



Professionalization in welfare-oriented civil society organizations: Comparison of board chairs and executive directors concerning motives for engagement and leadership ideals

Jayeon Lee & Roberto Scaramuzzino

To cite this article: Jayeon Lee & Roberto Scaramuzzino (2022): Professionalization in welfare-oriented civil society organizations: Comparison of board chairs and executive directors concerning motives for engagement and leadership ideals, Nordic Social Work Research, DOI: [10.1080/2156857X.2022.2158916](https://doi.org/10.1080/2156857X.2022.2158916)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/2156857X.2022.2158916>



© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



Published online: 22 Dec 2022.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 13



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)

Professionalization in welfare-oriented civil society organizations: Comparison of board chairs and executive directors concerning motives for engagement and leadership ideals

Jayeon Lee and Roberto Scaramuzzino

School of Social Work, Faculty of Social Science, Lund University, Lund, Sweden

ABSTRACT

The implications of professionalization of civil society organizations have seldom been explored in relation to the governance structure of organizations' and leaders' different terms of engagement. This study draws on a survey targeting leaders of Swedish welfare-oriented civil society organizations (N. 140) and compares the motives for engagement and leadership ideals of two groups of leaders: board chairs, whose engagement in civil society organizations is largely on a voluntary basis, and executive directors, who are mostly employed full time as leaders. Sweden, characterized by a strong tradition of leadership ideals emphasizing voluntary commitment within advocacy-orientated civil society organizations, serves as a relevant empirical context for exploring the implications of professionalization. In fact, the shift in recent decades from advocacy to service, in the orientation of Swedish CSOs, and especially within the social welfare policy area, has placed greater emphasis on the need for professional employed staff. The results show that the motives and leadership ideals of the executive directors reflect ideals of professionalized civil society organizations compared to the board chairs, confirming the contrast between the traditional ideals of voluntary civic engagement and the career-oriented and employment-mediated managerial leadership role. The presence of two leadership positions entailing different grounds for engagement (voluntary vs. paid) and different motives and ideals, could be traced back to the combination of a still-strong popular movement tradition and increasing demand of professional skills.

KEYWORDS

Civil society organizations; leadership ideals; professionalization; values; swedish welfare model

Introduction

In the professionalization literature addressing the non-profit sector, the proximity and possible hybridization of the voluntary sector's actors incorporating market logics has been critically discussed (see Billis 2010). Moreover, the impact of professionalization on philanthropy in terms of a shift in the practitioners' social identities, values, and lifestyles has been a topic of debate (e.g. Schambra and Shaffer 2011). In practical terms, expanded professionalism entails not only an increase in paid, full-time staff in charitable organizations, but also employment of management instruments adopted from the for-profit sector because of organizational rationalization (Hwang and Powell 2009). Scholars have argued that an emphasis on managerial professionalism in the longer-term risks translating political into technical problems, in turn promoting instrumental orientations at the cost of participatory ethos and volunteerism (ibid.), and thus creating tensions within organizations due to conflicting organizational identities (Kreutzer and Jäger 2011). Thus,

CONTACT Roberto Scaramuzzino  Roberto.Scaramuzzino@soch.lu.se

© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

scholars point to a potential trade-off between efficiency and goal displacement in the professionalization processes of non-profit and civil society organizations.

These discussions, however, have seldom been linked to the formal governance structure of non-profit human service organizations in civil society which often involves two types of leaders: board chairs and executive directors. Scholars of non-profit management and leadership have paid attention to the division of labour between the two types of leaders, and power relations between them (e.g. Bernstein, Buse, and Bilimoria 2016). This paper connects debates about professionalization of voluntary organizations to the distinction between leadership positions based on employment on one hand, and voluntary engagement on the other hand. The paper explores whether and how different leadership roles, entailing different degrees of monetary remuneration, are associated with different motives for engagement and leadership ideals.

To do so, the study compares two groups of leaders: board chairs, who are formally elected to represent civil society organizations (CSOs) and are heads of boards; and executive directors, who are employed by and hold top managerial positions in the central administrative units of the organizations. Based on a survey study conducted among leaders of Swedish CSOs active within the social welfare policy area, we explore possible differences between chairs and directors regarding their motives for engagement and leadership ideals. Both board chairs and executive directors are conceived as core agents that uphold the values of CSOs (Kreutzer and Jäger 2011). However, their positions ideally entail different responsibilities (representation vs. management), conditions of appointment (election vs. recruitment), and employment (voluntary vs. paid).

In our comparison of the two types of leaders, we address the following three research questions:

- (1) Do the different leadership positions (board chairs and executive directors) entail different degrees of monetary remuneration?
- (2) To what extent do board chairs and executive directors differ regarding their stated motives for engagement and perception of leadership ideals in civil society?
- (3) Which factors (including leadership positions) explain the differences in the stated motives for engagement and the perceptions of leadership ideals among civil society leaders?

The distinction between employment and voluntary engagement is particularly relevant in Sweden, where organized civil society has been characterized by a popular movement tradition emphasizing civic engagement and voluntarism. However, the shift in recent decades from advocacy to service, in the orientation of CSOs, and especially within the social welfare policy area, has placed greater emphasis on the need for professional employed staff, e.g. social workers (Meeuwisse and Sunesson 1998).

Changing leadership ideals: popular movement tradition and professionalization

A trend towards managerialism in civil society is rather well documented in many countries, not least in the US, and points to an increased professionalization of the sector at the detriment of membership, democratically elected leaders and volunteering (e.g. Hwang and Powell 2009; Skocpol 2003). This trend in Sweden is particularly evident due to recent and swift liberal reforms in an otherwise social-democratic context, some of which are directly a translation of policy measures from an Anglo-Saxon context (Johansson and Johansson 2012).

Swedish civil society is often described as primarily advocacy-oriented, and made up of popular mass movements with an emphasis on internal democracy, representation of societal groups (e.g. retirees, women, immigrants), membership, volunteerism, fostering citizenship and social relations, and strengthening democracy (Hvenmark 2008; Trägårdh 2010). Financially, CSOs are much more reliant on membership fees and volunteers than on public funding and employed staff (Lundström and Wijkström 1997). These features of Swedish civil society have been linked to the Social

democratic welfare state's way of structuring its relation to civil society and an understanding of civil society as made of popular movements, in other words the popular movement tradition (Ibid.).

Based on these premises, it has been argued that the popular movement tradition carries certain organizational traits (Lundström and Svedberg 2003) and leadership ideals (Madestam 2015; Meeuwisse, A, and R. Scaramuzzino *forthcoming*). Leadership ideals and motives of engagement can be linked to more general discussions about the values and attitudes of leaders in different organizations and sectors (e.g. Miller-Stevens et al. 2018). These values and attitudes are dependent on factors at both institutional level (country-context and sector), organizational level (mission and tasks), and individual level (age, gender, country of birth) (cf. Kallio, J., A. Meeuwisse and R. Scaramuzzino 2015). In the same way as different systems of values can be linked to different sectors, such as non-profit and private sector (see Miller-Stevens et al. 2018), they can also be linked to different understandings of the role of civil society organizations and their leaders, for instance the popular movement tradition in a Swedish context.

According to a popular movement tradition (Lundström and Svedberg 2003; Madestam 2015; Author's own, *forthcoming*) leaders tend to take their legitimacy from the status upheld within the organization and the movement, rather than from outside. Thus, the principle of self-organization creates an expectation that the leader is part of the group being represented (a retiree, a woman, an immigrant, etc.), a requirement that may be even more important than formal education or work experience. The democratic representational structure of Swedish CSOs requires a leader to be elected or recruited from within the organization or the movement, rather than from outside (cf. Meeuwisse and Sunesson 1998).

However, recent trends have called the persistence of this model into question. Over the last 20 years, the Swedish state has increasingly expected that civil society actors will help resolve societal challenges through partnership arrangements in both policy formation and service delivery (Johansson, H., A, Kassman, and R. Scaramuzzino 2011). The development of New Public Management models, a broadening contract culture, and increased public expectations of 'value for money' have created the opportunity for CSOs to act as professional providers of public services and to step in when the state fails to deliver (Johansson, Arvidson, and Johansson 2015). Swedish CSOs also act within a multi-level organizational and political environment that is characterized by a sharp growth in the number of European and international networks and associations of CSOs (Ahrne and Brunsson 2008; Johansson and Kalm 2015). This development has created new opportunities for CSOs to access knowledge and expertise and resources, as well as gaining recognition (Meeuwisse, A. and R. Scaramuzzino 2019).

Increasing numbers of paid employees, and the introduction of new management practices resembling for-profit companies, could arguably create tensions with the traditional logic of voluntary commitment and organizational identities, which are based on proximity to members or groups that the organizations represent. These trends could strengthen other ideals of leadership in civil society that emphasize managerial professionalism, mastery of rationalized forms of organizational governing, and bureaucratic procedures in interacting with external actors (Hwang and Powell 2009). This type of leadership draws its legitimacy from the status obtained outside the organization in relation to other stakeholders, such as users, funders, and donors, as well as the public authorities with which the leaders collaborate.

The traits ideally associated with this professional leadership include individuals with the relevant education, expertise, knowledge and managerial skills necessary for leading an organization, who are able to access a large network of personal and professional connections spanning across sectors and who have previous work experience from different sectors (Author's own, *forthcoming*). These traits are in stark contrast to the popular movement tradition and its conception of elected representatives who are deeply anchored in an organization at the grass-roots level. They also have a long-term engagement and commitment to the cause based on moral obligation compared to professional leaders who would relate their commitment and engagement to their career and professional development (cf. Madestam 2015).

To return to our two groups of leaders, while board chairs are present in all Swedish CSOs, executive directors are mostly present in organizations with abundant resources. The need for an additional leader, a director with administrative and managerial responsibilities, could therefore be considered a consequence of the increased need for managing CSOs' complex internal organizational procedures, and a sign of professionalization of the sector in Sweden.

While professionalization entails complex and multiple dimensions of organizational changes, in this study we focus on one particular and measurable aspect that can be operationalized in a relatively straightforward way. We understand professionalization as the process by which civil society leaders' engagement in their organizations is based on high degrees of monetary remuneration as opposed to low (symbolic) degrees of remuneration or non-paid commitment. Furthermore, although professionalization as a concept entails a process towards an increasingly professional character in a sector, organization or group, our study addresses the status of professionalization as a possible outcome of the above-described processes in Swedish civil society. As stated in the second and the third questions, we work with survey data capturing 'stated' motives for engagement and 'perceived' leadership ideals among civil society leaders without delving into potentially hidden or unarticulated motives or ideals held by our survey respondents. Our analytical focus is on the comparison between the two groups of leaders occupying different leadership positions.

Previous research

Scholars of non-profit organizations have explored the possible existence of diverging perceptions of the two types of leadership roles and their contributions to organizational performance and development (Bernstein, Buse, and Bilimoria 2016; Brown 2007; Jäger and Rehli 2012; LeRoux and Langer 2016; Siciliano 2008). These studies broadly agree about the importance of complementary and corporative relations between the two types of civil society leaders. Some argue that civil society leaders internalize and are socialized into a common ethos through their engagement (cf. 'nonprofit ethic' in Suarez 2010). Others find that executive leaders and board members do not share much, and disagree about many governance questions, apart from the organizations' mission statements (Siciliano 2008).

A few previous empirical studies point to the fact that employees in voluntary organizations are motivated to a greater extent by non-monetary incentives such as organizational values, missions, and social surroundings (Bassous 2015; Selander 2015). While the career paths and professional backgrounds of executive managers in the US non-profit sector have been empirically investigated (Norris-Tirrell et al., 2018; Suarez, 2010), we have been unable to find any studies that specifically compare employed executive leaders and elected representatives to find out whether there are differences between the two groups in terms of motives for engagement and leadership ideals.

Moreover, we have found very few studies on Swedish civil society leaders (see Göransson 2007 & Segnestam Larsson 2015 for a few exceptions) and such studies rarely focus on leadership values (see Miller-Stevens et al. 2018 on the UK case). A comparison of board chairs and executive directors of Swedish CSOs gives us the opportunity to explore whether these two groups of leaders differ when it comes to levels of professionalization in terms of conditions of engagement, employment, and remuneration. Then, we can compare the motives for engagement and different perceptions of leadership ideals in the two groups of leaders. Based on the different roles the two groups of leaders have in the organizations and in the Swedish context, we expect important differences between them. These expectations lead us to formulate the following three hypotheses related to our three research questions:

- (1) Executive directors are to a larger extent engaged based on monetary remuneration compared to board chairs.
- (2) Executive directors' motives for engagement and perception of leadership ideals are more in line with a professionalized civil society than board chairs' ones, which are in their turn more in line with a popular movement tradition.

- (3) After controlling for relevant factors, leadership positions still explain differences in the stated motives for engagement and the perceptions of leadership ideals.

Methods

Data and sample

This article draws on a survey study of Swedish CSO leaders active at the national level and at the regional level in the Skåne region. The study has been approved by the Regional Ethical Board in Lund (Dnr. 2017/616) and was conducted in autumn 2017. The target population is civil society elites at national level and at regional level in Skåne within the social welfare area. The sampling process followed two steps, drawing on the so-called positional method in elite studies (Hoffman-Lange 2007).

First, relevant CSOs were identified by studying lists of organizations participating in national conferences on social welfare, migration, and integration. At the regional level, lists of participants at regional conferences were also screened, as were lists of members of regional CSO umbrella organizations. The population included many interest organizations for groups such as tenants, women, retirees, migrants, ethnic minorities, etc. It also included humanitarian and solidarity organizations, cultural organizations, and organizations involved in adult education. A total of 136 CSOs were identified, including 100 at the national level and 36 at the regional level.

These 136 organizations are representative of national and regional (for Skåne) CSOs that are active and have an established position in the area of social welfare and integration policy. However, they cannot be seen as representative of organized civil society in Sweden, which comprises over 200,000 organizations, most organized at the local level (see Scaramuzzino, R., and M. Wennerhag 2019). The choice of organizations was based on the assumption that it was more likely that we would find employed leaders among this 'organizational elite' at a national and regional level than at a local level (see Göransson 2007 for a discussion of organizational elites).

The second step involved identifying the top representative and administrative leaders in the CSOs and obtaining their email addresses in order to send them the questionnaire. A total of 17 organizations at the national level were excluded because we could not find information about their leaders on the internet. Our requests to the organizations to obtain such information unfortunately went unanswered. Among these 17 organizations, ethnic and religious organizations were clearly over-represented, a group of organizations that is generally more difficult to reach (Scaramuzzino, R 2012).

Of the organizations included in the study, a number of them had just one representative elected leader, a chair (*ordförande*), while most had also recruited a second leader, a director, with more of an administrative and management role, often called the Secretary General (*generalsekreterare*), executive (VD, *Verkställande direktör*), principal (*rektor*), or similar. The deputies (vice-chairs and vice-directors) were also included in our sample. A total population of 211 leaders with valid email address were identified at the national level and 69 at the regional level. These 280 leaders comprise our target population.

The organizational position was the only criterion for leaders to be included in the sample. Many leaders held leadership positions in multiple CSOs at different levels, and the message with the link to the questionnaire did not state which organization or which position had been considered in the sampling process. Rather, it stated that respondents had been included because they held a leadership position in civil society. It also stated that the questions related to their backgrounds, organizational assignments, commitment to civil society, and their views on leadership. Thus, they were not expected to answer as leaders of a specific organization but rather as individuals. The questionnaire in Swedish was sent to the whole population, followed by three reminders, during one

Table 1. Sampling and response rate.

| | National level | Regional level | Total |
|---|----------------|----------------|-------|
| Number of organizations identified | 100 | 36 | 136 |
| Number of organizations included in the sample | 83 | 36 | 119 |
| Number of individual leaders included in the sample | 211 | 69 | 280 |
| Number of answers | 106 | 34 | 140 |
| Response rate (%) | 50.2 | 49.3 | 50.0 |

month in autumn 2017. One respondent chose not to participate. The response rate was 50%, as shown in [Table 1](#):

Variables

As the analysis compares board chairs and executive directors, a key variable is the leadership position held by the respondents. The distinction between chairs and directors could not be based on our sampling, due to the level of anonymity of the respondents in the survey. The variable instead has been operationalized through two separate questions in the survey: ‘Are you chairman, or similar, of a civil society organization?’ and ‘Are you Secretary General, manager, or similar, of a civil society organization?’. [Table 2](#) shows the distribution of respondents according to their answers to these two questions divided by the national and regional sub-sample.

For the purpose of our analysis, we have excluded two smaller groups of leaders: seven leaders who answered that they were neither chairs nor directors, and 24 leaders who stated that they held both positions. These two groups were, on the one hand, too small to be analysed statistically and, on the other hand, presented either none of the features on which we have based our comparison (i.e. being a representative or administrative leader) or presented both features. The variable hence included only two groups: 1) the respondent that had stated that they had a position as chair (and not a position as directors) and 2) the respondents that had stated that they had a position as director (and not position as chairs).

Here follows a description of the other variables used in the analysis and the questions from the survey from which they originate from, and lastly how they are related to our hypotheses. For the exact wording of the questions and the response alternatives, see Appendix (for the whole survey questionnaire in Swedish see Scaramuzzino, R 2020). To test our first hypothesis (Executive directors are to a larger extent engaged based on monetary remuneration compared to board chairs), we have chosen two survey questions related to employment and monetary remuneration. The first one asked, ‘Is your primary employment in a civil society organization?’. The second question asked, ‘How large proportion of your income is derived from elected position and employment in civil society?’. We regard these two variables as measures of professionalization.

To test our second hypothesis (Executive directors’ motives for engagement and perception of leadership ideals are more in line with a professionalized civil society than board chairs’ ones, which are in their turn more in line with a popular movement tradition), we have chosen two survey questions followed by a set of specifications. These questions can be linked to different sets of attitudes and values (cf. Miller-Stevens et al. 2018). The first question asks ‘To what extent do you agree with these statements? I have chosen a leading position in civil society in order to . . .’ and presents a series of different kinds of motivation for becoming a leader. The second question asks,

Table 2. Distribution of the leaders between positions and according to sub-samples.

| N. (%) | Chair | Director | Total |
|-----------------|----------|----------|-----------|
| National sample | 39 (70) | 43 (81) | 82 (75) |
| Regional sample | 17 (30) | 10 (19) | 27 (25) |
| Total | 56 (100) | 53 (100) | 109 (100) |

Table 3. Motives for engagement and civil society leadership ideals.

| | Popular movement tradition | Professionalized civil society |
|------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Motives for engagement | <i>Moral obligation</i> | <i>Professional development</i> |
| Leadership ideals | <i>Grassroots support</i> | <i>Formal education</i> |

‘In your opinion, what is the significance of the following factors regarding the opportunity of attaining a leading position in civil society?’ and presents a series of different leadership characteristics.

These two variables measure different aspects of leadership. The first shows the personal motivation of the respondents for becoming a leader. The second shows how the respondent perceives leadership ideals in civil society in terms of what is required to become a leader. As they occupy different positions, we expect them to differ regarding the requirements they deem important. Based on our previous overview of the popular movement tradition which can be understood as in contrast to a professionalized civil society, we identify the alternative ‘moral obligation’ as an ideal-typical motive for engagement and the alternative ‘having grassroots support’ as an important leadership ideal in the popular movement tradition (cf. ‘street credentials’ in Suarez (2010)). In contrast, the alternative ‘professional development’ as a motive for engagement and ‘formal education’ as an important aspect of leadership are identified as characterizing a more professionalized civil society (see Table 3).¹

To test our third hypothesis (After controlling for relevant factors, leadership positions still explain differences in the stated motives for engagement and the perceptions of leadership ideals) we use the four variables related to motives for engagement and perception of leadership ideals as dependent variables (DV) and a set of variables as factors or independent variables (IV). As we use binary logistic regression for the analysis, these variables have been transformed into binary variables (so-called ‘dummy variables’) with two different values ‘1’ and ‘0’.

Dependent variables

The DVs for motives of engagement have been recoded with the two first alternatives (‘Not at all’ and ‘To some extent’) as ‘0’ and the two latter (‘To a great extent’ and ‘To a very great extent’) as ‘1’. The DVs for leadership ideals have been recoded with the two first alternatives (‘Very important’ and ‘Quite important’) as ‘1’ and the two latter (‘Not so important’ and ‘Not important at all’) as ‘0’.

Independent variables

The first IV is the leadership position of the respondent described above which already presents only two alternatives i.e. chairs and directors. The second IV is the geographic level at which the leader is active, operationalized as the two sub-samples i.e. national and regional level (see Table 2). The third IV is the gender of the respondent based on the survey question ‘Gender’ in the survey followed by the alternatives ‘Female’, ‘Male’ and ‘Other gender’. As the third option was not chosen by any respondent, also this variable had only two values. The fourth IV is the age of the respondent based on the survey question ‘Age – please state your age’ as an open numeric question. This variable was recoded in two age groups i.e. the respondents aged 65 or younger and the respondents aged 66 or older. The fifth IV is the level of formal education of the respondent based on the survey question ‘What is your highest level of education?’ with eight alternatives following the different levels of Swedish education system. This variable was recoded in two groups i.e. the respondents that had no university degree and the respondents that had university degree. The sixth and last IV is related to leadership training based on the survey question ‘Have you received leadership training that is specific to civil society?’ with two possible answers: ‘Yes’ and ‘No’.

Data analysis methods

We base our analysis on a medium size N. of leaders divided in two groups of very similar size. Directors are slightly overrepresented in the national sample compared to chairs, who are in turn slightly overrepresented in the regional sample. This is consistent with the expectation that organizations at a national level are more professionalized than organizations at a regional and local level. Because of this bias, we include the sub-sample as a variable in the analysis of the factors that explain the differences in our dependent variables. We have also looked at the distribution of the leaders among different policy areas based on a question about their main areas of activity, and found no significant differences. This suggests that there is no particular bias regarding the policy areas in which chairs and directors are active.

To answer our first two research questions, we explore the differences between chairs and directors using bivariate cross tabulation. We hence compare chairs and directors concerning the two variables on employment and monetary remuneration and our four dependent variables, two for motives of engagement and two for leadership ideals. As measure of correlation, we use Cramer's V which '... is a measure of substantive significance. It answers the question, How strong does the relationship appear to be?' (Marchant-Shapiro 2015). It gives a value between 0 and 1, where the value 0 represents no association and the value 1 represents complete association.

Furthermore, to answer our third research question we also test, through binary logistic regression, the relevance of leadership positions against a set of relevant control variables such as sub-sample, gender, age, education, leadership training experience. These variables relate to organizational and institutional factors that are often considered in studies of values and attitudes (e.g. Kallio et al., 2013). The results of the analysis include B coefficients (B), standard errors (S.E.) and odds ratios (Exp(B)). Odds ratios higher than 1 show that the IV makes it more likely for the respondent to agree on the motive for engagement or leadership ideal used as DV while ratios lower than 1 makes it less likely. The level of explanatory power of the model is measured by Nagelkerke R-square.

Results

Leadership positions and professionalization

Our first hypothesis is that *executive directors are to a larger extent engaged based on monetary remuneration compared to board chairs*. We thus expect leaders with director positions to be employed in the CSOs full time and thereby remunerated for their leadership role to a greater extent. A comparison of the employment of the respondents to our survey tends to support our hypothesis that the primary employment of nearly all directors (94%) is actually in civil society and we can assume that this employment is linked to their managerial position. In contrast, only 16% of all chairs among our survey respondents have their primary employment in civil society.

Since chairs also often receive monetary compensation – albeit in the form of honoraria rather than a salary – for their leadership positions, it is relevant to look at the extent to which the leaders' incomes are derived from their positions and activities in civil society. It is also possible that chairs support themselves mainly through holding leadership positions in civil society, although not as employees. However, our analysis shows that for the majority of chairs (86%), the proportion of income from their positions in civil society is quite low, while the majority of directors (88%) derive more than a half of their income from their leadership position in civil society. The mean proportion of income from civil society for chairs is 19% (SD = 32.1) and for directors 88% (SD = 30.9). The difference between these mean values is statistically significant and the correlation is strong (Eta square 0.55; $t(100) = -11.071$, $p = 0.000$).

These results support our first hypothesis showing that the executive director position in CSOs entails a higher degree of professionalization than the chair position in terms of employment and

Table 4. Motives and leadership ideals.

| % | Chair | Director | N. | Cramer's V. |
|--|-------|----------|-----|-------------|
| <i>Motives for becoming a leader</i> | | | | |
| Professional development | 43 | 77 | 109 | 0.351** |
| Moral obligation | 57 | 38 | 109 | 0.195** |
| <i>Perception of leadership ideals</i> | | | | |
| Formal education | 34 | 58 | 108 | 0.240* |
| Have support within the movement and at a grassroots level | 95 | 83 | 107 | 0.188† |

Sig. †: $P = <0,1$ *: $P = <0,05$ **: $P = <0,01$ ***: $P = <0,001$

remuneration. A director's engagement in a CSO depends not only on voluntary commitment but also on wage work and monetary compensation that comprise most of the leader's total income. The opposite is true for chairs.

Motives for engagement and perception of leadership ideals

The following analyses investigate the similarities and differences between the two categories of civil society leaders with regard to their stated motives for engagement, as well as perceived leadership ideals in civil society. By doing so we test the second hypothesis that *executive directors' motives for engagement and perception of leadership ideals are more in line with a professionalized civil society than board chairs' ones, which are in their turn more in line with a popular movement tradition.*

The motives and leadership ideals in Table 6 relate to either the professional leadership (e.g. professional development and formal education) or to the popular movement tradition (e.g. moral obligation and having support within the movement and at a grassroots level).

Table 4 shows that the directors mention professional development as a motive for becoming leaders in civil society to a greater extent than chairs (77% compared to 43%). In contrast, a higher proportion of chairs (57%) regard moral obligation as their motive for civil society engagement compared to directors (38%). These differences are statistically significant. These differences confirm that individuals who lead CSOs as directors, with greater managerial and administrative responsibilities, tend to have more personal and career-oriented goals with their engagement in civil society. These differences are in line with the fact that the majority of directors are employed in CSOs and derive most of their income from their employment. This also applies to the leadership ideals, i.e. a higher proportion of directors (58%) consider formal education to be an important aspect of civil society leaders compared to chairs (34%). Another statistically significant difference between the two leadership categories relates to the importance of having support in your own movement/organization, in which it is predominantly chairs who consider this aspect to be important for becoming civil society leaders (95%) and somewhat fewer directors (83%) who consider this aspect important. This ideal relates to the popular movement tradition.

In other words, directors tend to uphold motives and leadership ideals related to a professional role to a higher degree than chairs do, while chairs tend to uphold motives and leadership ideals related to a popular movement tradition to a higher degree than directors do. These results tend to support our second hypothesis.

Is it really about leadership positions?

As for the differences we found between chairs and directors in terms of their motivation for civil society engagement and their perceived ideals of civil society leadership, the following analysis concerns the question of whether we can attribute these differences to leadership positions, or if there are other explanatory factors that account for the differences we found. For this purpose, we carried out four binary logistic regression models, with four different dependent variables indicating the different motives for engagement and leadership ideals considered in the previous section.

Table 5. Factors that explain motives for civil society engagement and perception of leadership ideals (binary logistic regression).

| | Popular movement tradition | | | | | | Professionalized civil society | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|------|--------|--------------------|-------|--------|--------------------------------|------|--------|------------------|------|---------|
| | Moral obligation | | | Grassroots support | | | Professional development | | | Formal education | | |
| | B | S.E. | Exp(B) | B | S.E. | Exp(B) | B | S.E. | Exp(B) | B | S.E. | Exp(B) |
| Leadership position (president ref.) | -1.17 | 0.49 | 0.31* | -1.82 | 0.88 | 0.16* | 1.25 | 0.49 | 3.50** | 1.79 | 0.55 | 5.99*** |
| Sub-sample (regional level ref.) | 0.49 | 0.50 | 1.05 | 0.92 | 0.72 | 2.51 | -0.60 | 0.55 | 0.55 | 0.18 | 0.51 | 1.20 |
| Gender (male ref.) | -0.68 | 0.45 | 0.51 | 0.73 | 0.72 | 2.08 | 0.98 | 0.47 | 2.67* | 0.84 | 0.48 | 2.32 |
| Age (66 or older ref.) | 1.45 | 0.58 | 4.28* | 0.75 | 0.92 | 2.11 | 0.77 | 0.55 | 2.17 | -2.01 | 0.63 | 0.13*** |
| Country of birth (foreign-born ref.) | -1.02 | 0.67 | 0.36 | -0.97 | 1.17 | 0.38 | 0.44 | 0.64 | 1.56 | -0.67 | 0.67 | 0.50 |
| Education (upper secondary school or lower ref.) | -0.38 | 0.55 | 0.69 | -0.21 | 0.91 | 0.81 | -0.03 | 0.54 | 0.97 | 0.60 | 0.60 | 1.83 |
| Leadership training CS (no leadership training in CS ref.) | -0.37 | 0.44 | 0.69 | 0.77 | 0.73 | 2.17 | -0.13 | 0.46 | 0.88 | 0.38 | 0.45 | 1.46 |
| Constant | 1.00 | 0.92 | 2.78 | 2.39 | 1.54 | 10.93 | -1.08 | 0.93 | 0.34 | -0.14 | 0.94 | 0.87 |
| Observations | | 107 | | | 105 | | | 107 | | | 106 | |
| Nagelkerke R square | | 0.21 | | | 0.157 | | | 0.27 | | | 0.26 | |

Sig. †: $P < 0,1$ *: $P < 0,05$ **: $P < 0,01$ ***: $P < 0,001$

By this analysis we test our third hypothesis that *after controlling for relevant factors, leadership positions still explain differences in the stated motives for engagement and the perceptions of leadership ideals.*

The results of the binary logistic regressions with the four dependent variables are shown in Table 5. In all four models, we controlled for potential differences that could arise due to the different governance levels at which the leaders' organizations are active (sub-sample variable), demographic backgrounds (gender, age, country of birth), and educational backgrounds (university education and participation in leadership training specific to civil society).

For all four dependent variables representing motives for engagement and leadership ideals in civil society, the leadership position made statistically significant differences after controlling for all the above-mentioned factors.

The first model focuses on the dependent variable *moral obligation* which is a motive of engagement associated with the popular movement tradition. Holding a directorship, compared to the reference category of those holding a chair position, decreases the likelihood that moral obligation is a civil society leader's motive for engagement by 69% $((0.31-1)*100)$. However, we find another factor that explain the differences in motives. In fact, being 65 years old or younger, compared to the reference category (those 66 or older), increases the likelihood that moral obligation is a civil society leader's motive for engagement by more than 328% $((4.28-1)*100)$. This correlation could be indications of a more idealistic view of civic engagement among younger leaders.

The second model focuses on the dependent variable *grassroot-support* which is a leadership ideal related to the popular movement tradition. Holding a directorship, compared to the reference category of those holding a chair position, decreases the likelihood that a civil society leader considers having grassroots support to be a leadership ideal by 83% $((0.16-1)*100)$. No other factor seems to correlate with our dependent variable.

The third model focuses on *professional development* a motive of engagement associated with professionalized civil society. Holding a directorship, compared to the reference category of those holding a chair position, increases by 250% $((3.50-1)*100)$ the likelihood that a civil society leader has professional development as their motive for engagement. In other words, directors are two and a half times more likely than chairs to have professional development as their motive for engagement in civil society. We also find another significant factor here, namely gender. Interestingly, being female increases by 167% $((2.67-1)*100)$ the likelihood that a civil society leader's motive for engagement is professional development. As Swedish CSOs employ more female than male

employees (60% of employees in civil society are female, according to SCB (2018), compared to 48% across the whole labour market), one possible explanation is that female leaders regard civil society as an arena and an opportunity for professional development to a greater extent than their male counterparts.

The fourth model focuses on the dependent variable *formal education* as a leadership ideal associated with the professionalized civil society. Holding a directorship, compared to the reference category of those holding a chair position, increases by 499% $((5.99-1)*100)$ the likelihood that a civil society leader considers formal education as an important part of attaining a leadership position in CSOs. In other words, directors are nearly five times more likely to consider formal education to be an important prerequisite for civil society leaders, compared to chairs. In this model age also matters, insofar as leaders aged 65 years old or younger are less likely than older leaders by 87% $((0.13-1)*100)$ to consider formal education to be an important part of attaining a leadership position. While difficult to interpret, this result is in line with our finding in model 1 that younger leaders are more likely to have a moral obligation as a motive for their engagement in civil society. It is therefore reasonable that they regard formal education as being less important.

In short, when controlling for relevant factors, the position of director or chair has some explanatory power for the differences in motives and leadership ideals in terms of chairs being more supportive of motives for engagement and leadership ideals related to the popular movement tradition and directors of those related to professionalized civil society. Hence, we also find support for our third hypothesis.

Discussion

Our study has explored the state of professionalization concerning national and regional CSOs active in the social welfare policy area, with a narrow understanding of professionalization as a process leading to an increasing share of leaders employed by CSOs instead of being involved on a voluntary basis. The analysis has focused on comparing two groups of leaders: chairs and directors. The extent to which the groups of leaders emphasize different motives and leadership ideals have seldom been explored in relation to the governance structure of organizations and leaders' different terms of engagement.

Our study shows that directors are employed by CSOs to a greater extent than chairs, and that monetary compensation for their engagement comprises their income to a much greater degree, compared to chairs. In order to explore whether professionalization measured in this way is related to different sets of motives and leadership ideals among civil society leaders, we studied to what extent the leaders identify themselves with the four ideal-typical categories corresponding to the popular movement tradition and the professionalized civil society. The results show that leadership position (chairs vs. directors) has explanatory power for the differences we find in terms of stated motives for engagement and perceived leadership ideals in civil society. This is true even when controlling for factors such as the level of governance at which the leaders' organizations are active and social and educational backgrounds. Chairs are more likely to have motives of engagement and leadership ideals in civil society that correspond to the popular movement tradition (moral obligation and grassroots support), while directors are more likely to have motives of engagement and leadership ideals in civil society that correspond to a more professionalized civil society (professional development and formal education). Thus, a fault line can be clearly drawn, resonating with previous studies (e.g. Kreuzer and Jäger 2011) that highlight the tensions between the traditional ideals of voluntary civic engagement/representation logics and the more career-oriented and employment-mediated engagement/managerial leadership role.

Understanding the long-term effects of the seemingly increasing number of managerial leadership positions in CSOs may require more in-depth studies on the career trajectories of individual civil society leaders. As the age factor appears to be of relevance to leaders' motives for engagement and perceived leadership ideals, it could be that chairs and directors follow different career paths,

where directors, as professional leaders, concentrate on the more productive ages of employment while chairs are more evenly distributed, but with a higher concentration at retirement age. It is also possible that the positions represent different career stages through which people move between positions during their adult life span. A third possibility is that different cohorts of leaders follow different career patterns and that director positions are occupied by younger leaders, as this is a newer phenomenon. If we look at the age of the leaders, we note in fact that chairs are over-represented among both leaders who are younger than 36 and those over 65, while directors are more concentrated between 36 and 65 years of age.

The presence of two leadership positions entailing different grounds for engagement (voluntary vs. paid) and partly different motives and ideals, could be traced back to the combination of a still-strong popular movement tradition and increasing demand of professional skills (Hwang and Powell 2009; Skocpol 2003; Meeuwisse and Sunesson 1998). Having two types of leaders, drawing their legitimacy based on different ideals, might be a way for CSOs to manage demands for leaders to be democratically representative and committed to the cause, while being managerially competent and professional. From this point of view, the division of labour between leadership positions (Bernstein, Buse, and Bilimoria 2016) seems a rational and effective way of handling possibly conflicting expectations. However, our results also show that there seems to be a consensus around certain aspects of the Swedish popular movement tradition, such as having support within the movement and at the grassroots level, beyond different types of leadership positions.

Conclusions

We argue that these findings add an often-neglected dimension to the discussion on professionalization in civil society organizations, namely, the emergence of civil society leaders as a new profession. This could be the result of two separate but interrelated processes. On the one hand, leaders tend to internalize organizational goals and norms and ‘... tend to act and speak on behalf of the interests of their institutions’ (Gulbrandsen 2019, 29). This theory holds if we assume a common ethos in the civil society sphere. This view is supported by a number of previous empirical studies that point to the importance of value congruence among employed staff in voluntary organizations (Bassous 2015; Selander 2015). On the other hand, it has been argued that individuals tend to conform to the norms and values of people in similar positions rather than in subordinate positions (Brass et al. 2004). This could explain the similarities we found among leaders because of the isomorphic tendencies among the leadership strata, regardless of whether they were elected or salaried. In this sense, the professionalization of civil society leaders could also be interpreted in terms of a process of establishing a specific profession with common knowledge and values (cf. DiMaggio and Powell 1983), for instance through specific training programmes targeting civil society leaders (Altermark, Johansson, and Stattin 2022).

In our analyses, we rely greatly on the ideal-typical distinction between the Swedish popular movement tradition and the professionalized CSOs (see Table 3) in order to tease out the potential implications of professionalization in civil society. Whether professionalization will lead to changes in prevalent values for civil society depends ultimately on the organizational division of labour between the leadership positions, their power dynamic, and how these factors ultimately affect organizational decision-making. An important question is therefore whether employment of paid leaders is merely about the functional specialization of Swedish civil society in the face of increased organizational complexity, or whether it also entails devaluation of representative leadership in favour of administrative and managerial leadership. The present study supports further empirical studies that take these two leadership positions as a point of departure.

Notes

1. Other answer alternatives in the survey question about motives for engagement were for example 'self-support', 'Express my opinions' and 'Increase public awareness'. In the survey question about leadership ideals, other answer alternatives were for example 'Experience of working at the international level', 'Kinship and social background' and 'Media contacts'.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

This work was supported by the Swedish Agency for Youth and Civil Society under Grant 0943/16; and Riksbankens jubileumsfond M17-0188:1 under Grant M17-0188;; Myndigheten för Ungdoms- och Civilisamhällesfrågor Myndigheten för Ungdoms- och Civilisamhällesfrågor [0943/16];

References

- Ahrne, G., and N. Brunsson. 2008. *Meta-organizations*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Altermark, N., H. Johansson, and S. Stattin. 2022. "Shaping Civil Society Leaders: Horizontal and Vertical Boundary Work in Swedish Leadership Training Programmes." *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*. doi:10.1007/s11266-022-00519-x.
- Bassous, M. 2015. "What are the Factors that Affect Worker Motivation in faith-based Nonprofit Organizations?" *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 26 (1): 355–381. doi:10.1007/s11266-013-9420-3.
- Bernstein, R., K. Buse, and D. Bilimoria. 2016. "Revisiting Agency and Stewardship Theories. Perspectives from Nonprofit Board Chairs and CEOs." *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* 26 (4): 489–498. doi:10.1002/nml.21199.
- Billis, D. 2010. "Towards a Theory of Hybrid Organizations." In *Hybrid Organizations and the Third Sector*, edited by D. Billis, 52–58. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Daniel J. Brass, Joseph Galaskiewicz, Henrich R. Greve, and Wenpin Tsai. 2004. "Taking Stock of Networks and Organizations: A Multilevel Perspective." *AMJ* 47: 795–817. doi:10.5465/20159624.
- Brown, W. A. 2007. "Board Development Practices and Competent Board Members: Implications for Performance." *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* 17 (3): 301–317. doi:10.1002/nml.151.
- DiMaggio, P. J., and W. Powell. 1983. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review* 48 (2): 147–160. doi:10.2307/2095101.
- Göransson, A., edited by. 2007. *Maktens kön: Kvinnor och män iden svenska makteliten på 2000-talet (The Gender of Power: Women and Men in the Swedish Power Elite in the 2000s)*. Nora: Nya Doxa.
- Gulbrandsen, T. 2019. *Elites in an Egalitarian Society: Support for the Nordic Model*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hoffman-Lange, U. 2007. "Methods of Elite Research." *The Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*, edited by R. J. Dalton and H.-D. Klingemann, 910–928. Oxford: OUP Press.
- Hvenmark, J. (2008) *Reconsidering membership: A study of individual members' formal affiliation with democratically governed federations* (Doctoral dissertation). Stockholm: School of Economics.
- Hwang, H., and W. W. Powell. 2009. "The Rationalization of Charity: The Influences of Professionalism in the Nonprofit Sector." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 54 (2): 268–298. doi:10.2189/asqu.2009.54.2.268.
- Jäger, P. U., and F. Rehli. 2012. "Cooperative Power Relations between Nonprofit Board Chairs and Executive Directors." *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* 23 (2): 219–236. doi:10.1002/nml.21061.
- Johansson, H., M. Arvidson, and S. Johansson. 2015. "Welfare Mix as a Contested Terrain: Political Positions on government–non-profit Relations at National and Local Levels in a Social Democratic Welfare State." *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 26 (5): 1601–1619. doi:10.1007/s11266-015-9580-4.
- Johansson, H., and M. Johansson. 2012. "From a "Liberal" to a "Social Democratic" Welfare State: The Translation of the English Compact into a Swedish Context." *Nonprofit Policy Forum*. 3, 2. doi:10.1515/2154-3348.1057.
- Johansson, H., and S. Kalm, eds. 2015. *EU Civil Society: Patterns of Cooperation, Competition and Conflict*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Johansson, H., A. Kassman, and R. Scaramuzzino. 2011. *Staten och det civila samhällets organisationer i ett föränderligt välfärdssamhälle – Perspektiv på en överenskommelse (State and civil society organizations in a changing welfare society - Perspectives on an agreement)*. Stockholm: Överenskommelsen.
- Kallio, J., H. Blomberg, and C. Kroll. 2013. "Social Workers' Attitudes Towards the Unemployed in the Nordic Countries." *International Journal of Social Welfare* 22 (2): 219–229. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2397.2012.00891.x.
- Kallio, J., A. Meeuwisse and R. Scaramuzzino. 2015. "Social workers' attitudes to privatization in five countries." *Journal of social work* 16 (2): 174–195.
- Kreutzer, K., and U. Jäger. 2011. "Volunteering versus Managerialism: Conflict over Organizational Identity in Voluntary Associations." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 40 (4): 634–661. doi:10.1177/0899764010369386.
- LeRoux, K., and J. Langer. 2016. "What Nonprofit Executives Want and What They Get from Board Members." *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* 27 (2): 147–164. doi:10.1002/nml.21234.
- Lundström, T., and L. Svedberg. 2003. "The Voluntary Sector in a Social Democratic Welfare state—the Case of Sweden." *Journal of Social Policy* 32 (2): 217–238. doi:10.1017/S0047279402007006.
- Lundström, T., and F. Wijkström. 1997. *The non-profit Sector in Sweden*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Madestam, J. 2015. "Vem Kan Bli Förtroendevald" [Who Can Become a Trustee]. *Förtroendevald – Åtta forskare om möjligheter och utmaningar för förtroendevalda i ideell sektor*, edited by O. S. Larsson, 30–63. Stockholm: Idealistas förlag.
- Marchant-Shapiro, T. 2015. *Statistics for Political Analysis: Understanding the numbers*. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Meeuwisse, A. and R. Scaramuzzino, edited by. 2019. *Europeanization in Sweden - Opportunities and challenges for civil society organizations*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Meeuwisse, A. and R. Scaramuzzino. forthcoming. "Producing leadership legitimacy in civil society - A study of online presentations of leaders in Sweden." *Manuscript accepted for publication in Journal of Civil Society*.
- Meeuwisse, A., and S. Sunesson. 1998. "Frivilliga Organisationer, Socialt Arbete Och Expertis" [Voluntary Organizations, Social Work and Expertise]. *Socialvetenskaplig tidskrift* 2-3: 172–193.
- Miller-Stevens, K., J. A. Taylor, J. C. Morris, and S. E. Lanivich. 2018. "Assessing Value Differences between Leaders of Two Social Venture Types: Benefit Corporations and Nonprofit Organizations." *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 29 (5): 1–13. doi:10.1007/s11266-017-9947-9.
- Norris-Tirrell, D., J. Rinella, and X. Pham. 2018. "Examining the Career Trajectories of Nonprofit Executive Leaders." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 47 (1): 146–164. doi:10.1177/0899764017722023.
- Scaramuzzino, R. 2012. *Challenges When Studying Diffuse Forms of Organisations in Civil Society*, edited by K. Jacobsson and K. Sjöberg, 25–40. Lund: Faculty of Social Sciences, Lund University.
- Scaramuzzino, R. 2020. "Ledaren i det svenska civila samhället - En enkätstudie (The leader in Swedish civil society - A survey study)." *Research Reports in Social Work*. 2020 vols, 4. Lund: School of Social Work, Lund university.
- Scaramuzzino, R., and M. Wennerhag. 2019. "Europeanization of Swedish civil society: motives, activities, and perceived consequences." In Meeuwisse, A. & Scaramuzzino, R., eds. *Europeanization in Sweden - Opportunities and challenges for civil society organizations*. 75–107. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Schambra, A. W., and L. K. Shaffer. 2011. "Civil Society and Institutional Philanthropy." *The Oxford Handbook of Civil Society*, edited by M. Edwards, 443–454. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Segnestam Larsson, O., ed. 2015. *Förtroendevald – Åtta Forskare Om Möjligheter Och Utmaningar För Förtroendevalda I Ideell Sektor [Trustee – Eight Researchers about Opportunities and Challenges for Trustees in the Voluntary Sector]*. Stockholm: Idealistas förlag.
- Selander, K. 2015. "Work Engagement in the Third Sector." *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 26 (4): 1391–s1411. doi:10.1007/s11266-014-9465-y.
- Siciliano, J. 2008. "A Comparison of CEO and Director Perceptions of Board Involvement in Strategy." *Non-profit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 37 (1): 152–162. doi:10.1177/0899764007301287.
- Skocpol, T. 2003. *Diminished Democracy: From Membership to Management in American Civic Life*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- 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. doi:10.1177/0899764009350370.
- Trägårdh, L. 2010. "Från Folkrörelse till Civilsamhälle: Staten Och Samhället I Det Moderna Sverige" [From Popular Movement to Civil Society: The State and Society in Modern Sweden]. *Det Svenska Civilsamhället – En Introduktion*, edited by J. von Essen, 23–41. Stockholm Forum för Frivilligt Socialt Arbete.

Appendix

| Variables | Survey question | Response alternatives |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| Leadership position | Are you chairman, or similar, of a civil society organization? Are you Secretary General, manager, or similar, of a civil society organization? | Yes, No |
| Measures of professionalization | Is your primary employment in a CSO? | Yes, No |
| | How large a proportion of your income is derived from elected position and employment in civil society? | Please state percentage |
| Motives for becoming a leader | To what extent do you agree with these statements? I have chosen a leading position in civil society in order to: - Develop professionally - I see it as a moral obligation | Not at all, To some extent, To a great extent, To a very great extent (the two first response alternatives have been recorded as negative while the latter two have been recorded as positive) |
| Perception of leadership ideals | In your opinion, what is the significance of the following factors regarding the opportunity of attaining a leading position in civil society? - Formal education - Support in the movement, at a grassroots level or in the group being represented | Very important, Quite important, Not so important, Not important at all (the two first response alternatives have been recorded as negative while the two latter have been recorded as positive) |
| Background factors | Gender | Female, Male, Other gender |
| | Age | Please state age |
| | In which country were you born? | Please state country |
| | What is your highest level of education? | None, Primary and Lower secondary school, Upper Secondary school, University, PhD |
| | Have you received some form of leadership training? | Yes, No |
| | Have you received leadership training that is specific to civil society? | Yes, No |
| | I lead an organization with extensive resources I lead an organization that has influence over policy I lead an organization that has a critical stance towards public policy I lead an organization that provides services on behalf of public authorities | Not at all, Not particularly = 0 To some extent, Quite much, Very much = 1 |