



King's Research Portal

DOI:

[10.1111/jcc4.12194](https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12194)

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Theoharis, Y., Vitoratou, S., & Sajuria, J. (2017). Civil Society in Times of Crisis: Understanding Collective Action Dynamics in Digitally-Enabled Volunteer Networks. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 22(5), 248–265. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12194>

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Civil Society in Times of Crisis: Understanding Collective Action Dynamics in Digitally-Enabled Volunteer Networks

Yannis Theocharis

Mannheim Centre for European Social Research (MZES), University of Mannheim. A5, 6 (Building A), Room A213, 68159, Mannheim, Germany

Silia Vitoratou

Department of Biostatistics & Health Informatics, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neurosciences, IoPPN, King's College London, Room S2.10, SE5 8AF, London, United Kingdom

Javier Sajuria

School of Geography, Politics, and Sociology, Newcastle University, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE1 7RU, United Kingdom

Social media play an important role in political mobilization. Voluntary engagement can especially benefit from new opportunities for organizing collective action. Although research has explored the use of Twitter by decentralized individuals for this, there has been little emphasis on its use for community engagement and the provision of public goods. Even less is known about its role in the emergence and offline expansion of spontaneous self-organized solidarity initiatives. This paper investigates how networked communication facilitates self-organization and the development of ties in a network of volunteers in Greece. To examine whether initiative-specific community feelings that can transcend online-offline divides evolve in such hybrid networks, the analysis is complemented with individual-level data drawn from a survey with the initiative's volunteers.

Keywords: Social Media, Twitter, Civic Engagement, Volunteerism, Civil Society, Social Networks.

doi:10.1111/jcc4.12194

In the last 2 decades, scholars and campaign specialists have been intrigued by the shifts in the nature of organizing collective action, and of organizations themselves (Miles & Snow, 1986; Nohria & Berkeley, 1994; Powell, 1990). Such developments have been interpreted as marking an oftentimes radical departure from bureaucratic organizations with formal, centralized leadership, specific roles, and the strategic deployment of resources, to more networked structures with fewer constraints and rules of action, and

Editorial Record: First manuscript received on February 25, 2016. Revisions received on October 7, 2016, January 31, 2017 and April 19, 2017. Accepted by Noshir Contractor on July 6, 2017. Final manuscript received on July 12, 2017. First published online on September 5, 2017.

an emphasis on self-organization (Powell, 1990). More recently, interest in these changes has been compounded by the rapid advance of information and communication technologies (ICTs) and the changes in the organization of information production in the early 2000s (Benkler, 2006; Lupia & Sin, 2003). Theoretical illustrations of these changes have taken into consideration the entire spectrum of organizational change (Bennett & Segerberg, 2013; Bimber, Flanagin, & Stohl, 2012; Chadwick, 2007; Karpf, 2012), and conceptualizations have been proposed with regards to the impact of technology on political action repertoires (Van Laer & Van Aelst, 2010; Flanagin, Stohl, & Bimber, 2006).

The crux of these recent, and more sophisticated in terms of theorizing the complexity of organizing forms, accounts, is that technology has affected processes of collective action organization in ways that are often more complex than the transition from bureaucratic to flexible organizational structures. In particular, the impact of social media platforms with diverse affordances has created interesting empirical questions about the ways in which these tools enable individuals not only to organize, but also to create complex, polymorphous, and multidimensional organizations. Although the nature of such organizations is hard to place in the broader collective action space, they play an increasingly prominent role in societies.

Whilst recent mobilizations have provided scholars with ample material for empirically studying the dynamics of digitally-boosted and digitally-enabled protest action organization (Barberá et al., 2015; Bastos, Mercea, & Charpentier, 2015; Conover, Ferrara, Menczer, & Flammini, 2013; González-Bailón, Borge-Holthoefer, Rivero, & Moreno, 2011; Theocharis, Lowe, van Deth, & García Albacete, 2015), research has mostly overlooked mobilization in civil society. Specifically, little attention has been given to the role digital media can play in enabling people to engage voluntarily in community problem-solving (Wells 2014, 616) for the provision of public goods or services in cases of state withdrawal, or non-responsive state institutions. Voluntary engagement characterized by a reliance on social media and cooperative action through non-market and non-institutional mechanisms, became particularly prominent in several parts of Europe since the onset of the financial crisis. Although the crucial societal role of such initiatives has often attracted the attention of mainstream media (Henley, 2012), no studies have empirically illustrated how digital communication, as a driving force of collective action organization, allows solidarity initiatives to organize and transition within the broader collective action space, and how they compare to existing paradigms in the digital protest literature.

The present study investigates how digital media impact collective action dynamics. It uses as an example the pioneering solidarity initiative #tutorpool, which arose in Greece during one of the most turbulent periods in its modern history. In doing so, the study tackles two main questions: How do digital media provide individuals with opportunities to organize and coordinate collective action for the provision of public goods in times of non-responsive state institutions? How does the organizational configuration of such initiatives change depending on the opportunities and constraints they encounter, and what consequences does this have for their members? Advancing empirical studies that focus either only on the structural (González-Bailón & Wang, 2015) or only on the individual level (Penney & Dadas, 2014), this study provides insights related to both the network's communication logic *and* its participants' experiences (for similar approaches see Mercea & Bastos, 2016). Our endeavour offers one of the first contributions on how individuals can self-organize actions that sustain long-term public service under conditions of financial strain, collapsing institutions and public provisions.

Background: The Economic Crisis in Greece and the State of Civil Society

In 2010, the Greek government's decision to enter what was going to be the first of many economic adjustment programmes, committed the country to tough austerity measures. These led to a record rise in unemployment, a radical increase in poverty and homelessness levels, and a dramatic rise in suicide rates

leading, as a consequence, to intense political turbulence, mass protests, and civil disobedience. While the organization of protest is a routine characteristic of political life in Greece, community involvement and voluntary engagement rank among the lowest in Europe (Sotiropoulos, 2015). The intensification of the crisis, however, led to the gradual change of this picture. Countless informal self-organized initiatives and self-help groups spawned since 2010 seeking to help those mostly affected (Sotiropoulos, 2015, p. 3). Although new media played an important role in protest mobilizations at the time (Theocharis, 2016), the way in which these tools enabled citizens to organize solidarity and boost volunteerism remains unexplored.

The Creation of #tutorpool

#tutorpool is but one of the many solidarity initiatives that emerged in Greece since the beginning of the financial crisis. According to its creators (Henley 2012), #tutorpool began on Twitter without previous organization in December 2011. It started with a tweet pointing out that many Greek families could no longer afford to pay the tuition fees of their children's after-school tutorials, due to the belt-tightening that came along with the austerity policies¹. The user prompted her followers with education degrees to offer free courses to students of vulnerable families and seek others in their neighbourhoods willing to do the same. The hashtag #tutorpool emerged from the discussion and in less than 24 hours it was trending first in the Greek twittersphere. With more and more volunteers declaring support and availability through the hashtag or personal messages, the user who sent the first tweet voiced the idea for creating a structured initiative and sought further tools for its implementation. She created and tweeted e-mail accounts, and asked those interested to teach, or in helping her coordinate potential volunteers, to send e-mails. The response for both was overwhelming and after 3 days a small group of users, to which we will refer as the core organizational team, met offline and decided to put the idea into action. The group agreed on a clearly defined code of conduct that prohibited any kind of financial profit or the promotion of views related to political parties. The core team's role became to implement the idea, manage the technical aspects, and facilitate the meeting between tutors and families.

The core team used several online tools: (a) a Twitter account (@tutorpool), for announcing calls for volunteers; (b) a Facebook page; and (c) the website (www.tutorpool.gr) where parents and tutors registered in order to book courses. Interested teachers registered declaring the topic and the day/time of availability, and could mark on a map the area where they were willing to travel for teaching (see section 5 in supplementary material). All these details could be accessed from the registered families, who saw whether there was a tutor in their area offering the topic of their interest. If so, the parents activated an automated e-mail to the tutors and their communication began without any other involvement from the rest of the #tutorpool members. It is only at that point that both parts (child and its family/tutors) revealed their full identities to one another. Both parents and teachers took full responsibility for this transaction in the best interest of the student, after accepting the terms and conditions of the initiative. This structure was formulated in order to protect both sides and, most importantly, to promote and ensure the self-organizing nature of the initiative for the years to come. About a month later, the website launched and the group's activities were in full swing. In the 3 years that followed, more than 1500 tutors participated in #tutorpool, offline in neighbourhoods, or via Skype performing valuable public service and inspiring, in the process, similar – even state-supported – initiatives.

In all, one can identify three classes of #tutorpool members and supporters, the first two of which included members of the core organizational team who undertook the practical and technical necessities for the realization and maintenance of the initiative: (a) **online-offline volunteers-tutors**: those who helped in the initiative's organization and supported it online and who *also* taught offline; (b) **online-only**

volunteers: a group of online users who helped spread the calls for volunteers via Twitter, and supported and spread the idea and the news of #tutorpool but *did not* teach offline, (c) **offline-only tutors:** those who learned about the initiative through word of mouth, email, or through conventional media and registered on the website as volunteers, but whose *sole* engagement with the initiative was teaching offline.

#tutorpool's embedded innovative recruitment practices, combined organizational logics that stretched from highly crowd-enabled to institutionalized ones, and required participants with different skills who would be willing to play very diverse roles, some of which implied an unequal expenditure – but also enjoyment – of personal and community resources. Its success cannot be understood only through the examination of how the effective use of digital tools lowered participation and organization costs. The crucial empirical question is how communication patterns enabled its organizational structure to shape-shift so quickly and so radically within the map of collective action and how this affected its members' experiences.

Collective Action Theory and #tutorpool's Evolution

Social media have been thought to have a transformative effect on the organization of collective action (Bennett & Segerberg, 2013; Earl & Kimport, 2011). At the crux of these theoretical accounts is the “conception of collective action as communicative in nature ... insofar as it entails efforts by people to cross boundaries by expressing or acting on an individual (i.e. private) interest in a way that is observable to others (i.e. public)” (Flanagin et al., 2006, p. 32). The beginning of #tutorpool, whereby the initiative's idea and hashtag emerged in the middle of a conversation and subsequently led to several people trying to figure out on Twitter how to organize a solidarity initiative, is a textbook example of the idea of communication as collective action organization (Flanagin et al., 2006; Bennett & Segerberg, 2013). Perhaps the most interesting development of the influence of ICTs on collective action has been the melding of old (vertical) with new (horizontal) forms of collective action that lead to collective actions with highly differentiated modes of involvement by its participants. According to Flanagin et al. (2006), collective actions can be thought of, and arrayed orthogonally, as exhibiting variation along two independent and fundamentally communication-based dimensions: (a) the mode of *interaction* used (ranging from personal to impersonal) and (b) the mode of engagement felt among participants in these efforts (ranging from entrepreneurial to institutional).

The stages of #tutorpool's evolution are sufficiently clear theoretically, but network dynamics are complex processes that raise interesting empirical questions about communicative interactions. Although there are different ways to think about collective action, Flanagin et al.' (2006) framework (adapted in Figure 1) is a theoretically fertile way to account for its communicative aspect. By viewing groups in terms of interaction and engagement, it places the emphasis on the ways in which members enact personal relations and various activities or, in other words, on what people do and how they communicate, and not solely on organizational structures (Bimber et al., 2012, p. 96). As such, in the case of #tutorpool, the different quadrants enable us to observe in practice several components of the initiative's organizational dynamics: how the various ways in which volunteers with very different roles, responsibilities, and involvement with the initiative interacted (or not) with one another; how these different modes of engagement generated organizational hybridity; and what are the consequences of these different levels of engagement and interaction for the initiative more broadly. #tutorpool's membership structure exhibited a very diverse repertoire of actors, which, as we discuss later, could fulfil very different engagement patterns and preferences: from very ephemeral, low-cost, and low-responsibility, to deeply committed, high-cost, and with multiple and critical responsibilities. This exemplifies what many in the literature have highlighted as a core point of departure for understanding collective action, i.e. that citizens seek more flexible association with causes, ideas, and political organizations, and are




Figure 1 #tutorpool's transition on the collective action space (Figure adapted from Flanagin et al. 2006, p. 34). *Note:* The arrows reflect the initiative's temporal order in its movement across the collective action map. *Acronyms:* ONOV = Online-only volunteers; ON/OFV/T = Online-offline volunteer-tutors; OFOT = Offline-only tutors.

keen on adopting personal action frames. Consequently, a key characteristic of collective action in the contemporary environment is that form is more flexible and can be adapted to fit context (Bennett & Segerberg, 2013; Chadwick, 2007; Flanagin et al., 2006), as well as individual needs.

These considerations about the (very) different modes of engagement and interaction on the part of an organization's members, raise an important question about the practical consequences for the organization itself: What does an organization like #tutorpool *mean* to its members, and do different ways of associating with the organization have consequences for its structure and future prospects? As Bennett and Segerberg note (2013, p. 13), in connective action organizations and groups have various degrees of internal cohesion as members are increasingly likely to pursue a personal path to engagement. This results in different engagement experiences and, as we will show in the case of #tutorpool, different levels – and recipients – of commitment. In what follows we discuss three distinct phases in the evolution of #tutorpool, and generate specific hypotheses that allow us to empirically illustrate how communication shaped its organization, and what were the consequences for its different members.

Phase 1: Emergence through Connective Action

#tutorpool emerged in the midst of a conversation and it is plausible that, after repeated interaction with one another, the members involved in this initial discussion developed interpersonal relations and potentially strong ties. As such the engagement with the initiative experienced by this class of members involved diverse opportunities for participation, and was accompanied by different levels of

responsibility and contribution. These are all entrepreneurial elements which locate #tutorpool's emergence in quadrant II of the collective action space (Figure 1). More substantially, it was Twitter's technological affordances that enabled these individuals to meet online in the first place, helping them form a core group of interested volunteers. It is hard to imagine how a group of decentralized individuals with such a diverse skillset and willingness to volunteer could have come together so fast, and with so few coordination costs could shape the idea for a highly complex initiative (and succeed in making it work in a single month). From an empirical point of view, the Twitter exchanges that allowed this entrepreneurial mode of engagement to flourish, should be reflected in the communication structure around #tutorpool. We propose **(P1)** that the #tutorpool network's communication structure had initially a highly dense structure, pointing towards the development of strong communicative ties between core members.

Phase 2: Institutionalization and Recruitment

The core team took immediate steps towards a more institutionalized and rationalized structure, a not inevitable but hardly surprising development (Aldrich, 1979). Building a website in which potential tutors could register, creating a database of volunteers and families in different locations and, most importantly, creating a strict code of conduct that is publicly available, marks a transition toward the kind of institutional mode of action that is characteristic of quadrant III (Figure 1). It is a kind of collective action that involves a set of normative rules of engagement prescribed by an official leadership team, as well as practices that have to be followed (Flanagin et al., 2006, p. 37), and points towards the establishment of a more closed group that sets the rules of the game (see also Shaw & Hill, 2014).

Once the recruitment structures were ready to accommodate volunteers, establishing communication patterns that could push the call for volunteers as far across users' networks as possible became the initiative's top priority. Hundreds of messages were posted on Twitter and were subsequently retweeted. This aspect of online recruitment implies that, from an organizational point of view, along with retaining its institutional seat in quadrant III, #tutorpool also occupied a place within the two entrepreneurial quadrants (I and II). Anyone who heard about the initiative on Twitter or any online-only volunteer with an interest in it, unconstrained by any organizational boundaries and completely unknown to the organizing team, could help get its call for volunteers across the network by retweeting @tutorpool's calls for volunteers. Extant research has indeed stressed the importance of the casual, small-time (Earl & Kimport, 2011) engagement of individuals who represent the diminishing online activity around committed minorities within the network, in increasing the reach of tweeted material (Barberá et al., 2015). From an empirical point of view this should be reflected in the communication around #tutorpool: **(H1)** #tutorpool's communication network will, across time, display higher levels of bridging structures, pointing towards an attitude of reaching outside the more closed core group, and establishing bridging ties. We can also hypothesize that the empirical reality will also reflect that only a small group of highly engaged with the initiative accounts will have the monopoly in crafting and distributing calls for volunteers on Twitter. This implies that these users would be highly active as producers and recipients of information, as well as information brokers that have greater capacity to bridge structural holes (than the average retweeter) which could hamper information diffusion (González-Bailón & Wang, 2015, p. 102). We hypothesize that **(H2)** a core group of core user-organizers played a pivotal role in producing, receiving and brokering information across time.

Phase 3: Public Service and Community Building

The last (ongoing) phase of the initiative saw #tutorpool volunteers begin to teach children everywhere in Greece, offering invaluable public service. Notably, however, an important subset of the initiative's volunteer base -- the offline-only tutors -- remain largely unknown to each other in spite of their

shared affiliation as tutors. This reflects a type of engagement that locates their action in quadrant IV (institutional/impersonal) (Figure 1). These volunteers retain *only* impersonal contact with the core team and the whole initiative in general, via e-mail or the website. This leaves them with very few opportunities for developing strong ties with other members and, as a consequence, a weaker sentiment towards the initiative.

This important aspect of #tutorpool's organizational structure implies that its transition (as depicted in Figure 1) across and within quadrants in which different classes of members experience different modes of engagement and interaction, should have consequences for the way different classes of participants experience their engagement with the initiative. The level of attachment to what can be thought of as "the #tutorpool community" can help us observe these variations. For example, those online-only volunteers and online-offline volunteers-tutors of quadrants II and III should, due to more frequent online interaction with each other, be more likely to develop a stronger sentiment of attachment to the initiative than that of the offline-only tutors (quadrant IV), who only experience very weak or no ties. Is that plausible?

Literature has shown that the online realm can be a fertile place for further developing existing social ties and establishing new, community ties (Ellison, Steinfield, & Lampe, 2007; Gruz, Wellman, & Takhteyev, 2011). This leaves open the possibility that typical features of community such as a sense of membership, a feeling of integration and a shared emotional connection (McMillan & Chavis, 1986) could be developed among participants. All these features are very valuable bonding resources as they may contribute to loyalty and long-term commitment to a group's cause -- an aspect that some have argued comes in short supply in technology-enabled movements (Gladwell, 2010). An individual's position in the #tutorpool network may, therefore, *define* her attachment to the initiative, and the consequences this relationship may have for the initiative more broadly. In his discussion of participatory civics, Zuckerman (2014, p. 162), building on Hirschmann's *Exit, Voice and Loyalty*, stresses how loyalty to an organization can provide the basis for its long-term survival, especially in difficult times when members are disappointed with it (Hirschmann even argues that individuals can raise their voice and persuade the organization to change its path). Sense of attachment to organizations with very flexible organizational structures, like #tutorpool, may thus turn out to be an extremely important aspect that safeguards its existence, but which may not be equally distributed among its multilayered membership base. It is plausible that, due to different engagement experiences, attachment to the initiative was a resource from which participants who remained unknown to one another (the offline-only tutors) were deprived from. In hypothesis form, (H3) offline-only tutors should display significantly lower levels of community attachment to #tutorpool when compared to the rest of the initiative's participants.

Data & Methodology

Network Data and Metrics

Testing the three hypotheses put forward above, and illustrating the proposition, requires two sources of data: (a) data at the network level that enable us to study the communicative structure of collective action, and (b) data at the individual level that can provide information about the experiences of different classes of #tutorpool participants. In order to examine #tutorpool's communication network as it went through different phases, we use Twitter data from December 2011: from day one of its appearance on Twitter, and for the next 6 months. The data ($N = 4,760$ tweets) were collected using Twitter's public API using the term "#tutorpool." We took every tweet that contained this hashtag, and filtered out those that did not contain a mention, a "RT" or a "via" (i.e. @) to another user. With the remaining tweets we created an edge list of senders and receivers, and constructed monthly networks. All the tweets from a given month




Figure 2 (left): Evolution of the #tutorpool network from the beginning of the initiative in December 2011.

represent a static network with a set number of vertices and edges. Figure 2 shows the distribution of edges and vertices for each month, with a specification of the different phases of the network.

To answer the hypotheses focused on the network level (H1- H2) we need different types of information. First, to detect how fragmented the #tutorpool network was, we searched for the connected components (see also below for modularity measures). Second, for measuring not only the most important brokers in the network, but also their role in spreading information, we use *betweenness centrality*, which considers the overall network structure in relation to a vertex's position, and calculates how many times a vertex sits on the shortest path (known as "geodesic") linking two other vertices. We also calculate *edge betweenness centrality*, which considers the number of the shortest paths that go through an edge in a graph or network, to verify that the actors with the highest betweenness score are also those most important for the spread of information. Finally, if the organizational logic follows a pattern of diffusion and not, say, mutual exchanges, the information flow should be rather one-directional than reciprocal. As our Twitter network is set up as a network of tweet exchanges or retweets between Twitter users, looking at the *network reciprocity* metric allows us to establish the proportion of pairs of actors that have a reciprocated, or a one-directional, tie between them. In other words, it allows us to establish whether the emphasis is on information diffusion.

To understand the formation of structural signatures such as bridging (H1) and bonding ties (P1), we follow Burt's (2005) approach, and use his main metric for brokerage or the presence of bridging ties: *network constraint index*. To measure bonding, we depart from Burt and use a different metric, *network modularity*. Constraint represents the ability of any given member of the network to access other members of it. A higher level of individual constraint means that the member depends more on others to access the rest of the network. Since constraint is measured from zero to one, a score of one represents no brokerage, while zero represents full brokerage. We then average the individual levels across the network. Unlike constraint, modularity is measured at the network level and ranges from -0.5 to 1, where positive numbers reflect the presence of dense groups within the network and lack of connections between them. In particular, in order to identify correctly the membership of each node to one or more dense groups, we use the random walks algorithm. This procedure assumes that shorter paths between the nodes denote the presence of denser groups within the networks. Both indicators have been used in the literature (Bianconi et al. 2014; Sajuria et al. 2015; Shen et al. 2014) as a way to assess the presence of bonding and bridging ties.

In order to provide empirical tests for the observed levels of brokerage and closure, we have used network simulation as a baseline. In particular, we have estimated random networks to compare with each of our static monthly networks. This procedure follows the Configuration Model (Bender & Canfield, 1978; Molloy & Reed, 1995) for random networks. This method is an extension of the traditional approaches to random graphs (i.e. Erdos-Renyi) in the sense that, on top of estimating random networks with the same numbers of nodes and ties, it also takes into account the degree distribution of the real networks. For each month, we estimated 1,000 simulations based on the observed networks. This allows for a realistic set of random structures that do not follow traditional attachment patterns. For H1 we calculate the average constraint and modularity coefficients across each group of 1,000 simulations, and compare them to our observed networks. We use this approach to produce a random benchmark which, in turn, approximates a traditional test against a null hypothesis. Around each estimation and where possible, we produce a 95% confidence interval.

Individual Level Data and Measures

Our second source of data originates in a short survey distributed to #tutorpool volunteers by one of the authors of this study in July 2013 -- and thus when the initiative's activities have already been established for 2 years. Using the initiative's database, we emailed a questionnaire to all #tutorpool registered tutors, which at that time amounted to 802. Importantly, this means that we were granted access to all three different classes of participants mentioned earlier. The questionnaire, which addressed three different topics - political and civic participation and attitudes, attachment to the #tutorpool community and demographics (including social media use) - remained online until August 2013 and two reminders were sent regarding its completion. It was filled out by 159 volunteers; that is, 20% of the registered #tutorpool tutors at the time, and included all members of the organizing team. Although we cannot exclude the possibility of self-selection bias, the demographic characteristics of the tutors who filled in the questionnaire were almost identical to the ones found on #tutorpool's online registry (see section 4 in the supplementary material), and thus the sample is fairly representative of the #tutorpool volunteers.

We measured sense of community by adapting the battery developed by McMillan and Chavis (1986) to the #tutorpool context (for the full list of items see supplementary material). Four of the questions were considered in the analysis as indicators of community attachment. Item factor analysis for categorical data was employed (in MPLUS) to confirm this hypothesis. The unidimensional model that included all items had close fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 2.852$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.240$; RMSEA = 0.052, CFI = 0.997). Therefore the factor (labelled as community attachment index (CAI)) scores were employed in subsequent analysis to summarize the information provided by the responses in the four items. Using one-way ANOVA tests, we searched for significant differences between our index and the participants' SES, as well as between our index and a number of initiative-specific items aimed at capturing members' past community involvement and, most crucially, *interaction* with other members of the community. These included how much time the participant had spent with other #tutorpool members online and in person (offline), how much usage they had made of different social media platforms, and how did they first hear about #tutorpool.

Results

Organizational Logic and Brokerage in the #tutorpool Network

H1 predicted that the communication structure of the #tutorpool network had initially a highly dense structure, pointing towards the development of strong communicative ties between core members. In line with the hypothesis, extant research shows that most online networks are often organized around

Table 1 Main characteristics of #tutorpool network over time (Dec 2011 – May 2012)

Network Metrics	Dec. 2011	Jan. 2012	Feb. 2012	Mar. 2012	Apr. 2012	May 2012	Total
Vertices	445	418	280	323	160	16	1166
Edges	971	1089	539	725	407	18	3087
Network diameter	7	6	6	6	4	2	7
Maximum indegree	319	261	263	501	316	8	438
Maximum outdegree	77	80	23	45	58	3	79
Average degree	4.4	5.2	3.9	4.5	5.1	2.3	1,8
Av. clustering coefficient	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.3	0,166
Reciprocity	0.08	0.11	0.04	0.03	0.01	0.00	0,012
Modularity	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.5	0,341
Strng. Connected Comp.	12	9	7	5	3	3	18
Size of largest component	421	400	267	311	156	11	1039
(Proportion of the network)	(95%)	(96%)	(95%)	(96%)	(98%)	(69%)	(89%)
Proportion of nodes remaining from first cohort	100%	33%	23%	22%	13%	2%	N/A

structural holes that prevent the diffusion of information (González-Bailón & Wang, 2015). #tutorpool's network was no different. As P1 comprises two different elements – the presence of a dense network structure, and a group of core members - we use a dual approach to describe it. First, we look at the full network (that is, all the vertices and edges over 6 months) in the search of connected components. Our analysis shows that the network is formed by a single weakly connected component, and that the number of strongly connected components is rather high (18, see Table 1). Along with this connected component census, the positive scores for modularity at all stages of the network show that this was a fragmented network with densely connected groups. These results thus confirm the first part of P1. Next we seek to identify the presence of a core group. To assess its presence and composition, we use betweenness centrality (BC). The distribution of BC (available in supplementary material) shows a skewed distribution with only a small number of users with the highest betweenness, as well as most influential dyads for information diffusion. Computing the value for the edges with the top 5 highest edge betweenness centrality resulted in the following pattern:

1. *User1* → *User2*; 2. *@tutorpool* → *User2*; 3. *User2* → *User3*; 4. *@tutorpool*
→ *User4*; 5. *User5* → *@tutorpool*

This result confirms H3, namely that a minority of highly committed users (in this case a team composed of *User1*, *User2*, *User3*, *User4* and *@tutorpool*), played a significant role in generating and brokering information to the network². Although the above results are based on the aggregate 6-month data, the same group – with minor changes in vertex order - appears to be the one mostly active in information brokering also when the network is broken down into 6 single-month periods, lending support to the idea that this tightly connected group of #tutorpool users found above were indeed the chief diffusers of information within the network. Table 1 offers a summary of the most important network characteristics and Figure 3 provides further evidence showing the betweenness centrality of these top 5 users




Figure 3 (right): Betweenness of the top 5 central users in relation to the monthly averages.

over time in comparison to the average score for the entire network. As a way of standardization, we use the average as a benchmark and focus on the standard deviations from the mean (i.e. *z-scores*). We find a pattern similar to that found in recent studies on the use of social media for the organization of protest campaigns, whereby the large majority of users surround a small epicenter of protests, displaying less (but highly critical for efficient information distribution) online activity around the committed minority (Barberá et al. 2015). In Figure 3, most of the core users of the network show a consistent higher betweenness centrality than the average. Some exceptions represent the @tutorpool account, which only moved to the top during the second month, while @User1, who first tweeted about the #tutorpool idea, remains central across the 6 months under study. This result also confirms P1's second statement, that the dense structure of the network is linked to the development of communicative links within the core members of the network.

The evidence presented above is indicative of the organizing group's success in diffusing the message away from the core of the network (the network diameter was 7 – a relatively high number for a network of #tutorpool's size), and of the importance of the large number of less committed “messenger” type of users whose retweeting helped the message travel across the network. Our final measure, network reciprocity, had a pooled value of 0,012 which is very low. The information conveyed is in line with our expectations that connectivity within the network was mainly one-directional. Once put forward, the hashtag was used predominantly for mentioning others, or for retweeting. Interactive replies were much less the focus.

In order to test H1, namely that #tutorpool's communication network will, across time, display higher levels of bridging structures, we further disentangle the network's diffusion practices. We first establish a baseline – i.e. that the #tutorpool network has *some* structure – and then we investigate the levels of closure and brokerage across time in relation to random simulations. As Figure 4 illustrates, the observed networks show clear differences to the random simulation, which was to be expected. The observed levels of modularity are higher than the results from the configuration model for most of the time, which is an indication that the core members of #tutorpool's Twitter community were




Figure 4 Comparison of closure and brokerage between observed and simulated networks.

interested in forming a tight group and sustaining it over time. This provides further confirmation to P1 and shows that the members of the core group were successful in keeping a cohesive group, a finding that can be linked to our individual-level analysis below, which shows that members who had spent time interacting with other members of the initiative online were also more likely to feel greater levels of attachment to the #tutorpool community. At the same time, however, Figure 3 shows that the levels of brokerage remain mostly consistent throughout the examined time-frame, yet in February and later in May, they are higher than the random simulations (constraint has an inverse relationship to brokerage). We interpret this as evidence that the network also put effort in reaching outside the closed group establishing bridging ties, and that it succeeded at a certain point in time - supporting H1. Also when the network becomes much smaller (i.e. last month), and only due to the size, we could expect that the levels of brokerage get smaller. However, the #tutorpool network shows the opposite trend.

For the size of the networks, these results seem slightly surprising. The higher levels of closure at the beginning of the network reflect that the initial impulse of the initiative came from the core group of organizers, but the high brokerage at the same time shows that they were consistently aiming to distribute the information outside their inner network – consistent with the initiative's purpose (a graphical representation of this pattern can be found in the supplemental material). Over time, the influence of the central nodes remains – as evident also from the consistently high betweenness centrality, while the levels of bridging ties become significantly different than random. Our interpretation is that the bridging ties started to build up as more people learned about the initiative on Twitter and joined the conversation. We caution that an alternative interpretation may be that, as the network's dense groups slowly dismantled, the members of the central groups remained the only brokers among the dispersed peripheral clusters, thus increasing the value of brokerage, in which case our argument for an outwards development – as opposed to a structural effect – would be weakened. The overall analysis, however, does support the idea that this was an outward-looking network with the objective of diffusing information to achieve the highest possible recruitment. The combined presence of high modularity and brokerage, along with a cohesive core over time and low levels of reciprocity, all point towards this direction.

#Tutorpool Volunteers' Participatory Experience

How did #tutorpool members with different levels of involvement and interaction with others experienced their participation? H3 suggested that offline-only tutors would display significantly lower levels of community attachment when compared to members who engaged with the community online and who came into contact with other members. We first report descriptive information about the background of #tutorpool members who filled the survey against the general population of Greece. We used representative data from the latest wave of the European Social Survey. #tutorpool had a significantly higher percentage of women (67.5% versus 55.9% respectively, $\chi^2 = 7.156$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.007$), and its members were more highly educated when it came to Master's and PhD degrees (Msc: 34.4 % versus 8.4% and PhD: 15% versus 1.5% respectively, Bonferroni adjusted $p < 0.05$ in both cases), and younger than the general population ($\chi^2 = 31.254$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.001$). The percentage of unemployed members (23%) is higher than the general level of unemployment in the country at that time (15.8%) based on the Hellenic Statistical Authority. No significant differences were found between those who had previously engaged with civic organizations and those who did not. Clearly #tutorpool activated a young and highly educated segment of the population that had little or no job security. One could argue that it was exactly because of the members' lack of employment that they were able to invest personal resources to #tutorpool, subsequently developing an attachment to the initiative. Yet, based on our ANOVA tests, we found no significant differences between all these sociodemographic variables in relation to feelings of community attachment to #tutorpool.

Our further ANOVA tests confirm our hypothesis (H3) that offline-only tutors should display significantly lower levels of community attachment to #tutorpool when compared to the rest of the initiative's participants. We find significant differences in the mean CAI between those who have spent time with other members of the tutorpool initiative online ($F(1,156) = 11.452$, $p = 0.001$) and offline ($F(1,150) = 8.634$, $p = 0.004$), and those who did not (all plots are available in the supplementary material). Overall, having spent more time online and/or offline with other #tutorpool members corresponds to a higher level of attachment to the #tutorpool community. The picture supports our theoretical expectations. There is a division in the experiences in relation to the #tutorpool community between (a) people who did not interact ("spent time") with other #tutorpool members online or offline and who generally engaged in a rather institutional way (i.e. who only registered and went ahead to teach), and (b) those who spent time with other members online or offline, and engaged in a more entrepreneurial way with the initiative which also involved closer interaction with others.

Although our descriptive statistics show that the vast majority of tutors felt close to the initiative (77% of our sample stated that they "feel as part of the #tutorpool community"), group (b), as we saw, scored significantly higher in level of attachment to the community. Those who interacted with others for the coordination of the initiative, felt closer to it than those who have little to do with its organizational aspect and whose membership focused only on teaching offline. This creates an interesting division in terms of how invested different classes of the initiative's members were in it. Presumably, the offline-only tutors felt that this was a worthy endeavour that they ought to support, and did exactly what they deemed to be the best way of supporting it: taught children voluntarily, but without meddling in the organizational work. This implies identifying with the initiative and its goals, but investing most of one's personal resources with the child and the family. The kind of weak or strong ties that tutors could subsequently develop with the family and the child is an extremely important aspect of the social capital-building that #tutorpool may have motivated *outside* its own organizational auspices. We were unable to capture this aspect in our survey but it is an important by-product of such organizations that should be studied further.

Finally, our tests related to the different ways in which our participants learned about #tutorpool prior to engaging with it, show that those who learned about its existence through social media had

a higher level of attachment to the initiative ($F(3,152) = 3.208, p < 0.001$). Post hoc tests (Bonferroni adjustments for multiple comparisons) revealed that those who learned about the initiative via Twitter are the ones with the highest mean community attachment scores. This too corroborates our theoretical expectations, as well as the results of the network analysis, by highlighting the important role of technology for bringing people together and shaping the community itself, as well as the members' experiences.

Discussion

Extant literature has overlooked the use of social media for volunteering and the provision of public goods or services. Yet such use has become increasingly widespread and important over the past few years. Our study finds that Twitter can provide a space in which individuals without previous knowledge of one another can establish networked communication ties for the long-term, sustained organization and coordination of voluntary action. This is an important contribution to a literature that has so far been focused mainly on protest mobilization.

Although #tutorpool is but one example of a solidarity initiative, our empirical endeavour produces insights that we think are relevant for other civil society initiatives powered by digital media. #tutorpool's evolution emphasizes the key role of hybridity (Chadwick, 2007) in understanding collective action dynamics in digitally-enabled solidarity initiatives. Digital media communication can bring together decentralized and potentially disparate individuals around a common cause – an aspect similar to how digital media are used to organize large-scale protest events, such as Occupy, today. Personal interaction at that level may provide individuals with opportunities to shape an agenda for the collective action effort. The immediate next step, however, seems to be radically different than in many digitally enabled protests.

Solidarity initiatives such as #tutorpool have a clear goal ahead of them whose solution often does not have to wait for policy attention, but can be tackled immediately through voluntary action. In this way, and as opposed to protest groups which have to pin down long-term objectives (e.g. inequality in the case of *Occupy*), meddle over their ideological consistency, and find ways to pressure political actors, voluntary initiatives can (and must) come up with an organizational structure that will help accomplish their goal immediately. #tutorpool achieved this by taking a hybrid organizational form when the organizing team realized that they had to “shapeshift” to manage certain tasks. While #tutorpool made the most out of the flexible engagement enacted by some volunteers throughout its whole life span at the online information distribution level, it, at the same time, created formal organizational structures to manage more difficult tasks related to volunteer management. These involved creating databases to store information, establishing clear rules, and recruiting people who would support the initiative and who could offer a specific skillset without which the initiative couldn't provide public services. Such voluntary initiatives differ from crowd-enabled protest networks such as Occupy (Bennett & Segerberg, 2013), which often resist the transition to formal structures of organization (Calhoun, 2013), are unable to perform important tasks often performed by institutionalized structures (Kreiss, Finn, & Turner, 2011) and, as a consequence, eventually dismantle. That there was a group of dedicated organizers who carefully orchestrated the distribution of the #tutorpool idea shows that in the case of #tutorpool organization was more akin to hierarchical logics seen in digital media-enabled collective endeavours as diverse as the Arab Spring protests organization in Egypt (Howard & Hussain, 2011, p. 48), and the ways in which peer-production communities sometimes operate (Shaw & Hill, 2014, p. 229). In this sense #tutorpool provides an important example of how digital media enable individuals to *sustain* across time digital initiatives with formal organizational structures.

Thinking about the consequences of having members with different levels of engagement and the importance of commitment for the long-term sustenance of organizations, we observe with interest that attachment to the initiative was not uniform among the different classes of members, and depended on one's position in the overall #tutorpool network. Despite their affective relationship with the initiative, offline volunteers were less invested with the initiative as a community, but probably very invested with the child they undertook. This stresses the idea that, outside the core group, commitment took a different form, relating to the specific role that members had to fulfil. It is thus not unreasonable to assume that, although #tutorpool's operational logic will not change as time passes by, attachment and loyalty to the initiative may - in the long run - wane, as tutor and child move slowly away from the initiative and into the family nucleus in which another form of attachment and loyalty is built. This presents us with an interesting situation in which waning attachment to the initiative *does not* result in the organization "losing" in collective action terms. Rather, we observe the (successful) creation of the conditions for a certain class of members whose role does not afford them much attachment to the initiative, to build loyalty with those they are supposed to help. In instrumental terms, therefore, the organization appears to be highly successful in achieving its purpose. An additional related lesson learned here, which also distinguishes this case from those of protest mobilization, is that technology in these types of actions may play an important role, not only in organizing action but, crucially, in creating alternative reward schemes away from market-based ones - much as the ones discussed by Benkler (2006, p. 6) - that different types of participants can strive for. Such digitally-enabled initiatives may thus tap a form of societal resource-creation that becomes available in the form of helping those who have an immediate need for it (in this case the students), but also in the form of fulfilling community or participatory needs.

The structural complexity of #tutorpool is a compelling example of how organizational structures can emerge with the use of digital technology. Although entrepreneurial engagement has existed before, the use of technology makes #tutorpool a different undertaking in terms of how fast it moved across the collective action space, while simultaneously coexisting in multiple quadrants (Chadwick, 2007; Flanagan et al., 2006). Remarkably for an initiative with no financial resources, #tutorpool was able to take up organizational forms that could integrate participants with very different functional attachment and potential for resource accumulation.

Broader implications

Our findings are important when considering the broader consequences of digital technology use for voluntary action organization. First, although #tutorpool is used here as an illustrative case, it reflects an intertwinement of using digital technology and organizing social life that may become increasingly common in the coming years. Using digital technology to pool educational resources is just one expression of the deeper phenomenon of state's withdrawal from the welfare sector. This phenomenon is neither exclusive to Greece, nor particular to financial crises. It can be encountered in other cases where institutions are faltering, and has been documented previously -- although not as much in countries where institutions are fully consolidated, as in areas of limited statehood whereby communities use digital media to meet challenges arising from deficient and non-responsive state institutions (Livingston & Walter-Drop, 2014). In response to it, ordinary people may find the use of digital technologies as a meaningful way to become participants, rather than spectators or complainers in the complex processes and conversations about democracy and participation in public life (Evas and Boyte, 1992). Indeed, as Wells (2014, p. 213) perceptively notes elsewhere it could be that "this approach to activism is not a product of technology -- in fact, it may be the reverse: the technology that we know and love may be the product of this mentality".

Second, although #tutorpool assembled a diverse set of volunteers and organized them into achieving a very specific goal, tutors had to subsequently take the major step of integrating themselves within the personal and social world of the child they undertook to teach. This implied building trust not only with the child itself but also with its family, thus potentially enabling a process of social capital generation within the family. This new phase – which we are not able to capture in a study that focuses only on a particular (mainly communicative) subset of #tutorpool's institutional existence and social ramifications – could become the point of departure for those involved to establish more trustful relationships with others in the future. There is a strong case to be made about the potential of digital technology towards the generation of not only particularized and initiative-specific, but also *generalized* trust – the most difficult form of trust to create in adult people. The ramifications of such initiatives, especially for countries where volunteering is scarce and civil society underdeveloped, are significant.

Acknowledgments

In memory of Panos Economou, scholar and poet, co-founder of #tutorpool and devoted tutor till the very end, and Petros Papathanasiou, journalist and blogger, co-founder of #tutorpool and passionate supporter. The authors would like to thank the tutors who participated in the survey. We would also like to thank the four reviewers for their excellent and thought-provoking comments. We are grateful to Jan van Deth, Andreas Jungherr, Pablo Barberá and Joost de Moor for reading and valuably commenting on previous version of the manuscript. Our special thanks go to the organising team of #tutorpool (in alphabetical order: Dimas Christos, Economou Panos, Hasanakos Yiannis, Fotopoulou Manina, Gelis Spyros, Klossa Natalia, Lardikou Christina, Morfopoulos Petros, Mpougias Antonis, Mpouchalakis Milos, Papanoti Agathi, Papathanasiou Petros, Patrikarakou Katerina, Poulitsas Thanos, Roumelioti Marianna, Stergiou Petros, Vitoratou Silia, Xanthopoulos Harris). The views/interpretations expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the #tutorpool organizers, volunteers, and participating parents/students.

Notes

- 1 After-school support is essential for any student in Greece aiming to secure a place in higher education.
- 2 After contacting the #tutorpool team we verified that all five accounts identified were members of the organizational team. To retain user anonymity, we here print only the first three characters of their Twitter handles.

References

- Aldrich, H. E. (1979). *Organizations and environments*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Barberá, P., Wang, N., Bonneau, R., Jost, J. T., Nagler, J., Tucker, J., & González-Bailón, S. (2015). The critical periphery in the growth of social protests. *PLoS ONE*, 10(11).
- Bastos, M. T., Mercea, D., & Charpentier, A. (2015). Tents, tweets, and events: The interplay between ongoing protests and social media. *Journal of Communication*, 65(2), 320–350.
- Bender, E. A., & Canfield, E. R. (1978). The asymptotic number of labeled graphs with given degree sequences. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 24(3), 296–307.
- Benkler, Y. (2006). *The wealth of networks: How social production transforms markets and freedom*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Bennett, L. W., & Segerberg, A. (2013). *The logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bianconi, G., Darst, D. K., Iacovacci, J., & Gortunato, S. (2014). Triadic closure as a basic generating mechanism of communities in complex networks. *Physical Review*, 90(4).
- Bimber, B., Flanagin, A. J., & Stohl, C. (2012). *Collective action in organizations: Interaction & engagement an era of technological change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Calhoun, C. (2013). Occupy Wall Street in perspective. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 64(1).
- Chadwick, A. (2007). Digital network repertoires and organizational hybridity. *Political Communication*, 24(3), 283–301.
- Conover, M. D., Ferrara, E., Menczer, F., & Flammini, A. (2013). The digital evolution of Occupy Wall Street. *PLoS ONE*, 8(5).
- Earl, J., & Kimport, K. (2011). *Digitally Enabled Social Change: Activism in the Internet Age*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Ellison, N., Steinfield, C., & Lampe, C. (2007). The Benefits of Facebook “Friends:” Social Capital and College Students’ Use of Online Social Network Sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(4), 1143–1168.
- Flanagin, A. J., Stohl, C., & Bimber, B. (2006). Modeling the Structure of Collective Action. *Communication Monographs*, 73(1), 29–54.
- Gladwell, M. (2010). *Why the Revolution Will not be Tweeted*. The New Yorker. Retrieved from http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2010/10/04/101004fa_fact_gladwe
- González-Bailón, S., Borge-Holthoefer, J., Rivero, A., & Moreno, Y. (2011). The Dynamics of Protest Recruitment through an Online Network. *Nature*, 1(197).
- González-Bailón, S., & Wang, N. (2015). Networked discontent: The anatomy of protest campaigns in social media. *Social Networks*, 95–104.
- Gruzd, A., Wellman, B., & Takhteyev, Y. (2011). Imagining Twitter as an Imagined Community. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 55(10), 1294–1318.
- Henley, J. (2012). *Pooling resources to provide an education*. The Guardian. Retrieved from: <http://bit.ly/2jEajDZ>
- Howard, P. N., & Hussain, M. M. (2011). The Upheavals in Egypt and Tunisia: The Role of Digital Media. *Journal of Democracy*, 22(3), 35–48.
- Karpf, D. (2012). *The MoveOn Effect: The Unexpected Transformation of American Political Advocacy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kreiss, D., Finn, M., & Turner, F. (2011). The limits of peer production: Some reminders from Max Weber for the network society. *New Media & Society*, 13(2), 243–259.
- Livingston, S. & Walter-Drop, G. (2014). *Bits and Atoms: Information and Communication Technology in Areas of Limited Statehood*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lupia, A., & Sin, G. (2003). Which Public Goods are Endangered?: How Evolving Communication Technologies Affect The Logic of Collective Action. *Public Choice*, 117(3–4), 315–331.
- McMillan, D. W., & Chavis, D. M. (1986). Sense of Community: A Definition and Theory. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 14(1), 6–23.
- Mercea, D., & Bastos, M. T. (2016). Being a Serial Transnational Activist. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 21, 140–155.
- Miles, R. E., & Snow, C. C. (1986). Organizations: New concepts for new forms. *California Management Review*, 28(62–73).
- Molloy, M., & Reed, B. (1995). A critical point for random graphs with a given degree sequence. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 6((2-3)), 161–180.

- Nohria, N., & Berkeley, J. D. (1994). The virtual organization: Bureaucracy, technology, and the implosion of control. In C. Heckscher & A. Donnellon (Eds.), *The post-bureaucratic organization: New perspectives on organizational change* (pp. 108–128). Sage.
- Penney, J., & Dadas, C. (2014). (Re)Tweeting in the service of protest: Digital composition and circulation in the Occupy Wall Street movement. *New Media & Society*, 16(1), 74–90.
- Powell, W. W. (1990). Neither market nor hierarchy: Network forms of organization. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 12, 295–336.
- Sajuria, J., VanHeerde-Hudson, J. et al. (2015). Tweeting Alone? An analysis of bridging and bonding social capital in online networks. *American Politics Research*, 43(4), 708–738.
- Shaw, A., & Hill, B. M. (2014). Laboratories of Oligarchy? How the Iron Law Extends to Peer Production. *Journal of Communication*, 64(2), 215–238.
- Shen, C., Monge, P., & Williams, D. (2014). Virtual brokerage and closure: Network structure and social capital in a massively multiplayer online game. *Communication Research*, 41(4).
- Sotiropoulos, D. (2015). Civil Society in Greece in the Wake of the Economic Crisis. Retrieved from <http://www.eliampep.gr/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/kas.pdf>
- Theocharis, Y. (2016). Every Crisis is a Digital Opportunity. In A. Bruns, E. et al. (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Social Media and Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Theocharis, Y., Lowe, W., van Deth, J. W., & García Albacete, G. (2015). Using Twitter to mobilize protest action. *Information, Communication & Society*, 18(22), 202–220.
- Van Laer, J., & Van Aelst, P. (2010). Internet and Social Movement Action Repertoires. *Information, Communication & Society*, 13(8), 1146–1171.
- Wells, C. (2014). Civic Identity and the Question of Organization in Contemporary Civic Engagement. *Policy & Internet*, 6(2), 209–216.
- Zuckerman, E. (2014). New Media, New Civics? *Policy & Internet*, 6(2), 151–168.

Supporting Information

Additional supporting information may be found in the online version of this article:
Appendix S1. Supplementary material

About the Authors

Yannis Theocharis is Research Fellow at the Mannheim Centre for European Social Research (MZES), University of Mannheim, Germany. His research focuses on political behavior, political communication, new media, and social networks.

Silia Vitoratou is a lecturer in Psychometrics and head of the Psychometrics and Measurement Lab in the department of Biostatistics & Health Informatics, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neurosciences, King's College London, UK. Her research focuses on latent variable models methodology and applications in mental health settings.

Javier Sajuria is Lecturer (Assistant Professor) in Politics at the School of Geography, Politics, and Sociology, Newcastle University, UK. He is also a member of Newcastle University's OpenLab. His research focuses on political behaviour, comparative politics, elections, and quantitative methods.