style, leaders deploy similar tool kits independent of the profile of their organization. On the basis of the responses of leaders in different NGO profiles, the characteristic features of NGOs pursuing *environmental issues* are well visible. This study may summarize them as follows:

While leaders of NGOs in environmental profiles typically perceive supportive organizational culture, rule-following is a dominant feature of leadership style. In organizational culture dimensions, we have seen the articulation of opinions in terms of relationship-orientedness. Leadership style is determined by selling and participating style. Leaders possess higher than average and overall high values

of resilience compared to other NGOs. While emotional intelligence is low in the factor of confidence on average, they scored conspicuously high in self-realization, collective responsibility, interpersonal relationships and flexibility compared to external samples as well as other NGOs.

While this study is unable to compare our results with research on NGOs' organizational idiosyncrasies and social psychological features in Hungary, works that explore the functions, operational environment and challenges of NGOs (Bartal, 2004; Kuti, 1998, Nárai, 2004) expect characteristic features from NGO leaders that they consider to be in harmony with the results of this study. They project that persons in leadership positions will have high emotional intelligence scores and high values of resilience. They prefer supportive culture in the organization they lead, while their leading is characterized by flexibility, cooperation, and service (Greenleaf, 1977).

With regards to the assessment of this research, the study must highlight that I know of no similar work conducted in Hungary that should have explored the leadership features of NGOs along the criteria employed here. When evaluating the results of the leaders, the paper must also add that the volume of the entire sample requires the examination of a population that is larger than examined here. The results here are preliminary due to the limitations of sample size. These results may help with the creation of further hypotheses, and call attention to the lack of research in Hungary on the organizational and social psychological aspects of civil organizations.

REFERENCES

- Bakacsi, Gy. (1996). *Szervezeti magatartás és vezetés*. Budapest: Közgazdasági és jogi Tankönyvkiadó.
- Balázs, L. (2015). *Organizational culture and emotional intelligence in school*. Saarbrücken, Németország: Lambert Academic Publishing (LAP).
- Balázs, L. (2019). Civil szervezetek és vezetői sajátosságok: Vizsgálati lehetőségek szervezetpszichológiai megközelítésből. *Civil Szemle*, 16(4): 25-41.
- Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence. *Psicothema*, 18: 13–25.
- Bartal, A. M. (2004). *Cél- és érdekorientált szervezetek a nonprofit szektorban: A nonprofit szervezetek új szempontú tipizálása egy empirikus kutatás eredményei alapján*. Foundation for Hungarian Higher Education.
- Brundage, H., & Koziel, M. (2010). Retaining top talent still a requirement for firms: focus on people now to keep turnover costs down when the economy improves. *Journal of Accountancy*.
- Ebrahim, A. (2003). *NGOs and Organizational Change: Discourse, Reporting and Learning*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511488566>



- Farkas, D., & Orosz, G. (2015). Ego-Resiliency Reloaded: A Three-Component Model of General Resiliency. *PLoS ONE*, 10(3). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0120883>
- Frooman, J. (1999). Stakeholder Influence Strategies. *The Academy of Management Review*, 24(2): 191–205. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1999.1893928>
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Poulit Press.
- Hailey, J. (2000). Learning NGOs. In D. Lewis & T. Wallace (Eds.), *New Roles and Relevance: Development NGOs and the Challenge of Change*. West Hartford, Connecticut: Kumarian.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1988). *Management and Organizational Behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Járai, R., Vajda, D., Hargitai, R., & Nagy, L. (2015). A Connor-Davidson reziliencia kérdőív 10 itemes változatának jellemzői. *Alkalmazott Pszichológia*, 15(1): 129–136.
- Kerekes Sándor (2011). Fenntarthatóság és társadalmi felelősség – a globalizálódó világ megoldatlan problémái. *Magyar Bioetikai Szemle*, 3(1): 4–13.
- Kuldip, S. (2014). Servant leadership in non-governmental organizations (NGOs). *Journal of Administrative Science*, 11(1).
- Lukács, E. (2007). A nonprofit szervezetek magyarországi kialakulásának és jogi szabályzásának jellegzetességei. In A. Gubik (Eds.), *VI. Nemzetközi Konferencia a közgazdász képzés megkezdésének 20. évfordulója alkalmából: volume 2: 322–329*. Miskolc: University of Miskolc.
- Molnár, M. (2010). General Accountability Standards for Hungarian Civil Society Organizations: Towards Organizational Effectiveness. *Advances in Management*, 3(2): 14–19.
- Molnár, M., & Farkas, F. (2005). Towards a Universal Standard of Nonprofit Accountability: 'Standard of Standards' in NGO Accountability? *First ISTR-EMES International Conference: Concepts of the Third Sector: The European Debate. Civil Society, Voluntary and Community Organizations, Social Economy*. PS5_S4a: 1–17.
- Monostori, K. (2007). *Környezettudatosság Magyarországon: Attitűd és cselekvés a szelektív hulladékgyűjtésben*. PhD dissertation, Budapest: Budapest Corvinus University, School of Sociology.
- Nárai, M. (2004). A civil szervezetek szerepe és jelentősége az egyének, közösségek, illetve a társadalom számára. *Educatio*, 2004/4: 616–634.
- Pavluska, V. (2002). Van-e helye a marketingnek a nonprofit szervezetek menedzselésében? *Gyakorlat és kutatás*. Program director: Harsányi László, Kuti Éva, Török Mariann. Budapest: Nonprofit Kutatócsoport Egyesület, 1–17.
- Pierog, A. (2013). *Civil szervezetek vezetési és működési sajátosságai*. PhD dissertation, Debrecen: University of Debrecen.



DOI: 10.38120/banusad.919398

BANÜSAD, 2021; 4(1), 47-68

Quinn, R. E., & Rohrbaugh, J. (1983). A spatial model of effectiveness criteria: Towards a competing values approach to organizational analysis. *Management Science*, 29(3): 363–377.

<https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.29.3.363>

Robbins, S. P. (1993). *Organizational behavior*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall International, Inc.

Schermerhorn, J. R. (2001). *Management*. Wiley.

Wolin, S. J., & Wolin, S. (1993). *The Resilient Self: How Survivors of Troubled Families Rise Above Adversity*. New York: Villard Books.