

# A NEW BEGINNING

Basis for discussion on a new approach  
to positioning and activity of progressive human  
rights organisations in Croatia

Authors: Nives Miošić and Sara Lalić

# **A NEW BEGINNING**

Basis for discussion on a new approach  
to positioning and activity of progressive human  
rights organisations in Croatia

Project **A new beginning** – Sectoral Innovations for a Proactive, Progressive and Influential Human Rights Civil Society is financially supported by € 199,909.82 under the Active Citizens Fund from Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway through the **EEA Grants**.

This publication was made possible with the financial support from eea Grants funded by Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway. The content of this publication is the sole responsibility of the Centre for Peace Studies and does not necessarily reflect the views of donor countries and Fund Operator.

This publication was financially supported by Civitates.

The content of the publication is the sole responsibility of the authors and the publisher, and it does not necessarily reflect the views of Civitates or its partner foundations.

**Publisher:**

Centre for Peace Studies

**For the Publisher:**

Sara Lalić

**Authors:**

Nives Miošić and Sara Lalić

**Survey research conducted by:**

Hendal d.o.o.

**Research associates:**

Tea Dabić, Tina Đaković, Željka Geto, Ana Gvozdić, Klara Horvat, Veselinka Kastratović, Sandra Kasunić, Pia Helena Markota, Tena Mur, Ivan Novosel, Cvijeta Senta, Lovorka Šošić and Branka Vierda

**Graphic design:**

Petra Vrdoljak

**Summary prepared by:**

Eva Marija Jurešić

**Translation:**

Ivana Pogačić

**ISBN:** 978-953-7729-73-8

Zagreb, January 2023

# Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 1. Introduction and methodology  | 6  |
| 2. Context   | 9  |
| 3. Perception of the contributions made by human rights organisations in Croatia over time | 11 |
| 4. Identity determinants of human rights organisations                                     | 16 |
| 5. Advocacy potential and capacities   | 19 |
| 5.1. Factors affecting advocacy potential  | 20 |
| 5.2. Cooperation in advocacy activities  | 22 |
| 5.3. Advocacy successes and failures   | 23 |
| 5.4. Advocacy in the future  | 24 |
| 6. Media visibility and mobilisation potential   | 26 |
| 7. Legal aid and strategic litigation  | 31 |
| 8. Looking forward   | 34 |
| 9. Conclusion  | 36 |
| – References   | 40 |
| – Annex: Table presentation of the main findings of the survey research                    | 42 |

# 1. Introduction and methodology

This report presents the results of a research conducted from November 2021 to April 2022 for the purpose of preparing a basis for discussion and designing new working methods and new models of cooperation for progressive human rights organisations in Croatia regarding institutional and legal advocacy, legal support for victims of human rights violations, public communication and mobilisation of citizens in matters of human rights protection and promotion. The research was carried out as part of the project 'A New Beginning – Sectoral Innovations for a Proactive, Progressive and Influential Human Rights Civil Society' implemented by Human Rights House Zagreb, Centre for Peace Studies, Croatian Youth Initiative for Human Rights, Centre for Peace, Nonviolence and Human Rights Osijek and Human Rights House Foundation from Norway, with financial support from Active Citizens Fund in Croatia and Civitates fund. The aim of the project is to increase the social and political influence of human rights organisations in response to degrading human rights standards in Croatia, the increasingly difficult socio-economic situation and the institutions' inertia when it comes to finding a rights-based solution for the increasingly complex political and socio-economic challenges of today. Consequently, the purpose of this research is to gain insight into the difficulties human rights organisations face in the areas of advocacy, legal support, public communication and mobilisation of citizens, but also to map ideas for overcoming these difficulties.

The concept of human rights organisations in this research refers to civil society organisations that through their missions, objectives and activities contribute to the realisation or preservation of the values referred to in Article 3 of the Constitution of the Republic of Croatia: freedom, equal rights, national and gender equality, peace-making, social justice, respect for human rights, inviolability of ownership, conservation of nature and the environment, the rule of law and a democratic multiparty system. In other words, we are referring to progressive civil society organisations that protect and promote human rights of the first, second and third generation, thereby building and strengthening a democratic political culture. More precisely, the purpose of fostering awareness about human rights is to foster democracy, within which civil society organisations constitute its complementary component.<sup>1</sup> It is important to highlight such an understanding in view of the relativisation of the con-

---

<sup>1</sup> Vujčić, V. (2000), 'Svijest o ljudskim pravima', *Politička misao*, Vol XXXVII, No. 3, p. 67-68.

cept of human rights, which attempts to restrict or abolish human rights of some groups by discursively hijacking the human rights terminology.

This global trend, taking place within the so-called ‘culture wars’<sup>2</sup>, appeared in Croatia about 15 years ago, and has been more present since the 2013 referendum on the constitutional definition of marriage, which, thanks to structural weaknesses of referendum legislation, introduced a heteronormative definition of marriage into the Constitution. Therefore, organisations and initiatives gathered around attempts to restrict various human rights, which use the human rights discourse in public space, as well as their political representatives, are referred to as regressive in this research. More precisely, we consider they undermine the democratic political culture, demean and hinder the work of progressive organisations, using, among other things, democratic instruments contrary to their original purpose.

The research methodology included qualitative and quantitative methods. In addition to desk research, 17 semi-structured interviews and four focus groups were conducted. Interviewees included journalists, representatives of the academia, representatives of institutions and experts who follow the work and/or cooperate with human rights organisations, while the representatives of CSOs – a total of 21 of them – participated in focus groups. With participants’ consent, all interviews and focus groups were recorded, transcribed and finally coded according to the areas they dealt with: (1) identity determinants of human rights organisations, (2) advocacy potential and capacities, (3) media visibility and mobilisation potential, (4) legal aid and strategic litigation and (5) looking forward. We would like to thank everyone for their willingness to take the time to participate in this research.

The quantitative part of the research includes a survey conducted by Henda agency on a representative sample of 900 citizens of the Republic of Croatia over the age of 16. The survey was conducted at the end of March and the beginning of April 2022, using two methods of data collection: CATI – telephone survey on fixed telephone lines (40% of the sample) and mobile phones (30%), and an online survey (30%). Double sampling was done for stratification by six regions and four settlement sizes. The size of each stratum was based on the share of the population within the stratum in the total population over the age of 16 according to the latest available census (2011).

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Ozzano L. and A Giorgi, (2015), *European Culture Wars and the Italian Case - Which side are you on?*, London: Routledge; Kuhar, R. and D. Paternotte (ed.), (2017), *Anti-Gender Campaigns in Europe – Mobilizing against Equality*, London and New York: Rowman & Littlefield International; Furedi F. (2018), *Populism and the European Culture Wars - The Conflict of Values between Hungary and the EU*, London: Routledge.

**Table 1:**  
Presentation of the planned  
and achieved sample

| REGION                                 | Planned sample |      | Achieved sample |      |
|--|----------------|------|-----------------|------|
|  | N              | %    | N               | %    |
| Zagreb                                 | 233            | 26.2 | 236             | 26.2 |
| Northern Croatia                       | 138            | 15.2 | 137             | 15.2 |
| Slavonia                               | 167            | 18.7 | 168             | 18.7 |
| Lika, Kordun, Banija                   | 75             | 8.1  | 73              | 8.1  |
| Istra, Hrvatsko Primorje, Gorski Kotar | 108            | 12.2 | 110             | 12.2 |
| Dalmatia                               | 179            | 19.6 | 176             | 19.6 |
| SETTLEMENT SIZE                        | N              | %    | N               | %    |
| Up to 2,000                            | 347            | 38.0 | 349             | 38.8 |
| 2,001-10,000                           | 148            | 16.5 | 144             | 16.0 |
| 10,001-100,000                         | 178            | 20.1 | 179             | 19.9 |
| over 100,000                           | 227            | 25.3 | 228             | 25.3 |
| SEX                                    | N              | %    | N               | %    |
| Male                                   | 429            | 48   | 424             | 47.1 |
| Female                                 | 471            | 52   | 476             | 52.9 |
| AGE                                    | N              | %    | N               | %    |
| 16-29                                  | 189            | 21.0 | 187             | 20.8 |
| 30-44                                  | 216            | 24.0 | 220             | 24.4 |
| 45-59                                  | 306            | 34.0 | 305             | 33.9 |
| 60+                                    | 189            | 21.0 | 188             | 20.9 |

The report begins with a brief description of the context, followed by a part of the findings of the survey conducted within this research about the perception of the contribution of human rights organisations to the promotion and preservation of human rights and democracy in Croatia, supplemented by a summary of the few studies conducted so far on the topic. This is followed by a presentation of research results concerning the identity determinants of human rights organisations. Next follow chapters on the three main focus areas of this research, that is, fields of work of human rights organisations: advocacy potential and advocacy capacity; media visibility and mobilisation potential, legal aid and strategic litigation. After that, the report contains a chapter focusing on the work of human rights organisations for the future, and it closes with a conclusion. At the end of the publication, there is an Annex showing the results of the survey conducted among the general population in Croatia.



## 2. Context

Until 2015, the institutional framework for civil society development consisting of the Croatian Government Office for Cooperation with NGOs, the National Foundation for Civil Society Development and the Council for Civil Society Development (hereinafter referred to as the Council) developed respecting the principles of participatory democracy, understanding the role of civil society in democratic and socio-economic development, and respecting the autonomy of civil society activity. As such, it was widely recognised internationally as an example of good practice.<sup>3</sup> However, the institutional framework started to weaken with the change of government in 2015, which was in practical terms reflected in the 2016 Decision on reducing the share of lottery funds intended for civil society development from 14.21% in 2015 to 6.88% in 2016. In 2022, this share amounts to 10.65%.<sup>4</sup>

Relations between civil society representatives and institutions also changed at the level of the Council. In the sixth convocation of the Council, its president assessed the cooperation as difficult, emphasising the Council's failure to preserve the institutional framework and good communication between state administration bodies and CSOs, and concluding that the issue of financial sustainability of civil society remains crucial for the next convocation.<sup>5</sup> In addition to putting off the adoption of the national strategic framework for civil society activity for years, the implementation of the Operational Programme Efficient Human Resources (OPEHR) 2014-2020 greatly contributed to disrupted relations, both due to delays in launching announced calls or not launching them at all, in some cases project evaluation and selection procedures that lasted several years, and finally due to the way funds are controlled and the dynamics in which requests for reimbursement (ZNS) are approved. The latter problems concern primarily the National Foundation for Civil Society Development, which in the context of OPEHR 2014-2020 is the level 2 implementing body responsible precisely for the evaluation, cost control and payment of requests for reimbursement.

---

<sup>3</sup> Sumpor, M., Rašić Bakarić I. and Đokić I., Vanjsko vrednovanje Nacionalne strategije stvaranja poticajnog okruženja za razvoj civilnog društva 2016.-2020., p. 8, Zagreb: Institute of Economics, available at: <https://udruga.gov.hr/UserDocImages/dokumenti/Evaluacijska%20studija%20-%20UZUVRH%20-%20finalno%20izvjesce.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> Please see: <https://narodne-novine.nn.hr/search.aspx?upit=Uredba+o+kriterijima+za+utvr%20c4%91ivanje+korisnika+i+na%20dinu+raspodjele+dijela+prihoda+od+igara+na+sre%20c4%87u&naslovi=da&sortiraj=1&kategorija=1&rpp=10&qtype=3&pretraga=da>

<sup>5</sup> Minutes of the 18th convocation of the Council for Civil Society Development, held on 13 March 2020, p. 8-9, available at: <https://udruga.gov.hr/UserDocImages/dokumenti/Zapisnik%2018.%20sjednica%20-final.docx>

In view of the context described above, it is not surprising that the European Commission in its 2020<sup>6</sup> and 2021<sup>7</sup> Rule of Law reports for Croatia noted the civic space in Croatia is narrowed, by taking over the CIVICUS rating, and the Civil Society Organization Sustainability Index (CSOSI) also recorded a decline. From 2016 onwards, the results of this index show deterioration or stagnation in all aspects.<sup>8</sup>

The minutes of the seventh, current convocation of the Council testify that relations are still quite disrupted.<sup>9</sup> The year 2021 and the beginning of 2022 were also marked by new controversies related to OPEHR programming for the period 2021-2027. According to unofficial information, the new programming included a planned reduction of the allocation for civil society by seven times compared to the previous financial period, it did not set a priority axis that would enable capacity building and development of civil society and it announced that civil society would be horizontally integrated through various priority axes, mainly in the role of service provider.<sup>10</sup>

The very title of the project within which this research was conducted – *A New Beginning - Sectoral Innovations for a Proactive, Progressive and Influential Human Rights Civil Society* – shows that CSOs have recognised the need to devise new ways of action so that they could continue carrying out activities aimed at protecting human rights and building a democratic political culture while staying true to their organisational missions. As already stated in the introductory part, this research will serve as the basis for this demanding task.

---

<sup>6</sup> EC (2020), 2020 Rule of Law Report, Country Chapter Croatia, p. 17, available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1602579986149&uri=CELEX%3A52020SC0310>

<sup>7</sup> EC (2021), 2021 Rule of Law Report, Country Chapter Croatia, p. 21, available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52021SC0713>

<sup>8</sup> Cf. USAID (2021), 2020 Civil Society Organization Sustainability Index for Croatia, available at: <https://storage.googleapis.com/cso-si-dashboard.appspot.com/Reports/CSOSI-Croatia-2020.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> Minutes available at <https://udruge.gov.hr/istaknute-teme/savjet-za-razvoj-civilnoga-drustva/zapisnici-sa-sjednica-savjeta/144>

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Minutes of the 5th convocation of the Council for Civil Society Development, held on 23 July 2021, p. 3-8, available at: [https://udruge.gov.hr/UserDocImages/dokumenti/Zapisnik%205.%20sjednica%20Savjeta\\_final.pdf](https://udruge.gov.hr/UserDocImages/dokumenti/Zapisnik%205.%20sjednica%20Savjeta_final.pdf)

### 3. Perception of the contributions made by human rights organisations in Croatia over time

Desk research has shown that several studies were conducted on the perception of CSOs in Croatia, but there is little research on the actual contribution of progressive human rights organisations to the improvement of the protection and promotion of human rights and democratic values.

A 2006 study entitled *Vrijednost vrednota: civilno društvo i hrvatska demokratizacija*<sup>11</sup> (The worth of values: civil society and Croatian democratisation) concluded that despite enormous efforts and numerous activities and programs, as well as a large number of direct beneficiaries and a wide range of target groups, CSOs failed to achieve sufficient visibility of their activity in the field of human rights protection and democratisation. Similarly, the study *Udruge u očima javnosti* (Associations in the public eye) (2006)<sup>12</sup> showed that at the time citizens were most familiar with, or in other words they could name, at least one civil society organisation dealing with war veterans and victims (39%), environmental protection (36%), political organisations and campaigns (33%), and problems of poor people (30%). On the other hand, the least known were those dealing with the status of national minorities (5%), civil society development (4%) and unemployed persons (4%).<sup>13</sup> 73% of respondents to this study had a positive view of civil society organisations. At the same time, according to citizens' opinion, CSOs contributed the most to raising people's awareness of their rights (55%), and secondly to developing civil society and democracy (43%). However, 53% of respondents at the time considered that civil society organisations contribute little or nothing at all to improving quality of life and 50% that they contribute little or nothing at all to resolving concrete problems of life.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Kunac, S. (2006), *Vrijednost vrednota: civilno društvo i hrvatska demokratizacija*, Zagreb: B.a.B.e

<sup>12</sup> Franc, R. et al. (2006), *Udruge u očima javnosti: istraživanje javnog mnijenja s osvrtima*, Zagreb: AED, available at: [https://udruge.gov.hr/UserDocImages/UserFiles/Udruge\\_u\\_ocima\\_javnosti\(2\).pdf](https://udruge.gov.hr/UserDocImages/UserFiles/Udruge_u_ocima_javnosti(2).pdf)

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.

A similar study was conducted in 2012 with the aim of identifying possible changes in the visibility and public perception of CSOs.<sup>15</sup> It showed that public perception had not changed significantly. However, there have been some positive but also negative developments in terms of particular attitudes about civil society. Positive changes occurred in terms of higher perception of efficacy (59.1%), higher perception of the level of contribution to improving quality of life (59.2%), reduced scepticism about CSOs and increased willingness to participate in their work. At the same time, negative changes in perception referred to a decrease in financing support from public sources (22.8%) and greater dissatisfaction with the contribution to the development of democracy and civil society.<sup>16</sup>

A study conducted by the Faculty of Political Science in 2018,<sup>17</sup> which was partly concerned with the perception of CSOs, showed that 45% of surveyed citizens believe that CSOs should be included in decision-making processes occasionally, and a further 30% would include them often, which indicates a relatively high level of citizens' trust in CSOs' capacities to contribute to the quality of political decisions.

A similar level of support for including CSOs' views and opinions into public policies was confirmed by our 2022 survey, where 39% of respondents somewhat agree and another 26% strongly agree with the statement 'Authorities should listen to and take into account the proposals of CSOs'. In addition, 63% of respondents somewhat or strongly agree that CSOs are beneficial for society, however, 59% consider them to be insufficiently visible in the public eye. On the other hand, about the same proportion of respondents feel that CSOs are not sufficiently committed to the rights of the groups they deal with (45%) and that they only deal with the rights of minorities, but not the majority (42%).

Furthermore, this survey confirmed that citizens are relatively reluctant to finance CSOs from the state budget. Consequently, as many as 61% of respondents believe that CSOs should operate on a volunteer basis, or that they should be financed mostly from EU funds (54%) or by donations from citizens and private companies (40%).

Only 28% of respondents to the survey have trust in the work of CSOs, which can be considered a relatively low share. However, more citizens

---


<sup>15</sup> Franc, R. et al., (2012), Vidljivost i javna percepcija udruga u Hrvatskoj 2012. Zagreb: SIPU International AB-TACSO Croatia Office, available at: <https://zaklada.civilnodrustvo.hr/uploads/files/sectionModuleFile/2016/11/18/AolwUdcGMGXT7iMvFTPIEb4E3p1AVXVq.pdf>

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Faculty of Political Science (2019), 'Gradani/ke o politici, demokraciji, Gongu', available at: <https://gong.hr/2019/03/06/gradanike-o-politici-demokraciji-gongu/>

trust CSOs than political and other institutions at the national level (government, parliament, political parties, courts, State Attorney’s Office), and CSOs are also more trusted than unions, the media and the social welfare system, as shown in the chart below. In such circumstances, trust in CSOs can be considered satisfactory, all the more so because in case of need, 32% of the respondents would definitely turn to a CSO, and a further 40% would maybe do it.


**Chart 1: Trust in institutions and organisations (n=900)**



Respondents to this survey believe that CSOs should deal with the protection of children with special needs in the largest percentage (88%), followed by persons with disabilities (87%) and consumers (85%). 56% of respondents believe that CSOs should deal with the protection of the rights of national minorities, while the work of CSOs to protect the rights of LGBT persons is the only topic that does not have the outright support of respondents (40%).


Respondents who assessed that CSOs should address these topics and/or target groups perceive that CSOs are most successful in protecting the rights of children with special needs and persons with disabilities, and the least successful in fighting corruption and protecting the rights of persons at risk of poverty.

Chart 2: CSO performance according to topics/areas



Finally, regarding the type of activities that human rights organisations should engage in, the surveyed citizens give priority to free legal aid and humanitarian work, and are least inclined to non-profit journalism. However, as can be seen from the chart below, each of the listed types of activities enjoys the support of a simple majority of citizens.

**Chart 3:** Type of activities that CSOs should engage in (n=900)



## 4. Identity determinants of human rights organisations

The identity of civil society organisations is determined by many factors, and both civil society organisations and external stakeholders can perceive it in different ways. Unlike most 'external' participants in qualitative research who primarily associate the work of human rights organisations with vulnerable groups at risk of discrimination or, to a lesser extent, protection of citizens' political rights, the representatives of the organisations themselves who participated in focus groups refer more often to organisations dealing with the protection of socio-economic and third generation rights (primarily the environment). In so doing, they point out that, regardless of the topic or target group they deal with, what makes those organisations human rights organisations is precisely their rights-based approach characterised by activism as a method of action. The approach to the design and implementation of rights-based public policies implies, on the one hand, empowering citizens to know and actively demand the exercise of their rights, and, on the other hand, the obligation of the government and its institutions to guarantee citizens with those rights, without discrimination.

The participants in qualitative research provided different answers about (self)identification of types of organisations that can be called human rights organisations. However, the prevailing opinion is that these are primarily advocacy organisations that deal with the protection of rights of various minority or vulnerable groups. Participants predominantly point out that direct work with people in need combined with the implementation of watchdog activities are the foundation and indispensable part of activities that enable advocacy. On the other hand, advocacy and work on policy solutions make them generators of knowledge in the specific areas they deal with, so they partly fulfil the role of think tanks which should have an advisory function in decision-making. However, in the current circumstances, this function is largely disabled.

A small part of the participants in qualitative research defines human rights organisations primarily as a link between government institutions and citizens in need, that is, as those who should primarily be involved in raising awareness for the purpose of educating citizens. In this context, with the exception of CSOs primarily engaged in providing services to citizens in need, criticism was voiced regarding insufficient activity and presence of human rights organisations in communities, with people, working on their empowerment. Most participants believe that a large number of CSOs have locked themselves in their offices and work inside



their own 'boxes', but they partly associate this with their need to 'survive' within changed circumstances, along with extremely demanding project administration, which some consider to be deliberate sabotage.

Some participants define as human rights organisations also the CSOs that primarily or exclusively deal with the provision of services, which they consider to be in a slightly more difficult situation due to such a position, both in terms of preserving the autonomy of the organisation due to project financing, and because their focus on providing services and supporting beneficiaries does not leave them enough room to innovate approaches. This particularly applies to CSOs to which the government has transferred welfare state activities, which part of the participants considers as a wrong approach in steering the development of civil society because it can force organisations to choose between criticising the government and securing funds to continue their work.

Ultimately, participants stress that the issue of organisational identity is a matter of organisational autonomy, which also depends on the specific moment and circumstances, emphasising that some CSOs were forced to change identities in order to adapt to donor strategies. On the other hand, they think that those CSOs that fuse different identities and work methods are the strongest, emphasising that to be effective it is important to find a good balance of all identities, especially in current circumstances.

Furthermore, participants point out that today progressive human rights organisations are labelled as undesirable among decision-makers, and criticism coming from them is perceived as an attack. Human rights have become a topic that is discussed in the political arena, and to that extent progressive human rights organisations are perceived as political actors.

Participants also emphasise the paradox of public perception where progressive organisations are considered politically biased, 'while the right-wing ones, who push their ideology and political goals by using human rights terminology, are not perceived as politically biased'. In their opinion, this is particularly prominent in areas outside Zagreb, where progressive organisations are perceived as a space for building future political actors, referring to political parties *Možemo!* (We can!) and *Zagreb je naš* (Zagreb is ours), while this is not the case with regressive organisations. However, the survey conducted as part of this study confirms these views only to some extent. More specifically, 34% of respondents agree with the statement 'CSOs are an extension of political parties', 22% disagree, and 44% are undecided on the issue, with no statistically significant regional differences.

The list of specific recognised organisations within the qualitative part of the research is quite long and reflects all the mentioned identity deter-

minants. Participants thus included among human rights organisations, for example: Babe!, Centre for Peace Studies, Human Rights House Zagreb, Are You Syrious?, Documenta - Centre for Dealing with the Past, Centre for Peace, Nonviolence and Human Rights Osijek, CESI – Centre for Education, Counselling and Research, Autonomous Women's House, Centre for Women War Victims Rosa, Association for Human Rights and Civic Participation PaRiter, Domine, Women's Network Croatia, Croatian Network for the Homeless, Gong, Right to the City (Pravo na grad), Green Action (Zelena akcija), Zagreb Pride, Youth Initiative for Human Rights and RODA – Parents in Action. However, the survey found that almost half of the surveyed citizens (47%) and up to 57% of those in the 16-29 age group could not name any civil society organisation.

## 5. Advocacy potential and capacities

Most of the citizens surveyed in quantitative research indirectly support institutional advocacy as one of the key methods to achieve CSOs' influence on public policies. More specifically, 65% agree with the statement 'Authorities should listen to and take into account the proposals of CSOs', and as many as 73% think that CSOs should engage in research as one of their working methods.

Despite such strong support for advocacy activities, participants in the qualitative part of the research emphasise that in current socio-political circumstances the space for advocacy activities has shrunk. Consequently, CSOs' participation in decision-making processes, for example through working groups, is characterised as a 'fig leaf' for those in power, because their proposals in working groups are marginalised and rejected. In the opinion of the participants, closing off the legislative procedure, strong centralisation of the decision-making and management processes, fast-track procedures and postponing the adoption of strategic documents at the national level make it impossible for CSOs to have a stronger influence. Participants also do not see any room for influencing in the formalised public debate that takes place at the end of the policy process, that is, at the moment when it is fundamentally impossible to influence a proposed policy solution. As a tactic to bridge the impossibility of achieving impact at the national level, some organisations have transferred advocacy efforts to local/regional authorities in those environments where progressive organisations are not perceived as 'hostile'. An example of citizenship and civic education stands out in this sense, which, due to being blocked at the national level, has been successfully advocated and implemented in several local/regional areas in Croatia, with a tendency to spread.

Participants in the qualitative part of the research believe that isolated positive developments in terms of successful advocacy activities are possible only in matters which are not politically sensitive (such as combating poverty or humanitarian action) and matters which are beneficial to the image of those in power, which refers to both the national and local level.

In such circumstances, both the 'external' participants and the participants from CSOs generally assess that advocacy efforts are significantly less successful than ten years ago.

## 5.1 FACTORS AFFECTING ADVOCACY POTENTIAL

Participants associate several factors with a significantly weaker advocacy influence compared to the period before Croatia's accession to the European Union. The weaker influence is also reflected in the fact participants assess there has been a general backsliding in terms of protection and promotion of human rights.

On the one hand, with Croatia's accession to the EU human rights organisations lost the leverage they had during the accession process, especially at its end, when joint advocacy efforts by a number of organisations gathered within Platform 112 resulted in numerous improvements to the legislative framework precisely in the chapter on judiciary and fundamental rights.

Therefore, participants conclude that in today's conditions it is difficult to work systematically on advocacy, because lack of resources for advocacy means that it is based on enthusiasm, volunteering and precarious work, which is not sustainable in the long term and leads to burnout at work.

Some participants point out that today even the EU itself is shrinking civic space (for example, the issue of Croatia's entry into Schengen area and the policy towards migrants), as well as the fact that the EU has changed its priorities.

Another factor is the year 2016, a turning point concerning the treatment and perception of progressive organisations by political actors influenced by the global conservative right. Despite the short-term nature of the government under Tihomir Orešković, the change of government after the early elections from 2017 onwards did not significantly change its attitude towards human rights organisations. In fact, in the opinion of CSO participants, the repercussions of 2016 are still present and reflect in the continued marginalisation of human rights organisations, as well as in a changed approach of once supportive to now degrading institutional framework, which on the one hand seeks to make the CSOs numb and passive and on the other hand to co-opt them.

Some participants from institutions believe that despite the 'bad period' for civil society, the very survival of the institutional framework is 'proof of the tenacity' of mechanisms that are still under construction and whose performance largely depends on the people who manage them and less on political conviction. The problem, however, in the authors' opinion, is that this argument lacks consideration of the fact that these same managers are politically appointed.

Nevertheless, the lack of capacity of institutional actors has emerged as a third factor that negatively affects the advocacy potential of human rights organisations. More specifically, participants refer to lack of leadership in institutions and the rudimentary nature of institutions, negative selection of personnel, formalistic and passive bodies that cannot be influenced, essential misunderstanding of human rights and loss of institutional memory due to changing governments. They also voice criticism related to the underdeveloped awareness of how to operationalise action plans instead of disorganised problem solving, as well as the tendency to formally adopt conventions,<sup>18</sup> without thinking about their implementation.

In addition to these shortcomings, CSO representatives stress the 'numbness' of government offices dealing with various aspects of human rights which, in their view, have become 'institutions of the executive power that do not have the capacity to deal with human rights'.

Therefore, in recent years, advocacy has been reduced to lobbying individuals within institutions with whom CSOs have previously built relationships, and whose departure from the institution is considered a major loss. On the other hand, given the unfavourable political environment, 'small triumphs' achieved through individuals in institutions are sometimes conditioned by 'insisting that we don't go public with it, so that they could get things done through in-house mechanisms'. In this way, CSOs are forced to choose between improving the policy framework and their public advocacy action through which they could positively influence the public perception of their importance and impact.

The last factor that negatively impacts the advocacy potential of human rights organisations is the shift of generations in the organisations themselves, whereby one part of former employees started working as consultants, and the other became politically active. Political activation of some former employees of CSOs contributed to the hostile atmosphere within the political decision-making space, and the shift of generations resulted in a shortage of experienced people in human rights organisations, hampered by a lack of opportunities for building advocacy capacities. On the other hand, CSOs testify to a considerable challenge of recruiting new/young employees who, accustomed to precarious working conditions, show lower levels of commitment to the organisation and its goals.

---

<sup>18</sup> For example, the Istanbul Convention or the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

## 5.2 COOPERATION IN ADVOCACY ACTIVITIES

Cooperation among human rights organisations on advocacy activities is not characterised by competition, which the participants of the qualitative part of the research assess as positive. At the same time, they recognise that cooperation has died down in the last few years, which they attribute primarily to funding conditions and the consequent focus on projects of their own organisations, which has negatively impacted the activist aspect of work.

Given the funding conditions, deadlines and project administration, cooperation is mostly determined by project partnerships, which are sometimes more formal than real and, in such cases, burdensome for the organisation leading the project. In this context, participants recognise the need to open and develop channels to connect 'stories' and build solid project partnerships.

At the sector level, cooperation has been awakened relatively recently due to serious problems civil society in Croatia faces, but it focuses on ensuring a more stable financial framework for action. As such, however, it has the inherent weakness of being perceived as aimed at preserving one's own positions, because it is hard to understand that the survival of human rights organisations is one of the safeguards that will prevent the further collapse of human rights.

Participants estimate that today there are significantly fewer allies than before, and at the institutional level, as already pointed out, they are reduced to individual persons and individual units of local self-government, trade unions, academia, and part of the media and journalists. On the other hand, they emphasise a lack of alliance from those institutions that are responsible for the development of civil society, which was most obviously reflected in the inaction of the National Foundation for Civil Society Development and the Government Office for Cooperation with NGOs during the campaign for the 2021 local elections, when civil society was called out in public, without almost any reaction from those institutions.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> The director of the Government Office for Cooperation with NGOs, Helena Beus, made a statement on the financing of civil society organisations when asked by media outlet Jutarnji list. More available at: <https://www.jutarnji.hr/vijesti/hrvatska/vlada-o-skorinim-optuzbama-evo-sto-su-nam-odgovorili-o-financiranju-udruga-i-njihovoj-kontroli-15076075>

## 5.3 ADVOCACY SUCCESSES AND FAILURES

CSO representatives evaluate their performance in advocacy in the last 10 years with a school grade of 3 or C (good) and point out that performance depends on political will, policy area and moment, that is, external circumstances that cannot be influenced. They characterise their work on advocacy as a 'disorganised' combination of more often reactive and less often systematic actions. They also point out that today's advocacy goals are significantly less ambitious, which is partly a source of frustration. Therefore, performance is measured by progress in relation to the initial situation, and what was set as a goal is very rarely achieved. Another way of measuring advocacy performance is preventing the adoption of bad policy solutions, but also putting topics on the political agenda that results in less resistance once the policy solution is adopted (e.g., gender equality in the workplace).

As advocacy successes, many participants in qualitative research from both groups include the #spasime (#saveme) initiative and the protection against domestic violence, the rights of LGBTIQ persons and same-sex families, especially in the context of the right to foster care, the rights of the child and the rights of persons with disabilities. Participants believe that, given the social and political circumstances, it is much easier today to advocate the rights stemming from social policy and demographic measures. As regards failures, participants mention the area of migration management, refugee treatment and their integration, although they point out that the case of M.H. and Others v. Croatia before the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) has significantly damaged the Croatian government. In addition, as advocacy failures they list efforts related to the policy of enabling civil society development and those related to the consequences of managing the COVID-19 crisis.

## 5.4 ADVOCACY IN THE FUTURE

In view of all the above, CSOs themselves recognise the need to build lobbying capacities, to find time to reflect on, anticipate and create strategies in order to move from reactive to proactive mode of action and to build well-functioning ties between organisations providing services and those performing monitoring and advocacy for the purpose of mutual empowerment and support to advocacy efforts. Participants in qualitative research highlight several recommendations aimed at improving advocacy activities and their performance:

- 1. Stronger engagement and partnerships with relatively functioning mechanisms for the protection of human rights** – primarily ombudsperson institutions as leverage for imposing certain topics, and then the newly established Human Rights Council of the Government of the Republic of Croatia. This requires CSOs to agree on priorities to be worked on through the Council.
- 2. Stronger engagement towards the progressive political opposition in Parliament** – especially the green-left bloc, but also other actors from the centre to the left. Here, however, it should be noted that CSOs are cautious about stronger cooperation with the green-left bloc precisely to avoid objections that civil society has been instrumentalised by this new political option, which has largely originated from civil society.
- 3. Increased use of the Constitutional Court** as an instrument for improving the protection of human rights, either by bringing actions before the constitutional court or in the form of *amicus curiae* ('friend of the court').
- 4. Move institutional advocacy to the EU level** in order to try to influence the policy process in the domestic hostile environment through external pressure. In this context, it is necessary to build capacities for advanced lobbying within the EU, to start monitoring EU legislative initiatives from the very beginning and anticipate and find policy solutions for transposing new EU regulations into domestic legislation.
- 5. Capacity building for action within the EU institutions**, CJEU and the European Ombudsman.
- 6. Building relationships and creating atypical stakeholder platforms and *ad hoc* citizens' initiatives** that seek to influence decision-making processes, including for example the business sector, academia, trade unions, lawyers. Building such relations, according to the par-



ticipants, also implies organising discussions with dissenting voices from other sectors, which would help to find compromise solutions and to build transversal coalitions with a common goal. At the same time, these broad coalitions provide for compelling arguments in the defence against attacks related to ‘taking political sides’.

## 6. Media visibility and mobilisation potential

Participants in qualitative research from both groups largely agree that human rights organisations are successful in placing their topics in the media landscape, but the problem is the brevity of the media cycle in which it is difficult to maintain attention on one topic long enough to reach a wider audience.

The participants also identify the problem of infodemics and the low level of media literacy of most citizens. In addition, some participants believe that topics related to human rights are followed by a very narrow audience from the ranks of supporters and of the so-called 'haters', which can also have a negative impact – for example on the mobilisation of opponents, whereby the distortion of the concept of 'human rights' imposes the need to reflect on whether it is even appropriate to speak in that discourse. In this context, they stress the need to shift focus to topics such as access to services, inequality and injustice – rather than focusing on target groups of human rights organisations with whom most people find it difficult to identify.

Interviewed participants link the success of media placement to building relationships with specific journalists, whereby the interviewed journalists draw attention to the importance of responding to all media calls because often journalists "have to fight for that topic in their own news-room". This "fight" means that not all topics are equally visible in the media, and that the non-representation of human rights issues and organisations in the media is a by-product of the generally bad state of the media – ownership structure, editorial policies and clickbait journalism. When it comes to the public broadcaster, participants believe that only topics "harmless" to the government go through, while the CSO work on topics "dangerous" to the government (for example, the treatment of migrants) is used by the public broadcaster to defame these organisations.

According to the survey results, citizens are informed about the work of CSOs mostly through television (49%) and the internet (46%), followed by social media (37%) and family, friends and acquaintances (26%). As an information channel, radio has been mentioned by 14% of participants.

Part of the participants in the qualitative part of the research believes that mainstream media blackout has been largely successfully circumvented through social media, primarily Facebook, but that in the future it is necessary to use Twitter much more as a channel used primarily by

journalists and opinion makers in Croatia. Likewise, when it comes to the need to reach out to young people who do not follow the media and who, according to participants, lack a 'sense of collective belonging', it is necessary to develop the communication tools they use – Snapchat, TikTok and Instagram. The survey confirms the necessity of switching to online channels of communication with young people.

**Table 2:**  
Sources of information  
about the work of CSOs

| HOW DO YOU GET INFORMED ABOUT THE WORK OF CSOS? | TOTAL SAMPLE | SUB-SAMPLE 16-29 |
|---|--------------|------------------|
| Television                                      | 48.8%        | 37.4%            |
| Radio   | 13.9%        | 13.4%            |
| Newspaper                                       | 11.2%        | 8.6%             |
| Web portals                                     | 46.3%        | 47.6%            |
| Social media (Facebook, Twitter, Instagram)     | 36.6%        | 57.8%            |
| CSOs websites                                   | 16.3%        | 20.9%            |
| Family, friends, acquaintances                  | 25.8%        | 22.5%            |
| Personal involvement                            | 0.1%         | 0.0%             |
| I don't get informed                            | 2.8%         | 1.1%             |
| Other   | 0.4%         | 0.0%             |
| TOTAL   | 100.0%       | 100.0%           |

In this regard, participants in the qualitative part of the research emphasise the necessity to develop a 'smart media strategy' and to employ good PR or communication experts belonging to these generations in order to successfully build new communication channels.

Mobilisation potential results from media/public visibility which may lead to support. However, participants in qualitative research point out in part that the problem of human rights organisations is not their (non)visibility, but the prevailing negative perception as 'parasites', those whose objectives are to acquire finance, those who represent a destructive factor in society, who are 'foreign mercenaries' and that only humanitarian organisations are well accepted by the general public. This part of the participants thinks that the most visible human rights topics are polarising and that "right-wing organisations that mobilise on fear and divisions" are more successful in mobilising citizens around such topics.

This perception, however, is only partially confirmed by the findings of the survey. More specifically, less than half of the respondents (46%) agree with the statement 'CSOs are extracting public funds', and only slightly more than a third (37%) agree with the statement 'CSOs exist only to pay for themselves'. Space for action can be seen in the relatively high percentages of those who neither agree nor disagree with all of the statements, which varies from 32% to 44%, with the highest percent-

age referring to the statement about financing through foreign centres of power.

According to participants in the qualitative part of the research, progressive organisations face the challenge of ensuring that those who agree with their values also begin to identify with them, and the participants believe that people's willingness to engage mainly comes down to those who are directly affected by a particular issue. According to the results of the survey, the problem related to the mobilisation of citizens to engage in the activities of CSOs was correctly identified. More precisely, only 18% of the citizens surveyed are active in a CSO. On the other hand, it is encouraging that 46% of those surveyed said that they might join a CSO, which means that they are open to engagement.

Part of the participants in the qualitative part of the research believes that the visibility of CSOs beyond a small circle of people is questionable, and expanding that circle is a demanding task that is hampered by project-oriented work and administration, especially in the context of the need to get out of the circle of "experts" into communities and engage resources for live conversations with people in their communities. However, part of the participants believes it is precisely this aspect of work on promoting the values of solidarity, equality and parity that can make a sustainable change. In addition to direct fieldwork, it can also be built through the already mentioned professionalisation of public relations, investments in digital skills and digital campaigns, building of storytelling skills and cooperation with influencers. In other words, participants from both groups recognise the need for CSOs to step out of their comfort zone.

In this context, interviewees and focus groups recommend a politically more pragmatic and ideologically flexible approach that will enable alliances with those with whom they have not been sought or built so far. An example of a CSO that successfully adapted to the new era and managed to mobilise many citizens without prominent ideological fronts, but respecting the principles of human rights protection and promotion, is Solidarna Foundation. Its crowdfunding campaigns also had a mobilising effect, and the wide support was reflected in the increase in corporate philanthropy for its objectives.

Participants in qualitative research also recognise successful mobilisation tactics in symbolic cases that evoke emotions – resignation or empathy - and that provide for advanced forms of cooperation with a diverse range of actors. As an example of such an action, a large number of participants referred to #spasime (#saveme) initiative, where they recognised the importance of a catchy and emotionally charged hashtag, the engagement of influencers and their storytelling skills. However,


they also point out that it was #spasime that revealed all the weaknesses of the institutional advocacy by CSOs that have been dealing with the topic of family and gender-based violence for decades, precisely because the government reacts exclusively to media/public pressure instead of arguments.

Another more recent example was the quick raising of funds to cover the fine and legal expenses of Dragan Umičević, a volunteer with the NGO Are You Syrious?. The latter action is associated with a feeling of resignation and a perceived great injustice, although some of the research participants believe that there was no significant mobilisation outside the circle of already aware and active citizens.

When considering the mobilisation potential, it should be taken into account that not only the number of people gathered at protests makes a mobilisation successful, but that in the modern world mobilisation can also happen through digital channels. More specifically, according to CSO representatives, the organisation of protests is the most difficult and risky form of mobilisation, and in this context it is important to weigh whether the invested resources will be returned in the form of citizen support. It is also important to recognise situations where a successful digital campaign can be jeopardised by an attempt to organise protests on the same topic.

Another important issue identified by participants is the need to define what is desired of the people we seek to mobilise: 'what space do we give them to act, except to like posts?' In this context, several participants of the qualitative research also referred to the action Hrvatska može bolje (Croatia can do better), which in the last 20 years has been the largest mobilising action in Croatia, and which, at the same time, is disappointing precisely due to the lack of strategy on how to proceed with this support.

In the survey, respondents ranked certain aspects of their lives on a scale from 1 to 5 (1=I wouldn't engage at all; 5=I would strongly engage). According to the results, respondents would engage the most in topics related to family and health, and the least in matters of religion, but as can be seen from the chart, with the exception of religion, they assessed almost all aspects as equally worthy of engagement. On the other hand, when choosing the three most important aspects, 72% of respondents chose family, 67% chose health, and 35% financial security.

**Chart 4:** Perception of importance and readiness to engage (n=900)

## 7. Legal aid and strategic litigation

Free legal aid provided by human rights organisations to beneficiaries is considered an extremely important aspect of their work by both the interviewed external stakeholders and CSO representatives themselves. Surveyed citizens agree with them, with as many as 88% of them believing that human rights organisations should provide free legal aid as part of their work. This is also a form of CSO work that received the support of the largest share of citizens in the survey, and it is closely followed, with 86%, by direct provision of services to citizens in need.

In the qualitative part of the research, external interviewed stakeholders stress the importance of legal aid primarily in the context of beneficiaries, because they believe that without legal aid from human rights organisations many people would not have won very big and important battles, in other words, without pro bono lawyers they would not have been able to defend themselves. At the same time, they point out that it is difficult to provide free legal aid in a country that does not have elements of the rule of law, and that the providers of free legal aid are 'social workers without a system'. They assess the legal solution for providing free legal aid as a poor and completely inefficient mechanism that needs to be changed because it currently serves only 'for the government to wash its hands'. To that extent, they believe that free legal aid, as a key service that the system cannot provide, works much better when it is provided on a project basis, and not through the Free Legal Aid Act. The key objection to the Act is complicated administrative requirements, accompanied by insufficient financial support which, on the one hand, prevents continuity of activities and, on the other hand, severely limits the recruitment and retention of lawyers.

Apart from the fact of helping concrete people, CSO representatives see great value of providing free legal aid in gaining insight into the actual situation in a certain area and identifying systemic problems, which is extremely important in the context of their institutional advocacy efforts. Legal support is extremely important in a situation where vulnerable groups do not trust institutions.

The problems the participants identify include lack of resources to recruit lawyers and the consequent reliance on volunteer engagement, which results in the ability to provide only basic assistance to beneficiaries, often accompanied by the frustration of beneficiaries who have long been waiting for the response of the volunteer lawyer. In such

circumstances, some CSOs have developed an alternative solution – by building their own capacities for proper referral to institutions that are in charge of solving the problem. Others use short-term solutions such as paying monthly lump sums to a law firm from institutional support received from foreign foundations. The third option is to finance legal aid through consulting services of their in-house lawyers.

According to the above-mentioned Act, CSOs providing free legal aid apply to one-year tenders whose funds are insufficient and whose payments are late, which makes any strategic litigation impossible. Among other obstacles to more effective provision of legal support to beneficiaries, CSOs identify poor interest of lawyers in working in civil society, especially outside Zagreb, and lack of specialised legal aid for cases of violations of civil, democratic rights.

As for strategic litigation, participants in qualitative research consider it an extremely valuable method of fighting for the protection of human rights – not only in the case of people whose rights have been specifically violated, but also later because of the impact on the system through the implementation of judgments and action plans. Strategic litigation experiences are transferred to policy dialogue, working groups, e-consultations and in this context serve as a means of positioning CSOs in the policy field.

In addition, successful strategic litigations enable media coverage, expose the authorities and are important for strengthening people's trust in human rights organisations, which ultimately, according to the participants, strengthens political culture.

Despite such recognised importance, interviewees and focus groups identify a large number of obstacles. Firstly, strategic litigation before national courts is extremely slow, with inconsistent case law being another aggravating factor 'and even when there is a positive development, someone quickly obstructs it.' In the context of litigation before the ECtHR, participants believe these judgments to be extremely important, however "in our dysfunctional system, judgments may not fully translate into changes in public policy, but at least they act as a warning.' In addition, they identify lack of resources for monitoring the implementation of general measures from ECtHR judgments and a lack of 'capacity and time for third party interventions before ECtHR, although this could significantly improve the system.' In relation specifically to strategic litigation related to discrimination, interviewed participants also see a problem in unadopted strategic documents and lack of focus of the Government Office for Human Rights and Rights of National Minorities.



Some of them feel that CSOs should focus on the Constitutional Court as a place through which some issues can be put on the political agenda.


External stakeholders recommend strengthening cooperation with law firms, including reviving cooperation through training for lawyers, designing crowdfunding campaigns for strategic litigation that can simultaneously represent advocacy action, and recognising whistle-blower protection as a new area for strategic litigation. Representatives of human rights organisations recognise the need for mutual reinforcement regarding the selection of cases for strategic litigation.

## 8. Looking forward

Participants of the qualitative research also reflected on the topics/areas on which, in their opinion, progressive human rights organisations should focus in the future. Given the numerous problems related to the protection and promotion of human rights in Croatia, it is not surprising that participants listed many topics on which it is necessary to continue working, including anti-discrimination, especially of ethnic minorities and the LGBTIQ population. They also stress the need to continue working on the rights of refugees, migrants and asylum seekers, on gender equality issues (especially conscientious objection in medicine) and protection against domestic violence, and preventing and denouncing hate speech online and offline while safeguarding freedom of expression. In the field of political and civil rights, the issues that stand out refer to the electoral system and corruption and conflicts of interest.

Areas in which the interviewed participants see the need to step up efforts include discrimination of the elderly and young people, especially regarding the quality and availability of public services – health, education and social services. In addition, a stronger engagement is also expected on climate change issues, housing rights and social and economic inequalities in general.

The results of the survey regarding target groups/topics that human rights organisations should deal with are presented in the chart below. They support the expressed views regarding significantly higher preferences of citizens for addressing humanitarian issues and the most vulnerable members of the community (children with special needs and persons with disabilities). Issues connected to protecting the rights of refugees and migrants, national minorities and the rights of LGBTIQ persons have significantly lower levels of support, which confirms that a significant part of citizens in Croatia still, unfortunately, has not internalised the values of equality and parity.

**Chart 5:** Areas that CSOs should deal with (n=900)

In the context of "new" topics, a great number of participants in the qualitative part of the research emphasised the impact of artificial intelligence on human and labour rights and the protection of digital privacy, along with the quality and availability of drinking water and food. Also, a number of participants mentioned the need to monitor the work of the judiciary and the rule of law, recognising this area as a 'white spot' in the Croatian civil society sector. Finally, the issue of media legislation and media freedom in Croatia was also mentioned in the context of infodemics.

CSO representatives themselves also mentioned most of the listed topics, emphasising the need to work on preserving acquired rights, and the need for much more teamwork, mutual networking and cooperation with the scientific community and educational institutions for the socialisation of young generations. Most importantly, they recognise the need to find time to develop a common narrative and common action strategies.

## 9. Conclusion

This research, conducted through interviews and focus groups with key stakeholders, including representatives of civil society organisations, and through a survey on a representative sample of citizens of the Republic of Croatia over the age of 16, gave us insights into the basic aspects of work of progressive civil society organisations, i.e., human rights organisations in Croatia. The research shed light on the performance and limitations of their work in advocacy, media visibility and mobilisation of citizens, as well as legal aid and strategic litigation.

Advocacy is undoubtedly an important aspect of the activities of civil society organisations, and it is most successful precisely when it is connected to the direct protection of human rights. However, today advocacy is less successful than ten years ago. This is largely linked to the socio-political context, which is characterised by a shrinking civic space and less opportunities for advocacy. Progressive civil society organisations have less and less opportunities for real influence through existing institutional mechanisms for advocacy, through participation in working groups, bodies and consultations with the interested public. Compared to the period ten years ago, the European Union is no longer a lever that can be used to influence policies and legislation in the field of human rights; the influence of right-wing or regressive political actors is growing; in Croatia, there is a visible lack of political will and capacity of institutions to integrate the ideas of human rights organisations into public policies. At the same time, civil society organisations themselves suffer from an internal lack of capacity due to generational change, increasing bureaucratisation, administrative burden and lack of options for financing advocacy and activist initiatives, which consequently results in being 'locked in offices' and insufficiently connected to the community. In these circumstances, civil society organisations are increasingly resorting to disorganised and reactive action and are less ambitious in advocacy. Although relations among progressive organisations in Croatia have traditionally not been marked by competitiveness, but by solidarity and cooperation, in recent years, under the influence of the factors already mentioned, this cooperation has largely died out compared to previous times. Project partnerships are thus more common than activist-advocacy coalitions, which, of course, negatively affects the impact and success of advocacy initiatives for progressive social change.

As far as media and public visibility is concerned, human rights organisations are generally successful in placing their topics and activities in the media, mainly thanks to building relations with specific journalists. It is important to note that not all topics and activities, nor civil society organisations, are equally visible in the media. However, due to problems concerning the media, such as the brevity of media cycle and editorial policies in the media, it is very difficult to keep the public's attention on certain topics for a long time. On the other hand, it is difficult to gain exposure with the public broadcaster with topics that could be "unpleasant" for the current government, that is, critically oriented organisations have restricted access to Croatian national television's airtime. However, the visibility of civil society organisations should certainly not be a goal in itself because sometimes it also mobilises hostile actors and citizens. Some citizens have a negative perception of civil society organisations, but there is also a significant part of those who support progressive civil society, as well as those who are in some way undecided, or cannot be counted neither among their supporters nor opponents. Here lies the potential for further mobilisation of citizens to support the progressive ideas of civil society organisations and engage in their work. However, this potential is insufficiently used primarily due to limitations caused by project-oriented work and administration and lack of capacity for grass-root community work, which is precisely what could ensure a long-term and sustainable progressive social change.

As far as the legal activities of civil society organisations are concerned, both free legal aid and strategic litigation represent extremely important methods of action. Free legal aid is particularly important to the victims of human rights violations, but also to human rights organisations which in this way get the opportunity to identify systemic problems, necessary for creating the basis for institutional advocacy. In this sense, free legal aid is also an important advocacy tool. However, the legislation regulating free legal aid is completely inadequate to respond to the needs, and the funding of CSOs providing free legal aid is insufficient and accompanied by complicated administrative requirements, which reduces the interest of lawyers to work in civil society organisations. CSOs are trying to tackle these problems in various ways, such as finding other sources of funding and building cooperation with specific lawyers, but this is still insufficient, so free legal aid is largely unavailable to citizens who need it. Strategic litigation as a method is an immensely important advocacy tool, which in some way sets the stage for changes in the policy area and enables media coverage of certain topics. However, strategic litigation at the national level is often very lengthy, and the case law is inconsistent. The European Court of Human Rights, where some human rights organisations litigate, is an important institution, but it requires great financial capacities and close cooperation with interested lawyers. Human rights organisations generally lack the capacity to monitor the

implementation of general measures from the judgments of the ECtHR, so sometimes even the cases won do not result in better national legislation and public policies.

Looking at the findings of the research, the question remains what progressive civil society should do to partially or completely offset the challenges it faces and to increase its impact. The answer to this question is certainly not easy, because the situation in which civil society finds itself is part of the wider social, political and economic context, both in Croatia and worldwide. The country's attitude towards civil society certainly depends on the political will of the actors in power, which is lacking in this case, and the government's attitude towards progressive civil society is hostile. In such a context, progressive civil society has limited room for manoeuvre, but through research we have established that by changing the strategies of action in the area of advocacy, media visibility and mobilisation of citizens, legal aid and strategic litigation there may still be some room for progress. Of course, it is also necessary to define action strategies concerning the very functioning of civil society or shrinking civic space, particularly in terms of the legislative and institutional framework for civil society development, civil society funding, and its participation in public policymaking.

In the area of advocacy, it is evident that CSOs need to make use of institutional space, that is, resort to those institutions, bodies and political actors that are still open to progressive civil society. Furthermore, it should be examined to what extent redirecting attention to advocacy towards the institutions of the European Union would yield results at the national level as well. Also, in terms of advocacy, broader non-project cooperation within civil society, along with the creation of atypical advocacy platforms together with other actors, is an approach worth trying out. In the area of public visibility and mobilisation of citizens, the necessity for a change in approach has been established, both in terms of creating messages and in terms of channels for communication with certain segments of the public. Certainly, moving away from professional jargon, that is, simplifying public communication in order to evoke empathy and activate values shared by a large part of the population, is an approach to be developed. Problems faced by victims of human rights violations should be communicated publicly not only from the perspective of the vulnerability of groups at risk to which these victims belong, but also by appealing to the values of equality, social justice and the right to access social services. Linking the problems that progressive civil society deals with to the daily experiences of people they address on the one hand, and appealing to values that are important to people on a daily basis, such as family, health and financial security, could bring long-term results. In addition to developing communication on channels followed by young people, primarily social media, it is important to find

capacities for more direct work with communities. In terms of legal aid and strategic litigation, it is necessary to seek changes to the legislation regulating this area, but also to strengthen cooperation with law schools and law firms.

In the coming period, CSOs involved in this project will work intensively to bring together civil society organisations in order to figure out how to translate all of this into practice. In any case, this research will be of help in that, and the authors hope that in a few years similar research will establish that civil society in Croatia is in a somewhat better position than today, and that the socio-political context is more favourable to the protection and promotion of human rights.

## References

Buljan, I. and Horvat, K. (2020), Pristup financiranju za organizacije civilnog društva u Hrvatskoj, Zagreb: Human Rights House Zagreb, available at: [https://www.kucaljudskihprava.hr/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Pristup-financiranju-za-organizacije-civilnog-drustva-u-Hrvatskoj\\_web.pdf](https://www.kucaljudskihprava.hr/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Pristup-financiranju-za-organizacije-civilnog-drustva-u-Hrvatskoj_web.pdf)

European Commission (2020), 2020 Rule of Law Report, Country Chapter Croatia, p. 17, available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/HR/TXT/DOC/?uri=CELEX:52021SC0713&from=EN>

European Commission (2021), 2021 Rule of Law Report, Country Chapter Croatia, p. 21, available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/HR/TXT/DOC/?uri=CELEX:52021SC0713&from=EN>

Faculty of Political Science (2019), 'Građani/ke o politici, demokraciji, Gongu', available at: <https://gong.hr/2019/03/06/gradanike-o-politici-demokraciji-gongu/>

Franc, R. et al. (2006), Udruge u očima javnosti: istraživanje javnog mnijenja s osvrtima, Zagreb: AED, available at: [https://udruge.gov.hr/UserDocImages/UserFiles/Udruge\\_u\\_ocima\\_javnosti\(2\).pdf](https://udruge.gov.hr/UserDocImages/UserFiles/Udruge_u_ocima_javnosti(2).pdf)

Franc, R. I Šakić, V. (2007), Stavovi javnosti o nevladinim organizacijama 2007., Zagreb: AED, available at: [http://int.uzuvrh.hr/UserFiles/stavovi%20javnosti\\_2007\(2\).pdf](http://int.uzuvrh.hr/UserFiles/stavovi%20javnosti_2007(2).pdf)

Furedi F. (2018), Populism and the European Culture Wars - The Conflict of Values between Hungary and the EU, London: Routledge

Franc, R. et al., (2012), Vidljivost i javna percepcija udruga u Hrvatskoj 2012. Zagreb: SIPU International AB-TACSO Croatia Office, available at: <https://zaklada.civilnodrustvo.hr/uploads/files/sectionModuleFile/2016/11/18/AolwUdcGMGXT7iMvFTPIEb4E3p1AVXVq.pdf>

Jašić, S. (2020), Državni udari na civilno društvo potpomognuti EU fondovima, Zagreb: GONG, available at: <https://gong.hr/2020/06/09/drzavni-udari-na-civilno-drustvo-potpomognuti-eu-f/>

Kunac, S. (2006), Vrijednost vrednota: civilno društvo i hrvatska demokratizacija, Zagreb: B.a.B.e.



Ozzano L. and A Giorgi, (2015), *European Culture Wars and the Italian Case - Which side are you on?*, London: Routledge

Kuhar, R. and D. Paternotte (ed.), (2017), *Anti-Gender Campaigns in Europe – Mobilizing against Equality*, London and New York: Rowman & Littlefield International

Sečkar, B. (2021), *Analiza administrativne opterećenosti korisnika prilikom provedbe EU projekata – iskustvo udruga*, Zagreb: GONG, available at: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/187muXa3EC6IcUT2WassTogfKokX83ssNw/view>

Sumpor, M., Rašić Bakarić I. and Đokić I., *Vanjsko vrednovanje Nacionalne strategije stvaranja poticajnog okruženja za razvoj civilnog društva 2016.-2020.*, Zagreb: Institute of Economics, available at: <https://udruge.gov.hr/UserDocImages/dokumenti/Evaluacijska%20studija%20-%20UZUVRH%20-%20finalno%20izvjesce.pdf>

USAID (2021), *2020 Civil Society Organization Sustainability Index for Croatia*, available at: <https://storage.googleapis.com/cso-si-dashboard.appspot.com/Reports/CSOSI-Croatia-2020.pdf>

Vujčić, V. (2000), 'Svijest o ljudskim pravima', *Politička misao*, Vol XXXVII, No. 3

## Annex: Table presentation of the main findings of the survey research

**Table 3:**

Do you trust the following organisations and institutions?

Use a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 means 'I don't trust at all' and 5 'I completely trust'

|                                  |                                | n   | %    |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----|------|
| <b>GOVERNMENT</b>                | 1 I don't trust at all         | 316 | 35,1 |
|                                  | 2 I generally don't trust      | 278 | 30,9 |
|                                  | 3 I neither trust nor distrust | 199 | 22,1 |
|                                  | 4 I generally trust            | 85  | 9,4  |
|                                  | 5 I completely trust           | 22  | 2,4  |
| TOTAL                            |                                | 900 | 100  |
|                                  |                                | n   | %    |
| <b>PARLIAMENT</b>                | 1 I don't trust at all         | 337 | 37,4 |
|                                  | 2 I generally don't trust      | 290 | 32,2 |
|                                  | 3 I neither trust nor distrust | 208 | 23,1 |
|                                  | 4 I generally trust            | 50  | 5,6  |
|                                  | 5 I completely trust           | 15  | 1,7  |
| TOTAL                            |                                | 900 | 100  |
|                                  |                                | n   | %    |
| <b>TOWN AND MUNICIPAL MAYORS</b> | 1 I don't trust at all         | 189 | 21   |
|                                  | 2 I generally don't trust      | 256 | 28,4 |
|                                  | 3 I neither trust nor distrust | 294 | 32,7 |
|                                  | 4 I generally trust            | 120 | 13,3 |
|                                  | 5 I completely trust           | 41  | 4,6  |
| TOTAL                            |                                | 900 | 100  |
|                                  |                                | n   | %    |
| <b>POLITICAL PARTIES</b>         | 1 I don't trust at all         | 381 | 42,3 |
|                                  | 2 I generally don't trust      | 304 | 33,8 |
|                                  | 3 I neither trust nor distrust | 173 | 19,2 |
|                                  | 4 I generally trust            | 32  | 3,6  |
|                                  | 5 I completely trust           | 10  | 1,1  |
| TOTAL                            |                                | 900 | 100  |

**Table 3:**  
Do you trust the following  
organisations and institutions?

Use a scale from 1 to 5 where  
1 means 'I don't trust at all'  
and 5 'I completely trust'

|                                  |                                | n   | %    |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----|------|
| <b>COURTS</b>                    | 1 I don't trust at all         | 263 | 29,2 |
|                                  | 2 I generally don't trust      | 281 | 31,2 |
|                                  | 3 I neither trust nor distrust | 249 | 27,7 |
|                                  | 4 I generally trust            | 92  | 10,2 |
|                                  | 5 I completely trust           | 15  | 1,7  |
| TOTAL                            |                                | 900 | 100  |
|                                  |                                | n   | %    |
| <b>STATE'S ATTORNEY'S OFFICE</b> | 1 I don't trust at all         | 248 | 27,6 |
|                                  | 2 I generally don't trust      | 260 | 28,9 |
|                                  | 3 I neither trust nor distrust | 283 | 31,4 |
|                                  | 4 I generally trust            | 96  | 10,7 |
|                                  | 5 I completely trust           | 13  | 1,4  |
| TOTAL                            |                                | 900 | 100  |
|                                  |                                | n   | %    |
| <b>POLICE</b>                    | 1 I don't trust at all         | 81  | 9    |
|                                  | 2 I generally don't trust      | 151 | 16,8 |
|                                  | 3 I neither trust nor distrust | 293 | 32,6 |
|                                  | 4 I generally trust            | 299 | 33,2 |
|                                  | 5 I completely trust           | 76  | 8,4  |
| TOTAL                            |                                | 900 | 100  |
|                                  |                                | n   | %    |
| <b>MILITARY</b>                  | 1 I don't trust at all         | 54  | 6    |
|                                  | 2 I generally don't trust      | 105 | 11,7 |
|                                  | 3 I neither trust nor distrust | 274 | 30,4 |
|                                  | 4 I generally trust            | 311 | 34,6 |
|                                  | 5 I completely trust           | 156 | 17,3 |
| TOTAL                            |                                | 900 | 100  |
|                                  |                                | n   | %    |
| <b>SOCIAL WELFARE SYSTEM</b>     | 1 I don't trust at all         | 121 | 13,4 |
|                                  | 2 I generally don't trust      | 238 | 26,4 |
|                                  | 3 I neither trust nor distrust | 336 | 37,3 |
|                                  | 4 I generally trust            | 172 | 19,1 |
|                                  | 5 I completely trust           | 33  | 3,7  |
| TOTAL                            |                                | 900 | 100  |

**Table 3:**  
Do you trust the following  
organisations and institutions?

Use a scale from 1 to 5 where  
1 means 'I don't trust at all'  
and 5 'I completely trust'

|                               |                                | n   | %    |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----|------|
| <b>HEALTHCARE SYSTEM</b>      | 1 I don't trust at all         | 82  | 9,1  |
|                               | 2 I generally don't trust      | 133 | 14,8 |
|                               | 3 I neither trust nor distrust | 306 | 34   |
|                               | 4 I generally trust            | 310 | 34,4 |
|                               | 5 I completely trust           | 69  | 7,7  |
| TOTAL                         |                                | 900 | 100  |
|                               |                                | n   | %    |
| <b>CHURCH</b>                 | 1 I don't trust at all         | 228 | 25,3 |
|                               | 2 I generally don't trust      | 146 | 16,2 |
|                               | 3 I neither trust nor distrust | 246 | 27,3 |
|                               | 4 I generally trust            | 173 | 19,2 |
|                               | 5 I completely trust           | 107 | 11,9 |
| TOTAL                         |                                | 900 | 100  |
|                               |                                | n   | %    |
| <b>MEDIA</b>                  | 1 I don't trust at all         | 221 | 24,6 |
|                               | 2 I generally don't trust      | 175 | 19,4 |
|                               | 3 I neither trust nor distrust | 328 | 36,4 |
|                               | 4 I generally trust            | 139 | 15,4 |
|                               | 5 I completely trust           | 37  | 4,1  |
| TOTAL                         |                                | 900 | 100  |
|                               |                                | n   | %    |
| <b>CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS</b> | 1 I don't trust at all         | 107 | 11,9 |
|                               | 2 I generally don't trust      | 200 | 22,2 |
|                               | 3 I neither trust nor distrust | 340 | 37,8 |
|                               | 4 I generally trust            | 231 | 25,7 |
|                               | 5 I completely trust           | 22  | 2,4  |
| TOTAL                         |                                | 900 | 100  |
|                               |                                | n   | %    |
| <b>UNIONS</b>                 | 1 I don't trust at all         | 190 | 21,1 |
|                               | 2 I generally don't trust      | 254 | 28,2 |
|                               | 3 I neither trust nor distrust | 323 | 35,9 |
|                               | 4 I generally trust            | 119 | 13,2 |
|                               | 5 I completely trust           | 14  | 1,6  |
| TOTAL                         |                                | 900 | 100  |

|                                |                                | n   | %    |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----|------|
| <b>SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS</b> | 1 I don't trust at all         | 53  | 5,9  |
|                                | 2 I generally don't trust      | 87  | 9,7  |
|                                | 3 I neither trust nor distrust | 250 | 27,8 |
|                                | 4 I generally trust            | 382 | 42,4 |
|                                | 5 I completely trust           | 128 | 14,2 |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                   |                                | 900 | 100  |

**Table 4:**  
Do you trust the following  
organisations and  
institutions?

Use a scale from 1 to 5 where  
1 means 'I don't trust at all'  
and 5 'I completely trust'

|                                      | MEAN | STANDARD<br>DEVIATION | MEDIAN | MINIMUM | MAXIMUM | N     |
|--------------------------------------|------|-----------------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| <b>GOVERNMENT</b>                    | 2,13 | 1,07                  | 2      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>PARLIAMENT</b>                    | 2,02 | 0,99                  | 2      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>TOWN AND MUNICIPAL<br/>MAYORS</b> | 2,52 | 1,10                  | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>POLITICAL PARTIES</b>             | 1,87 | 0,92                  | 2      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>COURTS</b>                        | 2,24 | 1,04                  | 2      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>STATE'S ATTORNEY'S<br/>OFFICE</b> | 2,30 | 1,03                  | 2      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>POLICE</b>                        | 3,15 | 1,08                  | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>MILITARY</b>                      | 3,46 | 1,09                  | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>SOCIAL WELFARE SYSTEM</b>         | 2,73 | 1,03                  | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>HEALTHCARE SYSTEM</b>             | 3,17 | 1,07                  | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>EDUCATION SYSTEM</b>              | 3,29 | 0,97                  | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>CHURCH</b>                        | 2,76 | 1,34                  | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>MEDIA</b>                         | 2,55 | 1,14                  | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS</b>        | 2,85 | 1,01                  | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>UNIONS</b>                        | 2,46 | 1,01                  | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS</b>       | 3,49 | 1,04                  | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |

**Table 5:**  
How do you get informed about the work of CSOs?

|  | N   | %    |
|--|-----|------|
| <b>TELEVISION</b>                                  | 439 | 48,8 |
| <b>RADIO</b>                                       | 125 | 13,9 |
| <b>NEWSPAPER</b>                                   | 101 | 11,2 |
| <b>WEB PORTALS</b>                                 | 417 | 46,3 |
| <b>SOCIAL MEDIA (FACEBOOK, TWITTER, INSTAGRAM)</b> | 329 | 36,6 |
| <b>CSOS WEBSITES</b>                               | 147 | 16,3 |
| <b>FAMILY, FRIENDS, ACQUAINTANCES</b>              | 232 | 25,8 |
| <b>PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT</b>                        | 1   | 0,1  |
| <b>I DON'T GET INFORMED</b>                        | 25  | 2,8  |
| <b>OTHER</b>                                       | 4   | 0,4  |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                       | 900 | 100  |

**Table 6:**  
In your opinion, CSOs should be dealing with the protection of who or what?

Use a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 means 'They shouldn't deal with this at all' and 5 'They should deal with this'

|  |  | N   | %    |
|--|--|-----|------|
| <b>RIGHTS OF REFUGEES AND OTHER MIGRANTS</b> | 1 They shouldn't deal with this at all             | 55  | 6,1  |
|  | 2 Mostly they shouldn't deal with this             | 72  | 8    |
|  | 3 They neither should nor shouldn't deal with this | 184 | 20,4 |
|  | 4 Mostly they should deal with this                | 321 | 35,7 |
|  | 5 They should deal with this                       | 268 | 29,8 |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                 |  | 900 | 100  |
|  |  | N   | %    |
| <b>RIGHTS OF NATIONAL MINORITIES</b>         | 1 They shouldn't deal with this at all             | 83  | 9,2  |
|  | 2 Mostly they shouldn't deal with this             | 74  | 8,2  |
|  | 3 They neither should nor shouldn't deal with this | 240 | 26,7 |
|  | 4 Mostly they should deal with this                | 274 | 30,4 |
|  | 5 They should deal with this                       | 229 | 25,4 |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                 |  | 900 | 100  |
|  |  | N   | %    |
| <b>RIGHTS OF LGBTI PERSONS</b>               | 1 They shouldn't deal with this at all             | 199 | 22,1 |
|  | 2 Mostly they shouldn't deal with this             | 117 | 13   |
|  | 3 They neither should nor shouldn't deal with this | 223 | 24,8 |
|  | 4 Mostly they should deal with this                | 201 | 22,3 |
|  | 5 They should deal with this                       | 160 | 17,8 |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                                 |  | 900 | 100  |
|  |  | N   | %    |

**Table 6:**  
In your opinion, CSOs should be dealing with the protection of who or what?

Use a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 means 'They shouldn't deal with this at all' and 5 'They should deal with this'

|   |  |          |          |
|---|--|----------|----------|
| <b>WOMEN'S RIGHTS</b>                       | 1 They shouldn't deal with this at all             | 35       | 3,9      |
|   | 2 Mostly they shouldn't deal with this             | 38       | 4,2      |
|   | 3 They neither should nor shouldn't deal with this | 130      | 14,4     |
|   | 4 Mostly they should deal with this                | 289      | 32,1     |
|   | 5 They should deal with this                       | 408      | 45,3     |
|   | TOTAL  |          | 900      |
|   |  | <b>N</b> | <b>%</b> |
| <b>RIGHTS OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE</b>  | 1 They shouldn't deal with this at all             | 24       | 2,7      |
|   | 2 Mostly they shouldn't deal with this             | 29       | 3,2      |
|   | 3 They neither should nor shouldn't deal with this | 94       | 10,4     |
|   | 4 Mostly they should deal with this                | 255      | 28,3     |
|   | 5 They should deal with this                       | 498      | 55,3     |
|   | TOTAL  |          | 900      |
|   |  | <b>N</b> | <b>%</b> |
| <b>RIGHTS OF HOMELESS PEOPLE</b>            | 1 They shouldn't deal with this at all             | 29       | 3,2      |
|   | 2 Mostly they shouldn't deal with this             | 35       | 3,9      |
|   | 3 They neither should nor shouldn't deal with this | 136      | 15,1     |
|   | 4 Mostly they should deal with this                | 302      | 33,6     |
|   | 5 They should deal with this                       | 398      | 44,2     |
|   | TOTAL  |          | 900      |
|   |  | <b>N</b> | <b>%</b> |
| <b>RIGHTS OF PERSONS AT RISK OF POVERTY</b> | 1 They shouldn't deal with this at all             | 25       | 2,8      |
|   | 2 Mostly they shouldn't deal with this             | 31       | 3,4      |
|   | 3 They neither should nor shouldn't deal with this | 113      | 12,6     |
|   | 4 Mostly they should deal with this                | 304      | 33,8     |
|   | 5 They should deal with this                       | 427      | 47,4     |
|   | TOTAL  |          | 900      |
|   |  | <b>N</b> | <b>%</b> |
| <b>RIGHTS OF ELDERLY PERSONS</b>            | 1 They shouldn't deal with this at all             | 22       | 2,4      |
|   | 2 Mostly they shouldn't deal with this             | 25       | 2,8      |
|   | 3 They neither should nor shouldn't deal with this | 100      | 11,1     |
|   | 4 Mostly they should deal with this                | 288      | 32       |
|   | 5 They should deal with this                       | 465      | 51,7     |
|   | TOTAL  |          | 900      |
|   |  | <b>N</b> | <b>%</b> |
| <b>RIGHTS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES</b>  | 1 They shouldn't deal with this at all             | 20       | 2,2      |
|   | 2 Mostly they shouldn't deal with this             | 13       | 1,4      |
|   | 3 They neither should nor shouldn't deal with this | 88       | 9,8      |
|   | 4 Mostly they should deal with this                | 229      | 25,4     |
|   | 5 They should deal with this                       | 550      | 61,1     |
|   | TOTAL  |          | 900      |

**Table 6:**

In your opinion, CSOs should be dealing with the protection of who or what?

Use a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 means 'They shouldn't deal with this at all' and 5 'They should deal with this'

|  |  | <b>N</b> | <b>%</b> |
|--|--|----------|----------|
| <b>RIGHTS OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS</b> | 1 They shouldn't deal with this at all             | 19       | 2,1      |
|  | 2 Mostly they shouldn't deal with this             | 15       | 1,7      |
|  | 3 They neither should nor shouldn't deal with this | 72       | 8        |
|  | 4 Mostly they should deal with this                | 198      | 22       |
|  | 5 They should deal with this                       | 596      | 66,2     |
| TOTAL  |  | 900      | 100      |
|  |  | <b>N</b> | <b>%</b> |
| <b>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION</b>              | 1 They shouldn't deal with this at all             | 20       | 2,2      |
|  | 2 Mostly they shouldn't deal with this             | 27       | 3        |
|  | 3 They neither should nor shouldn't deal with this | 105      | 11,7     |
|  | 4 Mostly they should deal with this                | 280      | 31,1     |
|  | 5 They should deal with this                       | 468      | 52       |
| TOTAL  |  | 900      | 100      |
|  |  | <b>N</b> | <b>%</b> |
| <b>FIGHT AGAINST CORRUPTION</b>              | 1 They shouldn't deal with this at all             | 40       | 4,4      |
|  | 2 Mostly they shouldn't deal with this             | 40       | 4,4      |
|  | 3 They neither should nor shouldn't deal with this | 98       | 10,9     |
|  | 4 Mostly they should deal with this                | 176      | 19,6     |
|  | 5 They should deal with this                       | 546      | 60,7     |
| TOTAL  |  | 900      | 100      |
|  |  | <b>N</b> | <b>%</b> |
| <b>CONSUMER PROTECTION</b>                   | 1 They shouldn't deal with this at all             | 21       | 2,3      |
|  | 2 Mostly they shouldn't deal with this             | 28       | 3,1      |
|  | 3 They neither should nor shouldn't deal with this | 90       | 10       |
|  | 4 Mostly they should deal with this                | 290      | 32,2     |
|  | 5 They should deal with this                       | 471      | 52,3     |
| TOTAL  |  | 900      | 100      |
|  |  | <b>N</b> | <b>%</b> |
| <b>LABOUR RIGHTS</b>                         | 1 They shouldn't deal with this at all             | 32       | 3,6      |
|  | 2 Mostly they shouldn't deal with this             | 39       | 4,3      |
|  | 3 They neither should nor shouldn't deal with this | 110      | 12,2     |
|  | 4 Mostly they should deal with this                | 240      | 26,7     |
|  | 5 They should deal with this                       | 479      | 53,2     |
| TOTAL  |  | 900      | 100      |
|  |  | <b>N</b> | <b>%</b> |
| <b>OTHER</b>                                 | 1 They shouldn't deal with this at all             | 8        | 10       |
|  | 2 Mostly they shouldn't deal with this             | 1        | 1,3      |
|  | 3 They neither should nor shouldn't deal with this | 10       | 12,5     |
|  | 4 Mostly they should deal with this                | 24       | 30       |
|  | 5 They should deal with this                       | 37       | 46,3     |
| TOTAL  |  | 80       | 100      |



**Table 7:**  
In your opinion, CSOs should be dealing with the protection of who or what?

Use a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 means 'They shouldn't deal with this at all' and 5 'They should deal with this'

|  | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION | MEDIAN | MINIMUM | MAXIMUM | N     |
|--|------|--------------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| <b>RIGHTS OF REFUGEES AND OTHER MIGRANTS</b> | 3,75 | 1,15               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>RIGHTS OF NATIONAL MINORITIES</b>         | 3,55 | 1,21               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>RIGHTS OF LGBTI PERSONS</b>               | 3,01 | 1,40               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>WOMEN'S RIGHTS</b>                        | 4,11 | 1,05               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>RIGHTS OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE</b>   | 4,30 | 0,97               | 5      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>RIGHTS OF HOMELESS PEOPLE</b>             | 4,12 | 1,01               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>RIGHTS OF PERSONS AT RISK OF POVERTY</b>  | 4,20 | 0,97               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>RIGHTS OF ELDERLY PERSONS</b>             | 4,28 | 0,94               | 5      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>RIGHTS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES</b>   | 4,42 | 0,89               | 5      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>RIGHTS OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS</b> | 4,49 | 0,87               | 5      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION</b>              | 4,28 | 0,94               | 5      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>FIGHT AGAINST CORRUPTION</b>              | 4,28 | 1,10               | 5      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>CONSUMER PROTECTION</b>                   | 4,29 | 0,93               | 5      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>LABOUR RIGHTS</b>                         | 4,22 | 1,05               | 5      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>OTHER</b>                                 | 4,01 | 1,25               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=80  |

**Table 8:**  
How successful are CSOs  
in: (Use a scale from 1 to  
5 where 1 means 'Not at  
all successful' and 5 'Very  
successful')

|   |                                       | N   | %    |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----|------|
| <b>PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF REFUGEES AND OTHER MIGRANTS</b> | 1 Not at all successful               | 32  | 4,1  |
|   | 2 Mostly not successful               | 119 | 15,4 |
|   | 3 Neither successful nor unsuccessful | 415 | 53,7 |
|   | 4 Mostly successful                   | 176 | 22,8 |
|   | 5 Very successful                     | 31  | 4    |
| TOTAL   |                                       | 773 | 100  |
|   |                                       | N   | %    |
| <b>PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF NATIONAL MINORITIES</b>         | 1 Not at all successful               | 23  | 3,1  |
|   | 2 Mostly not successful               | 101 | 13,6 |
|   | 3 Neither successful nor unsuccessful | 398 | 53,6 |
|   | 4 Mostly successful                   | 175 | 23,6 |
|   | 5 Very successful                     | 46  | 6,2  |
| TOTAL   |                                       | 743 | 100  |
|   |                                       | N   | %    |
| <b>PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF LGBTI PERSONS</b>               | 1 Not at all successful               | 27  | 4,6  |
|   | 2 Mostly not successful               | 93  | 15,9 |
|   | 3 Neither successful nor unsuccessful | 305 | 52,2 |
|   | 4 Mostly successful                   | 138 | 23,6 |
|   | 5 Very successful                     | 21  | 3,6  |
| TOTAL   |                                       | 584 | 100  |
|   |                                       | N   | %    |
| <b>PROTECTING WOMEN'S RIGHTS</b>                            | 1 Not at all successful               | 61  | 7,4  |
|   | 2 Mostly not successful               | 158 | 19,1 |
|   | 3 Neither successful nor unsuccessful | 361 | 43,7 |
|   | 4 Mostly successful                   | 198 | 23,9 |
|   | 5 Very successful                     | 49  | 5,9  |
| TOTAL   |                                       | 827 | 100  |
|   |                                       | N   | %    |
| <b>PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE</b>   | 1 Not at all successful               | 40  | 4,7  |
|   | 2 Mostly not successful               | 166 | 19,6 |
|   | 3 Neither successful nor unsuccessful | 382 | 45,1 |
|   | 4 Mostly successful                   | 215 | 25,4 |
|   | 5 Very successful                     | 44  | 5,2  |
| TOTAL   |                                       | 847 | 100  |
|   |                                       | N   | %    |
| <b>PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF HOMELESS PEOPLE</b>             | 1 Not at all successful               | 89  | 10,7 |
|   | 2 Mostly not successful               | 242 | 29   |
|   | 3 Neither successful nor unsuccessful | 374 | 44,8 |
|   | 4 Mostly successful                   | 107 | 12,8 |
|   | 5 Very successful                     | 23  | 2,8  |
| TOTAL   |                                       | 835 | 100  |
|   |                                       | N   | %    |
| <b>PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS AT RISK OF POVERTY</b>  | 1 Not at all successful               | 146 | 17,3 |
|   | 2 Mostly not successful               | 250 | 29,6 |
|   | 3 Neither successful nor unsuccessful | 333 | 39,4 |
|   | 4 Mostly successful                   | 93  | 11   |
|   | 5 Very successful                     | 23  | 2,7  |
| TOTAL   |                                       | 845 | 100  |

Tablica 8:

Koliko su udruge uspješne u:

Koristite skalu od 1 do 5 gdje 1 znači 'Uopće nisu uspješne', a 5 'Jako su uspješne'

|   |                                       | N   | %    |
|---|---------------------------------------|-----|------|
| <b>PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF ELDERLY PERSONS</b>             | 1 Not at all successful               | 95  | 11,1 |
|   | 2 Mostly not successful               | 232 | 27,2 |
|   | 3 Neither successful nor unsuccessful | 378 | 44,3 |
|   | 4 Mostly successful                   | 122 | 14,3 |
|   | 5 Very successful                     | 26  | 3    |
|   | TOTAL                                 |     | 853  |
|   |                                       | N   | %    |
| <b>PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES</b>   | 1 Not at all successful               | 57  | 6,6  |
|   | 2 Mostly not successful               | 160 | 18,5 |
|   | 3 Neither successful nor unsuccessful | 379 | 43,7 |
|   | 4 Mostly successful                   | 234 | 27   |
|   | 5 Very successful                     | 37  | 4,3  |
|   | TOTAL                                 |     | 867  |
|   |                                       | N   | %    |
| <b>PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS</b> | 1 Not at all successful               | 64  | 7,4  |
|   | 2 Mostly not successful               | 173 | 20   |
|   | 3 Neither successful nor unsuccessful | 350 | 40,4 |
|   | 4 Mostly successful                   | 234 | 27   |
|   | 5 Very successful                     | 46  | 5,3  |
|   | TOTAL                                 |     | 867  |
|   |                                       | N   | %    |
| <b>PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT</b>                           | 1 Not at all successful               | 65  | 7,6  |
|   | 2 Mostly not successful               | 181 | 21,2 |
|   | 3 Neither successful nor unsuccessful | 396 | 46,4 |
|   | 4 Mostly successful                   | 174 | 20,4 |
|   | 5 Very successful                     | 37  | 4,3  |
|   | TOTAL                                 |     | 853  |
|   |                                       | N   | %    |
| <b>FIGHTING AGAINST CORRUPTION</b>                          | 1 Not at all successful               | 271 | 33   |
|   | 2 Mostly not successful               | 226 | 27,6 |
|   | 3 Neither successful nor unsuccessful | 242 | 29,5 |
|   | 4 Mostly successful                   | 60  | 7,3  |
|   | 5 Very successful                     | 21  | 2,6  |
|   | TOTAL                                 |     | 820  |
|   |                                       | N   | %    |
| <b>PROTECTING CONSUMERS</b>                                 | 1 Not at all successful               | 97  | 11,4 |
|   | 2 Mostly not successful               | 209 | 24,6 |
|   | 3 Neither successful nor unsuccessful | 360 | 42,3 |
|   | 4 Mostly successful                   | 154 | 18,1 |
|   | 5 Very successful                     | 31  | 3,6  |
|   | TOTAL                                 |     | 851  |
|   |                                       | N   | %    |
| <b>PROTECTING LABOUR RIGHTS</b>                             | 1 Not at all successful               | 140 | 16,9 |
|   | 2 Mostly not successful               | 209 | 25,2 |
|   | 3 Neither successful nor unsuccessful | 347 | 41,9 |
|   | 4 Mostly successful                   | 112 | 13,5 |
|   | 5 Very successful                     | 21  | 2,5  |
|   | TOTAL                                 |     | 829  |

**Table 9:**  
How successful are CSOs in: (Use a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 means 'Not at all successful' and 5 'Very successful')

|  | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION | MEDIAN | MINIMUM | MAXIMUM | N     |
|--|------|--------------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF REFUGEES AND OTHER MIGRANTS | 3,07 | 0,84               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=773 |
| PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF NATIONAL MINORITIES         | 3,16 | 0,85               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=743 |
| PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF LGBTI PERSONS               | 3,06 | 0,85               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=584 |
| PROTECTING WOMEN'S RIGHTS                            | 3,02 | 0,98               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=827 |
| PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE   | 3,07 | 0,92               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=847 |
| PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF HOMELESS PEOPLE             | 2,68 | 0,92               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=835 |
| PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS AT RISK OF POVERTY  | 2,52 | 0,99               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=845 |
| PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF ELDERLY PERSONS             | 2,71 | 0,95               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=853 |
| PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES   | 3,04 | 0,94               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=867 |
| PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF CHILDREN WITH SPECIAL NEEDS | 3,03 | 0,99               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=867 |
| PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT                           | 2,93 | 0,94               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=853 |
| FIGHTING AGAINST CORRUPTION                          | 2,19 | 1,06               | 2      | 1       | 5       | N=820 |
| PROTECTING CONSUMERS                                 | 2,78 | 0,99               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=851 |
| PROTECTING LABOUR RIGHTS                             | 2,60 | 1,00               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=829 |

**Table 10:**  
Would you turn to a CSO for support in case of need?

|  |              | N   | %    |
|--|--------------|-----|------|
| WOULD YOU TURN TO A CSO FOR SUPPORT IN CASE OF NEED? | Yes          | 290 | 32,2 |
|  | No           | 178 | 19,8 |
|  | Maybe        | 364 | 40,4 |
|  | I don't know | 68  | 7,6  |
| TOTAL  |              | 900 | 100  |

**Table 11:**  
Are you involved in  
the activities of a CSO?

|   |     | N   | %    |
|---|-----|-----|------|
| <b>ARE YOU INVOLVED IN THE<br/>ACTIVITIES OF A CSO?</b> | Yes | 158 | 17,6 |
|   | No  | 742 | 82,4 |
| TOTAL   |     | 900 | 100  |

**Table 12:**  
Would you get involved  
in the activities of a CSO?

|   |              | N   | %    |
|---|--------------|-----|------|
| <b>WOULD YOU GET INVOLVED<br/>IN THE ACTIVITIES OF A CSO?</b> | yes          | 130 | 17,6 |
|   | no           | 202 | 27,4 |
|   | maybe        | 339 | 45,9 |
|   | i don't know | 67  | 9,1  |
| TOTAL   |              | 738 | 100  |

**Table 13:**  
To what extent do you  
agree that human rights  
organisations should use the  
following methods in their  
work?

|   |                                | N   | %    |
|---|--------------------------------|-----|------|
| <b>PROVIDING FREE LEGAL AID</b>   | 1   strongly disagree          | 13  | 1,4  |
|   | 2   somewhat disagree          | 14  | 1,6  |
|   | 3   neither agree nor disagree | 103 | 11,4 |
|   | 4   somewhat agree             | 263 | 29,2 |
|   | 5   strongly agree             | 507 | 56,3 |
|   | TOTAL                          |     | 900  |
| <b>DIRECT PROVISION OF SERVICES TO<br/>CITIZENS IN NEED (E.G. PERSONS AT<br/>RISK OF POVERTY, PERSONS WITH<br/>DISABILITIES, ELDERLY PERSONS)</b> | 1   strongly disagree          | 8   | 0,9  |
|   | 2   somewhat disagree          | 11  | 1,2  |
|   | 3   neither agree nor disagree | 171 | 19   |
|   | 4   somewhat agree             | 239 | 26,6 |
|   | 5   strongly agree             | 471 | 52,3 |
|   | TOTAL                          |     | 900  |
| <b>RESEARCH</b>   | 1   strongly disagree          | 23  | 2,6  |
|   | 2   somewhat disagree          | 37  | 4,1  |
|   | 3   neither agree nor disagree | 179 | 19,9 |
|   | 4   somewhat agree             | 300 | 33,3 |
|   | 5   strongly agree             | 361 | 40,1 |
|   | TOTAL                          |     | 900  |
| <b>PUBLIC PRESSURE ON POLITICIANS<br/>(ADVOCACY)</b>  | 1   strongly disagree          | 33  | 3,7  |
|   | 2   somewhat disagree          | 32  | 3,6  |
|   | 3   neither agree nor disagree | 131 | 14,6 |
|   | 4   somewhat agree             | 275 | 30,6 |
|   | 5   strongly agree             | 429 | 47,7 |
|   | TOTAL                          |     | 900  |

**Table 13:**  
To what extent do you agree that human rights organisations should use the following methods in their work?

|                                       |                                | <b>N</b>   | <b>%</b>   |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------|
| <b>PUBLIC CAMPAIGNS</b>               | 1 I strongly disagree          | 45         | 5          |
|                                       | 2 I somewhat disagree          | 42         | 4,7        |
|                                       | 3 I neither agree nor disagree | 183        | 20,3       |
|                                       | 4 I somewhat agree             | 316        | 35,1       |
|                                       | 5 I strongly agree             | 314        | 34,9       |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                          |                                | <b>900</b> | <b>100</b> |
|                                       |                                | <b>N</b>   | <b>%</b>   |
| <b>EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES</b>         | 1 I strongly disagree          | 16         | 1,8        |
|                                       | 2 I somewhat disagree          | 26         | 2,9        |
|                                       | 3 I neither agree nor disagree | 141        | 15,7       |
|                                       | 4 I somewhat agree             | 312        | 34,7       |
|                                       | 5 I strongly agree             | 405        | 45         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                          |                                | <b>900</b> | <b>100</b> |
|                                       |                                | <b>N</b>   | <b>%</b>   |
| <b>HUMANITARIAN WORK</b>              | 1 I strongly disagree          | 15         | 1,7        |
|                                       | 2 I somewhat disagree          | 15         | 1,7        |
|                                       | 3 I neither agree nor disagree | 114        | 12,7       |
|                                       | 4 I somewhat agree             | 294        | 32,7       |
|                                       | 5 I strongly agree             | 462        | 51,3       |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                          |                                | <b>900</b> | <b>100</b> |
|                                       |                                | <b>N</b>   | <b>%</b>   |
| <b>ORGANISING CULTURAL ACTIVITIES</b> | 1 I strongly disagree          | 18         | 2          |
|                                       | 2 I somewhat disagree          | 39         | 4,3        |
|                                       | 3 I neither agree nor disagree | 214        | 23,8       |
|                                       | 4 I somewhat agree             | 336        | 37,3       |
|                                       | 5 I strongly agree             | 293        | 32,6       |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                          |                                | <b>900</b> | <b>100</b> |
|                                       |                                | <b>N</b>   | <b>%</b>   |
| <b>NON-PROFIT JOURNALISM</b>          | 1 I strongly disagree          | 41         | 4,6        |
|                                       | 2 I somewhat disagree          | 56         | 6,2        |
|                                       | 3 I neither agree nor disagree | 250        | 27,8       |
|                                       | 4 I somewhat agree             | 302        | 33,6       |
|                                       | 5 I strongly agree             | 251        | 27,9       |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                          |                                | <b>900</b> | <b>100</b> |

**Table 14:**  
To what extent do you agree that human rights organisations should use the following methods in their work?

|   | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION | MEDIAN | MINIMUM | MAXIMUM | N     |
|---|------|--------------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| <b>PROVIDING FREE LEGAL AID</b>   | 4,37 | 0,85               | 5      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>DIRECT PROVISION OF SERVICES TO CITIZENS IN NEED (E.G. PERSONS AT RISK OF POVERTY, PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES, ELDERLY PERSONS)</b> | 4,28 | 0,87               | 5      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>RESEARCH</b>   | 4,04 | 1,00               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>PUBLIC PRESSURE ON POLITICIANS (ADVOCACY)</b>  | 4,15 | 1,04               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>PUBLIC CAMPAIGNS</b>   | 3,90 | 1,09               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES</b>   | 4,18 | 0,92               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>HUMANITARIAN WORK</b>  | 4,30 | 0,87               | 5      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>ORGANISING CULTURAL ACTIVITIES</b>   | 3,94 | 0,96               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>NON-PROFIT JOURNALISM</b>  | 3,74 | 1,07               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |

**Table 15:**

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

Use a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 means 'I strongly disagree' and 5 'I strongly agree'

|   |                                | N   | %    |
|---|--------------------------------|-----|------|
| <b>CSOs CSOS ONLY DEAL WITH THE RIGHTS OF MINORITIES, BUT NOT THE MAJORITY.</b>         | 1 I strongly disagree          | 75  | 8,3  |
|   | 2 I somewhat disagree          | 121 | 13,4 |
|   | 3 I neither agree nor disagree | 330 | 36,7 |
|   | 4 I somewhat agree             | 221 | 24,6 |
|   | 5 I strongly agree             | 153 | 17   |
|   | TOTAL                          |     | 900  |
|   |                                | N   | %    |
| <b>CSOs ARE EXTRACTING PUBLIC FUNDS.</b>  | 1 I strongly disagree          | 82  | 9,1  |
|   | 2 I somewhat disagree          | 118 | 13,1 |
|   | 3 I neither agree nor disagree | 290 | 32,2 |
|   | 4 I somewhat agree             | 219 | 24,3 |
|   | 5 I strongly agree             | 191 | 21,2 |
|   | TOTAL                          |     | 900  |
|   |                                | N   | %    |
| <b>CSOs ARE FUNDED BY FOREIGN CENTRES OF POWER.</b>                                     | 1 I strongly disagree          | 138 | 15,3 |
|   | 2 I somewhat disagree          | 155 | 17,2 |
|   | 3 I neither agree nor disagree | 394 | 43,8 |
|   | 4 I somewhat agree             | 143 | 15,9 |
|   | 5 I strongly agree             | 70  | 7,8  |
|   | TOTAL                          |     | 900  |
|   |                                | N   | %    |
| <b>CSOs ARE NOT SUFFICIENTLY COMMITTED TO THE RIGHTS OF THE GROUPS THEY DEAL WITH.</b>  | 1 I strongly disagree          | 67  | 7,4  |
|   | 2 I somewhat disagree          | 96  | 10,7 |
|   | 3 I neither agree nor disagree | 331 | 36,8 |
|   | 4 I somewhat agree             | 269 | 29,9 |
|   | 5 I strongly agree             | 137 | 15,2 |
|   | TOTAL                          |     | 900  |
|   |                                | N   | %    |
| <b>CSOs EXIST ONLY TO PAY FOR THEMSELVES.</b>   | 1 I strongly disagree          | 107 | 11,9 |
|   | 2 I somewhat disagree          | 133 | 14,8 |
|   | 3 I neither agree nor disagree | 327 | 36,3 |
|   | 4 I somewhat agree             | 206 | 22,9 |
|   | 5 I strongly agree             | 127 | 14,1 |
|   | TOTAL                          |     | 900  |
|   |                                | N   | %    |
| <b>CSOs SHOULD BE FINANCED MOSTLY FROM EU FUNDS.</b>                                    | 1 I strongly disagree          | 65  | 7,2  |
|   | 2 I somewhat disagree          | 70  | 7,8  |
|   | 3 I neither agree nor disagree | 277 | 30,8 |
|   | 4 I somewhat agree             | 295 | 32,8 |
|   | 5 I strongly agree             | 193 | 21,4 |
|   | TOTAL                          |     | 900  |
|   |                                | N   | %    |
| <b>CSOs SHOULD BE FINANCED MOSTLY BY DONATIONS FROM CITIZENS AND PRIVATE COMPANIES.</b> | 1 I strongly disagree          | 93  | 10,3 |
|   | 2 I somewhat disagree          | 137 | 15,2 |
|   | 3 I neither agree nor disagree | 306 | 34   |
|   | 4 I somewhat agree             | 230 | 25,6 |
|   | 5 I strongly agree             | 134 | 14,9 |
|   | TOTAL                          |     | 900  |



**Table 15:**

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

Use a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 means 'I strongly disagree' and 5 'I strongly agree'

|  |                                | N   | %    |
|--|--------------------------------|-----|------|
| <b>CSOs ARE INSUFFICIENTLY VISIBLE IN THE PUBLIC EYE.</b>                        | 1 I strongly disagree          | 34  | 3,8  |
|  | 2 I somewhat disagree          | 75  | 8,3  |
|  | 3 I neither agree nor disagree | 264 | 29,3 |
|  | 4 I somewhat agree             | 313 | 34,8 |
|  | 5 I strongly agree             | 214 | 23,8 |
|  | TOTAL                          |     | 900  |
|  |                                | N   | %    |
| <b>AUTHORITIES SHOULD LISTEN TO AND TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE PROPOSALS OF CSOs.</b> | 1 I strongly disagree          | 22  | 2,4  |
|  | 2 I somewhat disagree          | 57  | 6,3  |
|  | 3 I neither agree nor disagree | 236 | 26,2 |
|  | 4 I somewhat agree             | 351 | 39   |
|  | 5 I strongly agree             | 234 | 26   |
|  | TOTAL                          |     | 900  |
|  |                                | n   | %    |
| <b>CSOs ARE BENEFICIAL FOR THE SOCIETY.</b>                                      | 1 I strongly disagree          | 43  | 4,8  |
|  | 2 I somewhat disagree          | 51  | 5,7  |
|  | 3 I neither agree nor disagree | 235 | 26,1 |
|  | 4 I somewhat agree             | 345 | 38,3 |
|  | 5 I strongly agree             | 226 | 25,1 |
|  | TOTAL                          |     | 900  |
|  |                                | N   | %    |
| <b>CSOs SHOULD OPERATE ON A VOLUNTARY BASIS.</b>                                 | 1 I strongly disagree          | 37  | 4,1  |
|  | 2 I somewhat disagree          | 62  | 6,9  |
|  | 3 I neither agree nor disagree | 251 | 27,9 |
|  | 4 I somewhat agree             | 275 | 30,6 |
|  | 5 I strongly agree             | 275 | 30,6 |
|  | TOTAL                          |     | 900  |
|  |                                | N   | %    |
| <b>CSOs ARE AN EXTENSION OF POLITICAL PARTIES.</b>                               | 1 I strongly disagree          | 65  | 7,2  |
|  | 2 I somewhat disagree          | 130 | 14,4 |
|  | 3 I neither agree nor disagree | 398 | 44,2 |
|  | 4 I somewhat agree             | 197 | 21,9 |
|  | 5 I strongly agree             | 110 | 12,2 |
|  | TOTAL                          |     | 900  |
|  |                                | N   | %    |
| <b>CSOs WORK AGAINST THE INTERESTS OF CROATIA.</b>                               | 1 I strongly disagree          | 248 | 27,6 |
|  | 2 I somewhat disagree          | 197 | 21,9 |
|  | 3 I neither agree nor disagree | 294 | 32,7 |
|  | 4 I somewhat agree             | 105 | 11,7 |
|  | 5 I strongly agree             | 56  | 6,2  |
|  | TOTAL                          |     | 900  |

**Table 16:**

To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

Use a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 means 'I strongly disagree' and 5 'I strongly agree'

|   | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION | MEDIAN | MINIMUM | MAXIMUM | N     |
|---|------|--------------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| <b>CSOs ONLY DEAL WITH THE RIGHTS OF MINORITIES, BUT NOT THE MAJORITY.</b>                | 3,28 | 1,15               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>CSOs ARE EXTRACTING PUBLIC FUNDS.</b>  | 3,35 | 1,21               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>CSOs ARE FUNDED BY FOREIGN CENTRES OF POWER.</b>                                       | 2,84 | 1,11               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>CSOs CSOs ARE INSUFFICIENTLY COMMITTED TO THE RIGHTS OF THE GROUPS THEY DEAL WITH.</b> | 3,35 | 1,09               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>CSOs EXIST ONLY TO PAY FOR THEMSELVES.</b>   | 3,13 | 1,18               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>CSOs SHOULD BE FINANCED MOSTLY FROM EU FUNDS.</b>                                      | 3,53 | 1,13               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>CSOs SHOULD BE FINANCED MOSTLY BY DONATIONS FROM CITIZENS AND PRIVATE COMPANIES.</b>   | 3,19 | 1,17               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>CSOs ARE INSUFFICIENTLY VISIBLE IN THE PUBLIC EYE.</b>                                 | 3,66 | 1,05               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>AUTHORITIES SHOULD LISTEN TO AND TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE PROPOSALS OF CSOs.</b>          | 3,80 | 0,98               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>CSOs ARE BENEFICIAL FOR THE SOCIETY.</b>   | 3,73 | 1,05               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>CSOs SHOULD OPERATE ON A VOLUNTARY BASIS.</b>  | 3,77 | 1,08               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>CSOs ARE AN EXTENSION OF POLITICAL PARTIES.</b>  | 3,17 | 1,05               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>CSOs WORK AGAINST THE INTERESTS OF CROATIA.</b>  | 2,47 | 1,19               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |

**Table 17:**

When you think about your current life, how important are the following things to you, that is, how much would you engage to improve them?

Use a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 means 'I wouldn't engage at all' and 5 'I would strongly engage'

|  |                            | N   | %    |
|--|----------------------------|-----|------|
| <b>FAMILY</b>                            | 1 I wouldn't engage at all | 13  | 1,4  |
|  | 2                          | 16  | 1,8  |
|  | 3                          | 76  | 8,4  |
|  | 4                          | 147 | 16,3 |
|  | 5 I would strongly engage  | 648 | 72   |
| TOTAL                                    |                            | 900 | 100  |
|  |                            | N   | %    |
| <b>FRIENDS</b>                           | 1 I wouldn't engage at all | 13  | 1,4  |
|  | 2                          | 27  | 3    |
|  | 3                          | 137 | 15,2 |
|  | 4                          | 274 | 30,4 |
|  | 5 I would strongly engage  | 449 | 49,9 |
| TOTAL                                    |                            | 900 | 100  |
|  |                            | N   | %    |
| <b>HEALTH</b>                            | 1 I wouldn't engage at all | 8   | 0,9  |
|  | 2                          | 17  | 1,9  |
|  | 3                          | 75  | 8,3  |
|  | 4                          | 185 | 20,6 |
|  | 5 I would strongly engage  | 615 | 68,3 |
| TOTAL                                    |                            | 900 | 100  |
|  |                            | N   | %    |
| <b>CLEAN ENVIRONMENT</b>                 | 1 I wouldn't engage at all | 12  | 1,3  |
|  | 2                          | 22  | 2,4  |
|  | 3                          | 126 | 14   |
|  | 4                          | 270 | 30   |
|  | 5 I would strongly engage  | 470 | 52,2 |
| TOTAL                                    |                            | 900 | 100  |
|  |                            | N   | %    |
| <b>PRIVACY</b>                           | 1 I wouldn't engage at all | 11  | 1,2  |
|  | 2                          | 27  | 3    |
|  | 3                          | 141 | 15,7 |
|  | 4                          | 241 | 26,8 |
|  | 5 I would strongly engage  | 480 | 53,3 |
| UKUPNO                                   |                            | 900 | 100  |
|  |                            | N   | %    |
| <b>PERSONAL FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE</b> | 1 I wouldn't engage at all | 14  | 1,6  |
|  | 2                          | 13  | 1,4  |
|  | 3                          | 101 | 11,2 |
|  | 4                          | 265 | 29,4 |
|  | 5 I would strongly engage  | 507 | 56,3 |
| TOTAL                                    |                            | 900 | 100  |
|  |                            | N   | %    |
| <b>FINANCIAL SECURITY</b>                | 1 I wouldn't engage at all | 11  | 1,2  |
|  | 2                          | 15  | 1,7  |
|  | 3                          | 120 | 13,3 |
|  | 4                          | 267 | 29,7 |
|  | 5 I would strongly engage  | 487 | 54,1 |
| TOTAL                                    |                            | 900 | 100  |

**Table 17:**

When you think about your current life, how important are the following things to you, that is, how much would you engage to improve them?

Use a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 means 'I wouldn't engage at all' and 5 'I would strongly engage'

|   |                            | N   | %    |
|---|----------------------------|-----|------|
| <b>PERSONAL REPUTATION</b>                          | 1 I wouldn't engage at all | 34  | 3,8  |
|   | 2                          | 61  | 6,8  |
|   | 3                          | 231 | 25,7 |
|   | 4                          | 270 | 30   |
|   | 5 I would strongly engage  | 304 | 33,8 |
|   | TOTAL                      |     | 900  |
|   |                            | N   | %    |
| <b>TRADITION</b>                                    | 1 I wouldn't engage at all | 42  | 4,7  |
|   | 2                          | 83  | 9,2  |
|   | 3                          | 231 | 25,7 |
|   | 4                          | 251 | 27,9 |
|   | 5 I would strongly engage  | 293 | 32,6 |
|   | TOTAL                      |     | 900  |
|   |                            | N   | %    |
| <b>HOMELAND</b>                                     | 1 I wouldn't engage at all | 52  | 5,8  |
|   | 2                          | 67  | 7,4  |
|   | 3                          | 190 | 21,1 |
|   | 4                          | 231 | 25,7 |
|   | 5 I would strongly engage  | 360 | 40   |
|   | TOTAL                      |     | 900  |
|   |                            | N   | %    |
| <b>HOMELAND</b>                                     | 1 I wouldn't engage at all | 52  | 5,8  |
|   | 2                          | 67  | 7,4  |
|   | 3                          | 190 | 21,1 |
|   | 4                          | 231 | 25,7 |
|   | 5 I would strongly engage  | 360 | 40   |
|   | TOTAL                      |     | 900  |
|   |                            | N   | %    |
| <b>SUCCESS / CAREER</b>                             | 1 I wouldn't engage at all | 36  | 4    |
|   | 2                          | 62  | 6,9  |
|   | 3                          | 235 | 26,1 |
|   | 4                          | 294 | 32,7 |
|   | 5 I would strongly engage  | 273 | 30,3 |
|   | TOTAL                      |     | 900  |
|   |                            | N   | %    |
| <b>MY PERSONAL RIGHTS</b>                           | 1 I wouldn't engage at all | 8   | 0,9  |
|   | 2                          | 17  | 1,9  |
|   | 3                          | 112 | 12,4 |
|   | 4                          | 252 | 28   |
|   | 5 I would strongly engage  | 511 | 56,8 |
|   | TOTAL                      |     | 900  |
|   |                            | N   | %    |
| <b>RIGHTS, PROSPERITY, CONCERN FOR OTHER PEOPLE</b> | 1 I wouldn't engage at all | 18  | 2    |
|   | 2                          | 17  | 1,9  |
|   | 3                          | 155 | 17,2 |
|   | 4                          | 304 | 33,8 |
|   | 5 I would strongly engage  | 406 | 45,1 |
|   | TOTAL                      |     | 900  |

**Table 17:**

When you think about your current life, how important are the following things to you, that is, how much would you engage to improve them?

Use a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 means 'I wouldn't engage at all' and 5 'I would strongly engage'

|                      |                            | N   | %    |
|----------------------|----------------------------|-----|------|
| <b>ENTERTAINMENT</b> | 1 I wouldn't engage at all | 38  | 4,2  |
|                      | 2                          | 91  | 10,1 |
|                      | 3                          | 257 | 28,6 |
|                      | 4                          | 289 | 32,1 |
|                      | 5 I would strongly engage  | 225 | 25   |
| <b>TOTAL</b>         |                            | 900 | 100  |

**Table 18:**

When you think about your current life, how important are the following things to you, that is, how much would you engage to improve them?

Use a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 means 'I wouldn't engage at all' and 5 'I would strongly engage'

|   | MEAN | STANDARD DEVIATION | MEDIAN | MINIMUM | MAXIMUM | N     |
|---|------|--------------------|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| <b>FAMILY</b>                                       | 4,56 | 0,83               | 5      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>FRIENDS</b>                                      | 4,24 | 0,92               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>HEALTH</b>                                       | 4,54 | 0,8                | 5      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>CLEAN ENVIRONMENT</b>                            | 4,29 | 0,89               | 5      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>PRIVACY</b>                                      | 4,28 | 0,92               | 5      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>PERSONAL FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE</b>            | 4,38 | 0,86               | 5      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>FINANCIAL SECURITY</b>                           | 4,34 | 0,86               | 5      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>PERSONAL REPUTATION</b>                          | 3,83 | 1,09               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>TRADITION</b>                                    | 3,74 | 1,14               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>HOMELAND</b>                                     | 3,87 | 1,19               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>RELIGION</b>                                     | 3,26 | 1,44               | 3      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>SUCCESS / CAREER</b>                             | 3,78 | 1,07               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>MY PERSONAL RIGHTS</b>                           | 4,38 | 0,84               | 5      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>RIGHTS, PROSPERITY, CONCERN FOR OTHER PEOPLE</b> | 4,18 | 0,92               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |
| <b>ENTERTAINMENT</b>                                | 3,64 | 1,09               | 4      | 1       | 5       | N=900 |

**Table 19:**  
Which of these things  
is most important to you?  
(three possible answers)

|   | <b>N</b>   | <b>%</b>   |
|---|------------|------------|
| <b>FAMILY</b>                                       | 634        | 71,9       |
| <b>FRIENDS</b>                                      | 116        | 13,2       |
| <b>HEALTH</b>                                       | 590        | 66,9       |
| <b>CLEAN ENVIRONMENT</b>                            | 87         | 9,9        |
| <b>PRIVACY</b>                                      | 56         | 6,3        |
| <b>PERSONAL FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE</b>            | 144        | 16,3       |
| <b>FINANCIAL SECURITY</b>                           | 310        | 35,1       |
| <b>PERSONAL REPUTATION</b>                          | 22         | 2,5        |
| <b>TRADITION</b>                                    | 21         | 2,4        |
| <b>HOMELAND</b>                                     | 70         | 7,9        |
| <b>RELIGION</b>                                     | 105        | 11,9       |
| <b>SUCCESS / CAREER</b>                             | 37         | 4,2        |
| <b>MY PERSONAL RIGHTS</b>                           | 77         | 8,7        |
| <b>RIGHTS, PROSPERITY, CONCERN FOR OTHER PEOPLE</b> | 57         | 6,5        |
| <b>ENTERTAINMENT</b>                                | 13         | 1,5        |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  | <b>882</b> | <b>100</b> |

