

# СОЦІАЛЬНА ТА ЕКОЛОГІЧНА ЕКОНОМІКА

УДК 334.012.46=111

## CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS: CURRENT STATE OF RESEARCH

**Popova T., Associate Professor**

Tavria State Agrotechnological University, Melitopol, Ukraine

*Civil society organizations have long been the lost continent on the social landscape of our world. Only recently they have attracted serious attention from government officials, business representatives, academics and experts, representatives of donor agencies and the press. Few quantitative data exist in most places concerning numbers of CSOs, their size, activities, economic weight, finances, and role. Deeper understanding of the factors that contribute to their growth and decline has been almost nonexistent. To fill this gap, the paper includes a problem and needs analysis of Ukrainian CSOs, a study of regional trends in the Ukrainian third sector and conclusions with regards to changes that have been observed in CSOs from 2002 to 2012.*

**Keywords:** Civil society organizations; democratic process; associations; social services

### Introduction

Civil society sector (civil society organization or “third sector” organizations) is a broad array of organizations that are essentially private, i.e., outside the institutional structures of government; that are not primarily commercial and do not exist primarily to distribute profits to their directors or “owners”; that are self-governing; and that where people are free to join or support voluntarily. More specifically, a social enterprise is conceived of as meeting both an economic and social goals within the third sector. The third sector refers to all non-profit organizations fostered by civil society. The key examples of these organizations include local community organizations, mutual self-help groups, rural and agricultural cooperatives, rural partnerships, and nongovernmental organizations [1].

Civil society plays different roles at different stages of the democratic process such as democratic transformations and democratic consolidation. At the stage of democratic transformations, the role of civil society is important for mobilization of pressure for political changes. The key role of civil society in the process of democratic consolidation is to prevent abuse of power by the state, avoid concentration of power in the hands of one person, and encourage wider citizens’ involvement and critical attitude to the government’s activities[2].

CSOs provide delivering qualitative and cost-effective social service primarily by developing innovative approaches to providing such services. Among them there are those that don’t provide either the state or commercial organizations. Besides, such institutions promote organization of citizens for self-satisfaction of their interests without additional financial or administrative cost to the state, distribute a charity and provide targeted and operational charity assistance, participate in decision-making and provide so much efficient solutions with regard to the interests of different social groups.

So, the civil society sector is thus a major social and economic force in countries throughout the world. Ukraine tries to conform to the worldwide

trend of the growing awareness of the third sector’s role in serving public or community purposes. The theme of the agricultural third sector rose to political prominence and is centrally taken up at the top-level conferences held by Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine and EU officials.

The growing role of the third sector is a part of the overall upsurge of civil society initiatives in Ukraine, as evidenced by recent studies. To promote sustainable socio-economic development at local level by strengthening participatory governance and encouraging community-based initiatives throughout Ukraine CBA-II Project is implemented in all 25 regions of Ukraine. This Project is funded by the European Union and is co-financed and implemented by United Nations Development Programme, with the support of the Government of Ukraine and in partnership with local executive bodies of self-governance [3].

### Overview of Recent Evidence

According to rankings by powerful international organizations development of civil society in Ukraine gradually improved during the period of independence, and in recent years did not show positive dynamics, but kept some stability at the achieved level. They are better than in other post-Soviet countries, while significantly behind indicators of Baltic countries. Thus, the results of *Nations in Transit* study of international non-governmental organization Freedom House (where the evaluation of various areas of democratic development of transition countries carried out on a scale of 7 points – “worst”, one point - “The best”), assessment of civil society in Ukraine has improved from 4.75 points in 1998 to 3 points in 2005 and 2.75 points in 2006-2011. In “civil society” trend Ukraine demonstrated the greatest progress and, accordingly, got the best assessment in relation to other indicators. In other areas of research *Nations in Transit* Ukrainian ratings look less successful: in 2011 “Rating of democratic development” (i.e., the average overall, integrated from others) was 4.61 points, “national democratic governance” – 5.5 points, “election process” – 3.5 points, “Independent

Media” – 3.75 points, “Local democratic governance” – 5.5 points, “Judiciary system and independence of judges” – 5.5 points, “Corruption” – 5.75 points (12). To determine the specified ranking of civil society foreign experts take into consideration the growing number of non-governmental organizations in Ukraine (NGOs), their organizational capacity and financial stability, legal and political environment in which they operate, the development of independent trade unions, the level of participation of groups protecting the interests of the political process [4].

According to another reputable rating, which is determined within study USAID *NGO Sustainability Index* state of civil society in Ukraine was estimated at 3.5 points (on a scale of 1 to 7, where threshold consolidation is 3 points). Thus the weakest components NGO sustainability is the financial viability (4.2 points) and their perception of public (3.8 points), the strongest are advocacy (2.8 points) and providing services (3.3 points). Significantly, in terms of advocacy NGOs have even crossed the threshold of consolidated democracy. For overall assessment of foreign experts civil society in Ukraine is characterized as transitional and unconsolidated, i.e. something that has not reached the level of developed democracies and keeps the risk of returning to a less developed state [5].

Number of registered associations differs quite significantly according to various sources. No one official statistical accounting method (Unified state register of enterprises and organizations of Ukraine, Ministry of Justice of Ukraine) can obtain accurate quantitative information about the development of civil society. For example, procedure of Unified state register of enterprises and organizations of Ukraine does not include entities and centers, which are legalized by the executive committees of local governments [6]. In addition, state confrontation combines indicators fundamentally different types of nonprofit institutions and organizations (from own NGOs to trade exchanges) and distributes certain types of civil society organizations (CSOs) across

different institutional sectors. This does not allow receiving data concerning economic indicators of the civil society institution, including their share in GDP of Ukraine. Any of these methodologies of statistical account of CSOs doesn't correspond to European standards in this area.

2011 was characterized by stabilization of the positive trends of institutional development of civil society. There is some evidence suggesting that it was continued further increase in the number of officially registered associations, although the dynamics of this growth slowed. According to the Unified State Register of Enterprises and Organizations of Ukraine, that was published by State Statistics Service of Ukraine, it was registered (including international, national and local organizations, their centers, branches and separate units) 71,767 NGOs (67,696 in 2010), 27,834 trade unions and their associations (26,340 in 2010) 13,475 charitable organizations (12,860 in 2010), 13,872 associations of combining owners of apartment houses (11,956 in 2010) and 1306 self-organized communities (1210 in 2010) [7].

On the basis of these data it appears that the trend of increasing the number of officially registered associations year by year is fixed both at the level of public organizations with national and international status, and at the local level. According to the Statistical Bulletin “NGOs in Ukraine” of State Statistics Service of Ukraine, there were 3,529 associations that have been legalized by the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine (an increase compared to 2009 by 7.6% and to 1996, 4.8 times), from which there were 185 political parties and 3344 civic organization (5.2% and 94.8% in the total number of public associations accordingly) on January 1, 2011. Of the total number legalized public organizations 2619 institutions have national status and 725 international. 77,252 local NGOs are legalized by local registering authorities. It is observed that their amount increase in comparison with 2009 by 7.5%. Also the trend is typical for all regions of Ukraine.

**Table 1**

The growing number of associations in Ukraine in 2008-2012\*

Associations	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Public organizations and their branches	54862	59321	63899	67696	71767
Trade unions and their local unions	20405	22678	24649	26340	27834
Charities	10988	11660	12267	12860	13475
Association of apartment houses	6848	8549	10329	11956	13872
Self-organized communities	-	-	1152	1210	1306

\* For January 1 of years indicated in the table [8]

A positive factor that promotes transparency in the activities of CSOs and informing the citizens about their activities is searching engine United registry community groups" that operates in the open access from March 2009 on the official website of the Ukraine Ministry of Justice. For a long time representatives of CSOs have insisted on creating such an information resource. This register contains information about 3526 legalized organizations with

national and international statuses, 323 legalized public organizations through an establishment notification, 1118 charitable organizations, 66 permanent arbitration courts, 22 creative unions [9].

Public activity covers almost all spheres of public life today. In the structure of public organizations on the direction and activities in 2010, the largest share (16.7%) takes health and physical education and sports associations (an increase compared to

2009 by 8.5%). Professional unions and youth organizations are, respectively, 10.4% and 9.6% of the total number of NGOs, associations of veterans and disabled persons – 8.6%, educational and cultural organizations – 5.2% (an increase compared to 2009 6.9%, 5.2%, 6.8% and 6.5% accordingly).

It is of interest to examine the results of the annual survey of Ukrainian civil society organizations in the light of our problem [10].

The survey of CSOs was conducted in May 2010. Almost half of all respondents reported that children and youth is one of three major sectors in which they work (44%). The next major sectors of activities are civic education issues (27%) and human rights (27%). 25% of respondents surveyed in 2010 work in solving social issues sector.

The most widespread types of activities among CSOs are children and youth, civic education, human rights, and solving social issues. In 2003-2010 the number of organizations working in such sectors as solving social issues (25% in 2010, 36% in 2009), human rights (31% in 2010, 27% in 2010), NGO sector development (13% in 2010, 17% in 2003), politics, legislation, state (14% in 2010, 18% in 2009) decreased.

The most frequent type of activities selected by CSOs was training and consultation, chosen by 37% respondents in 2010 (47% of surveyed CSOs in 2009 (the difference is statistically significant at 1% level), 42% in 2007) and protection of interests and lobbying selected by 37% respondents in 2010, 41% in 2009 (the difference is statistically significant at 1% level), and 26% respondents in 2007.

In 2010 compared with the research in 2009, the number of CSOs with the main group of clients consisting of organization members increased (2010 – 24%, 2009 – 21% of surveyed CSOs). At the same time, the number of organizations whose main clients are students (2010 – 17%, 2009 – 22% of surveyed CSOs) and other CSOs (2010 – 15%, 2009 – 18% of surveyed CSOs) decreased.

When comparing the results of the 2010 research to 2002, one can see a trend toward a decrease of the number of CSOs whose clients are children (2010 – 21%, 2002 – 27%), and women (2010 – 17%, 2002 – 13%). However, the number of organizations whose clients are the youth (2010 – 40%, 2002 – 46%) increased.

Below there are results of a cross analysis of several questions conducted for the trends and relations between the sectors and types of activities non-governmental organizations were engaged in [10].

In 2010 research and analysis were chosen by 22% of respondents (24% in 2009, 9% in 2007, and 23% in 2006, 2004, and 2005).

After analyzing the respondents' answers from 2010 and previous years, the main needs of Ukrainian CSOs were identified as the following: material resources, clear legislation, and fruitful cooperation

with business structures and governmental agencies.

Data of 2010 research shows that 78% of CSOs choose Financial Support as the core need. This index is high and has remained stable during the last nine years. Compared with results from 2009, need for financial support decreased by 3% (difference is statistically insignificant at 5% level). 58% of respondents stated the need for training. 43% of CSOs pointed to the need for more information, this index decreased by 7% compared to 2002.

Analysis of the results of research for the last nine years shows that the need for equipment has decreased compared to previous years. At 39%, the number of CSOs to specify this need was the lowest recorded percentage from the last nine years.

For the ninth consecutive year, insufficient funding remains the most serious problem facing Ukrainian CSOs. The need for funding exceeded all other internal needs by 16% in 2010.

An analysis of increasing needs during nine years shows grooving of problems with limit cooperation with businesses. One can assume that this fact can be explained by the absence of information about CSOs and lack of professionalism. Although in 2010 this figure remained the same as in 2009, there was still a significant increase compared to 2002 (the difference is statistically significant at 1% level). Analysis of data collected during 2002-2010 shows that the need for equipment has dramatically decreased over time. Compared to 2009, in 2010 it decreased by 4% (difference is statistically significant at 1% level).

The main external obstacles which were defined during the 2002-2010 surveys are lack of interest on the part of businesses (47% of CSOs) and authorities (45% of CSOs), legislation in general (44%) and tax legislation (35% of respondents). The problem of low interest from government authorities decreased by 4% compared with 2009 (45% in 2010, 49% of CSOs in 2009). The reason for low interest on the part of government authorities can be explained by low awareness level of authorities as for CSOs activities. In 2002-2010 one could also observe a growth of the number of CSOs that mention low interest from business in CSOs activities. Such low interest from the business sector can be explained by the financial crisis and the low level of information about CSOs activities that the business sector can access [10].

All these data have been interpreted to mean that CSOs has as a favorable conditions and negative conditions for their development. Among potential for social enterprise development there are below provisions:

- since the Orange revolution the third sector has enjoyed more freedom and been subject to less harassment;
- delivery of public services by third sector organizations is allowed by law;

- the law on social services allows third sector organizations to receive compensation for the services supplied;

- promising improvements have been introduced by the Civil Code [11].

There are such constraints on social enterprise development:

- the third sector is not yet fully recognized by the general public, government and for-profit enterprises;

- the registration process for unions of citizens is more time-consuming than that for for-profit companies;

- unnecessary requirements in the Law on Social Services can be seen as discriminatory against third sector organizations;

- lack of resources for third sector organizations and limited access to available ones;

- practically, the only way whereby unions of citizens can generate income through economic activity is through commercial firms.

### Concluding Remarks

There were no significant changes in the types of CSO activities. However, compared to the data of the 2009 research, 2010 demonstrated a significant decrease of the number of CSOs providing training and consultative services, carrying out educational work, protecting and lobbying public.

The most important internal problem for Ukrainian CSOs is insufficient financing. It should be said that compared to the previous three years this problem decreased significantly. One can also see a considerable decrease of the number of CSOs that demonstrated a lack of professional staff. The latter fact can be explained by an increased capacity of CSOs to involve highly professional employees due

to the financial crisis and increased prestige of the work in nongovernmental organizations. During the last nine years, the level of insufficient cooperation with business and inadequate availability of equipment has remained rather high.

The majority of the interviewed CSOs indicated that imperfect tax legislation is the major

external problem for Ukrainian CSOs. It should be mentioned that compared to the previous years, the number of CSOs that mentioned low interest from business and the government in CSOs activities decreased significantly. This fact can be explained by the increased level of cooperation between CSOs and the governmental and business organizations.

It is important to underline the general features that national policies should follow with respect to:

- the legal and fiscal framework (national policies should nurture a new and enabling legislative framework and fiscal measures allowing a full recovery of the third sector and development of social enterprises (cooperatives and other types of social enterprises);

- interaction with public agencies (national policies should allow state and local authorities to grant compensation for the production and delivery of goods and services by social enterprises that are of public interest);

- the institutional context for social enterprises (national policies should support capacity-building for social enterprises, sustain their growth and foster networking among them (consortia, financing bodies, education/training etc.), preferably through a joint venture between local government and social enterprises.

### References

1. Salamon, Lester M.(2010) 'Putting the civil society sector on the economic map of the world', *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, pp. 167-210.
2. Lyubov, Palyvoda & Sophia, Golota (2010), *Civil Society Organizations in Ukraine. The State and Dynamics (2002-2010)*, Kyiv.
3. *Community Based Approach to Local Development Project (2011)*. Available at <http://cba.org.ua/ua/about/about-cba>
4. *Civil Society in Ukraine (2012)*, Report of the national institute for strategic studies (2012), Kyiv
5. *Indicators of Unified State Register of Enterprises and Organizations of Ukraine on January 1, 2012*. Available at [http://ukrstat.org/uk/express/expr2012/01\\_12/13\\_.zip](http://ukrstat.org/uk/express/expr2012/01_12/13_.zip)
6. USAID, Europe and Eurasia, *The NGO Sustainability Index*. Available at [http://www.usaid.gov/locations/europe\\_eurasia/dem\\_gov/ngoindex/](http://www.usaid.gov/locations/europe_eurasia/dem_gov/ngoindex/)
7. *Nations in Transit – Ukraine (2011)*. Available at [http://www.freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/inline\\_images/NIT-2011-Ukraine.pdf](http://www.freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/inline_images/NIT-2011-Ukraine.pdf)
8. *Indicators of Unified State Register of Enterprises and Organizations of Ukraine on January 1, 2012*. Available at [http://ukrstat.org/uk/express/expr2012/01\\_12/13\\_.zip](http://ukrstat.org/uk/express/expr2012/01_12/13_.zip)
9. *Social organizations in Ukraine (2010)*, Statistic bulletin 2011, Ukraine.
10. *Unified register of civic formations*. Available at <http://www.minjust.gov.ua/0/unitarylist/>
11. *Civil Society Organizations in Ukraine. The State and Dynamics (2002-2010)*, Report 2011, Kyiv
12. Carlo, Borzaga, Giulia, Galera & Rosco Nogales (2011), *Social enterprise: a new model for poverty reduction and employment generation*, Report April 2012. Available at <http://socs.civicus.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/State-of-Civil-Society-2011.pdf>

У статті автором проаналізовані тенденції розвитку організацій “третього сектору”, визначені стримуючі та активізуючі їхню діяльність фактори, запропоновані напрямки національної політики щодо розвитку даних інституцій.

**Ключові слова:** організації “третього сектору”, демократичні процеси, асоціації, соціальні послуги

В статье автором проанализированы тенденции развития организаций “третьего сектора”, определены ограничивающие и стимулирующие их деятельность факторы, предложены направления национальной политики относительно развития данных институций.

**Ключевые слова:** организации “третьего сектора”, демократические процессы, ассоциации, социальные услуги

Дата надходження до редакції: 21.04.2013

Рецензент: д.е.н., доцент яворська Т.І.

УДК 339/9 (7/8)

## ГЕНДЕРНІ ЗАСАДИ РОЗВИТКУ СІЛЬСЬКОЇ ЕКОНОМІКИ: АМЕРИКАНСЬКА МОДЕЛЬ

**Н.М. Куцмус**, к.е.н., Житомирський національний агроекологічний університет

Проаналізовано соціально-економічні процеси, що впливають на розвиток сільської економіки США. Встановлено стратегічні напрями та механізми розвитку сільських територій. Виявлено особливості участі жінок у сільськогосподарському виробництві. Конкретизовано суть та напрями реалізації американської концепції гендерної політики в умовах сільського економічного простору.

**Ключові слова:** гендер, гендерна політика, гендерна рівність, сільська економіка, сільський розвиток.

**Постановка проблеми.** Високий рівень досягнутого соціального та економічного розвитку Сполучених штатів Америки не применшує, а, навпаки, посилює увагу до проблем сільського розвитку, інтегрованості сільської економіки та її складових до процесів, які відбуваються в масштабах національної економіки в цілому. Започатковане у 1970-их рр. явище “рурального ренесансу” обумовило потребу в формуванні політики розвитку сільських територій, спрямованої не стільки на забезпечення якості життя сільського населення, скільки створення сприятливих умов для подальшого розвитку сільської економічної системи, активізації її функцій, що сприяють економічному зростанню території, підвищенню привабливості як місця проживання та ведення бізнесу. При цьому сільськогосподарська галузь сільської економіки США, що характеризується провідними позиціями у світовому виробництві та торгівлі агропродовольчими товарами<sup>1</sup>, доповнюється галузями та видами бізнесу, непов’язаними з аграрним виробництвом. Досягнутий рівень економічної диверсифікованості сільської економіки США виступає запорукою для повноцінної самореалізації сільського населення у трудовій та суспільній сферах. Мотивацією до наукового дослідження даного явища виступає комплекс особливостей, властивих сільській економіці США, які створюючи необхідні можливості для

зайнятості чоловіків та жінок, сприяють утвердженню рівності чоловіків та жінок в економічній, політичній та громадській сфері, а також подоланню існуючих гендерних проблем.

**Аналіз останніх досліджень.** Науково-практична проблема розвитку сільських територій знайшла своє відображення в працях низки вітчизняних та зарубіжних науковців. Так, загальні положення теорії та методології сільського розвитку сформульовані у працях О. Бородіної, А. Вайєса, П. Готліба, Г. Гріна, С. Деллера, Т. Зінчук, Дж. Кромартъє, Б. Ліу, Д. Маркуїлера, Т. Осташко, В. Петрікова, І. Прокопи, Л. Хантера, В. Юрчишина та ін. Дослідженню гендерних аспектів соціально-економічних процесів на сільських територіях були присвячені роботи таких вчених як: Д. Аларкон, Дж. Анкер, Г. Анрікез, С. Бовуар, Б. Бок, О. Деджі, К. Делі, М. Кімелл, Дж. Колінз, Дж. Літл, С. Разаві, Ч. Тейлор, М. Хартл та ін. Отримані ними результати дозволяють стверджувати про важливість гендерної рівності у забезпеченні соціального та економічного зростання сільських територій, ефективного використання їх ендегенного потенціалу, формування стратегічних перспектив розвитку. Разом з тим, сукупність використовуваних напрямів, методів та інструменти вирішення гендерних проблем сільського простору є маловивченими та, відповідно вимагають проведення подальших досліджень, узагальнення нагромадженого позитивного досвіду щодо ефективності гендерної політики, зокрема, США, з метою обґрунтування методології та стратегії їх розв’язання в Україні. Зазначене становить **мету даного дослідження**, яка пе-

<sup>1</sup> За інформацією бази даних ФАО, у 2010р. США стали лідером з експорту таких видів продукції як соя – 18586,3 млн. дол. США, кукурудза – 10110,5 млн. дол. США, пшениця – 6751,0 млн. дол. США, бавовна – 5747,6 млн. дол. США (<http://faostat.fao.org/site/342/default.aspx>).