



LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

The Europeanization of Swedish CSOs – a survey

Roberto Scaramuzzino & Magnus Wennerhag



Background and general research problem

- Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) represent citizens and make claims vis-à-vis government both at national level and local level
- EU strategies to involve, integrate, incorporate and tame CSOs
 - Will the EU be able to overcome the label of being a project for ‘the elite’ and not for the citizens of Europe?
 - Can CSOs become a bridge between policy-making in Brussels and the views and perceptions of citizens at national and local levels?
 - Will CSOs representing ‘marginalised groups’ be included, or are the new participatory methods mainly a tool for those already included?



Thematic study three

- To investigate and analyse EU collaboration among Swedish CSOs working with welfare policies
 - Aim: to analyse:
 - » features, patterns and experiences of collaboration on EU and national/local level
 - » degree of institutional access at EU/national/local level
 - » match/mismatch between EU policies and domestic policies etcetera
 - » whether welfare CSOs differ from other types of CSOs
 - Method: national survey directed to CSOs



Previous national surveys

- Johns Hopkins Project (Salamon et al. 2004) 36 countries
- For Sweden:
 - The Swedish Johns Hopkins Study (Lundström & Wijkström 1997) (3,115 cases, 50% response rate)
 - Wijkström & Einarsson 2006 (2,069 cases, 34% response rate)
 - Statistics Sweden 2010 (1,829 cases, 61% response rate)
 - Swedish National Board for Youth Affairs 2012 (758 cases, 50,1% response rate)



Europeanisation

- The influence of the EU on Swedish CSOs.
- Swedish CSOs' usage of the EU (programs, processes and arenas) to ameliorate the situation for their members/target groups both in Sweden and abroad.
- CSOs are both objects and subjects in processes of Europeanisation.



Analytical scheme

- Dependent variables (dimensions of Europeanization):
 - Membership in EU-based umbrella org./networks.
 - Strategies for influencing politicians and officials at EU-level
 - EU as a source of resource
- Independent variables
 - Local context (type of municipality)
 - Level of professionalization (employed staff)
 - Membership size
 - Resources (public financing)
 - Type of CSO



The sampling

- Sample made from six different categories of CSO:s, based on categories and register data from SCB (Statistics Sweden):
- Three types of organisation and activity (SNI-codes):
 1. Social service and care (SNI 86-88)

E.g. Red Cross, Women's shelter, Crime victim advocacy, Disability org., Save the Children, AA.
 2. Interest representation (SNI 94)

E.g. Trade unions, professional and employers' org.; Political parties; Immigrants'/Pensioner's org.; Cultural associations; Freemasonry lodges.
 3. Religious congregations ["registrerade trossamfund"]

Including congregations of Church of Sweden.
- Two levels of economic activity: "active" and "non-active"



Population and sample

- Population: **80,015** CSOs representing **38%** of Swedish organised civil society.
- Stratified sample: Different percentage rates for each sub-population (see percentage within brackets). Data presented weighted for these differences.

	Social service and care	Interest representation	Religious congregations	Total (N)
Active	878 [100%]	1,765 [12%]	516 [50%]	3,159
Non-active	910 [50%]	1,812 [3%]	299 [25%]	3,021
Total (N)	1,788	3,577	815	6,180



CSOs not included in survey (ca. 120.000 org)

- Associations which are not active in social service and care or in interest representation (e.g. sport clubs)
- Stock companies
- Economic associations
- Rental cooperatives
- Joint property units
- Foundations
- Friendly/benefit societies
- Public corporations
- Unemployment funds



SNI vs. ICNPO (International classification of non-profit organisations) (%)

ICNPO	Social service and care	Interest representation	Religious congregations	Total
Social services	46	10	1	19
Health care	7	3	0	4
Education & research	4	6	0	5
Development & housing	2	7	0	4
International activities	18	2	1	6
Advocacy & politics	11	15	0	12
Labour & business	1	10	0	6
Religion	1	11	98	20
Culture and recreation	3	33	0	19
Other	7	4	0	5
Total (N)	789	1,453	368	2,610

Response rate

2,743 questionnaires returned. 741 questionnaires not part of population (wrong address, organization ceased to exist, etc.) = **50,4% response rate**

	Social service and care	Interest representation	Religious congregations	Total (%)
Active	57%	53%	49%	53%
Non-active	51%	46%	40%	47%
Total (%)	54%	50%	46%	50%
Total (N)	837	1,538	368	2,743

Active vs. "non-active" CSOs (1)

- Standard sample criterion for earlier Swedish CSO surveys, also used by Statistics Sweden.
- "Active" organizations meet at least one of the following criteria (according to data from the Swedish Tax Agency):
 - Had employed staff
 - Paid wages
 - Sent other information to the Swedish Tax Agency [kontrolluppgift]
 - Had incomes
 - Had assets > 10 Mkr and/or income from interest > 0.5 Mkr
- But what about the smaller and more informal CSOs?



Active vs. "non-active" CSOs (2)

	Active CSOs	"Non-active" CSOs
Had activities in 2012 (%)		
Yes	97	89
<i>Yes, but only occasionally</i>	2	5
No	1	5
No. of <i>members</i> (median value)	175	90
No. of <i>paid staff</i> (mean value)	23	1
Part of <i>local</i> network/umbrella org. (%)	73	60
<i>national</i> network/umbrella org. (%)	79	68
<i>EU level</i> network/umbrella org. (%)	24	15
Receive public funding (state/municipal)	61	37



Membership in umbrella org. (ICNPO) (*weighted, %*)

	Local	National	EU/European
Social services	71	72	15
Advocacy & politics	75	79	23
Labour & business	55	75	30
Other	52	57	8

Which of the following types of networks, federations or umbrella organisations is your organisation directly affiliated to?



Experience of trying to influence politicians and officials (ICNPO) (*weighted, %*)

	Local	National	EU/European
Social services	71	24	6
Advocacy & politics	89	51	12
Labour & business	49	44	13
Other	37	12	3

How often do you try to influence politicians or officials at the following levels of decision on issues which are central for you org.?

Often + Sometimes



LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

Importance of public financing (ICNPO) (*weighted, %*)

	Local municipality	State	EU
Social services	55	24	4
Advocacy & politics	54	22	6
Labour & business	6	6	1
Other	35	15	4

How important are the following sources of income for the budget of your organisation?

Very important + Quite important



LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

What determines CSOs' degree of Europeanization?

- Binary logistic regression
- Dependent variables:
 - » Member of network/umbrella org. at EU/European level
 - » How often org. influences politicians/officials at European level. *Often/sometimes (vs. rarely/never)*
 - » Perceived importance of European level for achieving organization's goals. *Very/quite (vs. not very/not at all)*
 - » EU bodies' resources important for organization's economy. *Very/quite important (vs. not important/receive no resources)*
- Independent variables:
 - » No. of individual members / paid staff
 - » Dependence of public funding
 - » Geographical location (big cities)
 - » ICNPO categories
- Odds ratios / Exp(B)



	EU network member	Influence EU politics	EU perceived relevant	EU-financing important
No. of members (ref.=1–99)				
100–999 members	–	–	–	–
> 1000 members	4.0 ***	2.8 **	–	–
Meta-organization	–	2.7 **	1.6 *	–
Employed staff (ref.=0)				
< 5	2.1 ***	–	1.8 ***	–
5 or more	3.0 ***	–	1.9 *	–
Org. in big city (> 200 000 inhabitants)	1.7 **	3.3 ***	1.8 ***	–
Public funding (ref.=no)				
1–50%	–	–	–	3.9 ***
51–100%	–	2.1 **	2.0 ***	3.2 ***
ICNPO-category (ref.=other)				
Social services	–	–	–	–
Health care	–	–	–	–
International activities	2.3 *	2.9 **	–	–
Advocacy and politics	–	2.9 ***	1.9 **	0.4 *
Labour and business	–	–	–	–
Religion	–	–	0.2 ***	0.2 **
Culture and recreation	0.4 **	0.3 **	0.3 ***	–
Cases included in regression (N)	1,338	2,044	1,820	1,728
Nagelkerke's R²	.228	.192	.194	.126

Results of regression

Most important determinants:

- **EU network membership:**
 - » Many members, paid staff, located in big city
 - » ICNPO: international (+), culture/recreation (-)
- **Often influence EU politicians/officials:**
 - » Many members, meta-organizations, located in big city, highly state-funded
 - » ICNPO: international and advocacy/politics (+), culture/recreation (-)
- **Perceive European level as important to achieve goals:**
 - » meta-organizations, paid staff, located in big city, highly state-funded
 - » ICNPO: advocacy/politics (+), religion and culture/recreation (-)
- **EU-funding important for organization:**
 - » highly state-funded
 - » ICNPO: advocacy/politics and religion (-)



General results

- 'Elite Europeanization' of CSOs?
 - » Big actors: Paid staff, many members / meta-organizations, centred to big cities.
- Economic support from local/national authorities → higher degree of Europeanization
- Social welfare CSOs less Europeanized than internationalist and advocacy/political CSOs, but more than religious and cultural/recreation CSOs





LUNDS
UNIVERSITET

	EU network member	Influence EU politics	EU perceived relevant	EU-financing important
No. of members (ref.=1–99)				
100–999 members	1.3	1.4	0.9	0.6
> 1000 members	4.0 ***	2.8 **	1.3	0.8
Meta-organization	1.8	2.7 **	1.6 *	1.8
Employed staff (ref.=0)				
< 5	2.1 ***	1.3	1.8 ***	1.6
5 or more	3.0 ***	0.9	1.9 *	2.1
Org. in big city (> 200 000 inhabitants)	1.7 **	3.3 ***	1.8 ***	1.1
Public funding (ref.=no)				
1–50%	0.9	1.3	1.2	3.9 ***
51–100%	0.9	2.1 **	2.0 ***	3.2 ***
ICNPO-category (ref.=other)				
Social services	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.6
Health care	1.1	1.5	0.9	0.3
International activities	2.3 *	2.9 **	0.8	0.9
Advocacy and politics	1.6	2.9 ***	1.9 **	0.4 *
Labour and business	1.1	1.6	1.3	0
Religion	0.8	0.5	0.2 ***	0.2 **
Culture and recreation	0.4 **	0.3 **	0.3 ***	0.8
Cases included in regression (N)	1,338	2,044	1,820	1,728
Nagelkerke's R²	.228	.192	.194	.126