

Daria Klishevich

Development of Youth Voluntary Service
Organizations in Russia and Germany.

WP 2012-06

Bielefeld University



St. Petersburg State University



***Centre for German and
European Studies (CGES)***



CGES Working Papers series includes publication of materials prepared within different activities of the Center for German and European Studies both in St. Petersburg and in Germany: The CGES supports educational programmes, research and scientific dialogues. In accordance with the CGES mission, the Working Papers are dedicated to the interdisciplinary studies of different aspects of German and European societies.

This paper has been produced within the framework of the Centre for German and European Studies (CGES/ZDES) under the supervision of Dr. Elena Belokurova.

Daria Klishevich graduated from the faculty of journalism of the St.Petersburg State University in 2010 and went on to pursue the MA programme, “Studies in European Societies” at St. Petersburg State University. Her academic fields of interest include volunteering, youth organizations, and nonprofit sector.

Contact: daria-klishevich@rambler.ru

Volunteering is considered to be an essential part of civil society. Youth voluntary service organizations, providing young people with the opportunity to engage themselves in voluntary projects, contribute to the development of youth in a democratic way and foster the sense of affiliation to the community and society as a whole. This paper investigates the development of voluntary service organizations with respect to two cases, which initially appear to differ from each other quite substantially: Russia and Germany. Three factors influencing the development of youth voluntary service organizations are examined: the state youth policy on the national level, understanding of volunteering prevailing in a country, and characteristics of the nonprofit sector. These three are at first applied to the country cases in general to shed light on the environments voluntary service organizations operate in, and then to the specific examples of four organizations of youth voluntary service in Russia and Germany. The initial hypothesis connected with three mentioned factors was that organizations in Russia experience certain difficulties in their work due to the lack of state support, instability of conditions in the nonprofit sector and somewhat distrustful attitude from the public because of negative connotations remaining from Soviet-era “mandatory voluntary work”, whereas German organizations by and large enjoy quite favorable conditions with respect to the regular state funding, robust nonprofit sector and mature understanding of voluntary work. Although this hypothesis was proved to a fair degree, in the course of the research it was revised and supplemented by a range of new insights which demonstrated among other things that the two cases do show certain similarities with respect to the development of voluntary service organizations.

Table of contents

Introduction	4
1. Theoretical Models of Youth Policy, Volunteering, and the Nonprofit Sector	9
1.1. Youth Policy: Definition and Organizing Principles of Classification	9
1.2. Volunteering: Definition and Concepts	12
1.3. Nonprofit Sector: Definition and Theoretical Models Social.....	15
2. Youth Policy, Volunteering and Nonprofit Sector in Russia and Germany	22
2.1. Youth Policy in Russia	22
2.2. Youth Policy in Germany	27
2.2.1. History of Volunteering in Russia	30
2.2.2. History of Volunteering in Germany	35
2.3. Nonprofit Sector	41
2.3.1. Nonprofit Sector in Russia	41
2.3.2. Nonprofit Sector in Germany	50
3. Influence of Youth Policy, Volunteering and Nonprofit Sector on the Examples of Russian and German Organizations	54
3.1. Methodology, Cases and Examples.....	56
3.1.1. Case of Russia	56
3.1.2. Case of Germany	60
3.2. Influence of Youth Policy on the Development of Youth Voluntary Service Organizations	63
3.2.1. Case of Russia	64
3.2.2. Case of Germany	67
3.3. Influence of Understanding of Volunteering on the Development of Youth Voluntary Service Organizations.....	70
3.3.1. Case of Russia	70
3.3.2. Case of Germany	73
3.4. Influence of NGO Characteristics on the Development of Voluntary Service Organizations	75
3.4.1. Case of Russia	76
3.4.2. Case of Germany	77
Conclusion	80
References	86

Introduction

The subject of volunteering is highly topical nowadays, and recently the year 2011 was chosen to be the European Year of Volunteering, which yet another time confirms the point. In order to characterize the versatile notion of volunteering (which in this paper will be used together with the terms “voluntary work”, volunteerism“ and “voluntary activities” as synonyms), the following definition adopted by the Council of the European Union will be addressed for now¹: volunteering means all types of formal, non-formal and informal activities a person performs on his or her own free will and without the aim of material remuneration. Volunteering is beneficial to a person who exercises it, community and society as a whole². Volunteering cannot be regarded without its inherent connection to the wider social and cultural context, since being a cultural and economic phenomenon, volunteering shows the way societies are organized, how social responsibilities are allocated and how much engagement from a citizen is expected (Anheier and Salamon: 2001, 1).

According to European Commission data, 92 to 94 million Europeans participate in volunteering, which comprises 23 % of all Europeans over 15 years old, so it indeed appears to be quite a significant number of people involved³. Depending on the country, the number of people volunteering is different, but undoubtedly significant. Volunteering as an important phenomenon is gaining increasing attention and interest in Russia as well; among the obvious reasons, to mention just a few for now, are extended social and cultural exchange of knowledge with foreign colleagues, intensified during the last decades, and not least the coming Olympic Games in Sochi in 2014, which, as any huge sport event, will require a great deal of voluntary work.

Young people are widely regarded to be among the keen volunteers, and this fact may be to a great extent explained by the considerable amount of time they are able to devote to voluntary work. Not the last reason is that voluntary service is often seen favorably with respect to university admissions and future employment. On the other hand, youth have a wide access to new technologies, above all Internet, which may be regarded with respect to youth as a tool for gaining social capital and contributing to the common good, and volunteering is one of the ways to do it (Ester and Vincken: 2003). The internet gives young people a perfect opportunity to be informed about the current needs for volunteers and the existing voluntary projects offered by various organizations. Voluntary service for young people is the opportunity to develop their identity within the community context, not as just a self-enclosed individual achievement, but more as a social identification going beyond the present moment of time (Yonnis et al: 2002, 132).

¹ The detailed description of the characteristics of the term “volunteering” will be provided in Chapter I.

² The Role of Voluntary Activities in Social Policy - Council of the European Union Conclusions. 3114th Employment, Social Policy, Health and Consumer Affairs Council Meeting (2011), p.1.

³ EYV 2011: Focus EU Figures on Volunteering in the EU. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://eyv2011.ie/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/EYV2011-figures-ENGLISH1.pdf>.

Youth voluntary service organizations constitute a framework for youth volunteering, providing young people with an opportunity to take part in a voluntary project. What they in fact do is arrange socially important projects in the local area for the young people to take part in. The projects may aim to engage solely local volunteers or international ones as well. I suggest to stick to the following lengthy but consistent umbrella definition of the youth voluntary service sector: “a wide range of personal commitments and engagements for civil society, short-, medium- and long-term voluntary services at national or international level, organized by a broad spectrum of non-governmental organizations, involving young volunteers from different countries, promoting peace, reconciliation, international understanding and co-operation, providing non-formal, intercultural learning experience in a large variety of fields, implemented under many different conditions, terms and regulations” (Schur: 2003, 4). The international aspect of volunteering highlighted in this definition is important but it is not the central aspect, since voluntary service organizations arrange a lot of voluntary activities involving only local participants. I consider youth voluntary service organizations to play a highly important role in society: engaging people in voluntary projects, they show the importance of civic participation from an early age, thus contributing to the democratic development of youth. Taking part in voluntary service projects may serve as an example of participation in youth associations which is seen as a “key activity in establishing a general level of social integration in terms of democratic citizenship” (IARD Study on the State of Young People and Youth Policy in Europe⁴: 2001, 16).

Youth voluntary service organizations in Russia are being developed in recent decades as a part of a more general trend of expansion of non-governmental organizations; the way they emerge and exist is, I assume, presupposed by the general lines of youth and social policy in the country. Youth voluntary service organizations in Europe have quite a rich history so far, with the first ones being established after the First World War on the wave of promotion of the values of peace and tolerance. Among the European countries I consider Germany to have quite a long tradition of volunteering in general and youth voluntary service organizations in particular. Apparently, voluntary service organizations in both countries exist in rather different circumstances; there are, however, factors which are expected to influence the development of youth voluntary service organizations in each case. Among such factors the most relevant are considered to be the following ones: state youth policy on a national level, historically developed understanding of volunteering, and the characteristics of the nonprofit sector in the country. These are important because, first, depending on the state youth policy and its crucial concepts, volunteering exercised by young people may be regarded as more or less significant phenomenon for youth development. Second, specific understanding and attitude to volunteering, developed as a result of historical processes in this or that country exerts influence on the way voluntary service is organized and

⁴ Study on the State of Young People and Youth Policy in Europe was accomplished by the European Commission DG for Education and Culture involving 18 European countries and coordinated by IARD - Istituto di Ricerca S.c.r.l. in Milan, Italy.

developed. Finally, the characteristics of the nonprofit sector in the country are essential for voluntary services to develop, since the nonprofit sector is the main field where voluntary service organizations generally operate (if taking into account three possible sectors: state, market and nonprofit sector).

Youth volunteering appears to be a burning issue nowadays, and the scientific community faces this topicality with a lot of research being done. Among others, for example, works of Sherraden et al. (2006), Schur (2003), and many others. They focus on various aspects with respect to voluntary work of young people (forms of youth volunteering, motivations, contribution to the civil society etc.). All the above mentioned factors – understanding of volunteering, youth policy on the national level, and characteristics of the nonprofit sector are to a different degree researched so far, with or without explicit connection to the work of youth voluntary service organizations. Understanding of volunteering is focused on by Smith (1999, 2004), Rochester (2006), Stebbins (1996) and others; youth policy is addressed in the works of Wallace and Bendit, Denstad (2009) and others; the nonprofit sector is examined by Salamon and Anheier in numerous studies, Zimmer (1999), Jakobson and Sanovich (2010, 2011). The present research is an attempt to somewhat combine the studied factors with respect to the development of youth voluntary service organizations and apply these factors first to the cases of countries, and then, to the examples of the concrete organizations which, as I believe, will provide relevant theoretical and empirical data and therefore will shed new light on the topic of development of youth voluntary service organizations. The comparison of the two cases – Russia and Germany – is to contribute to better understanding of each case's peculiarities and the importance and relevance of factors influencing the work of voluntary service organizations.

Research Goal

The goal of the paper is therefore to find out how the expected factors influence the development of youth voluntary service organizations in Russia and Germany. The goal presupposes the introduction of a range of objectives.

Objectives

In order to reach the research goal I will focus on the following objectives, namely: to

- Introduce the concept of youth policy, expose the theoretical models of youth policy;
- Examine the notion of volunteering and its characteristics;
- Study the concept of nonprofit sector, its definition and theoretical models;
- Analyze the peculiarities of youth policy in Germany and Russia; correlate them to the distinguished models;
- Investigate the historical prerequisites for the development of volunteering in Germany and Russia, the conceptual understanding of voluntary work in both countries and its evolution over time;

- Explore the characteristics of nonprofit sector in Russia and Germany, define the theoretical models relevant to the studied countries;
- On the empirical cases of youth voluntary service organizations in Russia and Germany identify which factors, from the ones introduced above, may be helpful to understand the differences which youth voluntary service organizations in the two countries demonstrate.

Object

The object of this research is voluntary service organizations in Russia and Germany. For the empirical data analysis, four organizations were selected: two in each respective country. All of them are directly or indirectly involved in youth voluntary service projects.

Subject

The subject of the study is the development of voluntary service organizations in Russia and Germany. Under the term “development” I mean the general prerequisites and conditions of the work such organizations in each respective country have.

Hypothesis

I assume that historically Russia and Germany have developed rather different essence of the factors relevant in studying youth voluntary service organizations, among them I consider to be youth policy, general understanding of voluntary work, and the characteristics of the nonprofit sector where voluntary service organizations operate. These differences presuppose the general framework within which youth voluntary service organizations function. Therefore I argue that, first, youth policy adopted in a country presupposes the way voluntary service organizations work and develop, given that the latter are predominantly oriented towards young people. Second, national histories shape the specific understanding of voluntary work in a country and the role volunteering has, and thus the work of voluntary service organizations is influenced by this understanding as well. Finally, characteristics of the nonprofit sector have their impact on voluntary service organizations because they predominantly function within its borders.

Methodology

The paper examines the influence which various factors exert on the development of voluntary service organizations in the cases of two countries. The methodological approach therefore includes elements of comparative and argumentative analysis. The material used in the dissertation was obtained from a number of sources. I should emphasize the practical orientation of this paper, and this presupposes the difficulty of identifying the pure theoretical and practical parts in this research. Primary and secondary sources were examined in order to gain a deeper insight into the investigated topic: books, scientific and newspaper articles, official documents. Empirical data were collected during two internships I have done in 2011 and 2012 in examined German organizations and through my work in one of the Russian organizations. Primary data for the research were

obtained through intensive interviewing. Seven semi-structured open-ended expert interviews were carried out, each of about 40 min. duration. I consider the expert interviews to be a valuable method of acquiring the empirical data with respect to the chosen topic, since they provide one with the opportunity to trace the work and development of voluntary service organizations from the point of view of people who are actively involved in this work. I find my work in one of the organizations as quite a useful way of getting “insider-information” on the development of the organization and changes it undergoes.

Thesis Structure

The present paper consists of introduction, three chapters and conclusion. In the first chapter I address three issues. First, I introduce the definition of “youth policy”, examine its characteristics and theoretical models. Second, I expose the phenomenon of volunteering with its distinctive features. Finally, I investigate the notion of the “nonprofit sector” and represent the theoretical models of nonprofit regimes. As a result, initial hypotheses are offered.

In the second chapter I move on to the country cases and apply the factors introduced in detail in the first chapter to the immediate environments of the two countries under study, hence reformulated hypotheses appear as a result of the examination at this stage.

The third chapter is devoted to the testing of hypotheses in the examples of selected voluntary service organizations. Conclusion represents the final crucial points which come up as a result of the analysis.

1. Theoretical Models of Youth Policy, Volunteering, and the Nonprofit Sector

In this chapter, three topics will be addressed. First, a definition of the concept “youth policy” will be given, basic characteristics of youth policy and its theoretical models will be explored. Second, the phenomenon of volunteering will be introduced, and distinctive features of volunteering will be presented. Third, a definition of nonprofit sector and its theoretical models will be provided. The goal of this chapter is to formulate the hypotheses which will then be applied in the second chapter with respect to the studied countries – Germany and Russia.

1.1. Youth Policy: Definition and Organizing Principles of Classification

In order to understand whether differences in youth policies of examined countries presuppose the way voluntary service organizations work, we should at first introduce the very concept of youth policy implemented on the national level. According to Denstad, national youth policy is “a government’s commitment and practice towards ensuring good living conditions and opportunities for the young population of the country” (Denstad: 2009, 13). The youth policy is not necessarily summarized in one legal document, although it is a preferable case, but may be disseminated across different papers; youth policies are not necessarily based on the legislation (Ibid). Special characteristics of youth are, as a rule, taken into account and focused on in youth policies, namely: “public youth policy should reflect the challenges and obstacles young people face in their transition from childhood to adulthood” (Siurala: 2006, 7). Youth policies are generally separated from education, training and labour market policies (Walther et al.: 2002, 7).

The concept of youth policy appeared as a definition in scientific and political literature in the 1950-1960s and was connected to the development of youth as an independent social force and their self-orientation in social economic space (Krikunova: 2007, 278). By the 1970s youth policy had become an independent element of state policy, which was reflected in adopting a range of laws dedicated to the realization of youth rights to education and employment, and to the support of young families. By the end of the 1990s, according to the UN data, about 100 countries had adopted special laws on development and social protection of youth; nearly 90 states have structures and bodies elaborating and coordinating state youth policy (Ibid).

Authors of the IARD Study mentioned in the introduction define two general approaches: policy as a dynamic concept and as a static concept (to the extent a policy in fact can be static; I would prefer the term “well-established”). The latter usually means that youth policy has been introduced in a country rather a long time ago and has a stable tradition so far (the example provided are the countries of Northern Continental Europe). The former, dynamic approach

can be found in countries where youth policy does not have deep roots yet, like, for instance, in Mediterranean countries (IARD Study: 2001, 11). I suppose that this division in fact correlates with the history of youth policies, namely whether the youth policies are well developed throughout the history in the direction and content it has nowadays, or the turn has been made recently; this issue will be examined later.

In order to examine the youth sector in the two countries compared I adopt a classification offered by Wallace and Bendit. According to these scholars, the youth sphere in some countries experiences a lack of attention and is considered as a field of social policy. It even looks marginalized in comparison with other state policies (Wallace and Bendit: 2009, 441). It may often be the result of dissemination of youth-related issues across different ministries and legal documents. The youth policy can be classified through the following principles:

1. Philosophies of intervention: dominant concept of youth, aims of intervention, problems associated with young people;
2. Target groups, which are subject to special attention;
3. Organization of the youth sector as a field of social policy (Ibid, 444)

Philosophies of intervention are important in understanding the youth policy main direction. The idea is based on two types of perception of youth traditional for European youth policies: as a resource and as a problem (IARD Study: 2001, 11). The former includes a perception of youth as a resource to themselves and to the society as a whole (Ibid). “Young people can be considered a valuable resource in several ways. According to the IARD report a central element in this discourse is that young people are not solely valued as potential contributors to society, in their status as adults-to-be, but also in their present status as youth, whereby they contribute to society for the very reason that they are young” (Walther et al.: 2002, 29). Here the example of the Nordic countries can be brought, for instance, Sweden (Siurala: 2006, 13).

The second approach tends to see youth as a potential problem, which means that young people should be protected against the threats they may face in a process of their development (IARD Study: 2001, 11). “Young people are conceived of as either potential victims of their upbringing and conditions, or as victims and potential perpetrators because of their personal traits and character. Which is in contrast to youth as active participants in the continuous construction of society, youth life and their own identities” (Walther et al.: 2002, 28). The problem-oriented approach may mean that youth policies are aiming first of all to educate young people and to better qualify them on the assumption that they lack the necessary qualifications⁵. Wallace and Bendit mention the United Kingdom among the representative countries of such approach with youth issues discussed in a framework of social exclusion on a national level (Wallace and Bendit: 2009, 444; Cohen & Ainley: 2000).

⁵ Youth policy in Estonia (2000) Report by International Group of Experts for the European Steering Committee for Youth. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: http://youth-partnership-eu.coe.int/youth-partnership/documents/EKCY/Youth_Policy/docs/YP_strategies/Policy/COE_youth_policy_Estonia_En.pdf

The perceptions of youth as a resource and as a problem are not mutually exclusive, they are usually together in youth policy documents, supplementing each other, the domination of the one depends on historical peculiarities and national characteristics, and on the current political and economic situation (IARD Study: 2001, 82). Thus, “the image of “youth as a resource” is more common in periods of stability, economic growth, and social reforms while the image of “youth as a problem” prevails in periods of economic crisis, of political instability, and when youth in society and in the media are being presented as “dangerous”, “deviant”, “criminal”, “violent”” (Ibid).

Among the usual aims of youth policy Wallace and Bendit name promotion of youth autonomy, political and social participation, and integration of young people into adult society (Wallace and Bendit: 2009, 446). The problems targeted by youth policies and issues of worry regarding the young people are: “concern about the extension of the youth phase” (Ibid, 447), which includes the prolonged staying with parents and consequently, delayed family transitions; social exclusion, unemployment, homelessness (Ibid).

The target group of youth policy may presuppose the nature of youth sector in the country: “in countries with a narrow age conception of youth, it is more likely that there will be more homogenous models of youth policy. In countries where there is a wider age definition of youth, there are necessary much more heterogeneous youth policies because they apply to different sub-groups” (Ibid, 448). Wallace and Bendit present in this respect the examples of the UK and Ireland where the target group is considered to be relatively narrow: from 13-15 to 25 years old and the main targets of intervention here are the disadvantaged youth seen as social problem. In the Central European countries, on the other hand, the age group of people considered to be youth is wider, namely from birth to 25-30 years old, and youth policies are consequently more diverse, since they are focused on very different age groups with their various needs and problems (Ibid).

The third distinct element is youth sector. It is defined as a well-structured combination of youth policy, youth work and youth legislation (IARD Study: 2001, 60). In terms of the organization of the youth sector, minor and major youth sectors are defined: major youth sector with youth policy concentrated within the framework of definite institutions; minor youth sector with responsibility for youth issues delegated to a range of sectors as education and employment (Ibid, 449). For example, as Wallace and Bendit describe, countries with the major youth sectors usually have Youth Ministry, youth research institution doing research on youth, and an umbrella organization which unites all the youth organizations (Austria and Germany are the examples here). As for the minor sector countries, youth policies are rather dispersed to different other sectors with some kind of coordination as in Belgium and Sweden, for example (Ibid). Countries without a special youth sector may be defined as well: “countries in which youth policy is fractured into traditional sectors and without a centre”; Italy and Denmark are the cases here (IARD Study: 2001, 60). Another point of difference is the allocation

of youth policies to a sole public institute such as a youth ministry, directorate or across different ministries (Ibid, 449 – 450).

It would be erroneous to consider, however, that youth policies are homogenous in each case. Moreover, as Wallace and Bendit put it, “youth policies are especially difficult to classify because they are often scattered around different institutions and ministries who themselves do not have a consistent model of youth and frequently they are decentralized to a regional and local level” (Ibid, 456). Taking this into account, in my work I nevertheless will try to find dominant concepts in youth policies of Russia and Germany, keeping the above-mentioned components of classification as a basis. In doing the conceptualization of the German and Russian youth policy sector, it is necessary to take into account that German youth sector is, due to historical reasons, better structured than the Russian one. Moreover, since it has existed in Germany in its current state for quite a long time, it is better studied, often in the framework of European youth policies. Therefore, it tends to be attributed to some groups and clusters according to different principles. The studies of Russian youth problems and realization of youth policies appear to be not that extensive (Krikunova: 2007, 281).

Thus, the hypothesis is the characteristics of the reviewed elements of youth policies will correlate to the overall principles of voluntary service organizations’ work. Among them the most favoring to the development of youth voluntary service organizations appear to be perception of youth as a resource to themselves and to the society, major youth sector, and focus on promotion of youth autonomy and participation.

1.2. Volunteering: Definition and Concepts

*“Volunteerism is as diverse as individuals who volunteer”
Volunteering and Social Activism (2006)⁶*

For the understanding of the historical roots of volunteering and the possible implications they have on the general perceptions of volunteering, it is necessary first to introduce the very term “volunteering”. It embraces quite a lot of different meanings, and some of them seem to sound rather abstract: they tend to be connected with the words “peace”, “tolerance”, “assistance” etc., and the very core of the activity performed and its results remain sometimes quite vague. Researchers define the term in different ways.

For example, in the Background Paper “Volunteering and Social Development” (1999) Smith, referring to Cnaan et al. (1998), claims that public perceptions of the term “volunteering” are strongly influenced by national specifics, and the very idea of what volunteering is differs significantly among different countries. However, the core and general characteristics, the author

⁶ Joint study by the CIVICUS (World Alliance for Citizen Participation), the International Association for Volunteer Effort (IAVE) and United Nations Volunteers (UNV). Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.unv.org/fileadmin/img/www/Volunteerism-FINAL.pdf>.

supposes, are quite similar in all countries: a reward, free will, a nature of benefit, an organizational setting, and a level of commitment. Although different in each case, they include working mainly for the value of the activity carried out (reward is not a primary goal), of one's own free will (not being forced), aiming to help “an identifiable beneficiary or group of beneficiaries”, formally or informally, and with at least “some degree of sustained commitment” (Smith: 1999, 3-4).

Smith identifies four more specified types of volunteering, depending on the result and initial aim: mutual aid or self-help; philanthropy or service to others; participation; and advocacy or campaigning (Smith: 1999, 4). Therefore, it is clear that this definition is quite complex. Smith underlines a wide range of characteristics influencing the nature of volunteering, among them the level of development of the country is crucial. Smith believes that less developed countries tend to use more informal practices of volunteering, while in more industrialized states, formal structures of volunteering are widespread. Besides, religion can have an influence on the nature of volunteering in different ways.

In Smith's perspective, the importance of volunteering is stipulated by its two benefits to society. First, it contributes to economic development, since volunteers perform activities that would otherwise have to be funded by the authorities. Second, Smith believes, volunteering strengthens communities – solidarity, tolerance, and cooperation among the members. And it is not including the benefits for volunteers themselves which are quite diverse: from personal satisfaction and fighting social exclusion, to better opportunities for employment.

Modern trends in volunteering, Smith argues, are not always positive, despite the widespread recognition of voluntary activities. Globalization processes characterized by rising individualism and a decline in civic involvement are among the challenges volunteering faces internationally. But not all the tendencies are negative: advances in information technologies together with volunteer opportunities in the sphere of assistance to elderly people (ageing processes matter) open new perspectives in the field of volunteering. The issue of the relations with the state, Smith finds relevant as well, since there are some points that may be controversial here such as treating of public expenditures by the state allowing for the fact that volunteers carry out their activities for free. Thus, Smith presents the notion of volunteering as multifaceted activities which are significantly influenced by the characteristics of a specific country, the situation in political, economic, and other spheres. Such a complex approach to the concept of volunteering is essential, if one wants to examine it not as an abstract issue of support and assistance, but as a set of miscellaneous activities aiming to reach a wide range of socially important goals.

In other research, Smith (2004) examines the definition of the term “volunteering” through the opposition “volunteering and civic service”. The differences between the two can help to more profoundly understand the essence of the term volunteering: according to Smith, civic service is assumed to “focus on a period of substantial engagement”, and not necessary voluntary (Smith: 2004, 65). Therefore, volunteering, on the contrary, is seen by Smith as a

temporary voluntary (of one's free will) activity. Thus, time characteristics are highlighted in this definition.

Sherraden et al. expand on a range of possibilities of volunteering: it includes not just regular work on the social projects in the home place, but also participation in international short- and long-term workcamps, recovering activities performed in the regions having suffered from natural disasters, travelling to developing countries so as to share your professional knowledge and skills with people, spending a year abroad after school in order to better know oneself and the world (Sherraden et al.: 2006, 164). Here the characteristics of international volunteering are provided, but the very idea of volunteering does not necessarily include travelling somewhere, as basically it is in the first place a concept of assistance, no matter where.

Rochester suggests examining the essence of the term "volunteering" in the framework of three perspectives, each stressing its own view on what volunteering is. In my opinion, to some extent it serves as a kind of a summary of the abovementioned definitions. The first approach is so called nonprofit paradigm which is referred as a prerogative of the US, the UK and "some other developed countries"; this paradigm is shaped by the academic interests from economic, management and law spheres (Lyons et al.: 1998, excerpted from Rochester: 2006, 3) with the focus on "comparatively large and well-staffed nonprofit organizations which provide public services" (Ibid). This model presupposes that voluntary effort is a philanthropy and is seen as unpaid labour which is additional to the work of paid staff in a formally organized agency which means that volunteers work under the norms and procedures adopted for paid staff (Ibid). As Stebbins puts it, volunteers are regarded here as "helpers, as people filling a distinct, contributory role in modern society and, more particularly, in certain kinds of organizations" (Stebbins: 2004, 2)⁷.

The second perspective is believed to be widespread in European countries and defined by Lyons et al. as civil society paradigm with the academic interests from the political and sociological spheres: volunteering is understood here as an activism and force for social change. The focus here is on the organizations depending exclusively on their members-volunteers, and volunteering here is described as horizontal, as opposed to vertical volunteering in case of nonprofit paradigm. In the USA these kinds of organizations are defined as grassroots organizations (Ibid).

According to the third approach, volunteering is seen as a form of leisure: being identified as such by some scholars already about thirty years ago, this paradigm was however underestimated and widely considered as negligible because of the probable "association of leisure with ideas of fun and frivolity which are at odds with the serious business of much voluntary action and with terms like 'amateur' and 'hobbyist' which are often used pejoratively" (Ibid). Stebbins suggested to use the definition "serious leisure", namely "the systematic pursuit of an amateur, a hobbyist or a volunteer activity sufficiently substantial

⁷ Quote excerpted from Rochester: 2006, p. 3.

and interesting in nature for a participant to find a career there in the acquisition and expression of a combination of its special skills, knowledge and experience” (Stebbins: 1996, 215). The idea and essence of volunteering, as Rochester argues, is in the combination of all the three perspectives (Rochester: 2006, 4).

I argue, together with the other presented scholars, that definition and understanding of volunteering is to a significant extent presupposed by the country characteristics; therefore, the review of the national histories of the examined countries with respect to volunteering may shed light on the current meaning voluntary work has and the role it plays in society.

1.3. Nonprofit Sector: Definition and Theoretical Models Social

As was already mentioned, voluntary service organizations usually exist in the space between the state and business, and this space is referred to with several definitions, among which I find relevant for the purposes of my research the following two definitions as synonymous ones: nonprofit sector and third sector, third sector is meant here as the one together with state and market. Of course, volunteering can exist not only within the framework of non-governmental organizations, but in public and business ones as well: Anheier and Salamon (2001), for example, provide statistics for a range of European countries where one in ten volunteered for public or state organizations (Ibid, 12). I will nevertheless focus on the nonprofit sector as a dominant framework for the existence of voluntary organizations. I will examine the notion of nonprofit sector, its characteristic features, and study the models of the sector in different countries, which may shed new light on the differences in the way voluntary service organizations work in Russia and Germany.

Yet the very first step, defining the nonprofit sector, appears to be already quite challenging; as Salamon and Anheier (1997, 1) explain, the difficulty of finding the umbrella term may be explained by two main reasons. First, there is, as mentioned above, a tremendous variety of entities that may be considered to be part of the third sector. Here in fact a question arises: are we indeed able to define a sector which includes such various entities? (Salamon and Anheier: 1998, 216). Salamon et al. consider that all the entities tended to be grouped inside the nonprofit sector share some common features: the fact that they are not aimed at generating profit involves, on one hand, an idea that people have a right and freedom to improve the quality of their lives and the lives of the others; on the other hand, a notion of solidarity, namely understanding that one is responsible not only for oneself but for the community as well (Salamon et al.: 2003, 1). “Uniquely among social institutions, the institutions of the nonprofit or civil society sector merge these two impulses, producing a set of private institutions serving essentially public purposes” (Ibid).

There is a second difficulty in finding a term for the nonprofit sector as third sector: although it has been since recently a subject of keen interest among researchers, it is still sometimes neglected in comparison with the two other sectors, public and private, both of which demonstrate far greater influence and

power in contemporary societies (Salamon and Anheir: 1997, 2). The second argument, the authors believe, is not sufficient either, since the nonprofit sector is economically far more significant than is commonly considered, and moreover managed to challenge the power of the state and market, having given birth to a range of significant social and political movements (Ibid).

In order to conceptualize the third sector and better understand what is in fact meant under this term Salamon and Anheir define a set of characteristics of the entities attributed to be inside the nonprofit sector and elaborate a structural-operational definition. According to the scholars, the entities of nonprofit sector should be:

- *“Organizations*, i.e. institutionalized to some meaningful extent;
- *Private*, i.e. institutionally separate from government;
- *Non-profit-distributing*, i.e. not returning profits generated to their owners or directors;
- *Self-governing*, i.e. equipped to control their own activities;
- *Voluntary*, i.e. involving some meaningful degree of voluntary participation” (Salamon and Anheir: 1998, 216).

The organizations operating within nonprofit sectors are identified as non-governmental, nonprofit, third sector organizations. Taking into account the differences between the three terms, I will mostly use the definition “non-governmental organizations” (NGOs) referring to the organizations functioning within neither state nor market sectors.

Heinz assumes NGOs to be a necessary instrument of modern societies, and their history throughout the 20th century has shown quite obviously that the welfare state and market enterprises are hardly able to create and sustain just societies. Thus, nonprofit organizations were the reaction to the ineffectiveness of state and market in this regard, and the necessity of people to meet their social needs adequately (Heinz: 2006, 6). Heinz considers NGOs to play three roles in contemporary societies:

1. NGOs provide citizens with the opportunity for the self-organization of society. It means in fact, that people are enabled through local initiatives and problem-solving to work collectively for the common good. NGOs with their various activities in different fields – education, health, environment, etc. – reflect the diversity of society. NGOs are a chance for the people to care for the genuinely important issues, civic goals and social values (Ibid). “By empowering citizens and promoting change at the “grass roots”, NGOs both represent and advance the pluralism and diversity that are characteristic of vibrant and successful modern societies” (Ibid). Nonprofit organizations sustain a very significant area between the state and market. Helping to fulfill the common good, NGOs lie between the government - which cares for providing and managing public goods on the one side; and for-profit organizations - producing goods and private

- wealth. Thus, NGOs in fact provide a system of additional checks and balances, since they are independent both from the state and from commercial enterprises (Heinz: 2006, 6.). NGOs are consequently the watchdogs of state and business, as Heinz defines them, which at the same time are able to contribute to advanced public goods through building productive partnerships across the all three sectors (Ibid, 6).
2. NGOs moreover, are considered as crucial sources of experimentation and social change, because they can take risks which are economically too challenging for business and politically too challenging for the government. "In modern societies across the globe, countless innovations pioneered by NGOs have subsequently been adopted as government policy. Numerous models of service delivery that are considered "best practice" today were devised, tested, and improved over many years of experimentation by NGOs" (Ibid).

In contemporary societies a shift to free markets and private enterprise, according to Heinz, led to a decrease in social cohesion and an increase in economic and social inequity. In such a situation nonprofit organizations are seen as an instrument to sustain the balance between the excesses of capitalism and the inefficiencies of the state (Ibid). On the other hand, globalization and individualization, increasing the importance of the third sector, at the same time pose a challenge to it, since nongovernmental organizations have to cope with changing environments and redefine their identity in terms of new circumstances (Zimmer and Hallmann: 2002).

In a broader perspective, the third sector, having a genuine link to the concept of civil society⁸, and, in turn, its ingredient – social capital, is seen as a precondition of democracy (Hemment: 2004, 220-221; Salamon et al.: 2003, 2). Hemment refers to the influential book of Putnam who defined social capital as the "features of organization such as networks, norms and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit" (Putnam: 1995, 67)⁹. Putnam considers social capital as a crucial component of a successful democracy. Organizations of the third sector play a vital role within this framework, generating this social capital which they then transfer to the broader society, recreating the polity (Hemment: 2004, 220). Hemment refers therefore to a metaphor of society as a three-legged stool: market, government and third sector; in order to function successfully, a balance between the three should be found and sustained with the nonprofit sector as an equal player (Ibid, 221).

Since the end of the 20th century the nonprofit sector has been attracting ever more attention within the academic community. In order to conceptualize it and analyze its scale, funding and structure in different countries, The Comparative Nonprofit Project Sector Project was launched by The Johns

⁸ Following Anheier (2007) I adopt a broad definition of the civil society which involves both formally registered and informal organizations and initiatives, created by citizens and not connected to the distribution of profit and/or usurpation of power and open to all potential participants. For the discussion see: Anheier (2007). Reflections on the Concept and Measurement of Global Civil Society.

⁹ Quote excerpted from Hemment: 2004, p. 220.

Hopkins Center for Civil Society Studies in the USA in 1991. The project “grew out of an increased need for basic information about civil society organizations following a dramatic “associational revolution”¹⁰. The research is conducted in 45 countries by the local experts providing insights into country cases.

In order to conceptualize the nonprofit sector, in this paper the social origins theory proposed by Anheier and Salamon is applied, since it observes the third sector as an element embedded in social and economic structure in its interconnection with the state and market (the concept of “embeddedness” is taken from the work of Seibel (1990)). The scholars consider the appearance and growth of the nonprofit sector not only within the context of broad social, political and economical developments but as well in the perspective of historical, cultural and legal frameworks characteristic to the definite countries, which I find relevant with respect to my case and necessity to compare two countries.

The theory of social origins is based on a critical assessment of the third sector theories which existed before and includes a modification of Esping-Andersen’s typology of welfare state regimes (Anheier and Salamon: 2001, 14) which therefore appears to deserve special attention. I will only briefly address the main provisions of the typology which then were reframed by Anheier and Salamon with respect to the nonprofit sector.

Esping-Andersen (1990) compared policies on income-support, pensions and unemployment in different countries by the degree of de-commodification and the kind of stratification produced in society. De-commodification means to which extent welfare services are free from the market; consequently, high de-commodification means that welfare does not depend on income (i.e. welfare is not treated as a commodity), in countries with a high level of commodification, on the opposite, welfare services are sold on the market (Giddens: 2006, 367). Thus, three models of welfare state regimes or clusters can be distinguished:

1. Liberal (Anglo-Saxon) regime is characterized by means-tested programs, modest universal transfers and modest social insurance plans. Benefits are provided to low-income people, usually working class. Guaranteeing only modest benefits which besides carry negative public stigma, the state encourages private welfare schemes. The examples here are the US, Australia and Canada (Esping-Andersen: 2006, 167).
2. Corporatist (continental) regime with its historical corporatist-statist legacy is distinguished by high de-commodification but welfare services depend on class and status. Being shaped as well by the Church, this regime aims to support traditional familyhood (Ibid). “This type of welfare regime may not be aimed at eliminating inequalities but at maintaining social stability, strong families and loyalty to the state” (Giddens: 2006, 367). Germany, Austria and France are the illustrations.

¹⁰ Comparative Nonprofit Project Sector Project. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://ccss.jhu.edu/research-projects/comparative-nonprofit-sector/about-cnp>.

3. Social-democratic regime-cluster with social democracy as a dominant force of social reform is defined with the high level of commodification and universal benefits (Esping-Andersen: 2006, 167). “Rather than tolerate a dualism between state and market, between the working class and middle class, the social democrats pursued a welfare state that would promote an equality of the highest standards, not an equality of minimal need as was pursued elsewhere” (Ibid). Scandinavian countries demonstrate predominantly social-democratic welfare regime, although it is hardly possible to find a single pure case, as the author warns.

Esping-Andersen’s typology triggered heated debate: some scholars suggested other typologies, others proposed to identify distinct Mediterranean or East Asian types, or rejected the very idea of a welfare typology (Fenger: 2007, 7). For me it is, however, important that this division gave an impulse and was adopted by Anheier and Salamon to elaborate a nonprofit sector theory which I find appropriate to serve my research needs. Thus, the scholars distinguished between the four models of nonprofit development or nonprofit regimes with particular role of the state, position of nonprofit sector and, most notably, “each also reflecting a particular constellation of social forces” (Anheier and Salamon: 1998, 226). The authors acknowledge these types not to be pure ones – there are significant variations across the countries that fall into any group (Ibid). Anheier and Salamon use two main dimensions to differentiate the regimes: the extent of the state social welfare spending and the scale of nonprofit sector; the results are reflected at the Table 1.

Table 1. Models of Third Sector Regimes Developed by Anheier and Salamon (1998)

Government Social Welfare Spending	Nonprofit Sector Scale	
	Low	High
Low	Statist	Liberal
High	Social Democratic	Corporatist

Source: Anheier and Salamon (1998, 228)

Thus, liberal nonprofit sector regime is characterized by low state welfare spending together with relatively high third sector scale. Such a model may be found in the countries where the middle class is quite influential, and at the same time opposition from traditional land elites or from working movements is not playing an important role (Ibid, 228-229). As result, the idea of extending government social welfare protection is not very popular, and preference is given to voluntary approaches. Consequently, a limited state welfare spending is accompanied by sizeable nonprofit sector. The most prominent representative countries here are the USA and the UK (Ibid, 228).

Social democratic model is characterized by the opposite features. High-scaled state welfare spending leaves not much room for third sector welfare providers. Such situation may be found in the countries with politically powerful working class (although it acts together with other social classes). The limited nonprofit service providing sector in this case does not necessarily mean a limited nonprofit sector in general (Ibid). “To the contrary, given the political battles involved in the extension of state-financed and state-provided welfare protections, we can expect nonprofit organizations to still be quite active in such societies, but with a significantly different role. This is a role not as service providers but as vehicles for the expression of political, social, or even recreational interests” (Ibid). The example here are Finland and Sweden, in the latter, as Anheier (2000) notes, a wide network of volunteer-based advocacy is functioning in a society with a very developed welfare state (Anheier: 2000, 8). Here another division made should also be taken into account: the one between expressive and service nonprofit organizations. The first are active in the fields of health, education, social services, economic development and housing; the latter in the fields of culture and recreation, environment, civic activism and advocacy (Olate: 2007, 34).

The third model is corporatist, distinct with both extensive government welfare spending and high-scale nonprofit sector. The peculiarity of such regimes is an extensive cooperation between the state and nonprofit organizations (Salamon: 2006, 414). Here the state has to act together with the third sector, having found a kind of compromise in its attempt to keep the support by key social elites while anticipating more radical demands for social welfare protection (Anheier and Salamon: 1998, 229).

The fourth model is called statist where the state can control a significant scope of social policies, but not as a tool of the organized working class, as in the case of social democratic regimes. Here, powerful political and economic elites impede the emergence of significant nonprofit organizations or keep them constrained through legal and extra-legal control (Salamon: 2006, 414). Although the nonprofit institutions can act as a supplement in terms of welfare provision, they cannot counter the state power or demand a cooperative role in setting or executing state policy (Ibid). One of the best examples here is Japan. Obtaining their empirical data on a wider range of countries, Salamon and Sokolowski later came to a conclusion that a given typology is not applicable to some countries and defined therefore distinct Asian, Latin American and African models (Salamon and Sokolowski: 2006).

The typology suggested by Anheier and Salamon (1998) appears to be especially relevant for my research not only because it provides a conceptualization and typologization of NGOs, but also since it can be well applied to the concept of voluntary work. The two abovementioned scholars accomplished it while studying volunteering cross-nationally in order to find distinct features of regimes in terms of the role voluntary work plays there, and to connect it to the broader social and cultural context (Anheier and Salamon: 2001). They explain the somewhat neglected position volunteering had until

recently in contemporary societies exactly as an inability of researchers to observe it in the wider perspective, tending instead just to see it as giving time for some particular purpose (Ibid, 1). However, “as a cultural and economic phenomenon, volunteering is part of the way societies are organised, how they allocate social responsibilities, and how much engagement and participation they expect from citizens” (Ibid). Therefore, society-state relations and the role of the state have crucial impact in defining the place volunteering has in each particular country. Based on their theory of social origins, Anheier and Salamon (2001) studied the role and place of volunteering cross-nationally and related it to the regime types (Table 2).

Table 2. Volunteering in Nonprofit Regime

Nonprofit Sector Type	Size of Paid Labour	Volunteer Input
Liberal	High	High
Corporatist	High	Low
Social Democratic	Low	High
Statist	Low	Low

Source: Anheier and Salamon: 2001, 17.

Thus, liberal model is characterized by a high level of volunteering, the strong emphasis is on service provision (Ibid). “In liberal countries volunteering plays economically and politically the most important role. It is part of the cultural repertoires of these countries, and typically expected from citizens” (Ibid). Social democratic regimes experience a high level of volunteering as well, the relations between the state and volunteering are much less instrumental (Ibid). Volunteering is less connected to the provision of services, since there the state retains a dominant position on a basis of political consensus. Consequently, volunteering is more pronounced in the areas of community building, recreation and life style (Ibid, 18). Corporatist regimes are characterized by low levels of volunteering in comparison with liberal and social democratic regimes, and historically are linked to the state provision, and sometimes stand in instrumental and even strained relationships to the state (Ibid, 17). Finally, in the statist regimes high levels of volunteering are also not observed, since such regimes historically have not found a special place for volunteering therefore public recognition of the role of volunteering remains very modest (Ibid, 18).

Thus, I assume that the identified characteristics of different nonprofit regimes should influence the work of voluntary service organizations, since I examine exclusively the voluntary service organizations operating within the frame of nonprofit sector.

To sum up, a review of the primary and secondary sources with respect to theoretical models of youth policy and its characteristic features, concept of

volunteering and its distinct elements, phenomenon of nonprofit sector and its models was conducted. As a result the following hypotheses were put forward:

- *First, youth policy is characterized by a range of distinct elements or organizational principles which together define its essence, the work of voluntary service organizations as the entities oriented predominantly towards youth is hence influenced by these elements which define youth policy;*
- *Second, the understanding of volunteering is to a great extent predetermined by the national histories and evolution this term has experienced over history, thus I assume that the work of voluntary service organizations as entities directly dealing with volunteering is consequently influenced by the perception of volunteering in this or that country;*
- *Finally, since the nonprofit sector is also characterized by diverse elements shaping distinct theoretical models, these models and their characteristics may shape the work of voluntary service organizations.*

These hypotheses will be applied first to the cases of countries, and then to the cases of specific organizations in Russia and Germany.

2. Youth Policy, Volunteering and Nonprofit Sector in Russia and Germany

In the first chapter, factors that may influence the work of voluntary service organizations were introduced in terms of their theoretical essence. The second chapter then will be devoted to the application of the identified elements and characteristics of these factors to the specific environment of the two countries I have chosen to examine. The aim of this chapter is therefore to test the hypotheses put forward in the previous chapter with respect to the Russian and German cases on a country level, and to posit a next range of hypotheses which will be then tested on the level of voluntary service organizations in both countries.

2.1. Youth Policy in Russia

Before analyzing peculiarities of youth policies in Russia, it is necessary to emphasize the very special conditions which young people in contemporary Russia experience. The process of development of what is in fact a new country, coincided with growing up of those who were born since the end of the 1990s. As Selezneva points out, “modern young people appeared to live in a special historical period, experiencing a process of socialization not on the basis of inherited material and moral values, but themselves taking part in producing these values” (Selezneva, 2006: 118). Dafflon even uses Durkheim’s concept of anomie describing the current state of uncertainty, insecurity and lack of self-

confidence Russian young people demonstrate (Dafflon, 2009: 4). This should be taken into account in the discussion on the topic.

Youth policies in Russia, if we consider them independently of the Soviet past, have a rather young history to be well-established, the elaboration started in fact in the end of the 1990s. Before the 1990s, in the USSR, the party-state model of youth policies had a clear structure and the main instruments of its realization: Komsomol and The Pioneers, which corresponded to the necessities of the Communist Party to foster young future members to take the place of older members in the future. Komsomol, being the ideological organization, fulfilled, at the same time, important social functions, having the right of legislative initiative and a considerable budget (Zelenin: 2009, 34). In the USSR, youth were regarded in bio-political terms, as a potential threat to the equilibrium of governance (Cohen and Ainley: 2000, 80), therefore it should be constantly guided, and this view was expressed not just in the control measures, but in shaping youth infrastructure and regular contributions to the resource base (Omelchenko, 2004). That led to the special role youth policies played during the Soviet time: “Soviet youth were directly involved in official policy (of their own accord or compulsorily), The Pioneers and Komsomol as young political organizations played an important role in shaping national history, helped to make radical shifts in power, ideology and economics” (Omelchenko: 2004, 4-5). As Lorenz puts it, ideologically-based youth services were not totally compulsory and always left some room for youth’s needs and aspirations to autonomy (Lorenz: 2009, 24).

Since the very nature of state policies with the end of Soviet era changed drastically (not to mention the challenges of the 21st century such as globalisation), new guidelines needed to be found, in the sphere of youth issues as well. Thus, the Russian youth policy is seen as rather dynamic policy, and the organization of youth sector adds points to such statement. The word “dynamic” may have different connotations here. On one hand, dynamic means increasing attention which the state pays to youth issues (or at least claims): a process of modernization of youth policy has started in recent years (Kochetkov: 2009, 35), and commenting on the declaration of the year 2009 as the Year of Youth, then president Medvedev announced that it “will give a unique opportunity to find and probe new more effective methods of cooperation in elaboration of the basis of Russian youth policy”¹¹. Therefore, a clear aim to in fact establish new youth policy is expressed. On the other hand, dynamic has rather unstable connotation, meaning that the state youth policy is lacking clear structure and legal basis (Kochetkov: 2009, 18). Regarding the notion “dynamic” in the sense of “being recently introduced; new” some scholars, however, consider that youth policy in Russia in fact made of the same flesh and blood of the Soviet system when it comes to its paternalistic and punitive nature and object orientation (Lovzova and larskaya: 2009, 161).

According to Federal Service of State Statistics (2010), more than 33 million of young people of 15 – 29 years old live in Russia, which is about 23,3%

¹¹ Quote excerpted from Kochetkov: 2009, p. 35.

of the country's total population (Youth in Russia: 2010, 9). The target group of Russian youth policy is hardly well-defined: the Strategy of the State Youth Policies defines its target group as young people of 14 – 25 years old, whereas the Federal Targeted Programme “Youth of Russia” considers it as the ones from 14 to 30. Such a broad orientation presupposes that not just traditional youth policy issues such as socialization and education are on the agenda, but support for young families as well.

The structure of youth policy institutions in Russia is complex and based on the Ministry of Sport, Tourism and Youth Policy created in 2008 through reorganization of the State Committee for Youth Affairs. For the first time in modern Russian history the words “youth issues” appeared in the name of a State Ministry (Rozhnov, 2). There is a Department of Youth Policy inside the Ministry. Legislative authorities include Youth Issues Committee in The Federation Council and a Committee on Youth Issues in The State Duma. Three levels of youth policies are divided: federal, regional and municipal.

In terms of legislation, youth policy in Russia is still underdeveloped. Although it is in many respects defined with the priorities of the Constitution (Kochetkov: 2009, 116), which concerns the basic rights, freedoms and responsibilities of all citizens (including young people), and so far the very definition of youth policy is not introduced in the Constitution (Omelchenko: 2006). The state youth policy is regulated by a range of other legal documents such as “On state support of youth and children's public associations”, “On physical training and sport in The Russian Federation”, “On higher and post-higher professional education” and others. The Strategy for State Youth Policy was adopted in 2006; on the basis of the Strategy and Concept of long-term development of the country till 2020, the Federal Targeted Program “Youth of Russia” for the years 2011 – 2015 was elaborated. It should start being implemented in 2012, according to the Minister of Sport, Tourism and Youth Policy – Vitaly Mutko¹². The federal law on youth policies is not elaborated yet, although there was a lot of discussions that the law should be passed. Arefiev points out that the organization of the Russian youth sector is characterized by instability, since “the federal bodies of executive power relieve one another all the time” (Arefiev: 2008, 31).

In order to examine the main guiding principles of youth policies in Russia, I have analyzed the abovementioned documents and their critical review by scholars.

“In the system of state governing, youth policy is a component of policies in the field of social-economic, cultural and national development of the country” (Rozhnov, 1). Although youth policy is declared to receive an increasing attention from the state, it may nevertheless be regarded as marginalized if we take into account the following wording from a vice-minister of sport, tourism and youth policy Rozhnov: “We managed to include a separate section “Youth Policy” in a

¹² Mutko: FCP po infrastructure dlya dosuga molodezhi zarabotaet s 2012 goda. Ria Novosti. March 16, 2011. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://ria.ru/society/20110316/354527973.html>.

Concept of long-term development of the country till 2020” (Ibid, 3-4). The very formulation sounds as if the youth policy wouldn’t have been per se regarded as an issue important enough to be certainly a part of such a fundamental document.

In terms of the dichotomy “problem versus resource” the perception of youth in Russia seems to be unequivocal: young people are regarded as a resource of the state, as the state officials and documents proclaim. The Strategy for State Youth Policy declares its aim as development of youth potential in the interests of Russia (Strategy: 2005, 8). “For the state youth are simultaneously a resource and a partner”; “Not oil and gas are our resources but youth”¹³ announces Vladimir Zhidkikh, chairman of Youth Issues Committee in Federation Council. What this example tells us about how the Russian resource approach differs from the ones provided in IARD Study is a specific understanding of resource: the formula “young people being resource for the country and for themselves” lacks the second part here. Youth are seen rather as an object needed to reach a goal: wealth of the country. Youth are, moreover, under considerable pressure to face the challenges modern society deals with: “The whole range of problems and contradictions Russia will face in the coming decade shapes rather harsh demands to new generations” (Strategy, 4). Young people are seen as the ones who must pay the increased price of working in the ageing society with more people living on welfare payments, and not to forget that Russian youth are supposed to make transitions into adulthood earlier than their European peers.

A different perception of youth as a problem may be expressed in another dichotomy: “subject – object”. Although the value of youth as a subject of youth policy is proclaimed, the very formulation sounds somewhat contradictory if we consider “resource” as a synonym of “object”: “State should consider youth as a basic strategic resource of the state and society, as a subject, not merely an object of social and economic policy” (Rozhnov, 1). Youth policies researchers doubt that a “subject” approach dominates the state discourse of attitudes to young people in Russia (Iarskaya and Lovzova; Omelchenko). Quite the opposite, Iarskaya and Lovzova believe that youth are regarded as object and as a homogenous group with a definite list of characteristics, therefore, youth policy fails to address the real necessities of youth, trying to substitute the youth issues with its own perception of youth agenda, often far from youth interests, since it solely aims to socialize young people as loyal supporters of the state authorities (Iarskaya and Lovzova: 2009, 156).

Omelchenko believes that in reality, despite the announcements and the content of documents, within the framework of the Russian youth policy youth is problematized as a very concept. Youth therefore “cause panic, are seen as a crucial risk factor in modern society and a reason for many contemporary illnesses” (Omelchenko: 2004, 2). Such statements do not look groundless. Referring to the Strategy of state youth policy, we can suppose that its

¹³ Vladimir Zhidkikh: Dlya gosudarstva molodezh’ – eto odnovremenno resurs i partner. *Nasha Vlast’*: Dela I Lica, № 9(100), 2009. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://duma.tomsk.ru/page/14154/>.

formulation shows its binding character; I am not declaring the absolute binding gist of the Strategy – a place for youth development and youth initiatives is given as well. But the very selection of the information for the first paragraphs (as the introduction and the postulation of the main points of the document) induces a reader to regard a state discourse of youth as problematized: youth are considered responsible for the democratic development of the country, but believed to be apolitical which is seen as a threat to the political stability of the country. In the conditions of increasing migration, youth, according to the Strategy, should champion the ideas of tolerance and strengthen international and intergenerational relations. However, this role appears to meet a contradictory response from the young people themselves. Further, a whole series of problems associated with young people is given: from the uneven allocation of youth labour resources and youth unemployment to youth crime, HIV infected youth and orphans. (Strategy, 4-7).

To conclude, Russian youth policy perceives youth as a mixture of problem and recourse with some utilitarian attitude and some compulsory set. Some scholars define it as the economic approach (Pershtukin: 2009, 73). Nevertheless, the very concept of youth appears to be quite contradictory: on the one hand, young people are represented as a socially disadvantaged group: according to then prime-minister Putin, “Youth are the most dynamic, but at the same time the most vulnerable part of our society, they are able to do much and should be supported”¹⁴. On the other hand, a wish to withdrawal from paternalism presupposes the fact that youth are not seen as a group that needs any benefits in comparison to other groups of population. In the exact wording: “an important peculiarity of state youth policy shaping is the refusal to regard it as means, aiming mainly to make benefits for the youth compared to the other social groups” (Rozhnov: 2006, 1).

Omelchenko offers a classification of youth discourses typical for a Russian society, discourses that are reflected in state youth policies as well that reinforced after the economic crisis:

1. *Discourse of a threat*: intensified with the economic crisis as a fear that lack of economic opportunities to get an access to significant resources will lead to moral degradation of young people. The scholar refers to a citation typical in the framework of such discourse: “We are not able to do anything with the present-day generation of young people – it is lost. These are the children of the parents robbed in the 1990s, they are now grown up as skinheads and natsbols¹⁵. We should save those who are 2 years old now, and the ones that are not born yet” (State Duma deputy Govorukhin on parliamentary hearings of bills on moral education of children). Of course, the quote is much too radical, but it reflects the essence of the threat discourse.

¹⁴ Quote excerpted from Nemeryuk: 2009, p. 105.

¹⁵ Natsbol is an acronym designating a person who adheres to the ideology of National Bolshevism, here used with the explicitly negative connotation.

2. *Discourse of a victim (victimization)*: youth are perceived here as a victim of social and economic changes of the recent time, and the consequences will be social infantilism, phobias and going to the virtual sphere.
3. *Discourse of heroisation of youth (discourse of hope)*: young people are treated as the ones who are able to overcome the consequences of the economic crisis, and the ones who can save the country from social cataclysms¹⁶.

We can find all three discourses in the Strategy: young people are associated with definite problems, but they are in fact seen as those who must compensate the side-effects of ineffective social policy. Interestingly, in 2009 a provocative video was released on video sharing website YouTube, devoted to the Year of Youth in Russia, later announced to be a part of PR campaign to promote the Year of Youth 2009¹⁷. The video had a strong accusatory and demanding semantics with the leading idea “You, young person does not do anything whereas your country is dying”.

Thus, according to the identified above models and their distinctive features, Russia tends to have quite a dynamic youth policy with broad target group and minor youth sector; with respect to the dominant view of youth a specific object attitude may be defined.

Hypothesis: specific attitude towards youth as primarily a resource for dealing with the current and future economic problems leads to the situation when youth voluntary service is neglected; a growing wish of young people to take part in voluntary projects finds expression in the establishment of informal grassroots¹⁸ organizations that work on membership fees and get grants to some projects from various sources including foreign ones.

2.2. Youth Policy in Germany

Youth policies in Germany, as I mentioned before, are often studied in the context of European policies, and are sometimes attributed in terms of that, namely as forming a distinct cluster with the other Central European countries. But as scholars note, German youth policies, despite the general spirit of European values, have their own distinctive points.

Youth policies in Germany are considered by the scholars as generally well-established and well-structured. Arguing about the marginal role youth policies play in the United Kingdom, British scholars Cohen and Ainley give an example of other European countries, and, not coincidentally, Germany is named first among the countries where “issues of youth policy cover the whole extent of

¹⁶ Omelchenko E. Molodezhny vyzov. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.polit.ru/article/2011/04/07/lessons/#sdfootnote4sym>.

¹⁷ Eidel Y. My vse popalis' na kryuchok. Chastnyi Korrespondent. March 2, 2009. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.chaskor.ru/p.php?id=3930>.

¹⁸ Using the term “grassroots” I mean here not only natural and spontaneous social initiatives from below, but organizations that were created on a basis of such initiatives, and run on nominal budgets by volunteers. From here on, I will use the definition “grassroots” in this meaning.

social, cultural, educational and psychological formation, and are addressed as important topics by mainstream politicians and engage the interest of major intellectuals” (Cohen and Ainley: 2000, 79).

In terms of stormy historical past, namely the 20th century’s political and social cataclysms, Germany has some similarities with Russia. The difference is the basis of new German policies after the National Socialist era (not only regarding youth but overall) started acquiring the features characteristic for it nowadays already at the end of the Second World war, that is why, not surprisingly, youth policies nowadays appear to be in such a robust state.

The number of young people of 15 – 29 years old is near 13,2 million in Germany, according to the 2011 data, this accounts for about 16,2% of the whole population (Wondratschek: 2011, 5; German Statistic Service). Germany is a country with a broad definition of youth in terms of the age groups concerned: age from birth to 25 – 30 years is regarded as youth (IARD Study: 20016 57). The authors of IARD Study note on the example of Europe that differences in national youth concepts are presupposed by historical and political reasons, and Germany illustrates this point with its tradition of defining both children and youth as “Jugendliche” (young people) (Ibid., 58).

Germany is a country where a mixed resource-problem youth approach is adopted, and it is the consequence of the considerably broad age group covered by the term (Wallace and Bendit: 2009, 444), therefore children are seen as those who need protection, and “for younger people they are more likely to be viewed as a resource and the focus as they grow older changes from employment concerns towards housing and welfare” (Ibid, 446). Walther et al. consider that although the mixture of problem – resource attitudes to youth is clearly seen in the German case, the former nevertheless traditionally has a priority, shaping the policies having their focus on social integration and prevention of participatory problems. Youth policies are referred to as “youth assistance” here and include the whole field of youth care (Walther et al.: 2002, 31).

Among the main aims of youth policy is improvement of the social opportunities of youth, support in dealing with everyday life, and promotion of their participation. The best solution against probable marginalization here is involvement in society, politics and business. Development of the personality, childcare, gender equality and resistance to extremism are on the agenda as well (Wondratschek: 2011, 2). Wallace and Bendit consider that the general idea of youth integration into adult society in fact takes different forms, and in the German case it indicates the paternalistic stance of the policy, since youth are seen as those who should be protected (Wallace and Bendit: 2009, 446). This point of view may be supported by the fact that of the leading legislative documents within German youth policy is Children and Youth Protection Law.

The legislative basis of German youth policy is also well-established (Rodin: 2011). In addition to the main provisions of the Constitution, there are general laws such as the German Civil Code, German Penal Code, and Federal

Social Assistance Act which are of particular significance to children, young people and families (Wondratschek: 2011, 14) and the variety of national laws more or less concerning youth issues. Regional and local legislation requires administrative districts and towns to set up a youth office (Ibid.).

The German case is an example of major youth sector. Its organization includes three levels: federal level, the level of states (Länder) and the municipal level. At the same time, youth policies are seen as “the general responsibility of society” (Wondratschek: 2011, 2), so that not only federal, state and municipal authorities are supposed to be responsible for it, but, as well, voluntary child and youth organizations (Ibid). A distinctive feature of German youth policy is that on the Federal level, it has been represented for several decades with a Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth. The Ministry coordinates the activities of national and federal organizations for children and youth work and assists with methods and orientations of work, monitors the execution of federal laws, supports cultural and sport education of youth, and international youth exchanges (Database on International Youth Work in Germany: 2008, 8). The main tool of the ministry to support children and youth is the Child and Youth Plan of the Federation. Other Federal ministries are directly or indirectly involved in the provision of youth policies to the extent that they are responsible for the issues that touch upon young people such as education, employment, health, justice and social, interior, regional and urban policies (Wondratschek: 2011, 2). Besides, the respective committees in charge of youth issues within the Federal Parliament exist.

On the regional level, public authorities are represented by the Conference of Youth and Family Ministers. The Conference works with a regularly changing chairperson representing the conference at the European level. The Conference includes ministers and senators dealing with youth and children's issues from the federal states. The target of the Conference is to provide equal development of programs and institutions and support of local youth offices in the states (Wondratschek: 2011, 9).

At the same time, there are actors of German youth policies that comprise public and non-public nature: the Child and Youth Welfare Association, the Federal Association for the Protection of Children and Young People. Among non-public actors there are the Federal Youth Council, Regional Youth Council and local ones, and a wide spectrum of youth NGOs (Ibid). Although the organization of the German youth sector is complex with a variety of public and non-public actors on all the levels involved, the characteristic feature is immediate youth work is provided through non-state institutions, various public foundations, religious and voluntary organizations, in other words, “people themselves do it through the associations they themselves established” (Arefiev; 2008, 33). It corresponds in fact with the general principle of subsidiarity typical for the German welfare state which means that, in the provision of welfare services, non-state organizations should act first, and state ones intervene just if there is no alternative (Voluntary Action in Germany, 2). The very principle of subsidiarity makes it possible for non-governmental organizations to get state

funding on the implementation of socially important projects (Anheier and Siebel, 2001: 97). This principle in case of youth policies, although involving delegation of the youth policies provision to the civil society, presupposes that the organizations of civil society are “more or less incorporated into the state structure as institutionalized vehicles of welfare rather than being independent of it (Wallace and Bendit: 2009, 451).

The German case therefore demonstrates the example of static well-established youth policy with broad target group and dominant attitude to youth as a mixture of resource and problem.

Hypothesis: view of the youth as a resource and problem mixture is seen in German case with a greater emphasis on the attitude “youth as a resource for themselves” leaves considerable space for youth voluntary service projects; the specific paternalistic nature of youth policies in Germany stipulates the well-established and well-structured nature of formal voluntary service organizations funded mainly from the state.

2.2.1. History of Volunteering in Russia

Analysis of literature on historical roots of volunteering in Russia shows that generally two approaches are adopted by the scholars. Both regard volunteering in Russia in its contemporary understanding as a phenomenon which emerged at the end of the Soviet era in 1990s with the establishment of the first non-governmental organizations. Both consider volunteering in one form or another to have a long tradition stemming from the very beginning of the Slavic history. Some scholars, however, tend to neglect the contribution of Soviet-time volunteering believing it to be mainly “forced volunteering” (Lugovaya: 2007; Novikov: 2011), some even tend to avoid the word “voluntary” meaning it was in fact the opposite (Govaart et al.: 2001). Others argue that the work on a voluntary basis, widespread in the USSR in many cases was indeed chosen by one’s own free will, therefore it would be wrong to disregard this period at all (Parshina: 2009; Kudrinskaya: 2006, Voronova: 2011).

In Russian literature and everyday practice, two definitions of volunteering and volunteers are used: first, *волонтерство* and *волонтер* which come from French word *volontair* – of one’s own free will and *it by-term* – from Latin *voluntarius*, *voluntas* – good will. Second, equally with them Slavic definitions *добровольчество* and *доброволец* are widespread (Kazakevich: 2004, 1). During a long time period, literally by the end of the 20th century, both terms served exclusively in a military context in order to nominate those who voluntarily served in the army (Ibid). Sinetsky points out that such understanding was characteristic for Medieval Europe as well, with the one important exception: this military service – usually done during wars and battle actions – was there not without a reward, quite the opposite, in those times “volunteers” and recruits bargained with each other all the time in order to get more advantageous conditions of a contract (Sinetsky: 2006, 104). With the course of time, the meaning of the term “volunteer” had been changing, since with the end of

another war the so-called volunteers often had to fulfill the responsibilities of the recruits who were killed. Thus, the meaning of the term gradually transformed: the one who can help with the housework (Ibid).

Since Russia didn't have a mercenary army, the evolution of the term "volunteer" and the essence of voluntary work took place in another way here. The communal way of life presupposed mutual supportiveness and cooperation as one of preconditions of successful husbandry. Therefore, voluntary work for a long time was regarded as an obvious thing and an end in itself; these characteristics of commonness and naturalness explain why volunteers were not shaped into a distinct group (Ibid). The Christian idea of love for one's neighbor may also be regarded as an impetus which contributed to the acknowledgement of the importance of voluntary work (Lugovaya: 2007, 209). Till the 16th century when secularization of charitable activities started, the church played a significant role in voluntary activities of the people, and voluntary work was widespread in monasteries (Ibid). As Govaart puts it, the activity of volunteerism within the framework of the church is presupposed by the financial donations from the elites; it wasn't in fact an activity for the masses (Govaart et al.: 2001, 119). Some scholars point out the traditional inclinations of Slavic people as another factor which influenced the popularity of voluntary work (Lugovaya: 2007, Voronova: 2011).

In the 18th century, with the separation of the church from the temporal power, the focus of volunteering shifted: according to a common belief popular at that time, poverty leads to immorality and crimes, therefore the state should intervene to help those in need. State interference, however was limited to legislation and administrative measures. Special medical institutions created on private donations performed the functions of hospitals, orphanages and hospices; people there often worked on a voluntary basis (Ibid, 209).

Sinetsky considers the turn of the 18-19th centuries as a separate phase of volunteering development characterized by the beginning of capitalist relations when the nature of social relation had been gradually changing. The shift to capitalism was uneven in different countries; but it defined the mechanisms of world development up to the present day (Sinetsky: 2006, 105). The main point here, according to Sinetsky, is that capitalism abolishes human dependence from the inherent social status; social and economic wealth since that time in many respects have depended on a person himself. Uneven distribution of resources led to the necessity of regulating social peace in another way: charity and voluntary work became the instruments for that. Gradually volunteering came to be considered to be a special social service with an exceptional moral significance (Ibid).

The political reforms of the 1860s contributed to the emergence of some social organizations focused on a variety of spheres, among others, on care for the weak and charity; these were private and provided the kind of help that was not covered by the state (Govaart et al.: 2001, 119). Such organization often took the form of self-help and mutual support with women, having only limited access to the regular labour market, as dominant contributors (Ibid). The beginning of

the 20th century was marked by the emergence of Russian branches of some large international voluntary organizations such as the Red Cross (1905) and Care for the Poor (1905) (Ibid).

The revolution of 1917 changed the situation in terms of voluntary work rather significantly. The change of ideology meant that voluntary work and charity were strictly divided, since the latter was regarded as unnecessary in the society of total equality (Sinetsky: 2006, 106). As a result of the Soviet policies, activities of voluntary and charitable organizations were almost impossible to carry out; many were closed (Voronova: 2011, 334). Bolshevik policy involved using voluntary work as a resource for solving the numerous social problems; especially young people were involved into cultural and educational activities, work against illiteracy. 1919 the first “subbotniks¹⁹” were carried out, and it marked the emergence of new forms of voluntary work: in their free time, youth without compensation accomplished repair, cleaned the enterprises areas, schools and hospitals (Ibid). “Every student was obliged to take part in social activities in the programs designed and financed by the state. Participation in such programs was a prerequisite for good study and career opportunities” (Govaart et al.: 2001, 120). Although being in fact focused on, youth were not the only actors of voluntary work during Soviet times. Along with genuinely unpaid workers, those categories of people were regarded as volunteers, who carried out different kinds of socially important work in various regions of the country and got a salary as a compensation of hard working conditions (Novikov: 2011, 141).

During the World War II period a lot of volunteers joined the Red Army. Voronova believes the Timur movement²⁰ emerged shortly before the War to be one of the brightest examples of volunteering in its contemporary understanding. The movement involved a great number of youth and children, and carried out various voluntary activities; the work was especially intensive during the War period (voluntary movement intensifies as a rule during trials and tribulations when the destiny of a country or a group of people is at stake (Sinetsky: 2006, 105)). Later the state enactment on creating the voluntary youth squads was announced, but the initial idea was born in society (Voronova: 2011, 335-336). Another, less well-known example was the Pioneer’s two-year plans - which can also be regarded as voluntary activities. Imitating the five-year economic plans their parents had to carry out, children adopted similar methods of work in terms of their voluntary activities; it helped to structure Pioneer volunteering (Ibid). Despite a number of genuinely voluntary projects and activities which existed during the Soviet time, common voluntary work (“общественная работа”) during harvest and subbotniks includes compulsory elements to a great extent, and therefore can hardly be regarded as volunteering in its contemporary understanding (Novikov: 2011, 142).

¹⁹ Subbotniks were the days of voluntary work “organized for cleaning the streets of garbage, fixing public amenities, collecting recyclable material, and other community services”. Accessed 01.06.2012. In <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Subbotnik>.

²⁰ “Timur movement (*Тимуровское движение*) was an altruistic youth volunteering movement in the Soviet Union promoted via mass youth organizations of Little Octobrists and Young Pioneers. <...> The idea of the movement was borrowed from the popular novel for youth *Timur and His Squad* by Arkady Gaidar”. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Timurite_movement.

In fact, Soviet authorities substituted concepts and took the powers of voluntary movement establishing and shaping them with the aim of dealing with issues of state importance (Ibid, 142). Sinetsky points out that the significant turn of volunteering paradigm observed with the establishment of the Soviet Union led to the following important changes in understanding of volunteering: first, volunteering started to be considered as a self-sufficient type of public activity; second, volunteering overcame a sphere of negative connotations (support of socially-disadvantaged people) and thus was then seen as an optimistic and emotionally attractive activity (Sinetsky: 2006, 106). Nevertheless, the Soviet approach to volunteering significantly changed the attitude of people towards it. As Sinetsky argues, at the first voluntary movement enjoyed a great support of Soviet people. The ideology of volunteering acquired a state status; voluntary work was an asset and an important condition of status growth being indeed prestigious and honorable in the heyday of the USSR. For all that, the Soviet, mainly administrative, methods to implement volunteering led to the undermining of its moral basis. Thus mass consciousness lost the humanistic foundations of voluntary work (Ibid).

The end of the Soviet era and the beginning of a new historical period was marked by another extreme: the overwhelming influence of commercialization, selfishness and pragmatic ideas was characteristic especially for the first post-Soviet years (Sinetsky: 2006, 106). However, this very social atmosphere, which might seem at first sight hardly encouraging for voluntary work, contributed nevertheless to its development in a country unsettled by social disturbances (Novikov: 2011, 142). As Hemment puts it, work in a wide range of different informal groups and associations that mushroomed in the 1990s was an opportunity to engage themselves in a construction of a healthy society for people who found themselves devalued and shut out from the new sources of economic and symbolic capital in the new democratic Russia” (Hement: 2004, 227).

The word “volunteer” got its current meaning in the 1990s when the first nongovernmental organizations started to emerge. These were specialized in environmental issues, social care, sport, restoration of historical heritage, groups for handicapped, single mothers and elderly people were set up as well. From the beginning young people of 16 – 20 years old were among the most active volunteers (Govaart et al.: 2001, 120). Govaart et al. denote Russia of those times as a “fallow land“ in terms of building civil society and developing voluntary work (Ibid, 120). There was indeed a need for social initiatives at that time, but a lack of experience complicated the development; therefore in order to transfer knowledge, ideas, methods and understanding of voluntary work, exchanges with organizations from Europe and the US were established (Ibid). Two interesting and, I believe, revealing examples of such exchanges are provided by Govaart et al. (2001): in 1991, the leaders of two social organizations – Moscow Charity House and the Society of Mercy – were invited to attend courses for nongovernmental organizations and volunteer management in the USA. The Moscow Charity House was founded in 1991 by a group of democratic delegates from Moscow in order to unite volunteers and organizations and produce a

common approach to tackle social problems. Another example: in 1993, the Centre of European Volunteers and the International Association for Volunteer Effort organized the Conference of European volunteers in Moscow. “A result of this exchange was a more widespread understanding in Russia for voluntary work as a means to help build the new democracy” (Govaart et al.: 2001, 121). Therefore, a Western definition was in fact grafted onto the Russian ground.

On this wave, the development of voluntary organizations went on through the 1990s with gradual emergence of local volunteer centers, Volunteer Forum in Moscow and celebration of the specific dates devoted to the recognition and promotion of volunteerism: the Week of the Volunteer in December with the internationally celebrated Volunteer Day – 5th of December, and the Week of Good Deeds in April. Since the end of the 1990s, a special attention has been paid to promoting volunteering outside Moscow (Ibid).

Govaart et al explain at length the constraints the first Russian voluntary organizations faced because of the legacies of the past and mandatory volunteering, because people tended to ask why they should work voluntarily now, if everybody was a volunteer in Soviet time “and what good did it do?” (Ibid, 122). The main task was to make clear the difference between voluntary work as a work of own’s free will in a democratic society and mandatory work claimed to be voluntary (Ibid). “Thus, the first seminars highlighted the fact that in a democracy the individual decides when, how and for whom somebody will voluntarily spend his/her time and a campaign slogan ‘help yourself by helping others’ was introduced” (Ibid).

The end of the 1990s was the beginning of new stage voluntary movement in Russia has experienced with a special focus on building an infrastructure for volunteering, creating volunteer centers and developing goals for the future (Ibid). Although volunteering in Russia through constant exchanges of knowledge and experience with Western countries has a substantial international support, the acknowledgement from the state is still a burning issue.

Some degree of recognition was demonstrated since the launch of preparation to the Sochi Olympic Games 2014. There is a widespread opinion, however, that this kind of state recognition aims solely to reach the short-term goal, namely to encourage people to volunteer in Sochi, providing that organizing an event of such a profound scale as a rule presupposes the involvement of a large unpaid work force.

Hypothesis: since the understanding of the concept “voluntary work” has undergone significant changes in the 20th century in Russia, with some depreciation of the phenomenon, voluntary service organizations may experience lack of project participants and have to invest additional efforts in the promotion of volunteering. At the same time, the review of the 1990s history of the emergence of voluntary movement in its current sense make us come to a hypothesis that contemporary understanding of volunteering in Russia is in fact transported from Western countries. Opposition to the “mandatory voluntary” work and acceptance of Western experience and notion of voluntary engagement

appear to be the two pillars that the current Russian understanding of volunteerism is built on. This may be a factor influencing the way voluntary service organizations function in Russia.

2.2.2. History of Volunteering in Germany

Germany is not seen as a classic volunteering country as the US, Denmark or England, all of which have a long tradition of institutionally fostering and encouraging civic engagement of people (Kamlage: 2008, 3). Understanding of volunteering has undergone quite significant changes during the history.

Scholars agree that finding the only German definition equivalent to the word “volunteering” is hardly possible, since there are a number of similar concepts having yet significant differences. Wiedermann believes some of them are even competing (Wiedermann, 3). The distinction between them sheds light on the historical development of the phenomenon:

- First of all, there is a traditional term *Ehrenamt* translated as *honorary work* or *honorary office* equivalent to *ehrenamtliche Tätigkeit – honorary office activity*. These concepts mean voluntary activities in the framework of formal organizations such as churches, welfare associations, clubs etc. Permanent membership is usual here. “The voluntary work is either unpaid or an expense allowance is received. Literally translated the terms refer to a “task or an office assumed on honorary basis”, however experts have considered this definition as too restrictive”²¹.
- The terms *freiwilliges Engagement (voluntary involvement, voluntary engagement)* and *Freiwilligenarbeit (volunteering, volunteer work)* correspond to the wide range of other voluntary activities, exercised in the framework of formal and informal organizations in the spheres of sport, culture, activities in civic-action group, self-help, neighborhood activities (Wiedermann, 3)
- The definition *bürgerschaftliches Engagement* translated as voluntary civic activities stresses the specific character of all the voluntary activities; civic involvement is understood as being active member of the community (Ibid)
- The concept *Freiwilligendienste (voluntary service)* refer often to the youth services performed within the framework of Voluntary Year as a part of official program usually carried out after finishing the secondary education (National Report Germany).

Wiedermann provides the results of the First National Survey on Volunteering carried out in 1999 when the interviewees were asked to choose one of the five commonly used terms in order to define the activities they perform. *Volunteer work* was the most popular choice with 48%, *honorary work* earned 32%. As Wiedermann notes, some people may rather prefer

²¹ Study on the Volunteering in the European Union. Country Report Germany (2011). Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://europa.eu/volunteering/de/node/1205>.

“*Freiwilligenarbeit*” since it better reflects the self-conception than the older term “*Ehrenamt*” (Wiedermann, 4-5). Thus, a generally accepted term does not exist. It causes some difficulties and may provoke a reasonable question: the history of what is presented here? The answer is: I inspect here the history of “volunteering”; since a general German term for that can hardly be found, I refer to the history of the terms that are all, so to speak, inside the concept “volunteering”.

German volunteering is also regarded as having deep historical roots. What I, however, find important to stress, is that scholars tend to refer to different historical periods as initial points. Some look back to the origins of German history (Wagner: 2007), the others in fact examine volunteering as a phenomenon acquiring significance just in the 19th century. Presumably such difference is stipulated by the broader and narrower understanding of the term “voluntary work” or, to put it another way, it depends on whether a scholar refers to the roots of the voluntary work, or the first steps of more or less systematic work on one’s own free will for the good of the community. We should bear in mind that most voluntary work history in Germany is in fact the history of *Ehrenamt*; with respect to *Freiwilligenarbeit* or *Freiwilliges Engagement*, both are mostly regarded as modern concepts. If we start with the former perspective, it finds the roots of volunteering in the necessity of the people to exist in different climate conditions, demanding to function successfully as a community with its principle of cooperation and supportiveness, not to forget about the Christian influence (Wagner: 2007, 4). The first organizations which functioned with voluntary work went back to the 10th century with the Foundation Bürgerspiralstiftung in Wemden, Bavaria.

The next important milestone is found already in the 18th century, when Hamburg almshouse was founded as the first organization which relied on systematic voluntary work. Hamburg was divided into 60 districts, for each three volunteers were responsible. Here, as Wagner puts it, the roots of the voluntary traditions in Germany can be found: the organization of voluntary work is characterized by the combination of private initiative and state responsibility (Ibid, 5). The roots of volunteering as one of civic virtues may be found in the religious beliefs of Protestant ascetism, if we refer to the works of Weber in this regard (Hein, 531). Protestant values encouraged an active stance both in economics and in society, voluntary work we refer to here as an expression of this active stance. Religion influenced the mode of people’s behavior, and the process of secularization could not change such behavior modes; “protestant values and virtues have become self sustaining and have continued to influence modern behaviors without necessarily being rooted in religion anymore” (Ibid).

Religion should be particularly taken into account while describing the history of honorary work in Germany; the very stance the church had towards an individual and the state, their relationships are of crucial importance in understanding the roots of voluntary activities (Birnkrut: 2003, 44). And here both Protestantism and Catholicism should be referred to. In accordance with Catholic religious doctrine, the state is subordinate to the church; and such

subordination presupposes the tradition of poor relief exercised by the Catholic Church. Honorary office is here meant to be not only the work without money but physical and mental mercy to one's neighbour who is a child of God. Love to those who are around was expected and even demanded (Ibid). With respect to Protestantism, honorary office finds its roots in Calvin's view of people as God's instrument; they are therefore supposed to take part in shaping the world in the name of God. Moreover, a person should not be tired to transform the world performing God's commandments (Ibid, 47).

During the 18th century the notion of voluntary work was also influenced by civic humanism, a set of ideas that involved the understanding of civic freedom in the opportunity to engage oneself for the benefit of the community. In the middle of the century the rise of the bourgeoisie was observed, but not in a revolutionary way, rather in a state-influenced direction with the strengthening of the cities and communities, and consequently, the bourgeoisie, whose aspirations towards more involvement on the communal arena were satisfied in the result of the reforms of Prussian state structure (Ibid, 47-48).

The unusual mixture of private voluntary initiatives and authoritarian understanding of the state was a characteristic feature of the Prussian state. The reforms of 1808 marked the first self-government of the communes, which was a kind of compromise the state offered to the rising bourgeoisie. The definition of voluntary work was then introduced that is widely used nowadays as well, namely that citizens may be responsible to take over the municipality without claiming salary for that, which means voluntarily (Wagner: 2007, 6). The very understanding of voluntary work here appears to be quite ambiguous, since the very idea of working on one's free will coincides here with the notion of responsibility. Fischer considers therefore that the very notion "honorary office" has controversial connotations in terms of its reference to voluntary activities because of its connection to monarchical class society (Fischer: 2008, 168).

In the middle of the 19th century the idea of self-regulating of society was gaining more support from the citizens; the state, according to this early liberal understanding, is seen exclusively as a contingency reserve in case of emergency (Birnkraut: 2003, 49). As a result of such a stance, the Elberfelder System was adopted (named after the city where it was first used), which is referred to by the scholars as the beginning of social work in Germany. The city was divided into quarters, with honorary workers providing poor relief in each of them (Ibid). Wagner points out that voluntary workers were therefore those who stood at the origins of social work. As he goes on, the German welfare state with respect to its emergence, is, to a considerable degree, the result of honorary work (Wagner: 2007, 6).

Although the element of self-organization was adopted at that time, the development of volunteering occurred in fact within the framework of autocratic state government, Anheier and Salamon point out. The 19th century is marked by the emergence of many associations and foundations which employed paid staff as well, but were managed and run by volunteers (Ibid, 5). As the scholars explain it: "in the 19th century, the modernization of public administration and the

development of an efficient, professional civil service within an autocratic state under the reformer Lorenz von Stein allocated a specific role to voluntarism: voluntary office in the sense of trusteeship of associations and foundations — positions that became the domain of the growing urban middle class” (Ibid). Anheier and Salamon believe that the characteristic feature of German understanding of volunteering as ‘honorary office work” was its development in the state where national and local democratic institutes were still underdeveloped. The trusteeship aspect then has been gradually perceived separately from other activities performed voluntarily, for instance, caring for the poor which “remained the domain of the church and, increasingly became part of the emerging workers’ movement during the industrialization period“ (Ibid).

The later development of volunteerism in Germany is marked by the further emergence of associations and, most notably, of the so-called “peak”²² welfare care organizations before the World War I. Their activities were inextricably linked to the principle of subsidiarity: in the second half of 19th century the necessity of an institutionalized welfare state clearly emerged, and the state encouraged the growth of peak organizations, since the provision of welfare services was shifted onto the latter (Birkraut: 2003, 53). Among those were German Caritas Association (*Caritasverband*), Association of Non-affiliated Charities (*Deutscher Paritätischer Wohlfahrtsverband, DPWV*), Worker’s Welfare Service (*Arbeiterwohlfahrt, AWO*), German Red Cross (*Deutsches Rotes Kreuz, DRK*), Welfare Service of the Protestant Church (*Diakonisches Werk*), and Central Welfare Agency of the Jews in Germany (*Zentrale Wohlfahrtsstelle der Juden in Deutschland*) (Wiedermann, 2). The principle of subsidiarity was the reason of a very special notion of volunteering adopted in Germany by that time, different from other countries “primarily due to requests by the German state for “politically controlled citizen participation” and voluntary labour inputs in the 19th century. Hence the German terms from this time <...> ‘Ehrenamt’ and ‘ehrenamtliche Tätigkeit’ emphasised the ‘honorary component, officialdom and public legitimation’ rather than voluntarism per se”²³.

During the Nazi period the whole range of associations and foundations under the policy of enforced political conformity (*Gleichschaltung*) were incorporated into the party system and appeared under state control; some were oppressed. So, for instance, the free welfare associations were initially reorganized under the umbrella Nazi-controlled organization, and then, with the exception of the Red Cross, made up the National-Socialist People’s Welfare (Anheier and Seibel: 1993, 7).

The postwar period was a time of rapid growth of the international voluntary service movement, a concept which had emerged already after the World War I on the wave of peace and reconciliation promotion. The idea was to encourage peaceful co-existence, cooperation and friendship among nations under the motto of “International Peace Movement”. The first event in the

²² The word “peak” emphasizes here the highest level.

²³ Study on the Volunteering in the European Union. Country Report Germany (2011). Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://europa.eu/volunteering/de/node/1205>.

framework of international voluntary service took place in 1920 in Verdun, France, where a group of French, German, Austrian, English and Swiss volunteers were made up, some of them former-soldiers and therefore ex-enemies. Together, they rebuilt a village which had been devastated in a bloody battle (Schur: 2003, 6). The idea of work for the benefit of other people without getting money for it was here a unifying concept through which the necessity to maintain peace was realized.

Internal volunteering existed throughout the 20th century in the Federal Republic of Germany mainly within the framework of peak organizations described above²⁴. With respect to the GDR, the development of voluntary work proceeded in a different direction. Voluntary organizations as a part of nonprofit sector existed in GDR in an inseparable connection to the state ideology in the framework of “mass social organizations”. Although the citizens were constitutionally granted the right of free association, voluntary organizations, as all others, had to exist under the supreme authority of the Socialist Unity Party. Thus, all the local organizations had to be part of one of the “mass social organizations” such as Free German Youth (Anheier et al.: 2000, 2). As Anheier et al. note, despite the obvious party orientation and ideological dependence, voluntary organizations worked to a great extent similarly with the ones operated in the Western part of the country. “Beside the party ideology related voluntary activities or campaigns, volunteering also took place under the roof of the Lutheran Church. The Catholic Church was less represented due to the smaller number of members” (Wiedermann, 3). With the unification of the two German states some eastern voluntary organizations were transformed into registered associations, some dissolved; there are still two competing points of view on the way voluntary organizations in Eastern Germany operate nowadays. Some scholars believe that East Germany, notwithstanding party influence, managed to build a local civil society independent of the state. Others say Eastern German organizations lacking the experience of volunteering and self-organization are significantly influenced by the Western ones (Anheier et al.: 2000, 1 – 2).

Wagner considers the history of honorary activities in the beginning of the 20th century and by its end through the opposition honorary office – full time workers. The latter were perceived as professionals and the formers as a help function; such understanding substantially changed with the years (Ibid, 7-8). As Anheier and Salamon put it, volunteers were until recently regarded as „amateurish ‘do-gooders’ and relics of the past to be replaced by paid professional staff capable of performing tasks more effectively and efficiently“ (Anheier and Salamon: 2001, 1). By the 1970s the role of volunteering in Germany seemed marginalized because of the professionalization of social work, the traditional sphere of voluntary activities (Wiedermann). At that time a heated public debate started in order to find a more appropriate concept of volunteering and culture of civic engagement of people; those debates were caused by the legitimacy crisis of the welfare providers and the rise of new social movements (Schur: 2003, 4).

²⁴ Ibid.

The 1990s were a time when the understanding of volunteering in Germany started changing, with the emergence of many new organizations and structures. There are several reasons for that provided by the scholars. I will first address the point of view Kamlage expresses, since it explains the difference in perception of volunteering through the historical changes in the end of the 20th century. Showing the general outlook, Kamlage supposes that “individualistic values of self-expression, autonomy, freedom and participation gained influence, whereas traditional systems of beliefs and related institutions like church, family and authority lost significance” (Kamlage: 2008, 4). All of that caused the change in the motivation people have to engage in voluntary activities from traditional motives like duties, obedience and religious and civic norms as charity and altruism to the more secular ones like self-interest and self-expression (Ibid). The former motives Kamlage attributes to the honorary service (*Ehrenamt*), the latter – to the volunteering as *Freiwilliges Engagement*. Along with different motives the two have some other differences we touched upon only briefly above while defining various terms “volunteering” has in the German language. Important here is the conception, according to Kamlage’s point of view, that honorary work is exercised predominantly on a basis of permanent membership in large-scale organizations like churches and welfare organizations; it is focused on others. Whereas voluntary engagement is performed chiefly within the context of temporary projects, often in non-institutionalized social movement groups and grass-roots organizations and includes the volunteers’ demand to obtain personal gains like additional skills and competences (Kamlage: 2008, 5). The growth of the latter kind of volunteering posed a challenge to traditional organizations which, Kamlage states, not only faced the new type of volunteers but a decrease in traditional volunteering. As a result, the traditional voluntary organizations had to adopt new measures to attract volunteers, some of them were launching volunteer centers and programs within their associations. These were “defined by greater involvement and participation by volunteers in the management and running of the organizations and the development/design of projects than what was previously the case”²⁵. Anheier and Salamon also provide the example of the Voluntary Social Year (although it had appeared already in 1964²⁶) giving the young people an opportunity to obtain useful skills and knowledge while volunteering (Anheier and Salamon: 2001, 2). What we consider important here is that Kamlage in fact sees the transition of volunteering from being activities predominantly for the benefit of others (though different motivations may exist simultaneously) to being activities focused to a great extent on oneself (private gains). Kamlage links such a change in understanding of voluntary work with the broader context of state transition in Germany. According to the scholar, the driving forces of globalization and Europeanization led to the changing relations between the state, market and society. As a result competition between states intensified, and the regulating capacities of the German state decreased. Consequently, more a liberal notion of the state was

²⁵ Study on the Volunteering in the European Union. Country Report Germany (2011) Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://europa.eu/volunteering/de/node/1205>.

²⁶ Mobility of young volunteers across Europe. Case Study Germany: 2010, p. 170.

adopted in Germany with the place for new government arrangements between state, market and society (Kamlage: 2008, 5). Anheier and Salamon connect the changing perception of volunteering with a wider perspective of social change, namely individualization, briefly touched upon above, and secularization of the contemporary industrialized societies. These led people away from traditional forms of volunteering – from lifelong activities to permanent projects; from service to others to more output-oriented activities with tangible pay-offs (Anheier and Salamon: 2001, 12).

Some scholars find other reasons why volunteering was perceived in a different way from the 1990s on. One of the explanations is that political reforms of the 1990s, which led to the intensified competition between welfare associations and other welfare service providers for obtaining state resources, contributed to the greater demand for volunteers traditional peak organizations experienced²⁷. The unification of the two states in Germany also posed a question of further development of voluntary work already within the framework of one country and was to some extent a process of rethinking the idea of volunteering. Anheier and Salamon attribute it to the greater recognition of volunteering demonstrated by national governments worldwide since the 1990s with the year 2001 proclaimed by the General Assembly of United Nations as the Year of Volunteer (Anheier and Salamon: 2001, 2).

Hypothesis: the history of volunteering in Germany shows that the perception of voluntary work has undergone some changes as well; although, unlike in Russia, there was by and large no essentially negative connotations of volunteering across the history. The change of perception is rather linked to the changing environments of the 21st century and means that, together with traditionally established structures for voluntary services, new ones are gaining popularity and this fact may influence the work of the older ones.

2.3. Nonprofit Sector

2.3.1. Nonprofit Sector in Russia

Russia as a successor of the USSR together with the other Eastern Block countries attracts much attention in terms of its third sector development, with the main focus on the question: whether the nonprofit sector has become the integral part of civil society or it is still a surrogate of the state authorities? (Anheier et al.: 2000, 1). In order to conceptualize the third sector in Russia using the chosen typology of Anheier and Salamon, first, the type of Russian welfare state regime should be defined, and this task is already challenging. Boiko, referring to Esping-Andersen, considers that the Russian model of the welfare state can hardly be characterized: during the Soviet time there was no market economy in the country, and the contemporary situation with social policy demonstrates that

²⁷ Study on the Volunteering in the European Union. Country Report Germany (2011). Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://europa.eu/volunteering/de/node/1205>.

the Russian model is a mixture of different regimes' characteristics, with some often contradictory features (Boiko: 2003, 86)²⁸. Fenger used Esping-Andersen's typology and hierarchical cluster analysis to assess whether Russian and other post-communist welfare states can be attributed to one of the three regimes. He came to the conclusion, however, that the differences between the group of post-communist states and the group of Western countries are very significant, and they are larger than the differences within each group (Fenger: 2007). The scholar argues that post-communist countries are characterized by the features of conservative-corporatist and, to a lesser extent, social democratic types. Considering the differences between traditional Western welfare regimes and post-communist ones to be so substantial, Fenger questions the legitimacy of application Esping-Andersen's typology to the post-communist countries' cases (ibid). Although I am unable to clearly define the Russian welfare regime, and in turn, to correlate it with the nonprofit sector (Jakobson and Sanovich (2010) believe that the reason is unfinished formation of welfare regime in Russia), I will nevertheless try to give an overview of the Russian nonprofit sector, using some statistical and research data obtained by the scholars working on the subject.

According to the data of the Centre for Studies of Civil Society and Nonprofit Sector at the National Research University Higher School of Economics²⁹, the level of engagement in Russian NGO is similar to the East European ratio, but considerably less than in Western Europe. Since the beginning of radical social-economic reforms and especially after adopting in 1996 the federal law "On nonprofit organizations" the number of NGOs has shown stable growth, with roughly 275 thousand nonprofit organizations by the end of 1990s. Now the growth is not that steady because of various reasons (Zadorin et al.: 2006, 5). The 2009 Rosstat data is 669,9 thousand NGOs in Russia (which is 2% more than in the previous year). It is, however, significant to stress that official statistics cover the organizations that cannot be attributed as structures of the civil society, namely the institutions created by the state or municipal authorities, and consumer cooperatives. A number of NGOs without the abovementioned structures is 360 thousand organizations³⁰. The very statistical data on the third sector is rather controversial and could hardly be proved, for there are a lot of nominal organizations which in reality do not run any activity (according to the abovementioned Research Centre on Civil Society, more than a half exist just on paper³¹); some have a very limited lifespan; other organizations are not registered, therefore it is difficult to obtain any information on their activities (ibid).

²⁸ For elaboration of the topic of the Russian welfare state see: Boiko: 2003; Manning N, Shkaratan O., Tikhonova N. *Work and Welfare in the New Russia*. Alderhot: Ashgate, 2000; Manning N. *Social Policy and the Welfare State // Russia in transition: politics, privatisation and inequality*. David Lane. Longam Group UK limited, 1995, P. 199—220.

²⁹ Centre for Studies of Civil Society and Nonprofit Sector conducts empirical research on Russian civil society according to the methodology of and in partnership with the World Alliance for Citizen Participation (CIVICUS) and the Research Centre on Civil Society at the John Hopkins University (USA).

³⁰ Getman N. *Statisticheskii portret nekommercheskogo sektora v Rossii*. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://opec.ru/1320628.html>.

³¹ Ibid.

In order to define the crucial elements in terms of the Russian nonprofit sector functioning, I will also refer to the other classification of Anheier and Salamon (1994), which was the result of cross-national research on nonprofit sector, aiming to find some distinct patterns of it across twelve countries. The scholars suggested the framework which fits quite well my goal to give an overview of the very diverse and in fact hardly well-structured Russian third sector characteristics. As Anheier and Salamon put it, “while the character and role of the nonprofit sector in any country is ultimately shaped by the entire pattern of social, economic, and political development of that country, at least three more general factors also seem to play a significant role: first, the legal structure that exists; second, the level of development; and third, the degree of centralization in political and social terms” (Anheier and Salamon: 1994, 10).

1) Legal system. It can influence the function of the third sector significantly by making it easier/more difficult to establish certain kind of institutions (Ibid.). Anheier and Salamon distinguish between the two types of legal system: first, civil law countries (Germany, France, Italy etc.), where the rights and obligations by individuals and organizations are explicitly spelled out in codified laws which define what constitutes a permissible private action for the public good (Ibid). Second, common law countries (the US and the UK) where instead of such strictly codified laws a system of case laws is adopted that “define what the evolving sense of the community means by the public good. The result is a far more open field for the formation of nonprofit organizations claiming public-benefit status” (Ibid).

Russia is presumably characterized by the former type of legal system. Nonprofit legislation started to develop since 1990s with more than 40 laws that included the definition “third sector”³². Now the basic legal documents in the sphere of nonprofit organizations are the Civic Code and the Federal laws “On nonprofit organizations” and “On Public Associations”. More than 30 different organizational legal forms of NGOs are stipulated by the legislation, since it is a prerogative of a range of special laws³³. Valyavina points out that legislation on NGOs is not well-structured, lacks consistency and logicity, since the adoption of special laws led to the unjustified growth of forms and types of NGO; and such diversity does not represent an orderly system (Valyavina: 2009). There are besides some internal contradictions, for example on the question of state corporations, which are formally considered as nonprofit organizations, or self-regulating organizations (Ibid).

The nonprofit legislation has been a subject of a heated debate since the last decade, mainly in terms of its control from the side of the state authorities. This control is generally considered to be the answer to the “color revolutions” in Post-Soviet countries. As Jakobson explains it: “For many NGOs that were among the leaders of the sector, the situation considerably worsened after the color revolutions and Yukos case which led to the dismantling of Open Russia

³² Mironova S. Opređenje i status nekommercheskih organizatsiy v Rossii. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://minjust.karelia.ru/4212/4221/5581/5584/>.

³³ Getman N. Op. cit.

Foundation, the strongest Russian sponsor organization. The authorities started to give signals to both the NGOs and the donors that either depoliticizing or the open support of the government are preferable, and besides that too close ties with foreign donors and foundations tending to have political influence are not welcome as well” (Jakobson, 50).

Thus, in 2005 amendment to Federal laws was adopted, which toughened the rules of registration and activity of NGOs on the basis of its “threat to national unity, and unique identity and cultural heritage”. Then president Putin announced that it was inadmissible to sponsor the illegal political activity from abroad with the help of NGOs. The situation slightly changed in 2007 with some liberalization of the nonprofit legislation, and in 2009 with more favorable conditions on NGOs work and registration. In 2010 then president Medvedev signed a law on creating a special institute of socially-oriented NGOs which are considered to receive the economical support from the state on a priority basis. Among the priority directions are childcare and defense, support of talented youth and programs on interethnic and interreligious conflicts settlement. In 2010 some nonprofit organizations got tax concessions³⁴. In 2011 – beginning of 2012 some toughening trends are again observed with the special focus on youth: in 2011 within the Ministry of Sport, Tourism and Youth Policy methodological recommendations were elaborated expanding on the topic of counteraction to youth extremism, especially encouraged by NGOs financed from abroad³⁵. Moreover, president’s counselor Yuriev in 2011, commenting on the meeting of then president Medvedew with NGOs representatives expressed a state wish to cooperate only with nonprofit organizations that benefit but not harm or stand idle. With respect to the “detrimental” ones, a reference to the color revolutions was clearly made³⁶. Interestingly, the appeal is supported from the Orthodox Church, with its representatives insisting on the absolute transparency and accountability of nonprofit organizations funded from abroad³⁷. In the light of controlling issue we can observe as well the unwillingness of the state to decide a widely discussed question with the tax cuts for NGOs which unlike in Western countries have not been adopted on a wide scale yet.

This lengthy reference was made with the aim of showing that NGOs are often seen in terms of the possible political threat they pose to the state authorities, and the legislation is not least shaped by this fact. Some experts suppose that a following division is made: loyal NGOs (socially-oriented) and disloyal (monitoring, human rights organizations)³⁸. Sponsorship from foreign organizations is not encouraged (though not prohibited); and the very scheme of

³⁴ Kak menyalas’ sistema kontrolya za NKO v Rossii. Kommersant Newspaper. № 36 (4577), March 2, 2011. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.kommersant.ru/doc/1594277>

³⁵ Granik I. Gosudarstvo podelit NKO na poleznye i vrednye. Kommersant Newspaper. №62 (4603), 09.04.2011. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.kommersant.ru/doc/1618970>

³⁶ Krasnov E. Vot vam, NKO, I Yur’ev den. 11.04.2011. Electronic magazine Filantrop. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://philanthropy.ru/climate/2011/04/11/5450>

³⁷ Deyatelnost NKO v Rossii ne dolzhna ugrozhat’ ee bezopasnosti, zayavlyayut v RPC. 02.02.2012. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.newsru.com/religy/02feb2012/chaplin.html>

³⁸ Bocharova S. “Golos”, ne boltai! Electronic Newspaper Gazeta.Ru. 24.02.12. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: http://www.gazeta.ru/politics/elections2011/2012/02/24_a_4011929.shtml

state control of NGOs is not very transparent which may complicate the activities of the nonprofit organizations.

2) Level of development the third sector has achieved is the second criterion Anheier and Salamon offer. The overall developments in the Russian nonprofit sector raise considerable skepticism among the majority of foreign experts (Jakobson and Sanovich: 2010). With respect to its economic growth, the sector is not yet seen as a serious contributor to the economy: “the contribution of Russian non-profit sector to national economics (1,2%) is comparable to developing or post-socialist countries, with Russia slightly falling behind <...> As compared to developed countries, Russia is lagging far behind”³⁹. In order to describe this broad and somewhat ambiguous characteristic carefully, I will address the work of Jakobson and Sanovich (2010) who elaborated three models of the third sector development in Russia; in order to supplement it with some critical insights, I will refer to the article by Alekseeva (2010), which clearly demonstrates the existence of different viewpoints on the development of the nonprofit sector.

Jakobson and Sanovich presented a theoretical framework for the analysis of the evolution of the third sector according to four dimensions: developmental driving forces, sector structure, dominant organizational culture, and relation with the state. The scholars distinguish therefore between the three models, focusing on the demand for, and supply of, key resources and institutions, namely latent growth in the late Soviet Union, import-dependent in the 1990s, and the rooted model since the beginning of 2000s (Jakobson and Sanovich: 2010). Following Volkova (2012), I present the main points of the abovementioned theoretical framework in the Table 3.

Table 3. Models of the Third Sector Development in Russia

Models	latent growth	import-dependent	Rooted
development driving forces	state and party ideology; spontaneous public response to its activities and inefficiency	foreign donors' activity	altruistic aspirations and public (especially middle class) and business self-organization, emerging from below
sector structure	informal cells, but overall vertical hierarchies	dominance of vertical connections	horizontal connections

³⁹ Role of Non-Profit Sector in Economic Development of Russia (2005), Project “Integration of Civil Society for Non-Profit Taxation Reforming”, The Institute for Urban Economics, p. 13.

dominant organizational culture	bureaucratic culture of the Soviet state	behavioral standard of Western donors; patterns of the Soviet bureaucratic practice or nascent Russian business	Mixed: characteristics of various cultures from previous stages of development
relation with the state	submission and total control	benevolent non-interference; to varying extents, necessity to reckon with corrupt bureaucrats' selfish interests	not harmonious yet: from conflict to partnership
inner potential for development	Low	Middle	Differentiated

Source: Jakobson and Sanovich: 2010, Volkova: 2012

The brief overview of each model is needed to supplement and explain the Table 3.

Latent growth model. Jakobson and Sanovich disagree with the scholars who tend to neglect the Soviet period in terms of its influence on the third sector development. Before the death of Stalin, civic activism was suppressed or forced out to the private sphere; later some room for self-organization and mutual help at the official organizations on the lowest level emerged (Sanovich: 2009, 11). The authors consider the Soviet social activism to be structured by the state and to exist mainly in three forms: as a simple mutual help, as activism within the state structure that were left outside the total control of the state, or as a protest against state ideology (Ibid, 283). Institutions of self-organization (as being partially transformed from the institutions created by the party in its own interests) in the Soviet Union were not very effective and stable, but they provided some space for the third sector development (Ibid). The dissident movement is considered by Jakobson and Sanovich to be a crucial force in the preparation of political reforms and later emergence of the third sector in Russia. Activities of the dissidents were also somewhat shaped by state policy, since the latter influenced the development of self-organization and cooperation within the dissident community (Ibid, 284).

The import-dependent model. With the end of the Soviet period, an appeal to philanthropy and voluntary action is clearly observed as an effort to compensate for the withdrawn state services (Deacon: 2000, 148). At that time,

however, people by and large were not very much willing or able to engage in third sector activities: economic crisis led to the situation when money and time became acutely scarce resources; the general mood was not encouraging to the development of the third sector, and the lack of experience hindered initiatives towards self-organization (Jakobson, 46). The demand for assistance and services that could be provided by the third sector increased tremendously as the state significantly reduced its welfare activity. In such circumstances the weakness of social, cultural and economic basis for the third sector was at that time to a great extent compensated through the import of ideas, skills, knowledge and organizational decisions (Ibid, 47). “Donors did not give money alone. They transferred to Russia the culture of the Western, mainly American, third sector through activist training, curricula, teaching aids, etc., and in communication with leading Russian TSOs, many of which were established on their initiative” (Jakobson and Sanovich: 2010, 286). Not all the NGOs got financing; this very aspect was a point of criticism, Alekseeva, well-known civil society practitioner and analyst, commented. She insists on the basis of the research conducted in 1994 – 1996 by the Charities Aid Foundation Russia, that the majority of Russian NGOs of that time did not receive any foreign funding (Alekseeva: 2010, 308). Alekseeva believes that NGOs that got foreign sponsorship constitute just 20% - 25% percent of all the organizations, and therefore she questions the legitimacy of the second model. As she puts it, “what is true is that a massive social sector, independent of foreign aid and by and large ignored by foreign foundations, existed in the shadow of better organized, more visible TSOs that received foreign funding” (Ibid, 309). Therefore, Alekseeva argues, it is not correct to cover all of the NGOs of the studied period by the umbrella-definition “import-dependent model”. They were weak, and experienced a lack of resources but it is hardly worth overestimating the impact foreign donors had (Ibid).

The rooted model is characteristic for the Russian third sector since the beginning of 2000s. Jakobson and Sanovich attribute the development of this model to a great extent to the emergence of a massive middle class (Jakobson and Sanovich: 2010, 289). As Anheier and Salamon argue, the creation of nonprofit organizations is in fact the work of urban middle class, especially educated; thus, the stronger the middle class is, the stronger the nonprofit sector is likely to be (Anheier and Salamon: 1994, 11). Not underestimating the ability of other classes to engage in the third sector, I accept the fact that the rise of the middle class, mainly explained by the economically stable period, constituted a social basis for the development of the third sector, not to forget about much more active support from business at that time (Jakobson and Sanovich, *ibid*). The turn to the third sector was, to some extent, a response to the restricted measures of the government with respect to political competition that resulted in a shift to private life. In terms of structural characteristics, the third sector represented the following chief spheres of NGOs activities: social service, education, healthcare, and the work of professional guilds and unions (Ibid).

This model shows some obstacles to the stable growth of the nonprofit sector. First, it is a lag of effective third sector institution supply behind resource supply (Jakobson and Sanovich: 2010, 291): for example, according to the 2006

statistics, 85% of philanthropists were acting on their own, although more than a half of them would prefer a collective action (Ibid). Second, a lack of confidence people demonstrate towards NGOs and towards other people in general (according to the 2006 poll, 47% of people considered some organizations to make profit under the mask of the third sector); second, a lack of money (64%), time (23%) and information (11%). on activities occurring within the framework of the third sector (Ibid, 292-293). Jakobson and Sanovich emphasize the fact that despite the time/money/confidence shortage people demonstrate a potential wish and readiness towards engagement in the third sector, thus, there is a root for the sector to survive and develop preconditioned by the overcoming of this prejudice, establishment of an appropriate information infrastructure and improvements in institutions themselves.(Ibid, 293).

Alekseeva argues that such a definition – the rooted model – arises from the authors' aspiration to exaggerate the influence of the foreign donors' activity during the previous period (namely, only now is the sector becoming rooted opposed to a presumably "unrooted" former stage) (Alekseeva: 2010, 310). She insists that this model may be rather nominated "balanced" where "different types of TSOs take their place and their share of public attention and different types of TSOs are seen to be equally important without preferences to this or that type of activity" (Ibid). Alekseeva distinguishes between the three types of third sector organizations existing nowadays in Russia:

- First, the remnants of policy-focused NGOs that faced a considerable decrease in foreign funding and now should deal with the choice whether to stick to their mission or to make some give-and-take in order to be eligible for the Russian foundations of the state support (Ibid).
- Second, registered social needs-focused organizations existing since the 1990s. These were created (or transformed from the Soviet institutions) as mechanisms of survival in the tougher times of economic crisis and now to a considerable degree have lost their importance because of improved economic conditions and other various legal ways of survival; these NGOs are therefore today searching for the new identity (Ibid.) They still lack public trust and resources; some advanced – sometimes through closer connections to the state and going back to the Soviet model of public organizations as extended instruments of government; some have turned to politics (Ibid, 311).
- Finally, third group is, according to Alekseeva, a vital sign of the country's and citizens' wealth. The organizations of the third type are mostly non-registered initiatives and associations of the middle class, "the first TSOs in the new Russian history that are created not by the needy or those united by common personal interests or even by protest, but by those who care about others, about people totally unrelated to them" (Ibid). The peculiarity and simultaneously the challenge with respect to the last group is its organizations existing in almost total isolation from policy-focused and social needs-focused organizations with activists and donors relying predominantly on personal contact and person-to-person assistance

wishing utter transparency. They are not willing to create formal structures because of the threat of immediate corruption (Ibid).

Both approaches suggested by Jakobson and Sanovich on one hand, and Alekseeva, on the other hand, show that the third sector in Russia, its recent developments notwithstanding, still experiences a stage of formation.

3) Degree of centralization is the last criterion offered by Anheier and Salamon in order to conceptualize the nonprofit sector; this criterion refers to the degree of centralization the citizens are ready or required to accept in the country's basic political and institutional structures (Anheier and Salamon: 1994, 12). The scholars argue that the more centralized the structure is, the less room for sustainable nonprofit sector is left and vice versa. Two examples are provided: Germany with its federal administrative structure, has historically quite lively nonprofit sector whereas France having centralized government, demonstrates a less vibrant third sector (Ibid).

The new Russian state at the beginning of the 1990s faced a challenge of transforming a highly centralized state structure into a federal one. A consensus among the scholars was reached, that the attempts to build a successful federal structure in the 1990s failed (Zhuravskaya: 2010). During the then new president Putin's first term a radical reform of federalism was accomplished which in fact meant much increased influence of the central government and decreased weight of the regions in terms of policy design and its implementation at all levels (Ibid, 71). Some scholars even call the current state structure "a mockery of federalism" (Ross: 2003). It is widely believed by the researchers that the reforms at the beginning of the 2000s led, in reality, to a greater centralization of the state despite the declaration of adherence to federalist principles (Zhuravskaya: 2010, Ross: 2003, Kapustina: 2001). Therefore, if we stick to Anheier and Salamon's assumption, we come to the conclusion that in terms of political and institutional structures Russian nonprofit sector is rather close to the French case with its high degree of centralization, leading to the less favorable conditions for its development and sustainable growth (we certainly do not equate the two cases, though).

The legislative changes on the third sector in the 2000s described above go in tune with the overall trend towards centralization. Anheier and Salamon believe there is a significant factor that influences the degree of centralization, namely state-Church relations with limited opportunities for the third sector in countries where the Church and state represent the a single unit; countries that demonstrate a sharp separation between the two are considered to have much more room for the flowering of the third sector (Anheier and Salamon: 1994, 12). With respect to Russia a first case may be distinguished: during the 2000s an obvious convergence of the Church and the state is observed. Here a wish the Church expressed towards influencing the public perception of the NGOs, mentioned above when the Church announced its position towards foreign-funded nonprofit organizations, may be appraised as a clear sign of state-church close relations.

Hypothesis: the review of the state of the nonprofit sector in Russia demonstrates that NGOs in Russia at the current stage still experience uncertainties with respect to future developments in the sector, legislation, and attitude from people and the state; this leads to a hypothesis that the overall environment in the nonprofit sector may be not very encouraging for the development of voluntary service, and therefore voluntary service organizations may experience some difficulties in their work because of that.

2.3.2. Nonprofit Sector in Germany

The third sector in Germany is widely regarded to have a long and stable tradition, although, as Seibel and Anheier clarify, the area between state and market is not commonly understood as a single institutional sector (Anheier and Seibel: 1993, 1). Having deep roots, it has therefore been examined much more thoroughly than the Russian third sector and has hence been applicable to various theoretical frameworks so far. First of all, I will focus on the three factors influencing the state of the nonprofit sector, defined by Anheier and Salamon, that were also addressed with respect to the Russian case.

1) Legal system. German legal system is characterized by the existence of the two distinct systems of law: the civic law applies to organizations and private individuals; the public law applies to public institutions (Anheier and Salamon: 1994, 4). Organizations hence should be a subject of either civic or public law. Regarding nonprofit organizations such distinction is hardly possible, since they, being private organizations, are often serving essentially public purposes (Ibid.). In order to respond to this challenge, various special provisions have been made with defining a range of civil law institutions that serve public needs (for example, so called “ideal associations” – Vereine, or foundations) (Ibid). These provisions notwithstanding, a certain degree of ambiguity remains in place in terms of the definition of the nonprofit sector (Ibid). As Anheier and Salamon put it, the third sector “is thoroughly mixed up with both governmental and private, for-profit spheres. The search for a nonprofit sector in Germany thus requires exceptional diligence and patience as well as a high tolerance for legal intricacy”. We may attribute such uncertainty partly to the historical roots of the German nonprofit sector and namely with its subsidiarity principle that, on one hand, preserves the freedom of NGOs, but on the other hand, leaves room for its dependence on the state in terms of financial support (although the current trends are showing changes, we will expand on this topic below).

2) Level of development achieved by the third sector. Zimmer and Hallmann (2002) note that the German nonprofit sector demonstrates clear economic strength and importance in the labour market (Ibid, 4). Anheier and Siebel declare that the significance of nonprofit sector in Germany is proved by the fact that social service organizations as, for example, Caritas and Diakonie, are among the largest employers in the country together with industrial giants Volkswagen and Bosch. The nonprofit sector, according to the data of above-mentioned authors, with about 5% of total employment, in terms of economic

weight is close to the transport and communication industry and surpasses chemical and printing industries combined (Anheier and Seibel: 2001, 1). The contribution the German nonprofit sector makes to the economy is roughly 4%⁴⁰.

3) Degree of centralization. Germany is a federal state with its states enjoying a considerably high degree of political power (Anheier and Salamon: 1997, 314), and this federalism, stemming from feudal times, together with subsidiarity principle, having its roots in the conflict between the state and the Catholic Church, leaves room for the favorable conditions for the nonprofit sector development (Anheier and Salamon: 1994).

In terms of Esping-Andersen's typology Germany represents a traditional example of a corporatist welfare state existing for rather a long time and under different political regimes with no dramatic alterations except for extending the system to embrace new categories of citizens and cover new risks and needs (Offe: 1991). The stable condition of corporatism was, however, recently contested as a contemporary trend of the German welfare state (Zimmer: 1999), I will address this issue below when I focus on the principle of subsidiarity developments.

According to the social origins theory, Germany is attributed to the corporatist regime as well (Anheier and Salamon: 1998, 242), and this needs some additional explanation. In order to provide it, I should cover the three distinct features of the formation of German society, that have historical roots and prerequisites, and that have therefore shaped the nonprofit sector significantly (Ibid). Some points will touch the issues provided above in the part devoted to the history of volunteering provided above; it is understandable if we take into account that the development of volunteering was taking place in fact within the framework of the nonprofit sector emergence. The abovementioned three features are:

- Principle of self-administration or self-government. This point has its roots in the 19th century conflict between the state aristocracy and bourgeoisie when freedom of association was partially granted within the autocratic society as a kind of compromise to mitigate the above mentioned conflict (Anheier and Seibel: 1993). "The principle of self-government, enacted in the chambers of commerce, professional associations and the new municipal constitutions, created a far-reaching pattern of institutional learning" (Ibid). What is important here is that the associational freedom was granted only to a limited degree, whereas the full control of institutional and political dynamics was still in the hands of the state (Ibid). By the end of the 19th century, another conflict emerged, this time between the state and the growing workers movement; the strategy of the state here was similar: with governmental policy and political integration it attempted to integrate the workers into the new nation-state, weakening the social democratic movement (Ibid, 5). Reform on social security

⁴⁰ Role of Non-Profit Sector in Economic Development of Russia (2005), Project "Integration of Civil Society for Non-Profit Taxation Reforming", The Institute for Urban Economics, p.13.

legislation also included the principle of self-administration, since social insurance corporations were independent bodies with representatives of the employers and employees on the board (Ibid). But, as Ahneier and Seibel stress, the state still exercised a close supervision over the principle of self-administration. They define the situation as a kind of “state-controlled autonomy”, a classic model of neo-corporatism which has become a model of German politics as a whole and government-third sector relations in particular (Ibid).

- Principle of communal economy (Gemeinwirtschaft). According to it, non-market, non-competitive production of commodities and delivery of services is implied (Ibid, 7). The principle was based on non-capitalist order of economic production. “Communal economy refers to that part of the economy which is guided by the principle of maximizing the public good rather than private returns only” (Ibid, 15). Anheier and Seibel stress that the term *Gemeinwirtschaft* is essential by itself, since it bears some resemblance and connection to the notion of *Gemeinschaft* (community) developed by Toennis; and *Gemeinwirtschaft* can therefore be understood as a form of communal economy, and a third choice between “free market capitalism” and “bureaucratic socialism” (Ibid, 5). It is also important that this has contributed to the revival of rural traditions of help among independent producers. The term lost some of its influence recently because many of the communal economy organizations have turned commercial (Ibid).
- The principle of subsidiarity also explains many features of state-nonprofit sector relations. Subsidiarity means that the state carries out only the functions that the private sector cannot provide, and that larger units such as the central government perform exclusively the tasks that are beyond the capabilities of smaller units such as regional and local government, but also private units such as church congregations or the family (Anheier: 2005, 298). This principle also stems from a conflict, this time between state and the Catholic Church in the second part of the 19th century. In Protestant Prussia intensified political Catholicism was a subject of concerns and a challenge, therefore the Catholic-related groups had to experience some restrictive measures (Anheier and Seibel: 1993, 6). Although the conflict was later settled, it led to the adoption of the subsidiarity principle which meant “the priority of individual compassion and solidarity instead of state-organized assistance and public welfare programs” (Ibid), therefore considering the role of the state as solely “subsidiary” one. This attitude after World War II became crucial for state-nonprofit sector interactions (Ibid).

Subsidiarity has thus quite a long tradition, but it achieved its full impact in terms of nonprofit sector formation only by the 1970s - predominantly in the spheres of health care and social service provision (Anheier: 2005). The principle of subsidiarity involves the implementation of public welfare programs through a network of free welfare associations (peak organizations) that were granted legal

privileges against commercial competitors, and represented partnership between the state and parts of the nonprofit sector (Ibid). In the areas of health care and social services “government was obliged to cooperate exclusively with the Welfare Associations and to provide them substantial financial support; at the same time, the independence and self-determination of the local service-delivering NPOs was guaranteed” (Zimmer: 1999, 41). What is, however, significant, is that the nonprofit sector grew more actively in the spheres where this partnership developed, such as social services, but in others, such as education, growth was less obvious (Anheier: 2005, 298). Because of the privileged positions welfare associations turned into the largest parts of the German nonprofit sector (Zimmer, *ibid.*).

Such favorable position, however, by the 1980s led to a crisis of legitimacy, as Zimmer argues, when welfare associations were accused of losing connection to the local constituencies and turning into huge bureaucracies; the general accusation was inability to respond adequately to the needs of the German postmodern society (Ibid). All these contributed to the undermining of the subsidiarity principle, according to Zimmer: as she puts it, in the results of the changes brought by the fiscal crisis, peak organizations lost their privileged position “particularly in youth welfare services, outpatient care, and care for the elderly, less well established NPOs as well as commercial providers were accepted on equal footing with the Associations and therefore became eligible for insurance allowances as well as government grants” (Ibid, 44). Such changes led to a situation where welfare organizations had to adopt new business-like approaches in the new environment which, in the case of some local NGOs, meant change of the legal form to the business (Ibid, 45). These circumstances, Zimmer explains, may be presupposed by the general trend of the rise of the civic culture in Germany going in tune with the recent tendency of neoliberal shift to welfare pluralism, resulting in a preference of a more competitive approach to welfare service provision with nonprofit, commercial, and public service providers. What this shift simultaneously involves is the integration of self-help groups, volunteers and family members into a revised system of health care and social services provision (Ibid). A turn to welfare pluralism and competitiveness as its characteristic feature brought up a question: do the nonprofit organizations indeed serve the needs of welfare clients best? (Zimmer: 2011).

Apart from the crisis of legitimacy, welfare associations faced a crisis of identity, as Zimmer believes, and this crisis is presupposed by its new position as a social service industry that has to put an emphasis on efficiency (Ibid). As a result, welfare associations answer with separation between their lobbying activities and service provision, with local nonprofit organizations focusing on the latter and associations – on the former; and with greater involvement of volunteers as an attempt to preserve a special organizational culture and identity (Ibid).

Zimmer questions in terms of undermining the principle of subsidiarity – the core issue of corporatism – the very effectiveness of the corporatist idea with respect to the German nonprofit sector (Ibid, 46). The new local initiatives as a

reflection of civic activity on the local level are gaining force, whereas peak organizations are losing support and legitimacy (Ibid, 46-47). Zimmer and Hallmann (2002) argue that the public perception of the NGOs is very different: the third sector organizations active in the sphere of health care and social services provision traditionally heavily subsidized by the state, are to a great extent seen as incompetent and thus unable to compete with the market (Zimmer and Hallmann: 2002, 9). Whereas NGOs active in the fields of environment and international activities enjoy a high reputation and are perceived as the embodiment of civic-mindedness and values (Ibid.). By and large the German nonprofit sector, Zimmer argues, is at a crossroads nowadays, since the trends of postmodern society with its increased individualism and the intensified social movements contravene the applicability of corporatism to provide and sustain the vitality of the nonprofit sector in the changed circumstances (Zimmer: 1999, 47).

Hypothesis: a review of the German nonprofit sector shows that despite the fact that the state appears to be quite robust, which is explained historically with the developments the country started to experience in the 19th century, the current trends demonstrate some signs of changes the sector is going to face. These changes are mainly connected with the undermining of the principle of subsidiarity, which, in terms of voluntary service organizations, may lead to the necessity for them to be also more competitive to get state funding and to engage people to volunteer.

Thus, after examination of the issues of national youth policy, understanding of volunteering and third sector characteristics on the level of national environments in Russia and Germany, another range of hypotheses were introduced. They will be presented in the introductory part to the third chapter and will be tested later on the concrete examples of organizations examined in both countries.

3. Influence of Youth Policy, Volunteering and Nonprofit Sector on the Examples of Russian and German Organizations

In the previous chapter the implementation of youth policy on the national level in Russia and Germany was addressed; understanding of volunteering in both countries throughout history and nowadays was examined; and the nonprofit sector with its distinct features in Russia and Germany was focused on. As a result of these examinations initial hypotheses were reformulated and the following hypotheses were introduced:

1) Youth policy on the national level influences the development of youth voluntary service organizations in Russia and Germany. In the Russian case, youth policy with its predominant orientation to view youth more as a resource of dealing with the current and future economic hardships leads to the situation when the youth voluntary service organizations are neglected in the sense that they are not supported by the state as a per se essential part of youth

development. The expected result is therefore an establishment and development of grassroots organizations that exist mainly on membership fees and various grants. In Germany, on the other hand, the mixed resource-problem approach of dealing with youth is expected to mean that young people are more a “resource for themselves”, and such attitude leaves much space for youth voluntary service projects; the specific paternalistic nature of youth policies in Germany stipulates the well-established and well-structured formal voluntary service organizations funded mainly from the state.

2) The perception of volunteering influences the development of youth voluntary service organizations in Russia and Germany. Since the understanding of the concept “voluntary work” has undergone significant changes in 20th century in Russia, with some depreciation of the phenomenon, voluntary service organizations may experience a lack of project participants and have to invest additional efforts in the promotion of volunteering. At the same time, the review of the history of the 1990s, with the emergence of voluntary movement in its current sense, makes us come to a hypothesis that contemporary understanding of volunteering in Russia is in fact transported from Western countries. Opposition to the “mandatory voluntary” work and acceptance of Western experience and notion of voluntary engagement appear to be the two pillars that the current Russian understanding of volunteerism is built on. This may be a factor influencing the way voluntary service organizations function in Russia. With respect to Germany, the history of volunteering in this country shows that the perception of voluntary work has undergone some changes as well; although, unlike in Russia, there was, by and large, no essentially negative connotations to the notion of volunteering across the history. The change of perception is rather linked to the changing environments of the 21st century and means that, together with traditionally established structures for voluntary services, new ones are gaining popularity and this fact may influence the work of the former ones.

3) The distinct features of the nonprofit sector influence the development of youth voluntary service organizations in Russia and Germany. Review of the state of the nonprofit sector in Russia demonstrates that NGOs in Russia at the current stage, still experience uncertainties with respect to future developments in the sector, legislation, and attitude from people and the state; this leads to a hypothesis that the overall environment in the nonprofit sector may not be very encouraging for the development of voluntary service, and therefore voluntary service organizations may experience some difficulties in their work because of that. Review of the German nonprofit sector shows that despite the fact its state appears to be quite robust - which is explained historically by the specific developments the country started to experience in the 19th century, the current trends demonstrate some signs of changes the sector is going to face. The changes are mainly connected to the undermining of the principle of subsidiarity, which, in terms of voluntary service organizations, may lead to the necessity for them to be more competitive to get the state funding and to engage people to volunteer.

These hypotheses will thus be tested in the third chapter below on the examples of organizations in Russia and Germany. The first part will introduce the two cases – Russian and German with two respective examples each (four in total), the second part will include the testing of hypotheses on youth policy, the third part – on understanding of volunteering, the fourth part – on the nonprofit sector. Finally, the fifth part will present a conclusion.

3.1. Methodology, Cases and Examples

In order to test the hypotheses on the two chosen cases – Russia and Germany – I selected four organizations directly or indirectly involved in the process of voluntary service in Russia and Germany. Empirical data were collected through the internships in the two of studied organizations, through the work in one of them and through interviewing the staff of the last one.

Below I will provide the description of each of the organizations I selected as an example for this or that case. The main issues I addressed with respect to each organization will also be presented. It may appear that more space is devoted to Good Deeds Case, the reason is my work in this organization that explains the more detailed observation of the activities carried out. I will nevertheless try to avoid using it to the prejudice of the paper findings.

3.1.1. Case of Russia

In Russia two organizations were chosen: Good Deeds Case and German-Russian Exchange. Such selection is presupposed by the fact that both organizations perform voluntary service projects.

3.1.1.1. Good Deeds Case (*Чемодан добрых дел*)

Good Deeds Case as a voluntary service organization created in 2010. The main and initial direction of its development was organizing international youth workcamps. Workcamp is a voluntary project where young people (although age limit usually does not exist) participate in a project for the local community. Short-, middle- and long-term projects are defined, with accordingly following duration: 2-4 weeks, 3-6 months, more than 6 months. The range of activities is quite wide: reconstruction, environmental protection, work with children, elderly or disabled people. As a rule, people from different countries take part in such activities, therefore except the immediate result of their voluntary work, they are encouraged to share their cultural and personal experience for the better understanding of the people around the world.

The organization participates in implementation of the workcamps within the umbrella-association Alliance of Youth Voluntary Service Organizations (since Good Deeds Case is quite young so far, it has a right to participate in Alliance activities only on condition that it gets five support letters from partner organizations from the Alliance). In order to understand how the system of

workcamp implementation functions, I will briefly describe the work of the Alliance.

The procedure is the following: two representatives of every member or partner organization of the Alliance participate in a Technical Meeting; every organization presents via them projects of volunteering camps in their respective countries, and gets acquainted with other projects. As a rule, then bilateral negotiations aim at signing agreements between organizations. This mutual exchange results in the fact that every national organization possesses a database of workcamp projects prepared to be done in the current year. This database is then offered to volunteers in the home country, who choose a project to participate in. The process of sending volunteers from a country is, as a rule, facilitated by a national volunteer organization, which sends an application of an individual to the organization, which arranges a chosen workcamp, and vice versa. A national organization serves as a necessary go-between for a volunteer and the organization which arranges a project – otherwise the two could interact without a third side. But the latter is stipulated by the very aims of cooperation and development of volunteering around the world: a person pays a fee to a national organization to take part in a project, and this money is used to arrange workcamps in the home country of this organization. A host organization, by-term, uses fees from its volunteers going to other workcamps, to organize projects at its place. A procedure of sending/receiving volunteers is well-established and requires the agency of the Alliance. Thus, the initial direction of Good Deeds Case development was solely implementation of workcamps in St. Petersburg and sending local volunteers to workcamps in different countries. In 2011 Good Deeds Case sent 35 and hosted 20 volunteers. Gradually the range of projects widened. As the chief of the organization puts it:

“At first we had just an idea to develop international workcamps. But very fast this idea turned out to be not the only one, we initiated other projects such as a free Spanish conversational club, because one of volunteers knew Spanish; then the project “Combating stereotypes” emerged, where we invited a foreigner living in St. Petersburg or just visiting the city to participate in a meeting with local people interested in intercultural communication. Step by step, a lot of other projects showed up” (Interview 1, Good Deeds Case).

Among the other activities of Good Deeds Case is, for example, participation in environmental projects (e.g. refuse collection), arrangement of leisure activities for children living in orphanages and elderly people in geriatric homes (e.g. New Year performance of volunteers), support of animal shelters, and organization of various kinds of cultural activities for young people. As well as the conversational club mentioned above (now different languages are available, among others French, German and English) and the project “Combating stereotypes”, following activities are carried out: amateur theatre, parody shows and culinary project “World Cuisines”. Thus, starting with international workcamps (which involves the organization of those in one’s local environment if one wants to take part in the exchange system facilitated by the Alliance), Good Deeds Case turned into a youth organization with a varied range of activities with social (work with children,

elderly), cultural and intercultural orientation. It should be noted, of course, that workcamps per se may be devoted to social needs as well; however, workcamps are generally seasonal activities, and they are as a rule arranged during summer – beginning of autumn (it is the most popular season, though during other times of the year workcamps are arranged as well, there are not many of them available). The other projects are implemented irrespectively of season.

The choice of Good Deeds Case is to some extent influenced by the fact that I work in this organization, but I consider this choice as quite reasonable, since the position of “insider” enables me to examine the organization from within. I admit that in such case a threat of subjectivity exists; I nevertheless tried to reduce the risk. I have worked in Good Deeds Case since its creation in November 2010 (the fact that such a young organization was chosen, in my opinion, allows to trace its development literally from the first steps). My work enables me to participate in the implementation of projects and observe the whole range of activities performed by Good Deeds Case. As noted, I had an opportunity to observe the work of the organization from its origins, and, what is crucial, the changes that took place within this short lapse of time of a year and a half. In order to deepen my knowledge on the organization, its values and principles of work, I conducted two interviews with its director. Despite her young age, she already has quite a solid working experience in the sphere of youth voluntary service, since she used to work in another St. Petersburg organization, Mir Tesen, for several years, and afterwards had decided to create her own organization. Good Deed Case may be regarded as a grassroots organization, since it was originally created as an initiative of several young people willing to establish a successful voluntary service organization because the one which existed before its creation, Mir Tesen, was considered to function not that effectively and needed improvement. Afterwards, this initiative grew into a registered organization of voluntary service and then into a youth organization with a wide spectrum of activities performed, although it still experiences a stage of rapid development with a lot of new projects and ideas emerging all the time. Although Good Deed Case is quite a young organization, it has received some credits so far. For example, workcamp “Petersburg Initiatives” implemented by Good Deeds Case in 2011 was recognized as the Best Voluntary Project in the city contest carried out by the House of Youth⁴¹, and the chief of Good Deeds Case in February 2012 won the title of the head of the Best Youth or Children's Public Association 2011⁴².

3.1.1.2. German-Russian Exchange (Немецко-русский обмен)

Since I neither did an internship in the second chosen organization German-Russian Exchange, nor work there, the empirical data on this organization were collected through the examination of its website <http://obmen.org/> and through the interview with Volunteer and Internship

⁴¹ Nash gorod stal eshe dobree. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://dom-molodej.spb.ru/?cat=6&paged=2>.

⁴² Molodezhnaya premiya 2011 // Delovoy Peterburg.02.03.2012: http://www.dp.ru/a/2012/03/01/Molodezhnaya_premija_2011/

Programmes Coordinator. German-Russian Exchange was created in 1992 as the St. Petersburg office of German organization Deutsch-Russischer Austausch e.V. emerged in 1991 in Berlin on donations collected during public campaign aiming to attract attention to social problems in Russia⁴³. As a representative of the organization explains,

“German-Russian Exchange was created by student-volunteers who wanted somehow to establish good relations between the two countries, to help the emergence and development of civil society in Russia” (Interview 3, German-Russian Exchange).

German-Russian Exchange develops projects in four main directions: voluntary exchange, school exchange, cultural exchange and human rights education. Besides, the organization helps young people to find places to do an internship abroad. According to the organization’s information, volunteering as a core idea has been introduced since the creation of German-Russian Exchange. The organization does not arrange workcamps yet (but provides another examined organization, Good Deeds Case, with a place to introduce their programs):

“We had an idea to develop workcamps, we have just recently had a presentation Good Deeds Case did with respect to their workcamps. I think there is a great demand for such things nowadays” (Interview 3, German-Russian Exchange).

German-Russian Exchange implements projects within the framework of European Voluntary Service, financed by the European Union; it is the main direction of volunteering development in the organization. Such projects are voluntary service as well; they focus on personal development, promotion of informal education and tolerance to different cultures. Young people work in social, environmental, cultural and sport spheres. These are the long-term projects, duration 3 – 12 months. German-Russian Exchange as a sending and hosting organization sends about 15 volunteers per year to different countries, and hosts 3 at its office, according to the information from its representative.

In fact, there are a lot of projects that involve volunteers, as well as the ones implemented in the frame of “voluntary exchange”. For example, a new project Underground was recently introduced:

“The project includes excursions to contemporary German places in St. Petersburg, and the idea is that Germans who live here and Russian youth cooperate and search for such modern German places, elaborate excursions and carry them out for all interested” (Interview 3, German-Russian Exchange).

Moreover, German-Russian Exchange promotes exchange between journalists, NGO specialists between Russian and European countries, arranges study seminars on volunteering, youth political education, festivals, encourages youth civic and cultural initiatives.

⁴³ Nemetsko-Russkii Obmen: Istroya. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://obmen.org/objects/istoriya>.

3.1.2. Case of Germany

In Germany as well two organizations were studied: the International Youth Joint Service (die Internationalen Jugendgemeinschaftsdienste) and the Foundation German Russian Youth Exchange⁴⁴. The first is a voluntary service organization (although the scope of its projects goes beyond the limits of such a definition, this issue will be discussed later); the second one is an organization that is active in the sphere of financing different kinds of youth projects; it may be thus also relevant with respect to the development of voluntary service organizations in Germany.

3.1.2.1. Foundation German-Russian Youth Exchange (Stiftung Deutsch-Russischer Jugendaustausch: SDRJA)

In both of chosen German organizations I have done internships. Although the foundation German-Russian Youth Exchange in Hamburg cannot be regarded as a voluntary service organization itself, it is, in my opinion, an interesting example in terms of studied topic. SDRJA is rather an organization that serves as an intermediary in funding various youth programs and offers advice to volunteers who are going to engage themselves in long-term voluntary service (we should bear in mind with respect to funding issue that only bilateral programs between Germany and Russia are financed due to a specific nature of the foundation which I will address below). The foundation has been working since 2005. This organization specializes in the sphere of youth exchanges between Russia and Germany, and aims at enhancing cooperation, evolving mutual understanding, and developing friendly relations between people of the two countries. The foundation is financed by means of the German Federal Ministry of Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth, the Robert Bosch Foundation, the Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg and The Committee on Eastern European Economic Relations.

There are three directions of exchanges encouraged by the foundation: school, teachers', and professional exchanges. What is important, the scope of organization's activities is not limited to the exchanges only: SDRJA deals as well with the problems of young migrants, and general questions of advancing civic education and participation. Another essential activity carried out at the foundation is promotion of the Russian language. Various projects aim to encourage young people from Germany to study Russian, and what is here crucial – many projects are free of charge. One striking example here is "Russisch kommt!"-box. It is in fact a big box full of materials to learn Russian: the Russian studies books, itineraries, games, toys and various resources helpful in terms of Russian language promotion. This box may be obtained and used for some time without paying (excluding delivery costs). The foundation has a sister

⁴⁴ From here on, for the sake of space saving, I will generally refer to the International Youth Joint Service using the German abbreviation *ijgd*, and, following the style guide of the organization, I will use lowercase letters and plural form. Besides, to avoid confusion, I will address German-Russian Youth Exchange, using the German abbreviation SDRJA (from German: Stiftung Deutsch-Russischer Jugendaustausch).

organization in Moscow (Stiftung Internationaler Jugendaustausch – Фонд международных молодежных обменов), but the activities of the latter, according to the data of SDRJA, are not as wide-scale due to various reasons, first of all, due to lack of financing⁴⁵.

I have done a two-month internship at the foundation; during that time I had an opportunity to take part in the organization's activities. I examined different kinds of sources useful in terms of getting to know how the foundation functions: printed data, information on the official website (<http://www.stiftung-drja.de>), discussions with my colleagues and the head of SDRJA. The essence of the day-to-day work of SDRJA is processing numerous applications received from youth organizations throughout Germany. The latter seek to get financing, and the foundation is basically an intermediary here which considers the applications relevant enough in terms of some necessary conditions (a German youth organization should have a partner in Russia, the aim of the exchange lies in the very exchange, there should be a definite number of participants etc.). What was also important in terms of my work at the foundation: I was a witness and a participant of some events and projects held there in the framework of its activities. For instance, I took part at the meeting with Russian participants of the project carried out with the Association German Youth in Europe (Deutsche Jugend in Europa Bundesverband). Besides, I participated at the meeting with the members of St. Petersburg based organization "Coming Out" which fights for equal treatment of gays, lesbians, bisexual and transgender people. The meeting was held in Hamburg town-hall and some politicians involved in supporting gay and lesbian rights took part in the discussion. The meeting was an example of activities accomplished within the bounds of a definite project, which got the financing via intermediary – SDRJA. Participation in such kind of activities helped me to get a detailed impression of the foundation's work – not just at the office where the application are dealt with, but where the real projects are carried out in practice as well.

3.1.2.2. International Youth Joint Service (Die Internationalen Jugendgemeinschaftsdienste: ijgd)

The second German organization is ijgd, voluntary service organization with six head offices and twelve regional offices in Germany. As noted above, the range of activities ijgd performs, goes far beyond voluntary service projects, therefore the organization tends to define itself as "active in the field of international youth work⁴⁶". ijgd were founded at the turn of 1949 – 1950 years when pupils from Hannover organized the first workcamps to promote ideas of peaceful working and living together of different nations without negative stereotypes about each other on the wave of postwar peace and tolerance encouragement⁴⁷. ijgd are a member of one of six peak organizations mentioned

⁴⁵ From a private conversation with an employee of the department Out-of-School Exchange at German Russian Youth Exchange.

⁴⁶ ijgd: Who We Are and What We Do. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.ijgd.de/Who-we-are.33.0.html?&L=1>

⁴⁷ Festschrift zum Jubiläum der Internationalen Jugendgemeinschaftsdienste. 2009, p. 5.

in the second chapter, namely the Association of Non-affiliated Charities (Deutscher Paritätischer Wohlfahrtsverband, DPWV)⁴⁸. ijgd cooperate with other partners with other members of this association in its work.

Here a distinction should be made between different projects implemented by ijgd. According to the report *Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe* produced by the Public Policy and Management Institute in 2009, two groups of voluntary service in Germany are defined. First, there are programs such as European Voluntary Service (EVS), briefly touched upon with respect to German-Russian Exchange, which also implement projects in the framework of this program, and German national programs which are defined with the umbrella term “regulated”, because they fall under jurisdiction of public law and thus subsidized by the state. The second group is so-called “non-regulated” voluntary projects which are subject to private law and hence usually not financed by the state, but rather through the agreement of hosting and sending organizations⁴⁹ (the scheme was described on the example of the Alliance of Youth Voluntary Service Organizations above; it is not the only tool to facilitate the cooperation of organizations with respect to the arrangement of workcamps, but it is a well-known one and unites 49 members from 30 countries of Europe, America and Asia⁵⁰). ijgd offer about 120 workcamps in Germany per year which is about 20% of all workcamps arranged in Germany, and sends the German volunteers abroad to workcamps implemented by the partner organizations⁵¹.

Regulated national German voluntary projects which ijgd arrange include Voluntary Year of Social Service (Freiwilliges Soziales Jahr), Voluntary Year of Ecological Service (Freiwilliges Ökologisches Jahr), Voluntary Year of Social Service Abroad (Freiwilliges Soziales Jahr International), Voluntary Year in Monument Preservation and Care (Freiwilliges Jahr in der Denkmalpflege), Voluntary Year of Social Service in Politics (Freiwilliges Soziales Jahr im Politischen Leben), Voluntary Year of Social Service in Science, Engineering and Sustainability (Freiwilliges Soziales Jahr in Wissenschaft, Technik und Nachhaltigkeit). These are all a possibility for young people to engage themselves voluntarily for a year and, as a rule, are focused on people from 16 to 26 years old who have finished compulsory schooling. The first Voluntary Year of Social Service Program was implemented in 1964, later various spheres were added⁵². Very often German young people use the year after their compulsory schooling is completed to think over the future directions of their lives and either travel or participate in voluntary year. It helps to try their hand in some new activity and understand what they would probably like to study in the future. ijgd support volunteers during their voluntary year with various seminars, educational meetings, workshops and other mutual activities aiming to foster the exchange of knowledge, experience and encourage sharing of ideas.

⁴⁸ Deutscher Paritätischer Wohlfahrtsverband - Gesamtverband e. V.: Mitglieder: <http://www.der-paritaetische.de/verband/mitglieder/i/jgd/>

⁴⁹ *Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe* (2010), p.169.

⁵⁰ The Alliance of Youth Voluntary service Organizations: [http://www.alliance-network.eu/index.php?page=Page-](http://www.alliance-network.eu/index.php?page=Page-2)

2.

⁵¹ *Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe*. Op. cit.

⁵² *Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe*, p. 170.

My month-internship took part in Magdeburg office of ijgd. During this internship I worked in the department of international workcamps and had a chance to acquire a deep impression of ijgd work principles, values and main directions of its activities. My duties included immediate work in the department such as processing requests of young people willing to engage themselves in one of the voluntary service project; cooperation with a partner Russian organization with respect to one of the projects implemented in 2012 in Bryansk; and elaboration of the flyer on the Russian-German project. Moreover, I had a wonderful opportunity to get a deep knowledge of ijgd's activities through participation in two seminars carried out by the organization. The first one was devoted to camp-leading (Jugendleitung Seminar, Wittenberg, 17 – 22 February 2012) and focused on the methods of youth work and skills necessary for the workcamp leaders. In fact, I got an introduction into the basic principles of ijgd's work there, which then were specified with respect to the workcamp environment. The second seminar is the one on work with the media carried out in the framework of Voluntary Ecological Year Program (Magdeburg, 24 – 26 February 2012), which was a usual meeting of the long-term volunteers engaged in this program. This seminar was led by my colleague Franziska Ilse who coordinated my work during the internship and therefore introduced me into the whole range of the projects of such kind implemented within the Voluntary Ecological/Social Year Programs. These two seminars enabled me to investigate two examples from the range of very diverse projects implemented by ijgd and to be a participant, not just an observer of those, which I find especially important in terms of getting profound knowledge on the organization examined. Besides the abovementioned activities, books and brochures on ijgd were studied, as well as its website <http://www.ijgd.de>. I conducted also four interviews with Ann-Katrin Preuschoft, chief of Magdeburg office, and with Franziska Ilse, executive officer responsible for workcamps and youth education (two interviews with each person).

The German case with its two examples appears to be quite an illustrative one; however, one should take into consideration the fact that no grassroots organizations in Germany were examined. I admit that I didn't study any grassroots voluntary service organizations in Germany, since it is much easier to find one having existed within the framework of formal structure for a long time already, as it is in the example of ijgd. Therefore, examination of grassroots German organization seems to be quite an interesting direction for future research and besides a necessary element for deeper understanding of the studied topic.

3.2. Influence of Youth Policy on the Development of Youth Voluntary Service Organizations

In this part the influence of youth policy on the national level will be applied to the examples of Russian and German organizations with the aim of testing the hypotheses.

3.2.1. Case of Russia

According to the hypothesis introduced in the result of the two previous chapters, youth policy in Russia influences youth voluntary organizations in a way that orientation of youth policy to regard young people rather as a resource to deal with current problems the country faces, leads to the situation where youth voluntary service is neglected by the state (here I mean generally that such projects are not supported or financed by the state); hence grassroots organizations emerge and have to exist on membership fees and grants. This hypothesis appeared to be confirmed almost utterly. First of all, lack of financial support from the state was repeatedly mentioned:

“It is generally very hard to obtain any financing from the state; the Committee on Youth Policy and Cooperation with Public Associations – its second part hardly functions at all! There is one grant within the committee but everything is already allocated there before the contest starts, every year the same organizations take part, and the same win”; “There is impossible to receive a permanent financial support from the state – money which we need in order to have the organization existed; there are always grants which means subsidy – one should first spend his own money, and then he will be reimbursed by the costs; “The Committee on Youth Policy is the poorest among others, much poorer than, for example, The Committee on Social Policy” (Interviews 1 and 2, Good Deeds Case).

Although the previous expert mentions that it is “almost impossible” to get a grant from the state, Good Deeds Case managed to do it recently with respect to its new project “Dream in a Suitcase” which aims to help socially disadvantaged people to fulfill their dreams. Nevertheless, the system of subsidizing on youth projects is seen by the experts as an obstacle to voluntary service development.

“Organization should have its own resources to carry out a project. Thus we can say that youth initiatives are not supported by the state – youth can hardly find the financial resources to perform projects” (Interview 3, German-Russian Exchange).

In spite of this, state support does exist, though not in financial form, rather in the form of granting accommodation or transport for some short-term voluntary projects.

An expert from German-Russian Exchange emphasizes the difference between the two countries in the way they finance voluntary service organizations: the support of the organization from the state on a regular basis is impossible in Russia, unlike in Germany. The expert from Good Deeds Case agrees:

“We exist on membership fees which cover some expenses – on mobile communication, on documents, posting, there are always some small spending which we pay with fees <...> the situation when the Committee on Youth Policy every month transfers to our account 5 thousand rubles is impossible” (Interview 1, Good Deeds Case).

German-Russian Exchange as an established long before organization financed to a considerable degree through German foundations and the European Union, appears to suffer less from the lack of state financial support; for newly emerged Good Deeds Case such a lack of resources is more obvious, since this organization can indeed be defined as solely voluntary: people engaged in its activities do not earn money, and the organization still does not have its own office:

“This year we want to save some money on hosting volunteers here; we are going to negotiate with one of the big supermarket chains to provide us with food for the volunteers, for a chain it is little money, and we would rent an office on them and pay some minimal salary to those who work in Good Deeds Case” (Interview 1, Good Deeds Case).

Lack of financial support from the state and hence, shortage of money, on one hand, may to a considerable degree be disadvantageous for the development of youth voluntary service organization, on the other hand, such “extreme conditions” should inevitably encourage organizations to all the time make up new projects deserving financial support. As expert from Good Deeds Case puts it, “There should always be a constant search for the money” which makes them invent new projects.

What appears to be interesting in state-voluntary organizations relations is the role informality plays there. New organizations tend to be regarded with a certain degree of distrust; allowing for the fact that, as the expert from Good Deeds Case puts it, “the same organizations that have existed for 15 years participate in state contests every time”, newcomers experience difficulties in getting recognition.

“When some new organization comes up, it is unknown, it is not trusted, it will hardly get a subsidy from the state. It is a bit easier for Good Deeds Case, since we have already got along well with the Committee so far – by why? Because there are people there with whom we have good personal relations. Exactly because of these good relations we have acquired a good treatment from the state, and it means that Good Deeds Case is known in the Committee, thus if we need some information support (not financial), we will most likely get it” (Interview 2, Good Deeds Case).

Support of the organizations loyal to the state is another emphasis put by the experts of both organizations:

“If the state supports some organizations, these are close to it. The first contest for grants in St. Petersburg was distributed among the ones close to the state – state-established organizations, there are quite a lot of them, and they obtain most of the grants from the state <...> they therefore implement projects the state approves, on patriotic education, for example” (Interview 3, German-Russian Exchange).

The general course of youth policy on volunteering development, although proclaiming encouragement of youth initiatives, still appears to neglect the real needs of voluntary service organizations. This point may be confirmed by the

observation made by the expert from German-Russian Exchange: “We have recently had a Year of Volunteering in Russia – either last or this year; the very fact that I do not remember means that no significant activities devoted to this year were carried out”. Absence of official status of a volunteer (legislative neglect) gives evidence on the above-mentioned point:

“We still face the difficulty when we cannot officially get a visa with respect to volunteering. There is no such definition in legal documents yet. Thus, there are either youth relations or an internship or some agreements with universities that make invitations as if volunteers studied there” (Interview 3, German-Russian Exchange).

Treatment of youth as more a resource to deal with current problems is a point confirmed by the experts:

“In Russia all the stratum of population are treated equally by the state, namely, not the state for you, rather you for the state. You are supposed to give birth, to earn more money to support the ageing population, pensioners, allowing for our proportion of working population and those who are out of work. Strange it may be, youth are supposed to think about that, not the state. I would say, there is a consumer attitude to young people. The state is not interested therefore to develop youth from some other points, I think” (Interview 3, German-Russian Exchange).

Evidence on such a position may be given with respect to the development of very specific parts of the voluntary movement; the coming Olympic Games in Sochi in 2014, as every event of such scale needs thousands of volunteers. That is why the state started encouraging young people to engage themselves as volunteers in Sochi. Such encouragement may be seen rather negatively as a single event that does not include plans on long-term development:

“Development of volunteering promoted by the state is connected to such point projects as the Olympic Games, in my opinion. The state just realized that it would need people to help to accommodate quests, to regulate the events during the Games. Then the Football World Championship in 2018 will be held in Russia. Until that time volunteering will for sure be proclaimed by the state as an important phenomenon, if we win some other event, maybe later as well” (Interview 3, German-Russian Exchange).

What appears to be problematic with respect to the Olympic Games is that volunteering tends to be perceived as essential just in terms of the necessity to arrange the sport event in a proper way. Therefore some doubts come up, whether voluntary work per se, irrespectively of current needs is regarded by the state as an important element in the personal development of people. According to a more positive stance, expressed by Dmitry Chernyshenko, Sochi Games CEO, the Games will contribute to the reigniting of the voluntary movement in Russia and will bring about a deep change to Russian society⁵³.

⁵³ Chernyshenko D. Sochi 2014 Reignites Youth Volunteering in Russia. New Europe. November 27, 2011. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.neurope.eu/blog/sochi-2014-reignites-youth-volunteering-russia>.

The empirical data analysis with respect to the examined issue, influence of the state youth policy on the development of youth voluntary service organizations, confirms the initial hypothesis; in the situation where the state supports voluntary movement quite selectively, voluntary service organizations are encouraged to elaborate new interesting projects all the time to have a chance of getting state subsidy. Such chance, as it was shown above, exists, in spite of quite a sober view of the situation experts demonstrated, but anyway organizations need to rely on some other sources of funding. In terms of other sources, old-established organizations such as German-Russian Exchange (which celebrates its 20th anniversary in 2012), which besides have developed connections to the foreign foundations, are in more advantageous positions than newly-emerged ones, such as Good Deeds Case.

3.2.2. Case of Germany

With respect to the German case and influence of youth policy on voluntary service organizations development the following hypothesis was introduced: since the youth are seen in Germany as rather a mixture of a resource and a problem, there is much space for different kinds of projects focused on self-development of young people, and voluntary service is one of the directions of such projects. It results in well- and long-established voluntary service organizations funded mainly from the state. The hypothesis was generally confirmed as a result of empirical data analysis, some unexpected points came up though. It is necessary to take into account that the fact that Germany has a well-developed structure of voluntary service organizations was obvious from the very outset (the large-scale programs funded from the state such as Voluntary Year of Social Service, give evidence); the question was though, whether this structure was indeed influenced by the youth policy in the way described above, and whether some changes are taking place at the present time.

First of all, the youth policy in Germany declares the inherent importance of the notions “non-formal education” and “informal education” along with formal education⁵⁴. The three forms of learning were defined by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)⁵⁵. Formal education or learning then is organized, structured and has learning objectives. Non-formal education means an educative processes characterized by flexible curricula and methodology that can be adapted to the necessities and interests of students (Zaki Dib: 1988, 301). The second, informal education does not correspond to an organized and systematic approach to education and supplements both formal and non-formal education. Informal education means learning that is never organized, “has no set objective in terms of learning outcomes and is never intentional from the learner’s standpoint. Often it is referred to as learning by

⁵⁴ For detailed information see e.g. Rauschenbach et al. (2004) Non-formale und informelle Bildung im Kindes- und Jugendalter or the brochure Anerkennung Außerschulischer Bildung (2011) of Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth, available online: <http://www.bmfsfj.de/RedaktionBMFSFJ/Abteilung5/Pdf-Anlagen/Dokumentation-fachforum-erkennung-ausserschulischer-bildung,property=pdf,bereich=bmfsfj,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf>. Accessed 01.06.2012.

⁵⁵ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Informal_learning. Accessed 01.06.2012.

experience or just as experience”⁵⁶. This latter type of learning is actively encouraged among young people in Germany. The expert from SDRJA in a private conversation highlighted the crucial importance of informal education for young people recognized by the state. The very fact that this organization was created with the support and financed partly by the German Federal Ministry of Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth gives evidence that projects implemented through this intermediary – SDRJA – are recognized as essential for the development of youth in Germany. I bear in mind that the organization is mainly focused on exchanges but projects such as the ones which voluntary service organizations implement also constitute a part of informal learning, according to the broad definition of OECD, and some of them may be financed through the foundation⁵⁷. If we take into account the existence of a sister-organization of the foundation in Russia, whose activities are considered to be less effective due to lack of funding, an assumption may be put forward that informal education in Russia is less recognized as inherently important for youth development.

The concept of informal education goes in tune with the support of youth initiatives exercised within the examined German organizations. A notable example here is a possibility to get the funding in order to create some youth initiative, and no other support except material is expected to encourage self-organization and self-development of young people. One of such projects under the aegis of ijgd is Fahrradkino aiming to generate electricity with one’s own bicycle in the process of watching movies. The very fact of a chance of young people if they want to do something together to create a working group and get the funding for that serves as a weighty argument when saying about youth initiatives support and promotion:

“Young people created a Workgroup of Sustainable Development and had meetings repeatedly during the year. They worked together, exchanged ideas, developed concepts for seminars, and there were no educators or ijgd workers there. And then the idea of Fahrradkino came up. I think it is a distinctive feature of ijgd, that we approve such things and provide young people with money. They receive money when they have meetings, they have their travel costs reimbursed, they get money for the materials” (Interview 7, ijgd).

The German experts in fact confirmed the point about solid state support of voluntary projects:

“The considerable part of our funding is provided by the state – on federal level and on the level of states (Länder) <...> in fact almost all the NGOs in Germany are one way or another financed by the state either directly by personnel costs or by project subsidies”(Interview 4, ijgd).

⁵⁶ Recognition of Non-formal and Informal Learning. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: http://www.oecd.org/document/25/0,3746,en_2649_39263238_37136921_1_1_1_1,00.html

⁵⁷ One of the examples here is the youth work training Multiplikatoren-schulung Schritt für Schritt arranged by ijgd in 2011 and financed partly through the foundation German-Russian Youth Exchange.

At the same time the very structure of state support of voluntary service organization is undergoing some changes, namely decrease of state financial support (I will provide a lengthy quote for the sake of better understanding of the situation:

“Of course if I, for example, compare to Russia, the structure of funding is still rather good in Germany <...> but first, a lot of things were come off, and second, much is connected to project subsidies, that means for some definite lapse of time – 2-3 years there is funding, and then there is not, so a threat exists that one starts everywhere, and cannot implement something continuously. The other thing is that funding decreased significantly, and it has to do, in my opinion, with the changed priorities – children and youth work doesn’t play such an important role in a way that when it is invested in this sphere, the focus is more on professional orientation, school education” (Interview 7, ijgd).

Thus, the influence of youth policy is experienced to a certain degree of state-funding reduction which may be a reflection of the general deterioration of economic situation, the expert from ijgd, however, considers such cutback as a politically influenced choice:

“It is a political decision, because when I hear all the time that there is no money, it is something that politics always says: we should save. It is nonsense <...> Since Germany still has a lot of money, it is a question of priority-setting, where to spend the money for” (Interview 7, ijgd).

Another direction of state youth policy (as an inherent part of the general state policy) influence is the question of the federal voluntary service (Bundesfreiwilligendienst) which is of particular importance with respect to the examined topic. Federal voluntary service is a permanent program started since 1st of July 2011 as a consequence of the abolition of compulsory military service (Wehrpflicht) and, therefore an alternative service (Zivildienst). Federal voluntary service is focused on men and women of all ages who want to engage themselves voluntarily in a project in various spheres such as social, ecological, cultural spheres, in sport, integration and educational spheres. The duration of the service is from 6 to 24 months, social insurance and pocket money are provided⁵⁸. Voluntary service organizations such as ijgd were influenced by the introduction of federal voluntary service significantly:

“When the compulsory military service was abolished, it was initially forgotten that an alternative service was attached to it. Through the alternative service many hospitals, care institutions, retirement homes and so on benefited a lot – actually to a great extent the social system in Germany was kept by means of the alternative service. So a decision should have been found fast. And with the orientation on youth voluntary service (Voluntary Year of Social Service, Voluntary Year of Ecological Service), a federal voluntary service was introduced. <...> I think that a big

⁵⁸ Der Bundesfreiwilligendienst. Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.bmfsfj.de/BMFSFJ/Service/themen-lotse,did=168670.html>.

problem is that with federal voluntary service is that it was implemented too quickly. The state had no concept, and just said: “Do-do-do”, and it makes the whole story so complicated up until today” (Interview 6, ijgd).

The influence the state exercised on voluntary service organizations in this case expressed in a certain pressure on them to implement the new federal program in a short lapse of time. For the organizations like ijgd that are now expected to work with those who want to take part in federal voluntary service programs, these activities are quite new and special, since they mean the work not necessarily with young people, but with all age groups:

“We have now about 230 volunteers for federal voluntary service, and a good half of them, more than a half, let us say so, 140 are adults, it is an age group we have never worked with <...> That’s a challenge for us”. (Interview 6, ijgd).

Thus, the initial hypothesis of the influence state youth policy exerts on voluntary service organizations after the analysis of empirical data has acquired a new meaning: the fact that the state pays considerable attention to voluntary service development was, on one hand, contested by the fact of state funding decrease, forcing organizations search for other sources of funding (this issue will be additionally touched upon while investigating the influence of the characteristics of the nonprofit sector). On the other hand, obvious influence of state youth policy in the question of federal voluntary service leads to the situation where youth voluntary service organizations have to deal with some new responsibilities, and they basically experience certain pressure (with respect to the federal voluntary service it would be presumably more correct to take into consideration the influence of state policy in general, and not youth policy specifically, since it is under the authority of Federal Office for Family and Functions of Civil Society).

3.3. Influence of Understanding of Volunteering on the Development of Youth Voluntary Service Organizations

Below the influence of understanding of volunteering will be studied with respect to the Russian and German organizations.

3.3.1. Case of Russia

According to the hypotheses introduced as a result of the first two chapters, the understanding of volunteering that significantly changed across the Russian history influences the development of youth voluntary service organizations in the following way: two principal notions relevant with respect to the essence of voluntary work in Russia may be defined. These are opposition to “mandatory voluntary” work exercised in Soviet Union, and core characteristics relevant in understanding of what voluntary work is, imported from abroad at the time when national voluntary movement in its worldwide perception was making its first steps. At the same time, some conscious or subconscious references to the

Soviet-time voluntary work may result in a lack of motivation young people demonstrate towards engagement in volunteering projects. The hypothesis was partly confirmed by the empirical data in the examples.

The concept “imported understanding of volunteering” was to a different degree relevant with respect to two studied organizations. German-Russian Exchange, initiated as St. Petersburg office of German organization Deutsch-Russischer Austausch, from the very beginning acquired the German (European) understanding of voluntary work:

“Our concept is a German concept of volunteering, it experienced rapid development after the World War II. They have the most robust voluntary projects in Europe, and half of international volunteers in Europe are Germans” (Interview 3, German-Russian Exchange).

Good Deeds Case is more interesting case here as an organization created in Russia by Russian people without any immediate connotations to the Western organizations. As an expert describes,

“At first we didn’t have an acute understanding of what volunteering was, it came a bit later. Initially we just had an understanding what was international workcamp and that volunteers were those who did something from the heart, without money, so we had unformed understanding at the beginning, it was based on our participation in international projects and on understanding of voluntary work imported from abroad” (Interview 1, Good Deeds Case).

Interestingly, this very understanding of volunteering as a deed “from the heart” is mentioned by the expert from German-Russian Exchange, while describing the core of voluntary work through the opposition “internship – voluntary project”:

“We divide internships and voluntary programs; internship for the university is something different from voluntary work you do for yourself, from the heart, you try to help people” (Interview 3, German-Russian Exchange).

Further development of Good Deeds Case showed a shift from solely arrangement of workcamps and sending local volunteers abroad to implementation of various projects in social and cultural spheres. On one hand, such change was presupposed by the necessity to carry out projects in “non-workcamp” seasons – spring, autumn and winter:

“Still we live here permanently, and we should do something here. It is impossible to go abroad all the time to implement some projects there, they are anyway season ones, as workcamps, some projects are arranged for a year, and in order to have the organization functioning, we should all the time arrange something here. Later some other projects emerged that then became socially oriented” (Interview 1, Good Deeds Case).

The understanding of volunteering that has been shaped within Good Deeds Case was based on the “inherent necessity of a human being to give some amount of his energy on a good deed”. On the other hand, volunteering in case

of both organizations is explained through the opposition to some initially different perception of voluntary work. The experts mention that there are people who still do not understand the essence of specific characteristics of voluntary activities (wrong notion of volunteering):

“There is a gap nowadays between what is going on in reality and how people perceive it, especially those who are used to consuming. Today volunteering gets more popularity and demands appear like “We need volunteers for extras”. So people understand in a wrong way what volunteering is and where volunteer should use their forces” (Interview 2, Good Deeds Case).

Such erroneous perception of volunteering may be attributed to the state authorities and state-affiliated organizations:

“In such organizations people have no idea at all, what volunteering is; they think it is free work on every occasion. They can, for example, call and ask: give us please volunteers to distribute newspapers of the Committee. And the fact that distribution of the Committee’s newspapers is not a socially important action – they do not understand it at all. They think volunteers are people that can be involved freely in any kind of job any time” (Interview 3, German-Russian Exchange).

Some ambiguity in understanding of voluntary work may be traced if we take into consideration motivations young people express to participate in voluntary projects. This paper doesn’t aim to examine the issue of motivation, since there is a separate and significant direction of the research on volunteering. I will just briefly touch some points connected to the motivation relevant in the light of this research. Thus, lack of understanding what voluntary work means is expressed by local volunteers willing to take part in European Voluntary Service projects:

“We try to send people who are really interested in the project, otherwise we will have problems. If a person is not motivated enough, for example, he doesn’t know at all how to work with disabled people, but went to work with disabled people – there would be a catastrophe. If there is no other motivation except “why not going abroad and living there for a while?”, a project is most likely to finish before the end” (Interview 3, German-Russian Exchange).

Such misperception of volunteering or, presumably, intentional neglect of socially important element of volunteering (which per se includes the “by-products” such as joy to help people or, as in the case of international projects, an opportunity to travel) although it does not have explicit connotations to the devalued nature of volunteering as a result of Soviet Union period, may be evidence of the fact that some people still do not have a confident perception of voluntary work as an activity of one’s own free will for the benefit of other people who do not belong to the immediate environment. Experts did not mention explicitly the influence of Soviet-time “mandatory voluntary work”:

“Contemporary young volunteers are far from the ones before, and they, of course, do not take into consideration the Soviet experience, because they do not know it, it is now a newly introduced phenomenon, rather trendy one” (Interview 2, Good Deeds Case).

Therefore, a lack of motivation we expected as one of the results of devalued nature of volunteering in Russia, wasn't found, the general lack of motivation was mentioned once (Good Deeds Case expert) as a usually topical issue not only in Russia and without any links to the depreciation of the very notion. What appears also to be significant is the fact that not always volunteering is considered as a work for the good of people exercised on one's own free will (although it presumably does not have to do with the depreciation of this concept); it may be regarded as a consequence of quite a young history volunteering in its contemporary sense has in Russia.

3.3.2. Case of Germany

The understanding of volunteering in Germany was a subject to some changes across history too, as it was represented in previous chapters, the difference with the Russian case is that there were in fact no explicitly negative connotations to this notion. The changing perception of voluntary work may be rather referred to the overall changing environments of the globalization era with the rise of social initiatives and grassroots organizations; thus, according to the hypothesis introduced, such new environments may result in a lack of participants of the projects which may tend to engage themselves in some informal initiatives. The hypothesis was to a certain degree confirmed.

First, lack of motivation to engage in voluntary projects demonstrated by the young people was indeed mentioned by our experts; the reason is, however, not the rise of new informal initiatives but some permanent causes such as a lack of time when young people create families:

“We have at the moment a problem at ijgd that there is an age gap between volunteers: when young people get older, they tend to engage themselves in voluntary projects less than before. All the people are different, there are those who have families and take part in volunteering, but by and large young people go on with volunteering only when their children grow older” (Interview 4, ijgd).

Besides, some other reasons, characteristic for the contemporary society such as demographic ones are mentioned:

“All companies, whether big or small, do suffer from a demographic gap. Since we are lacking young people we have a strong competition amongst companies, educational institutions or NGOs to recruit young people (Interview 5, ijgd).

On the other hand a concept “professionalization of voluntary work” was introduced by one of the experts:

“One can say about professionalization of volunteering. Although it is called voluntary work, there are training-courses for volunteers, they get a little money. Nowadays it is necessary almost for every job application in Germany to write that you engage yourself in a voluntary project” (Expert interview 4, ijgd).

Such changed understanding of voluntary work among European youth was mentioned by the respondent of German-Russian Exchange who finds here the connection to youth unemployment:

“Volunteering is so popular in Europe nowadays because there is a considerable percent of young people who are unemployed, and hence everyone has a mania to find as many internships and voluntary programs as possible to get the experience and become competitive on the labor market” (Interview 3, German-Russian Exchange).

Thus, voluntary work is often seen by young people as an opportunity to be later more capable of competition to get a job or, in case of unemployment, to fill one’s CV by some temporary activities in the meantime. Such changed attitude may be another argument to the point of professionalization of voluntary work. But voluntary organizations are to a certain extent themselves guilty in this situation: on one hand, a wish to make voluntary projects more attractive for people is proclaimed, and one of the ways here is to create conditions attractive for young people (with a legal status of volunteer basically equated with a status of a student, with pocket money paid during projects), and on the other hand, youth are then believed to have more individualistic and to some degree selfish stance towards volunteering.

Another evidence in the question of the changed attitudes is international voluntary projects, where participants as well tend to show some changed stance:

“Young people are now inclined to do a voluntary year or some other voluntary project but more with the intention to obtain some professional experience. It is no more to say: “I will now go to France or Spain or Sweden, because I want to learn the other culture and try myself”, it is rather “I want to learn this and that” <...> It is getting really tough to recruit German youngsters for international workcamps inside Germany.” Interviews 4 and 5, ijgd).

Of course, we should bear in mind that international voluntary projects always have some additional motivation except the sheer willingness to work on a voluntary basis (and international workcamps inside Germany provide young Germans with an opportunity to meet people from different countries, which may serve as such additional motivation as well) ; the changed attitude with respect to such projects, nevertheless, may be considered as an argument to a statement on professionalization of voluntary work.

Some scholars consider voluntary programs such as Voluntary Year of Social Service as per se an attempt of the state and nonprofit organizations to meet the changed needs of young people in contemporary society and to provide

them with new institutional structures to encourage volunteering, since understanding of the concept has been influenced more by specific needs and individualization in recent decades, and less by traditional notions like “service to the nation”. The Voluntary Year projects thus are expected to give youth more than just an opportunity to volunteer but some additional skills and competences for future professional life (Anheier and Salamon: 2001, 3).

On the other hand, a part of the hypothesis on the rise of grassroots activities as a reflection of the changed attitude to volunteering and to a certain degree a challenge to voluntary service organizations, were not confirmed. In the following comment a representative of ijgd expands on this point:

“About your presumption that people are more willing to engage in informal organizations, I am not so sure. Of course certain kinds of people would rather be active in organizations such as ATTAC⁵⁹ or a local initiative etc. But even small initiatives are getting formalised at some point in Germany – Germany is a very formalized country” (Interview 5, ijgd).

At this point a reference to Smith (1999) may be made: he, as mentioned in the first chapter (part 1.2.) argued in favor of crucial connection between a country’s level of economic development and the nature of volunteering. If we apply his point to the cases of Germany and Russia, the empirical data provide support to it. The quote above gives evidence to Smith’s opinion that volunteering in more industrialized countries (Germany) is exercised in a more formalized way, whereas in less developed countries (Russia) more informal practices are used.

Thus, the initial hypothesis was confirmed in a way if we consider changed attitudes of young people and lack of motivation because of the overall changed environments, and voluntary service organizations do have a shortage of volunteers because of that. A lack of motivation may be in some cases supplemented by simply changed motivations for taking part in voluntary projects: the latter appear to be more an advantage for the future competition on the labour market. The part of the hypothesis on grassroots activities, influencing the work of voluntary service organizations, was not confirmed. This point, however, obviously needs further investigation.

3.4. Influence of NGO Characteristics on the Development of Voluntary Service Organizations

This part focuses on testing the hypotheses with respect to nonprofit sector influence on the examples of Russian and German organizations.

⁵⁹ “Attac is an international movement working towards social, environmental and democratic alternatives in the globalisation process” - <http://www.attac.org/>. Accessed 03.06.2012.

3.4.1. Case of Russia

The hypothesis with respect to this part of the research and the Russian case was the following one: characteristics of the nonprofit sector in Russia, namely its uncertain state in terms of legislative conditions and a somewhat suspicious attitude towards the sector from the public, influence the development of voluntary service organizations in a way that they experience some kind of difficulties in their work. The hypothesis was partly confirmed in the result of empirical data analysis. A notion of legislative hindrances was mentioned with respect to the tax payments:

“If there is a long-term project, some organizations pay compensation, - it is impossible that a person works for a long period of time and does not get anything. In developed countries there is a non-tax area for such things. In our country such compensation is regarded as an income” (Interview 3, German-Russian Exchange).

Thus, such obstacles as imperfect legislation influence the development of voluntary service organizations by adding some bureaucratic procedures which are worldwide regarded as unnecessary in terms of NGOs that perform such kind of projects. Idea of instability may be traced in unwillingness (which in fact means impossibility) to elaborate long-term plans:

“We all the time receive the applications from those who want to work as a volunteer for us, and we have to refuse them because we already got three people to volunteer next year. And people ask: “What about 2013?”. I say: “Sorry, in Russia no one plans for such long lapses of time!” (Interview 3, German-Russian Exchange).

Of course, this observation is to a certain degree ironic, and German-Russian Exchange does have long-term plans but it still gives evidence of the extent of uncertainty people working in NGOs experience. The next comment confirms this idea as well:

“I think that since the year 2006 when the conditions of NGOs work became much tougher than before, the situation got better at the moment, they are moved away from the Orange revolution in Ukraine, will see what will be after yet another wave of protest marches, will there be another toughening” (Interview 3, German-Russian Exchange).

Thus, a feeling of instability is expressed, which is connected to the political situation in the country, more or less favoring of NGOs development in different periods of time. This dependence on the current political situation is expressed in an attitude towards the general stance to the youth the state authorities demonstrate (here a reference to the part 3.2.1. may be made):

“We first thought that all the declarations to promote volunteering were connected exclusively to the Olympic Games. But there is a second reason: the state tries to distract the youth from politics. All those processes that we experienced, all those protests frightened the authorities, and now, for example,

even Seliger⁶⁰ is redirected almost utterly to social projects. Hence if before they had an idea to attract young people to participate in politics because they were supposedly apolitical, today, quite the opposite, enough politics” (Interview 2, Good Deeds Case).

The uncertainty and instability NGOs experience, and presumably to some extent still somewhat ambiguous reputation they have, may be the reason why so many people in fact prefer not to address any of them if they face a necessity to work voluntarily. Our experts mention the rise of civic activity people (to a great extent youth as well) demonstrated:

“Young people motivate each other themselves, there are a lot of environmental activists who take part in subbotniks, a good example of volunteers is fire control in 2010 when people just gathered at social networking websites and went to places where they were needed, or where the equipment was collected <...> It was voluntary actions. Or poiskoviki, people who search for those who are missing before the police find it necessary to start the search operation” (Interview 3, German-Russian Exchange)

The heated debate on the rise of civic activity started at the end of 2011 with the growth of the protest movement after the Duma elections. Some experts regard those protests as links of the same chain. Elena Topoleva, chief of Agency on Social Information believes that such civic activity has not appeared out of the blue but was growing gradually in various displays such as fire control in 2010, search for missing children, fight with car flashers⁶¹ and illegal building. “It may seem to have no connection either to volunteering or to charity, but in fact these activities constitute links in one and the same chain”⁶². The point of view experts of Russian organizations expressed goes in tune with and gives the evidence to the assumption that the uncertain conditions which Russian NGOs experience lead to the rise of some voluntary movements in the form of social initiatives of people who want to solve the problems they face in their lives together.

3.4.2. Case of Germany

According to a hypothesis elaborated as a result of the previous chapters – the characteristics of the German nonprofit sector influence the development of voluntary service organizations in the following way: although due to its rich history and considerable degree of development the nonprofit sector is considered to be in quite a robust state, its features are nevertheless subject to a

⁶⁰ “Seliger is a youth educational forum held since 2005 at Lake Seliger in the Russian Tver Region” [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seliger_\(forum\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seliger_(forum)). Accessed 01.06.2012. Is widely regarded to be a space for education youth in a direction of loyalty to the state authorities.

⁶¹ Here large-scale protests against car with flashers are referred to, namely when people campaigned against the abundance of cars granted with special signs and consequently rights (as a rule cars used by the authorities and bureaucracy) in comparison with ordinary drivers who were therefore in a disadvantageous position.

⁶² Matyukova N. Bezvozmedno, to est darom. Delovoy Peterburg. January 15, 2012. Accessed 01.06.2012. In: http://www.dp.ru/a/2012/01/13/Bezvozmedno_to_est_darom/.

gradual change, and undermining of subsidiarity principle is named among the major changes which may make voluntary service organizations be more competitive in terms of getting state funding and attracting new participants for the projects.

First of all, the interconnectedness of all three influencing factors is exposed very well with respect to the examined factor: in part 3.2.2. where influence of national youth policy was addressed, the idea of decrease of state funding in the German case was very explicitly expressed. If we take into account the significant role the German state traditionally plays with respect to the nonprofit sector organizations, we may conclude that such a decrease, being the consequence of various reasons (among them, presumably, the above mentioned undermining of subsidiarity principle) indeed influence the work of voluntary service organizations. I will repeat below some excerpts from the interview provided above to present the idea in the context:

“Funding decreased significantly, and it has to do, in my opinion, with the changed priorities – children and youth work doesn’t play such an important role in a way that when it is invested in this sphere, the focus is more on professional orientation and school education. The spheres of out-of-school or out-of-school political education experience a little bit populist attitude. The other thing is that we as a provider of voluntary service programs nevertheless do it, and here to a great extent the other sources of funding such as donations, sponsorship, membership fees and similar things are expected to play a role” (Interview 7, ijgd).

These financial hardships in terms of state funding may be regarded as the consequence of the nonprofit sector changes. The next comment gives additional evidence:

“There is still a good funding structure for schools and similar, but with respect to the out-of-school sphere a lot depends on the private area. <...> The sharing is still difficult, in a way that there are big gaps that should be filled in some other way to implement the projects. And we are more dependent on political decisions than before, at least as I can say from the experience of previous years, political decisions that sometimes are not comprehensible” (Interview 7, ijgd).

The expected consequence of the state funding decrease is intensified competition between the organizations; after all, as ijgd-expert puts it, “basically all the NGOs compete with each other – who makes the best projects, that gets the project funding” (Interview 4, ijgd). But there can be another side to this issue:

“I have experienced a lot of times the situation when there is less funding, organizations try to say: that is my thing, but at the very moment when everyone makes his own thing, politics has a big chance to intervene, because when there are a lot of single actors, when there are a lot of single skittles, they can be easily thrown one after another. But when there is a large bulk of them, they may be thrown but will rebuild themselves fast

again, and this is a kind of solidarity principle which works here” (Interview 7, ijgd).

So the opposite effect is in fact greater solidarity between the organizations that are connected to each other and to some extent constitute a united actor in the relations with the state. The next remark goes in tune with this point:

“I think such kind of work (youth work) may be done only in cooperation. In the middle is a young person, and one can change the society only in a solid cooperation with a lot of partners. I believe it means a lot of exchange, but at the same time it means a focusing of forces in order to move something in social-political terms” (Expert interview 2, ijgd).

Thus, together with usual competition between NGOs ideas of partnership and solidarity are assuming ever greater importance. Interestingly, the expressed solidarity appears to be the one exercised in a sort of opposition to the state. This may disprove the hypothesis of the influence of a corporatism crisis. The presented point nevertheless needs further investigation.

In order to sum up the findings obtained as a result of hypotheses testing, a table with accompanying comments will be provided in conclusion below.

Conclusion

In this paper the development of voluntary service organizations in Russia and Germany was focused on. The possible factors influencing the development of such organizations were studied at first through a theoretical lens, then in the cases of selected countries, and after all, on the specific examples of four organizations that perform youth voluntary service projects in two countries. The examination of the examples was indisputably relevant and necessary with respect to the investigated topic, since the overview of country environments in terms of different factors and their possible influence was without doubt not enough to reach the research goal, but helped to introduce a new range of hypotheses which then were applied to the selected examples of organizations. The analysis of the examples, in turn, gave an opportunity to acquire new insights and shed new light on the studied subject.

In terms of hypotheses it should be considered that partly they were confirmed, and partly new unexpected points came up which let me see the examined issue from a different perspective. Table 4 presents crucial concepts identified as a result of hypotheses testing in condensed form.

Table 4. Findings

<i>Hypotheses</i>	Russia	Germany
<i>Youth policies</i>	<p>Confirmed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Lack of financial support – Subsidy from the state – Necessity to have own resources to get the subsidy – Unfair competition – Support of loyal organizations – Role of informality – Necessity to be competitive to obtain project subsidy – Selective support of volunteering (volunteers for the Olympic Games) – Resource attitude to youth – consumer attitude to youth - Social initiatives as an answer on state neglect 	<p>Partly confirmed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Importance of informal education – Support of youth initiatives – Good structure of funding – Considerable state funding but since recent years decreased – Influence of political decisions Pressure to face new responsibilities (federal voluntary service)

<p><i>Understanding of volunteering</i></p>	<p>Rather not confirmed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of understanding - Different perceptions - Imported notion - Domestic notion “a deed from the heart” - Lack of motivation - Neglect of social orientation 	<p>Partly confirmed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of motivation, but because of permanent reasons (creation of family) - Changed attitudes to volunteering - Volunteering as an asset in terms of future employment - Volunteering as a tool to gain new skills and competence - More individualistic attitude to volunteering - Professionalization of voluntary work
<p><i>Characteristics of NGOs</i></p>	<p>Confirmed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legislative constraints - Uncertainty - Dependence on political situation - Rise of social initiatives 	<p>Partly confirmed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decrease in state funding - Nonprofit sector changes - Competition to get the project funding, but at the same time greater solidarity between organizations as a united opposition to the state and its political decisions

I will address all three factors with respect to the two cases. Youth policy on a national level indeed appeared to influence the development of the studied organizations. In the Russian case, the umbrella concept is a lack of the real state support in a broad sense. The word “real” emphasizes here a specific attitude the state demonstrates with respect to voluntary service organizations: on one hand, a wide-scale support of voluntary initiatives is clearly declared, on the other hand, there is still a shortage of real mechanisms of such support which voluntary organizations representatives obviously express. “State support” is here meant not only as funding, although the lack of funding was repeatedly mentioned by the Russian experts. First of all, as experts admit, it is impossible to get permanent funding from the state to provide the organization with a means of existence, the state funding is as a rule a project funding in a form of subsidy, meaning that an organization should have its own money to implement a project

before. Interestingly, although the experts do have “success stories” in obtaining state funding for their projects, and quite recent ones, they nevertheless insist that getting funding from the state is very difficult, not least because of unfair competition practiced during state contests and grants distribution. What I find relevant as well is the fact that even though the experts expanded in detail on the issue of state funding shortage, they nevertheless haven’t explicitly stated it to be a hindrance to voluntary service development. I may assume that it reflects the expressed idea of non-reliance on the state (it is senseless to wait for something from the state, so we will do it ourselves another way). Presumably, a solid state support is even not expected from the experts. They prefer to search for other ways to solve the problem of finance deficit. Lack of support with respect to the legislative side is a disadvantage voluntary service organizations face in their work: the absence of a legal status of a volunteer makes organizations, for example, search for some other ways of deciding the question with visas for participants in international projects. What may be generally considered as a result of state youth policy influence in the Russian case is the encouragement of voluntary service organizations to make up new projects, to search for new ways of funding and support, to basically rely on voluntary activities solely (Good Deeds Case is a very relevant example here as an organization that does not have any paid staff or office so far).

The German case demonstrates quite a different way of the state youth policy influence exerted on voluntary service organizations. First of all, the very fact that the state finances on a regular basis the work of voluntary service organizations (which is in Russia considered to be “impossible”) and a lot of regular voluntary projects such as Voluntary Year of Social Service already gives evidence that the state pays a good deal of attention to youth voluntary service. The latter is considered to be a way of informal learning which is, in turn, recognized as essential for young people’s development. The experts point out, however, that although the structure of voluntary service funding in Germany is still very fine (especially if comparing it to the Russian case), due to changed priorities, the state funding has significantly decreased in recent years. This makes voluntary service organizations turn to other sources of funding, and here some similarity with the Russian case is observed. The difference is, in my opinion, that in Russia the organizations basically do not rely much on state support, because they do not expect it; in Germany, on the other hand, the organizations, being used to state support, do experience the changed attitudes from the state and have to re-orient themselves to other sources of financial support. The influence of German youth policy on voluntary service organizations is also expressed in a certain degree of pressure which the state puts on them in regard to the question of the implementation of federal voluntary service. I assume that being dependent on the state, as most of NGOs in Germany are, due to the historical prerequisites of the nonprofit sector development, voluntary service organizations have to make some kind of concessions as in the case of federal voluntary service.

Thus, the hypotheses with respect to the influence of the youth policy on the national level was confirmed with respect to the Russian case and partly

confirmed – to the German case. Perception of youth as a mixture of a resource and a problem, major youth sector and focus on youth self-development and participation proved to be more advantageous to youth voluntary service organizations development, as in the German case, and perception of youth as more an economic resource of the society and minor youth sector lead to the neglect of these organizations' development, as in the Russian case.

Understanding of volunteering prevailing in the country does influence the work of voluntary service organizations but the results of the empirical analysis did show some new insights in this concern. The main issue with respect to the Russian case is that expected lack of motivation and difficulty in recruiting new participants for the projects, though it exists, but first, was not denoted by the experts among the burning problems seriously influencing the work of the organizations. Secondly, these phenomena, in the eyes of the experts, do not have an explicit connection to the devaluation of the concept “voluntary work” as a result of Soviet-time “mandatory voluntary work”. I assume that the generation of young volunteers active nowadays do not express affiliation to the voluntary movement of previous times in our country (if it is legitimate in fact to talk about voluntary movement at all): understanding of voluntary work indeed appears to be built on two pillars. First, imported notion borrowed from the Western countries, second, some sort of domestic meaning of voluntary work which rests on the “inherent necessity of one to do a good deed” and on willingness to decide some questions oneself because the state is not expected to help. I argue that it is hardly relevant to overestimate the influence of the imported perception of volunteering with respect to the Russian case, since volunteering in Russia does show signs of its own identity shaped in the domestic environment. This issue would be a very interesting point to do further investigation.

The German case is characterized by the lack of participants for the projects as well; I would argue that here this issue as a current difficulty sounded clearer. Young people in Germany, according to the experts, tend to express a changed attitude to volunteering connected to their future necessities on the labor market; this may be regarded as a consequence of the overall shift in understanding of voluntary work as more concentrated on oneself than on the community needs. On the other hand, if we regard the regular projects of voluntary service organizations as years of voluntary service as an attempt to make volunteering more attractive for the young people orienting to get the additional qualifications and competences while doing voluntary service, this very trend does not seem to be newly introduced. Voluntary service organizations appear to be somewhat in a trap here: they do want to attract people to take part in volunteering and create favorable conditions for that, but then they claim the youth to be more oriented towards their own necessities and interests than in voluntary work as a work for the good of the community. Deeper investigation of young people's motivations for engaging in voluntary projects may shed new light on this point, because initially it was not among the objectives for reaching the goal of the paper, but came up as a result of studying the consequences of the changed understanding of volunteering.

Thus, the hypothesis concerning the influence understanding of volunteering exerts on the development of youth voluntary service was rather not confirmed in Russian case and partly confirmed in German case. Historical connotations expected to play a significant role in shaping the general perception of volunteering appeared not to have that fundamental an influence, as Russian case demonstrated.

The influence of the nonprofit sector characteristics proved to be considerable in both cases to a different degree. Although the models of nonprofit sector were not applied to the Russian case due to its complex nature and recent history, the theory of social origins helped a lot to identify the elements useful in examination of the nonprofit sector. In the case of Russia, the overall connotations of uncertainty and instability with respect to the nonprofit sector organizations were quite clearly expressed. Such instability though does not influence the organizations in such a way as to create the necessity to campaign against or shape the methods of work because of that. The organizations rather treat such conditions as an overall climate that depends on the political decisions on higher levels, and somewhat adapt to it just implementing their project in a way they find appropriate. Unfavorable conditions of work for the NGOs may be regarded as the reason for the growth in informal initiatives experienced in recent years as a possible answer to the unwillingness of the state to treat NGOs more mildly.

In the case of Germany, the influence of the nonprofit sector characteristics, and, more specifically, its recent changes are experienced by the voluntary service organizations not only and not necessarily with intensified competition in terms of the decrease of state funding (taking into account the traditional role the state plays with respect to the nonprofit sector, it may be regarded as an expression of the changes in the overall environment that the sector operates in), but at the same time as an incentive to exercise greater solidarity among the organizations as a kind of united opposition to the state. This influence means hence the intensified cooperation and partnership between the organizations. On the other hand, the question of a crisis of corporatism did not find much evidence with respect to the investigated examples, but I believe that it still is a possible direction for future research.

Therefore, the hypotheses with respect to the characteristics of the nonprofit sector influencing the development of youth voluntary service organizations were confirmed in the Russian case and partly confirmed in German case.

Thus, all three factors proved to be to a different extent influential in terms of the development of voluntary service organizations both in Russia and Germany. The degree of influence (though hardly estimated) appears to be different and not always unambiguous. I argue that voluntary service organizations in Russia and Germany exist in rather different environments: well-established system of voluntary projects supported by the state, generally favorable in terms of nonprofit sector characteristics in the latter case, and quite recently emerged still developing structure generally neglected by the state in the

former case. These environments, being shaped in fact by the examined factors influencing the development of voluntary service organizations, determine the way organizations meet the current challenges such as decrease in (in case of Germany) and lack of (in case of Russia) state funding. Russian organizations tend to either turn to the other sources of funding or be more competitive in elaborating new projects to get state subsidy; German organizations though generally demonstrating the same patterns of behavior, tend to be traditionally more dependent on the state (the example of the implementation of federal voluntary service is quite relevant here). On the other hand, these general environments mentioned above are shaped by the understanding and attitudes to the phenomenon of volunteering; in the German case they appear to have changed in the direction of the more individualistic stance which youth have begun to demonstrate towards voluntary service, and it is expressed sometimes in unwillingness of young people to engage themselves in volunteering. Such stance was identified with respect to the Russian case as well, but to a lesser degree; I argue that this point may be to a great extent explained by the fact that volunteering in its contemporary understanding exists in Russia not that long time, and therefore probably experiences the primary stages of development (no negative connotations implied) characterized by active involvement of young people. Besides, volunteering is assumed to be a sort of answer to the inability of the state to provide people with some welfare services which therefore are covered through voluntary activities. These conclusions may serve simultaneously as a basis for the further research, for instance, on motivations young people have to volunteer because, after all, the development of voluntary service organizations inherently depends on the presence of volunteers; further investigation on the question of what motivates youth to volunteer and to what extent they are ready to volunteer would therefore shed new light on the future prospects of voluntary service organizations in both countries.

References

1. Alekseeva O (2010) Commentary on Jakobson and Sanovich: The Challenging Landscape of the Russian Third Sector, *Journal of Civil Society*, 7:2, pp. 307 – 311.
2. Alliance of Voluntary Service Organizations: <http://www.alliance-network.eu>. Accessed: 01.06.2012.
3. Anheier H. K. (2005) *Nonprofit organizations: Theory, Management, Policy*. New York, 450 p.
4. Anheier H. K. and Salamon L. M (2001) Volunteering in cross-national perspective: Initial comparisons, *Civil Society Working Paper 10*, 20 p. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.avso.org/voluntary/Int%20DOC/volunteering.pdf>.
5. Anheier H. K. and Seibel W. (1993) Defining the Nonprofit Sector: Germany, Working Papers of the The Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project, 32 p. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: http://ccss.jhu.edu/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2011/09/Germany_CNP_WP6_1993.pdf.
6. Anheier H.K. (2007) Reflections on the Concept and Measurement of Global Civil Society, *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, Vol. 18(1), pp. 1–15.
7. Anheier H.K., Priller E. and Zimmer A. (2000) Civil society in transition: The East German third sector ten years after unification, *Civil Society Working Paper 15*, 12 p.
8. Außerschulischer Bildung (2011) Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.bmfsfj.de/RedaktionBMFSFJ/Abteilung5/Pdf-Anlagen/Dokumentation-fachforum-erkennung-ausserschulischer-bildung,property=pdf,bereich=bmfsfj,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf>
9. Birnkraut G. (2003) Ehrenamt in kulturellen Institutionen im Vergleich zwischen den USA und Deutschland, Dissertation zur Erlangung des Grades einer Doktorin der Philosophie (Dr.phil.), 265 p. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://d-nb.info/968776450/34>.
10. Chernyshenko D. Sochi 2014 Reignites Youth Volunteering in Russia. *New Europe*. November 27, 2011. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.neurope.eu/blog/sochi-2014-reignites-youth-volunteering-russia>.
11. Cohen P. and Ainley P. (2000) In the Country of the Blind? *Youth Studies and Cultural Studies in Britain*, *Journal of Youth Studies*, Vol. 3(1), pp. 79 – 95.

12. Dafflon D. (2009) Youth in Russia - The Portrait of a Generation in Transition, A research report by the Swiss Academy for Development, 50 p.
13. Database for International Youth Work Germany (2008), 28 p. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: http://www.dija.de/fileadmin/medien/downloads/L%C3%A4nder/Germany_youthpolicies.pdf.
14. Deacon B. (2000) Eastern European welfare states: the impact of the politics of globalization. *Journal of European Social Policy*, Vol.10 (2), pp. 146 – 161.
15. Denstad F. Y. (2009) Youth Policy Manual: How to develop a national youth strategy, 93 p. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: http://youth-partnership-eu.coe.int/youth-partnership/documents/EKCYP/Youth_Policy/docs/YP_strategies/Research/YP_Manual_pub.pdf.
16. Der Bundesfreiwilligendienst. Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.bmfsfj.de/BMFSFJ/Service/themen-lotse,did=168670.html>.
17. Deutscher Paritätischer Wohlfahrtsverband - Gesamtverband e. V.: <http://www.der-paritaetische.de/>. Accessed: 01.06.2012.
18. Dib C. Z. (1988) Formal, Non-Formal and Informal Education: Concepts/Applicability, AIP Conference Proceedings, Vol. 173, pp. 300-315.
19. Die Internationalen Jugendgemeinschaftsdienste: <http://www.ijgd.de/>. Accessed: 01.06.2012.
20. Esping-Andersen G (2006) Welfare states in the 21st Century. In: C. Pierson and F. Castles, eds. *The Welfare State Reader*. 2nd Edition. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 160 – 175.
21. Ester P. and Vinken H. (2003) Debating Civil Society: On the Fear for Civic Decline and Hope for the Internet Alternative, *International Sociology*, Vol. 18 № 4, pp.659-680.
22. EYV 2011: Focus EU Figures on Volunteering in the EU. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://eyv2011.ie/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/EYV2011-figures-ENGLISH1.pdf>.
23. Fenger H.J.M (2007) Welfare regimes in Central and Eastern Europe: Incorporating post-communist countries in a welfare regime typology, *Contemporary Issues and Ideas in Social Sciences*, 30 p.
24. Festschrift zum Jubiläum der Internationalen Jugendgemeinschaftsdienste (2009). Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: http://www.ijgd.de/fileadmin/user_upload/PRESSE/60-Jahre-Festschrift_kl2.pdf.

25. Giddens A. (2006) Poverty, Social Exclusion and Welfare. In: Giddens A. Sociology, 5th edition.
26. Govaart M., Dall H. and Munz A. (2001) Volunteering worldwide, Nederlands Instituut voor Zorg en Welzijn.; Verwey-Jonker Instituut ,276 p.
27. Hein P. (2001) Volunteering in Japan and Germany: How Moral Citizenship Strengthens Society and The State, CEU Political Science Journal, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 521-543.
28. Heintz S. (2006) The Role of NGOs in Modern Societies and an Increasingly Interdependent World, 14 p. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: http://www.rbf.org/sites/default/files/The_Role_of_NGOs_in_Modern_Societies_and_Increasingly_Interdependent_World.pdf.
29. Hemment J. (2004) The Riddle of the Third Sector: Civil Society, International Aid, and NGOs in Russia, Anthropological Quarterly, Vol. 77, № 2, pp. 215-241.
30. IARD Study on the State of Young People and Youth Policy in Europe (2001), 147 p. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: http://ec.europa.eu/youth/archive/doc/studies/iard/summaries_en.pdf.
31. Jakobson L. and Sanovich S. (2010): The Changing Models of the Russian Third Sector: Import Substitution Phase, Journal of Civil Society, 6:3, pp. 279-300.
32. Jakobson L. and Sanovich S. (2011): The Russian Third Sector: New Driving Forces—A Rejoinder, Journal of Civil Society, 7:2, pp. 233-239.
33. Kamlage J.-H. (2008) The Awakening Giant: The Development of Civil Society Infrastructure in Germany, 27 p. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1804851>.
34. Lindemann M. (2010) Voluntarism in Social Welfare and Urban Government: The Case of Hamburg, 1700 – 1799, Journal of Urban History 2010, Vol. 36 (3), pp. 316–331.
35. Lorenz W. (2009) The Function of History in the Debate on Social Work. In: Verschelden G. et al. (eds.) The history of youth work in Europe and its relevance for youth policy today, pp. 17 – 25.
36. Mobility of Young Volunteers Across Europe. Case study Germany (2010), pp. 176–192. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://community.cev.be/download/210/649/Mobilityofyoungvolunteers.pdf>.
37. National Report – Germany. Study on Volunteering in the European Union. Country Report Germany. 52 p. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://europa.eu/volunteering/en/press-media/resources/10/32>.
38. Offe C. (1991) Smooth Consolidation in the West German Welfare State: Structural Change, Fiscal Policies, and Populist Politics. In: Goodin and Mitchell (ed.). The Foundations of the Welfare State II, 1991.

39. Olate R. (2007) Youth Volunteerism in Latin America and the Caribbean: The Formalization of Voluntary Service and the Theory of Social Origins, 153 p.
40. Rauschenbach et al. (2004) Non-formale und informelle Bildung im Kindes- und Jugendalter
41. Recognition of Non-formal and Informal Learning. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In:
http://www.oecd.org/document/25/0,3746,en_2649_39263238_37136921_1_1_1_1,00.html.
42. Rochester C. (2006) Making Sense of Volunteering, 39 p. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In:
http://ws1.roehampton.ac.uk/researchcentres/csvca/researchconsultancy/Making_sense_of_volunteering.pdf.
43. Role of Non-Profit Sector in Economic Development of Russia (2005), Project “Integration of Civil Society for Non-Profit Taxation Reforming”, The Institute for Urban Economics, 17 p.
44. Ross. C. (2003) Putin’s federal reforms and the consolidation of federalism in Russia: one step forward, two steps back! Communist and Post-Communist Studies, Vol. 36, pp. 29–47.
45. Salamon L. M and Anheier H. K. (1994) Caring Sector or Caring Society? Discovering The Nonprofit Sector Cross-Nationally, Working Papers of the The Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project, 19 p. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: http://ccss.jhu.edu/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2011/09/CNP_WP17_1994.pdf.
46. Salamon L. M. (2006) Government – Nonprofit Relations from an International Perspective. In: Boris, E. T. - Steurle, C.E. (eds.) Nonprofits and Government. Colaboration and Conflict. Washington, The Urban Institute Press, pp. 399 – 432.
47. Salamon L. M. and Anheier H. K. (1998) Social Origins of Civil Society: Explaining the Nonprofit Sector Cross-Nationally, *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, Vol. 9, No. 3., 213–248.
48. Salamon L. M., Hems L. C. and Chinnock K. (2000) The Nonprofit Sector: For What and for Whom? Working Papers of the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project, 31 p. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: http://ccss.jhu.edu/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2011/09/CNP_WP37_2000.pdf.
49. Salamon L. M., Sokolowski S. W. and List R. (2003) Global Civil Society. An Overview, The Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project , 64 p.
50. Schur W. (2003) Development of International Youth Voluntary Service in the EU: A Comparison of Programme & Policy Development in Germany, Italy and France.

51. Sherraden et al. (2006) The Forms and Structure of International Voluntary Service, *Voluntas*, Vol 17, pp. 163–180.
52. Siurala L. (2006) A European Framework for Youth Policy, 56 p. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: http://youth-partnership-eu.coe.int/youth-partnership/documents/EKCYP/Youth_Policy/docs/YP_strategies/Policy/COE_european_framework_4YP_EN.pdf.
53. Smith J. D. (1999) Volunteering and Social Development A Background Paper for Discussion at an Expert Group Meeting New York, November 29-30.
54. Smith J. D. Civic Service in Western Europe (2004), *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol.33, pp. 64–78.
55. Stebbins R. A. (1996) Volunteering: A Serious Leisure Perspective, *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, Vol. 25(2), pp. 211–224.
56. Study on the Volunteering in the European Union. Country Report Germany (2011). Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://europa.eu/volunteering/de/node/1205>.
57. Volunteering and Social Activism (2006) Joint study by the CIVICUS (World Alliance for Citizen Participation), the International Association for Volunteer Effort (IAVE) and United Nations Volunteers (UNV), 29 p. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.unv.org/fileadmin/img/www/Volunteerism-FINAL.pdf>.
58. Wagner S.F. (2007) Kurze Geschichte der Ehrenamtlichkeit. 10 p. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.ehrenamtsbibliothek.de/literatur/Kurze%20Geschichte%20der%20Ehrenamtlichkeit.pdf>.
59. Wallace C. and Bendit R. (2009) Youth Policies in Europe: Towards a Classification of Different Tendencies in Youth Policies in the European Union, *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 441–458.
60. Walther A., Moerch Hejl G. and Bechmann Jensen T. (2002) Youth Transitions, Youth Policy and Participation – State of the Art Report, 65 p.
61. Wiedermann A. Voluntary Action in Germany: Facts and Figures, 15 p. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.cev.be/data/File/FactsFigures%20Germany%20final.pdf>.
62. Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia: <http://www.wikipedia.org/>. Accessed: 01.06.2012.
63. Wondratschek K. (2011) Country Sheet on Youth Policy in Germany, 26 p. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: http://youth-partnership-eu.coe.int/youth-partnership/documents/Questionnaires/Country/Country_sheet_2011/Country_sheet_Germany_2011.pdf

64. Youniss J., Bales S., Christmas-Best V., Diversi M., McLaughlin M. and Silbereisen R. (2002) Youth Civic Engagement in the Twenty-First Century, *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 12(1), pp. 121–148.
65. Youth policy in Estonia (2000) Report by International Group of Experts for the European Steering Committee for Youth: Accessed: 01.06.2012. In http://youth-partnership-eu.coe.int/youth-partnership/documents/EKCYP/Youth_Policy/docs/YP_strategies/Policy/COE_youth_policy_Estonia_En.pdf.
66. Zhuravskaya E. (2010) Federalism in Russia, Working Paper _o 141, pp 59 – 77.
67. Zimmer A. (1999) Corporatism Revisited—The Legacy of History and the German Nonprofit Sector, *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, Vol. 10, No. 1, Nonprofit Sector Policy at the Crossroads, pp. 37-49.
68. Zimmer. A and Hallmann T. (2002) Trapped in an Identity Gap? Self-Perception and Self-Esteem of Nonprofit-Organizations in Changing Environments, 23 p. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: http://www.istr.org/resource/resmgr/working_papers_cape_town/zimmer.pdf.
69. Арефьев А. Молодежные обмены между Россией и Германией: статистический и социологический анализ. М.6 Центр социального прогнозирования, 2008. – 340 С.
70. Бородкин Ф. Третий сектор в государстве благоденствия // *Мир России*. 1997. № 2. – С. 67 – 116.
71. Бочарова С. «Голос», не болтай! // *Газета.Ру*. 24.02.12. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: http://www.gazeta.ru/politics/elections2011/2012/02/24_a_4011929.shtml.
72. Валявина, Е. Развитие законодательства о некоммерческих организациях /Е. Ю. Валявина // *Журнал российского права*. -2009. - № 1. - С. 7 – 19.
73. Владимир Жидких: Для государства молодежь – одновременно ресурс и партнер // *Наша власть: дела и лица*. 2009. №9(100). Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://duma.tomsk.ru/page/14154/>.
74. Волкова Г. Развитие некоммерческого сектора в условиях формирования социально-ориентированной экономики. Автореф. дис. на соиск. уч. степ. канд. эк. н. Саратов, 2012. – 28 с.
75. Воронова Е. Добровольчество как форма благотворительности в современной России // *Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета*. 2011. Сер. 2, вып. 1. – С. 330 – 342.
76. Гетьман Н. Статистический портрет некоммерческого сектора России // 05.10.2010. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In <http://opes.ru/1320628.html>.

77. Граник И. Государство поделит НКО на полезные и вредные // Коммерсант. №62 (4603). 09.04.2011. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.kommersant.ru/doc/1618970>.
78. Деятельность НКО в России не должна угрожать ее безопасности, заявляют в РПЦ // 02.02.2012. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.newsru.com/religy/02feb2012/chaplin.html>.
79. Динамика развития и текущее состояние сектора НКО в России. Аналитический обзор по результатам анализа государственной статистики, баз данных НКО и опросов общественного мнения. АНО «Социологическая мастерская Задорина», 2006.
80. Зеленин А. Государственная молодежная политика Российской Федерации: концептуальные основы, стратегические приоритеты, эффективность региональных моделей. Автореф. дис. на соиск. уч. степ. д. полит. н. Н.Новгород, 2009. – 58 С.
81. Казакевич Л. К вопросу об эволюции термина «волонтерство» // Accessed: 01.06.2012. In http://www.tusur.ru/export/sites/ru.tusur.new/ru/science/events/social/section/sec_1/1-12.pdf.
82. Как менялась система контроля за НКО в России // Коммерсант. № 36 (4577). 02.03.2011. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.kommersant.ru/doc/1594277>.
83. Кочетков А. Конституционные основы молодежной политики государства [Текст] / А.Кочетков // Право и государство: теория и практика. – 2009. – № 6. – С. 116-119.
84. Кочетков А. Парламент Российской Федерации и государственная молодежная политика [Текст] / А.В.Кочетков // Право и государство: теория и практика. – 2009. – № 10. – С. 35-38.
85. Краснов Е. Вот вам, НКО, и Юрьев день // Филантроп. 11.04.2011. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://philanthropy.ru/climate/2011/04/11/5450>.
86. Крикунова В. Молодежная политика в современной России: понятие, субъекты, факторы формирования // Известия Российского государственного педагогического университета им. А.И. Герцена. 2009. № 101, С. 277 – 283.
87. Кудринская Л. Добровольческий труд: сущность, виды, специфика // Accessed: 01.06.2012. In http://ecsocman.hse.ru/data/633/013/1220/Sotsis_5_06_p15-22.pdf.
88. Луговая Е. Добровольческий труд в истории дореволюционной России // Accessed: 01.06.2012. In http://www.nbu.gov.ua/portal/Soc_Gum/Gich/2009_3/GCN4p208-213.pdf.

89. Матюкова Н. Безвозмездно, то есть даром // Деловой Петербург. 15.01.2012. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: http://www.dp.ru/a/2012/01/13/Bezvozmedno_to_est_darom/.
90. Миронова С. Определение и статус некоммерческих организаций в России // <http://minjust.karelia.ru/4212/4221/5581/5584/>.
91. Молодежная премия 2011 // Деловой Петербург. 02.03.2012. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: http://www.dp.ru/a/2012/03/01/Molodezhnaja_premija_2011/.
92. Молодежь в России. 2010: Стат. сб./ЮНИСЕФ, Росстат. М.: ИИЦ «Статистика России», 2010. – 166 с.
93. Мутко: ФЦП по инфраструктуре для досуга молодежи заработает с 2012 года // РИА Новости. 16.03.2011. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://ria.ru/society/20110316/354527973.html>
94. Немерюк А. О молодежной политике в современной России // Accessed: 01.06.2012. In <http://www.isras.ru/files/File/Vlast/2009/04/O%20molodegnoj%20politike.pdf>.
95. Немецко-Русский Обмен: <http://obmen.org/>. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In
96. Новиков М. А. История, проблемы и перспективы развития молодежного волонтерства в России // Исторические, философские, политические и юридические науки, культурология и искусствоведение. Вопросы теории и практики. Тамбов: Грамота, 2011. № 6. Ч. 3. С. 141-144.
97. Омельченко Е. Молодежный вызов // Accessed: 01.06.2012. In <http://www.polit.ru/article/2011/04/07/lessons/>
98. Омельченко Е. Молодежь для политиков vs. молодежь для себя? // Accessed: 01.06.2012. In <http://polit.ru/article/2006/06/15/youth/>
99. Омельченко Е. Молодежь: открытый вопрос // Accessed: 01.06.2012. In http://ecsocman.hse.ru/data/615/676/1219/otryvok_om.pdf.
100. Паршина Ю. Волонтерское движение и его истоки в России // Известия Волгоградского государственного педагогического университета. 2009. № 10. – С. 106 – 109.
101. Першуткин С. Молодежная политика и «Стратегия – 2020» С. Н. Першуткин // Государственная служба. – 2009.– № 1.: 72 – 75.
102. Результаты всероссийского исследования НКО. Центр исследований гражданского общества и некоммерческого сектора Государственного университета – Высшей школы экономики. М., 2010. – 85 С.
103. Рожнов О. Молодежная политика в новой системе государственного управления Российской Федерации. М., 2008. – 5 С.

104. Санович С.В. Консолидация гражданского общества в переходной России: Препринт WP10/2009/03. — М.: Издательский дом Государственного университета – Высшей школы экономики, 2009. — 32 с.
105. Селезнева М. Молодежь как стратегический ресурс развития российского общества // Образование: вчера, сегодня, завтра. Материалы научно-практической Интернет-конференции. 1 – 5 ноября 2006 г. – С. 118 – 121.
106. Синецкий С.Б. (2006) Эволюция добровольчества: история становления новой социальной парадигмы. Вестник ЮУрГУ, № 17 (72)
107. Стратегия государственной молодежной политики в Российской Федерации. М., 2005. – 36 С.
108. Эйдель Ю. Мы все попались на крючок // Частный корреспондент. 02.03.2009. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: <http://www.chaskor.ru/p.php?id=3930>.
109. Якобсон Л. Российский третий сектор: от импорта к импортозамещению // Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: http://www.civisbook.ru/files/File/Yakobson_doklad.pdf.
110. Ярская В, Ловцова Н. (2009) Молодежная политика: разные и пока не равные // Журнал исследований социальной политики. С. 151–164. Accessed: 01.06.2012. In: http://ecsocman.hse.ru/data/2011/01/18/1214867634/larskaya_Lovzova_Molod.politika.pdf.

Appendix. List of interviews and respondents

Interview 1: chief of Good Deeds Case.

Interview 2: chief of Good Deeds Case.

Interview 3: employee of German-Russian Exchange.

Interview 4: employee of ijgd Magdeburg.

Interview 5: employee of ijgd Magdeburg.

Interview 6: chief of ijgd Magdeburg.

Interview 7: chief of ijgd Magdeburg.



ZDES Working Papers

Arbeitspapiere des Zentrums für Deutschland- und Europastudien

Рабочие тетради Центра изучения Германии и Европы

Universität Bielefeld – Fakultät für Soziologie
Postfach 100131 – 33501 Bielefeld – Deutschland

Staatliche Universität St. Petersburg – 7/9 Universitetskaja Nab.
199034 St. Petersburg – Russland

<http://zdes.spbu.ru/>

info@zdes.spbu.ru