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Abstract

Although non-profit organizations in Russia have been growing, the independent sector still faces many obstacles. Despite this, many local NGOs work successfully in social spheres, including work with disadvantaged youth. In this paper, we discuss two recent US-Russia exchange projects, which highlight the importance of intersectoral partnerships and the contribution of informal volunteer movements to strengthening civil society in Russia. We analyze the perception and participation of project participants, integrating quantitative and qualitative information from nine surveys, along with participatory observations and personal communications. The results show a positive effect of collaboration, as well as a strong contribution of informal volunteer movements to developing new programs for youth/children at risk and strengthening civil society in Russia. Local NGOs play an important role in providing needed social services, informal volunteer networks make important contributions, and overall, Russian civil society may be more vibrant than previous scholarship suggests.
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Introduction and overview

The sudden collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 affected not only political and economic aspects in the country, but also changed the state welfare system and social benefits for the majority of the population by transforming education, family and child welfare, housing, health care and pension systems to new market economy conditions (Cook, 2005; Rodeheaver & Williams, 2005). Families with children have been mostly affected by this transition (Cook, 2005). Poverty rates for households with two or more children almost doubled in the 1990s relative to households with no children or just one child (Goskomstat, 1999 cited by Cook, 2005). As the whole state system has changed over the last three decades, the responses of Russian citizens to new conditions have been also changing. One of the positive responses to the changing political and socio-economic environment in the country is an engaging in civil society development in all spheres of life. Charitable foundations, social movements and formal or informal voluntary organizations have multiplied in Russia after the transition to the market economy (Rodeheaver & Williams, 2005), and many of them have started to address the social problems of families and children that the state structures fail to address. As of January 1st, 2009, the total number of civil society organizations functioning in the Russian Federation was 360,000 (Jakobson, Mersiyanova and et al., 2011). However, according to a CIVICUS study, the percentage of the population, which participated in local community-based activities, was three times higher (28%) than the percentage of the population, which participated, in socially based formal organizations (Jakobson, Mersiyanova and et al., 2011). While some studies highlighted the impact of local community voluntarism and informal volunteer movements on the development of civil society in Russia, still more precise examples, especially outside of the Moscow region, and their detailed examination are missing from the literature (Salamon, 2010; Javeline & Lindeman-Komarova, 2010). In this article, we will address this gap by discussing aspects of the development of civil society engagement in North Caucasus in relation to youth and child welfare, specifically the role of volunteerism in providing needed social services as well as in building a more robust civil society generally. The structure will be as follows: After presenting some background on the topic of civil society in Russia including a brief history of child and youth welfare in Russia, we will enumerate challenges still facing civil society, especially in the area of youth welfare. This will set the stage for our first project, the SIECP, which we will introduce and describe, and show how our evaluation results of that project not
only indicated success but motivated the research questions for our second project, Prevention Bridges. A description of this project, our methods, and discussion of our results will be followed by conclusions concerning peer-to-peer exchange programs and civil society more broadly.

Civil Society in Russia
In general, most scholars define civil society as a sphere for organized social activity that is distinguished from private family life, the for-profit goals of the economic sector and the inner politics of the state. For example, Henry & McIntosh Sundstrom (2006, p.5) offered the following definition: “…civil society is a space of citizen-directed collective action, located between the family and the state, and not directed solely toward private profit." Some scholars also include informal movements into the definition of civil society (Cohen & Arato, 1992). For example, Salamon explains that “the defining questions is not whether the group is legally or formally recognized but whether it has some organizational permanence and regularity as reflected in regular meetings, a membership, and a set of procedures for making decisions that participants recognize as legitimate” (Salamon, 2010 p. 177). Through civil society, all citizens can express their opinion and influence policy changes through their organizational activities (Howard, 2003), and the active involvement of non-profit organizations and volunteers can improve the effectiveness and quality of service delivery that state welfare institutions usually fail to provide (Thomson, 2006). As Putnam argues “states whose residents trust other people, join organizations, volunteer, vote, and socialize with friends - are the same states where children flourish: where babies are born healthy and where teenagers tend not to become parents, drop out of school, get involved in violent crime …” (Putnam, 2000 p. 296).

Although voluntary organizations, unions and movements in Russia have been spreading widely since the early 1990s, the independent sector still faces many obstacles, and the relatively slower pace at which it is developing in Russia relative to other countries of Eastern Europe has been a topic of interest for western scholars. For example, Howard (2003) connected ordinary citizens' lack of motivation to join any formal organizations with the prior communist experience when people were forced to have organizational memberships and participation in state-controlled organizational activities was mandatory. He argued: "people’s current behavior is
shaped by their prior experiences and how they interpret those experiences” (Howard 2003, p.97). However, the new generation of citizens has no firsthand knowledge of communist doctrine and experience, having been raised in newly formed conditions with the hope of a democratic future. Civil society development during the 2000s experienced “trust-related and informational” barriers, while Russian citizens doubted whether organizations were fulfilling their missions or engaging in business affairs in order to contribute their time and money (Jacobson & Sanovich, 2010, p. 14-15). Additional challenges include the weak structure of the Russian non-profit sector, government control on their activities and funding, limited funding opportunities, scanty salaries, and a shortage of volunteers (McIntosh Sundstrom & Henry, 2006). In addition, state policies can slow down the functioning and development of non-governmental organizations. For example, a recent law jeopardizes the work of organizations, which receive their funding through international donors by labeling them “foreign agents” (Federal Law No. 121-FZ of 2012). This law was adopted by the Russian government in November 2012 and requires any non-governmental organization, prior to receipt of funding from any international sources, to register in the Ministry of Justice registry as a “NGO carrying functions of a foreign agent” if this organization intends to conduct political activities. In the original document of 2012, the definition of ‘political activities’ is so unclear that it could put at risk any civil, social, economic or environmental activity in Russia that receives funding from abroad. According to Amnesty International, the enforcement of this law caused more than one thousand Russian organizations to go through different check-ups about their activities and funding. Many were made to pay overwhelmingly high fines for failing to register, and some were shut down. In June 2016, an amendment to the law was passed that explains the definition of ‘political activities’ and eliminates organizations working in the areas of science, art, health, environmental protection and social support. However, this document doesn’t protect non-political organizations from being labeled and forced to register as ‘foreign agent’ if they receive funding from abroad (Amnesty International, 2016). Lastly, the impact of the Law was harmful to civil society in the way that the state-funding dependency converted many organizations from being influencers of policy changes to becoming “the agents of social policy” for their own government (Crotty et.al, 2014, p.1265).
Because of strong governmental control over civil society activities, some western scholars have started to question the growth and even the existence of civil society in Russia (Schmidt-Pfister, 2008). However, in our opinion, the western approach to civil society in Russia, especially the assertion that it does not exist, does not provide a complete picture of the development of the third sector in Russia. Some scholars are calling to more balanced evaluation of Russian civil society (Javeline and Lindemann-Komarova, 2010; Ivanova & Neumayr, 2017), and we are in solidarity with them. This is especially important in the case of volunteers' contributions to youth and child welfare in Russia that we would like address in this article, an area of service provision that is heavily dependent on civil society in Russia as well as in most societies, because state funding commonly fails to keep pace with the need for services for vulnerable youth and children.

**Youth/Child Welfare Institutions in Russia**

The system of social welfare for children and youth in pre-revolutionary Russia started to form in the 19th century. This process coincided with the historical stage that is locally referred to as ‘the New Time,’ when charity in Russia received a significant ideological impetus from the humanistic views of the European Enlightenment. The target groups that attracted both the state and the emerging social institutions were children left without parental care, orphans, street children, beggars, disabled children, and children with mental illnesses. Shelters, kindergartens, nurseries and colonies became the most common forms of children’s social welfare institutions. Education, training and vocational training of children were carried out in such facilities (Ulyanova, 2000).

After the revolution, the core of the Soviet system of children’s social protection was the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Some pre-revolutionary types of social assistance to children were improved (for example, children's homes, educational institutions and children's organizations), and others were abolished (for example, shelters, institutions of church and monastery support, private charities). The main components of the paradigm of children’s social protection which emerged in the early 90's included the integration of the national social protection of children into the international system; the improvement of legislative guarantees of childhood wellbeing; the introduction and development of the institution of commissioners for
children’s rights and the professionalization of social educators and social workers; the decentralization of the children’s social protection system, granting greater powers to state authorities; the differentiated approach to social assistance, providing targeted assistance to the children most in need; and, the introduction of a scientific and theoretical basis for the protection and support of children in the context of a humanistic education paradigm (megapredmet.ru).

At the beginning of the ongoing reforms of 90s, it was already clear that solving issues of children’s welfare would be impossible without the support of civil society, in particular without the combination of state aid to children with the non-state (third) sector, without the expansion of the socio-educational infrastructure and its partial commercialization, and especially without increasing the role of non-state institutions such as the church, private and corporate charities and civil organizations. There are many reasons for this. State children's institutions do not cope effectively with problems because of their conservatism and low levels of professional competence and motivation. They work mainly using outdated and inefficient methods, and they rarely master innovative techniques. Proposed new and potentially more effective approaches, even if they are accepted, are very often formalized in ways that do not achieve their goals. The staff of the institutions is overly occupied with bureaucratic work. The process of diversifying social institutions to address the varied problems of children at risk is neither supported nor incentivized. The levels of interdepartmental, intersectoral interactions and professional literacy of specialists are very low. The levels of confidence and motivation in NGOs are low as well. Volunteer organizations are mainly used for concerts and individual entertainment events, but not for the implementation of long-term regular rehabilitation and prevention programs.

However, recently, the situation with NGOs has begun to change for the better. The Russian government has begun to allocate funds to support the activities of civil organizations on the national and the regional levels, and the transparency of the grant competitions among socially oriented non-profit organizations has significantly increased. The non-profit organizations themselves carry out a variety of programs in the field of prevention of social problems among children and youth. However, the level of professionalism still leaves much to be desired. There are frequent cases in which fraudulent non-profit organizations are formed simply to finance inefficient state programs or to report events that take place only on paper. NGOs that have
contacts with foreign partners, even if they do not have the status of a ‘foreign agent,’ are often perceived as unpatriotic. The level of trust in them is undermined by letters with recommendations not to cooperate sent to the heads of institutions and organizations.

**Development of Non-governmental Organizations in the Stavropol Region**

In 1998, two civil organizations, the Stavropol Regional Branch of the Russian Charitable Foundation "No to Alcoholism and Drug Addiction (NAN),” and an informal youth organization "Volunteers' Movement of Stavropol” were formed in Stavropol. NAN is a non-profit organization, founded in 1987, with its head office in Moscow. By 2015, there were 65 branches, and it was one of Russia's largest non-government entities in Russia. NAN continues to develop programs aimed at preventing alcohol and drug addiction, as well as to help individuals already affected. It creates comprehensive programs to help children in crisis situations, engages in the revisioning of juvenile justice in Russia, implements programs to develop civil society institutions and forms social programs based on public initiatives (NAN website). The Stavropol branch has taken on the same goals and tasks.

Social volunteering began to develop in parallel with the activities of the Stavropol NAN branch in 1998. It was originally the focal activity of the youth wing of the Association of Social Services, and developed into an independent entity, the Volunteers Movement of the Stavropol Region. The movement became an independent youth organization and later turned into a non-profit partnership of volunteering associations and NGOs working in the interests of local children and youth.

During the first all-Russia Civil Forum in 2000, which addressed the topic "The main priorities in solving problems of childhood," it was agreed that no state agencies would be able to create a safe environment for children without broader participation, especially by civil organizations (Civil Forum Materials, 2001). At the Forum, the All-Russian union of civil organizations “Civil Society for Children of Russia” (CSCR) was created. This union was intended to address the interests of children and develop collaborative relations between governmental, non-governmental and commercial organizations, based on the principles of social partnership and interactive policy (The All-Russian Conference, CSRC 2001). The non-governmental, non-profit organizations contributing to the creation of the CSRC received
significant support (Charter of the CSRC, 2001). In 2001, at the final conference of the Union, it was noted that one of the most important outcomes of the past decade was the formation and strengthening of a new social force represented by non-governmental organizations in Russia. Participants of the conference, using personal experiences, argued that the intensive development of civil society in Russia underlay the conditions for effective social partnership, and that it was time to develop a system of cooperation by using the enormous potential of the emerging civil society in Russia.

The Volunteers Movement of the Stavropol Region (hereafter referred to as the DDS), working in close partnership with the North Caucasus Federal University, celebrates its 20th anniversary in 2018. The DDS became the basis for the creation of the Association of Volunteer Movements of the Caucasus in 2010 and initiated the creation of the Association of Volunteer Movements of the CIS\(^1\) countries in 2014. The DDS has successfully raised the profile and credibility of volunteerism (Kirillova, 2011, 2015 and Mitrofanenko, 2016). According to Mitrofanenko's personal observation of several generations of DDS volunteers, the effectiveness of programs DDS has implemented, the credibility of the organization among professional communities, and the success of participants all show that university students can be effectively motivated to participate in civil society through their participation in professionally oriented volunteer activities in programs of social support for children at risk. For example, 30% of the DDS members continue to engage in professional development or practical activities related to their own area of study or professional interests in the field of social protection and have academic degrees, 15% opened their own successful private organizations, 15% became leaders of NGOs and others work in different institutions, having authority among industry experts (Mitrofanenko, 2018).

Despite the size, geographical reach and broad base of support of organizations such as NAN, over the 17 years that have followed oversight and transparency of governmental programs has remained low. Systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of social projects is only now starting to occur, but it has not yet been permitted to examine state structures. For example, the attempted establishment of a possible expert council devolved into a symbiosis of former departmental councils consisting mainly of representatives of high-ranking officials. Therefore,
in many ways the formation of social policy has not changed significantly. It is, as before, built on mostly unmotivated, ineffective and extremely expensive principles and practices. One important issue is the lack of coordination across different organizations, despite the fact that the need for coordinated efforts has long been recognized. In the mid-1990s, a branch of the South Russian Resource Center was established through the Soros Foundation in the Stavropol region. Its activities contributed to the development of the third sector in the Stavropol region. Unfortunately, with the termination of funding, the Center was closed, and all the NGO coordination was lost. However, the need to unite different social organizations was still recognized, and therefore, coalitions between existing non-governmental organizations were formed. Thus, in 2001, the Association of Social Services was formed. Its aim was to unite all non-governmental organizations working in the interests of socially unprotected groups of the population. It included about 10 organizations and carried out joint planning of activities such as training programs and conferences. The Stavropol NAN foundation played the leading role in this association. In the years 2005-2006, the Foundation implemented a collaborative project supported by the Public Chamber of the Russian Federation with the goal of creating a Resource Center for supporting NGOs and developing non-profit activity in the Stavropol Region. The project resulted in grant writing training for more than 40 organizations, and 10 of them won grants for the implementation of their projects in the next year.

The activities of the Stavropol NAN have subsequently focused on working with children at risk. In this domain, the Stavropol branch built the most extensive network in the whole of NAN, including more than 20 organizations in the south of Russia. This exemplifies the distinctive strength of NAN in Stavropol, namely creation of networks for collaborative sharing of resources and expertise along with a focus on practical, effective strategies for improving the situation of children at risk. It is this commitment to collaboration that solidified NAN's position as the Russian partner in the collaborative projects with the University of Oregon, which will be discussed in later sections of this paper.

Intersectoral collaboration between the state and the civil sector further achieved a striking success in protecting children's rights with the 2012 adoption of the "National Strategy for Children for 2012-2017" (Decree of the President, 2012). Social policy regarding children began
to undergo positive changes. However, it is not yet possible to say that this progress has achieved sustainability. The main reason for the insufficient level of protection for children in difficult life situations is the lack of public examination of programs. While the program for evaluating the effectiveness of social projects is only now beginning to unfold, it is not yet applicable to state organizations (Avtonomov & Hanashvili, 2010).

**Current situation**

The picture in southern Russia remains mixed at present. While progress has been made, the overall level of development of non-profit organizations implementing programs for children at risk remains rather low. Many organizations do not have experience in developing and implementing projects or finding funds to support them, and many do not know where to obtain the necessary information. The lack of qualified, competent, experienced employees and activists in non-profit organizations makes creating a strong third sector, capable of positioning itself as an equal partner with the state, especially difficult in the Stavropol region.

In addition, and perhaps more importantly, social attitudes have not changed significantly, especially when it comes to the rejection of more repressive mechanisms for solving problems, including social problems of childhood. This was very clearly demonstrated by the legislation on Juvenile Justice that was introduced to the State Duma in 2002, but which did not receive final approval (Rodeheaver & Williams, 2005). This legislation was incorrectly interpreted by the general public as requiring that children be taken from parents in all cases of crisis, but in reality it was an attempt by civil organizations to create separate juvenile and family courts and to conduct specialized training for judges and social workers who can protect children’s rights and interests. As of today, “…there are no official, legal alternatives to the formal processing of juveniles in the criminal justice system, and in most cases juveniles undergo processing as adults by the police, adult courts and the system of correctional colonies, even for minor crimes” (Rodeheaver & Williams, 2005, p.239). The reform of the guardianship system has only been the main priority in Russia in rhetoric, but not in practice.

Therefore, it is important for Russian NGOs working with children in difficult life situations to have opportunities to interact with colleagues from countries in which the nonprofit sector has
a more established system for implementing programs to protect children’s rights, in order to provide a cross-fertilization of ideas and fresh approaches. This was the guiding principle behind the development of the two projects we will now turn to, the 2014 Eurasia Foundation’s US-Russia Civil Society Partnership Award-funded Students’ Internships Exchange for Child Protection (SIECP) Project, and the 2017 US State Department Peer-to-Peer Dialogue program-funded Prevention Bridges Project. Peer-to-peer Approach was used to support and to better understand Russian and US civil society, as well as to provide a cultural exchange experience for students to enhance intercultural understanding in both projects.

**Peer-to-peer Approach as a Framework for our Study**

We have taken the peer-to-peer approach that is usually used in peer education as the framework for our study. The peer education method is rooted in Social Learning Theory, which maintains, “that modeling is an important component of the learning process” (Turner & Shepherd, 1999, p.237). This theory is linked to peer education in terms of credibility, empowerment, role modeling and reinforcement (Turner & Shepherd, 1999). While peer education has been critiqued as “a method in search of theory rather than the application of theory to practice” (Turner & Shepherd, 1999, p. 235), its effectiveness has been demonstrated across a wide range of domains, notably gender and relationship education, parenting, health and wellness interventions and university advising, among others. Questions remain about its use in an intercultural setting, however. For example, Andrews & Manning (2016) report on a peer-to-peer exchange between Georgian and Swedish land reformers; because the historical and cultural contexts were so different, common ground for exchanging relevant ideas was too difficult to find, and the project was abandoned. Thus, while scholars of the peer-to-peer approach agree that it entails practitioners exchanging knowledge and experience with each other, and bringing back this knowledge to their organizations to put into practice (Andrews & Manning, 2016), there is not consensus regarding how best to implement a peer-to-peer approach cross-culturally, and indeed there has been little research overall analyzing the successes and failures of a peer-to-peer approach which engages peers from different cultures.

In our study therefore, we view the Peer-to-peer model not just as an opportunity to foster intercultural dialog, but also as an opportunity for research which can identify similarities and
differences as well as relative strengths and weaknesses of civil society in both countries. Through our research, we also seek to explore whether the Russian and the U.S. contexts are different enough that dialog can provide novel ideas and insights, yet similar enough for shared experiences to be relevant and transferrable. Thus, our findings will provide a contribution not just to a deeper understanding of civil society, but also a greater understanding of the peer-to-peer approach as a tool for understanding, and perhaps strengthening, civil society.

Both of the projects to be described in the section that follow are partnerships based on equal and reciprocal relationships at all levels of communication and international collaboration. At the institutional level, University of Oregon (UO) worked as an equal partner with Russian NGO “NAN”; at the personal level, UO faculty and students worked together with faculty and students from North-Caucasus Federal University; and at the professional level, U.S. NGOs’ practitioners worked with Russian NGOs’ practitioners. Thus, the projects comprised a range of peer-to-peer relationships. However, all project participants participated in all activities and learned in collaborative environment about civil society organizations in both countries, and so peer exchanges often connected participants at different professional stages, such as students with practitioners and faculty with organizers. However, and crucially, all participants participated in a rich and intensive collection of team-building and bonding activities which strengthened participants' perceptions of each other as peers who shared common experiences along with the common purpose of developing society through sharing knowledge reciprocally. As we will discuss in our conclusions, we propose that the unique structures of these two projects, with their heavy focus on team-building activities as well as professional activities, provides a model for enhancing the peer-to-peer approach across cultures, and for strengthening the identification of other participants as one's peers because they share a common purpose, not just because they are nominally of the same profession or at the same stage of the life cycle.

The Students’ Internships Exchange for Child Protection (SIECP) Project
The SIECP project was supported by a US-Russia Civil Society Partnership Award from the Eurasia Foundation for promoting and enhancing Russian-American intersectoral collaboration among academic institutions and non-profit and governmental organizations. Undergraduate students from North-Caucasus Federal University (NCFU) in Russia and the Family and Human
Services Program (FHS) of the University of Oregon (UO) in the United States participated in an exchange program in Eugene, Oregon, USA and in the North Caucasus region of Russia. The SIECP was intentionally designed with the goal of addressing the areas of weakness described above, including lack of transparent program evaluation, insufficient opportunities for sharing resources and information, lack of information about child/youth welfare systems in other countries and cultures, and the need to establish and develop networks for volunteers as well as professionals. The focus was on experiential learning as well as direct instruction.

The SIECP Project was implemented in two phases: winter and summer 2014. The first phase consisted of a two-week exchange program in Oregon for Russian students and faculty from NCFU. The program included a professional seminar, visits to local public and non-profit organizations that work with youth and families at risk, and observation of several FHS classes and internship sites. The Eugene seminar curriculum introduced the Russian participants to successful local prevention and intervention programs for runaway and homeless youth, youth with disabilities, youth with behavior problems, youth with alcohol/drug dependence, and youth in conflict with the law, including a youth rehabilitation center and other juvenile justice models.

The second part of the project in summer 2014 included student internships with a three-day professional development seminar for Russian child welfare practitioners in Stavropol. The internship activities were the following: one-day youth summit; three days of acclimatization and training activities in the mountains; a four-day backpacking trip; and, two days at the Black Sea coast with a tour to Olympic Sochi. The objectives of the summer program were to introduce effective public and non-profit child welfare programs and services, as well as to promote the importance of partnership relations among key stakeholders at local and regional levels, and exchange and promote effective child protection models and services. The three-day seminar curriculum was designed for professionals working with children at risk in different public sectors, such as education, health care, social welfare, and youth policies, as well as for post-secondary instructors and students, and representatives from local NGOs. The seminar was organized by the informal students’ organization “Volunteerism in Stavropol Region” along with the Department of Social Work at the NCFU. It was attended by nearly one hundred people.
After the seminar in Stavropol, the students from both countries conducted their two-week faculty-led internships.

In addition to the students and faculty, ten children between the ages of 14 to 17 years who resided in an orphanage also participated in the internship program. One of the internship objectives was to provide socio-rehabilitative activities for children in difficult life situations, which could help them to restore trust relationships, improve behavior management, and build and advance social skills. A second objective was for American and Russian students to have an opportunity to enhance their cross-cultural understanding of social problems in both countries and to advance their professional skills and knowledge. Finally, a third objective was to develop partnership relations between the two universities and among several Russian public and non-profit organizations.

**Evaluation Methods**
Because, as described in the previous section, lack of critical examination and evaluation of existing programs is a major obstacle to the improvement of youth social services in Russia, evaluation was an integral component of the SIECP project as well as the Prevention Bridges Project which will be discussed in detail below. The evaluation addressed the perceptions of all participants and integrated both quantitative and qualitative data from six surveys, which were constructed using a five-point Likert scale which ranged from ‘1 – unsatisfied’ to ‘5 - excellent.’ The surveys measured satisfaction with the exchange programs and opinions about the usefulness of the exchange curricula. In addition, the child participants from the centers made a self-assessment on the impact of the internship activities on their risk factors, such as aggressive and antisocial behaviors, dependency, and distrust.

**Results**
The results indicated that both phases of the project were highly successful. According to the results of the first survey for Russian participants, most faculty and students responded positively with either a good or excellent response, averaging 4.7 on the 5-point Likert scale, with narrative comments also uniformly positive. For example, one of the students from Russia wrote, “The seminars were beyond my expectations, we got much more information than I could hope. First
thing is how it was organized and presented, it was interesting and accessible, we received all expected information in a couple of seminars and it wasn't tiring at all…” In particular, all Russian participants highlighted the usefulness of curricula on programs and services for youth in conflict with the law, such as the juvenile justice center and a local nonprofit specializing in youth rehabilitation programs and services.

The second survey for American students, who hosted Russian students in their homes and assisted with the exchange program activities, showed that all students rated their cross-cultural experience as ‘good,’ ‘very good,’ or ‘excellent,’ with the average score at 3.3. The only negative comments centered on the language barrier and busy exchange program schedule that they assisted with during the two weeks; for example, one American student commented, “My experience in hosting students was excellent. Communication was a challenge first two days of hosting, but we worked out a system that aided in interpretation. The experience was excellent because I learned about Russian language, culture and about social services in Russia.” Another student added, “After the first few days it was easier to get along and we were definitely bonded, especially with the students.”

The three surveys that evaluated the two-week internship program in Russia documented similarly positive results. Most of the Russian students (69 %) rated the cross-cultural experience and relationships developed with American students during the internship as ‘excellent’ and the rest (31%) rated this aspect ‘very good.’ At the same time, Russian students rated their field study and relationships with children during the internship as ‘very good’ (54 %), ‘excellent’ (15%), ‘good’ (15%) and ‘satisfied’ (15%), and expressed a strong perception that internship activities for the children-participants were effective as a way to prevent antisocial behavior (39%) and dependency (31%) in children and as a building block of trust relationships (39%) and social skills (31%). American students also rated positively both their internship experience in Russia (average 4.6) and the relationships developed with Russian students and faculty (average 4.3). One of the American students wrote, “The communication I had with the students and faculty was great. It was an amazing experience for me and was something I will always remember. It was my relationships with the people on the trip that give me my fondest memories.” Perhaps surprisingly, the American students’ assessment of
practicing their professional skills with children showed that only minor improvements should be made in future projects to overcome language barriers with children. Instead, they suggested including more team building activities and games with children in the daily schedule of their internship in Russia. The overall rating for this part was 3.3. All students affirmed the potential of the children-participants and their good resilience skills. One of the students noted, “The kids have tons of potential…Many times I found them putting others ahead of themselves and it inspired me.” A second added, “I noticed that all of the children were friendly and respectful. I learned about each of the children (at risk) have very unique backgrounds and stories, are resilient and have a great potential for a positive future. I learned that there are very few social supports for these children at risk during their transition to adulthood.” The third student concluded “I wish I could have spoken (Russian) to the youth so that I could have gotten to know them better and we could have made closer bonds. I also learned that Russian youth are strong, brave, and very kind and supportive of the ones they love and care about.”

The final survey evaluating the SIECP was developed for the children-participants in the internship portion of the project. All rated the relationships with American and Russian students during the internship and activities as ‘5 - excellent.’ In addition, all the children were asked to make a self-assessment of the benefits of the internship on their own risk factors, such as aggressive and antisocial behaviors, dependency, and distrust. The results of the self-assessment confirmed that these risk factors were moderated by the internship experience as children rated all categories as ‘very good’ and ‘excellent.’

**Discussion of SIECP evaluation results**

The SIECP had a strongly positive, multilevel impact. First of all, the project contributed to the establishment of professional cooperation between the two academic institutions, the NCFU and the UO, as well as governmental and non-governmental organizations in both countries. Second, the exchange programs led to the establishment of lasting relationships between the host organizations and among the Russian and American students. For example, all Russian students who were involved in the project ended up joining “Volunteerism in Stavropol Region.” In addition, both American and Russian students enhanced their understanding of social problems from a cross-cultural perspective and advanced their professional skills and knowledge in youth
welfare. After their professional experience in Russia, American students became more conscious of their own cultural awareness and the strengths or needs of children and youth in difficult life situations at home and abroad. Moreover, because the internship focused on socio-rehabilitative activities for children that were aimed at restoring trust relationships, improving behavior management, and building social skills, the children-participants experienced gains in these areas, building on the friendly relations they developed with students and faculty from the UO and the NCFU. In addition, the U.S. participants learned about the nature and history of several previously unfamiliar regions of the Russian Federation. Finally, the project contributed to the establishment of lasting relationships between the hosting organizations, which led to the collaborative development of our second Peer-to-Peer Project: Prevention Bridges to Youth Positive Change.

Building on the success of the SIECP project, especially the mutually recognized value of Russia - U.S. collaboration in the field of youth welfare, in 2016 funding was successfully sought from the U.S. State Department-funded Peer-to-peer Dialogue Program to support a second exchange program, once again among youth volunteers in Stavropol, Stavropol Region, Russian Federation and in Eugene, Oregon, U.S.A.

**Prevention Bridges Peer-to-peer Dialogue Project**

Building on the lessons learned from the SIECP, the "Prevention Bridges to Youth Positive Change Project" (henceforth referred to as "Prevention Bridges") was designed with an explicit research as well as praxis focus. Evaluation instruments targeted five research questions concerning the possible role played by the peer-to-peer approach in illuminating and enhancing U.S. and Russian civil society, as well as addressing the issue of why there is disagreement in the literature regarding the robustness of Russian civil society. Specifically, the five research questions were:

1) What can the peer-to-peer approach reveal about US civil society?
2) What can the peer-to-peer approach reveal about Russian civil society?
3) Can the peer-to-peer approach lead to a more nuanced understanding of Russia’s civil society?
4) Why is there disagreement regarding the existence of a robust civil society in Russia?
5) Can the peer-to-peer approach be helpful for enhancing civil society?

Like the SIECP project, Prevention Bridges aligned naturally with the peer-to-peer approach. It focused on participatory models of civic engagement, experiential collaborative learning, and a focus on developing civil society through sharing knowledge reciprocally. The project focus on at-risk youth, youth delinquency and substance abuse is of vital importance to both societies, and efforts to ameliorate these problems rely heavily on volunteers, due to gaps in knowledge, funding and service provisions in the U.S., Russia, and indeed in most societies.

In the United States, the University of Oregon’s Department of International Studies was the host organization, and in Russia the Stavropol branch of the charitable foundation NAN ("No to Alcoholism and Drug Addiction") served as the local host and facilitator. As described above, NAN has branches throughout Russia, and has been well known since 1987 for efforts in education and training, treatment, information, networking and social care for juveniles, particularly those at risk. NAN also recruited participants from Volunteerism in Stavropol, the informal grassroots volunteer movement whose membership is loosely tied together for social and training purposes but not directed either centrally or top-down. Similarly, International Studies at Oregon's unique focus on theory and praxis attracts students with a higher-than-average propensity to volunteer actively, and further encourages them to do so through providing information and credit-bearing practicum courses, along with strong encouragement to conduct internships with international communities. Thus, while it is not a volunteering organization per se, it provides connections among, and encouragement to, volunteers.

Activities for the Prevention Bridges project centered around the exchange of visits to participants' home communities, with the Russian team first visiting Eugene, Oregon, and the American team visiting Stavropol, Stavropol Region three months later. Participants included both young volunteers and more seasoned professionals. The Oregon team consisted of seven students and two faculty coordinators. The Stavropol team consisted of seven young volunteers from Volunteerism in Stavropol, and two mature and established representatives of the non-profit sector. In addition, a summer school program in Archyz, North Caucasus (to be described in greater detail below) drew 23 participants, including five of the exchange participants along
with representatives from a range of civil society and youth welfare organizations throughout southwest Russian Federation.

**Methods**
Our methods included qualitative and quantitative data collection from three surveys and one focus group along with participatory observations and personal communications. Opinions from all participants were solicited at the conclusion of both the U.S. and the Russia stages of the project. At the end of the Eugene portion of the exchange, the U.S. participants engaged in a focus group debrief while the Russian participants completed an anonymous survey with 9 open-ended questions. At the end of the Stavropol portion, all participants received an anonymous survey with 19 questions, including Likert scale, sentence completion and open-ended questions. The questions covered the program in general (for example, "Overall how well did the summer school program meet your expectations?") as well as perceptions of volunteerism and civil society (for example, "What differences have you noticed between the functioning of Russian and American NGOs, based on your participation experience in the “Prevention Bridges” project?"). Results were tabulated to evaluate satisfaction with aspects of the program and an inductive approach was used to identify qualitative themes. Neither descriptive nor inferential statistics were used because the sample sizes were small. The Peer-to-peer approach itself also stimulated participants to consciously reflect about civil society and their place in it, and thus also provided a valuable research framework for the authors, who also used their own participant-observations as a research methodology.

**Results**
*Overview* With respect to the questions focused on program satisfaction, participants were consistently positively impressed with the project, in terms of both professional and personal development. With respect to the questions focused on civil society and volunteerism, participants were favorably impressed with the sociable, family-like approach of Russian volunteerism, and favorably impressed with the professional, job-like approach of the U.S. youth welfare organizations. In this section, we will elaborate upon these general patterns in greater detail.
Program evaluation: In their responses, both American and Russian participants agreed upon the following:

- As a tool for improving intercultural understanding and positive attitudes among Russians and Americans, the program was highly successful.
- The peer-to-peer approach, by investing participants in shared common activities, was effective and engaging for meeting expectations of both groups.
- The peer-to-peer approach facilitated participants' ability to highlight differences and similarities between Russian and US civil society, helping them to appreciate the distinctive features of each.
- While more Russians spoke English than Americans spoke Russian, both identified the lack of English proficiency of Russian participants as a problem; none identified lack of Russian proficiency among U.S. participants as a problem.
- Both groups of participants were favorably impressed with the inclusiveness of the other.

However, there were also interesting areas of disagreement:

- Russians wanted more structured activities, less free time; Americans wanted fewer structured activities, more free time.
- Americans were struck by the “family-like” relationships among Russian volunteers; Russians were struck by the professionalism but lack of communication among American volunteers.
- Americans most appreciated cultural experiences and knowledge (for example, learning about Russia and the North Caucasus); Russians most appreciated the professional experiences and knowledge they gained (for example, learning about youth welfare organizations and strategies).
- Russians were more likely to favor team-building activities as a critical part of the summer school curriculum; Americans were more likely to want more individual time and to view team-building activities as “extras.”
- Russians were struck by the inclusiveness built into U.S. NGO programming; Americans were struck by the inclusiveness shown by the Russian team towards ethnic diversity and disability of team members themselves.
American participants' impressions on Russian civil society Participants from the U.S. noted several differences between volunteering in Russia and their own experiences of volunteering in the U.S. In particular, they judged the affective dimension of volunteering as more salient in Russia than in the U.S., as summarized below:

- “Family-like” atmosphere, rather than “job-like.”
- Greater opportunities for youth in leadership positions.
- Stronger, longer relationship with one organization rather than a sampling of many different ones.
- For Russians, being a volunteer is an identity, whereas for Americans it is more a means to an end.\textsuperscript{ii}
- Russians are motivated to volunteer through internal rewards (camaraderie, team building activities), while Americans are motivated through external rewards (demonstrating skills and values for employment).

From the lists above, it can be seen that American participants view Russians’ motivation to volunteer to be more based on affective, intrinsic factors such as camaraderie, rather than the extrinsic factors that are more salient for them, such as being required to volunteer by schools and courses, and enhancing one’s resume and thereby enhancing one’s academic and professional prospects. Respondents were able to also describe consequences that followed from these differences, such as the fact that affective motivations lead volunteering to tie in directly with individual identity for Russians, while instrumental motivations lead volunteering to be a means toward an end such as a career or scholarship, which might be more significant for an American's identity. The intrinsic motivation may also lead to other aspects they noted, such as a more “family-like” atmosphere among Russian volunteers, as contrasted with a more “job-like” atmosphere among U.S.-based volunteers. It may also account for another factor they noted, which was that the Russian volunteers they encountered appeared to be more committed to a single organization for a longer period of time, whereas American volunteers tend to have a wide range of different kinds of volunteer experiences, for shorter times but with more different organizations. They also noted that volunteers in Russia assumed more leadership roles at a younger age than in the U.S., perhaps because of their longer and stronger commitment to a
single organization, or perhaps because in general volunteers in Russia tend to be younger, whereas in the U.S. volunteering cuts across generations to a greater extent.

**Russian participants’ impressions of U.S. civil society:** Participants from Russia also observed differences between U.S. and Russian volunteer roles and behaviors, commenting in particular on the high level of professionalism they observed in U.S. service organizations, as well as the better success of fundraising efforts. For them the most salient differences had not to do with the motivations and efforts of volunteers per se, but rather with aspects of civil society and service provision more generally, as shown below, in response to questions about what they had learned from the program about American civil society:

- Fundraising expertise and success.
- High level of professionalism.
- High level of government support.
- Lack of focus on institutional care.
- Inclusiveness with both gender and disability.
- Possibilities for and receptiveness to further international collaboration.

The Russian participants perceived strengths in U.S. civil society and social service provision that complemented the challenges they saw for Russian civil society and social service provision, supporting another goal of the Prevention Bridges project, namely to highlight similarities and differences in order to create reciprocal learning and problem-solving opportunities. They were most saliently struck by differences in care provision, especially the U.S. de-emphasis on institutional care for children, the focus on inclusiveness in service provision with respect to both gender and disability, and what they perceived as the high level of government support for social services. In addition, there was appreciation for the enthusiasm that civil society organizations in Oregon had shown for increased collaboration with them, something that was also supported in informal dialogue, indicating that the goal of the Peer-to-peer Program of increasing communication and understanding among Russian and American participants had been achieved.

**Russian participants’ reflections on Russian civil society:** In the surveys, participants were invited to reflect on their own experience of volunteering and relationship with civil society, with
the assumption that intercultural dialogue, such as was highlighted in the Peer-to-peer Project, can help participants reflect and deepen insight on their own, often previously unexamined practices and beliefs. The Russians’ self-perceptions mirrored, and expanded upon, the Americans’ assessment of Russian volunteers as being more internally and affectively, rather than externally and instrumentally motivated, than American volunteers, and they reported a range of reasons for participation:

- Affective ("I’m an optimist," "fascinating," "self-realization," "growth," "fulfill creative potential.")
- Volunteering helps youth see selves as agents ("find a platform for my personal ideas", "leadership" "opportunity to change the environment.")
- Only rare, secondary mentions of professional reasons ("obtain work experience" "fulfill my professional ambitions.")

Volunteering thus appears to be closely tied in with individual identity and citizenship and the connection of volunteering with a broader Russian civil society appears to be less salient:

- They also reported concerns about a possible gap between volunteering & civil society:
- Despite very positive views of volunteering, they have mixed attitudes regarding whether civil society overall is developing.
- They view change in attitudes on the individual level as a necessary first step.

However, the responses to this cluster of questions also suggest that many of the Russian participants did not actively think about their volunteering efforts in the context of a broader civil society, and some probably did not really understand the meaning of the term “civil society.” Most were focused instead on the very concrete actions and effects of volunteering, rather than the more abstract construct of “civil society.” Some of the Russian respondents left many of the questions about civil society blank, and later informal conversations with them supported the assumption that they weren’t familiar with the term or its meaning; this contrasts with the U.S. participants, who had all taken a course in which the term and concept were discussed. Most of the Russian respondents report observing changes in the valorization of volunteer activities and an increase in the professionalism of volunteers, especially among young people. However, they
continue to perceive obstacles, specifically corruption and lack of government support at the local level, along with a lack of visible structures for recruiting and placing volunteers. Although they see the attitudes of individuals changing to make them more receptive to volunteering, they still assess opportunities to volunteer as being often difficult to find. They also suggested that the Russian model of volunteerism, as more individual, less formal, less centralized and less extrinsically motivated can lead to less cooperation and communication among service providers, and a less unified voice with which to raise their status and visibility, which may limit their ability to garner local government support or to facilitate the recruitment and retention of volunteers.

Discussion: Returning to the five research questions
First of all, both projects were highly successful, providing a model for implementing the peer-to-peer approach across very different historical and cultural contexts, and including as “peers” participants at a wide range of professional stages, from students to experienced practitioners. We believe that the emphasis on team building and bonding, combined with the very practical experiential, rather than abstract and general, approach to knowledge sharing, are factors that contributed to the success. In addition, as was previously mentioned above, we view the peer-to-peer model not just as an opportunity to foster intercultural dialog, but also as an opportunity for research which can foreground similarities and differences as well as relative strengths and weaknesses. In this section, we will return to the five research questions that we posed above, and address each in turn:

1) What strengths and challenges did the peer-to-peer approach reveal about U.S. civil society? Participants from both Russia and the U.S. agreed that U.S. civil society emphasizes professionalism among volunteers and social service organizations, which results in a higher level of expertise and stronger ability to mobilize funds and other resources. While the more instrumental motivations and ambitions of U.S. volunteers lead to higher turnover, lower commitment to a particular organization, and communication challenges, the resulting increased contact among different individuals and organizations facilitates the sharing of new approaches and techniques, leading to a kind of ongoing cross-fertilization of best practices and ideas.
2) What strengths and challenges did the peer-to-peer approach reveal about Russian civil society? The team building approach and affective orientation of Russian volunteers can help to create more inclusive, cohesive bonds among volunteers, even in an informal volunteer organization such as the DDS. For example, the Russian team was quite diverse in terms of ethnicity, nationality and physical ability. While the sense of a “volunteer identity” and affective rewards that are cultivated among Russian volunteers lead to more continuity in staff and programming, overall the level of professionalism is not as high as it could be, and in particular fundraising skills are not well developed. Because the commitment to a single organization is strong, and because the rewards for volunteering are intrinsic rather than extrinsic, volunteers are less able to convey the value and importance of volunteering among the wider society, leading to a greater lack of awareness and participation overall.

3) Can the Peer-to-peer model lead to a more nuanced understanding of Russian civil society? As discussed in the introductory section of this paper, an ongoing controversy in the literature concerns the nature, scope and robustness of civil society in the Russian Federation. The unique value of the peer-to-peer approach is that its reciprocal sharing and immersive exchange allows for more nuanced examination and comparison. The responses of the participants themselves reveal that civil society in the form of volunteerism at the grassroots level is thriving, with active, inspired and committed volunteers making a wide range of contributions. The answer to this question, however, may be obscured by the variety of definitions regarding “civil society” and thus it may be more fruitful to avoid such binary analyses in favor of a more nuanced approach, using volunteerism as the lens to seek distinctive characteristics of Russian civil society. A further advantage of reciprocal sharing, hands-on immersion and an inherently comparative approach is that unanticipated cultural differences, such as the focus on intrinsic vs. extrinsic rewards, can deflect attention away the actual robustness of Russian civil society. Finally, the programmatic focus on shared values and the charge to find common ground uncovers similarities more fruitfully than does proceeding with a presupposition of difference. A further way that this research may provide a more accurate understanding is that participants themselves report that they perceive change occurring, suggesting that published reports on civil society in Russia may no longer be up to date in this rapidly evolving situation.
4) Why is there so much disagreement regarding the existence of a robust civil society in Russia? As alluded to in previous sections above, the many different definitions used by scholars and practitioners to label civil society are certainly one of the problems. Without a common definition, it is no surprise that attempts to identify and characterize it will be inconclusive. In addition though, we propose that the five following factors uncovered in this research project also play a part: 1) As we have shown, the vibrancy of civil society activities may not be salient because volunteer networks are informal and volunteer efforts are not acknowledged in scholarly, professional or academic venues because they are internally rather than externally motivated and rewarded. 2) Volunteer networks tend to be less professional and more social, making their status as building blocks of civil society less salient. 3) The fact that Russian volunteers are more likely to commit long term to one organization rather than to circulate among several makes them less visible and restricts communication networks that could amplify their presence. 4) The emphasis on volunteering within one’s own local community, rather than making volunteer trips to other communities or engaging in “volunteer tourism” also limits the visibility of volunteers’ activities. 5) Volunteering manifests differently in different societies, so there may be a mismatch between actual activity and indicators of activity. For example, in the U.S. organization websites typically contain links to volunteer opportunities and scholarship and university applications typically devote sections to them, but these indicators may be missing entirely in their Russian counterpart organizations.

5) Can the Peer-to-peer model be helpful for enhancing civil society? Our final question asked whether the Peer-to-peer model can be valuable for enhancing the strength of civil society organizations, and not just as a useful tool for understanding civil society. We have found that the reciprocal, peer-based dialogue model is indeed helpful for strengthening volunteers’ commitments while improving their skills and knowledge, and for developing and reinforcing networks of information and support. In addition to encouraging the reciprocal sharing of knowledge, it provides non-monetary compensation for volunteers who by definition are not compensated monetarily; for example, recognition from one’s peers is a valuable way to reinvigorate and reinspire, perhaps inoculating against the kind of burnout that can be frequent in the social services. It can strengthen networks of support and self-identification, and especially
for young volunteers, simply the opportunity to travel and meet and interact with peers from other cultures is exciting and validating.

**Conclusions: Youth volunteering as an incubator for a robust civil society**

We believe that this research has a broader impact, beyond the questions concerning the success of the projects themselves and the insights they reveal regarding civil society in Russia and in the U.S. Responding to the important question of how we might measure the impact of third sector organizations on democracy and legitimacy, we propose that more abstract impacts on hard-to-measure conceptual domains such as democracy and legitimacy can be assessed indirectly through assessing experiential impacts that we know are important for robust and vibrant civil societies. We suggest that the peer-to-peer approach facilitates the trust, skills, confidence, knowledge, networks, and sense of agentivity that are themselves the indicators of the potential for robust citizen involvement and investment in democracy. While these components may not be sufficient, they certainly are necessary, and therefore can provide crucial foundations for strengthening civil society. Furthermore, because of the youthfulness of most of the participants, these necessary traits will mature as the participants themselves mature, personally and professionally.

We therefore propose that youth volunteering can serve as an incubator for a more robust and extensive civil society. While a distinction is often made between socially and politically oriented civil society organizations, with youth volunteerism, especially with children, often considered apolitical and even self-indulgent, (Godfrey & Wearing 2012, Reas 2013, Carpenter 2015) we propose that there is a developmental relationship between the two, and that fostering habits of citizenship through youth volunteering can lead participants to a deeper understanding of the role of the citizen in the broader society. Traits such as trust, skills, confidence, knowledge, networks, and sense of agentivity can prepare young volunteers for leadership roles beyond the youth welfare organizations in which they first begin volunteering. While youth volunteering is inherently valuable, it can also model habits of citizenship and inspire at-risk youth themselves to feel a greater stake in their society. As previously discussed, the SIECP project provided at-risk children with rare access to highly enjoyable activities, and the children themselves believe that the bonds created with the volunteer-mentors reduced their own
tendencies toward aggressive and antisocial behaviors, dependency and distrust, factors that would undermine their ability to contribute as engaged, productive citizens. We argue that youth volunteerism can be an effective way both to provide appropriate services in the local context, and to develop the sense of civic responsibility and investment critical for a robust civil society, more broadly and longer term. In a multicultural society such as the Russian Federation, youth volunteerism linked informally in decentralized networks is inevitably and inherently local and community-based, and therefore may be most effective for addressing local needs. Moreover, youth who are still outside of the hierarchies of status and seniority can bring a greater willingness to listen to the populations they serve and a greater openness to new ideas.

The lines of evidence that lead us to this conclusion lie in both the demographic patterns that we saw and in volunteers' survey responses regarding their own involvement. There is a clear generational divide between the mostly twenty-somethings that participated in the program, and older Russians who may have had their experience of volunteering soured by the "mandatory volunteering" of the Soviet era. There is no reason to expect that the young volunteers' participation in civil society will decrease as they age; their experiences and views of volunteering are not only very positive, but as we saw in the discussion of the results, volunteering is an aspect of their identity, not just something they do. Already, our survey showed that most have volunteered with the same organization for extended periods of between four to fifteen years.

Most of the Peer-to-peer participants themselves expressed the belief that civil society in Russia is developing, and their aspirations for a more robust and effective civil society may in future motivate them to take more active leadership roles. They are not just garnering skills such as event planning and discussion facilitation, but they are gaining a sense of agency and trust in networks outside of their immediate circles that may encourage them to look outward toward a broader civil society. As several of the participants expressed, their fellow volunteers feel like a family to them. In this way then, the peer-to-peer approach may be incubating civil society through developing the habits of citizenship among young volunteers, even as it avoids false dichotomies of definition and bridges intercultural differences.
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Endnotes

1 CIS is the acronym for Commonwealth of Independent States, formed when the former Soviet Union dissolved in 1991, comprising ten former Soviet Republics: Armenia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan.

2 For example, the volunteer manual used by the informal network of volunteers in Stavropol introduces the idea of volunteering with the statement "A volunteer is a modern, educated individual with advanced views."