

Citizens' Intentions to Participate in Civil Society Organisations

Rigita Tijunaitiene, Jurgita Bersenaite

Siauliai University

Architektu str. 1, LT-78366, Siauliai, Lithuania

e-mail: rigita@smf.su.lt, jurgitabersenaite@gmail.com

crossref <http://dx.doi.org/10.5755/j01.ee.22.2.313>

This publication is from a series of articles (research results have been published in research journals "Engineering Economics", "Social Research", "Economics and Management: Current Issues and Perspectives" etc.), which is devoted to analysis of citizens' participation in activities of civil society organisations (hereinafter referred to as CSOs). In order to avoid repetition of scientific material, we will leave out here the broad description of theoretical aspects of motivation for participation in CSOs, which have been studied extensively in publications by Tijunaitiene (2009a); Tijunaitiene, Balciunas (2010); Tijunaitiene et al. (2009 a, b).

This article deals with citizens' intentions to participate in CSOs in the context of individualistic and collectivistic incentives. The article consists of three parts. First, with reference to a part of results of research carried out in 2007 here are analyzed links between individualistic motives for participation and citizens' intentions to participate in future. It is proposed in the article that for most of the research participants the most important individualistic incentives are internal incentives, i.e., greater self-realization, pleasure, valuable experience of learning, and greater self-confidence. This is grounded on the fact that in the research on values self-confidence is highly appreciated, and people's self-realization very often is related to public and social activities. For those who intend to more actively participate in CSOs in future it is very important to feel that they can control their life. Nevertheless, for citizens their personal interests are often above public interests.

The second part describes the analyzed links between collectivistic incentives and intentions to participate in CSOs by comparing two dimensions (joint activities and organizational activity competence), i.e., various statements that encompass factors and actual statistics of participation. There is made a statement that the dimension of joint activities is strongly expressed for those who intend to decrease or increase the intensity of participation, and also for those who intend to retain the same level of intensity. It follows that the stable albeit relatively low level of participation in CSOs (e.g., involvement in activities of labour unions or political parties) testifies that their permanent members are united by the aim to influence social and political processes. In addition, averagely expressed dimension of organizational activity competence lets us state that by participating in activities of CSOs citizens do not commit themselves to follow the public good in their activities, they rather associate their participation with leisure time, feeling well within the CSO or are influenced to participate by others.

Nevertheless most of the CSO members intended to retain the same level of intensity of participation.

The third part reveals the changes in participation in CSOs with reference to available statistical information as well as researches by other authors, it is summed up that currently the most active participation is in activities of local communities, because the interest is in issues of the nearest environment. Potential level of citizens' participation in CSOs is rather high, because it is social activities that are related to opportunities of self-realization.

Keywords: *civil society organizations, participation of citizens, motivation to participate, Mutual Incentives Theory, motives.*

Introduction

Civil society is seen as a field or a space that allows active people to team-up for joint activities (Ziliukaite et al., 2006; Simasius, 2007) who make up a network of voluntary associations, civic engagement that influences public life and social institutions (Putnam, 2000 cited from Butkeviciene et al., 2010), which strengthens the efficiency of civil society and supports development of the state and its economy (Kaminskas, Marcinkeviciene, 2009). Recently the concepts of *civil society* and *civil organisation* get used increasingly more often and more widely, which reflect abilities of citizens to form groups that are based on common interests (instead of relationship, profit, or power).

In scholarly literature, civil activeness is associated with children welfare, concept of a happy person, and psychological state of society (Chomentauskas et al., 2008; Chomentauskas, 2010). The data of the research carried out by the Civil Society Institute show that during the recent years the number of people who do not participate in civil activities is decreasing, nevertheless *participation* in activities of CSOs is seen variously. 64.7% of CSOs members say that the level of citizens' participation in local public affairs is rather low, meanwhile majority of local government administrations declare that civil society participation is rather normal or even high (Butkeviciene et al., 2010). Citizens' passivity in participation can be grounded on the fact that youth do not appreciate active life despite it being an accessible and reachable thing (Seskute, 2010). It turned out that CSOs have only slightly more civil influence than individual people have, and that those involved in civil activities risk losing their jobs or being under suspicion that their actions are sordid (Pilietines visuomenes institutas, 2011a). Furthermore, some researchers hold that people do not believe they can influence societal life (Zaleskiene et al., 2008; Buivydas,

2010). Scientists note that the trust is diminishing not only in government, but also in CSOs, and public activeness is declining as people get older.

Such somewhat passive participation of citizens in voluntary activities lets us assume that material-value orientations are dominant in Lithuania (Butkuvienė, 2005). Researches carried out during 2007-2010 show that residents of Lithuania gained slightly more civil power, therefore they have more and more democratic experience and skills. Yet this does not mean that civil power of people increases rapidly – inhabitants tend to support financially other persons or organizations (56%) or join episodic civil initiatives (50%) more than to actively get involved and participate in CSO activities (Pilietines visuomenės institutas, 2011b).

Still, “the greatest potential for civil activeness in Lithuanian society lies in local communities” (Pilietines visuomenės institutas, 2010, 2011a, b). Local communities are active in townships, therefore here it would be appropriate to illustrate using rather new research results that also confirm participation of citizens, although in a slightly different context, which is the case here: e.g., in services provided by municipalities. For example, Petukienė (2010), who studied participation of citizens in producing public services, states that the active members of local community usually participate in dealing with the issues of township council elections, establishment and action plan of local residents' community (67.5%), willingly participate in an organisation of celebrations, cultural and sports events (≈61%), slightly more rarely seek contact when economic problems emerge (≈55%).

Researches on individual aspects of participation have been published in the works by various foreign scientists: Morris (2001), Innes, Booher (2004), Simmons, Birchall (2005, 2007), Kosic (2007), Gottlieb, Gillespie (2008) and others. Authors in general identify individualistic and collectivistic incentives for participation. In the mentioned sources the following motives for participation are broadly analyzed: the need to express important values, acquire and solidify knowledge, abilities, to improve, satisfy utilitarian interests (career opportunities, useful social relations, solving personal, community's, and national problems), participate in important societal processes, be solidary, become a responsible and active member of society, feel being useful, reduce negative affect, escape from negative feelings, fulfil own potential, be listened to.

Scientific publications about citizens and their participation in various contexts are written by various authors, one of them is Tijunaitiene, the co-author of this article. Noteworthy are Ziliukaite et al. (2006) and employees of Civil Society Institute (2010) and other scientists who investigated individual segments of CSOs and participation in them. In Lithuania the topic of this article is analyzed by various representatives of social sciences: sociological researches on public activeness of people are done (Butkuvienė, 2005); society's civil power index is calculated (Degutis et al., 2008); involvement in voluntary activities is analyzed (Gedviliene et al., 2010; Urbikiene, 2010); people's political activeness, forms of participation, membership in parties (Tracinskiene, 2006; Ziliukaite, 2008; Imbrasaitė, 2008, 2009; Ramonaite, 2010), participation in solving local problems (Socialines ekonomikos institutas,

2004) are analyzed; citizens' values, including motives for participation, are investigated (Ziliukaite et al., 2006); researches carried out on individual (Savaneviciene et al., 2008) or municipal (Sakalas, Vienazindiene, 2010) level are published. Participation and related contexts are analyzed in managerial aspect by Neverauskas, Tijunaitiene (2007); Petukienė (2010); Tijunaitiene, Neverauskas (2009); Tijunaitiene, Petukienė (2004); Tijunaitiene (2008, 2009a, 2009b) and other authors. Regrettably, there is a lack of researches that would reveal and evaluate citizens' intentions and perspectives to participate in activities of CSOs.

Citizens' participation in CSO activities is determined by *individualistic* and *collectivistic incentives* (Tijunaitiene et al., 2009a, b; Tijunaitiene, Balciunas, 2010). Motives for participation have been analyzed and described in the previously mentioned publications, and in this article the focus is on how by building on individualistic and collectivistic incentives citizens assessed their intentions in the course of research and how active participation in CSOs presently is.

The **scientific problem** of the article is formulated in the following questions: How do individualistic and collectivistic incentives manifest in respect of further participation in CSO activities? How are promises of citizens to participate in further activities of CSO fulfilled in comparison to the current situation?

The **aim** of this article is to identify the present situation of actual participation in CSOs (with reference to the currently available data and facts) by considering and measuring against the part of results of empirical research carried out by Tijunaitiene in 2007 (i.e., opinions of the surveyed people about their intentions to participate in CSO activities at that time). Therefore the interest was in concrete perspectives of participation, to put that differently, in intentions in the context of individual incentives by identifying and describing the relations between collectivistic incentives to participate and intentions to participate that were compared to present-day situation and results of other researches. This substantiates the **novelty** of research results that are presented in this publication.

The research **objectives** are:

1. To analyze the relations between citizens' intentions to participate and individualistic incentives as part of the overall motivation to participate.
2. To identify the relation of citizens' intentions to participate in future collectivistic incentives and compare them to actual statistics of participation.
3. To reveal changes in participation in CSO with reference to available statistical information and researches by other authors.

The research **methods**. Analysis (systemic, contrastive, logical-critical) of scholarly literature on public/citizens' participation, measurement of motivation, and principles of motivating. The research, a part of which is presented in this publication as well, is based on interactive survey and written inquiry. Other empirical data have been collected from other sources (scholarly articles, reports and internet). In the process of processing data of the survey carried out by Tijunaitiene statistical methods have been applied: descriptive analysis, frequency analysis, factor analysis. To statistically process the research data SPSS 11.0 software has been used (for more on this, see Pukenas, 2005).

Methodology of assessment of citizens' intentions to participate in CSO activities

The article was constructed in the following stages:

First, a part of the results, which is discussed in this article, has been taken from empirical research carried out by Tijunaitiene in 2007 and based on mutual incentives theory developed by Simmons and Birchall (for more see Tijunaitiene et al., 2009a, b; Tijunaitiene, Balciunas, 2010). In research on citizens' participation in CSOs a questionnaire survey method was used. The questionnaire consisted of questions on sociodemographic variables, a type of membership in organisation, individualistic and collectivistic incentives, attitudes related to sympathy, moral beliefs, and rationality, and participation perspectives. In the quantitative research 987 respondents (864 living in Lithuania and 123 living abroad) participated. To distribute the instrument two ways were chosen: traditional and online filling-out of questionnaire. The prepared instrument was distributed via internet. Links to the questionnaire and requests to fill it out were sent to non-governmental organisations, communities and political parties, the official contacts of which were found on various portals.

Second, relationships between intentions to participate and individualistic and collectivistic incentives to participate were sought. Calculation of simple frequencies and crossing of groups of questions having been done, the respondents' answers to questions related to motivation to participate were presented, as well as their relations to future intentions. The analysis of collectivistic incentives was carried out after crossing the dimensions of collectivistic incentives and intentions to participate in future. Systemic, contrastive and logical-critical analysis of literature on the issues of participation was carried out in order to enable the comparison of what changes in participation in CSO activities took place from the intentions expressed during research to the present situation.

Context of individualistic incentives for citizens' intentions to participate in CSOs and actual situation

Such formations as political parties, professional or business associations, sports clubs, social movements, voluntary work, citizens' committees and other organizations, according to Simmons, Birchall (2005), Simasius (2007), Vigoda (2007), Tijunaitiene (2009a), Kaminskas, Marcinkeviciene (2009) and others, are considered CSOs, which differ from other organisations in that they have a different structure and organisational form, act independently from the government, without distributing profit, but controlling their activities by themselves and which are joined by people who voluntarily spend their time and money for this, as claimed by Tijunaitiene (2009a) after summarization of insights of various authors. In the recent years CSOs get increasingly more involved in local development, whenever the political and administrative system allows them to do so (Dvarionas, 2009), however, participation in CSOs in Lithuania "unites only one tenth of all inhabitants of the country" (Pilietines visuomenės institutas, 2010).

As it has been mentioned in the introduction of this article, this chapter deals with individualistic motives by comparing them to publications by other researchers. Therefore we will start with how citizens of Lithuania intend to participate in CSO activities in future. Table 1 presents the distribution of the opinions of the respondents who considered individualistic incentives being important. Such approach was selected because according to Simmons and Birchall (2005) cited by Tijunaitiene (2009a), "if in the past a certain kind of activity has been found rewarding, then the more similar the current activity is to the past one, the more likely people are to participate". Continuation of participation will be more likely if citizens receive what they expected and what they see as important. Opinions of respondents who mentioned different forms of rewards as *very important* were chosen for the analysis, because for all these respondents particularly important was the benefit receiving moment, for this reason it was interesting to find out if they would choose to participate in future if they received no reward. It must be noted that for the largest number of participants the most important benefits were *greater self-realization, pleasure, valuable experience of learning and greater self-confidence* (see Table 1). These are internal, non-material incentives.

One of the values – "self-confidence" as individualistic incentive to participate – was evaluated by the respondents in the research carried out by Seskute (2010) as very important. This value, and in the context of our research the motive of participation, manifests as ability to conceive, accept, and express own ideas, feelings, and wishes, to defend self, to get established in social environment without infringing other people's interests, rights, and dignity. By the way, self-confidence as one of the motives for public activeness was also named in publication by Zaleskiene et al. (2008), where participation of pupils and youth in CSOs was presented.

It can be said that on average one third of those to whom benefits are very important would participate in future even if they received no specific benefits. However, a half or more of the respondents are undecided or have doubts. In the context of the present research this group is particularly important, because they need stimulation the most, i.e., they are neither disappointed with participation, nor clearly plan their participation in future, therefore based on what benefits are the most important the stimulation (motivation) programs can be developed.

It is an interesting fact that 52% of the respondents who are motivated by *financial reward* said that even if they did not receive it they would still participate in future, and only 24% said with certainty that without receiving financial reward they would not participate. However, those to whom this benefit is very important constituted a very small number (N=32). Therefore although according to Simasius (2007) financial incentives to participate in CSOs are relatively small or they are absent, their members spend their spare time exactly in these organizations, because they "want to be only with people they want to see", but not with anyone.

Distribution of opinions of respondents who marked individualistic incentives as “very important” in respect of participation in future, simple frequencies, %

Statement	Respondents who said “very important”	<i>Would participate</i>	<i>Doubt it</i>	<i>Would not participate</i>
	N	%	%	%
Greater self-realization	404	32.10	58.30	9.59
Pleasure	402	37.79	49.24	12.98
Valuable experience of learning	369	29.60	61.60	8.80
Greater self-confidence	340	34.48	56.47	9.05
Possibility to express opinion	294	32.51	58.62	8.87
Sense of greater control over own life	190	43.59	45.30	11.11
Respect from other people	145	35.00	61.00	4.00
More significant social role	133	27.27	61.36	11.36
Benefit for career or political aims	108	31.25	56.25	12.50
Leaders of the organisation help to solve personal problems that emerge	49	31.58	57.89	10.53
Financial reward	32	52.00	24.00	24.00

A conclusion can be drawn that generally external incentives such as *financial reward, benefit for career or political aims, help of leaders of the organisation to solve personal problems* are less important for participation in future than internal incentives such as *pleasure, valuable experience of learning, sense of greater control over own life, possibility to express opinion* are. The latter are strongly related to the group of internal motives that was identified by Gedviliene et al. (2010): self-worth strengthening, new skills acquisition, personality development, etc. While comparing the obtained results with publications by other researchers, it is noticed that as a priority motive of behaviour of Lithuanians the authors distinguish pragmatism (Grigas, 2003; Ziliukaite, 2008; Chomentauskas, Puras, 2009) – activity that is based on seeking for benefit. It follows that for most people personal interests are above public ones.

For those who intend to participate less in future important are *respect from other people, more significant social role, and valuable experience of learning*. The latter internal incentive is the *most important* for those who intend to decrease participation intensity in future. It is obvious that for all the people who currently participate internal incentives are much more important than external (material) ones. Analogous results were obtained by Simmons and Birchall (2005) after conducting of a survey of users of public services by using the same instrument. Seskute (2010), who did value research in a slightly different context, also says that recognition in society takes a rather high position in value hierarchy.

It came out that respondents who chose *pleasure, sense of greater control over own life, more significant social role and benefit for career or political aims* as very important individualistic incentives are the least inclined to participate in CSOs in future (see Table 1). An explanation for this is that people are motivated to participate in CSOs activities by an opportunity to acquire skills and knowledge useful for professional or political activity, help other people, communicate, belong to a group of persons the values and ideas of whom are similar to theirs, realize one’s potential, participate in group decision-making, take on greater responsibility (Innes, Booher, 2004; Bingham, Nabatchi, O’Leary, 2005; Fung, 2006; Ziliukaite et al., 2006; Gedviliene et al., 2010). Intentions to participate in such activities in future decrease with the participation in

CSOs activities bringing less and less pleasure, not receiving expected benefits for various aims, inefficiently using possibilities of interaction among members of social networks.

To sum up it must be mentioned that all people have latent potential to participate, they only need to be “invited”. As pointed out by Verba et al. (1995, p. 3) – the authors of one of the world’s best-known studies on civil participation – people will be more active citizens if they have necessary motivation and competences and if they are asked to participate in CSO activities, if coevals or acquaintances shared information, experienced the impressions that highly motivate to participate in public activities (Urbikiene, 2010) where, according to Zaleskiene et al. (2008), it would be possible to develop communication skills, meet new people, receive new information and generally get ready for active civil activity in future.

Manifestation of collectivistic incentives to participate and participation intentions

As it has been claimed in previous parts of this article, motivation to participate in activities of CSO consists of individualistic and collectivistic incentives. Research results on individualistic incentives having been presented, there is a shift to collectivistic incentives and their interpretation in the context of contemporary facts that are available to the authors of this article. According to Denhardt (2001), actions need to be explained so that there opens up an opportunity to try to understand peoples’ intentions in future. After the consideration of what people thought about their future actions during the research period (which will be presented next), we will review the present situation as well.

Analyzing the behaviour of people we can judge about their future intentions, but we can also try to identify intentions from the statements of the people. That is, by asking those who participated in 2007 about their scope of intended participation in future we could make preliminary evaluation of future perspectives and reveal groups that are in the greatest need for the support and stimulation of motivation. Table 2 presents the links between two dimensions of collectivistic incentives and intentions to participate in future. For example, assessing the link of “*joint activities*” dimension (which includes such

incentives as *taking care of people of the community, participation in organisations strengthens the sense of being part of community, community members will only achieve results by joint activities, interests of every member must be represented*) to intention to participate in future we can make a statement that there are statistically meaningful differences. Of all (N=573) the respondents determined about participation in future, approximately 56% intended to participate in future more in comparison to the situation at that time (55.6% of respondents in this group have very strongly expressed dimension of “*joint activities*” and 42.2% – strongly expressed). The other part – 54% of the respondents determined about the

intensity of participation in future – intended to participate in future almost to the same extent, their dimension of “*joint activities*” is also rather strongly expressed (see Table 2). Therefore there is a strongly expressed social need and its satisfaction in a group of people who share similar interests.

The analyzed collectivistic motives are rational and significant for people who participate, for example, in activities of mutual help groups, seek to help themselves and other people to get over negative experience (addiction, disability, etc.), i.e., it is important to fulfill moral obligation and have compassion on others.

Table 2

Relationship between subscales of *joint activities* and *organizational activities competence* dimensions of collectivistic incentives and intentions to participate in future, Crosstabs, %

How actively, compared to the current situation, do you intend to participate in the organisation in future?		Joint activities				
		<i>Weakly expressed</i>	<i>Averagely expressed</i>	<i>Strongly expressed</i>	<i>Very strongly expressed</i>	
		%	%	%	%	
<i>Less</i>	N=173	0.6	6.4	31.8	61.3	
<i>Almost the same</i>	N=310	–	6.5	47.1	46.5	
<i>More</i>	N=90	–	2.2	42.2	55.6	
<i>Chi sq.=15.74; df=6; p=0.015</i>						
How actively, compared to the current situation, do you intend to participate in the organisation in future?		Organizational activities competence				
		<i>Very weakly expressed</i>	<i>Weakly expressed</i>	<i>Averagely expressed</i>	<i>Strongly expressed</i>	<i>Very strongly expressed</i>
		%	%	%	%	%
<i>Less</i>	N=172	2.9	14.0	37.8	36.6	8.7
<i>Almost the same</i>	N=309	3.6	20.4	37.2	32.4	6.5
<i>More</i>	N=90	–	13.3	28.9	43.3	14.4
<i>Chi sq.=16.11; df=8; p=0.041</i>						

Statistically meaningful differences are also found between dimension “*Organizational activities competence*” (which encompasses the following motives: *my organization knows best how to deal with social problems, persons who participate in the organization work well as a team, the organization solves the most important problems, I am sure that the management of my organization can resolve all issues*) and intensity of intentions to participate in CSO activities in future (see Table 2). “*Organizational activities competence*” is expressed neither very strongly, nor very weakly, this lets us state that the expression of this subscale is average. The dimension of over 37% of those who intend to participate in future with the same intensity among all who predict their participation intensity is averagely expressed and nearly the same expression is among those who intend to participate less. But it is strongly expressed among 43.3% of respondents who intend to participate in future more than they participated at the time of the research.

The group of citizens who evaluate collectivistic incentives rather well are citizens who participate in activities of political movements/ parties and labour unions. According to the data of Statistics of Lithuania of 2009 (Statistikos departamentas, 2010b) 3.1% and 3.4% of inhabitants of Lithuania participate in these CSOs, respectively. These are people who, according to Tijunaitiene et al. (2009a) are the most efficient, the most meaningful, as individuals. Looking at a short-term

perspective, the remaining stable level of participation in activities of political parties (has a tendency to increase slightly) and labour unions evidences that their members “are characterized by stronger aim to influence political and social processes in the country” (Ziliukaite, 2008). On the other hand, membership in a political party, according to Ramonaite (2010), is seen by some people as the work that “requires time, appropriate knowledge, and possibly innate abilities”, and this is the reason why there is no more significant increase in numbers of members. However, it must be noted that being a member of a party of a labour union does not automatically mean active participation, as emphasized in this article as well as all the researches carried out by Tijunaitiene and her co-authors. Therefore these facts must be assessed with caution.

Analyzing the results of the research it has been noticed that persons who evaluate the competence of organisational activity rather well identify themselves as group members, feel well there, despite the fact that they participate in CSO activities more under their momentum, because of pressure from others, or because they have free time. Based on the data of 2009, sports organisations the members of which are 4.8% of inhabitants in Lithuania (Kuno kulturos ir sporto departamentas prie Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybes, 2010) unite people who have no clearly expressed or reasoned civil motives. Even less people of Lithuania, i.e.1.8% (Statistikos departamentas, 2010a) participate in culture organisations where they

make friends among the members of the organisation and it is fun to be together without any commitment to public values. Therefore, as stated by Ziliukaite (2008), for the members of culture and sports organisations personal satisfaction and opportunities to satisfy their personal interests are more important.

To sum up the intentions to participate, we can say that most of those involved intended to keep the same level of intensity of participation – they comprised nearly 56% of all who knew that they will participate in future (31% of all respondents). Table 2 does not include the respondents who were undecided about their future participation. We also have to notice that there are no meaningful differences from other sub-scales (*identification with a group or results of its activities, dissatisfaction with quality of operations of the organisation and commitment to civil activities*).

We can only make assumptions about what was and is important to CSO members in regard to their future participation. In the opinion of the authors of the article, the most appropriate would be to repeat the research aiming to assess the current situation with the participation in CSOs. Nevertheless, as mentioned previously, this article has a different aim.

Assessment of current overall situation with participation in CSOs recently

As it has been already mentioned for several times, in the context of CSO activities citizens most actively participate in the activities of local communities (based on the data of *Civic Empowerment Index* calculated in 2010 34% of respondents participated in activities of the local community, but only 11% of respondents were involved in the activities of public organisations and movements), and such manifestation can be explained by the fact that 90% of inhabitants of Lithuania are interested in matters of the place they live in as well as problems of community (Pilietines visuomenės institutas, 2011a, b). As to further participation in activities of the local community, 74.5% of citizens are inclined to help employees of ward, 73.3% – to organise various events and celebrations, less (54.3%) would provide money for ward events and other activities (Petukiene, 2010).

Values of separate groups of people (for example, higher schools graduates) having been analyzed, it came out that care and compassion are important to youth (Aramaviciute, Martisauskiene, 2010). This fact may serve as an explanation why more than a half of respondents (41.8% of inhabitants of Lithuania aged 15-19, 51.2% of those aged 20-29, and 56% of older ones) in research done by Civil Society Institute pointed out that they gave money, things to charity or supported persons of public organisations in some other way (Pilietines visuomenės institutas, 2011a, b). This shows that citizens tend more to contribute to helping other only financially / materially than organise civil activities by themselves (Pilietines visuomenės institutas, 2011a).

According to Zaleskiene et al. (2008), in recent years “potential youth activeness indicator” remains in a rather high position, as approximately 60% of respondents relate self-realization exactly to public activities and working for the benefit of community. This high social engagement is

grounded on, for example, possibility to influence government decisions by participating in CSO activities. However, various youth organisations have too small numbers of members (only about 8% of working youth and 12% of students). This is likely influenced by unfavourable environment for the establishment of youth organisations at schools and other organisations.

On the other hand, as scale of alternative participation in civil society expands in the world, people undertake specific voluntary and society-oriented activities (Nacionalinis egzaminu centras, 2010). This is also confirmed by statistics on the participation of Lithuanian pupils in civil activities: environment protection and charity organisations attract more than 30% of pupils, however only one out of ten young people participates in political youth organisations. Most of them intend not to be active participants in political life when they grow up.

Conclusions

- Citizens' intentions to participate in CSOs having been *analyzed*, it was *found* that for most of the research participants the most important individualistic incentives are internal stimuli: greater self-realization, pleasure, valuable experience of learning, and greater self-confidence (this partly coincides with the results of other researches). This can be grounded on the fact that in research on values self-confidence is highly appreciated, and people's self-realization very often is related to public and social activities. For those who intend to more actively participate in CSOs in future it is very important to feel that they can control their life. Nevertheless, for citizens their personal interests are often more important than public interests.
- Relationships between collectivistic incentives and intentions to participate in CSO activities having been *analyzed*, it was *found* that dimension of *joint activities* is strongly expressed. For those who intend to decrease or increase their participation intensity or retain the current level it is also important to have a possibility to satisfy their social needs by participating in the activities of various interest groups (in our case, CSO). It follows that the stable albeit relatively low level of participation in CSOs (e.g., involvement in activities of labour unions or political parties) testifies that their permanent members are united by the aim to influence social and political processes. In addition, an averagely expressed dimension of *organizational activity competence* lets us state that by participating in activities of CSOs citizens do not commit themselves to follow the public good, they rather associate their participation with leisure time, feeling well within the CSO or are influenced to participate by others. Nevertheless most of the CSO members intended to retain the same level of intensity of participation.
- Results of researches published by different authors and statistics of participation in CSOs

which are available to the authors of this article having been *summarized*, we can sum up that currently the most active participation is in the activities of local communities, because people's

interest is in the issues of the nearest environment. Potential level of citizens' participation in CSOs is rather high, because it is social activities that are related to the opportunities of self-realization.

References

- Aramavičiute, V., & Martišauskienė, E. (2010). Absolventu, baigusių bakalauro studijas, požiūrio į dvasines vertybes diskursas. *Pedagogika*, 97, 16-23 [accessed on 26-01-2011]. Available online at <http://www.biblioteka.vpu.lt/pedagogika/PDF/2010/97/armar16-23.pdf>.
- Bingham, L. B., Nabatchi, T., & O'Leary, R. (2005). The New Governance: Practices and Processes for Stakeholder and Citizen Participation in the Work of Government. *Public Administration Review*, 65 (5), 547-558.
- Buivydas, R. (2010). *Pasitikejimas kaip socialinis kapitalas* [accessed on 28-01-2011]. Available online at http://www.sec.lt/sec_apzvalga/SEC_apzvalga_nr2.pdf.
- Butkeviciene, E., Vaidelyte, E., & Snapstiene, R. (2010). Role of Civil Society Organizations in Local Governance: Theoretical Approaches and Empirical Challenges in Lithuania. *Viesoji politika ir administravimas*, 33, 35-44.
- Butkuvienė, E. (2005). Dalyvavimas savanoriškoje veikloje: situacija ir perspektyvos Lietuvoje po 1990-ųjų. *Sociologija. Mintis ir veiksmai*, 2, 86-99.
- Chomentauskas, G. (2010). Lietuvos visuomenės psichologinė busena [accessed on 28-01-2011]. Available online at <http://www.humanstudy.lt>.
- Chomentauskas, G., Puras, D. (2009). Lietuvos susinaikinimo fenomenas – praskleista uždanga. *Psichologija Tau* [accessed on 28-01-2011]. Available online at http://www.psichologijatau.lt/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=186:fenomenas-2&catid=62:tyrimai.
- Chomentauskas, G., Puras, D., & Dereskeviciute, E. (2008). Nesaikingo alkoholio vartojimo neigiamos itakos Lietuvos konkurencingumui mažinimo galimybių identifikavimas. Taikomojo mokslinio tyrimo ataskaita [accessed on 28-01-2011]. Available online at http://www.ukmin.lt/lt/strategija/doc08/TMT_alk_itaka-2.doc.
- Degutis, M., Ramonaite, A., & Ziliukaite, R. (2008). *Lietuvos visuomenės pilietinės galios indeksas 2007 metai*. Vilnius: Pilietinės visuomenės institutas, TNS Gallup [accessed on 13-01-2011]. Available online at www.civitas.lt/admin/get_file.php?id=61.
- Denhardt, R. B. (2001). *Viesųjų organizacijų teorijos*. Vilnius: Algarvė.
- Dvarionas, D. (2009). *Socialinė ekonomika ir pilietinė visuomenė*. Metodinė priemonė. Kaunas: Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto leidykla.
- Fung, A. (2006). Varieties of Participation in Complex Governance. *Public Administration Review*, Special Issue, 66-75.
- Gedvilienė, G., Karaseviciute, S., Trečiokiene, E. (2010). Savanorystė socialinių gebėjimų ugdymo koncepcijoje. *SOTER*, 33 (61), 79-92.
- Gottlieb, B. H., & Gillespie, A. A. (2008). Volunteerism, Health, and Civic Engagement among Older Adults. *Canadian Journal on Aging*, 27 (4), 399-406.
- Grigas, R. (2003). Siuolaikinio lietuvių nacionalinio budo bruožai. Nerima keliančios trajektorijos (sociosofinė kritinė apžvalga). *Filosofija. Sociologija*, 1, 22–30 [accessed on 30-12-2010]. Available online at <http://www.elibrary.lt/resursai/LMA/Filosofija/F-22.pdf>.
- Imbrasaitė, J. (2008). Politinio dalyvavimo dinamika Lietuvoje 1999-2006 m. (Daktaro disertacija, Vytauto Didžiojo universitetas).
- Imbrasaitė, J. (2009). Political Participation Typology in Postcommunist Lithuania. *Social Sciences-Socialiniai Mokslai*, 2 (64), 67-78.
- Innes, J. E., Booher, D. E. (2004). Reframing Public Participation: Strategies for the 21st Century. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 5 (4), 419-436.
- Kaminskas, R., Marcinkeviciene, V. (2009). Patrono ir kliento santykių analizė: klientelizmo sociologiniai bruožai. *Mokslo taikomieji tyrimai Lietuvos kolegijose*, 6, 115-121.
- Kosic, A. (2007). Motivation for civic participation of immigrants: the role of personal resources, social identities, and personal traits. *POLITIS-Working paper*, 11, 1-30.
- Kuno kultūros ir sporto departamentas prie Lietuvos Respublikos Vyriausybės (2010). *Lietuvos sporto statistikos metraštis 2009* [accessed on 26-01-2011]. Available online at <http://www.kksd.lt/index.php?3523407219>.
- Morris, M. (2001). *Voluntary Work in the Welfare State*. London: Routledge.
- Nacionalinis egzaminų centras (2010). Tarptautinis pilietinio ugdymo ir pilietiskumo tyrimas [accessed on 26-01-2011]. Available online at http://www.smm.lt/svietimo_bukle/docs/tyrimai/tmp/Pilietinio_ugdymo_ir_pilietiskumo_tyrimas_ICCS_2009_Rezultatai_NEC.pdf.

- Neverauskas, B., & Tijunaitiene, R. (2007). Public Participation in City Governance Decision-Making: Theoretical Approach. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(4), 27-35.
- Petukiene, E. (2010). Klientu dalyvavimo viesosiose paslaugose valdymas Lietuvos seniunijose (Daktaro disertacija, Kauno technologijos universitetas).
- Pilietines visuomenes institutas. (2010). *Lietuvos pilietine galia ugtelejo, bet lieka menka. Lietuvos visuomenes ir mokytoju pilietines galios indeksas 2009*. Vilnius: Pilietines visuomenes institutas, TNS Gallup [accessed on 30-12-2010]. Available online at www.civitas.lt/admin/get_file.php?id=99.
- Pilietines visuomenes institutas. (2011a). *Lietuvos jaunimo pilietine galia* [accessed on 28-01-2011]. Available online at http://www.civitas.lt/admin/get_file.php?id=116.
- Pilietines visuomenes institutas. (2011b). *Pilietines galios indeksas 2011 m. sausis* [accessed on 28-01-2011]. Available online at http://www.civitas.lt/admin/get_file.php?id=115.
- Pukenas, K. (2005). *Sportiniu tyrimu duomenu analize SPSS programa: mokomoji knyga*. Kaunas: LKKA [accessed on 30-12-2010]. Available online at <http://www.lkka.lt/get.php?f.8491>.
- Ramonaite, A. (2010). Kodel zmones nestoja i partijas? Lietuvos gyventoju poziurio i partine naryste analize. *Politologija*, 2 (58), 3-29.
- Sakalas, A., & Vienazindiene, M. (2010). New Public Management and the Conceptual Upheaval of Human Resource Management. *Inzinerine Ekonomika - Engineering Economics*, 21(4), 417-425.
- Savaneviciene, A., Stukaite, D., & Silingiene, V. (2008). Development of Strategic Individual Competences. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(3), 81-88.
- Simmons, R., & Birchall, J. (2005). A Joined-up Approach to User Participation in Public Services: Strengthening the "Participation Chain". *Social Policy & Administration*, 39 (3), 260-283.
- Simmons, R., & Birchall, J. (2007). Tenant Participation and Social Housing in the UK: Applying a Theoretical Model. *Housing Studies*, 22 (4), 573-595.
- Socialines ekonomikos institutas. (2004). *Socialine ekonomika: Vietos bendruomenes. Poreikiai ir galimybes*. Tyrimo ataskaita. Kaunas.
- Statistikos departamentas. (2010a). *Lietuvos statistikos metraštis 2010* [accessed on 30-12-2010]. Available online at http://www.stat.gov.lt/uploads/metrastis/LSM_2010_Lt.pdf?PHPSESSID=.
- Statistikos departamentas. (2010b). *Narystes organizaciju nariu skaicius metu pabaigoje* [accessed on 20-12-2010]. Available online at <http://db1.stat.gov.lt/statbank/selectvarval/saveselections.asp?MainTable=M3190201&PLanguage=0&TableStyle=&Buttons=&PXSid=13431&IQY=&TC=&ST=ST&rvar0=&rvar1=&rvar2=&rvar3=&rvar4=&rvar5=&rvar6=&rvar7=&rvar8=&rvar9=&rvar10=&rvar11=&rvar12=&rvar13=&rvar14=>.
- Seskute, S. (2010). Studentu vertybiu pazinimas – kaip vienas is kompetencijos pletojimo veiksmu [accessed on 28-01-2011]. Available online at https://dspace.kauko.lt/bitstream/handle/1/679/seskute_straipsnis.pdf?sequence=1.
- Simasius, R. (2007). *Ne pelno organizacijos: prigimtis ir reglamentavimas*. Vilnius: Eugrimas.
- Tijunaitiene, R. (2008). Socialinio kapitalo konceptas: dalyvavimo kontekstas. *Ekonomika ir vadyba: aktualijos ir perspektyvos*, 1 (10), 186-192.
- Tijunaitiene, R. (2009a). Dalyvavimo pilietines visuomenes organizacijose motyvacijos raiska ir pletojimas (Daktaro disertacija, Kauno technologijos universitetas).
- Tijunaitiene, R. (2009b). The Conceptual Model of Activation of Participation Motivation Directed Towards "End Users" (Citizens). *Socialiniai Tyrimai-Social Research*, 3 (17), 120-131.
- Tijunaitiene, R., & Balciunas, S. (2010). Individualistic Motivation of Citizens Participating in Civil Society Organizations. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*, 21(4), 408-416.
- Tijunaitiene, R., & Neverauskas, B. (2009). Activation of Participation Motivation Directed towards Agents: A Conceptual Model. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(4), 71-77.
- Tijunaitiene, R., Neverauskas, B., & Balciunas, S. (2009a). Expression of Collectivistic Motives of Lithuanian Citizens Participation in Civil Society Organizations. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(3), 67-74.
- Tijunaitiene, R., Neverauskas, B., & Balciunas, S. (2009b). Motivation Expression of Citizen Participation in Organizations of Citizen Society. *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*(1), 65-74.
- Tijunaitiene, R., Petukiene, E. (2004). Visuomenes dalyvavimas kaip tyrimu objektas: teorinis aspektas. *Ekonomika ir vadyba: aktualijos ir perspektyvos*, 4, 284-291.
- Tracinskiene, L. (2006). *Pilieciu dalyvavimo galimybes priimant sprendimus vyriausybes ir savivaldybes lygyje*. Studija [accessed on 16-01-2011]. Available online at http://www.civitas.lt/files/Tyrimas_Pilieciu_Dalyvavimo_Galimybes_Priimant_Sprendimus.pdf.
- Urbikiene, V. (2010). Savanoryste ir jos itaka jaunimo socializacijai (Vilniaus technologiju ir dizaino kolegijos atvejis), (magistro darbas). Vilniaus pedagoginis universitetas.

- Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vigoda, E. (2007). From Responsiveness to Collaboration: Governance, Citizens, and the Next Generation of Public Administration. In: Bevir, M. (Ed.), *Public Governance*. Vol. 4 (131-153). London: SAGE Publications.
- Zaleskiene, I., Gudzinskiene, V., Orintiene, G., Suboc, V. (2008). *Visuomeniskai aktyvus 16 – 24 metu asmenys*. Tyrimo ataskaita [accessed on 26-01-2011]. Available online at http://www.smm.lt/svietimo_bukle/docs/tyrimai/sb/Visuomeniskai_aktyvus_asm_2009_03_10.pdf.
- Ziliukaite, R. (2008). Lietuvos jaunimo socialines politines vertybes: savanaudiskumas ir pilietines veiklos. *Politologija*, 2 (50), 3-22.
- Ziliukaite, R., Ramonaite, A., Nevinskaite, L., Beresnevičiute, V., Vinogradnaite, I. (2006). *Neatrasta galia: Lietuvos pilietines visuomenes žemėlapis*. Vilnius: Versus aureus.

Rigita Tījūnaitienė, Jurgita Bersėnaitė

Piliečių ketinimai dalyvauti pilietinės visuomenės organizacijose

Santrauka

Piliečių dalyvavimą pilietinės visuomenės organizacijų (toliau – PVO) veikloje sąlygoja *individualūs ir kolektyviniai stimulai* (Tījūnaitienė ir kt., 2009a, b; Tījūnaitienė, Balčiūnas, 2010). Straipsnyje akcentuojama tai, kaip remdamiesi individualiais ir kolektyviniais stimulais piliečiai vertino savo ketinimus atliekant tyrimą. Taip pat kreipiamas dėmesys į tai, kaip aktyviai šiuo metu dalyvaujama PVO.

Mokslinė straipsnio problema yra formuluojama klausimais: kaip reikšiami individualūs ir kolektyviniai stimulai tolesnio dalyvavimo PVO veikloje atžvilgiu? Kaip tesimi piliečių pažadai dalyvauti tolesnėje PVO veikloje palyginti juos su dabartine situacija?

Straipsnio **tikslas** – nustatyti dabartinę realaus dalyvavimo PVO situaciją (pagal šiuo metu pasiekiamus duomenis ir faktus), remiantis empirinio tyrimo, kurį atliko 2007 m. R. Tījūnaitienė, t. y. apklausus gyventojus dėl ketinimų tuo metu dalyvauti PVO veikloje, rezultatų dalimi. Taigi domėtasi konkrečiomis dalyvavimo perspektyvomis, kitaip tariant, ketinimais individualių stimulų kontekste, išskiriant ir apibūdinant kolektyvinių dalyvavimo stimulų ir dalyvavimo ketinimų sąsajas, kurios lygintos su šių dienų realijomis bei kitų tyrimų rezultatais. Tai pagrindžia tyrimo rezultatų, pateikiamų šioje publikacijoje, *naujumą*. Tyrimo uždaviniai:

1. Išanalizuoti piliečių dalyvavimo ketinimų ir individualių kaip bendros dalyvavimo motyvacijos dalies stimulų sąsajas.
2. Nustatyti piliečių ketinimų dalyvauti ateityje ryšį su kolektyviniais stimulais ir palyginti juos su realia dalyvavimo statistika.
3. Atskleisti dalyvavimo PVO pokyčius remiantis prieinama statistine informacija, kitų autorių tyrimais.

Tyrimo metodai. Mokslinės literatūros (sisteminė, lyginamoji, loginė-kritinė) visuomenės ir piliečių dalyvavimo, motyvacijos matavimo ir motyvavimo principų klausimais analizė. Tyrimas, kurio dalis pateikiama ir šioje publikacijoje, remiasi interaktyvia apklausa ir apklausa raštu. Kiti empiriniai duomenys surinkti iš kitų (mokslo straipsnių, ataskaitų ir interneto) šaltinių.

Analizuojant empirinio tyrimo rezultatus suformuluoti tokie apibendrinimai:

Nors pastaruoju metu PVO vis aktyviau dalyvauja regionuose, tačiau tik kas dešimtas Lietuvos gyventojas priklauso kuriai nors PVO.

Daugiausia dalyvaujančių gyventojų svarbiausiomis naudomis pripažįsta *didesnę savirealizaciją, malonumą, vertingą mokymosi patirtį* bei *didesnę pasitikėjimą savimi*. Tai – vidinės, nematerialinės paskatos.

Galima teigti, kad vidutiniškai trečdalis tų gyventojų, kam labai svarbi nauda, dalyvautų ateityje, jei ir negautų konkrečios naudos. Tačiau pusė arba daugiau nei pusė minėtų respondentų nėra tiksliai apsisprendę ir abejoja. Ši grupė yra ypač svarbi šio tyrimo kontekste, nes juos labiausiai reikia paskatinti, t. y. jie nėra nei nusivylę dalyvavimu, nei aiškiai numato savo dalyvavimą ateityje, todėl, atsižvelgiant į tai, kokios naudos yra svarbiausios, galima rengti skatinimo (motyvacijos) programas.

52 proc. respondentų, kuriuos motyvuoja *finansinis atlygis*, teigė, kad negaudami jo, vis tiek dalyvautų ateityje. 24 proc. teigė, kad negaudami atlygio nedalyvautų. Tačiau tokių, kuriems ši nauda labai svarbi, buvo ypač mažai (N=32). Vadinasi, PVO nariams yra svarbu, kas juos supa, su kuo jie leidžia laisvalaikį ir pan.

Galima daryti išvadą, kad apskritai išoriniai stimulai: *finansinis atlygis, nauda karjeros ar politiniams siekiams, organizacijos vadovų pagalba sprendžiant asmenines problemas* yra mažiau svarbūs nei vidiniai stimulai: *malonumas, vertinga mokymosi patirtis, jausmas, kad gali labiau kontroliuoti savo gyvenimą, galimybė reikšti savo nuomonę dalyvaujant ateityje*. Šie labai susiję su Gedvilienės ir kt. (2010) įvardyta vidinių motyvų grupe (savo vertės stiprinimu, naujų įgūdžių įgijimu, asmenybės tobulinimu ir kt.). Lyginant gautus rezultatus su kitų tyrėjų publikacijomis, pastebima, kad autoriai kaip prioritetinį lietuvių elgsenos motyvą išskiria pragmatizmą (Grigas, 2003; Žiliukaitė, 2008; Chomentauskas, Pūras, 2009), t. y. veiklą, pagrįstą naudos siekimu. Vadinasi, daugeliui asmeniniai interesai ir tikslai yra svarbesni už viešuosius.

Paaškęjo, kad respondentai, kuriems labai svarbūs individualistiniai stimulai: *malonumas, jausmas, kad gali labiau kontroliuoti savo gyvenimą, reikšmingesnis socialinis vaidmuo bei nauda karjeros arba politiniams siekiams*, mažiausiai linkę dalyvauti PVO ateityje. Dalyvavimui PVO veikloje teikiant vis mažiau malonumo, negaunant įvairiems siekiams naudos, kurios buvo tikėtasi, neefektyviai panaudojant sąveikas tarp socialinių tinklų dalyvių galimybes, mažėja ketinimai ateityje dalyvauti tokioje veikloje. Apibendrinant reikėtų paminėti, jog visi asmenys turi latentinį dalyvavimo potencialą, tik juos reikia „pakviesti“.

Pačių 2007 m. dalyvaujančiųjų asmenų paklausus, ar jie ketins dalyvauti ateityje, taip pat preliminarai buvo galima įvertinti ateities perspektyvas ir atskleisti grupes, kurioms labiausiai reikalingas palaikymas, motyvacijos aktyvinimas. Vertinant dimensijos „*veikimas kartu*“ (kuri apima tokius stimulus: *rūpestis dėl bendruomenės žmonių, dalyvavimas organizacijose stiprina bendruomeniškumo jausmą, bendruomenės nariai pasiekė rezultatus tik veikdami kartu, turi būti atstovaujami kiekvieno nario interesai*) ryšį su ketinimu dalyvauti ateityje, galima teigti, kad yra statistiškai reikšmingų skirtumų. Nustatytas stipriai išreikštas socialinis poreikis ir jo tenkinimas panašių interesų vienijamų žmonių grupėje.

Statistiškai reikšmingų skirtumų yra ir tarp dimensijos „*organizacinės veiklos kompetencija*“ (kuri apima šiuos motyvus: *mano organizacija geriausiai žino, kaip spręsti visuomenines problemas, organizacijoje dalyvaujantys asmenys gerai dirba kaip komanda, organizacija sprendžia svarbiausias problemas, aš įsitikinęs, kad mano organizacijos vadovai gali išspręsti visus klausimus*) ir ketinimų dalyvauti ateityje PVO veiklose intensyvumo. Piliečių grupė, kolektyvinius stimulus vertinanti gana aukštai, – piliečiai, dalyvaujantys politinių judėjimų ar partijų ir profesinių sąjungų veikloje. Tačiau reikia pastebėti, kad priklausymas partijai ar sąjungai dar nereiškia aktyvaus dalyvavimo (tai yra akcentuojama ne tik šiame straipsnyje, bet ir visuose Tījūnaitienės ir bendraautorijų tyrimuose). Todėl šiuos faktus reikia vertinti pakankamai atsargiai.

Analizuojant tyrimo rezultatus, pastebėta, kad aukštai organizacinės veiklos kompetenciją vertinantys asmenys identifikuoja save kaip grupės narį, gerai ten jaučiasi, nors PVO veikloje dalyvauja greičiau iš inercijos, dėl kitų spaudimo arba dėl to, nes turi laisvo laiko.

Apibendrinant dalyvavimo ketinimus galima teigti, jog didžioji dalis dalyvaujančiųjų asmenų ketino išlaikyti tą patį dalyvavimo intensyvumą, t. y. beveik 56 % visų, žinančių, kiek dalyvaus ateityje, arba 31 % visų. Taip pat tenka pastebėti, jog reikšmingų skirtumų su kitomis subskalėmis (*tapatintis su grupe ir jos veiklos rezultatais, nepasitenkinimo organizacijos veiklos kokybe ir įsipareigojimo pilietinei veiklai*) nėra.

Rigita Tijunaitiene, Jurgita Bersenaite. *Citizens' Intentions to Participate in Civil Society Organisations*

Kaip jau ne kartą šiame straipsnyje minėta, PVO veiklos kontekste piliečiai aktyviausiai dalyvauja vietos bendruomenių veikloje (remiantis 2010 m. apskaičiuoto „Pilielinės galios indeksu“ duomenimis, 34 % respondentų dalyvavo vietos bendruomenės veikloje ir tik 11 % apklaustųjų – visuomeninių organizacijų, judėjimų veikloje), o šią raišką galima paaiškinti tuo, kad 90 % Lietuvos gyventojų domisi savo gyvenamosios vietovės, bendruomenės problemomis (Pilielinės visuomenės institutas, 2011a, b). Vertindami savo tolimesnį dalyvavimą vietos bendruomenės veikloje, 74,5 % piliečių linkę padėti seniūnijos darbuotojams, 73,3 % – organizuoti įvairius renginius ir šventes, kiek rečiau (54,3 %) – skirti pinigų seniūnijos renginiams ir kitai veiklai (Petukienė, 2010).

Ištirus atskirų gyventojų grupių, pvz., aukštųjų mokyklų absolventų vertybes, paaiškėjo, kad jaunimui svarbus rūpestis ir užuojauta kitiems (Aramavičiūtė, Martišauskienė, 2010). Šis faktas gali paaiškinti, kodėl daugiau kaip pusė Pilielinės visuomenės instituto (2011a, b) tyrimo respondentų (41,8 % 15–19 metų; 51,2 % 20–29 metų ir 56 % Lietuvos gyventojų) nurodė, jog aukojo labdarai pinigų, daiktų arba kitaip parėmė asmenis ar visuomenines organizacijas. Tai rodo, kad piliečiai labiau linkę tik finansiškai ar kitaip materialiai prisidėti prie pagalbos kitiems nei patys organizuoti pilietinę veiklą (Pilielinės visuomenės institutas, 2011a).

Pastaraisiais metais, kaip teigia Zaleskienė ir kt. (2008), „potencialus jaunimo aktyvumo rodiklis“ išlieka gana aukšto lygio, kadangi apie 60 % respondentų savirealizaciją sieja būtent su visuomenine veikla ir su veikla bendruomenės labui. Šis aukšto lygio socialinis angažuotumas grindžiamas, pvz., galimybe daryti įtaką valdžios sprendimams dalyvaujant PVO veikloje. Visgi pernelyg mažai narių (tik 8 % dirbančio jaunimo ir 12 % studentų) sutelkia įvairios jaunimo organizacijos. Tam įtakos tikriausiai turi nepalanki aplinka kurti jaunimo organizacijas mokyklose, kitose organizacijose.

Kita vertus, pasaulyje didėjant alternatyvaus dalyvavimo pilietinėje visuomenėje mastams, imamas konkrečios savanoriškos, visuomeniškai orientuotos veiklos (Nacionalinis egzaminų centras, 2010). Tai liudija ir Lietuvos mokinių dalyvavimo pilietinėse veiklose statistika: aplinkosaugos ir labdaros organizacijoms pritraukiant per 30 % moksleivių, politinėse jaunimo organizacijose dalyvauja tik kas 10 jaunuolis. Dauguma jų užaugę ketina aktyviai nedalyvauti politiniame gyvenime.

Raktažodžiai: *pilielinės visuomenės organizacijos, piliečių dalyvavimas, dalyvavimo motyvacija, abipusių stimulų teorija, motyvai.*

The article has been reviewed.

Received in February, 2011; accepted in April, 2011.