


# Neziskový sektor v mezinárodním srovnání



# Identifikace srovnávacího projektu:

- **The Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project** is a systematic effort to analyze the scope, structure, financing, and role of the private nonprofit sector in a cross-section of countries around the world in order to improve our knowledge and enrich our theoretical understanding of this sector, and to provide a sounder basis for both public and private action towards it.
- The project utilizes a **comparative, empirical approach** that **relies heavily on a team of local associates** in the target countries and involves a network of local advisory committees.

- Center for Civil Society Studies
- Institute for Policy Studies
- The Johns Hopkins University
- 3400 N. Charles Street
- Baltimore, MD 21218-2688, USA
- Phone: 410-516-5463
- Fax: 410-516-7818
- E-mail: [cnp@jhu.edu](mailto:cnp@jhu.edu)
- Web site:

<http://www.ccss.jhu.edu/index.php?section=content&view=9&sub=3&tri=8>



# Project Countries

Denmark Belgium Norway The Netherlands Finland Switzerland  
United Kingdom France Denmark Sweden Italy Austria Czech Republic



# Kterých zemí se projekt týká...

**Table 1** Country coverage of the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project

## **Developed Countries**

Australia	Italy
Austria	Japan
Belgium	Netherlands
Finland	Norway
France	Spain
Germany	Sweden
Ireland	United States
Israel	United Kingdom

## **Developing Countries**

Argentina	Pakistan
Brazil	Peru
Colombia	Philippines
Egypt	South Africa
Kenya	South Korea
Mexico	Tanzania
Morocco	Uganda

## **Transitional Countries**

Czech Republic	Romania
Hungary	Slovakia
Poland	

# Kdo spolupracoval

- Argentina - *Mario Roitter*
- Australia - *Mark Lyons*
- Austria – *Ulrike Schneider*
- Belgium - *Jacques Defourny & Sybille Mertens*
- Brazil - *Leilah Landim & Neide Beres*
- Canada – *Michael Hall*
- Chile – *Ignacio Irarrazaval*
- Colombia - *Rodrigo Villar*
- Czech Republic - *Martin Potucek & Pavol Fric*
- Denmark – *Ole Gregersen & Thomas Boje*
- Egypt – *Amani Kandil*
- Finland – *Susan Sundback*
- France - *Edith Archambault*
- Germany - *Annette Zimmer & Eckhard Priller*
- Hungary - *István Sebestény & Renata Nagy*
- India – *Rajesh Tandon & S.S. Srivastava*
- Ireland - *Freda Donoghue*
- Israel - *Benjamin Gidron*
- Italy – *Gian Paolo Barbeta*
- Japan - *Naoto Yamauchi*
- Kenya – *Karuti Kanyinga*
- Korea, Republic of - *Tae-Kyu Park*
- Lebanon – *Hashem el-Husseini*
- Mexico - *Gustavo Verduzco & CEMEFI*

- **Morocco - *Salama Saidi***
- **The Netherlands - *Paul Dekker & Bob Kuhry***
- **New Zealand - *Massey University & Statistics New Zealand***
- **Norway - *Hakon Lorentzen & Karl Henrik Sivesind***
- **Pakistan – *Muhammad Asif Iqbal***
- **Peru - *Felipe Portocarrero & Cynthia Sanborn***
- **The Philippines - *Ledivina Cariño***
- **Poland - *Ewa Les & Slawomir Nalecz***
- **Portugal – *Raquel Campos Franco***
- **Romania - *Carmen Epure***
- **Russia – *Oleg Kazakov***
- **Slovakia - *Helena Woleková***
- **South Africa - *Mark Swilling***
- **Spain - *Jose Ignacio Ruiz Olabuenaga***
- **Sweden - *Tommy Lundstrom & Filip Wijkstrom***
- **Switzerland – *Bernd Helmig***
- **Tanzania - *Laurean Ndumbaro & Amos Mhina***
- **Thailand – *Amara Pongsapich***
- **Uganda – *John-Jean Barya***
- **United Kingdom – *Les Hems & Karl Wilding***
- **United States - *Lester Salamon & Wojtek Sokolowski***
- **Venezuela – *Rosa Amelia Gonzalez***

# ...a kterých typů organizací:

- **Organizations**, i.e., they have an institutional presence and structure;
- **Private**, i.e., they are institutionally separate from the state;
- **Not profit distributing**, i.e., they do not return profits to their managers or to a set of “owners”;
- **Self-governing**, i.e., they are fundamentally in control of their own affairs;
- **Voluntary**, i.e., membership in them is not legally required and they attract some level of voluntary contribution of time or money.

# ...a jakých aktivit:

**Table 1.2** Fields of nonprofit activity covered by Phase II of the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project

- 
- |                           |                                       |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Culture                | 7. Civic and advocacy                 |
| 2. Education and research | 8. Philanthropy                       |
| 3. Health                 | 9. International                      |
| 4. Social services        | 10. Religious congregations           |
| 5. Environment            | 11. Business and professional, unions |
| 6. Development            | 12. Other                             |
-



# 4 typy zdrojů dat

- Official economic statistics (e.g., employment surveys, population surveys), particularly those that included coverage of civil society organizations, giving, or volunteering. Where the civil society organizations were not separately identified in the data source, as was often the case, a variety of estimating techniques were used to determine the civil society organization share of particular industry aggregates;
- Data assembled by umbrella groups or intermediary associations representing various types of civil society organizations, or industries in which civil society organizations are active;
- Specialized surveys of civil society organizations; and
- Population surveys, focusing particularly on giving and volunteering.

# Hlavní zjištění projektu

# 1. Neziskový sektor jako významná ekonomická síla

- In the first place, in addition to its social and political importance, the civil society sector turns out to be a **considerable economic force**, accounting for a **significant share of national expenditures and employment**. More specifically, in just the 35 countries for which they have collected information:

# 1995-1998

- **A \$1.3 trillion industry.** The civil society sector had aggregate expenditures of US\$1.3 trillion as of the late 1990s, with religious congregations included. This represents 5.1 percent of the combined gross domestic product (GDP) of these countries.
- **The world's seventh largest economy.** To put these figures into context, if the civil society sector in these countries were a separate national economy, its expenditures would make it the seventh largest economy in the world, ahead of Italy, Brazil, Russia, Spain, and Canada and just behind France and the U.K.
- **A major employer.** The civil society sector in these 35 countries is also a major employer, with a total workforce of 39.5 million full-time equivalent workers including religious congregations.

# Kdyby byl neziskový sektor samostatnou ekonomikou:

**Table 3** The scale of nonprofit activity, 35 countries, 1995-98

- # \$1.3 trillion in expenditures
  - 5.1 percent of combined GDP
  
- # 39.5 million FTE workforce, including 21.8 million paid workers and 12.6 million FTE volunteers
  - 4.4 percent of economically active population
  - 46 percent of public sector employment
  - 10 times the employment in the utilities and textile industries in these countries
  
- # 190 million people volunteering
  - 221 volunteers per 1,000 adult population

*Source:* Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project

# Kdyby byl neziskový sektor samostatnou ekonomikou (1995):

**Table 4** If the civil society sector were a country...

<b>Country</b>	<b>GDP (trillion \$)</b>
U.S.	\$7.2
Japan	5.1
China	2.8
Germany	2.2
U.K.	1.4
France	1.3
<b>Civil society sector expenditures (35 countries)</b>	<b>1.3</b>
Italy	1.1
Brazil	0.7
Russia	0.7
Spain	0.6
Canada	0.5

# If the civil society sector were a country...2000


<u>Country</u>	<u>GDP (trillion \$)</u>
United States	\$11.7
Japan	4.6
Germany	2.7
United Kingdom	2.1
<b>Civil Society Land</b>	<b>1.9*</b>
<b>Expenditures (40 Countries)</b>	
France	1.9
China	1.7
Italy	1.2
Canada	1.0
Spain	1.0
Brazil	0.6
Russia	0.6

# 1995

**Figure 1: Paid employment in nonprofits vs. largest firm, ca 1995 (26 countries)**

---

**Nonprofits**



**Largest private corporation**






# Employment in Civil Society Organizations vs. Largest firms 2000


## Civil Society Organizations




## Largest Private Companies



# Kdyby byl neziskový sektor samostatnou ekonomikou – zaměstnanost:



# Civil Society Organization Workforce in context, 40 countries



\* Including volunteers

# Neziskový sektor - zaměstnanost



**n = 39.5 million**


\* 35-country weighted average.

**Figure 2** Civil society organization paid vs. volunteer labor, 35 countries\*

*Source:* Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project



# CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATION PAID VS. VOLUNTEER LABOR, 36 COUNTRIES




**n=65.5 million  
(including religion)**

## 2. Rozdíly mezi zeměmi

- In the first place, countries vary greatly in the **overall scale of their civil society workforce**.
- the civil society sector workforce — volunteer and paid — varies from a high of 14 percent of the economically active population in the Netherlands to a low of 0.4 percent in Mexico.

**Figure 1. Civil society organization workforce as a share of the economically active population, by country**




SOURCE: The Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project (2004)

Reference years: 1995-2000

Country-specific data on the above countries and additional countries with data published after 2004 can be found on the CGSS website's [Findings by Country](#) page.




# CSO workforce as a share of the economically active population, by country 2000






# CSO workforce as a share of the economically active population, by country 2000





# VOLUNTEERS AS % OF CSO WORKFORCE, BY COUNTRY CLUSTER




# Rozvinuté vs. rozvojové a tranzitivní ekonomiky

- **Developed vs. developing and transitional countries.** Civil society sector is relatively larger in the more developed countries.
  - In fact, the civil society organization workforce in the developed countries is proportionally more than three times larger than that in the developing countries (7.4 percent vs. 1.9 percent of the economically active population, respectively).
    - This is so, moreover, even when account is taken of volunteer labor and not just paid employment.
  
- The relatively limited presence of civil society organizations in the developing countries does not, of course, necessarily mean the **absence of helping relationships in these countries.**
  - To the contrary, many of these countries have strong traditions of familial, clan, or village networks that perform many of the same functions as civil society institutions. What is more, there are considerable differences in the scale of civil society activity even among the less developed countries.

# Rozdíly v zapojení dobrovolníků

**Figure 2.** Civil society organization workforce as a share of the economically active population, by level of development



SOURCE: The Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project (2004)

Reference years: 1995-2000

Country-specific data on the above countries and additional countries with data published after 2004 can be found on the GCSS website's [Findings by Country](#) page.

**Table 1.** Civil society sector workforce\* as a percent of the economically active population, 36 countries

Country	Paid staff	Volunteers	Total
Argentina	2.9%	1.9%	4.8%
Australia	4.4%	1.9%	6.3%
Austria	3.8%	1.1%	4.9%
Belgium	8.6%	2.3%	10.9%
Brazil	1.4%	0.2%	1.6%
Colombia	1.8%	0.6%	2.4%
Czech Rep.	1.3%	0.7%	2.0%
Egypt	2.7%	0.1%	2.8%
Finland	2.4%	2.8%	5.3%
France	3.7%	3.7%	7.6%
Germany	3.5%	2.3%	5.9%
Hungary	0.9%	0.2%	1.1%
India	0.6%	0.8%	1.4%
Ireland	8.3%	2.1%	10.4%
Israel	6.6%	1.4%	8.0%
Italy	2.3%	1.5%	3.8%
Japan	3.2%	1.0%	4.2%
Kenya	1.3%	0.8%	2.1%
Mexico	0.3%	0.1%	0.4%
Morocco	0.7%	0.8%	1.5%
Netherlands	9.2%	5.1%	14.4%
Norway	2.7%	4.4%	7.2%
Pakistan	0.6%	0.4%	1.0%
Peru	1.5%	0.9%	2.5%
Philippines	0.7%	1.2%	1.9%
Poland	0.6%	0.2%	0.8%
Romania	0.4%	0.4%	0.8%
Slovakia	0.6%	0.2%	0.8%
South Africa	1.8%	1.6%	3.4%
South Korea	1.9%	0.6%	2.4%
Spain	2.8%	1.5%	4.3%
Sweden	1.7%	5.1%	7.1%
Tanzania	0.5%	1.5%	2.1%
Uganda	0.9%	1.3%	2.3%
United Kingdom	4.8%	3.6%	8.5%
United States	6.3%	3.5%	9.8%
Developing / transitional	1.2%	0.7%	1.9%
Developed	4.7%	2.7%	7.4%
36 countries	2.7%	1.6%	4.4%

\* Excludes religious worship organizations.

**Table 3. Civil society sector FTE workforce, by field, 36 countries**

Country	Culture	Education	Health	Social Svcs	Environment	Development	Civic / Adv.	Foundations	International	Professional	n.e.c.	Total (thousands)
Percent of total civil society workforce*												
Argentina	13.8	31.5	9.8	13.5	1.6	15.7	1.8	0.1	0.8	8.2	3.2	659.4
Australia	22.7	17.9	14.9	23.6	1.4	10.4	2.9	0.2	0.4	3.3	2.4	579.7
Austria						n/a						184.3
Belgium	11.1	30.5	23.9	22.9	0.5	8.3	0.5	0.3	0.4	1.5	0.0	456.9
Brazil	15.1	35.1	17.5	19.2	0.2	3.0	0.7	0.0	0.4	8.6	0.3	1173.8
Colombia	7.5	20.2	15.3	18.7	0.8	18.5	1.6	1.5	0.1	14.9	0.9	377.6
Czech Rep.	35.8	10.6	11.9	13.1	6.1	6.7	3.5	2.2	1.4	8.6	0.0	115.1
Egypt						n/a						629.2
Finland	32.6	12.4	13.1	15.5	0.7	1.6	16.8	0.2	0.4	6.2	0.4	137.6
France	30.0	14.6	9.2	27.4	5.0	4.7	1.9	0.6	2.4	4.3	0.0	1981.5
Germany	19.7	7.6	21.8	27.2	2.8	4.4	3.3	1.0	1.6	4.2	6.4	2418.9
Hungary	36.8	8.9	4.7	15.1	2.2	11.3	2.3	3.7	1.0	14.0	0.0	54.8
India	12.2	39.3	12.0	31.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	6035.0
Ireland	10.5	43.0	23.3	13.0	0.9	5.7	0.5	0.7	0.4	1.7	0.3	150.3
Israel	8.6	41.4	27.2	16.0	0.6	0.8	2.0	1.6	0.1	1.6	0.0	176.7
Italy	23.9	14.8	18.0	26.1	1.2	3.6	3.0	0.8	0.6	6.7	1.2	950.1
Japan	5.5	18.5	37.3	17.3	0.7	1.9	0.5	1.1	1.6	5.0	10.7	2835.2
Kenya	4.7	10.8	10.1	18.6	4.0	20.2	5.3	0.3	0.0	1.5	24.5	287.3
Mexico	6.4	30.7	8.4	16.3	1.8	1.2	0.8	0.8	0.0	33.6	0.0	141.0
Morocco						n/a						157.9
Netherlands	17.2	23.1	29.5	20.3	2.0	1.7	2.9	0.2	1.2	1.8	0.0	1051.8
Norway	41.2	11.2	6.0	14.0	0.6	4.3	6.3	0.2	2.9	13.1	0.3	163.0
Pakistan	5.2	56.6	10.4	8.0	0.3	7.8	10.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	442.7
Peru	2.5	45.2	2.6	38.3	0.4	8.8	0.5	0.9	0.0	0.9	0.0	210.0
Philippines	5.6	30.5	2.0	6.2	2.1	21.3	1.7	1.0	0.4	29.3	0.0	517.6
Poland	32.7	22.2	6.7	19.5	1.7	1.0	1.0	0.4	1.0	10.8	3.0	154.6
Romania	28.6	15.1	8.5	32.2	2.2	2.4	3.8	1.0	4.0	2.4	0.0	83.9
Slovakia	37.0	20.4	1.9	10.1	9.0	1.1	3.8	5.6	0.9	9.1	1.1	23.0
South Africa	17.6	5.5	10.0	25.6	5.9	17.9	15.9	0.4	0.0	1.1	0.0	562.4
South Korea	4.9	40.5	25.8	15.5	0.0	0.0	9.9	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	535.4
Spain	15.2	20.6	10.5	30.8	3.0	9.2	5.9	0.1	2.6	1.8	0.2	728.8
Sweden	45.5	6.8	0.9	10.5	2.1	4.4	10.2	0.2	2.3	15.4	1.7	342.9
Tanzania	10.3	11.7	10.5	16.4	10.6	12.8	7.1	7.8	3.9	3.2	5.8	330.9
Uganda	22.7	12.8	6.7	28.8	1.0	20.2	0.5	1.0	0.2	3.3	2.6	228.6
United Kingdom	27.5	25.4	8.0	16.0	2.4	12.5	1.8	1.3	2.4	1.5	1.2	2536.0
United States	9.0	18.5	34.2	22.1	1.0	4.0	4.9	1.0	0.3	3.9	1.1	13549.1
Developing / transitional	16.6	24.9	9.7	19.3	2.8	9.4	3.9	1.5	0.8	8.6	2.6	12720.2
Developed	21.4	20.4	18.5	20.2	1.7	5.2	4.2	0.6	1.3	4.8	1.7	28242.7
36 countries	18.8	22.9	13.7	19.7	2.3	7.5	4.0	1.1	1.0	6.9	2.2	40962.8

\* Percentages add to 100% across fields.

## Private Philanthropy Across the World

Each of the three lists below provides a different perspective on philanthropic giving patterns in the countries studied by the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project. The first column includes all private philanthropy (giving + volunteering), the second covers only the value of volunteering, and the third covers only giving (cash and other property gifts).


Volunteering and giving as a share of GDP by country, including gifts to religious worship organizations where available, ca. 1995-2002

Country	All private philanthropy**	Country	Volunteering**	Country	Giving
The Netherlands	4.95%	The Netherlands	4.70%	United States	1.85%
Sweden *	4.41%	Sweden *	4.03%	Israel	1.34%
United States	3.94%	Tanzania	3.30%	Canada	1.17%
Tanzania	3.78%	Norway	3.18%	Argentina	1.09%
United Kingdom	3.70%	France	2.98%	Spain *	0.87%
Norway	3.42%	United Kingdom	2.97%	Ireland	0.85%
France	3.21%	Germany	2.49%	United Kingdom	0.84%
Germany	2.56%	United States	2.18%	Uganda	0.85%
Finland	2.43%	Finland	2.12%	Hungary	0.63%
Canada	2.40%	Belgium	1.59%	Tanzania	0.61%
Israel	2.37%	Australia	1.51%	Kenya	0.57%
Argentina	2.36%	Argentina	1.30%	Portugal	0.53%
Spain *	2.10%	Canada	1.26%	Australia	0.51%
Ireland	2.02%	Spain *	1.25%	The Netherlands	0.49%
Belgium	2.01%	Ireland	1.20%	South Africa	0.47%
Australia	1.99%	Israel	1.05%	Belgium	0.46%
South Africa	1.29%	The Philippines	0.96%	Slovakia	0.41%
The Philippines	1.18%	South Africa	0.83%	Sweden *	0.40%
Uganda	1.12%	Italy	0.80%	Finland	0.36%
Kenya	1.05%	Korea, Rep. of	0.78%	Norway	0.35%
Portugal	1.05%	Austria	0.61%	France	0.32%
Korea, Rep. of	0.96%	Japan	0.61%	Colombia *	0.32%
Italy	0.91%	Portugal	0.53%	Brazil	0.29%
Japan	0.82%	Kenya	0.49%	Poland	0.28%
Austria	0.78%	Uganda	0.48%	Czech Republic	0.27%
Hungary	0.74%	Romania	0.45%	Peru *	0.26%
Czech Republic	0.70%	Czech Republic	0.43%	The Philippines	0.23%
Colombia *	0.60%	India *	0.31%	Pakistan	0.23%
Romania	0.55%	Colombia *	0.28%	Japan	0.22%
Brazil	0.50%	Brazil	0.21%	Korea, Rep. of	0.18%
Slovakia	0.45%	Pakistan	0.13%	Austria	0.17%
India *	0.39%	Hungary	0.12%	Germany	0.13%
Poland	0.39%	Poland	0.11%	Italy	0.11%
Pakistan	0.36%	Mexico *	0.08%	Romania	0.10%
Peru *	0.33%	Peru *	0.06%	India *	0.09%
Mexico*	0.12%	Slovakia	0.04%	Mexico *	0.04%


■ Vybraná data, vybrané země...




# Value Added as % of GDP, NPIs vs. Selected Industries, Canada, 2000




# Contribution to GDP, Volunteers vs. Selected Industries, Canada




# Value Added as % of GDP, NPIs\* vs. Selected Industries, Belgium, 2003



# NPI Share of Belgian Value Added, Selected Fields



# Average Annual Change in GDP and GDP Contribution of NPIS



# 3. NS není jen poskytovatelem služeb


- **Service functions** involve the delivery of direct services such as education, health, housing, economic development promotion, and the like.
- **Expressive functions** involve activities that provide avenues for the expression of cultural, religious, professional, or policy values, interests, and beliefs. Included here are cultural institutions, recreation groups, religious worship organizations, professional associations, advocacy groups, community organizations and the like.
- ---The distinction between *expressive* and *service* functions is far from perfect, of course, and many organizations are engaged in both.

... i tak lze říci, že:

- **Service functions dominate in scale.** From the evidence available, it appears that the service functions of the civil society sector clearly absorb the lion's share of the activity.
  - Excluding religious worship, ... **an average of over 60 percent of the total paid and volunteer full-time equivalent workforce** of the civil society sector in the 32 countries for which we have activity data **work for organizations primarily engaged in service functions.**

# DISTRIBUTION OF CIVIL SOCIETY WORKFORCE, BY FUNCTION

**Service**  
**64%**



**Expressive**  
**32%**




# A ještě ke službám:

- **Education and social services are the dominant service functions.**

Among the service activities of the civil society sector, education and social services clearly absorb the largest share.

- Over 40 percent of the nonprofit workforce—paid and volunteer—is engaged in these two service functions on average.


# Rozdělení zaměstnanosti v NS dle typu aktivity



\* 32-country unweighted averages.


**Figure 6** Distribution of civil society sector workforce, by field and type of activity\*

# Dobrovolníci a typy aktivit



\* 32-country unweighted averages.

Figure 7 Distribution of civil society organization paid and volunteer workforce, by field\*



Percent of total

# Odchytky od obecných vzorců

- The first of these relates to the **Nordic countries** of Finland, Norway, and Sweden.
- The second relates to the countries of **Central and Eastern Europe** (the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovakia, and, to a slightly lesser extent, Poland).
  - In both of these groups of countries organizations primarily engaged in expressive activities absorb a larger share of the civil society workforce than do those engaged in the service functions. The most likely explanation for this is that **in both groups of countries the state assumed a dominant position in both the financing and delivery of social welfare services, leaving less room for private, civil society organizations.**

# To se týká nás...

- In Central Europe this was a product of the imposition of a Soviet-style regime in the aftermath of World War II. While this regime concentrated social welfare services in the hands of the state and **discouraged, or prohibited, the emergence of independent civil organizations**, it did sanction the limited creation of professional and recreational organizations, many of which survived into the post-Communist era.

# A tohle Severanů:


- In the Nordic countries, by contrast, a robust network of grassroots labor and social-movement organizations took shape during the late nineteenth century and pushed through a substantial program of social welfare protections financed and delivered by the state.
  - This limited the need for active civil society involvement in service provision but left behind a vibrant heritage of citizen-based civil society activity in advocacy, recreation, and related expressive fields.

# Co dodat:

- **While the structure of the civil society sector in these two groups of countries is similar, however, the scale of the sector differs widely.**
  - In particular, the civil society sector in the Central and Eastern European countries remained quite small nearly a decade after the overthrow of the Soviet-type regimes.
  - By contrast, in the Nordic countries, a sizable civil society sector remains in existence today, though it is largely staffed by volunteers and engaged in a variety of cultural, recreational, and expressive functions.



## 4. Zajímavá struktura příjmů



\* 32-country unweighted averages.

Figure 9 Sources of civil society organization revenue\*

# SOURCES OF CIVIL SOCIETY REVENUE (32 COUNTRY AVERAGE)

Philanthropy


12%

Government

35%

Fees

53%



# Platby a poplatky

## ■ Fees are the dominant source of revenue.

- In the 32 countries on which revenue data are available, 23 over half (53 percent) of civil society organization income comes, on average, **not from private philanthropy but from fees and charges for the services** that these organizations provide and the related commercial income they receive from investments and other commercial sources, including dues.

# Veřejné zdroje


- **Significant public sector support.**
- Nor is philanthropy the second largest source of civil society organization revenue internationally. That distinction belongs, rather, to government or the public sector.
  - An average of 35 percent of all civil society organization revenue comes from public sector sources, either through **grants and contracts or reimbursement payments** made by governmental agencies or quasi-nongovernmental organizations such as publicly financed social security and health agencies.

# Omezená role filantropie


## ■ Limited role of private philanthropy.

- Private giving from all sources—individuals, foundations, and corporations—accounts for a much smaller 12 percent of total civil society organization revenue in the countries we have examined, or one-third as much as government and less than one-fourth as much as fees and charges.

# Philanthropy as share of GDP, selected countries, 1995-2004



# Srovnání zemí podle typů zdrojů




Percent of total revenue

\* 32-country unweighted averages.

\*\* 29-country unweighted averages.



# SOURCES OF CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATION REVENUE, BY COUNTRY








# SOURCES OF CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATION REVENUE, BY COUNTRY

## Government Dominant



% may not add up to 100% due to rounding

# 5. Regionální vzorce

Developed Countries	Developing and Transitional Countries
<b>Anglo-Saxon</b> Australia U.K. U.S.	<b>Latin America</b> Argentina Brazil Colombia Mexico Peru
<b>Nordic Welfare States</b> Finland Norway Sweden	<b>Africa</b> Kenya South Africa Tanzania Uganda
<b>European-Style Welfare Partnerships</b> Austria Belgium France Germany Ireland Israel Italy Netherlands Spain	<b>Central and Eastern Europe</b> Czech Republic Hungary Poland Romania Slovakia
<b>Asian Industrialized</b> Japan South Korea	<b>Other Developing</b> Egypt Morocco Pakistan Philippines

# Regionální vzorce - Central and Eastern Europe

- ...Notable, perhaps, is the extremely small scale of the civil society sector in these countries—engaging only one-fourth as large a proportion of the economically active population as the overall 35-country average.
  - Indeed, the civil society sector in these countries is smaller than in any of the other regions we examined, including the developing countries of Africa and Latin America. Also notable is the relatively large presence of expressive activity within what little civil society sectors exist in these countries.

# Regionální vzorce - Central and Eastern Europe

- This is likely a reflection of the social welfare policies of the Soviet-era governments, which relied on direct provision of the most important social services by the “workers’ state” and discouraged reliance on private voluntary groups, including those affiliated with religious groups.
  - An embryonic civil society sector was tolerated in these countries, but largely for social, recreational, and professional purposes, and even then at least partly as vehicles for state control. In the aftermath of the collapse of the state socialist regimes, a number of these sanctioned organizations were able to make the transition into nonprofit status, often with the aid of captured state resources (buildings, equipment, and occasionally subsidies), and their relatively sizable presence is reflected in the data.

# Regionální vzorce - Central and Eastern Europe

- One particularly ironic byproduct of this peculiar history of civil society development in Central and Eastern Europe is the **relatively high level of reliance on philanthropic support** on the part of the region's civil society organizations.
  - Ironically, despite its socialist past, philanthropy constitutes a larger share of the revenues of civil society organizations in this region than in any other region (**20 percent vs. an all-country average of 12 percent**).
    - One explanation for this may be that when state enterprises were transformed into private firms, they spun off into nonprofit organizations many of the health and recreational services they previously provided to their workers free of cost, but they continued some degree of financial or in-kind support to these activities. Since these state enterprises became private firms, however, this support shows up in our data as private charity.

