



Partecipazione e Conflitto

** The Open Journal of Sociopolitical Studies*

<http://siba-ese.unisalento.it/index.php/paco>

ISSN: 1972-7623 (print version)

ISSN: 2035-6609 (electronic version)

PACO, Issue 11(1) 2018: 308-312

DOI: 10.1285/i20356609v11i1p308

Published in March 15, 2018

Work licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non commercial-Share alike 3.0 Italian License

BOOK REVIEWS

LESTER M. SALAMON, S. WOJCIECH SOKOLOWSKI AND MEGAN A. HADDOCK (2017), EXPLAINING CIVIL SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT. A SOCIAL ORIGINS APPROACH, BALTIMORE: JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY PRESS, ISBN 9781421422985, PP. 344

Anna Reggiardo

University of Genoa

The study of civil society, or nonprofit, sector has been the objective of the *comparative nonprofit sector project* of Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies, directed by professor L.M. Salamon, in the last 25 years. This book is the last work which offers a clear analysis of the expansion of civil society in 41 countries, with an insight on the latest data collected, in a period from 1995 to 2008. It fulfills the objective of putting the civil society sector in the economic map of the world, continuing the effort to put this sector in official statistic. This work is useful both for a first approach to the study of civil society sector, giving an overview of the state of the art about civil society sector, and for scholars that will found a rich amount of data and a developed theory on the development of civil society.

The Salamon, Sokolowski and Haddock's book offers a unique analysis on civil society sector, focusing on the organizational aspects of the broadest term "civil society". The authors, to distinguish the conceptualization of civil society from other similar concepts, utilize the term "Civil Society Sector" (CSS), defining his entities "Civil Society Organizations" (CSOs). This work wants to highlight various features of the CSOs and not only the non-profit-distribution element, abandoning the nonprofit label used in previ-

ous work, specifying that “[...] “civil society” term seems the closest to gaining truly universal usage and has the advantage of avoiding the negative connotations associated with the terms “nonprofit” or “nongovernmental”. (p. 272)”.

For first, this book, as previous work of the Johns Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies, deal with the problem of definition. The structural-operational definition, now adopted by the System of National Accounts and the International Labour Office, is still used. It specifies the five elements necessary to be defined a CCS entity: (i) organized, (ii) private, (iii) nonprofit-distributing, (iv) self-governing, (v) non compulsory or voluntary. It is clear that this definition cannot cover some gray areas, as point out in the book, and in some critical literature. The not-profit-distributing element is a criterion that could include some entities like banking and insurance industries, thus excluding some social enterprises, cooperatives and mutuals. For that reason the authors claim to have tried to interpret the definition on the basis of the context analyzed, still not by refusing the criticized non-profit-distributing criterion, due to his fundamental utility to make a statistical analysis.

After a brief introduction, the book is divided in two parts, one, more general, explains the development of CCS with statistical analysis and theoretical hypothesis, developing the social origins theory; the second part present data and details about 10 new, or newly update, countries, while including them in the theory proposed. A final appendix explains how the project grew from 1991, starting with 13 countries analyzed, to 2017 with an analysis of more than 41 countries. In this part of the book information can be found about objectives, conceptualization, approach and data sources and methodology of the project.

In the beginning, the size of CCS is defined. As in many other Salamon's work, the CCS is analyzed at economic level, and his economic importance is highlighted with some data. CCS employ 5.7 percent of the economically active population, with 54 millions full-time equivalent workers in the 41 countries analyzed. In this map, the contribute of volunteers is fundamental, being 37% of the workers, with an estimate number of volunteers amounting to 350 million.

Subsequently all the CSOs are classified by their primary activity on the basis of the International Classification of Nonprofit Organization (ICNPO), developed by the members of the Johns Hopkins project on civil society at the beginning of this work on non-profit sector. There is a macro-classification between expressive activities (civic and advocacy, professional associations, religious congregation, environment...) and service activities (education and research, social service, health). The service function is the most widespread, involving 59% of activities, but considering differences between paid staff and volunteers, the service function is predominant especially for paid staff.

The revenue structure of civil society presents some interesting elements. The major revenue for CSOs are fees (private payment services, membership dues, investment income), amounting at 50,3%. The second revenue resource is government, which contributes for 35,3%, while the latest source is philanthropy, even though is the one the public and media deal with more.

The CCS results to be very dynamic, since it has grown from the 1990s more than any other sector, such as service industries, mostly thanks to philanthropy and government contributions. These data may help to overcome the diffuse literature which states that a major contribution of government in CSS leads to a degrowth of private philanthropy: apparently both have been increasing in the last 25 years.

This introductory chapter, although displaying a general framework of dynamic development of the CSS in all the countries analyzed, which has been represented thanks to the general definition adopted, makes clear that major differences exist between the various countries. The proposal of the authors then is an application of the social origins theory to explain theoretically and empirically the major differences between CCS development in different countries, while invalidating the major existing theories on CSS development.

The first group of theories, whose validity is tested, are the "economic development theories". They make reference, in particular, to the work of S. M. Lipset (1959) which attributes the emergence of democracy to an economic growth. Considering CSOs as school of democracy, the data collected seems not to confirm this type of theory, since there is not a linear relationship between economic development and the development of nonprofit sector.

The second group of theories that are tested in the book are the "sentiment theories". For this type of theories the authors, referring to Adam Smith and his *Theory of Moral Sentiment* (1759) as a foundation, deal with the works of J. Coleman (1990) and R. Putnam (1993) on social capital, E. Banfield (1958) on "amoral familism" and F. Fukuyama (1995) on the cultural value of trust. These theories lack, according to the authors, in the causal model employed and in their explanatory power. One of the main argument utilized is that, for example, any religion could enhance the altruistic sentiments and charitable giving, making it a useless parameter to explain the differences in the development of CSOs. The proxy utilized to evaluate the religiosity is church attendance and that seems not to show any correlation with the size of CCS. Moreover, given that there is a correlation between altruistic sentiments and size of civil society, this explains only 23% of variance. It should be noted, of course, that these results are largely influenced by the choice of which indicators are utilized to detect altruistic sentiment (share of GDP devoted to charitable giving) or religiosity (church attendance).

The last group of theories that are observed and tested are the "preference theories". Preference theories are divided in two classical categories, the demand-side and the supply-side. The first ones are those of B. Weisbord (1977) about the State failure and H. Hansmann (1987) about the contract failure. The second one refers to E. James (1987) which emphasizes the importance of managers which are not primarily interested in profit. These theories, as previous analyzed, are tested and rejected by the authors. One of the critical point about the foundation elements of preference theories is that CCS size arises where government and market, or both, are decreasing. But the data show that there is a strong positive relation between government social spending and the size of CCS, while there is little evidence that an augmentation in philanthropy can be linked to a diminished contribution of government in CSS.

In opinion of the authors that the previous theories analyzed are "under-socialized" and fail to consider consistently the macroeconomic environment in which the different CSOs are included. What is lacking in these theories is to consider the implication of power in CSS development. Drawing from the theory of Barrington Moore Jr, described in *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, the authors shape the Social Origins of Society theory (SOCS).

SOCS implies that the CSS dimension depends on some institutional and social forces that have to be analyzed. Here the power sources considered will be socioeconomic classes and government, with political parties, trade organizations, membership organizations as power amplifiers. Social values and cultural beliefs are also taken into account with a clear causal link to the model of power. Finally all these observations focus on the fact that the patterns developed by these power relations persist during time, making reference to the theory of "path dependency" (Arthur 1994, Krugman 1991).

On the basis of SOCS theory the book shows that a determined numbers of patterns of power could arise and shape different models of civil society. These patterns form five ideal types: traditional, liberal, welfare partnership, social democratic and statist, each one with a particular type of "power constellation" and with specific hypothesized consequence on civil society.

The following passage is to test the SOCS theory on 41 countries. Apparently 26 countries out of 41 could be identified by one of this five patterns, and other 7 countries are borderline; the remaining 20% of countries are out of these patterns. Establishing some predicted value about some defining features as workforce, share of volunteers, service and expressive share of workforce, government and philanthropy share of revenue, this model includes the different countries in a particular pattern, that is further explained by an historic and political study of the specific country.

The 8 outlier countries are split in two groups, some described as models of delayed democratization and others defined as hybrid. In the authors opinion the existence of outliers is not a critical point of the theory, since it only highlights the fact that no country is static and some are simply evolving from a pattern to another, making clear that SOCS is a dynamic theory. This dynamic quality of the SOCS theory would also claim a kind of predictive power, making visible the pattern towards which a country is moving. It is to be noted that some countries defined as outlier, or not perfectly fitting in a pattern, are countries with regional differences that makes it difficult to consider them as a whole, as Switzerland, Italy or Canada.

The second part is about 10 specific countries, that are newly added to the list, or that had recently being updated: Switzerland, New Zealand, Australia as Liberal model – even though data include Switzerland in none pattern, The Netherlands and Chile as welfare partnership model, Austria as a dualistic pattern, combining elements of social democratic and welfare partnership pattern, Denmark as social democratic, Russia and Mexico as statist model and Portugal as a model in transition from statist to welfare partnership.

In my opinion, the great value of this work is his wide comparability with a clear use of definitions and concepts. This last work wants also to overcome some critics about the term “nonprofit”, adopting the term civil society, to put in evidence the positive features of a sector that will be visible not only to the detriment of the other two, state and market. The objective to bring civil society sector “into visibility into official statistic” (p. viii) and bring it into the economic map of the world is clearly achieved.

Finally, the other major challenge of the book, is the attempt to restore “consideration of power to the center of analysis of civil society”, stating that is a “central imperative if we are to understand the path that civil society developments takes” (p.125). This challenge seems to be an interesting key of lecture of civil society development, which deals with existing literature, with a particular consideration of sentiment theories, and the concept of social capital in particular. Surely, even if the huge amount of data is not collected in same moment, but over a period of 13 years, this is the first theory on CSS development tested on such a wide amount of data.