

Global Links, Local Roots? Varieties of Transnationalization and Forms of Civic Integration

April 2005



Center on Organizational Innovation

David Stark
*Department of Sociology, Columbia University
and the Santa Fe Institute*
dcs36@columbia.edu

Balazs Vedres
*Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, Central European University
and the Santa Fe Institute*
vedresb@ceu.hu

Laszlo Bruszt
Department of Social and Political Science, European University Institute
Laszlo.Bruszt@IUE.it

Research for this paper was supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation, SES-0115378. We are also grateful to the support of the Collegium Budapest/Institute for Advanced Study. Our thanks to Jonathan Bach for helpful comments, criticisms, and suggestions. We are rotating the order of authors' names across several publications that result from our collaborative research project.

This online paper may be quoted under fair use and academic conventions. This paper may not be published elsewhere in any form (including e-mail lists and electronic bulleting boards) without the author's express permission.

The preferred citation for this paper is: Stark, David, Balazs Vedres and Laszlo Bruszt. April 2005. "Global Links, Local Roots? Varieties of Transnationalization and Forms of Civic Integration," Working Papers Series, Center on Organizational Innovation, Columbia University. Available online at http://www.coi.columbia.edu/pdf/stark_vedres_bruszt_gllr.pdf.

Center on Organizational Innovation
Columbia University in the City of
New York
803 International Affairs, MC 3355
420 West 118th Street
New York, NY 10027
<http://www.coi.columbia.edu>

Global Links, Local Roots:

Varieties of Transnationalization and Forms of Civic Integration*

David Stark, *Columbia University and the Santa Fe Institute*

Balazs Vedres, *Central European University and the Santa Fe Institute*

Laszlo Bruszt, *European University Institute*

Abstract

In a rapidly changing society such as postsocialist Hungary, are civic organizations that are connected to transnational flows of information, resources, and partnership more likely to be disconnected from their membership base, from other civic organizations, and from other organizations outside the civic sector? Do transnational interactions come at the expense of domestic integration? To answer these questions we conducted a survey of 1,002 civic associations in Hungary in 2002. We identify seven varieties of transnationalization and we distinguish three forms of domestic integration – participation, embeddedness, and associativeness. Our findings indicate that civic actors do not face a necessarily forced choice between networks of global reach and those of domestic integration. Many Hungarian civic organizations, in significant numbers, do engage in transnational interactions while simultaneously integrated with their membership base, other civic organizations, and/or other non-civic organizations. In fact, the richest and most encompassing patterns of integration go hand in hand with the deepest and most encompassing patterns of transnationalization. These and related findings indicate that it would be mistaken to assume that transnationalization is necessarily accompanied by the domestic uprooting of civic organizations, whether as cause or as consequence.

Introduction

During the past decade, the societies of East Central Europe have experienced a rapid and profound economic, political, and social transformation that has restructured national institutions and re-arranged international linkages. Although the institutions of state and market have received more scholarly attention, no less transformative have been developments in a third domain – that of civic associations. Since 1989, the zone of civil society, once harshly suppressed under communism, experienced extraordinary growth. Where civic associations once operated in a gray zone of underground or semi-underground status, now literally tens of thousands are officially registered as associations promoting civic benefits. This institutionalization has been accompanied by an increasing transnationalization. Domestic organizations can

* Research for this paper was supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation, SES-0115378. We are also grateful to the support of the Collegium Budapest/Institute for Advanced Study. Our thanks to Jonathan Bach and Marissa King for helpful comments, criticisms, and suggestions. We are rotating the order of authors' names across several publications that result from our collaborative research project.

contact, communicate, and partner with transnational NGOs, many of which established a visible presence in these societies; and they can look to foreign-based foundations and NGOs, as well as international and supranational agencies, for financial support and non-monetary resources in the form of organizational transfer of skills, knowledge, and information.

Thus, at the same time that East Central Europe's fragile civic organizations were sinking their roots into the domestic society – building ties to their members and constituents as well as to other organizations – they were also building transnational ties to actors outside the country. Our task in this paper is to study the relationship between these twinned processes.

Our overarching research question lies, therefore, at the core of an emerging research agenda in the field of international development that focuses on the relationship between processes of transnationalization and domestic integration. That agenda examines how the rapid transnationalization of states, economies, and civil societies involves networks spanning national boundaries and asks how these networks interact with networks in the domestic setting. Can global connectedness co-exist with local rootedness? For economists and economic sociologists of development this question is formulated as whether and how foreign direct investment is integrated in the networks of local economies (Gereffi and Fonda 1992; Gereffi, 2004). The corresponding question for students of states and political societies is whether and how the growth of transnational ties is related to processes of association or dissociation at the level of domestic social and political alliances (Burawoy et al., 2000; Evans, 2000; O'Riain, 2000; Streeck, 1995).

In an earlier paper, we asked whether high levels of foreign investment could co-exist with the reproduction of inter-organizational ownership networks in a postsocialist economy. In a longitudinal study of the ownership structure of the largest 1,696 Hungarian firms from 1987-2001, Stark and Vedres (2006) found that massive foreign direct investment reshaped but did not disintegrate domestic networks. Cohesive networks of “recombinant property” (Stark 1996) remained robust throughout the period and, in fact, integrated foreign investment. In another earlier paper on the transnationalization of the state (Bruszt and Stark 2003), we asked: If adopting regulatory standards is the path to European integration, does social integration follow directly from these processes and practices? Does meeting the requirements for “European enlargement” enlarge or does it restrict the scope of social actors that are included in a development strategy? When domestic political elites are accountable, by new accounting rules, to supranational bodies, how does this shape the forms and mechanisms by which they are accountable to their citizens?

In this paper we focus on the relationship between domestic integration and transnational interactions in the domain of civic organizations. Specifically we ask whether civic organizations that are connected to transnational flows of information, resources, and partnership are more likely to be disconnected from their members, constituents, and other organizations in the civic sector. Does the reach of transnational NGOs into these organizations restrict their patterns of domestic association? In short, are global links likely to loosen local ties?

To answer these questions, we conducted a survey of 1,002 of the largest civic associations in Hungary, allowing us 1) to document the prevalence of transnational ties and to chart the types or varieties of transnational interaction, and 2) to document the prevalence of domestic ties and to chart variation across these organizations in their distinctive forms of such integration. Most importantly, our data allow us 3) to analyze the relationship between these processes as we investigate whether transnational interactions come at the expense of domestic integration. Are Hungarian civic associations becoming uprooted just at the moment when they might be establishing strong ties to society or are there patterns of transnationalization that can co-exist with the reproduction of domestic integration? Do transnationalizing civil societies, such as those of East Central Europe, face a forced choice between transnational integration and local embeddedness?

Our findings indicate that this is not a forced choice. With a robust model that incorporates key control variables, we find that civic associations with transnational ties are more likely than their counterparts without such ties to have deep roots in domestic societies. Transnationalizing civic organizations are more likely to be participatory, to be embedded in networks of local civic organizations, and to be associative with other domestic organizations outside the civic domain. Our findings, moreover, suggest that posing the problem as a possible forced choice presents a false choice. Our survey data make it possible not only to identify whether an organization has transnational ties but also to identify different patterns, or varieties, of transnationalization. We demonstrate that variation in the mode of transnationalization matters: the distinctive forms of transnationalization correlate with different patterns of domestic integration. In brief, although we do find a type of transnationalization that correlates with domestic uprooting, we also find that the richest and most encompassing pattern of domestic integration correlates with the deepest and most encompassing type of transnationalization.

Students of social movements have already demonstrated that transnational activism takes diverse forms and that these are linked in looser or in deeper ways to supportive domestic networks (Tarrow, 2005; della Porta and Tarrow, 2005). In this paper we show that at the intersection of the transnational and domestic fields we can find distinctive patterns of emergent transnationalizing public arenas based on the combination of modes of global connectedness and forms of local rootedness.

In the following two sections, we briefly discuss the key concepts of domestic integration and the transnationalization of the civic field respectively, providing historical context and pointing to theoretical expectations about the relationship between these processes. After describing our data collection, we test the relationship between transnational interaction and forms of domestic integration. In the subsequent section, we provide a more rigorous test by distinguishing varieties of transnationalization. To interpret these findings we adopt a notion of expanded public arenas that span the boundaries of between transnational and domestic fields.

Civic organizations and integration

Why is domestic integration important? How does it matter for democratization and development? And along what dimensions should it be conceptualized? In the Tocquevillian tradition in which Robert Putnam is a leading contemporary proponent,

a well integrated civil society is the key to its capacity to act as an agent of democratization of the state (political inclusion) and as an agent of social and economic inclusion (Putnam, 1993, 2002). In that tradition, integration is primarily about *connectivity* whether it be in the connections between organizations and their actively participating citizens (rootedness) or in the network ties among civic organizations within the sector (embeddedness). A civil society that is more rooted and embedded has more capacity to mobilize marginalized or excluded groups and to represent subaltern/repressed alternatives vis a vis the state (Skocpol, 1999, 2003). Similarly, the greater the density of the ties to participating citizens/members and to other cooperating organizations the greater is the capacity to defend civic values from excessive intrusions from the two other organizational domains, the state and the market.

How organized is the civic sector in Hungary and how deeply integrated into society are its civic associations? From the televised images of hundreds of thousands of demonstrators in its public squares in 1989 and from accounts of the dedicated work of dissidents who managed to circulate samizdat texts through underground distribution channels, one might assume that it is obvious that Hungarian civil society was already vibrant and could only become more so after the lifting of legal restrictions on the right to association. But recent studies suggest that the context of severe economic crisis followed by an embrace of the new values of a market economy, combined with the legacies of dissident organization, should lead us to question such assumptions. The puzzle that was formulated by Petrova and Tarrow in reference to East European civil societies in general applies also to the particular case of Hungary (Petrova and Tarrow, 2005). As in the region in general, also in Hungary we find a disjunction between a very low level political participation measured at individual level surveys, and a rapid growth and high number of civic organizations, some with demonstrated high mobilizing capacities.

The momentous political upheavals of 1989 in Eastern Europe were, in part, caused by popular movements; and the resulting legalization of free assembly, indeed, further spurred a rapid growth of civic organizations. As Table 1 indicates, the number of non-profit organizations in Hungary nearly doubled from 1989 to 1990. By 2003 there were more than fifty thousand registered nonprofit organizations, nearly six times as many as in 1989.

Table 1. The number of non-profit organizations in selected years in Hungary

Year	Number of non-profit organizations
1932	14,365
1982	6,570
1989	8,796
1990	15,945
1992	30,363
1995	42,783
2000	47,144
2003	53,022

Source: *Nonprofit szervezetek Magyarországon 2000*. Budapest, Central Statistical Office, 2002, p. 51.

Although the number of organizations might be taken to indicate a strengthening civil society, recent studies conclude that civil societies in Eastern Europe are weaker than in most other regions of the world (Hanley, 1999; Howard 2003; Letki 2003). Postsocialist citizens seem to be disillusioned with public life: turnouts at elections are low, and participation in voluntary associations is uncommon (Nelson 1996). Numerous studies have shown that there is a declining trend in voluntary activism in established democracies as well (Putnam 1998; Skocpol 2003), but participation in voluntary associations in Eastern Europe is considerably below the levels of the US and Western Europe (Curtis et al. 1992; Letki 2003). The percentage of the population holding membership in voluntary associations in Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Hungary (based on surveys between 1993-94) ranges from 14.5% in Poland to 31.2% in the Czech Republic (Letki 2003). This can be considered weak in comparison with the US (72.7%), but comparable to Spain (30.8%) or Italy (25.9%) (Curtis et al. 1992). By comparison with the post-Soviet states, however, the weakness of civil society in Eastern Europe translates more as an unrealized potential than a hopeless disintegration. (Green 2002; Miller, Heisli, and Reisinger 1997). The level of civic participation in post-soviet states is much below Central European countries, with only 6.2% of the population having any membership in voluntary associations in Russia, 8.7% in Ukraine, and 8.6% in Lithuania (Reisinger, Miller, and Heisli 1995). Throughout the postsocialist world, daily survival in the deepest economic crisis of the twentieth century in this region induced apathy about collective action (Palma 1991). As economic prospects improved, the emergent, profound consumerism in the region is an obstacle, some argue, to the formation and growth of voluntary associations (Illner 1998).

Civil society groups and mass voluntary participation were important causes of the collapse of state socialist regimes in Eastern Europe (Ekiert 1991; Tismaneanu 2001; Weigle and Butterfield 1992). However, the conditions of underground organization that allowed these groups to survive against the party-state, some believe, have contributed to the weakness and fragmentation of civil society after the democratic transition. Of concern is that the secrecy of dissident networks has continuing momentum even after the collapse of socialism, resulting in small, informal, mutually-isolated groups (Szalai 2002).¹ For the majority who were not engaged in underground oppositional networks, moreover, it was not easy to leave behind the fears of open engagement in public issues. Meanwhile, the change of the political system absorbed many intellectuals who were not compromised by earlier elite positions and who had the skills and aspirations to engage in politics. Many, perhaps most, of the key civil society actors – leading intellectuals of the samizdat era – found themselves in parliamentary or government positions after 1989, leaving a vacuum in the civil society field (Kennedy 1992; Miszlivetz and Jensen 1998).

To assess whether and how the Hungarian civic sector is integrated, we examine three dimensions of domestic integration. Given that recent scholarship identifies obstacles to citizen participation within civic organizations as well as obstacles to collaboration

¹ In Poland, for example, the monolithic social movement of Solidarity (Mason 1989) fractured into several competing parties, trade unions, and other groups and organizations (Ost 2005).

among civic organizations, we differentiate the first two dimensions along lines recognizable within the Tocquevillian tradition: participation and embeddedness.

Participation. In our study, we distinguish civic organizations that are participatory from those that are not. Organizations with participatory ties to their members and constituents are more rooted to local interests and more likely to represent them. We consider organizations as participatory if the ties to their members involve relations of accountability. Accountability to members, volunteers, and constituents means that they are more likely to give expression to their values outside or alongside the conventional frames of party/parliamentary politics. In addition to providing mechanisms for articulating greater voice from below, these ties increase the likelihood that such organizations will be able to mobilize constituents in collective action.

Embeddedness. As a second dimension of domestic integration we identify civic organizations that have ties to other organizations in the civic sector. We consider organizations as embedded if they have ties that involve relations of accountability to other civic organizations. In contrast to the downwards accountability of participation we think about collaborative ties as providing for horizontal accountability. Civic associations that cooperate with other organizations are more likely to take their values into account and thus to define the public goods represented by them in a more encompassing way. Cooperation with other organizations increases the opportunities to be evaluated by them and to evaluate them, perhaps along criteria different from those of evaluations by members and constituents on one side and from the evaluations of donors on another. Moreover, connections among civic organizations can increase effectiveness by providing channels to share relevant and timely information; and they can promote innovation by more rapidly diffusing knowledge about experimentation among organizations that are cooperating rather than isolated. In this way, connections among organizations promote social learning within a community of practice.

To these two dimensions of integration we add a third. Whereas Tocqueville and Putnam highlight density of connections, in our third dimension we highlight the importance of diversity.

In their attempts to make states and markets more inclusive, civic organizations often move beyond homogenous publics connecting actors within the same organizational field. They work together with actors from diverse institutional fields (government, business, science, mass media, education, etc.) to make more encompassing representations and to produce goods that can be seen as goods by actors from different fields with diverse metrics.² When they do so, they participate in publics associating diversity.

This dimension is missing from the “purist” civil society framework that focuses on “free spaces” of action by an “autonomous civil society” free from interference from the state and the market. In that frame, linkages and interlocks with the other two major organizational fields, if mentioned at all, are described as degenerations of

² See Streeck and Schmitter (1985) on “associationalism;” Sabel (1993, 1994, 1996) on “developmental associations;” and Stark and Bruszt (1998) on “deliberative associations.”

autonomous civil society, frequently denounced as bureaucratization or commercialization (for a critique of this approach see Emirbayer and Sheller 1998, Kocka 2004). Terminology that designates the sector by what it is not (e.g., “non-governmental” or “non profit”) further accentuates the focus on connections happening within a sector that is in between or outside states and markets to the neglect of productive interactions happening among actors across diverse domains.

Associativeness. Accordingly, as a third dimension of domestic integration we identify civic organizations that participate in projects that associate actors from diverse domains in the pursuit of defining and producing public goods. Whereas *participation* refers to an organization’s relations to its members and volunteers, and while *embeddedness* refers to its relations to other civic actors, *associativeness* refers to an organization’s relations to actors outside the civic domain. Specifically, we consider an organizations as associative if it participates in projects with at least one other non-civic organization. These activities do involve connections. But, rather than simply counting yet another type of tie, with this dimension we are alert to activities in which actors are actively making associations – making alliances across groupings, integrating what had formerly been disjoined, drawing connections between interests that had not been seen as compatible, searching for new frames in which dissimilar notions of the public good can be redefined as associated. Forming part of associative policy networks, civic organizations participate in democratic settings in joint policy formulations and in the creation of more encompassing normative regulations. (Evans, 1997; Howell and Pearce 2002). In forging various developmental associations, civic organizations that work together with actors from other organizational domains (business, national and local government, education, church, etc.) can contribute to the formulation and implementation of more inclusive policies and programs.

Transnationalization of the civic field

The nascent organizations of Hungary’s civic sector have developed in an economic and political context of extraordinarily rapid and far-reaching change. In the economic field, extrication from state socialism has been decisive: the planned economy and the dominance of state ownership have been systematically dismantled. At the same time, the entrance of foreign investment has been massive and the reorientation of trade has been dramatic (Stark and Vedres, 2006). The Hungarian economy, for example, is today arguably one of the most globalized economies in the world (Greskovits and Bohle 2001). The reduction in state ownership and the shift to market coordination, meanwhile, has not been accompanied by a simple reduction of the state but by an increase in its regulative, administrative, and planning capacity. State capacity, moreover, becomes increasingly defined as the capacity not simply to regulate but, in fact, to adopt specific regulations emanating from Brussels (Bruszt and Stark 2003). In the process of accession to the European Union, these states incorporated nearly 70,000 pages of European norms and standards. The transnationalization of the economy, thus, has been accompanied by the transnationalization of the state.

These dual processes of globalization in East Central Europe coincided with an intense period in which foreign actors moved in to aid the incipient civic societies of the region in a flurry of Western support. More than \$81 million dollars in grants to

the civil sector flowed into Hungary between 1989 and 1995 from Western foundations (Quigley 1997), and Western government agencies such as USAID and the EU Commission saw practical and ideological opportunities. US-based foundations led by the Soros, Ford, Mellon, and Mott foundations together with the National Endowment for Democracy largely accounted for the initial influx of funds. The prospect of EU accession, however, meant that the civic sector across the region felt the pull of Brussels more keenly than Washington, and US-based support for civil society soon shifted focus toward the Balkans and Central Asia. As a result, civil society organizations in East Central Europe adopted a much more intense engagement with EU priorities in order to meet the conditions for accession, often involving “twinning” with NGOs in Western Europe. At the same time NGOs in East Central Europe became increasingly institutionalized and integrated into transnational networks, in a context where NGOs active in two or more countries grew at a rate of almost 30 percent in the 1990s, for a total of over 37,000 by the year 2000 (Anheier et al 2001, UNDP 2002). From funding sources to programmatic priorities, NGOs have become more (inter)dependent on transnational networks of varying degrees, raising the question as to whether civic organizations can be both locally rooted and globally connected.

Although not univocal, prominent in the literature on civil society organizations are warning signs about the potential negative effects of transnationalization. For some authors, the problems are located in changes in the internal structure of the organizations whereby transnationalized organizations become professionalized, bureaucratized, and commercialized, leading to a de-radicalization of the organizations (Rucht 1999. pg. 218). For others, the negative effects of transnationalization result from accompanying changes in the relationship between the organization and its environment. The danger is that organizations with transnational links will become more oriented to their foreign contacts, partners, or donors than to their members or other domestic organizations. In that view, transnationalization uproots civil society organizations from their base in popular participation and separates the professionalized movement elite from the grassroots (Mendelson and Glenn, 2002; Bob, 2002, 2005). Based on well-documented case studies, Mendelson and Glenn, for example, find “in nearly every case” that the externally supported civic organizations “had weak links to their own societies” (Mendelson and Glenn, 2002:22). Citing examples of strong transnational ties resulting in “isolation and even ghettoization” of NGOs (p. 13), they argue that increased dependence on external donors removes the incentives to be responsive to domestic constituents, turns domestic NGOs against each other in their fight for scarce transnational resources, and diverts the attention of the NGOs away from the most pressing local problems (p. 14, p. 18). Similarly, Bob argues that in their fight for global attention and support local movements might feel pressed to give up their original goals. He suggests that the least participatory local movements might have the biggest competitive advantage in the fight for external support (Bob, 2002: 44).

But not all scholars observe or expect that transnational interactions lead to domestic uprooting. Some give primary stress to the positive aspects of transnationalization. In their study of Central European environmentalist civil society organizations, for example, Hicks and Carmin (2000) found that professionalized movement elites use their skills to mediate between grassroots concerns and the agendas of external donors, linking grassroots groups with transnational organizations. Others, such as

Tarrow (1998, 2001, 2005), and Keck and Sikkink (1998) point to a broader range of outcomes. Tarrow, for example, identifies cases when transnationalization configures a dual segregated field with an internationally linked sector on one side and a sector of isolated grassroots groups on the other (Tarrow, 1998).³ But he also notes that “transnational advocacy networks can help resource-poor actors construct new *domestic* movements out of combinations of indigenous and imported material (Tarrow 1998:192, italics in the original).” The work of Tarrow (1998, 2001, 2005; della Porta and Tarrow, 2005), Smith (2004, 2005) and Keck and Sikkink (1998) presents a rich description and analysis of the various ways local, national, and transnational activism might intertwine. We build on these insights.

To explore the relationship between transnational interactions and domestic embedding we need to identify the relevant kinds of interactions that distinguish transnationalized/transnationalizing⁴ organizations from those that are not. As the most elementary form of transnational interaction, civic organizations can communicate with foreign organizations such as NGOs, foundations, and supranational agencies. They can receive monetary donations from foreign sources, and they might also be the recipients of non-monetary resources such as information, skills, or know-how. Domestic civic associations can be involved in collaborations with their foreign counterparts, whether working together as part of a common action or directly partnering in a joint project. Finally, some organizations might actively take foreign actors into account when making their decisions and/or even formally report to foreign organizations.

These elementary forms provide a basic test: we can consider an organization as involved in transnational interactions if it participates in at least one of these forms. But our modeling will also move beyond this simple test to examine the empirically observed combinations of these elements with the aim of identifying distinctive varieties of transnationalization. In turning our attention to variation in the forms of transnationalization, we draw on insights by Barbara Stallings (1990) and Bela Greskovits (2002) who, in separate studies in the field of economics, convincingly demonstrate that what matters is not the presence or absence of foreign investment but the form or pattern it takes.⁵ Similarly, we expect that attention to the varieties of

³ Tarrow makes the parallel to the economic realm explicit when, with reference to Southern women’s movements, he fears that transnationalization might result in a “split very similar to the gap between its internationally oriented export sector and its domestic economies (Tarrow 1998:190).”

⁴ We use the terms “transnationalized” and “transnationalizing” interchangeably. The term “transnationalized” should not imply that the action was initiated by a foreign actor. We use the terms to refer to interactions that cross national borders and do not imply that a given civic organization is itself a “transnational social movement” (see the useful definition by Tarrow 2001:11.)

⁵ In her study of the role of foreign capital in economic development, Stallings (1990) shows that we must be attentive to the particular ways in which transnational resources flow into the domestic economy. Distinguishing among state aid, private lending to domestic governments, private to private financial flows, and Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), she demonstrates that some forms are positively correlated with domestic economic development while others are negatively correlated. Probing variation in FDI further, Greskovits (2002) demonstrates that it is the specific pattern of FDI and not FDI *per se* that should be the unit of analysis. FDI has

transnationalization will have significant explanatory power in analyzing the field of civic action.

Data

To test the relationship between transnational interactions and domestic integration we conducted a survey of Hungarian civic associations in 2002. Because our research design was, in part, motivated to map network ties among the organizations surveyed, we conducted our survey on a population of organizations and not a random sample. To identify the population of the largest Hungarian civic associations we used the database of the Hungarian Statistical Office to compile a list that ranked non-profit organizations by the size of their budgets. From that list we excluded organizations in the field of sports (e.g., soccer leagues) and leisure time activities (e.g., stamp collectors)⁶ as well as foundations whose sole purpose is to support a single organization (e.g., the fund-raising arm of a museum, hospital, school, or church) since our goal was to analyze civic associations that are raising public issues and providing public goods. We employed a leading public opinion polling firm with a strong track record of empirical survey research in the non-profit field to administer our survey instrument in face-to-face interviews, typically with the elected president, chief executive officer of the organization, or their deputies. From an initial list of approximately 1,500 of the largest civic associations country-wide we were able to successfully contact 1,002 organizations.

The survey included questions about values, projects, repertoires of action, technology use, accountability, and network ties. For the three most important projects of the past two years, as well as about an organization's ongoing activities, we asked detailed questions about partnerships, actions, and resources used. This survey allows us to identify several types of ties to foreign actors, as well as various forms of domestic integration. Appendix A and Appendix B list the variables and the corresponding survey questions used in this study. Table 2 below shows the frequencies of the various elementary forms of transnationalization in our population of civic associations.

dramatically different relationships to domestic economic change depending upon whether it comes in heavy investments with high asset specificity or in the form of easy-to-recover investments.

⁶ Newly formed civil society organizations bore marks of the routines under state socialism. Many organizations were related to leisure and sports activities, due in large part to the legacy of the socialist party-state's selective permissiveness (Miszlivetz and Jensen 1998).

Table 2.
Forms of transnationalization and their frequencies.

Forms of transnationalization	Frequency
Communicated with	29.8%
Providing money	28.3%
A named partner	33.0%
Directly involved	23.4%
Providing non-money resources	25.9%
Reported to	15.4%
Taken into account	11.0%
Any of the seven forms	54.4%

Domestic integration and transnationalization

In this section we test the relationship between transnationalization and the forms of domestic integration. In the basic cross-tabulations reported below, we count an organization as participating in transnational interactions if it is involved in at least one of the elementary forms of transnationalization. Almost 55 percent of the civic associations in our population of the largest organizations answered positively to at least one of the seven elements.

Along the first dimension of domestic integration we count a civic organization as *participatory* if it takes into account its member, volunteers, or activists when making decisions, has formal obligations to report to them, and/or involves volunteers in its activities. As Table 3 indicates, more than 57 percent of the Hungarian civic organizations are participatory according to this measure. Civic associations that are involved in transnational interactions are significantly more likely to be participatory than those organizations that do not engage in any form of transnationalization. Nearly two-thirds of the participatory organizations are transnationalized.

Table 3.
Transnationalization and participation

		Participation		
		Yes	No	Total
Trans-nationalized	Yes	341 (62.6)	204 (37.4)	545 (100.0)
	No	234 (51.2)	223 (48.8)	457 (100.0)
	Total	575 (57.4)	427 (42.6)	1002 (100.0)

Note: row percentages are in parentheses.

Along the second dimension we count a civic organization (CO) as *embedded* if it takes into account other domestic COs when making decisions or if it formally reports to at least one other domestic civic organization. Recall that, within the Tocquevillian/Putnamian framework, the density of inter-organizational cooperation is an important measure of the cohesion and hence capacity of civil society. Table 3 reports that the overall embeddedness of the Hungarian civic association sector is very low. Three-quarters (75.2 percent) of the civic associations in our population of large organizations rarely or never takes into account or reports to other COs within the sector. The embeddedness of civic organizations that are involved in transnational interactions, however, is much higher. Organizations that are transnationalized according to our working definition are nearly twice as likely to be intra-sectorally embedded than those that have no transnational ties. Conversely, whereas more than two-thirds of the embedded civic organizations belong to the transnationalized part of Hungarian civil society, the COs that are not involved in transnational interactions are largely isolated from other domestic civic organizations.

Table 4.
Transnationalization and inter-organizational integration

		Inter-organizational integration		
		Yes	No	Total
Trans-nationalized	Yes	174 (31.9)	371 (68.1)	545 (100.0)
	No	74 (16.2)	383 (83.8)	457 (100.0)
	Total	248 (24.8)	754 (75.2)	1002 (100.0)

Note: row percentages are in parentheses.

Along our third dimension of domestic integration we count a civic organization as *associative* if it had collaborative ties in its projects with at least two *different types* of domestic organizations. The types of organizational domains are as follows: other civic organizations, local and national governments and agencies, business firms, research or scientific institutes, churches, political parties, and the mass media. Organizations that report no partners, only one partner, or more than one partner but

all of the same type of organization are not counted as associating diversity. In Table 4 we report still a third significantly positive correlation between transnational interactions and domestic integration.

Although more than a half (56.7 percent) of the Hungarian COs are associative in their projects, the transnationalized COs are much more likely to participate in forms of collaboration that involve association across diverse domains. Whereas more than two-thirds of the transnationalized civic organizations are associative, less than half of the non-transnationalized COs are involved in projects associating diversity. Conversely, such associative projects are twice as likely to be done by transnationalized COs than by those that do not take part in any transnational interactions. To test this relationship further, we constructed a more demanding definition of associativeness by counting as associating diversity only those civic organizations that have three or more diverse types of actors in their projects. When doing so, the correlations (not reported in Table 4) between transnational interactions and associating diversity become even stronger: 72.1 percent of the ‘aggressively’ associative domestic COs are transnationalized.

Table 5.
Transnationalization and diverse association in projects

		Diverse association in projects		
		Yes	No	Total
Trans-nationalized	Yes	379 (69.5)	166 (30.5)	545 (100.0)
	No	189 (41.4)	268 (58.6)	457 (100.0)
	Total	568 (56.7)	434 (43.3)	1002 (100.0)

Note: row percentages are in parentheses.

These basic cross-tabulations show a consistent pattern: transnationalizing civic organizations are significantly more likely to be participatory, embedded, and associative than COs that are not involved in any form of transnational interactions. Instead of uprooting, disembedding or disassociating, transnationalization goes hand in hand with domestic integration.

To test the consistent positive statistical association between transnationalization and various forms of domestic integration we use logistic regression models. We can expect geographic location, the size of budget, and the sector of activity to be correlated with both the forms of domestic integration and transnational ties in ways that produces an apparent but artificial relationship between domestic integration and transnationalization.

Organizations located in the capital, Budapest, might have better chances to recruit activists. These organizations – dues to their advantageous location – might also have a better chance to meet and collaborate with other civil society organizations, and to involve partners from diverse fields. Organizations in Budapest might also have better chances to meet representatives of foreign organizations. By introducing geographic location as a control variable, one might reasonably expect the association

between transnationalization and domestic integration to disappear.

Size of budget might also be another third factor that is behind both domestic integration and transnational ties. Organizations with bigger budgets can provide more opportunities for participation, and can be more attractive project partners. A bigger budget allows organizations to maintain communication technologies (afford phone bills, subscribe to a broadband internet connection) necessary to keep in touch with foreign partners. Again, by controlling for budget, we might expect the original statistical association to disappear.

It is reasonable, finally, also to expect that the chances of becoming domestically integrated and transnationally connected varies by the sector of activity. For example environmental and human rights organizations are probably more likely to involve activists and volunteers than are cultural, religious, or developmental organizations. At the same time, transnational ties are probably denser in the environmental and human rights field than in social services or trade unions. Controlling for sector might leave the relationship between transnational ties and domestic integration insignificant.

The results of logistic regression models (presented in Appendix C) show that the statistical association between all three forms of domestic integration and having a transnational tie stays significant after introducing these controls. While each of the three control variables is significant in at least one model, the positive statistical association between transnationalization and all the forms of domestic integration remains robust.

Varieties of transnationalization

To this point we have demonstrated a positive correlation between transnational interaction and domestic integration. Moreover, for each of the three forms of domestic integration, this positive correlation is robust even when controlling for location, size of budget, and fields within the civic sector. In those cross-tabulations we used a simple definition – the presence of at least one kind of transnational tie – for a simple test of the relationship. In the following section we introduce more complex models to examine how varieties of transnationalization are correlated with the three forms of domestic integration.

As noted earlier, studies by Stallings and Greskovits suggest that, in addition to studying the presence or absence of transnational interactions, we should also explore variation in transnationalization. For a more demanding test of how varieties of transnationalization differ in their relationship to domestic integration, several avenues are available. Given that our survey allowed us to distinguish seven basic elements of transnationalization, we could, for example, construct an index, giving each organization a score for the sum of the kinds of ties reported. Alternatively, we could probe discrete combinations of elements. Combinatorics seems a more appropriate way to identify the varieties of transnationalization. But rather than starting with *a priori* combinations or with their mathematical permutations (in any case an extraordinary number), our method is unabashedly inductive: we identify varieties of transnationalization by examining the empirically observable combinations of the seven elements. To do so we use the Ward hierarchical clustering algorithm.

Table 6.
Varieties of transnationalization

Varieties of transnationalization	The foreign organization is:							n
	Communi- cated with	Providing money	A named partner	Directly involved	Providing non- money resources	Reported to	Taken into account	
1. No transnational tie	0.0 - -	0.0 - -	0.0 - -	0.0 - -	0.0 - -	0.0 - -	0.0 - -	457
2. Only communication	100.0 + +	0.0 - -	39.3	0.0 - -	0.0 - -	0.0 -	0.0 -	61
3. Donation	31.7	100.0 + +	20.7 -	14.6 -	0.0 - -	7.3 -	1.2 -	82
4. Nominal partnership	0.0 - -	28.3	100.0 + +	0.0 -	0.0 - -	0.0 -	0.0 -	46
5. Partnership without money	29.9	0.0 - -	61.2 + +	89.6 + +	73.1 + +	0.0 -	0.0 -	67
6. Partnership with money	54.4 + +	87.4 + +	58.3 + +	84.5 + +	99.0 + +	23.3 +	1.9 -	103
7. Accountability relationship	49.3 +	30.1	46.6 +	4.1 - -	8.2 -	78.1 + +	52.1 + +	73
8. Encompassing collaboration	88.5 + +	68.1 + +	96.5 + +	63.7 + +	91.2 + +	59.3 + +	61.1 + +	113
Total	29.8	28.3	33.0	23.4	25.9	15.4	11.0	1002

As Table 6 indicates, we can identify varieties of transnationalization based on distinctive combinations of the elementary forms of ties to foreign organizations. Organizations in the first cluster have no foreign ties of any kind. These were the organizations against which we compared the transnationalized organizations in our baseline cross-tabulations. The organizations in Clusters 2, 3, and 4 do have transnational ties, but in each case they tend to be predominantly of one type. All of the organizations of the variety we label *only communication* responded in our survey that they frequently communicate with foreign organizations; all in the *donation* category received grants or other monetary resources from abroad; and all of the organizations of the *nominal partnership* variety named a foreign partner. But the organizations with these three types of shallow transnationalization were not statistically likely to engage in transnational ties other than those that characterize their cluster. Unlikely to be directly involved with, report to, or take into account a foreign organization, they are similarly unlikely to benefit from shared knowledge through interactions with foreign organizations. These are transnational ties that do not bind: no big engagements, no big commitments.

Knowing that we have seven elements and seven varieties of transnationalization, and extrapolating from these three clusters alone, one might expect that each of the remaining clusters would correspond neatly to a predominant element. But the empirically observed combinations reported in Table 6 indicate that the varieties of transnationalization are more complex than such a simple mapping. Organizations in Clusters 5 and 6, for example, characteristically combine naming a foreign partner, direct involvement with a foreign organization, and receiving non-monetary resources. But they are not likely to report that they take foreign organizations into account in making decisions. As varieties of transnationalization, they are further distinguished from each other as a *partnership without money* and a *partnership with money*. Organizations in the latter variety are also likely to receive grants from, as well as frequently communicate with, foreign organizations. The presence of partnership combined with the absence of accountability suggests that these civic organizations are involved with foreign organizations on a project-by-project basis.

Organizations in Cluster 7 are slightly more likely than average to communicate with and name a foreign partner. But their distinctive characteristics are that are highly likely to report to and take into account foreign organizations. Moreover, by contrast with the two partnership variants, organizations in such an *accountability relationship* are statistically unlikely to have ties in which they are directly involved with a foreign partner. Nor do they report that a foreign organization has provided them with monetary or non-monetary resources. This finding was perplexing: these civic groups respond that they are reporting to foreign organizations and taking them into account, yet they are not likely to be working together with them in a joint project nor are they benefiting from knowledge transfer or foreign donations. As we shall see in the next section, these findings become less puzzling when we examine how the varieties of transnationalization are related to forms of domestic integration.

Organizations in Cluster 8 are involved in an *encompassing collaboration* with their foreign counterparts. Statistically likely to be engaged in each of the seven elementary forms, nearly all them name a foreign partner, communicate frequently with, and receive non-monetary resources from abroad. Partnering with and accountable to foreign actors, in this variety of transnationalization it is highly likely that

transnational ties are reaching deeply into these civic organizations just as the organizations are reaching outside their immediate environment.

The findings presented in Table 6 indicate that, in place of a unitary process of transnationalization, we can meaningfully identify distinctive variants of transnationalization. Patterned variation in the content of transnational ties means variation in the relationship *between* civic organizations and foreign actors. Does this variation imply differences in the relationships *among* domestic actors? That is, how are the varieties of transnationalization correlated with the forms of domestic integration? We turn to this question in the following section.

Patterns of emergent transnationalizing public arenas

By clustering the organizations according to the empirically-observed combinations of elements of transnationalization and cross-tabulating these with the forms of integration, we are able to identify key patterns at the intersection of the transnational and the domestic fields. Table 7 presents these cross-tabulations and demonstrates that the varieties of transnationalization are significantly related to the forms of domestic integration.

Combinations matter. As we see, some clusters (combinations of transnational interactions) go hand in hand with distinctive combinations of the forms of domestic integration. Some, for example, are significantly and positively correlated with cross-sectoral associativeness but not with participation and embeddedness; another correlates positively with participation and intra-sectoral embeddedness but not with associativeness; and one variety of transnationalization is significantly but negatively correlated with domestic embeddedness. Our findings about this latter, (“only communication”) variant suggest that analysts such as Keck and Sikkink (1998) were correct to be concerned that transnationalization could accompany domestic uprooting. But this cluster accounts for only 6.1 percent of all the organizations in our population; and the table as a whole suggests that we should not over generalize from this specific variety of transnationalization. The most disintegrated civic organizations are those with no transnational ties. Among the transnationalizing organizations, the shallow forms of transnationalization are the least integrated, four clusters are positively correlated with at least one form of integration, and the cluster characterized by the deepest, encompassing transnational collaboration is the cluster with an encompassing domestic integration.

Table 7.
Forms of domestic integration and varieties of transnationalization.

	Forms of domestic integration		
	Participation	Embeddedness	Associativeness
Varieties of transnationalization:			
1. No transnational tie	–	– –	– –
2. Only communication		–	
3. Donation			
4. Nominal partnership			+
5. Partnership without money			+
6. Partnership with money			+
7. Accountability relationship	+	+	+
8. Encompassing collaboration	+	+	+

Note: pluses and minuses represent adjusted standardized residual of the frequency of the given form of domestic integration. One plus means that the residual is greater than two, two plus indicates that the residual is greater than four. One minus, accordingly, indicates a residual of at least minus two, while two minuses indicate a residual less than minus four.

In interpreting Table 7 we should be cautious, as our language of “goes hand in hand with” suggests, not to read the direction of causation simply from the transnationalizing to the domestic dimension. We should certainly not jump to a conclusion that deep transnationalization has caused deep integration. Instead, it might be the case, for example, that organizations that have embedded ties to other organizations in the domestic civil sector are precisely those that are more likely to reach out to civic actors in the transnational field. But rather than reading Table 7 twice – first, down the rows implying causation from the transnational domain and, second, across the columns implying the reverse direction of causality – we are attentive to what the overall table reveals about distinctive patterns of civic life in Hungary. Restated, our intention is not to read the domestic and the transnational in terms of each other but to read both, in a sense, simultaneously in order to grasp the broad patterns produced at their various intersections. In concrete terms, we explore which types of combinations of forms of integration (e.g., participation + embeddedness) correlate with which types of empirically observed combinations of

transnational interactions (clusters) for the purpose of isolating the distinctive underlying grammars or logics that shape Hungary's public arenas.

With John Dewey and others, our interest is not in *the* public but in *publics* (emphatically plural) (Dewey, 1954; Emirbayer and Sheller 1998). A public assembly, a public arena, or simply "a public" is not some demographic group or otherwise categorical subset of "the public." It is composed not simply of persons but also of protocols – organizing principles and orientations (Girard and Stark 2006). It is relatively bounded, but less by geographic or other spatial features than by principles of inclusion and exclusion. In the civil sector it is within publics that the work of assembling takes place: assembling people, to be sure, but also assembling ideas, making links among (sometimes heterogeneous) programs, and linking programs to people.

As aspects of the underlying grammar of assemblage, we focus on organizing principles and orientations. In the Hungarian case, we observe one logic organized around the principle of accountability and another organized around the principle of partnership. Orientations of an intra-sectoral character focus on activities within the civic domain; inter-sectoral orientations reach across the civic and the non-civic fields. Four emergent types of transnationalizing public arenas are differentiated using these distinctions. In brief, the observed patterns are as follows: 1) Where accountability is the dominant organizing principle, we observe an intra-sectoral civic orientation. 2) Where partnership is the dominant organizing logic, we find an inter-sectoral orientation. 3) Where accountability and partnership combine as organizing principles, we observe orientations toward both civic and non-civic domains. 4) Absent these organizing principles, we find a foreign orientation without significant domestic integration. Table 8 presents our observations in summary form.

Table 8.
Transnational public arenas

		Partnership	
		Yes	No
Accountability	Yes	<p>DEVELOPMENTAL ASSOCIATIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizing principles: accountability and partnerships • Orientation: civic and non-civic domains • Domestic integration: Participatory, Embedded and Associative 	<p>INTRA-SECTORAL CIVIC GROUPS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizing principles: accountability • Orientation: civic domain • Domestic integration: Participatory and Embedded
	No	<p>INTER-SECTORAL PARTNERSHIPS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizing principles: partnership • Orientation: non-civic domain • Domestic integration: Associative 	<p>FOREIGN ORIENTED ORGANIZATIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizing principles: communication or donation • Orientation: foreign • Domestic integration: none

Intra-sectoral civic groups. The variety of transnationalization labeled “Accountability relationship” best represents our first ideal-typical public arena. Organizations of this type are highly likely to report to foreigners and to take foreigners into account and, at the same time, they are also highly likely to be participatory and embedded. That is, they are accountable in their foreign transactions as well as with their members and with other organizations in the civic sector. Unlikely to engage in any kinds of partnerships with foreign organizations, they are similarly unlikely to be involved in projects that bring together diverse kinds of organizations outside the civic sector on the domestic terrain. Their orientation is decidedly within the civic domain.

That these organizations are accountable to foreigners does not imply a hierarchical relationship. In the first place, they are accountable on all sides – not only to foreigners but to their members as well as to other civic organizations – positioned in a kind of multilateral, as opposed to vertical, accountability. Moreover, these organizations seldom receive financial support from foreign sources, nor are they likely to be the recipients of the transfer of know-how and other non-monetary

resources from their foreign counterparts. But why, then, do they take foreigners into account at all? The answer lies at the nexus of the foreign and domestic components. These organizations, with actively participating members, embedded in civic networks, are not engaging foreigners as supplicants but as allies in a common cause. Because they are compelled, by the logic of membership and embeddedness, to represent interests, and because they act in a transnationalizing world in which constraints and opportunities are increasingly shaped by non-domestic factors, in order to effectively represent local civic interests they are compelled to seek transnational allies. Entering the transnational arena, they encounter other non-domestic actors who, facing similar problems and opportunities, look to these participatory and embedded civic organizations as worthy allies. Although from time to time they might have a foreign “partner” with whom they engage in common action, they do not participate with their foreign counterparts in that NGO arena which is most projectified. Not in common projects, these transnationalized social movements act together as allies in a common cause.

Inter-sectoral partnerships. Organizations of the nominal partnership, partnership without money, and partnership with money varieties represent the second type of public arena – a mirrored opposite of the first. It is in this public arena that organizations that partner with non-civic organizations such as local governments, businesses, churches, and scientific and cultural institutions are also likely to partner with foreign actors. Organizations in these clusters engage with their transnational interlocutors as partners: they are significantly likely to name foreign organizations as partners, they list foreign organizations as collaborators in their ongoing or recent projects, and their high incidence of receiving non-monetary resources further indicates that they are actively participating in partnerships with their foreign counterparts. Despite this high level of direct foreign involvement, these organizations are not accountable to their foreign partners: they are less likely to report to foreigners or take them into account. And neither are they likely to be accountable to their members or to other organizations in the civic domain. As Table 7 indicates, the organizations in these varieties are not statistically likely to be participatory or embedded. These inter-sectoral partnerships are oriented to organizations outside the civic sector such as businesses, churches, and local governments with whom they work in projects.

Developmental associations. Both accountability and partnership tend to operate as organizing principles in the “Encompassing collaboration” variety; correspondingly, these organizations have a dual orientation, reaching out to both the civic and the non-civic domains. The most transnationalizing, these organizations are also the best positioned to do the most ambitious work of re-assembling ideas and interests in a public arena. When they are organizing diversity in the non-civic domain, they do so while embedded in networks to other civic organizations and with participatory ties to their members.⁷

⁷ The pattern we find here is similar to that identified by Randeria Shalini in her study of activists operating in supra-national arenas. Differentiating between “footloose experts” and “rooted cosmopolitans,” Shalini (2003) shows that the likelihood that diverse local interests will be represented by global activists in supra-national policy arenas depends on the existence of deep local roots. See also Petrova and Tarrow (2005).

Foreign-oriented organizations. Representing the fourth type of public arena we find the organizations of the second and third varieties. Neither accountable to their foreign interlocutors nor partnering with them, they are not likely to be domestically-integrated. In fact, as mentioned earlier, “Only communication” is negatively correlated with civic embeddedness. Organizations that merely communicate with or receive money from foreign sources, without being accountable to them or actively partnering with them, are not oriented to the domestic terrain. Unaccountable domestically, they cooperate neither within the civic domain nor with non-civic actors. Their outward orientation is to foreign organizations with whom they simply communicate or from whom they receive donations.

Conclusion: Rethinking Integration

In important contributions to the sociology of economic development Jennifer Bair and Gary Gereffi (2003, 2004) argue persuasively, on the basis of extensive field research in manufacturing cities in Mexico, that sustainable growth is more likely where the subsidiaries of foreign companies are embedded in network ties within the host economy, as locals and foreigners alike recognize that business networks can be viewed as a strategic resource. Taking these studies as their point of departure, Stark and Vedres (2005) conducted a longitudinal study of network formation and foreign direct investment in Hungary. They found that high levels of foreign investment can be compatible with inter-enterprise ownership networks in a developing economy, and they identified historical processes through which significant foreign investment is involved in cohesive network structures. Thus, whereas political economy has long been preoccupied with the question of how a national economy is integrated into the global economy, a new agenda for the field of economic development asks whether and how foreign investment is integrated into the local networks of host economies.

In this concluding section we re-examine our major findings in an effort to import this new agenda from the field of economic development into the field of the study of civil society. On the basis of our survey of 1002 civic associations in Hungary, we demonstrated that civic actors do not face a necessarily forced choice between networks of global reach and those of domestic integration. Many Hungarian civic organizations, in significant numbers, do engage in transnational interactions while simultaneously integrated with their membership base, other civic organizations, and/or other non-civic organizations. In fact, the richest and most encompassing patterns of integration go hand in hand with the deepest and most encompassing patterns of transnationalization. These and related findings indicate that it would be mistaken to assume that transnationalization is necessarily accompanied by the domestic uprooting of civic organizations, whether as cause or as consequence.

The new agenda in economic sociology suggests a further interpretation of our findings. Whereas the sociologists of economic development ask whether and how foreign direct investment is integrated into the local networks of the host economies, the findings of our current study can bear on the question of whether and how foreign direct involvement can be integrated into the local networks of the host civil society. Our findings in the Hungarian case suggest that deeply integrated organizations are

integrating the global and the local.⁸ These are truly developmental associations, developing their domestic public arena while contributing to the development of a global civic activism – not as agents of foreign NGOs but as interlocutors with them.

David Stark
Department of Sociology, Columbia University
and the Santa Fe Institute
dcs36@columbia.edu

Balazs Vedres
Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, Central European University
and the Santa Fe Institute
vedresb@ceu.hu

Laszlo Bruszt
Department of Social and Political Science , European University Institute
Laszlo.Bruszt@IUE.it

⁸ “In assimilative incorporation the qualities that define ‘foreign’ and ‘different’ do not change; rather, the persons who are members of foreign and different out-groups are, as it were, allowed to shed these qualities in their public lives. They can change from being ‘different’ and ‘foreigners’ to being ‘normal’ and ‘one of us’” (Alexander 2001: 244).

References

- Alexander, Jeffrey C. 2001. "Theorizing the "Modes of Incorporation": Assimilation, Hyphenation, and Multiculturalism as Varieties of Civil Participation." *Sociological Theory* 19:237-249.
- Bach, Jonathan and David Stark. 2002. "Innovative Ambiguities: NGOs use of Interactive Technology in Eastern Europe." *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 37(2):3-23.
- . 2004. "Link, Search, Interact: The Co-evolution of NGOs and Interactive Technologies" *Theory Culture and Society*, 21(3):101-117.
- Bair, Jennifer, and Gary Gereffi. 2003. "Upgrading, uneven development, and jobs in the North American apparel industry." *Global Networks* 3:143-169.
- Bob, Clifford. 2002. "Merchants of Morality." *Foreign Policy* March/April: 36-45.
- . 2005. *The Marketing of Rebellion: Insurgents, Media, and International Activism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruszt, Laszlo and David Stark. 2003. "Who Counts?: Supranational Norms and Societal Needs" *East European Politics and Societies* 17:74-82.
- Burawoy, Michael , Joseph A. Blum, Sheba George, Zsuzsa Gille, Teresa Gowan, Lynne Haney, Maren Klawiter, Steve H. Lopez, Seán Ó Riain, and Millie Thayer. 2000. *Global Ethnography Forces, Connections, and Imaginations in a Postmodern World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chilton, Patricia. 1995. "Mechanics of Change: Social Movements, Transnational Coalitions, and the Transformation Process in Eastern Europe." in *Bringing Transnational Relations Back In*, edited by T. Risse-Kappen. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cox, Robert W. 1999. "Civil Society at the Turn of the Millenium: Prospects for an Alternative World Order." *Review of International Studies* 25:3-28.
- Curtis, James E., Edward G. Grabb, and Douglas E. Baer. 1992. "Voluntary Association Membership in Fifteen Countries: A Comparative Analysis." *American Sociological Review* 57:139-52.
- Diani, Mario. 2001. "Social Movement Networks." *Culture and Politics in the Information Age: A New Politics?*, editor Frank Webster. London and New York: Routledge.
- della Porta, Donatella, Hanspeter Kriesi and Dieter Rucht. 1999. *Social Movements in a Globalizing World*.
- della Porta, Donatella and Sidney G. Tarrow, 2005. *Transnational Protest and Global Activism*. Rowman & Littlefield.

- Dewey, John. 1954. *The public and its problems* Chicago, Swallow Press.
- Ekiert, Grzegorz. 1991. "Democratization Processes in East Central Europe: A Theoretical Reconsideration." *British Journal of Political Science* 21(3):285-313.
- Emirbayer, Mustafa and Mimi Sheller. 1998. "Publics in History" *Theory and Society* 27:727-779.
- Evans, Peter (ed.). 1997. *State-society synergy : government and social capital in development*. University of California at Berkeley, International and Area Studies.
- . 2000. "Fighting Marginalization with Transnational Networks: Counter-Hegemonic Mobilization." *Contemporary Sociology* 29(1):230-41.
- Frentzel-Zagorska, Janina. 1990. "Civil Society in Poland and Hungary." *Soviet Studies* 42:759-777.
- Gereffi, Gary. 2004. "The Global Economy: Organization, Governance, and Development." Pp. xxx-xx in *Handbook of Economic Sociology*, edited by Neil Smelser and Richard Swedberg. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Gereffi, Gary, and Stephanie Fonda. 1992. "Regional Paths to Development." *Annual Review of Sociology* 18:419-448.
- Girard, Monique and David Stark. forthcoming. "Socio-technical Assemblies: Sense-making and Demonstration in Rebuilding Lower Manhattan." In Viktor Mayer-Schoenberger and David Laser, eds., *E-Government: New Technologies for Democracy*. Oxford University Press.
- Green, Andrew T. 2002. "Comparative Development of Post-Communist Civil Societies." *Europe-Asia Studies* 54(3):455-71.
- Greskovits, Bela. 2002. "Sectors, States and Post Socialist Development Paths." Budapest: Central European University, manuscript.
- Greskovits, Bela and Dorothy Bohle. 2001. "Development Paths on Europe's Periphery: Hungary's and Poland's Return to Europe Compared" *Polish Sociological Review* 1:3-28.
- Hanley, Sean. 1999. "Civil Society: An Idea Whose Time Has Gone?" *Central European Review* (No. 21: 1999)
- Hicks, Barbara and JoAnn Carmin. 2000. "Finding the Social in Movements: International Triggering Events, Transnational Networks and Environmentalism in Postcommunist Central Europe" paper presented at the International Society for Third Sector Research Fourth International Conference, Dublin, Ireland manuscript.

- Howard, Marc Morjé. 2003. *The Weakness of Civil Society in Post-Communist Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Howell, Jude and Jenny Pearce. 2002. *Civil Society and Development – A Critical Exploration*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Huber, Evelyne, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and John D. Stephens. 1997. "The Paradoxes of Contemporary Democracy." *Comparative Politics* 29(3):323-42.
- Illner, Michal. 1998. "Local Democratization in the Czech Republic After 1989." *Participation and Democracy: East and West*, editors Dietrich Rueschemeyer, Marilyn Rueschemeyer, and Björn Wittrock. New York: M. E. Sharpe.
- Kennedy, Michael D. 1992. "The Intelligentsia in the Constitution of Civil Societies and Post-Communist Regimes in Hungary and Poland." *Theory and Society* 21(1):29-76.
- Kumar, Krishan. 1993. "Civil Society: an Inquiry into the Usefulness of an Historical Term." *British Journal of Sociology* 44(3):375-95.
- Keck, Margaret and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists beyond borders: advocacy networks in international politics*. Ithaca, N.Y : Cornell University Press.
- Kocka, Jurgen. 2004. "Civil Society from historical perspective" *European Review* 12:65-79.
- Letki, Natalia. 2003. "Explaining Political Participation in East-Central Europe: The Role of Social Capital." *Studies in Public Policy*, number 381. Glasgow: University of Strathclyde.
- Mason, David S. 1989. "Solidarity As a New Social Movement." *Political Science Quarterly* 104(1):41-58.
- McDonough, Peter, Doh C. Shin, and Jose A. Moises. 1998. "Democratization and Participation: Comparing Spain, Brazil, and Korea." *The Journal of Politics* 60 (4):919-53.
- Mendelson, Sarah E. and John K. Glenn. eds. 2002. *The Power and Limits of NGOs: A Critical Look at Building Democracy in Eastern Europe and Eurasia*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Miller, Arthur H., Vicki L. Heisli, and William M. Reisinger. 1997. "Conceptions of Democracy Among Mass and Elite in Post-Soviet States." *British Journal of Political Science* 27(2):157-90.
- Miszlivetz, Ferenc and Jody Jensen. 1998. "An Emerging Paradox: Civil Society From Above?" *Participation and Democracy: East and West*, editors Dietrich Rueschemeyer, Marilyn Rueschemeyer, and Björn Wittrock. New York: M. E. Sharpe.

- Nelson, Daniel N. 1996. "Civil Society Endangered." *Social Research* 63(2):345-68.
- O'Riain, Sean. 2000. "The Flexible Developmental State: Globalization, Information Technology, and the 'Celtic Tiger,'" *Politics and Society* 28 (2):157-193.
- Ost, David. 2005. *The Defeat of Solidarity: Anger and Politics in Postcommunist Europe*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Palma, Giuseppe D. 1991. "Legitimation From the Top to Civil Society." *World Politics* 44:49-80.
- Paxton, Pamela. 2002. "Social Capital and Democracy: An Independent Relationship." *American Sociological Review* 67:254-77.
- Petrova, Tsveta and Sidney Tarrow. 2005. "Transactional and Participatory Activism: Domestic and Transnational Mobilization in the Emerging European Polity." Capstone Conference of the Cornell/CEU Mellon-Sawyer Group on a Transnational and Transcultural Europe. Budapest, June.
- Putnam, Robert. 2002. *Democracies in flux : the evolution of social capital in contemporary society* Oxford ; New York : Oxford University Press.
- . 1993. *Making democracy work : civic traditions in modern Italy* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- . 2000. *Bowling Alone: the Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Touchstone.
- Reisinger, William M., Arthur H. Miller, and Vicki L. Heisli. 1995. "Public Behavior and Political Change in Post-Soviet States." *The Journal of Politics* 57(4):941-70.
- Rueschemeyer, Dietrich. 1998. "The Self-Organization of Society and Democratic Rule: Specifying the Relationship." *Participation and Democracy: East and West*, editors Dietrich Rueschemeyer, Marilyn Rueschemeyer, and Björn Wittrock. New York: M. E. Sharpe.
- Rueschemeyer, Dietrich, Marilyn Rueschemeyer, and Björn Wittrock. 1998. "Conclusion: Contrasting Patterns of Participation and Democracy." *Participation and Democracy: East and West*, editors Dietrich Rueschemeyer, Marilyn Rueschemeyer, and Björn Wittrock. New York: M. E. Sharpe.
- Sabel, Charles. 1996. *Ireland: Local Partnerships and Social Innovation*. OECD Publications.
- . 1994. "Learning by Monitoring: The Institutions of Economic Development." Pp. 137-165 in Neil Smelser and Richard Swedberg, editors, *Handbook of Economic Sociology* Princeton: Princeton University Press and Russell Sage Foundation.
- . 1993. "Studied Trust : Building New Forms of Cooperation in a

- Volatile Economy,” *Human Relations*, 46 (9).
- Shalini, Randeria. 2003. “Footloose Experts vs. Rooted Cosmopolitans: Biodiversity Conservation, Transnationalisation of Law and Conflict among Civil Society Actors in India” in: *Tsantsa 2003*.
- Skocpol, Theda, 1999. “Advocates without members: The recent transformation of American civil life.” Pp. 461-509 in Theda Skocpol and Fiorina P. Morris. eds. 1999. *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- . 2003. *Diminished Democracy: From Membership to Management in American Civic Life*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Jackie. 2004. “Exploring Connections Between Global Integration and Political Mobilization.” *Journal of World Systems Research* 2004:255-85.
- Smith, Jackie. 2004. “Exploring Connections Between Global Integration and Political Mobilization.” *Journal of World Systems Research* 2004: 255-285.
- . 2005. “Globalization and Transnational Social Movement Organizations.” Pp. 226-248 in Gerald Davis, Doug McAdam, W. Richard Scott, and Mayer N. Zald, eds., *Social Movements and Organization Theory*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stallings, Barbara. 1990. “The Role of Foreign Capital in Economic Development.” In *Manufacturing Miracles: Paths of Industrialization in Latin America and East Asia* edited by Gary Gereffi and Donald Wyman. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press pp. 55-89.
- Stark, David and Bruszt Laszlo. 1998. *Postsocialist pathways: transforming politics and property in East Central Europe* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stark, David and Balazs Vedres. forthcoming. “Social Times of Network Spaces: Network Sequences and Foreign Investment in Hungary.” *American Journal of Sociology*, March 2006, vol 111, no 5.
- Streeck, Wolfgang. 1995. “Neo-Voluntarism: A New European Social Policy Regime?” *European Law Journal* 1(1):.
- Streeck, Wolfgang and Philippe C. Schmitter. 1985. “Community, market, state - and associations? The prospective contribution of interest governance to social order” in Streeck and Schmitter editors. *Private Interest Government. Beyond Market and State*, Sage Publications.
- Szalai, Júlia. 2002. "From Opposition in Private to Engagement in Public: Motives for Citizen Participation in The Post-1989 New Democracies of Central Europe ." *Social Research* 69(1):71-82.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in movement: social movements and contentious politics* New York : Cambridge University Press.

- . 2001. "Transnational Politics: Contention and Institutions in International Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 4:1-20.
- . 2005. *The New Transnational Activism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tismaneanu, Vladimir. 2001. "Civil Society, Pluralism, and The Future of East and Central Europe." *Social Research* 68(4):977-91.
- Vedres, Balazs, Laszlo Bruszt and David Stark. 2004. "Organizing Technologies: Genre Forms of Online Civic Association in Eastern Europe." Pp. 171-188 in Eric Kleinenberg ed., *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*.
- Ward, Joe H. Jr. 1963. "Hierarchical Grouping to Optimize an Objective Function." 58:236-44.
- Weigle, Marcia A. and Jim Butterfield. 1992. "Civil Society in Reforming Communist Regimes: The Logic of Emergence." *Comparative Politics* 25(1):1-23.
- Wiest, Dawn, Jackie Smith, and Ivana Eterovic. 2002. "Uneven Globalization? Understanding Variable Participation in Transnational Social Movement Organizations." Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association, Chicago.

Appendix A. Transnationalization Variables

Variable	Survey question	Coding	Frequency
The foreign organization is:			
Communicated with	How often does your organization communicate with foreign non-profit organizations or international organizations (such as EU, UN, World Bank)?	1 if often or always, otherwise 0	29.8%
Providing money	Did your organization apply with success for funding directly at foreign foundations or other foreign non-profit organization over the last five years?	1 if yes, otherwise 0	28.3%
A named partner	Did other organizations also participate in this project?	1 if foreign non-profit or international organization, otherwise 0	33.0%
Directly involved	Which of the following activities were done in this project? Which were those, that were done by a foreign non-profit or civil society organization? Or in which such organizations participated?	1 if there were any foreign organizations that directly participated in actions, 0 otherwise	23.4%
Providing non-money resources	Which of the resources on this card were used in this project? Which were the resources that were supplied (partly or fully) by a foreign organization?	1 if there were any resources excluding money supplied by a foreign organization, 0 otherwise	25.9%
Reported to	For which of the following do you have to make formal reporting?	1 if foreign non-profit or international organization, otherwise 0	15.4%
Taken into account	When your organization makes decisions, whose opinion of the following you need to take into account?	1 if foreign non-profit or international organization, otherwise 0	11.0%

Appendix B. Domestic Integration Variables

Variable	Survey question	Coding	Frequency
Domestic integration			
Participation	When your organization makes decisions, whose opinion of the following you need to take into account? For which of the following do you have to make formal reporting?	1 if volunteers, activists, members, or participants are taken into account or reported to, 0 otherwise	57.4%
Embeddedness	When your organization makes decisions, whose opinion of the following you need to take into account? For which of the following do you have to make formal reporting?	1 if other domestic non-profit organizations are taken into account or reported to, 0 otherwise	24.8%
Associativeness	Did other organizations also participate in this project?	1 if there were at least two kinds of partners (excluding foreign or non-profit categories) involved in at least one of the projects of the organization, 0 otherwise	56.7%
Budapest headquarters	Location of the headquarters in official registry	1 if Budapest, 0 otherwise	57.2%
Budget	What was the budget of you organization in the last fiscal year in local currency (in thousands)?		mean = 55,110 HUF
Sector	Which of the following categories describe best your main activity?		
Art, culture, science		1 if this sector, 0 otherwise	18.4%
Religion		1 if this sector, 0 otherwise	7.2%
Health, social services		1 if this sector, 0 otherwise	24.1%
Environment, human rights		1 if this sector, 0 otherwise	5.5%
Development		1 if this sector, 0 otherwise	7.2%
Business, professional		1 if this sector, 0 otherwise	21.2%
Trade union		1 if this sector, 0 otherwise	8.8%

Appendix C.

Table 9.
Logistic regression prediction of participation

Independent variables	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Any transnational tie	.563	.152	13.675	1	.000	1.756
Budapest	-.380	.160	5.627	1	.018	.684
Budget above median	-.042	.151	.079	1	.779	.958
Sector overall			108.667	7	.000	
Sector 1: art, culture, science	-.409	.283	2.091	1	.148	.664
Sector 2: religion	-.484	.347	1.947	1	.163	.616
Sector 3: health, social services	-.389	.274	2.015	1	.156	.678
Sector 4: environment, human rights	-.445	.366	1.480	1	.224	.641
Sector 5: development	-.478	.369	1.674	1	.196	.620
Sector 6: business, professional	1.610	.318	25.632	1	.000	5.004
Sector 7: trade unions	2.017	.445	20.557	1	.000	7.512
Constant	.112	.279	.161	1	.688	1.119

Table 10.
Logistic regression prediction of inter-organizational integration

Independent variables	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Any transnational tie	.988	.174	32.165	1	.000	2.687
Budapest	-.600	.174	11.963	1	.001	.549
Budget above median	.194	.165	1.388	1	.239	1.215
Sector overall			18.651	7	.009	
Sector 1: art, culture, science	.674	.397	2.892	1	.089	1.963
Sector 2: religion	.424	.484	.769	1	.380	1.529
Sector 3: health, social services	1.131	.377	8.993	1	.003	3.099
Sector 4: environment, human rights	.896	.460	3.803	1	.051	2.450
Sector 5: development	.514	.489	1.105	1	.293	1.672
Sector 6: business, professional	1.080	.383	7.958	1	.005	2.945
Sector 7: trade unions	.148	.488	.092	1	.762	1.159
Constant	-2.255	.385	34.277	1	.000	.105

Table 11.
Logistic regression prediction of diverse association in projects

Independent variables	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Any transnational tie	1.106	.146	57.017	1	.000	3.023
Budapest	-.051	.154	.108	1	.742	.950
Budget above median	.486	.146	11.075	1	.001	1.625
Sector overall			17.276	7	.016	
Sector 1: art, culture, science	-.363	.297	1.494	1	.222	.696
Sector 2: religion	.352	.366	.927	1	.336	1.422
Sector 3: health, social services	-.248	.289	.738	1	.390	.780
Sector 4: environment, human rights	.835	.441	3.589	1	.058	2.305
Sector 5: development	.149	.387	.147	1	.701	1.160
Sector 6: business, professional	-.308	.296	1.084	1	.298	.735
Sector 7: trade unions	-.497	.351	2.004	1	.157	.609
Constant	-.337	.285	1.393	1	.238	.714