

Part 4

Microstructural Factors: Social Networks

Until the mid-1970s, scholars tended to invoke explanations that paralleled the individualist, psychological orientation so prevalent in western culture when attempting to explain why only certain individuals participate in social movements and other forms of collective behavior. Differential recruitment and participation were explained by personality and/or psychological factors.

Lewis Feuer's account of the rise of the 1964 Free Speech Movement at Berkeley is an example of this kind of psychological theorizing. In his 1969 book, *The Conflict of the Generations*, Feuer argued that those who were drawn to the movement were apt to be those students—especially males—who saw in the movement a chance to play out unresolved emotional conflicts with their parents. Other observers, such as Eric Hoffer (1951) and Theodor Adorno (Adorno et al. 1950), argued that nondemocratic movements may disproportionately recruit those with "authoritarian personalities." Some proponents of the mass society approach (Kornhauser 1959) argue that movements provide "substitute communities" for those alienated, marginal members of society who are drawn to activism. And some psychological theories see activism as a form of aggression caused by various forms of frustration. These models are variations on the well established theme of frustration/aggression in psychology, which argues that much of human behavior, including activism, should be seen as a release of frustration through aggression. One specific application of this perspective to movement partici-

tion makes them available for participation. Specifically, researchers have focused on the role of personal or organizational networks in facilitating movement recruitment. The articles in this part exemplify this line of research and the conceptually supportive empirical findings it has yielded.

The first selection, by David Snow, Louis Gerlach, and Sheldon Eklund-Olson, was among the first to call researchers' attention to the network basis of movement recruitment. The authors' survey of nine studies of movement participation revealed that in eight of the nine cases, a vast majority of recruits were drawn into the movement by contact with a friend or relative previously involved with the group. The lone exception was Hare Krishna, which specifically targeted individuals lacking strong ties to friends and family.

The second selection, by Roger Gould, illustrates just how sophisticated the network approach to the study of movement recruitment has become. Using a variety of advanced statistical techniques, the author documents the role that mapping networks played in shaping participation in the republican revolt that shook Paris in the spring of 1871. Gould shows that in contrast to a class-based revolt that took place in Paris years earlier, the 1871 movement was rooted in mapping patterns of neighborhood and National Guard solidarity.

Another interesting extension of the network perspective, Doug McAdam and Ronnelle Compton those who took part in the 1964 Mississippi Freedom Summer Project with those who did not participate. Using original projections and follow-up surveys, the authors highlight a particular confluence of factors that greatly increased the likelihood of involvement. They show that applicants who had participated in the project in terms

of a salient prior identity (e.g., "Christian," "teacher," etc.), who were members of organizations supportive of this link between identity and action, and who encountered little opposition from parents or other significant others were overwhelmingly likely to make it to Mississippi.

Finally, in her interesting analysis of the rise of the women's liberation movement, Carol Mueller documents the crucial role that "submerged conflict networks" played, not only in drawing women into the burgeoning movement, but in facilitating the process by which pioneering activists fashioned the shared collective identity of feminism so crucial to the movement's growth. This is an important extension of the network perspective. Whereas most work on the topic has documented the role networks play in drawing recruits into a well established movement, Mueller shows that networks may also serve as the crucial social locations within which movements and the new conceptions of self and society they require are created in the first place.

References

- Adorno, T.W., E. Frenkel-Brunswick, D.J. Levinson, and R.N. Sanford. 1950. *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Feuer, Lewis. 1969. *The Conflict of the Generations*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gurney, J.N. and Kathleen Tierney. 1982. "Relative Deprivation and Social Movements: A Critical Look at Twenty Years of Theory and Research." *Sociological Quarterly* 23: 33-47.
- Hoffer, Eric. 1951. *The True Believer: Thoughts on the Nature of Mass Movements*. New York: The New American Library.
- Kornhauser, William. 1959. *The Politics of Mass Society*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- McPhail, Clark. 1971. "Civil Disorder Participation: A Critical Examination of Recent Research." *American Sociological Review* 36: 1058-1073.
- Mueller, Edward N. 1980. "The Psychology of Political Protest and Violence," in Ted Robert Gurr (ed.) *Handbook of Political Conflict*. New York: Free Press. ♦

pation is the theory of relative deprivation. The theory rests on the underlying assumption that perception that one is deprived relative to someone else creates "an underlying state of . . . psychological tension that is relieved by SM [social movement] participation" (Gurney and Tierney 1982: 36).

However intuitively and culturally appealing these kinds of explanations have fared poor receiving empirical support. Summarizing the exhaustive survey of the literature on the relationship between activism and various psychological factors, Mueller (1980: 69) concluded that "theological attributes of individuals . . . have minimal direct impact for explaining the occurrence of rebellion and revolution per se" (see also McAdam 1971).

Does this mean that psychological factors are irrelevant to the study of individual activism? Not necessarily. In our view, various cognitive and motivational factors are very important in recruitment and participation in social movements. The nature of the relationship is more complex than generally understood. The complex relationship and the importance of motivational and cognitive factors will be taken up in several parts.

Here we wish to examine a structural argument that focuses on an individual's structural proximity to a movement. The argument, which has evolved over the years, is that people participate in movements simply because they are motivationally inclined to but because their structural

10 Social Networks and Social Movements: A Microstructural Approach to Differential Recruitment

David A. Snow
 Louis A. Zurcher, Jr.
 Sheldon Eklund-Olson

Among the various issues and questions relating to the study of social movements, few have generated as much discussion and research as those pertaining to differential recruitment. Why are some people rather than others recruited into a particular social movement organization? Given the number of competing and functionally equivalent movement organizations frequently on the market at the same time, how is it that people come to participate in one rather than another? Why do some movement organizations attract a larger following and grow at a more rapid rate than others? Whether one scans the literature on religious cults and movements, political protest, the ghetto revolts of the 1960s, or student activism, the problem of differential recruitment surfaces as a dominant focal concern, both theoretically and empirically. Indeed, the study of movement recruitment has been "one of the most prominent characteristics of collective behavior research in recent years" (Marx and Wood, 1975:388).

Nonetheless, understanding of the process of differential recruitment, its underlying determinants, and implications for the spread and growth of social movements is still quite limited (Marx and Wood, 1975:393). As Zald and McCarthy (1979:240) concluded in their recent review of the resource mobilization approach, very little is known about the movement recruitment process

"Social Networks and Social Movements: A Microstructural Approach to Differential Recruitment," *American Sociological Review* 45: 787-801. Copyright © 1980 by the American Sociological Association. Reprinted with permission.

and the conditions under which various recruitment techniques are more or less successful.

The purpose of this article is to advance understanding of the movement recruitment process by assembling quantitative and qualitative data which bear on the relationship between movement recruitment and such microstructural factors as social networks, and by developing a set of corresponding propositions. Four focal questions structure the inquiry: (1) What are the microstructural avenues of movement recruitment? (2) What accounts for the differential availability of people for movement participation? (3) What are the structural characteristics of social movements which predict different recruitment strategies and patterns? (4) What implications do different recruitment strategies and patterns have for the spread and growth of a movement?

Data and Procedures

The article draws on three sets of data. The first is derived from an examination of social movement case studies through which we synthesize quantitative data pertaining to the recruitment process. References to the salience of such microstructural factors as social networks are not common, but our review of the literature reveals that most of the references tend to be impressionistic. There is a dearth of hard data specifying function of social networks in relation to differential recruitment to and the differential spread/growth of movements. However, we did find studies with quantitative data bearing directly on the recruitment process. The sample size of the studies varies from 31 to 310 participants, with a combined N totalling more than 1,200.

The second data set comes from an examination of recruitment to the Nichiren Shoshu Buddhist movement in America.² These data were derived from the senior author's observations and experiences as a participant-observer for a year and a half, his informal interviews with members, and his examination of a large sample of members' testimonies appearing in the movement's newspaper, *The World Tribune*. Since most editions of the newspaper contain general members' testimonies, 504 were selected from 1966 to 1974 (six per month) including a two-year period in which the data was not readily available. Three hundred thirty of the 504 testimonies provided information specifying mode of recruitment into the

ment. These 330 cases, coupled with 15 other members from whom recruitment information was informally elicited, yielded a sample of 345. Informal interviews with 25 Hare Krishna devotees supplement the data pertaining to Nichiren Shoshu. Twenty of the interviews were with members of the Krishna commune in Los Angeles, and five were with members of the Dallas commune. The interviews were conducted during the course of six visits to the Los Angeles commune and two visits to the Dallas commune.⁴

The third data set is derived from a nonrandom sample of University of Texas students. A questionnaire designed to gather information pertaining to movement recruitment and participation was administered to 550 students enrolled in ten different university courses in the Spring semester of 1979. The first part of the questionnaire contained a list of twenty-five social movement organizations within the Austin, Texas, area. The respondents were initially asked to indicate for each movement whether they were (a) unfamiliar with it; (b) familiar but not sympathetic or supportive; (c) sympathetic but not a participant; or (d) associated with it as a participant at one time or another. Three hundred of the 550 respondents indicated that they either were movement participants or were sympathetic with the objectives of one or more of the movements.⁵ Since we are concerned with differential recruitment, only the responses of the 135 participants and the 165 sympathizers are considered. The sympathetic non-participants constitute a kind of control group in that responses shed light on the question of why it is that people who are in sympathy with and active in a movement's value orientation do not always participate in movement activities. A comparison of the responses of both participants and sympathizers should yield a better understanding of differential recruitment.

Findings and Discussion

Microstructural Avenues of Recruitment
 Movement recruitment has generally been studied from a social-psychological/motivational point of analysis, with various state-of-the-art psychological attributes posited as the causal variables (see Cantril, 1941; Feuer, 1964; Hoffer, 1951; Klapp, 1969; Zald, 1970). However, reasonable the underlying assumption that some people are more susceptible to movement participation, that view

deflects attention from the fact that recruitment cannot occur without prior contact with a recruited agent. The potential participant has to be informed about and introduced into a particular movement. Thus, even if one accepts the popular contention that some individuals are predisposed social-psychologically to movement participation, the following question still remains: What determines which potential participants are most likely to come into contact with and be recruited into one movement rather than another, if into any movement at all?

It is a basic sociological tenet that social phenomena are not distributed randomly, but are structured according to aggregate or group membership, role incumbency, and the like. It thus seems reasonable to assume that movement recruitment, rather than being random or merely the function of social-psychological predispositions, will also be structured by certain sociospacial factors. Accordingly, we can begin to answer the above question by considering, first, the various sociospacial settings in which movements and potential participants can come into contact, and, second, the variety of generally available modes of communication through which information can be imparted.

Regarding the first concern, most spatial settings or domains of social life can be conceptualized in terms of a continuum ranging from public to private places.⁶ Examples of the former include shopping malls, community sidewalks, airports, bus stations, and city parks. Country clubs, an office, a sorority or fraternity house, and an apartment or home are illustrative of the latter.

The means of information dissemination can be conceptualized generally in terms of whether they are face-to-face or mediated. By face-to-face communication, we refer to all information, whether it be verbal or nonverbal, that is imparted when two or more individuals or groups are physically present. In contrast, mediated communication refers to information dissemination through institutionalized mass communication mechanisms, such as radio and television, or through institutionalized, but individualized and privatized, communication mechanisms such as the mail and telephone.

The cross-classification of these two dimensions suggests four general and fairly distinct microstructural avenues for movement information dissemination and recruitment. Figure 1 sche-

Figure 1
Classification of General Outreach and Engagement Possibilities for Movement Information Dissemination, Promotion, and Recruitment

FACE-TO-FACE		PRIVATE CHANNELS	
Face-to-face meetings, conferences, and public events, such as parades, rallies, and demonstrations, using family, friends, and acquaintances, and through the mass media, such as television, radio, and newspapers.		Promotion and recruitment via mail and telephone.	
PUBLIC CHANNELS		MEDIATED	

matically summarizes these alternative avenues, each of which is distinguished by the spatial domain of social life in which contact can be established and the means through which information can be imparted.

Given the alternative microstructural avenues, the question arises as to the relative yield of each in terms of actual recruits. In other words, is recruitment among strangers in public places more productive than recruitment along the other avenues, or are movement recruits typically drawn from existing members' extramovement friends, acquaintances, and kin?

Examination of the movement literature strongly suggests that the network channel is the richest source of movement recruits. Numerous studies allude to the importance of social networks as a conduit for the spread of social movements. While some of these works are theoretical or critical in orientation (Oberschall, 1973; Tilly, 1978; Useem, 1975; Wilson, 1973; Wilson and Orum, 1976), most are empirical studies of religious movements (Bibby and Brinkerhoff, 197

Dator, 1969; Gerlach and Hine, 1970; Harrison, 1974; Heirich, 1977; Judah, 1974; Lee, 1967; Lofland, 1966; Murata, 1969; White, 1970) or political protest or reform-oriented movements (freeman, 1973a; Jackson et al., 1960; Leahy, 1975; Marx, 1969; Orum, 1972; Petras and Zeitlin, 1967; Pinard, 1971; Tygart and Holt, 1972; Von Eschen et al., 1971; Woelfel et al., 1974; Zurcher and Kirkpatrick, 1976). Although suggestive, few of the investigations provide hard data specifying the relation between social networks and differential recruitment. However, ten studies were found with quantitative data bearing on the recruitment process. Table 1 summarizes the findings of all but one of the studies,⁷ clearly demonstrating the salience of social networks as a recruitment avenue. For each of the movements studied, with the exception of Hare Krishna, extramovement social networks constitute the primary source of recruits.

Our findings regarding recruitment to Nichiren Shoshu are consistent with those just presented. As indicated in Table 2, Nichiren Shoshu members are typically recruited into the movement by one or more members with whom they have a preexisting extramovement, interpersonal tie. Although Nichiren Shoshu members devote a considerable amount of time and energy to proselytizing in public places, these information dissemination and recruiting forays are not very productive. The author accompanied members on over 70 such expeditions, and only twice were recruits attracted. In contrast, all but one of the fifty-five Krishna devotees we interviewed recruited "off the street" by other members who are strangers at the time of contact. (Factors account for the different recruitment patterns of Hare Krishna and the other movements discussed later.)

Table 1. Studies with Data Specifying Mode of Recruitment to Various Movements (Percentage)

Investigator	Movement	N	Mode of Recruitment		
			% By Relatives	% By Friends, Acquaintances, ^a thr. Ntwks.	% Recruited Outside Networks ^b
Sills (1957)	March of Dimes	234	6	90	10
Murata (1969)	Sokagakkai	100	16	76	9
Dator (1969)	Sokagakkai	120	65	100	4
White (1970)	Sokagakkai	7	24	86	4
Gerlach and Hine (1970)	Pentecostal	77 ^c	47	32	21
Harrison (1974)	Catholic	169	4	59	4
	Pentecostal				
Bibby & Brinkerhoff (1974)	Evangelistic			74	26
Leahy (1975)	Protestantism	132	45	29	9
Judah (1974)	Anti-Abortion	31	26	65	9
	Hare Krishna	63	0	3	97

^a Includes all individuals recruited through networks other than familial or kinship (e.g., occupational neighborhood).

^b Includes all individuals recruited by strangers in the street or at mass meetings, or who sought out movement after learning about it through the public media, or who joined on their own initiative.

^c Percent recruited by relatives, if any, not reported. Of the 90% recruited through networks, 52% were recruited by friends, 20% through community network, and 18% through organizational and occupational networks.

^d Data derived from 200 testimonials of American members in a Sokagakkai newspaper. Of the 60% (120) indicating mode of recruitment, none was recruited by strangers or through the media. The reason for the large percentage recruited by relatives is that the majority of the individuals in the sample were American GIs stationed in Japan who were married to Japanese members.

^e Sample size not given. Percent figures based on the average of three to five different surveys. Percent figure for friends and acquaintances based on the average of three surveys; percent figure for relatives and last two columns based on the average of five surveys.

^f Figures based on the compilation of Gerlach and Hine's (1970:79-80) reported findings regarding separate Pentecostal churches.

^g Percent recruited by relatives or strangers, if any, not reported. Therefore the actual percentage recruited through networks may have been greater than the 59% reported.

Table 3. Recruitment Avenues of a Sample of University Students Participating in Various Movements (Percentage)

Recruitment Avenues	Movements		Totals (N:135)
	Political (N:81)	Religious (N:54)	
Public Places	7	0	4
Social Networks	63	80	70
Mass Media	30	20	26
Mail/Telephone	0	0	0

The important bridging function of social networks in relation to movement recruitment is further demonstrated by our findings regarding the sample of university students participating in various social movements. Additionally, these findings suggest that network linkages are not only important in accounting for religious movements, but also for political movements. As indicated in Table 3, 63% of the students participating in political movements were drawn into their respective movement's orbit of influence through a preexisting, extramovement personal tie.

The findings associated with the three data sets not only corroborate each other, but they also clearly demonstrate the importance of preexisting social networks in structuring movement recruitment. It is thus reasonable to suggest the following summary position:

Proposition 1: Those outsiders who are linked to one or more movement members through preexisting extramovement networks will have a greater probability of being contacted and recruited into that particular movement than will those individuals who are outside of members' extramovement networks.

The Importance of Social Networks in Accounting for Differential Availability

Proposition 1 and the data in which it is grounded suggest that recruitment among social networks is likely to be more productive than recruitment via the other microstructural avenues. However, the fact remains that not all relatives, friends or acquaintances of movement members participate in movement activities when invited. The findings reported in the preceding section report that, for all the movements studied, at least some members were recruited "off the street" or through the public media. The findings pertaining to Hare Krishna in particular suggest that some movements recruit most of their members through

Recruitment Patterns for Nichiren Shoshu and Hare Krishna (Percentage)

Works	Nichiren Shoshu (N:345)		Hare Krishna (N:25)	
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Works	17	96	82	4
	1	4	0	0
	0	0	0	0

channels other than social networks. The question thus arises as to who out of the pool of individuals contacted either through existing ties or through other recruitment avenues is most likely to become a movement participant?

One plausible answer is suggested by the many works that posit a psychofunctional linkage between social-psychological attributes (conceptualized as susceptibilities) and the goals and ideologies of movements (construed as appeals). According to this view, participation in movement activities is largely a function of certain fertile dispositions, such as alienation (Bolton, 1972; Oppenheimer, 1968; Ransford, 1968), relative deprivation (Aberte, 1966; Davies, 1971; Glock, 1964; Gurr, 1970), and authoritarianism (Hoffer, 1951; Lipset, 1960; Lipset and Raab, 1973). Although of longstanding popularity, the social-psychological dispositional approach has in recent years been called into question on both theoretical and empirical grounds.⁸ Moreover, our research suggests that the reason why some rather than other individuals join a movement once they have been introduced to it can be explained in large part by their structural availability. Specifically, the findings pertaining to Nichiren Shoshu and the sample of movement sympathizers suggest that the reason for participating in movement activities once invited is largely contingent on the extent to which extramovement networks function as countervailing influences. Since sets of social relationships can be more or less demanding in regard to time, energy, and emotional attachment (Ezizioni, 1975; Kanter, 1972), it follows that they can also vary in the extent to which they constitute countervailing influences or extraneous commitments (Becker, 1960) with respect to alternative networks and lines of action. Hence, some individuals will be more available for movement exploration and participation because of the possession of unscheduled or discretionary time and because of minimal countervailing risks or sanctions.

In the case of Nichiren Shoshu, these observations seem to hold for both those members recruited from the street and those recruited through social networks. Most were under 30, single, in a transitional role (such as that of student), employed in a line rather than in a managerial position, or in a state of occupational marginality. As a consequence, they tended to possess a greater amount of unscheduled time and generally lacked the kinds of extraneous commitments that are

likely to inhibit movement participation. Aside from the absence of a social tie to one or more members prior to initial contact, those recruited from the street differed from those recruited through networks only in that they were structurally more available for participation. This observation is illustrated by the following account of how and why one street-recruit, a twenty-five-year-old male, came to join Nichiren Shoshu:

I found myself here in L.A. with nothing but the clothes I was wearing. I didn't know anybody. I didn't have a lot of money. It was a really strange situation.

I had just flown into L.A. airport, and all my baggage came up missing. This was on a Saturday night. Since I didn't know anybody and didn't have any place to go, I went to the airport police station and was told to go to Travelers' Aid. But I learned that they wouldn't be open until Tuesday since this was a Labor Day weekend. So I waited around the airport until Tuesday and then went down to Travelers' Aid. They sent me to the Welfare Department. After spending four days waiting and filling out forms, I was told that I couldn't qualify for welfare because I wasn't a California resident.

At this point I didn't know what to do. So I spent a few nights at the Midnight Mission, and then decided to go to the Santa Monica Beach. That evening while I was walking around downtown Santa Monica, this guy came up to me and started talking about Nam-Myoho-Renge-Kyo (the Nichiren Shoshu chant), and asked if I would like to go to a meeting. Since I didn't have anything else to do, I went along.

All of a sudden I find myself at this meeting where everybody was chanting. I didn't have the faintest idea about what was going on. I had heard of the chant before, and didn't even know there was such a group as NSA. But since everybody was telling me to give chanting a try, I figured why not. I literally didn't have anything to lose. So I joined, and I've been chanting since—which is about four months.

Although this account differs somewhat from the stories of other street-recruits in its particular underscores what was common to the situation of the 85 street-recruits about whom we are able to gather information.⁹ They were all arrivals to or passing through the area in which they were recruited, or they were minimally proximal and demanding social relationships. Although one might argue that these street-recruits were "susceptible" to the "appeals" of Nichiren Shoshu, they joined because they were "loners," or "outcasts," we do not wish to suggest such an interpretation. Rather, we

biologically more compelling to argue that individuals who join social movements share the kinds of demographic and social characteristics that allow them to follow their interests and/or engage in exploratory behavior to a greater extent than individuals who are bound to existing lines of action by such extraneous commitments as spouse, children, job, and occupational reputation.¹¹

This microstructural interpretation is also suggested by our findings regarding the movement sympathizers in our sample of university students. By movement sympathizers, we refer to those individuals who indicate verbal support of or agreement with the goals of a movement, but who do not devote any time, energy, or other resources to advancing the movement's objectives. The major reasons given by the sympathizers for

Table 4. Reasons for Not Participating Given by Movement Sympathizers (Percentage)

Reasons	Movements			
	Political Religious (N:115)		Totals (N:165)	
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
Didn't know anyone	73	66	71	
Not enough time	64	61	63	
Didn't ask	57	47	54	
Didn't want to get involved	18	16	18	
Other				
Reason for not participating				
Didn't know anyone				9
Not enough time				4
Didn't ask				4
Didn't want to get involved				4
Other				

on the sidelines and not getting involved is indicated in Table 4. Most relevant to our discussion is the finding that nearly 70 percent of the sympathizers did not have enough time to participate. Had their lines of action not been constrained by competing, extramovement demands and demands, and had they been able to participate by a member with whom they were acquainted, then presumably they would have joined. This finding suggests that the sympathizer or "constituent" rather than the "participant" or "adherent."

These corroborating findings and inferences seem reasonable to suggest that, in the absence of a social tie to one or more members, differential recruitment is a function of differential availability,

which is best conceptualized as a microstructural phenomenon. That is, it is a function of how tightly individuals are tied to alternative networks and thus have commitments that hinder the recruitment efforts of social movement organizations. The following propositions summarize the argument. The first pertains to the relation between social networks and availability for movement participation. The second concerns the connection between structural availability and the probability of actual participation.

Proposition 2A: The fewer and the weaker the social ties to alternative networks, the greater the structural availability for movement participation.

Proposition 2B: The greater the structural availability for participation, the greater the probability of accepting the recruitment "invitation."

Here it might be argued that even though a social bond with one or more movement members and structural availability increase the probability of movement participation, they are not sufficient conditions. We would agree, especially since social action on behalf of noncoercive organizations is unlikely in the absence of instrumental, affective, or ideological alignment (Ezizioni, 1975; Kanter, 1972; Parsons and Shils, 1962). However, it is important to emphasize that people seldom initially join movements per se. Rather they typically are asked to participate in movement activities.¹² Furthermore, it is during the course of initial participation that they are provided with the "reasons" or "justifications" for what they have already done and for continuing participation. As C. Wright Mills emphasized some time ago (1940), vocabularies of motives are frequently supplied "after the act" to explain the "underlying causes of the act," even though they have little to say about how the act came about. We would thus argue that the "motives" for joining or continued participation are generally emergent and interactional rather than prestructured. That is, they arise out of a process of ongoing interaction with a movement organization and its recruitment agents. Although this alignment process has not received much empirical attention, its salience in relation to movement recruitment has been illustrated by Lofland's (1977a, 1977b) reexamination of the process by which one becomes a "Moonie" and by Snow's (1976) description of how Nichiren Shoshu strategically goes about the business of "luring" and "securing" recruits. In both cases the recruitment process is organized so as

gradually to "sell" prospects on the "benefits" of participation and to provide them with "reasons" for remaining a member. This is not to suggest that prestructured cognitive states and tensions are irrelevant for understanding movement joining. Rather, it is to emphasize that they must be aligned with the movement's value orientation, given specific forms and means for expression and amelioration, and put into the service of the movement (Zygmunt, 1972).¹³ In light of these observations, we argue that initial and sustained participation is largely contingent on the countervailing influence of alternative networks and intensive interaction with movement members. Whereas the first factor determines whether one is structurally available for participation, the second factor gives rise to the rationale for participation.

Structural Influences on Movement Recruitment Strategies and Patterns

In analyzing the recruitment process from the point of view of the movement itself, the relationship between movement structure (as determined by its network attributes) and recruitment opportunities and patterns requires attention. As indicated earlier, there are four general outreach and engagement channels that movements can exploit for information dissemination and recruitment: (1) They can channel their promotion and recruitment efforts among strangers in public places by face-to-face means; (2) They can promote via the institutionalized, mass communication mechanisms; (3) They can recruit among strangers in private places by such means as door-to-door canvassing; (4) They can promote and recruit through members' extramovement social networks. The question thus arises as to what determines the patterning and channelling of a movement's recruitment efforts.

Depending on their resource base and strategy, all nonsecretive movement organizations interested in expanding their ranks can exploit the first three recruitment possibilities. However, not all such movements are structurally able to use the network channel to the same extent since they do not all constitute open networks. Some movements are more restrictive and exclusive than others in that membership eligibility is contingent on the possession of certain ascribed or achieved attributes. In other movements, such as Hare Krishna, core membership may even be contingent upon the severance of extramovement inter-

personal ties. Since movement organizations can vary in the extent to which they are linked to or isolated from other networks of social relations, it follows that their recruitment opportunities can vary considerably. Accordingly, it seems reasonable to suggest the following propositions regarding the relation between a movement's network attributes and the channelling and patterning of recruitment efforts:

Proposition 3A: Movements requiring exclusive participation by their members in movement activities will attract members primarily from public places rather than from among extramovement interpersonal associations and networks.

Proposition 3B: Movements which do not require exclusive participation by their members in movement activities will attract members primarily from among extramovement interpersonal associations and networks, rather than from public places.

These two propositions are suggested when we compare our findings regarding recruitment in Nichiren Shoshu with those pertaining to Hare Krishna. As mentioned earlier, more than three quarters of our sample of NSA members reported that they were recruited into the movement by relatives, friends, or acquaintances. In contrast, one of the twenty-five Krishna devotees we viewed was recruited by a former acquaintance (Judah (1974:162) similarly found that only 10% of the Krishna devotees he interviewed "about it through a friend who was a devotee majority (66%) came into contact with the movement by encountering a public chanting scene a devotee in the street. Judah (1974:162) concludes that

... the results seem to indicate rather clearly the importance of the Movement's method of recruiting. It has attracted the attention of many people through its practice of chanting the Hare Krishna mantras in public. During these public ceremonies devotees sell the literature and engage the passerby in conversation about Krishna.

Anyone with firsthand knowledge of the Krishna movement will find little reason to disagree with Judah's (1974) observations. He fails to note that the movement in general does not recruit through public places but rather in particular have little choice other than to recruit in public places. Since membership in Hare Krishna requires an individual lifestyle and the severance of movement interpersonal ties, the movement

is compelled to concentrate its recruitment efforts in public places. Consequently, most of its members are recruited "off the streets."

In contrast, the Nichiren Shoshu movement does not involve communal life or require its members to sever their extramovement interpersonal ties. It is, therefore, structurally able to recruit both in public places and through members' extramovement networks. Consequently, it draws the bulk of its membership from those networks.

Implications of Recruitment Strategies for Movement Spread and Growth

The differential spread and growth of social movements has generally been analyzed in terms of the appeal of movement goals and value orientations to various target populations in the ambient society. That a movement's organizational structure, and particularly its network attributes, might function as an important determinant of its spread and growth has received only brief attention in the literature (Curtis and Zurcher, 1973; Zurcher and Kirpatrick, 1976). We now address this issue. Specifically, do differences in network attributes and recruitment opportunities have a significant impact on the success of a movement's recruitment efforts, as measured by the number of members actually recruited? The answer hypothesized depends not only on a movement's value orientation, but also on whether recruitment through social networks typically yields a greater return than does recruitment "off the street" or through the media. If the latter is generally more effective, then a movement's network attributes will be of little relevance to its overall growth. If, however, recruitment among strangers is not as effective as recruitment among movement members, then a movement's network attributes will be of significant importance to its growth and spread. Findings indicate that for those movements which recruit both in public places and through social networks, recruitment among acquaintances, friends, and relatives, then a movement's network attributes would constitute an important variable in relation to its growth and spread. Findings indicate that for those movements which recruit both in public places and through social networks, recruitment among acquaintances, friends, and relatives, then a movement's network attributes would constitute an important variable in relation to its growth and spread. Findings indicate that for those movements which recruit both in public places and through social networks, recruitment among acquaintances, friends, and relatives, then a movement's network attributes would constitute an important variable in relation to its growth and spread.

Proposition 4A: The success of movement recruitment efforts, measured by the numbers of outsiders actually recruited, will vary with the extent to which movements are linked to other groups and networks via members' extramovement interpersonal ties, such that:

Proposition 4B: Movements which are linked to other groups and networks will normally grow at a more rapid rate and normally attain a larger membership than will movements which are structurally more isolated and closed.

Aside from a few exceptions (Craven and Wellman, 1974a; Curtis and Zurcher, 1973; Turk, 1970), most social network analyses have focused on the individual and his or her interpersonal ties, with a paucity of social ties taken as evidence of objective or structural social isolation. That focus may be useful for understanding the structural determinants of individual behavioral patterns and propensities. However, it obscures the fact that social isolation can also occur at the group or movement level, as when a movement has few, if any, direct links with other groups and therefore constitutes a closed network or insulated system of social relations. When this occurs, Propositions 4A and 4B suggest that such movements will differ markedly from structurally less isolated movements in recruitment opportunities and patterns, and overall growth.

Empirical support is provided for the propositions by a comparison of the membership claims of the Nichiren Shoshu and Hare Krishna movement organizations in the United States. Since 1970 Nichiren Shoshu's membership claims have consistently hovered between 200,000 and 250,000. In contrast, members of the Los Angeles and Dallas Krishna communes have reported that the number of communal Krishna devotees throughout the country totals no more than 4,000. While efforts to reach an objective estimate of Nichiren Shoshu's membership suggest that it is about half of what the movement claims (see Snow, 1976:137-44), the point still remains that Nichiren Shoshu's membership far exceeds that of Hare Krishna. Given the fact that both are active, proselytizing movements, the question arises as to why the spread and growth of Nichiren Shoshu have far outdistanced those of Hare Krishna. Differences in the value orientation, promises, and membership demands of the two movements certainly constitute important variables in accounting for the difference in their spread and growth.¹⁴ However, Propositions 4A

and 4B point to a perhaps more significant determinant of the differential spread and growth not only of these two movement organizations, but also of social movement organizations in general: the extent to which a movement organization is linked to or structurally isolated from other groups and networks within its environment of operation.

Summary and Conclusions

In recent years the study of differential recruitment to and the differential spread and growth of social movements has been characterized by concern with the process through which movement organizations strategically expand their ranks and mobilize support for their cause. Yet, as both Useem (1975:43) and Zald and McCarthy (1979:240) have noted, there has been relatively little systematic research conducted on the details of the influence process. In order to shed greater empirical and theoretical light on the recruitment process, we have presented data derived from three sources. Our findings indicate that the probability of being recruited into a particular movement is largely a function of two conditions: (1) links to one or more movement members through a preexisting or emergent interpersonal tie; and (2) the absence of countervailing networks. The first condition suggests who is most likely to be brought directly into a movement organization's orbit of influence and thereby subjected to its recruitment and reality-construction efforts. The second indicates who is structurally most available for participation and therefore most likely to accept the recruitment invitation. Our findings also indicate that a movement's recruitment strategies and its resultant growth will vary considerably in the degree to which it constitutes a closed or open network of social relations. Taken together, these findings indicate that both the network attributes of movement organizations and members function as important structural determinants of differential recruitment to and the differential growth of movement organizations.¹⁵

Several theoretical and empirical implications are suggested by our findings and correspondent propositions. First, in contrast to the traditional assumption that movement recruitment efforts are largely a function of goals and ideology, our findings indicate that the mobilization process in general and the recruitment process in particular are likely to vary significantly with changes in

organizational structure. Indeed, our findings indicate that movement goals and organizational structure may occasionally contradict each other. When this occurs, as in the case of Hare Krishna, the organizational structure will function as the more important determinant of recruitment patterns.

Second, since social networks constitute microstructures, the findings suggest that microstructural variables are of equal, and perhaps greater, importance than dispositional susceptibilities in the determination of differential recruitment. We do not urge that dispositions be wholly ignored in attempts to understand the recruitment process. The notion "disposition" perhaps fully could be integrated with the network perspective by conceptualizing it in terms of the motive, instrumental and affective ties among latent and potential participants. People can be encapsulated (Lofland, 1977a; 1977b) by a movement when they are "dispositionally" linked to proselytizing network, and when that connection becomes expanded by exposure to increasingly broadened socialization messages.

Third, our analysis suggests that the question of "why" people join social movements can be adequately understood apart from an examination of the process of "how" individuals come to themselves with a particular movement. In it is our contention that the "whys" or "reasons" for joining arise out of the recruitment process itself. We would thus argue that further examination of movement joining and participation give more attention to how movements coax, and secure participants, and more attention to the factors that account for variations in movement strategies and their efficacy. An examination of such factors should move us beyond our knowledge about the recruitment process has, according to Marx and Wood (1977), reached "a point of diminishing returns."

Notes

1. Here we are following McCarthy (1977:1217-9) distinction between a social movement and a movement organization. The social movement as "a set of opinions or opposition to social change. A social organization which identifies its goals with the objectives of a social movement or a coalition and attempts to implement those goals."

is a conceptually useful distinction since individuals are recruited into and devote time and energy to movement organizations.

2. Nichiren Shoshu of America (NSA) is a Japanese-based, culturally transplanted, proselytizing Buddhist movement that seeks to change the world by changing individuals. It was formally introduced into America in 1960 and claims to have since attracted more than 200,000 members, the vast majority of whom are Occidental. For a detailed examination of the movement's ideology, goals, and operation in America, see Snow (1976; 1979).

3. *The World Tribune* is published five times weekly in Santa Monica, California. It was first issued in August 1964 and now has over 55,000 monthly subscriptions. It constitutes a useful record of the growth and history of the Nichiren Shoshu movement in America.

4. For a discussion of the origins, goals and ideology, and operation of Hare Krishna, see Daner (1976) and Judah (1974).

Classification of Respondents by Relationship to and Type of Movement

Movement Type	Participants*	Sympathizers*	Totals
Religious or Psychiatric	54	50	104
Political	81	115	196
Totals	135	165	300

* "Participants" refers to those individuals who devote time, energy, and other resources to the movement organization with which they are affiliated. They are what McCarthy and Zald (1977:1221) refer to as the "constituents" of a social movement organization.

"Sympathizers" refers to those individuals who have in or agree with the goals of a movement or movement organization, but do not devote any personal resources to it. They are what McCarthy and Zald (1977:1221) refer to as "adherents."

Movements classified as "Religious or Psychiatric" include Transcendental Meditation, Church of Scientology, Baha'i, Jehovah's Witnesses, Campus Movements for Christ, etc. Movements classified as "Political" include NOW, Right to Life, Young Socialist Alliance, Lesbian-Gay Alliance, John Birch Society, Anti-Nuke, etc.

Goffman (1963) and Lyman and Scott ("public places" refer to those regions or areas of community or society that are freely and officially open to most members of that community or social domain), on the other hand, refer to "public places" that are off-limits to all but actual members and guests, and in which outsiders are considered as actual or potential intruders.

7. Heirich's (1977) findings regarding conversion to Catholic Pentecostalism do not neatly fit into Table 1. However, the findings are consistent with those reported in Table 1. Among the 118 respondents "introduced to the movement by trusted associates," 75% were converts. In contrast, among the 187 respondents who were not introduced to the movement by trusted associates, only 31% were converts. Based on similar findings for other social influence variables, Heirich (1977:667) concluded that "it is clear that members of the movement, when recruiting, turn to previous friends and to persons they meet daily."

8. Much of the literature touching on the hypothesized association between preexisting social psychological strains and participation in movements suggests a relatively indeterminate relationship (see Aberle, 1965; Bolton, 1972; Marx and Wood, 1975; Petras and Zeilin, 1967; Portes, 1971a; Useem, 1975). Also the magnitude of statistical association between measures of social psychological variables and participation in movements and protest has generally been quite small and unconvincing (see Lewis and Kraut, 1972; McPhail, 1971; Moinat et al., 1972; Portes, 1971a; Snyder and Tilly, 1972). For varied criticisms of the social psychological-dispositional approach to movement joining, see McCarthy and Zald (1977: 1214-5). Snow and Phillips (1980). Turner and Killian (1972: 365). Useem (1975:11-18), and Zygmunt (1972).

9. The information pertaining to street-recruits is based on the testimonies of 61 Nichiren Shoshu members recruited off the street and on in-depth interviews with two street recruits to NSA and with 24 Hare Krishna devotees.

10. It thus follows that relatively few people are recruited directly off the streets for two basic reasons: First, most people walking the street are engaged in the business of completing a particular line of action—such as shopping, going to a movie, and the like—and, therefore, have little if any unscheduled or free time when confronted by movement recruiters. Second, most individuals walking the street in most urban areas have a number of fairly strong, proximal social relationships that function as countervailing influences, at least when confronted by a proselytizing stranger.

11. This interpretation is suggested by McCarthy and Zald (1973) in their initial discussion of resource mobilization, and by McPhail and Miller's (1973) treatment of the assembling process. Although one must be cautious about assuming that the dynamics underlying participation in civil disorders and social movements are the same, it is worth noting that this interpretation is consistent with McPhail's (1971) re-interpretation of the riot participation literature, Leachman and Singer's (1968) findings regarding participation in the 1967 Detroit riot, and Snyder and Kelly's (1979) discussion of the development of urban disorders. (Also see National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968:123.) Darley and

Batson's (1973) work on helping behavior also suggests that unscheduled or discretionary time is perhaps the most important determinant of Good Samaritanism.

12. This has been amply illustrated by a number of studies. In his examination of recruitment and conversion to the Unification Church, Lofland (1977a:306) found that initial contact "commonly involved an invitation to dinner, a lecture, or both" (see also Bromley and Shupe, 1979:171-4). Snow's (1976) findings regarding the recruitment practices of the Nichiren Shoshu movement reveal similar patterns. When recruiting in public places, Nichiren Shoshu members coaxed prospects to attend discussion meetings, chanting sessions, and other movement activities. Our observations of the recruitment efforts of Krishna devotees also indicate that the first step was to get prospects to the local temple. They were invited to attend a devotional session, to listen to discussion of the philosophy, or to attend a Sunday "love feast" (see also Judah, 1974).

13. In arguing that the "motives" for movement participation are largely emergent and interactional in character, we are at least implicitly questioning the rational calculus assumptions accepted by resource mobilization theorists. That perspective is most clearly represented in the work of McCarthy and Zald (1973; 1977) and Oberschall (1973). For an extensive critique of this "utilitarian" strand of resource mobilization theory, see Freeman and Gamson (1979) and Zurcher and Snow (forthcoming).

14. Regarding the differences in the value orientations and promises of the two movements, Nichiren Shoshu

is more practical and this-worldly in orientation. Rather than calling for a renunciation of worldly attachments and promising a transcendence of the material world, as is the case with Hare Krishna, Nichiren Shoshu promises the realization of personal enlightenment and happiness in the immediate here and-now. It is thus reasonable to assume that Nichiren Shoshu would appeal to a greater number of people than would Hare Krishna. Relatedly, membership in Nichiren Shoshu is much less demanding. Not only are Krishna devotees required to surrender to a movement their personal possessions and desires, but they are also required to sever their previous extramovement interpersonal associations and ties. In contrast, Nichiren Shoshu members are merely required to surrender some time and energy, and perhaps be willing to risk a negative reaction from nonmovement significant others. In short, not only is it easier to be a Nichiren Shoshu member than a Krishna devotee, but Nichiren Shoshu adherents live in and are "into" the here-and-now material world to a much greater extent than are the saffron-robed chanters and promoters of the Krishna mantra.

15. Our concentration upon microstructural factors in movement recruitment is not intended to denigrate scholars from equally necessary macrostructural findings of movement emergence, growth and decline. Blumer's (1951) identification of general social movements as seedbeds for specific movement forms remains heuristically important. The shifts in social trends, especially in values and their interpretations, can influence the relevance of networks (and networks in networks) for potential movement recruits

neighborhood lines. Paradoxically, neighborhood ties even determined the importance of organizational links that cut across neighborhoods.

Previous studies have rarely demonstrated that structural properties of relational systems are important for social movements, and there is no discussion in the literature of the ways in which formal and informal networks interact in the mobilization process. In the conclusion, I argue that these issues are best addressed through data collection procedures and analytic strategies that respect the structure of networks rather than reducing networks to individual-level counts of social ties.

Network Factors in Mobilization

The notion of social structure, in various guises, has played a role in theories of collective action for a long time (Smelser 1963; Oberschall 1973). However, it was only with the publication of Snow, Zurcher, and Eklund-Olson's (1980) seminal article that a specifically network-based conceptualization of structure gained currency in social movement research. Reacting to the undersocialized view of human behavior characteristic of early versions of the resource mobilization perspective (McCarthy and Zald 1973; 1977; Gamson 1975), Snow and his colleagues demonstrated that social ties to members of Nichiren Shoshu of America were instrumental in drawing new members into the organization. This was a significant finding because it focused attention on the "microstructural" bases of social movement recruitment.

Subsequent research has yielded similar results, most notably in McAdam's (1986, 1988b) study of recruitment to the 1964 Mississippi Freedom Summer project. But in each case, supposedly "structural" factors in recruitment are measured as individual-level variables: Ties between participants and movement activists that predate recruitment are counted and the resulting number used as an independent variable in a regression equation. In some cases, organizational affiliations or respondents' subjective evaluations about how integrated they are have been substituted for network data (see, e.g., Cable, Walsh, and Warland 1988).

While the difficulty of collecting and analyzing true network data make this a practical approach, it masks the complexity inherent in social networks and does not permit inquiry into the pos-

11 Multiple Networks and Mobilization in the Paris Commune, 1871

Roger V. Gould

A decade ago, Snow, Zurcher, and Eklund-Olson (1980) pointed to the importance of social networks in understanding the mobilization of social movements, but the state of research in this area is still best described as inchoate. Despite widespread acceptance of the idea that "network" or "structural" factors play a role in mobilization or recruitment, only a handful of studies have made genuine progress toward understanding the significance of these factors.

A principal reason for this state of affairs is that often because of data considerations researchers have typically used purely scalar variables to measure networks of social relations. "Network effects" are examined by simply counting social ties and using these counts as interval variables in regression equations, so that the probability which social ties influence mobilization is analyzed as though it operates exclusively on an individual level. This in turn means that two cases—network structure and multiplexity—received insufficient consideration in theory research.

My goal is to demonstrate that the effect of social ties on the mobilization of collective movements depends on the way in which these relations are measured and, more precisely, on the correspondence between organizational and informal use data on patterns of insurgency duration. I use data on patterns of insurgency duration in the Paris Commune of 1871 to show that social mobilization depended not on the sheer number of ties, but on the interplay between social ties and by insurgent organizations and preexisting social networks rooted in Parisian neighborhoods. Organizational networks maintained their relevance because they were structured along

with the Paris Commune, *American Sociological Review* 56: 716-739. Copyright © 1991 American Sociological Association. Reprinted with