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Abstract
This paper focuses on Italian human rights and advocacy associations in a context of reflexivity and marketisation. The scope is to investigate if the changes in the structures of these associations, due to reflexivity and marketisation, have an impact on social capital, and subsequently in the civil society development and contribution to democracy. The sample of 19 organizations analyzed show that the tendency towards more investment in fundraising changes their organizational structure, making them with more stable donors and less volunteers. Starting from these data, some observations on politicization of TSOs in Italy and possible implication on democracy, social solidarity and social capital are drawn. In conclusion it is considered that the real activation of volunteers and donors imply an horizontalization of TS, while when it is absent can imply more fragmentation.
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Introduction
The advocacy role of nonprofit sector has been analyzed by political science, sociology and nonprofit studies (Grønbjerg and Prakash 2017). Theda Skocpol in 2003 investigated the American “diminished democracy” addressing American civic associations; she highlighted how more professionally managed advocacy groups had taken the place of voluntary membership associations in America. These kinds of changes are verifying also in Italy in recent years, especially in those associations that have stronger bonds with Anglo-American civic culture. These changes are described in this paper with two different literature theories, reflexivity and marketisation; the concept of marketisation will help to explain professionalization, and its implication on donors and volunteers; the concept of reflexivity is useful to understand process of individualization and the research of self-fulfillment for those who volunteer or work in these associations.

This paper wants to deal with the advocacy and human rights role of nonprofit organization in the context of marketisation and reflexivity that is involving the Third Sector. The scope is to start a reflection about the possible consequences on social solidarity (Zoll 2004) of the internal structure transformation of these associations; to control if reflexive volunteers, but also donors, could be instrumentalized to gain an economic result at detriment to the social one. This could give a glance on
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the politicization of some of the human rights and advocacy association in Italy, and their production of social capital.

This paper is divided in four main section. The first one deal with the changes that are involving TS, as stated by recent literature; highlights on marketisation, reflexivity and brief summary of the current situation of expressive associations in Italy are made. The second one present the methodology and the results of the analysis of a sample of 18 Italian organizations; this analysis will show some changes in their structure and show the relevance of street fundraising for the survival of some of them; strong differences are evident between organizations born in a North-European and/or Anglo-Saxon environment, and Italian associations. In the third part some reflection about these dynamics are proposed, suggesting that a less trusted and more conflictual TS mean a politicized TS but that is not strictly linked to democracy and solidarity. In the final part I draw some conclusion and open questions that this analysis has arisen, that will need further study.

The original contribution and the utility of this paper is to analyze street fundraising in a sociological perspective to understand better his impact in the development of social capital. The subject of street fundraising *per se* has not be largely developed by the literature (Jay 2001; Sargeant and Jay 2003; Sargeant and Hudson 2008; Fleming 2009), that focused most on the English case; by addressing the Italian case this article wants to show a link between the Italian and the English case, due to the international nature of organization which use this technique; moreover this is interesting in a comparative perspective as it shows that also “native” Italian association are now watching to this kind of fundraising as a new opportunity.

1. Human rights and advocacy associations in Italy

Changes in Third sector: marketisation and reflexivity

I will first consider the named transformations of Third sector in general - marketisation and reflexivity, with some brief consideration about TS and volunteering in Italy; in the subsequent section I will analyze properly human rights and advocacy associations, and their structure transformation, choosing a sample of 19 big or medium human rights and advocacy associations in Italy.

In Italy volunteering is rising, the data of the National Institute for Statistic (ISTAT) show that from 2011 to 2015 has grown 16,2%. But, at the same time, various organizations complain a lack of volunteers. This can be explained thanks to a closer look to the most recent data on Italian volunteering: of 6 million volunteers, almost 3 million are individual volunteers (Guidi et al. 2016). This phenomenon of individual volunteering is not only Italian, but is worldwide spread, as shown by the increased interested of international statics in the subject. Indeed, the terms used to describe the individual volunteers are various: direct, informal and of course individual; theoretical ri-elaboration affirm that some of these individual volunteers are expression of a post-modern (Ambrosini 2016) o reflexive volunteering.

To explain the major differences between collective and individual volunteers, we can use the distinction operated by Hustinx and Lammertyn (2003). The first are the classical volunteers who are linked to an organization in a stable way, guided by spirit of commitment, the second one are more flexibly linked to an organization, organization can be more than one, or none at all; they find in volunteering first a way of self-fulfillment. The rise of individual volunteers could be linked to the
decrease of “militant tension” (Frisanco 2013) in traditional organizations, due to the reduction of a classical style of volunteering.

Reflexivity is both structural and individual. Authors as Beck, Giddens (1990) and Touraine (2004) have given a deep contribution to analyze the social transformation that operate an overcoming of first modernity, but that also involves individual who reflect about this structural transformation. Beck (2000) defines this new kind of volunteer as a “Freedom Children” that can “connect terms apparently contradictory: self-fulfillment and commitment for other, commitment for other as self-fulfillment” (p. 45, my translation).

Based on the analysis of Guidi et al. (2016) the profile of the Italian individual volunteer is mostly occupied by people who see volunteering as a help toward people near to them, as family, friends or acquaintances; only 13% of individual volunteers see volunteering as a way to help collectivity or environment (pp. 57-64). An IPSOS research on the civiness of Italians, confirm this trend, and put in evidence that restricted sociality is in the first place for the interviewed, more linked to oneself and the family than to the collectivity.b.

To sum up, reflexivity is an important element since it has transformed the role of the volunteer (Hustinx, Lammertyn 2003), that is less stable, more flexible and “alone”. Reflexivity influence all the subject involved in the association. Everyone now wants an occupation/donation which adhere to his personal path, to be free from excessively hierarchical logic.

The second element of transformation that is involving part of Italian TS is marketisation.

Since the expansion of TS, the question of entrepreneurship and marketisation of TS has been well developed in literature as we talk about service function associations – starting from Weisbord (1998), and less for the expressive one. This theme has been treated by literature concerning nonprofit management (Eikenberry, Kluver 2004; Eikenberry 2009; Sandberg 2016; Stefan Hielscher et al. 2017), but also international political economy considering NGOs (for example Kamat, 2004) and less by a political and sociological perspective. The tension between pursuing a social mission and meet the demands of market economy has been analyzed by Sanders and Mcclellan Boise (2014), with the assumption that accountability means being able to pursue the social goal of the association (Young 1998; 2002). Many works on TS marketisation are focused on USA and UK, even if some work about marketisation in non-Anglo-Saxon environment are treated (Vacecoka et al 2017). In Italy major attention is devolved in the professionalization and institutionalization of TS due to its strict relation with the public sector.

As reported by Marelli (2011), in Italy only from the ’90 we have seen the first step towards the market and a more entrepreneurial way to manage TS association: this trend came from those multinationals of solidarity that were rooted in Anglo-Saxon environment and decided to test their fundraising technique in an “unexploited” environment has it was Italy. Those organizations were mostly organizations involved in international cooperation, advocacy and human rights mission, environmental organizations.

The recent Third Sector reform in Italy (d.lgs. 106/2016) has acknowledged this necessity of economic resources by TSOs, by recognizing legitimate low profit organizations, and by opening and clarifying the opportunity in the market for the TSOs. The article 7 of the law has also recognized the
profession of fundraiser. In the end also in Italy the process towards professionalization and institutionalization, with some opening towards the market, has started and has fully received its recognition thanks to the recent reform.

While Italy has numerous little and medium associations that are moving towards a more professional way to raise more funds, especially to make convention with the public (Italian government and UE funds) and with foundations, some of the “big” associations in Italy now base the major part of their budget on the fundraising technique of face to face. Paolo Venturi, director of “The fundraising School”, says that too many consider fundraising “as mere technique of persuasion, but its true meaning is co-production”, this affirmation needs a better consideration for the face to face technique.

Face to face, or direct dialogue, is a way to make fundraising that help the association to have a good quantity of stable donors. It makes them emancipated from the public or other institution and give as well the ability to have medium and long-term planning. A donor that chose to donate something through the face to face in fact will donate a sum per month that goes between 10 to 30 euro. This kind of donations are raised by workers named “dialogatori” in Italy, a word that means “people who dialogue”. The explicit objective of this fundraising campaign is to increase the number of regular donors, which means to have the objective to retain the donor almost for five years; there is also a certain tax of “rejection”: certain studies (Sargeant and Hudson 2007) show that “in some cases charities may lose up to 50% of their new recruits in the first year of giving”.

They are usually divided by worker “in house”, directly hired by the association, and workers of external agencies, specialized in this kind of fundraising. The face to face, as a technique, was designed in 1995 in Austria, in Italy it is about 10 years that it is used, and this is its period of major expansion.

The face to face workers often are not subordinate to the organization or to the agency but work with occasional or autonomous work contracts, that means that they gain a percentage on the donations that they can afford each day, and they have not a relationship of subordination with the organization for which they work. Although it is presented as a flexible work, by fact most of f2f worker work 6/7 days all day long to gain enough donation.

A couple of consideration about this kind of work will be done, before considering the impact of their work on the organization structure. The name of this work - “face to face”- require reflecting about the nature of the relation that is created between the F2F workers and the donors. Since a transaction do not last more than 5 or 10 minutes and is based on marketing persuasion technique, it is not secondary wonder if this kind of donations are an actual activation of the single subject that decide to join a cause or is more a passive process of persuasion that do not generate actual adhesion to the mission of the determined association. The face-to-face interaction is highly considered by Putnam (1993) has a key element in developing interpersonal ties and develop a “bridging” social capital; extremely interesting is so the discursive choice of the term face-to-face which refer to this need of trust and cooperation of each human being.

Considering its characteristic F2F has been often object of media criticism, for the precarious working condition of F2F workers, and due to the excessively aggressive way to raise funds, for this reason these workers are better known in UK as “chuggers”, meaning “charity muggers”.

4
Despite criticism, F2F fundraising is an important element of some organizations, who prefer to rely on single donors, to do not have the pressure and constraints of big donors and the public or institutions funds. Concerning the other type of grants, literature has dealt with the possible implication to depend on big donors, or on public funding. The private fundraising literature has deal with the phenomenon of philanthro-capitalism (Nickel, Eikenberry 2009; Rodger 2013); concerning public fundraising, many claim the necessity of autonomy of the TS from the public – this line is well developed in Italy, but some authors say that there is no real influence for those association which rely predominantly to public funds (Neumayr et al., 2015). I find useful to concentrate now on opportunities and risks of this relatively new way of making funds.

Changes in the structure of associations

The focus of this paper is on the associations which have an expressive function, in particular human rights and advocacy associations, since the marketisation and the entrepreneurship discourse has been treated more consistently for what concern the service role of TS association. The term advocacy, highlights Pirni (Raffini et al. 2014), is difficult to synthesize in a univocal way, but it can be explained as the way an organization or a group influences politics and institution. Pirni divides between direct advocacy and indirect or social advocacy. While the first is expression of “a dialogue-confrontation-conflict with institution from representatives of the associations”, the second one is the promotion of “the mobilization of citizen so they can widen the base of the claim and enhance the power of influence the institutions” (p. 30, my translation). Expressive function is different from service one (Salamon 1997), since concern the power to vehiculate a political message and influence institutions.

In Italy the focus on service association is explained by their major importance in the TS, considering that health care, education and welfare service have the 92,1% of paid staff and the 84,2% of volunteer. Expressive function is less developed in most countries in the world as showed by the study of Salamon et al. (2017, p.31) - the balance between expressive and service function is for paid staff 69% and for volunteers 43%, as shown in fig. 1.

Figure 1. Ri-elaboration from ISTAT data-set of Italian expressive and service function associations (ISTAT, Censimento permanente delle istituzioni non profit. Primi risultati, 20 december 2017).
While the role of expressive function associations is minor in Italy, it is worth an analysis since it is the major place where to study new form - in Italy - of fundraising such as the face to face. Secondly there is a rising of mediatic and public attention towards this kind of associations. Major attention could be also given since, while there is a general grow of Third sector in Italy, the political activity and protection of the rights is decreasing (-22,9%), as well protection of environment (-22,9%). At national level, the 20,4% of association operate for the promotion and sustain of human rights: this concerns the 89,9% of association of protection of rights and political activity, 68,9% of associations for representation of interests and labor relations, 35,1% of cooperation and international solidarity and 31,3% philanthropy and promotion of volunteering (ISTAT, 2011).

Concerning the volunteers, 30,7% are involved in an expressive function, and the great majority of them in a religious association (+23,2%), that show a huge grown in general (+110,3%). The first association in Italy for number of volunteers is actually a religious one, Sant’Egidio, with 60,000 volunteers, far ahead the other organizations with great numbers of volunteers which do not exceed 5,000 volunteers (ISTAT 2011).

2. How face-to-face changes the structure of some human rights and advocacy associations in Italy

Methodology

To make some consideration about the impact of the face to face in the structure of advocacy and human rights associations I have analyzed the economic and social budget of 19 organizations; the organizations had to fulfill these requirements: operate in the field of advocacy and human rights; based in Italy, and, when part of an international organization, with autonomous budget.

The sample has been chosen on multiple basis: economic, human and “political” relevance. There is not a universal database of Italian nonprofit association which allow to compare microdata of the associations; I found it necessary to create a list of relevant association to analyze; the list constructed in this way thus will not have statistical relevance but is a first step for a useful and significant comparison.

“Open cooperazione” is an open dataset for those associations who operate in the field of international cooperation; the dataset shows that 55% of associations considered operate, among others, in the field of “advocacy/awareness raising”, so it is considered a first useful tool of comparison. The first five organizations have been chosen considering number of donors, volunteers, paid staff and budget1.

The inscription in the open data set is voluntary, so there were not all the major organizations in the field of advocacy and human rights. In order to consider organizations which deal with human, environmental and civil rights and not only international cooperation, other relevant association were chosen to add. Amnesty International and Oxfam where chosen to address associations which deal specifically the human rights theme worldwide; Greenpeace, WWF and Legambiente for animal and

1 The data from the open cooperazione data set, refer to the data available at the 10th June.
environmental rights, Legambiente is the biggest Italian organization about environmental rights; Associazione Luca Coscioni, Arcigay, Antigone about civil rights; the last three organization chosen are not chosen for their dimension but their relevance in the Italian public debate. Briefly, Associazione Luca Coscioni deal with civil rights linked to freedom of cure and scientific research, their main battle at the moment is about euthanasia, many of its associates are parliamentarian or member of the radical party; Arcigay is the biggest network of LGBTIQ+ associations in Italy; Antigone is the most relevant association in Italy that deals with the rights of prisoners, security issue and torture, many of its members are advocates or judges, or people linked to the justice system.

It was necessary to clean the data set from some of the previous organization. First, organizations selected as one of the first five from the open cooperazione dataset, which operate in international cooperation, but have not great attention for advocacy and human rights have been deleted because of their mission (CBM Italia onlus, Medici con l’Africa CUAMM). Other associations have been deleted due a lack of data (Legambiente and Fondazione aiutiamoli a vivere) that couldn’t afford any kind of comparison. The budget data refer to the last year recorded, namely 2016 where not specified otherwise.

There have been considered all stakeholders, namely donors (stable and not, where information was provided), volunteers and paid staff. It has also been considered revenues, charges for fundraising - where specified for face to face, income from private and public.

The data considered for each association where economic, budget, public or private origin of the funding, fundraising cost and revenue, and expense in face to face program and human number of donors generic and regular, number of volunteers, number of paid staff. All these data where not always clear or available. Where possible the numbers where calculated as show in Appendix in table 1.

To have a better knowledge of all these data, the tool of the social budget was really useful, as a mean of transparency; that is specially to deepen information about face to face program and regular donors’ program. Despite that, no useful information was found in any of the economic and social budget about the contract and economic position of face to face workers; the information that was seldom available was about the expense for campaign oriented in regular donor program.

Results

Complete results for all the associations are shown in Appendix in table 2. Here I provide some insight about these organizations structure, and I will try to provide a simple classification.

In figure 2, 3 and 4 are shown the numbers of individual donors, volunteers and staff.
Figure 2. The graphic shows the organization which have more individual donors, when possible it is shown how many of them are regular donors.

As we can see from the figure 2, those with more donors, specially regular donors, are usually not Italian native organizations; the numbers of regular donor can be explained by the use of F2F of the organization with highest numbers of donors; exception must be made for Arcigay, who as many regular donors as I considered donors all the associates of the organizations, which support the organization with their membership.

Considering volunteering in fig. 3, the Community of Sant’Egidio is the one with highest numbers of volunteers, with 60.000 volunteers; it is also the organization who invest less in fundraising. Sant’Egidio is a religious association which operate against poverty, his high diffusion demonstrates the widespread diffusion of religious volunteerism in Italy, due to its catholic tradition.
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Figure 3. Number of volunteers per association.
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Fig. 4 shows that organization more involved in international cooperation need more staff. It shows also that a lot of the organizations with high numbers of donors have a really little paid staff.

Figure 4. Number of paid staff per association.

![Paid staff]

Analyzing fig. 5 we can consider that to rely on single donors means higher investment in fundraising; more funds from private, more independence from big donors, means higher investment.
in fundraising. From Amnesty International to Comunità di Sant’Egidio the investment varies from 43.6% to 0.26%. The main source of fundraising for nonprofit organization in Italy are privates, followed by enterprises with 873 million of euros, of which 200 million from foundation and 673 from enterprises.

**Figure 5.** Investment in fundraising and revenue from private in a scatter graph.

![Investment in fundraising and revenues from privates](image)

In fig. 6 is shown that higher investment in program for search of stable donors - often face to face program, means higher revenues from private.

**Fig. 6** Revenues from private and investment in a program for stable donors in a scatter graph.
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Both revenues and investment in stable donors’ program are expressed in percentage. Action Aid and Emergency are not taken into account due to lack of data on face to face program.
All these figures show that the more an association wants to rely on private funds, the more is probable that it will invest in a face to face program; this kind of fundraising is more likely to show in certain type of organization, so it will be useful for next consideration to classify this group of organizations in three big categories:

(i) Type 1: Amnesty International, Greenpeace, Unicef, WWF, Action Aid, Save the Children, Medici Senza Frontiere, Oxfam. High investment in fundraising, high numbers of private donors, F2F strategies to raise the number of stable donors; typically, “multinational of solidarity”.

(ii) Type 2: Mani Tese, Cesvi, Emergency, Fondazione AVSI, Terre des Hommes, COOPI, Intersos. Most funds came from international institutions and enterprise; low budget in fundraising; typically, Italian organization involved in international cooperation.

(iii) Type 3: Luca Coscioni, Arcigay, Antigone. Budget under 1 million of Euros, most donation come from public or convention with foundation, the private donations came from memberships. A rise in investment in fundraising is planned; typically, Italian association for civil rights.

The community of Sant’Egidio is an outlier, since its advocacy role is strong in Italy, but not fit in any of the three categories above.

This few considerations wants to be a first step considering the double transformation that is involving the advocacy and human rights associations. There is reflexivity which is a driver of the birth of more and more individual and professional volunteers, on the other side there is a strong motivation for this kind of associations to search for an independent way to be sustainable. This way is found in the donations of stable donors. This path has been successfully started by the type (i) organization, which have their base not in Italy, but since it is revealed a good strategy also some of the type (iii) organization showed the intension to invest more in fundraising. Often the need of independence is found in the specific fundraising technique of face to face, which has strong effect on the organizational structure of these associations, with an augmentation of stable donors and relatively less volunteers; moreover volunteers of these associations can be often represented as individual volunteers, for example considering the diffusion of web-activism for a determined campaign, and occasional volunteerism for specific fundraising event.

These transformations involve the individual volunteers, donors, paid staff and F2F workers, and therefore it involves also the structure. Borzaga e Fazzi (2000, p. 18), already in the year 2000, make notice that the transformation of many nonprofits from volunteer associations to social enterprises with paid staff, was considered a natural step of the development of the associations, not considering the implication on the objectives and organizational behavior. Again now, the transformation of some human rights and advocacy associations, in organizations with more stable donors and individual volunteers, and less classical volunteers and occasional donors, is not just a step towards the development and emancipation of these associations but have consequence on the elaboration of objectives and organizational behavior in associations. In this picture we also must consider the relatively reduced formal staff, with all F2F workers hired by agency which do not appear as formal staff, but only as a cost in the budget for search of stable volunteers.
In the next section I open some question about this kind of structural and individual changes, considering what kind of impact it can have on democracy and solidarity in Italy, dealing with the politicization of these associations and their contribute in creating social capital.

3. Conflict of NGOs around the politicization of migrant issue: considerations on solidarity and democracy

Since the last years, TS, and in particular NGOs are not more a neutral argument in the public sphere. The Eldeman Trust Barometer put Italy at the first place for augmentation of distrust on behalf on ONG, with 13 points less than 2017. It seems that the debate is becoming more critical respect the nonprofit sector, not only the Italian literature started going over the rhetoric of good when speaking about volunteerism and TS (Moro 2014, Busso and Gargiulo 2016), but also the public opinion is becoming more critical. Many people do not trust nonprofit organizations, and IPSOS analyses show that they are the less trusted in Italy among economical institutions.

To be explicative I will treat the thematic of immigration, that is the one that have made the NGO so conflictual with institutions and in the public opinion. Nando Pagnoncelli, president of IPSOS, reported in an interview that the 45% of Italians think that NGO agree with traffickers, and the 75% is suspicious of illegal behavior. The spokesperson for the National Forum for Third Sector Associations, Claudia Fiaschi recently said about this:

“In 2017 we have seen media and institutions behavior that have delegitimate the precious work of NGO for rescue of refugees and migrant in the Mediterranean Sea. The weight of these charges has brought a libelous campaign which now risk having serious consequences, like the interruption of dozens of projects, not only devoted to migrants”.

Not all the budgets of the organization analyzed are up-to-date at the 2017, but for example MSF report that, even if they had an increment of 2% in the budget in 2017, that was not satisfactory when compared with the previous year when there has been a rise of the 8,5%. They esteem a loss of 4 million euros for the year 2017.

I quote from their budget

The instrumental polemics around humanitarian sea search and rescue operations have created in part of the public opinion a modification, in negative, in the perception of the non-governmental organization involved in the Mediterranean see, including MSF.

This kind of public debate has led Italian government to write a “code of conduct” for Italian NGOs in the search and rescue operation, and their work of rescue has become even more difficult. NGOs respect this kind of conflict are speaking about “criminalization of solidarity”: solidarity is no more, as NGOs, a neutral term in the Italian public opinion.

The example of the debate on rescue of migrants and refugees is the most powerful exemplification but is not the lonely since many civil rights have been object of great debate, with the associations in strong contrast with institutions and the public opinion: LGBTIQ+ rights and the “anti-gender” campaign have been a lot debated, but all the question of “living will”, abortion and others.

In conclusion the distrust and conflicts against NGOs, and in general human rights associations, seems a step toward their politicization. The political relevance of associations (Vitale, Biorcio 2016)
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seems to rise parallel with the de-politicization of the traditional sphere of deliberative democracy (De Nardis 2017). The politicization of these associations makes urgent to understand what kind of contribution they may give to a democracy discourse. While there is a long history of study that link social capital to associationism - from Toqueville to Putnam, it is necessary here to make some distinction, and consider if the ongoing changes in these associations need a deeper scrutiny.

As it appears from the recent facts, marketisation of social sector do not appear to diminish the political relevance of these associations. This seems to partially agree with the analysis of Han (2017) which has found that in UK social marketisation has by fact augmented policy influence of advocacy organizations.

What is not clear is if the politicizations correspond to an augmentation of social capital and democracy. We have seen that there is an augmentation of individual volunteering and stable donors. This could mean a wider audience of stakeholders that can control the staff, and the pursuing of the social mission of these associations. This could also mean that there is a huge social capital of people involved in a network interested in human rights and advocacy. This second passage could be problematic due to the marketisation of stakeholders in TS organization. The change to a “one – off” donor to a stable one, and from a collective volunteer to an individual one changes the entire organization and means different kind of networks and way to behave.

In a context of reflexivity, Pirni e Raffini (2016) argued that there is a “subjectivism in the collective sphere”, the subject does not more identify himself in a membership or in a collective identity in a strong and fixed way, but his identification with a particular group or cause is temporary, weak and non-exclusive. “[…] the subject is active within the collective dimensions in which its action can have a tangible return on the asset of the group, thus returning to the subject as identity source” (p. 819). This consideration of the collective sphere could well apply to the phenomenon of reflexive volunteerism, and in the more flexible structure of volunteerism in these associations. As weaker as it is, the adhesion, even temporary, to a determined cause or organization must start from an effective activation of the subject. If not, there will not be the conformation of a horizontal association, which is productive of social capital and temporary network. In the strategy of using volunteers to make fundraising, or invest in them as professional, and in the search of stable volunteer not always we can find an activation of the subject to a certain group, but some passive persuasion (for the donors) and instrumental adhesion for the volunteer. Considering the volunteer, more and more often to be a volunteer is required a CV and pass a selection: that professionalization of the volunteer make its activity more similar to a search for a job and induce to think that the temporal adhesion of the subject has as main driver an escape from precariousness. On the other hand, when donors are persuaded to donate with the face to face technique it is legitimate to reflect if it does truly generate an activation or not.

What is needing to be considered is if a major relevance of some organizations at political level is link to a wider audience of active stakeholders. If there is not been some relation (even flexible and temporal) between the stakeholders and mission of the associations, there would not be created any kind of network between stakeholder of the same associations. This would mean that even if there is an higher number of people involved in a determined association, is not subsequent that there is more social capital and cohesion in and out the associations. Hustinx et al. (2017) have point out that even “passive forms of involvement” could have strong influence in the creation of social capital. The observations of this work do not aim to go against this kind of observations, instead is open to the
idea of a change in TS that make urgent to overcome the ideas of classical volunteering and participation.

The point of this reflection is that a determined type of fundraising, where donors are treated as “good” may not express a kind of relation and adhesion to a cause. A donor persuaded by an interaction with the F2F worker, could have given his adhesion to the organization not as an effective choice, but as an action product of the contingency. This mean that we would not be able to speak of active or passive support, but no support at all.

A fundraising campaign has to be constructed to influence the culture, the democratic and civic culture of an environment. When it does not fulfill this objective but have as main objective to gain donors or volunteers – considering them more as an instrument, than a relation – the organization may have more political relevance but will not have stakeholders to sustain it.

The decrease in donation due to the false scandal about NGOs could be the consequence of a politicization do not sustain by a strong support. Another element is to consider the distance of the public from the type (i) organizations due to their territorial weaker roots. This kind of association even if have lots of offices with volunteers all around Italy, have a weaker direct links to the territory and their politicization and economical grow could not correspond to the Italian civil society orientation. Their political influence raises important question about the true contribution they give in the democratic discourse.

Conclusions

In conclusion we have considered some changes that are involving third sector, as marketisation and reflexivity. Then we have considered the not so diffuse expressive function in Italy and analyzed some of the major Italian associations of advocacy and human rights. An analysis of their budgets has shown that the organizations which invest more in fundraising rely on single donations, and to make this kind of funding sustainable they have to invest in face to face program to search for stable donors. This kind of fundraising operate a change in the structure of these associations which have a higher proportion of donors than other types. In the end these associations have grown bigger, and they became more politicized, conflictual and not trusted by the Italian public opinion.

The final question that open the transformations observed is linked to the social capital and democratic effect of these changes. Many scholars of social capital sustain that associationism is a signal of civicness and political participation, and that the main vehicles of it is the associationism and his diffusion (Putnam 1993); but it is considered that after these changes in TS, and its politicization, associationism in himself cannot be strictly correlated to the generation of social capital, when the recruitment of donors and volunteers do not happen via social relation, but by a “market type” relation.

Volunteerism and donations can be instrumentalize if their contribution is taken as an object and not as a relation. If there is not activation of the subject, and not a creation of networks, the mere numbers of people linked to an association could be a void number in term of democratization and solidarity. What is more, this instrumentalization could be applied to the figure of “dialogatore”, whose figure stands between the choice to work for a TSOs to a not chosen precariousness.
Corchia (1999) has analyzed another kind of functional pressure of volunteers’ association, not towards the market, but towards the public. This pressure makes Italian association isomorph to public administration and make it difficult to transform the propension to networking of Italian volunteering in a true social capital. The pressure of TS towards the public, or the market, could impoverish his relational vocation (Donati 1996, 2011), making it difficult for the association to be a true creator of social capital.

The aim of this paper was to rise some fundamental question about the expressive role of Italian Third Sector: if some new fundraising techniques can limit the role of producer of social capital of certain associations, if the marketisation and politicization of TS means a distancing of its identity from relational factor, and if it means a ri-elaboration of solidarity. Zoll (2003) argued that solidarity is long its path from solidarity between peers, to a solidarity in the difference: it is useful to analyze and understand the changes of TS, as a mean of social cohesion, in this context of change and “criminalization of solidarity”.

To sum up, the changes that are involving the first type of organizations could be an element of fragmentation: weaker donors, volunteers and precarious F2F workers, with stronger – economically and politically – managers which can have no true counterbalance in the stakeholders. Further specific case studies would need to be done to control this hypothesis, considering that face to face fundraising is more and more diffused.

The changes in TS, on the other hand, when are not present some “pathological” situation, show the rising of an audience of donors and reflexive volunteers that open to an horizontalization of the sector, that could mean more social capital and a less needed control to the staff, who would work collaborating with diffused stakeholders.

Notes


d. http://www.vita.it/it/article/2018/03/03/fundraising-come-cambiano-le-donazioni/146109/

e. Interview to Nando Pagnoncelli, president of IPSOS, in date 13/08/2017, link http://www.famigliacristiana.it/articolo/ong-e-immigrazione-ha-vinto-la-paura.aspx
Appendix

Table 1. Criteria for the elaboration of useful data from economic and social budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human capital of the organization</th>
<th>volunteers</th>
<th>When present only data about groups, the number is multiplied with the average numbers of volunteers per group (16 volunteers per group, as stated by ISTAT 2011).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donors (individuals)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Where it was not specified the number, it has been calculated considering the average donation of Italians (70€) as provided by weekly review VITA.it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>Face to face workers are not included due to lack of information in budgets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic capital of the organization</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Revenue in millions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp for Regular donors program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Where specified presence of face to face program; often face to face program linked to adoption programs; some organizations do not specify their expense in regular donor program, even if they exist (On the basis of recruiting page that have specific space with call for new “street fundraiser”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% FR cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>Often explicitly declared by the association but the content may vary consistently from different organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Public funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Italian government, Europe, UN agencies, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Private funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individuals, enterprise, foundations, etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2. Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Budget (million €)</th>
<th>Regular donors program (€)</th>
<th>FR cost</th>
<th>Public revenue</th>
<th>Private revenue</th>
<th>Regular donors</th>
<th>Donors - individuals</th>
<th>volunt eers</th>
<th>Paid staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ActionAid International</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Yes, but unknown</td>
<td>20,70%</td>
<td>5,10%</td>
<td>92,20%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>136451</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amnesty International</td>
<td>9,2</td>
<td>3341972</td>
<td>43,60%</td>
<td>1,00%</td>
<td>99,00%</td>
<td>39374</td>
<td>74292</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigone</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,20%</td>
<td>35,30%</td>
<td>3,20%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcigay APS 2017</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,60%</td>
<td>48,00%</td>
<td>52,00%</td>
<td>185,998</td>
<td>185998</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associazione Luca Cossioni</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>17571</td>
<td>2,40%</td>
<td>18,20%</td>
<td>82,80%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4896</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESVI</td>
<td>21,3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,00%</td>
<td>77,00%</td>
<td>23,00%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>46298</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comunità Sant’Egidio</td>
<td>14,9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,26%</td>
<td>55,00%</td>
<td>44,30%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>11268</td>
<td>60000</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOPI collaborazione internazionale</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6142</td>
<td>2,00%</td>
<td>90,30%</td>
<td>9,60%</td>
<td>5286</td>
<td>11748</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>3.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency</td>
<td>48,6</td>
<td>Yes, but unknown</td>
<td>6,00%</td>
<td>19,30%</td>
<td>44,00%</td>
<td>52235</td>
<td>398186</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>2.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fondazione AVSI</td>
<td>46,3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,00%</td>
<td>68,80%</td>
<td>31,20%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>20894</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td>1102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenpeace</td>
<td>8,3</td>
<td>2298079</td>
<td>37,70%</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
<td>100,00%</td>
<td>67,206</td>
<td>79067</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERSOS – organizzazione umanitaria onlus</td>
<td>48,8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,00%</td>
<td>99,00%</td>
<td>1,00%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>6857</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mani tese ong</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,00%</td>
<td>28,40%</td>
<td>50,00%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>14460</td>
<td>4253</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medici senza frontiere (2017)</td>
<td>57,9</td>
<td>4398532</td>
<td>17,00%</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
<td>96,00%</td>
<td>121492</td>
<td>292742</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>78,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>999,343</td>
<td>13,75%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>6030</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children Italia Onlus (2017)</td>
<td>111,6</td>
<td>9187663</td>
<td>18,60%</td>
<td>13,60%</td>
<td>70,00%</td>
<td>297018</td>
<td>407,309</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terre des Hommes</td>
<td>20,7</td>
<td>422786</td>
<td>4,00%</td>
<td>82,00%</td>
<td>18,00%</td>
<td>9215</td>
<td>10700</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unicef – comitato italiano per l’unicef onlus</td>
<td>55,7</td>
<td>6944807</td>
<td>36,90%</td>
<td>0,40%</td>
<td>86,50%</td>
<td>130000</td>
<td>313000</td>
<td>4794</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF (2017)</td>
<td>9,2</td>
<td>2545893</td>
<td>35,00%</td>
<td>16,00%</td>
<td>79,00%</td>
<td>72000</td>
<td>98000</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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