

Appendix A

THE SURVEY STUDY

Roberto Scaramuzzino and Magnus Wennerhag

The quantitative studies in this volume (chapters 3 and 4) are based on a large quantitative dataset resulting from a national survey that received responses from 2,791 Swedish civil society organizations (CSOs). The survey was carried out from November 2012 to March 2013 as part of the research program: Beyond the Welfare State—Europeanization of Swedish Civil Society Organizations (EUROCIV).

The sample for the survey was based on the categories used by Statistics Sweden (SCB) in their register of Swedish organizations (Företagsregistret). The focus of the research program was CSOs engaged in welfare issues and interest representation. To cover this type of organization, the sample included associations (*ideella föreningar*) and religious congregations (*registrerade trossamfund*).

In order to get access to economic resources and other benefits granted by Swedish legislation, most CSOs register with the authorities as belonging to one of these categories. An association is the most common organizational form for Swedish CSOs (Wijkström and Einarsson 2006), and it provides a legally simplified framework for certain activities (e.g., possibilities to make limited economic transactions without being taxed).

The sample was further specified by including only CSOs that were categorized by Statistics Sweden as associations involved in social service and care, associations involved in interest representation, and religious

congregations. These three categories were chosen in accordance with the overall aims of our research project, namely to provide a comprehensive analysis of how processes of Europeanization affect Swedish CSOs working with welfare policy and how they strategically make use of the European Union (EU) as a new political opportunity structure.¹ By selecting these categories, we thus excluded some other kinds of organizations, such as sports and recreational and leisure associations. Among the “social service and care” associations, one finds, for instance, the Red Cross, Save the Children, Alcoholics Anonymous, women’s shelters, crime-victim advocacy organizations, and disability organizations. Among the “interest representation” associations, one finds trade unions, professional and employers’ organizations, political parties, immigrants’ and pensioners’ organizations, and cultural associations. Religious congregations were chosen because they are often involved in social welfare activities on behalf of families living in poverty, undocumented migrants, and other marginalized groups. Among these registered CSOs, one finds local or regional chapters of national federations as well as the national federations themselves (most Swedish CSOs register their local, regional, and national bodies as separate associational entities). One also finds quite small CSOs that do not belong to any federation.

When gathering our sample from this population, we furthermore chose to include both organizations/congregations that were classified by Statistics Sweden as economically “active” and the ones classified as “non-active.” This classification is made only on the basis of an organization’s/congregation’s recent contacts with the Swedish Tax Agency. To be active, an organization has to meet at least one of the following criteria (according to data that Statistics Sweden get from the Swedish Tax Agency): have had employed staff, have paid wages, have sent other information to the Swedish Tax Agency, have had incomes, or have had assets of a higher value than 10 million SEK (approximately 1 million euros) and/or income from interest higher than 0.5 million SEK. In our study, we primarily wanted to study CSOs that had ongoing activities in some sense, and not just CSOs that had contacts with the Swedish Tax Agency. We therefore believed it to be relevant for our purposes to include both active and nonactive CSOs and only later on to exclude the organizations/congregations that according to themselves were totally inactive. To be able to do this, we included a question asking whether the organization had had any activities during the previous year.

In line with our expectations, our later analysis of the data showed that the differences between the associations labeled active by Statistics Sweden and the ones labeled nonactive were quite small in terms of actual activities (and regarding response rate). Of those being labeled as nonactive by Statistics Sweden, only 5 percent said they did not have any activities during

the previous year; the corresponding figure for associations labeled “active” was 1 percent (Scaramuzzino and Wennerhag 2013). The 76 cases of CSOs that had not had any activities during the previous year were excluded from our further analysis.

Through these choices, the total population of organizations forming the basis for our study’s sample consisted of 80,015 associations, which can be said to represent approximately 40 percent of formally organized Swedish civil society. According to Statistics Sweden’s calculations, Swedish civil society includes about 217,000 formal organizations (Statistics Sweden 2010).

Because the actual numbers of organizations differed significantly between the three categories constituting our population, we decided to make a stratified sample so as not to end up with insufficient numbers of cases for the smaller categories. In each of the three categories we furthermore sampled a lower percentage of the organizations being labeled nonactive. Table A.1 shows the exact sizes of each sample and how each sample corresponded to each of the categories percentagewise. Having used this stratified sampling procedure, we gave the CSO categories different weights in the analysis so that the presented results of univariate and bivariate analyses would be the same as if we had analyzed a nonstratified sample.

Table A.1. Sample Size, the Sample’s Relation to the Total Population, and the Response Rate

| | Social service and care | Interest representation | Religious congregations | Total (N) |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|
| Sample size | | | | |
| Active CSOs (N) | 878 | 1,765 | 516 | 3,159 |
| Nonactive CSOs (N) | 910 | 1,812 | 299 | 3,021 |
| Total (N) | 1,788 | 3,577 | 815 | 6,180 |
| Sample’s relation to total population | | | | |
| Percentage of total active population | 100% | 12% | 50% | |
| Percentage of total nonactive population | 50% | 3% | 25% | |
| Response rate | | | | |
| Active CSOs | 58% | 54% | 49% | 54% |
| Nonactive CSOs | 52% | 47% | 42% | 48% |
| Total (%) | 55% | 51% | 46% | 51% |
| Total (N) | 852 | 1,567 | 372 | 2,791 |

Source: EUROCIIV survey.

The survey questionnaire was sent by mail with a prepaid return envelope to the contact persons or office addresses of 6,180 Swedish CSOs randomly chosen from the total population. After three reminders and a short nonresponse survey by mail, 2,791 questionnaires were returned. The final response rate was 51.3 percent after a number of CSOs had been excluded because they had ceased to exist or changed their associational form, or due to faulty postal addresses. As can be seen in table A.1, the response rates of the three categories of CSOs varied between 46 percent and 55 percent, and the response rate of active CSOs was 54 percent while it was 48 percent for nonactive CSOs. Overall, we deemed these differences in response rates to be too small to take into account in the subsequent analysis. For more detailed information about the sampling procedure, see Scaramuzzino and Wennerhag (2013).

The three categories of CSOs from Statistics Sweden described above were used to create a sample in accordance with the overall aims of our research project. For chapters 3 and 4 in this book, however, we grouped the cases of our dataset according to theory-driven typologies that more clearly corresponded to this book's aims. Thus, in our analysis we compared ten categories of CSOs (as discussed in chapter 3) on the basis of survey data from 1,786 CSOs. To focus our analysis on the types of CSOs that are working with issues clearly related to the social welfare area, we excluded the 889 cases in our original sample that did not meet this criterion.

The typology for CSO types used in chapters 3 and 4 was inspired by a typology used in previous studies about associational life in Sweden (e.g., Vogel et al. 2003). In order to group the CSOs of our sample into this typology, we assessed the organization's focus of activity on the basis of their name, information given in answers to the survey about the organization's main goals and activities, and information found on the Internet (mostly the organizations' own websites). In appendix B we give an overview of the 10 types of CSOs we identified through this procedure, and the most common specific organizations within each type.

The CSOs were furthermore manually classified with regards to their organizational level, such as the geographical level where they mainly carry out their activities and have their members. Through this procedure, the CSOs were classified as local, regional, national, or supranational. For CSOs being part of national federations (and similar hierarchical organizational bodies), this was easy to determine because they are often named according to the municipality in which they are based. When it comes to CSOs not being named this way, we used information found on the Internet to be able to do this classification.

Note

1. More precisely, the specific categories included (according to Statistics Sweden's standard Swedish Standard Industrial Classification [SNI] 2007) were SNI 86 ("Hälsa- och sjukvård"—"Human health activities"), SNI 87 ("Vård och omsorg med boende"—"Residential care activities"), SNI 88 ("Öppna sociala insatser"—"Social work activities without accommodation"), and SNI 94 ("Intressebevakning; religiös verksamhet"—"Activities of membership organisations"). In our analysis, the organizations having the codes SNI 86, 87, and 88 are called "Social service and care," and organizations with code SNI 94 are called "Interest representation." For more information about the SNI 2007 standard, see <https://www.scb.se/en/documentation/classifications-and-standards/swedish-standard-industrial-classification-sni/>.

References

- Scaramuzzino, Roberto, and Magnus Wennerhag. 2013. "Influencing Politics, Politicians and Bureaucrats: Explaining Differences between Swedish CSOs' Strategies to Promote Political and Social Change." Paper presented at the ECPR General Conference, Bordeaux, France, September 4–7.
- Statistics Sweden. 2007. "SNI Swedish Standard Industrial Classification 2007." Retrieved from http://www.sni2007.scb.se/_pdf/080131snisorteradeng2007.pdf.
- . 2010. *Det civila samhället 2010: Ett regeringsuppdrag med undersökningar från Statistiska centralbyrån*. Örebro, Sweden: Statistiska centralbyrån.
- Vogel, Joachim, Erik Amnå, Ingrid Munck, and Lars Häll. 2003. *Föreningslivet i Sverige: Välfärd, socialt kapital, demokratiskola*. Stockholm, Sweden: Statistiska centralbyrån.
- Wijkström, Filip, and Torbjörn Einarsson. 2006. *Från nationalstat till näringsliv? Det civila samhällets organisationsliv i förändring*. Stockholm, Sweden: European Civil Society Press.