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- **Background**

This project investigated networking and alliance building among civic organisations (a term including voluntary groups, public interest groups, advocacy groups, community groups) promoting political advocacy and service delivery on environmental, minority and migrants’, social exclusion and community issues in Glasgow and Bristol. Its main aim was to develop an approach to political participation and collective interests’ representation from a social network perspective.

Analyses of political participation usually look at individual actors’ traits and behaviour (Parry et al., 1992; Dalton, 1996; Norris, 2002). Sometimes, focus is on political organisations, yet again treated largely as aggregates of individual cases (Dalton, 1994). Drawing upon our long standing interest in network mechanisms within collective action processes (Diani, 1992; 1995), we adopted a different perspective. We no longer took as our central interest the traits of the actors involved in political action, but the relations linking them to each other, and to political institutions and external parties.

In order to develop our framework (Diani, 2003; Diani & Bison, 2004), we engaged with theoretical and empirical traditions across sociology and political science. These included analyses of informal coalitions and networks in the political process (Knack, 1990); studies of political and cultural identities, the potential fragmentation of the public sphere, and its impact on grassroots civic networks (Lichterman, 1995; Melucci, 1996; Doherty 2003); investigations of the role of social networks as facilitators of individual involvement in collective action (McAdam, 1988; Passy, 2003); analyses of the role of voluntary organisations and public interest groups in policy networks (Laumann & Knack, 1987).

- **Objectives**

Our original proposal identified five main objectives:

1) to provide a systematic assessment of citizens’ organisations’ networks in two main urban areas in Britain;

2) to contribute to theories of political participation and political action focused on
patterns of interaction between actors rather than on actors' properties;

3) to test competing explanations of given network structures, emphasising interests and resources, ideological and cultural proximity, political opportunities, and amount and distribution of pre-existing social capital;

4) to fill a gap in available data sets about citizens' action, by collecting data on interorganisational relations across several areas of civic engagement;

5) to contribute to policy making by facilitating the understanding of networking processes which develop independently from the initiative of specific public agencies or political institutions, and sometimes in open hostility to them."

We trust all objectives have been achieved, if to a somehow different degree. As for goals 1 and 4, we have produced a study that we feel has the potential to become a standard reference in research on civil society networks (see the Outputs and Impacts sections). We have also generated some interesting preliminary results, and set a clear agenda in relation to goals 2 and 3 (see the Results section for details). We are more uncertain in relation to goal 5. The reception of our work among research users so far has been uneven. It has attracted significant attention among civil society organisers, including leaders of the major local umbrella organisations, while attempts to dissemination among senior civil servants and politicians have met with a mixed reception (see also the Activities and Impacts sections).

**Methods**

Glasgow and Bristol were chosen because of their different traditions of collective action and their different socio-economic structure. Between 2001 and 2002, face-to-face interviews took place with about 140 representatives of organizations in both cities. Of these, 124 organizations in Glasgow and 134 in Bristol were included in the unit of analysis (Table 1). These consisted of both local branches of UK-wide organizations (in Glasgow, also Scotland-wide), and independent local groups, with a varying degree of formalization and bureaucratization. In order to define our unit of analysis we combined reputational and positional criteria. Drawing on advice from local voluntary sector leaders, academics, and civil servants, and on available directories, we contacted all the organizations which were regarded as playing a city-wide role in the three areas; we used the same criteria to identify a first set of community organizations, which was then completed through positional (snowball) criteria. As resource constraints prevented us from looking at all relevant grassroots organisations across the whole cities, we focused on two areas, both relatively deprived.¹

---

¹ These were the Southside in Glasgow, an area with massive historical presence of working class, including neighborhoods such as Govan, Govanhill, Gorbals and Pollokshields; and the area including the neighborhoods of Easton, Knowles, Withywood and Hartcliffe in Bristol, featuring a strong presence of ethnic minorities.
Respondents were asked about their most important partners in alliances and in other exchanges, as well as about their traits and activities. Data were analysed through standard quantitative techniques as well as with routines specifically designed for network analysis (UCINET 6: Borgatti et al., 2002).

Between 2002 and 2003, we conducted a new round of 32 in-depth qualitative interviews. Some of the organisations representatives, contacted the previous year, and some representatives of umbrella groups were asked to comment on the preliminary results from the network analysis. This allowed us to introduce a major reflexive element in the project (Melucci, 1996).

Table 1: Glasgow and Bristol Organizations by their main area of activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th>Bristol</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities and migrants</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social exclusion &amp; community</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Results

Our main findings to date can be grouped under six headings:

1. *How important to civic organizations is currently grassroots networking, i.e., networking taking place outside top-down originated occasions such as Public Private Partnerships or the like?*

Alliance building was almost unanimously recognized as very important, with 85% of organizations agreeing that “Citizens' organisations are more effective if they manage to promote collaboration and joint campaigns”. However, such recognition went along with two diverging views of the voluntary sector as a whole.

Many respondents linked networking to a favourable view of the professionalisation of organizations (67%), the contribution or public-private partnerships to networking (52%) and access to grant information (46%), and – albeit on a smaller scale – on the attitude of Labour’s government towards citizens’ organizations (39%).

Many others, in contrast, voiced concerns about the marginality of citizens’ organizations within partnerships (65%), overall declines in rates of both voluntary (43%) and protest (41%) activities, and about citizens’ organizations’ tendencies towards self-reproduction (25%) and isolation (24%).
2. What are the forms and properties of networks linking civic organisations in contemporary British society?

Collective action processes may take different forms. We used three criteria to differentiate between them: the density of the informal networks linking organizations, the presence of collective identity, and the presence of conflictual interactions with opponents (Diani, 1992, 2003b). These generated a threefold typology of organizational, coalitional, and social movement processes.

An analysis of alliance networks (Diani and Bison, 2004) identified three different sets of organizations in each city, involved in distinctive network patterns, and matching our typology. Despite all the differences between the two cities, the structure of local networks turned out to be remarkably similar.

Figure 1 describes a structure where consensual organizational processes are dominant. Collective action is mainly conducted without targeting any specific opponent (table 2), and within the boundaries of specific organizations. These may be broadly interested in the same themes but are not involved in dense collaborations, nor share any specific identity. They aim primarily at strengthening both their structure and their identity and at securing control of specific issues or subsets of issues. Collaborations with other groups are rare and scattered across a broad range of different organizations. There are no densely connected networks of organizations sharing similar interests.

Figures 2 and 3 describe more dense and apparently similar patterns. In figure 2, consensus coalitional processes prevail. Organizations exchange densely with groups with similar concerns, addressing specific issues, once again without targeting specific opponents. However, these linkages do not correspond to identity bonds between the organizations involved. Groups join forces to push their agenda forward but do not feel linked to each other by a shared identity, once the specific actions and campaigns are over. Alliances and collaborations are mostly driven by an instrumental logic. Specific activities are not linked by actors into more encompassing narratives, that might assign them a broader meaning and make them part of a sustained series of collective actions.

Organizations in figure 3 most closely approximate a social movement process. They not only share both material and symbolic resources in order to promote more effective campaigns. They also more frequently identify each other as part of a broader collective actor, mobilized against political and social targets, whose goals and existence cannot be constrained within the boundaries of any specific protest event or campaign. They are more likely to share core activists, and a history of past participation in the same collective events. There is greater continuity over time to collective action in these cases, which goes beyond the instrumental dimension of coalitional activity (see Diani & Bison, 2004, for details).
Figure 1. Organizational network processes in the Glasgow and Bristol civic networks
Figure 2. Coalitional network processes in the Glasgow and Bristol civic networks
Figure 3. Social movement network processes in the Glasgow and Bristol civic networks
Table 2. Percentage of groups identifying public authorities and/or specific social groups as opponents in their main initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th>Bristol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Coalition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public authorities</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific social</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Differences significant at 0.001 level.

3. What are the implications of a network perspective for current theories of grassroots political participation?

A network, relational view of grassroots political processes forces us to redefine some basic assumptions of classic social movement theory, as well as the relationship between it and the theory of public interest groups (Jordan & Maloney, 1997; Burstein, 1999). In particular, our findings challenge two established views of the difference between social movements and interest groups:

3.1 Protest vs. pressure.

According to classic political science, social movements would differ from established interest groups for their use of protest rather than pressure (Rucht, 1995). However, in Glasgow, organizations involved in social movement processes were more inclined than organizations following consensual logics of action not only to use protest, but also pressure, to suggest a divide between political and non-political action rather than between moderate and radical politics (Table 3). In Bristol, the same organizations did not differ at all from the rest, to suggest a greater homogenisation of the whole civic sector as far as action repertoires go. These findings suggest that protest is not a necessary trait of social movement processes: it is a tactical tool that may or may not be used, depending on opportunity considerations and cultural orientations.
Table 3 Inclination to adopt specific tactics (1-100 scale *)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th></th>
<th>Social movement</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th>Social movement</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Coalitional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Coalitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protest</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32***</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>76***</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Diani (2004) for details on scale construction. Differences significant at 0.01 level (**), 0.001 level (***)

3.2 Social movements as loosely structured, informal organizations

That 'social movement organizations' should stand out because of some specific characteristics (Melucci, 1996; Kriesi, 1996) is similarly questionable. The organizations most closely involved in a social movement process actually display no differences to the others on a range of indicators of establishment or bureaucratization (table 4). They have been in existence for about the same time as the others, have similar numbers of registered and regular members, and have as bureaucratic – or loose – a structure as organizations in other blocks. They may show significantly lower budgets in Glasgow, but even there, it is difficult to establish a continuum between contentious political action and consensual collective action (their counterparts in Bristol seem to be no worse off than other groups in that city).

Table 4 Organisational consolidation by collective action processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th></th>
<th>Social movement</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th>Social movement</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Coalitional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Coalitional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in existence</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered members</td>
<td>2393</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>15642</td>
<td>6151</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>21202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly active members</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of formalisation</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget below £ 50,000</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>52**</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Difference significant at 0.01 level (**)

a Additive scale based on nine indicators of formalization.

b Differences on this variable not significant due to high in-group variance.
3.3 Social movement organizations vs. interest groups?

In the light of the data presented above, this conventional distinction loses its original reference to properties of the organization and/or its strategy, and takes up a new relational meaning: organizations with similar characteristics may be involved in social movement processes, or privilege coalitional or organizational logics of action (Diani, 2001). They will qualify as ‘social movement organizations’ or as ‘public interest groups’, depending on their location in specific patterns of relations, rather than on their intrinsic characteristics. This perspective enables us to move beyond endless discussions of whether environmental groups or human rights associations should belong in the realm of social movement or interest group politics. They may belong in either, depending on their network location.

4. What are the main issue cleavages between civic organisations?

We explored the possibility to associate specific issues to distinctive positions in alliance networks, and therefore to distinctive processes of collective action. We identified five main sets of issues: environment, ethnic & minority rights, social exclusion, housing, and globalisation (Diani, 2004). Of these, only interest in globalisation and (in Bristol) the environment seem to differentiate between organizations embedded in different collective action processes. Globalisation in particular seems to be the distinctive issue around which most of social movement activity developed in both cities. This not because social movements are not interested in other issues, but because the relative novelty of the topic and the lack of established issue owners (Petrocik, 1996) both facilitate and require collective action to develop along social movement patterns (Diani, 2004).

The reputation of Bristol as a stronghold of environmental activism is confirmed by the environment being the other issue characterizing social movement networks in that city. On the other hand, there seems to be little differentiation based on reference to longer established issues. It would make very little sense indeed to generically refer to ‘minority citizenship movements’, ‘social exclusion movements’, or ‘housing movements’, simply because of the attention many organizations pay to those issues. It is surely possible to identify radical political orientations among some of the organizations interested in those issues, but in general, the use of the term movement in reference to those cases is more confusing than enlightening. What we have are mostly organizational or coalitional processes without strong identity links between the organizations involved.
Table 5. Issue Interests (1-100 scales*) by City and Type of Collective Action Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Bristol</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coalitional</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
<td>Social Movement</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Coalitional</td>
<td>Organizational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>45 50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35 28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>56 31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic &amp; Minority</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44 41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalisation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44 23***</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38 22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44 47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41 124</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>25 134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a See Diani (2004) for details on scale construction.

*** Difference significant at 0.001 level; * difference significant at 0.05 level.

5. What is the relationship between different sectors of civic networks, public agencies, and established political actors?

The presence in both Glasgow and Bristol – and indeed increasingly in Britain (Byrne, 1997; Seel et al., 2000) - of movement organisations involved in dense networks ad also sharing contentious orientations, particularly towards public actors, does not prefigure an overall legitimacy crisis in the relationship between the voluntary and community sector and public institutions.

The quality of links to institutional actors (table 6 below) once again provides only partial support to the profile of social movement actors as anti-institutional. In Glasgow, organizations involved in social movement processes are significantly more critical than others of the growing role of public-private partnerships and other attempts to mobilize civil society 'from above', more upbeat about the prospects of grassroots campaigning, and less dependent on public funding than anybody else in the two cities. But this is not the case in Bristol.

Moreover, in neither city do the extent and quality of social movement organisations' ties to local institutions differ: organisations have extended collaborations with several city council departments (on the average, with about 40% of the departments in each council), regardless of their dominant logic of collective action; of those links, over half are considered satisfactory – again without differences between social movement organisations and other organisations.

While the levels of unhappiness with the functioning of representative democracy cannot be ignored (see also Results #1), one should also note that in each position of local civic networks there are several actors with extended and positive links to local institutions. This keeps communications open between the latter and citizens' organizations as a whole; it also prevents the formation of secluded niches consisting of organisations with oppositional, critical orientations, rich in bonding but poor in bridging social capital.
This finding is consistent with recent evidence at the individual level, suggesting a positive relationship between participation in organizations of any kind and general social trust (Johnston & Jowell, 2001), and rejecting any direct link between the rise of protest activity and the (presumed) fall of political trust (Bromley et al., 2001).

Table 6. Relationships to institutional actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coalitional</td>
<td>Organisational</td>
<td>Social Movement</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Coalitional</td>
<td>Organisational</td>
<td>Social Movement</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average percentage of city council departments group collaborates with</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average percentage of satisfactory links with city council departments</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public funds as one of two major sources of income</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51**</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinions about voluntary sector trends (1-100 scale)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of partnerships &amp; professionalization</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45**</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pessimist views of participation</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41*</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Difference significant at 0.001 level; * difference significant at 0.05 level.

6. How do differences in local political cultures and traditions affect the characteristics of civic organizations and/or their patterns of interaction?

Our findings also force us to better specify the relationship between local political contexts and patterns of participation. If we focus on the traits of individual actors, very few differences can be found between Glaswegian and Bristolian organizations taken as a whole: despite characterizations of Glasgow as a more radical and divided political environment than Bristol, Glaswegian organizations are no more inclined to use protest, nor more critical of institutions, no less institutionalised than their Bristolian counterparts. Moreover, those few significant differences not always support stereotypes: for example, the proportion of organizations claiming some identification with a social movement in Bristol exceeds significantly that in Glasgow.
However, this does not mean homogenisation of patterns of local associational life and political participation. Taking into account differences between organizations involved in organizational, coalitional, or social movement processes provides a more nuanced profile of grassroots participation in the two cities. Differences between Glasgow and Bristol are still remarkable, but they are largely filtered through network structures. In particular, Glasgow is internally much more differentiated than Bristol, as organizations involved in social movement processes differ much more consistently from others than in Bristol. In Bristol, in contrast, traits typical of social movements and contentious politics are as present as in Glasgow, but they are more evenly spread across the civic network.

How to account for those variations? Preliminary analysis of qualitative interviews offers some clues, to be further explored later. Glasgow and Bristol have quite different histories, and the social divisions and issues in the two cities are significantly different. Where Glasgow’s politics is driven by deep structural cleavages of class religion and nationality, Bristol’s seem to reflect a more integrated political system, shaped by a middle-class political culture. Interviewees’ descriptions of Bristol political culture range from “laid-back” and “apathetic” to a political culture emphasising the search for alternatives and practical solutions, rather than open confrontation.

In Bristol, outbursts of contention – most famously the 1980s Riots in St Paul’s – are regarded as out of character. Direct action is largely left to a small – if active – radical sector, which however does not take explicit organized forms (Purdue & Diani, 2003). This sharply contrasts with Glasgow’s deep divide between organisations adopting classic voluntary action approaches, and organisations opting for more militant ones. There, militant parties on the left of the political spectrum, most notably the Scottish Socialist Party, actually come to occupy a prominent role in local networks – as well as, notoriously, in electoral politics. This is not the case in Bristol.

• Activities

The project produced two main occasions for intellectual exchange. At its very start, an international seminar on “Social movement analysis: The network perspective” (Ross Priory, Loch Lomond, 23-26 June 2000) provided both the opportunity to elaborate the theoretical framework guiding the project (Diani 2003) and a forum for exchange among the very best scholars working at the intersection of social network analysis and collective action.

At the conclusion of the project, a Democracy & Participation Panel was organized under the title “Grassroots participation in contemporary Britain” in the context of the 6th European Sociological Association Conference, held in Murcia, Spain, from 23-26 September. The panel was very well attended. It provided an opportunity for dissemination to the European social science community of findings generated not only by our project but by a number of projects of related interest within the Programme. The panel was chaired by Christopher Rootes (Kent) who also acted as discussant, and included presentations by Mario Diani and Derrick Purdue, as well as by Brian Doherty (Keele), Fiona Devine (Manchester), and Alan Warde (Manchester).
An additional academic opportunity will arise in April 2004 when Mario Diani convenes with Derrick Purdie a workshop on "The changing structure of civil society" at the Annual Sessions of the European Consortium for Political Research in Upssala, Sweden.

Apart from these major gatherings, and the annual Democracy & Participation conferences, presentations summarizing findings from the project were held at UWE Bristol (2002 & 2003), Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques Paris (2003), Rockefeller Foundation Bellagio (2003), University of Crete (2002), the 1st ECPR International Conference (Canterbury 2001), the University of Trento (2001) and the University of Manchester (2002).

Papers originating from the project will also be presented at the 2004 INSNA Sunbelt Conference (Croatia, April), the Nature, Science and Social Movements Conference (Lesvos, June 2004), and the 2004 American Sociological Association meeting.

Dissemination activities with research users took two forms. At the end of the project, meetings were held with leaders of citizens’ organizations, local politicians and civil servants in Glasgow (on 25-26 August) and Bristol (9 September). We went beyond this, however, as an entire phase of the project was devoted to exchange with users. The in-depth qualitative interviews that took place from August 2002-March 2003 provided an opportunity for feedback and discussion with research users of preliminary findings, originated from the quantitative network analysis. The insights from those discussions will be fully incorporated in future research outputs.

- Outputs

The data files originating from the quantitative phase of the project have been made available to the ESRC Data Archive at Essex University. They consist of a unique combination of relational data, mapping different types of ties between citizens’ organizations in the two cities, and standard attribute data. They will also be made available to the data archive of the International Network for Social Network Analysis.

As for written outputs, full details follow. Three more journal articles and a book proposal are currently in preparation with a view to submission in 2004.

Books


Journal articles & book chapters


Conference papers


Working papers

Diani M., I. Lindsay, & D. Purdue. 2003. "Networks of citizens’ organizations in Britain. Report of main findings". Report distributed at meetings with research users in Glasgow (25-26 August) and Bristol (9 September).

• Impacts

The Oxford UP book has already had a substantive academic impact, and has been included in the newly launched Oxford Scholarship Online website. We are particularly pleased to report that a
preliminary paper from the project (Diani 2002b) has been used for instruction purposes, as an example of original application of blockmodeling techniques, by professor Ron Breiger, current editor of the journal Social Networks, and the originator of the blockmodeling approach (Breiger et al., 1975).

- **Future Research Priorities**

We shall continue to work along the lines already identified:

- Establishing the premises of a network theory of collective action;
- Developing the analysis of fragmentation and integration mechanisms in civil society;
- Integrating interest group theory and social movement theory.

We shall also attempt, however, to expand our investigations in two directions:

- The search for indicators enabling the study of the evolution of civil society networks over time;
- The comparative analysis of civic networks across different countries.
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