



COLLABORATION AND INNOVATION IN SOCIAL SERVICES: HYBRID ORGANIZATIONS AND AREAS OF INTERACTION

Milena Hristova Yorgova

Introduction

Debates surrounding changes to the welfare state and the expanding role of social services in maintaining the well-being of citizens have drawn attention to non-governmental organizations and their potential to reduce social and economic risk and vulnerability. These organizations face several challenges in adapting to changing ideological and political frameworks, which necessitate compromises in their degree of autonomy and are justified in terms of their survival.

An intensive hybridization of non-governmental organizations to solve problems in the social sphere occurs with the rise of the ideas of the new public management and the new public governance. Synthesized, this leads to changes in the positions of the state towards non-governmental organizations and their admission into some traditional security zones. This is dictated by the need to find forms of state intervention that are more adequate to market processes and is associated with implementing various political strategies in the field of public social services aimed at limiting costs¹, changing management², and changing financing³ (Yorgova 2023).

1 Refer users to services offered in the community and family.

2 Adoption of national standards guaranteed by the state; introduction of the contractual principle in the provision of services; privatization of the public sector.

3 Introduction of fees for social services; increase in user fees; financing through transfers from social security and other public funds, redirection of services to the non-governmental sector.

* <https://doi.org/10.62560/csz.2024.02.10>



The aim is to achieve more efficiency and effectiveness, and at the same time guarantee adequacy in terms of scope, variety of forms of support, accessibility, and quality of social services about the needs and expectations of citizens.

Non-governmental organizations are placed to operate in a competitive environment dominated by the understanding of *better management* of public social services. This requires them to rationalize their behavior as providers of social services by adopting higher requirements for accountability and professionalism on the one hand, and on the other hand – strengthening their market orientation and using business management practices. They are expected to demonstrate entrepreneurship in search of effective solutions, orientation of activity towards achieving results, focus on citizens as users, greater flexibility to changes in the demand for social services, cooperation between multiple interdependent participants that contribute to the provision of social services (government bodies, businesses, non-governmental organizations, citizens), innovation leadership (Manliev 2021).

Non-governmental organizations are forced to develop an increasingly high degree of *relational culture of cooperation* with the state and the businesses, based on jointly defined goals, distribution of responsibilities, and search for collective agreement (Petrov 2022). The paradigm of interaction between them, the state, and the businesses is changing in the direction of intensification of actions in each of these sectors on the one hand, and on the other – expansion of cross-sectoral integration, new frameworks of cooperation, and innovation. This is provoked by the complicating and deepening, especially in recent years, social and economic challenges to which the EU member states are responding, in the context of social services, with changes in the trajectory of welfare states – from reducing the state intervention towards a proactive strong welfare state (EC 2023). An institutional environment is established that stimulates hybridization and pushes non-governmental organizations as providers of social services from actions motivated by value rationality to actions determined by purposive rationality. Researchers (Cooney 2006; Milbourne 2013; Petrov 2022) express concerns to what extent, under these conditions, non-governmental organizations can maintain their social values and legitimacy and represent a distinctive and independent force in society.

Civil society and civil sector: evolution and characteristics

Civil society is usually defined as “the multidimensional, internally contradictory, dynamically changing reality of the private interests of individuals as free and autonomous subjects” (Encyclopedic Dictionary of Sociology, 1997: 88). In a dynamic plan, the concept is associated with the self-initiative of individuals in defense of their private interests, and in a static plan – with the set of immediately emerging institutions, which in their entirety represent the diverse interests of the members of a given society and play the role of a balancer and limiter of the state's intervention in public life.



By applying an exogenous approach to the definition of the concept – civil society is defined as a dynamic space outside the family, the state, and the market, which is created by individual and collective actions, organizations, and institutions, where common interests are publicly defended (Dakova et al. 2003). For Gancheva (Gancheva et al. 2009), this reality lies between the state and the private sphere, resp. the actions of the government, the legislature, and the judiciary, and the individual actions within the family, the confidential business, and the home. According to Gorchilova (2010), civil society plays the role of a corrective, a guarantor of rights compliance, a testing ground for innovative solutions, a mechanism for empowering citizens, and mobilizing support that often crosses local, regional, and national borders. It is a platform, a terrain on which the state, the market, and the people interact.

At the current stage, as a result of the geographical expansion of the idea of civil society with a focus on its practical functioning in different world regions and at a supranational level, the views on it are becoming more and more ambiguous, and the research searches are more about delineating its boundaries and for the analysis of national peculiarities in its functioning, its role, and contribution in different societies. Researchers point out (Kákai–Glied 2017; Hummel et. al 2020; Reianu 2024) that the civil societies in individual European countries have different characteristics, manifested in cultural and historical traditions, the focus of work, the scope of funding, etc. This makes it to some extent difficult to describe the civil sector and prescribe priorities (Reianu 2024), Gorchilova (2010) notes that moral and ethical considerations recede into the background “as if a tacit consensus is being reached that civil society in itself is something good, useful and characteristic of progress and democratic development” (Gorchilova 2010: 197). In recent years, however, there has been growing criticism of the “overly optimistic expectations with which the civil society is burdened” and “voices of expectation that civil organizations will continue to prove their legitimacy and democratic claims have been increasingly heard” (Gorchilova 2010: 212).

A fundamental characteristic of civil society is its pluralistic nature. Its structure is open, with an unlimited number of self-regulating and self-managing elements of formal and informal types. The most clearly distinguishable part of it is the formal (legally registered) civil organizations.

The civil sector is an element of civil society, but it is not a substitute for it. (Dakova et al. 2003; Gancheva et al. 2009; Tsenkov et al. 2010) The term “civil sector” is used to cover the entire range of organizations that enable citizens to associate, and that are not driven by profit motives (Petrov 2022). Tanev (2008) also notes that the civil sector is the institutional form of civil society and encompasses the entire system of specific institutions that enable citizens driven by motives other than profit to connect. For Pozharevska (2005:231) it is “a sector that lies between the state and the market, includes activities with a social orientation, the purpose of which is not to distribute profit and represents a significant social and economic force – a key element for the social policy of any country”.



Researchers (Salamon–Anheier 1997; Dakota et al. 2003; Gancheva et al. 2009; Tsenkov et al. 2010; Alcock 2010; Milbourne 2013; Petrov 2022) note the extraordinary variety of organizations that make up the civil sector, as well as the various nuances in the terminology used in their research. Broadly speaking, civil sector organizations are identified by four related themes: formality, independence, non-profit distribution, and volunteerism. The general understanding of them is that “they carry out an explicitly stated mission; are voluntary in origin and also often rely on volunteers; have socializing functions at the meso- and sometimes at the macro level; have advocacy functions, but also create social services and goods themselves; are not politicized in principle, but can perform political functions; do not pursue profit, but generate income, incl. their own; they have their idea of values, materialize it in interests, but respect the interests of others as well; in their totality they constitute the civil sector” (Petrov 2022:24).

Civil sector organizations are designated as non-governmental, non-profit, voluntary, civil, and charitable. All these terms are used interchangeably, although they express subtle differences in the understanding of the nature and purpose of organizations. According to Petrov (2022:25), “Behind these different names are different purposes and the different terms should be evaluated according to their usefulness in describing the part of reality that is of research interest”. There are international variations in the terminology used. Authors (Dakova et al. 2003; Pozharevska 2005; Gancheva et al. 2009; Tsenkov et al. 2010; Petrov 2022) note that in Bulgaria the term “volunteer” is not so popular, while “civil” is used relatively more frequently and implies the idea of pressure and action by independent citizens, while “charitable” leads to associations of direct assistance to the people in a disadvantaged position. The use of the terms “non-governmental” and “non-profit”, resp. “non-governmental organizations” and “non-profit organizations” acquires wider citizenship. Usually, when civil sector organizations are considered from a liberal perspective and in combination with local (economic) development, they are defined as non-profit, and when considered at the national level and about their role in public policy, they are more frequently called non-governmental. (Dakova et al. 2003:35)

In the context of social services, the understanding of “non-governmental” organizations emphasizes the distinction between governmental structures and development initiatives, as well as their role in public policy processes, and the use of “non-profit organizations” emphasizes the role of these organizations as providers of social services that do not distribute profit and work in the public interest.

Hybrid organizations and hybrid zones

The localization of the civil sector from the point of view of its connection with the state and the market leads to the construction of several models of interaction. These models are based on the idea of balance and interdependence of the three sectors.



According to Tanev (2008), this idea is based on the understanding that there does not exist and that it is not possible to have only one general social regulatory sphere, and that there are three levels of conflicting, parallel existing interests: the first level is the level of economic relations; the second covers relations at the level of society, which is the proper domain of politics, and the third is the intermediate level of groups, the relations between them and between them and society.

It is assumed that the three sectors obey different logic and pursue different goals. They are in complex interactions, simultaneously in a state of partnership and opposition. According to Paton (2009), the state is characterized by formality, regulation, coercion, redistribution; the market is characterized by entrepreneurship, investment, accumulation, and competition, while the civil sector is characterized by association, reciprocity, altruism, and democracy. Intersectoral interaction is illustrated by a triangular model, the vertices of which are occupied by the public, market, and civil sectors (Paton 2009; Alcock 2010).

Evers and Laville (2004) also adopt a triangular model for locating the civil sector, but according to them, it is part of the core of a triangle formed by other poles – state, market, and community (families, households, and other informal organizations). Civil sector organizations act as mediators to the main sources of welfare. They are distinguished from the community (informal) sector by their formality, from the state by their private nature, and from the market by their non-profit orientation.

The civil sector finds itself between the three sectors, both related to and distinct from them, but part of the mixed welfare economy. This model recognizes that civil sector organizations can occupy border areas between the sectors and exhibit characteristics of both the civil sector and other sectors (Alcock 2010).

The potential for civil sector organizations to overlap has drawn the attention of researchers (Alcock 2010; Billis 2010; Milbourne 2013; Karre 2020). Hybrid organizations are seen as a manifestation of the complex and overlapping relations between the state, the market, and the civil sector within the mixed welfare economy. Billis (2010) developed a circular model of three-sector interaction to capture this expanding hybridization, within which hybrid zones are identified. Each of these zones includes similar types of organizations that differ in their initial origins and value-goal impulse.

Based on the Billis' model, the following organizations can be distinguished:

- *Public-private hybrid organizations*. These are organizations that combine the logic of the state with the interest of the business. A public body and private individuals usually own them. Benefits such as risk sharing, and cost savings are sought in them. They are financed partly publicly and partly through revenue from the sale of goods and services, or shared by the state, local authorities, and private entities. The initiative to create them can come from the public sector, e.g. state enterprises, or from the business (chambers of commerce, tourist offices, etc.).
- *Public-civil hybrid organizations*. They carry out activities delegated by the state,



e.g. social services. They are financed by taxes and private donations. The impulse for hybridization can come "from below" or "from above".

- *Civil-business hybrid organizations*. These are organizations that integrate business models, and volunteer logic, and pursue more than one goal. The spectrum of hybridization is broad, including variations in the ratio between social purpose and profit. They can be broadly classified into 1) organizations that are primarily mission-oriented, usually with non-profit legal status, reinvesting their profit in social goals (a non-governmental organization that implements an economic activity⁴ that is additional and related to the subject of the main activity, social enterprise); 2) organizations for which the leading motive is profit, which they distribute to the owners, but which also include some social goals, mostly in connection with certain adverse consequences of the functioning of the economy (socially responsible businesses, corporate social responsibility) (Karre 2020; Petrov 2022).

In the context of social services, the hybrid zones between the civil and state sectors and between the civil and business sectors are of interest particularly those hybrid organizations which, although originally belonging to the non-governmental sector, have a different value-goal impulse. In general terms, these are organizations that have a legal organizational form – an association and a foundation but have distinctive features:⁵ some work for the public benefit, and others – invest in the "shared benefit"; some work "not for profit", and others - "for profit", but reinvest it in social goals meaningful to the community. The two types of organizations put human needs in the center, with a focus mostly on improving the quality of life of vulnerable groups of the population, but adopt a different logic: some rely primarily on state funding, while others look for new tools and financial mechanisms, incl. by including the social services produced and provided by them in commercial activity and introducing business models. In addition, both types of organizations operate in an environment that involves the creation of multiple partnerships and various forms of connections with and within the community based on shared values and principles. And – as providers of social services – some organizations provide mostly state-delegated social services, and the other organizations – operate as subjects of the social economy and provide social services as a business with social added value. Both types of organizations

4 Business activity is any activity of an NGO aimed at making a profit, regulated by the statute of the organization, but the income from which is used only to achieve the goals defined in the statute, without the possibility of profit distribution.

5 The manifestation of these features has specificity in a national socioeconomic and legislative context, e.g. in Bulgaria, the Law on Social and Solidarity Economy Enterprises (2018) introduces a statute, not a new legal form, for social enterprises. Associations and foundations can be registered as a social enterprise in the Register of Social Enterprises. "In this sense, the presence of more than one legal form is admissible as long as there are no restrictions in this direction and not the commercial activity, but the social purpose and activity are determining for the enterprise to function as a social enterprise. The economic activity serves the social goals and mission of the enterprise." (Todorova 2021:69)



are defined as so-called private providers of social services in a legislative context. They are perceived as a resource for compensating deficits in the public provision of social services on the one hand, and on the other – their participation is loaded with expectations for better quality of services because of innovation, flexibility, and striving to improve services in the process of their provision.

Social services: cooperation and innovation through hybridization of non-governmental organizations - Bulgaria's experience

A study of publications and documents (EC 2006; EC 2007; EC 2011; EC 2022) of the EU about social services gives reason to note that they are considered within the framework of documents with non-binding legal force. There is currently no common European definition, but efforts are being made to reach a common definition.⁶ Available definitions of social services are contextually determined. They depend on the specific environment and level of consideration (EU level, individual Member State level, regional and local level) and are usually linked to specific policy needs. Furthermore, they reflect the national context – scope, quality, organization – and depend on established traditions, values, culture, economic opportunities, etc. of the society within which they are located. (EC 2022)

The practice established so far in the EU considers social services as part of services of general interest. Social services are defined as person-centered; designed to meet vital human needs; are guided by the principle of solidarity and contribute to the protection of fundamental rights, human dignity, and non-discrimination. They aim to ensure the creation of equal opportunities for all and social inclusion (EC 2006; EC 2007).

In general terms, it can be assumed that social services are a range of services designed to provide support to meet a wide range of social needs in society, to specific groups within society, and to individuals in specific situations. A key characteristic of social services is their interactive nature, which distinguishes them from other types of social benefits (social assistance in kind or the form of monetary transfers) (EC 2022).

In the national context, based on the legislation in Bulgaria (Law on Social Services), social services are defined as support activities. The spectrum of this support includes 1) prevention and/or overcoming of social exclusion, 2) realization of rights, and 3) improvement of the quality of life. The common focus in the spectrum of support is social inclusion. Social services are referred to as the so-called personal social services. Individuals and families receive care, security, support, protection, information, and advice, which enable them to maintain their

6 A proposal for a common definition of social services in the EU was made in European Commission (2022): *“Study on social services with particular focus on personal targeted social services for people in vulnerable situations”*. The proposed definition follows established practice and tries to correctly reflect the diversity of social services.



physical and social functioning during difficult periods of life and prevent them from falling into extreme poverty and social isolation. Social services help users cope with difficulties in everyday life maintain or improve their quality of life, and fully participate in basic areas of public life.

The main providers of social services in Bulgaria are the municipalities. Private providers can also provide social services. These are physical persons registered under the Commercial Law and legal entities, both Bulgarian and foreign from member states of the European Union, or member states of the Agreement on the European Economic Area. Municipalities are responsible for the provision of social services financed from the state budget. They can independently organize and implement all activities or outsource the provision of social services to private providers. Private providers, however, need to have a license issued by the Agency for the Quality of Social Services (AQSS). They can also create social services which they finance independently.

According to the data of the Agency for the Quality of Social Services (RLSP 2024), there are 504 licensed private providers, of which 267 are providers with a legal organizational form – association, and foundation. Of the provided social services, 85% are financed by the state budget. It is not surprising, given the legal framework, that the most used way of providing social services is through independent organization and implementation of activities by the relevant municipal administration. The second most widespread form is outsourcing the management of social services to private providers, through which private providers manage approximately 17% of the funds allocated from the state budget for social services. Only 7% of the social services are funded by private providers (AQSS 2023).

According to data from the Register of Social Enterprises in Bulgaria (RSE 2024), most of the social enterprises included in it have the legal organizational form EOOD (Ltd). Registered as active social enterprises are sixteen non-governmental organizations with the legal organizational form of association and foundation. Researchers (Todorova 2021; Nachev 2022) note that a significant part of the registered social enterprises have limited resources – human and material, which does not allow them to deploy large-scale production activity, requiring a serious capacity to implement and use modern communication and information technologies in production. They carry out a wide range of economic activities in the fields of services and industry,⁷ and their social activities and/or goals are also in a wide range⁸ Nachev (2022) points out that sustainability is a problem for social enterprises, as it is most often associated with the presence of investments and the established

7 social work, social services for vulnerable groups, provision of food products and essential goods for people in remote places, building maintenance and landscaping activities, food production, clothing production, etc.

8 improving the quality of life of vulnerable groups; provision of training, provision of supported employment, implementation of social work (including without accommodation as well), support for social inclusion of vulnerable groups, qualification and retraining of persons from vulnerable groups on the labour market, etc.



culture of consumption of products and services from social enterprises. In the context of social services provided by non-governmental organizations with the status of social enterprises, micro-enterprises are more sustainable than small and medium-sized social enterprises. It is also found that they are more sustainable in the "industry" sector compared to the "services" sector. This is associated with the manufacturing of a product that satisfies needs that have arisen more permanently over time, in contrast to the offering of services that require a longer process of construction, institutionalization, and validation among service users. Social enterprises, while having the potential to address socio-economic challenges, are still not fully recognized. The study of the established practice in Bulgaria (Tsenkov et al. 2010) about the provision of social services by private providers gives reason to indicate that non-governmental organizations are perceived in the social services sector as a partners of the state rather than of the citizens. Many of these have emerged to fill deficits in social service provision as test laboratories for the creation of new social services and staff training.

A survey (BCNL 2022) of public attitudes towards non-governmental organizations shows that citizens expect the state to engage in solving serious social problems, and non-governmental organizations to play a complementary role by providing services and by working to achieve higher independence and social inclusion, advocacy, and protection of the rights of the people from vulnerable population groups. Manifestations of direct political pressure and sporadic donation campaigns of non-governmental organizations are not perceived particularly positively by the citizens. A kind of paradox is also registered – on the one hand, an increase in the positive attitudes towards non-governmental organizations based on solving specific problems, personal experience, participation, and a sense of representation, and on the other hand – when they are considered the political process, they acquire strongly negative connotation.

According to several authors (Todorova 2021; Petrov 2022; Dakota et al. 2003; Gancheva et al. 2009; Tsenkov et al. 2010), the political expediency of the state is the driving factor in the hybridization of non-governmental organizations as providers of social services – on the one hand, promotion and implementation of policies for social inclusion, regional development, employment, etc., and the other hand – increasing the capacity of non-governmental organizations to provide social services through partnership and/or through public procurement management mechanisms, and/or through stimulation of social entrepreneurial initiatives. Thus, the state takes advantage of the experience and expertise of non-governmental organizations in addressing public problems and needs by compensating for the inherent limitations of these organizations through regulation and funding.

The cooperation between the state and the non-governmental organizations in the context of social services expands their access to resources, guarantees the stability of their funding, provides channels for influencing the content of social policies, and this creates conditions and better opportunities to fulfill their social mission, but it can also lead to a loss of identity, lack of flexibility and innovation.

The presence of strong regulatory frameworks in the social services sector, as well as the dependence of funding on political will, can make non-governmental organizations too bureaucratic, distancing them from their civil nature (Petrov 2022).

Conclusions

Social services are an essential element of the European social model and contribute to the implementation of the principles of the European Pillar of Social Rights. They change and develop in response to social challenges and changing societal expectations. The dynamics of the changes in social services are determined by the changes in the economy and society.

Social services are extremely crucial in maintaining the integrity of society. Their social value and the presence of significant external effects determine the intervention of the state. It supports, regulates, and controls social services to generate higher public welfare, resp. their providers by promoting pluralism in the supply and greater flexibility to changes in demand for social services.

The provision of social services is carried out under broad representation, in which various non-governmental organizations participate actively. The partnership between the interested parties is established as a leading principle, which aims to improve the link between the services with the requirements of the users, increase the transparency in the decision-making process, and - more efficient distribution of financial resources. In this regard, non-governmental organizations are involved at various levels in the formation and implementation of social policies and practices.

The European Union takes a coordinating role in building a political commitment to enforce a vision of social services as preventive and supportive at all stages of life. However, this requires investments, an adequate legislative framework, and an active social dialogue. The search for solutions will inevitably stimulate sector hybridization and lead to new forms of collaboration and innovation.

References

- Alcock, Pete (2010): A strategic unity: defining the third sector in the UK. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 1., (1), pp. 5–24, <https://doi.org/10.1332/204080510X496984>
- AQSS (2022): *Agency for the Quality of Social Services. Annual analysis of the state and effectiveness of social services provided in 2022*, <https://aksu.government.bg/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/ezhegoden-analiz-na-sastoyaniето-i-efektivnostta-na-soczialnite-uslugi-pre-dostavyani-prez-2022-g..pdf>
- BCNL (2022): *Bulgarian Centre for Non-profit Law. Public attitudes towards the activities of civil organizations – results of a nationally representative survey 2022*, [https://bcnl.org/uploads/documents/0922_GO_Report\(1\)\(1\).pdf](https://bcnl.org/uploads/documents/0922_GO_Report(1)(1).pdf)



- Billis, David (2010): Towards a theory of hybrid organisations. In: Billis, D. (Ed.): *Hybrid organisations and the third sector: Challenges for practice, theory and policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 46–69, https://eprints.lse.ac.uk/55260/1/Billis_Towards_a_theory_of_hybrid_organizations_Ch3_HybridOrganizations_2010.pdf
- Commission of European Communities (2007): Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions accompanying the Communication on "A single market for 21st century Europe" – *Services of general interest, including social services of general interest: a new European commitment*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2007:0725:FIN:EN:PDF>
- Commission of European Communities (2006): *Communication from the Commission, Implementing the Community Lisbon programme: Social services of general interest in the European Union*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2006:0177:FIN:EN:PDF>
- Cooney, Kate (2006): The Institutional and Technical Structuring of Nonprofit Ventures: Case Study of a U.S. Hybrid Organization Caught Between Two Fields. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 17., (2.), pp. 143–161.
- Dakova, Vera–Dobrinka, Valkova–Angelina, Stoylkova– Gergana, Dzenkova–Galina, Nikolava–Tsanka, Vasileva–Violeta, Nenova–Iliana, Nikolova–Zdravko, Zhdrakov (2003): The non-governmental sector in Bulgaria in the context of development. "Workshop for Civic Initiatives" Foundation, https://frgi.bg/uploads/article/archive/doc_article_14_64.pdf
- European Commission, Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion (2023): *The future of social protection and of the welfare state in the EU*. Publications Office of the European Union, <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2767/35425>
- European Commission, Directorate-General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion (2022): *Study on social services with particular focus on personal targeted social services for people in vulnerable situations: final report*. Publications Office of the European Union, <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2767/552978>
- European commission (2011): Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. *A Quality framework for services of general interest in Europe*. https://ec.europa.eu/archives/commission_2010-2014/president/news/speeches-statements/pdf/20111220_1_en.pdf
- Evers, Adalbert–Jean-Louis Laville (Eds.) (2004): *The third sector in Europe*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Gancheva, Vera–Oleg Dimitrov–Martin Kostov–Irena Dimitrova–Vasilka Stoyanova–Yulia Bazhlekova –Nevena Dimitrova–Tsvetana Tsankova (2009): Analysis of the environment for the development of civil society structures and partnership experience with local authorities in the field of education. *Association "Human rights– step by step"*
- Gorchilova, Denitsa (2010): A comparative retrospective of the concepts of civil society. In: *Scientific works of the UNSS, T.II*. Sofia: UI "Economy", pp. 181–208
- Hummel, Siri–Laura Pfirter–Johannes Roth–Rupert Graf Strachwitz (2020): *Understanding Civil Society in Europe: A Foundation for International Cooperation*. Stuttgart: Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen. <https://doi.org/10.17901/AKBP1.12.2020>
- Karre, Philip Marcel (2020): Hybrid organizations between state and market. In: Billis, D.–Rochester, C. (Eds.): *International Handbook and Hybrid Organizations*. Cheltenham Glos: Edward Elgar, pp. 31–47, https://repub.eur.nl/pub/125095/Ch_Handbook_Hybrid_Organisations_-PM_KarrA-accepted_draft-.pdf



- Kákai, László–Glied, Viktor (2017): Sketch of the Hungarian non-profit sector after the regime change. *Civil Review*, 14., (3.), pp. 13–33. Available at: <https://www.civilszemle.hu/en/52-civil-szemle-2017-3/> [Accessed 06 April 2024]
- Milbourne, Linda (2013): *Voluntary sector in transition. Hard times or opportunities?* Bristol: Policy Press.
- Manliev, Georgi (2021): Evolution in Public Governance Models: From Administrative Management to the Hybrid and Normative Concept of Good Governance (Part I). *Economic and Social Alternatives*, 4., pp. 106–124.
- Mirchev, Mihail (1997): *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Sociology*. Second edition. Sofia.
- Nachev, Petar (2022): PhD Thesis, *Social dimensions of consumption and investment in social entrepreneurship*. Veliko Tarnovo: University of Veliko Tarnovo "St. St. Cyril and Methodius". Available at: <https://ras.nacid.bg/api/reg/> [Accessed 06 April 2024]
- Paton, R. (2009): (Towards) a sedimentary theory of the third sector. *Paper presented to the NCVO/VSSN Annual Research Conference*. Warwick University
- Reianu, Diana-Gabriela. (2024): Civil society in the context of the EU accession: the case of Montenegro. *Civil Review*, 21., (1), pp. 123–135, <https://doi.org/10.62560/csz.2024.01.08>
- Petrov, Simeon (2022): *Non-profit organizations – nature, roles, management*. Sofia: "St. Kliment Ohridski".
- Pozharevska, Romyana (2005): Non-profit organizations in the process of joining of the European community. In: *UNSS – Scientific works 2005*, pp. 214–258
- RLSP (2024): *Register of Licensed Social Providers in the Republic of Bulgaria*. Available at: <https://aksu.government.bg/registar-na-licenziranite-dostavchiczi-na-soczialni-uslugi-2/> [Accessed 06 April 2024]
- RSE (2024): *Register of Social Enterprises in the Republic of Bulgaria*. Available at: <https://secprod.mlsp.government.bg/index.php?section=HOME&a=33> [Accessed 06 April 2024]
- Salamon, Lester M.–Helmut K. Anheier, (1997): The Third's World Third Sector in Comparative Perspective. *Working Papers of the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project, no. 24*, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Institute for Policy Studies, <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=0ace75b505990bbc4c69aff0e908c2f4416fe6da>
- Tanev, T. (2008): *Analysis of public policies*. Sofia: Military Publishing House.
- Todorova, Teodora (2021): *Business with a social cause. Dimensions of social impact*. Veliko Tarnovo: I&B
- Tsenkov, Emil Todor–Yalamov, Todor–Galev, Pavel Antonov–Svetla, Encheva (2010): Civil Society in Bulgaria. Trends and risks. Center for the Study of Democracy. https://csd.bg/fileadmin/user_upload/publications_library/files/2010/2010_01_ENG_Civil_Society_in_Bulgaria.pdf
- Yorgova, Milena (2023): The welfare state through the lens of the social investment perspective: transformations and challenges. Tjāranu, A.–Németh, I.–Gabor, E.–Falus, O.–Zákota, Z. (Eds.): *Changing the Path. Crisis, Society, and Politics in the Contemporary World. Civil Szemle, Special Issue IV*, Budapest–Dunaújváros: Civil Szemle Alapítvány–DUE Press, 2023, pp. 209–218. Available at: <https://www.civilszemle.hu/en/004-kulonszam-2023-4-civil-szemle/> [Accessed 06 April 2024]