EXPLAINING THE PUZZLE OF HOMELESS MOBILIZATION: AN EXAMINATION OF DIFFERENTIAL PARTICIPATION

CATHERINE CORRIGALL-BROWN
University of British Columbia

DAVID A. SNOW
University of California, Irvine

KELLY SMITH
University of Arizona

THERON QUIST
Baldwin-Wallace College

ABSTRACT: *In this article, the authors examine participation in protests about homelessness by an unlikely set of participants—the homeless themselves. Through an analysis of data derived from 400 structured interviews with homeless individuals in Detroit, Philadelphia, and Tucson, the authors examine why and to what extent some homeless individuals, and not others, participate in movement-sponsored protest activities. In addition, the authors assess the degree to which the factors that affect participation in this population align with previous research on participation in social movements generally. They find that certain characteristics of the homeless population reduce the importance of social ties with other homeless individuals in the recruitment process and that, contrary to what much past work would lead one to expect, homeless individuals who are less biographically available are more likely to engage in protest activity. In addition, strain, which is often not a significant predictor of engagement in other populations, is an important predictor of differential participation among the homeless. This study highlights features of the homeless population that yield somewhat different correlates of participation than found in most movement participation studies and, in turn, cautions against presuming an overall model of participation that explains the engagement of all groups in the same way.*
Keywords: social movement; protest; homelessness; participation

Address correspondence to: Dr. Catherine Corrigall-Brown, 6303 N. W. Marine Drive, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada V6T 1Z1; *e-mail*: corrigall.brown@ubc.ca.

Sociological Perspectives, **Vol. 52, Issue 3, pp. 309–335, ISSN 0731-1214, electronic ISSN 1533-8673.**
 DOI: 10.1525/sop.2009.52.3.309.

In October 1989, well over 100,000 homeless individuals and their supporters gathered in Washington, D.C. to protest the plight of the homeless and to demand that the government attend immediately to the affordable housing crisis. Ten years later, in October 1999, 250,000 homeless individuals and advocates marched in the same location seeking governmental changes in housing policies and programs. These two events were highly visible mobilizations among the homeless, and subsequent research has documented the existence of such protest throughout U.S. cities since the early 1980s. In fact, between 1980 and 1990, there were at least 516 homeless protest events across 17 cities, ranging in size from an average of 299 participants in Washington, D.C. to 40 in New Orleans (Snow, Soule, and Cress 2005; Wagner 1993; T. Wright 1997).

Yet research on social movements and homelessness suggests that the homeless, as a group, should be rather unlikely candidates for movement recruitment and participation. The episodic, transitory character of homelessness, with estimates of more than 50 percent of homeless individuals cycling on and off the streets two or more times (Burt, Aron, and Lee 2001; Snow and Shockey 1998; Wong and Piliavin 1997), means that, in contrast to most populations, the homeless are a rather unstable population. They have high levels of spatial mobility and are diffusely distributed within cities, as they often migrate from one service-delivery area or subsistence node to another (DeVerteuil, Marr, and Snow 2006; Lee and Price-Spratlen 2004). As well, the homeless have a relatively high incidence of physical, mental, and substance-related disability (Burt et al. 2001; Shlay and Rossi 1992; J. D. Wright 1989). These factors, in conjunction with the survival value of anonymity and fictive names, render street relationships relatively thin and tenuous (Snow and Anderson 1993), which can undermine the formation of the kinds of social ties and networks found to facilitate movement recruitment in other populations (Diani 2004; Diani and McAdam 2003).

Social movement research posits that individuals who have a high or middle socioeconomic status, many social ties, and resources will be most likely to engage in protest. It is clear that the homeless are unlikely participants in all of these ways. However, as the examples of protest that have taken place suggest, there is incongruence between the expectations of social movement theory and the empirical reality of homeless protest. This incongruence is the focus of our research.

Drawing on structured interviews with a theoretically driven field sample of 400 homeless individuals in Detroit, Philadelphia, and Tucson, we examine why some homeless individuals, and not others, participate in movement-sponsored protest activities of which the homeless are the direct beneficiaries. In addition, we assess the extent to which the factors that affect participation in this population align with previous research on recruitment to and participation in social movements more generally.

Our inquiry is grounded in previous theories and research on movement recruitment and participation. We test the role of four groups of variables in predicting participation in social movements: social psychological factors, biographical availability, social ties, and context. We anticipate that some of the now routinely accepted correlates of recruitment and participation in social movements do not apply or work differently within homeless populations. These general models of

participation rest on a set of microlevel assumptions about human behavior and social context. When these assumptions do not hold, the general models of participation must be tailored.[1]

In particular, it is likely that the role of social ties operates differently for the recruitment of homeless individuals than for most other populations because of the generally tenuous ties among the homeless. Also, we expect that biographical availability in this population should not be associated with participation, as all homeless individuals are fairly biographically available in terms of free time. However, because of the more severe nature of deprivation among this group, we predict that the role of strain, which has not been as important in many other populations, will be a significant predictor of participation among the homeless. In short, our findings call for a more cautious and tailored approach to differential recruitment, one that is attentive to the characteristics of the adherent pool or population in question. Before discussing these general conclusions and the findings on which they are based, we first examine past work on participation in social movements generally.

EXPLANATIONS OF DIFFERENTIAL RECRUITMENT

The question of who participates in social movement activities and protest events has long been central to research on collective action. Indeed, it was once considered one of the two major orienting questions in the study of social movements (Wilson 1973:33). Although the study of social movements today is much more variegated both theoretically and empirically (see McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald 1996; Snow, Soule, and Kriesi 2004), the issue of differential recruitment and participation is still a major topic of inquiry (see Klandermans 1997, 2004; Rohlinger and Snow 2003).

Previous research has generated a number of competing explanations for movement participation and protest. These theories can be categorized into four general types: those that emphasize *social psychological* factors, such as strain, attributions, and collective identity and efficacy (Klandermans 2004; McAdam 1986; Rohlinger and Snow 2003); those that focus on *biographical availability* (Barkan, Cohn, and Whitaker 1995; Beyerlein and Hipp 2006; Kitts 1999; McAdam 1986); those that focus on *social ties* and networks (Diani 2004; Diani and McAdam 2003; Snow, Zurcher, and Ekland-Olson 1980); and those that accent *contextual* factors that facilitate the prospect of mobilization and participation, such as the existence of indigenous organizations and/or "free spaces" that nurture movement mobilization (Evans and Boyte 1986; Morris 1981; Polletta 1999).

In addition, while past research on social movement participation has tended to examine the effect of various predictive variables on whether individuals have participated in social movements, there is little work that assesses the level of participation in social movements once one is involved (but see Barkan et al. 1995; Oliver 1984). And most studies of social movement participation have only examined individuals who participate without comparing them with those who do not (but see Dixon and Roscigno 2003; Klandermans and Oegema 1987; Oegema and Klandermans 1994).

In this analysis, we compare participants and nonparticipants as well as level of participation for those who are involved. The increased variation in the dependent variable of participation allows for a more nuanced understanding of the predictors of differential recruitment to and participation in social movement organizations and events. Thus, we examine all four sets of factors (social psychological, biographical, social ties, and contextual) in relation to the differential recruitment and level of participation of homeless individuals in social movements and protest aimed at helping the homeless or eliminating the conditions that give rise to homelessness.

Social Psychological Factors

Strain. The use of strain, grievance, or deprivation theories has, at times, been unpopular in social movement research. However, these theories have long roots and are experiencing resurgence partly because of the addition of recently nuanced understandings of the multifaceted nature of strain (see Buechler 2004). Absolute deprivation is one variety of strain theory which posits that individuals who do not have the basic necessities required for survival will be most discontented and likely to protest (K. Marx and Engels 1848/1954; Piven and Cloward 1977; Van Dyke and Soule 2002; Wilkes 2004). Studies of the homeless find some support for this hypothesis. For example, Snow et al. (2005) find that measures of the absolute deprivation variant of strain (ratio of the median housing value to per capita income, unemployment rate, decline in manufacturing jobs, and poverty rate) were all positively correlated with the emergence of protest among the homeless, although such measures do not tap directly into the actual felt sense of material deprivation among the homeless.

In addition to absolute deprivation, individuals can experience a sense of deprivation when what they want or think they should have exceeds what they actually have (Snow and Oliver 1995). This relative deprivation is not necessarily based on objective conditions but is related, instead, to how people assess their current situation in comparison to other reference groups or past or anticipated future situations (Davies 1962; Geschwender 1968; Gurr 1970; Seeman 1981). Such relative deprivation is hypothesized to increase the prospect of movement participation.

Collective Orientations. Individuals have multiple identities, including collective identities, conceptualized as a sense of "we-ness" or "one-ness" that derives from perceived shared attributes or experiences among those who comprise a group, often in contrast to one or more perceived sets of others (Hunt and Benford 2004; Melucci, Keanne, and Mier 1989). Research assembled by Stryker, Owens, and White (2000) shows a strong relationship between collective identification and participation in activism. This relationship has been confirmed in studies of specific populations, such as older people and gay men (Simon et al. 1998), a group of Dutch farmers (Klandermans and de Weerd 2000), and young women engaging in feminist activism (Liss, Crawford, and Popp 2004). This work suggests that in order to become active in support of a social group, it is important to have a strong sense of collective identity with or sense of belonging to that group.

In addition to feeling a sense of one-ness with a group, individuals must feel that working with others can be fruitful. These feelings of collective efficacy indicate that an individual feels that it is possible to create change through working with others (Gecas 2000). Individuals who feel more collectively efficacious are more likely to engage in activism.

Attributions. Attribution theory concerns itself with how people explain the causes of action and events, how they predict future events, and the behavioral and political consequences of attribution processes (Bradley and Cole 2002; Bramson 1961; Ferree and Miller 1985; Lane 1962; Menec and Perry 1995). Miller et al. (1981:509) state that for one to be mobilized toward participation, one must go through a politicization process in which "a systemic rather than self-directed explanation for one's current status" is acknowledged and accepted. They explain that this leads to the realization that deprivation does not represent an aftermath of any individual deficiency but rather derives from inequities that exist in the social structure (Miller et al. 1981:509). Thus, what was perceived as individual misfortune comes to be viewed as collectively experienced, structurally determined injustice (J. Marx and Holzner 1977).[2] When individuals see their own misfortune or the misfortune of others as a result of factors outside of the individual's control, they are more likely to want to offer assistance (Bradley and Cole 2002; Menec and Perry 1995). This can lead individuals to engage in collective action aimed at changing parts of the system that produce the conditions affecting their deprived status (Miller et al. 1981).

Biographical Availability

Individuals experience life cycle changes that make them more or less biographically available to participate in social movements. Biographical availability is "the absence of personal constraints that might increase the costs and risks of movement participation, such as full time employment, marriage, and family responsibilities" (McAdam 1986:70). Several authors suggest a link between activism and the absence of these or other biographical constraints (Cable 1992; Rochford 1985). For example, McAdam's (1986:70) study of recruitment to the Freedom Summer project highlights the degree to which participants were "uniquely free of the type of [biographical] constraints that might have inhibited participation."

It is important to note, however, that not all work in this area finds that those who are more biographically available are more likely to engage in protest. Prior studies have generally found that being biographically unavailable does not automatically hinder participation in social movements (Barkan et al. 1995; Beyerlein and Hipp 2006; Passy and Giugni 2001). If anything, these studies find that biographical constraints actually increase involvement in some social movements (Nepstad and Smith 1999; Wiltfang and McAdam 1991). Other studies find that being married, having children at home, and engaging in full-time employment are unrelated to level of involvement among members of a voluntary organization mobilizing to stop a hazardous waste facility from being located in their community (Kitts 1999). And work by Barkan et al. (1995) and Passy and Giugni (2001)

similarly find that these sorts of constraints do not reduce the propensity of an individual to engage in activism.

Social Ties

Social ties have long been recognized as important predictors of participating in social movements and protest. The probability that individuals will join an organization depends on the number and strength of social network ties that connect group members to each other and to nonmembers (McPherson, Popielarz, and Drobnic 1992). This is because social movement activities are usually embedded in dense relational settings (Diani 2004). For this reason, individuals who are integrated into their community are more likely to engage in protests (McAdam 1986; Useem 1998).

Many studies show that social ties are important means by which individuals are recruited to social movements. For example, Morris (1981) finds that the Southern sit-in movement of the 1960s developed out of preexisting social networks that germinated in black churches, colleges, and protest organizations. These preexisting social structures provided the resources and communication networks that were critical to the spread of the movement (Morris 1981). In her study of the women's movement, Freeman (1975) also finds that communication networks were important in that those women who were not connected into networks did not mobilize. In addition, participation after recruitment is higher for those members who have more pre- and postrecruitment ties with other social movement organization members (Barkan et al. 1995). In light of the foregoing, it follows that social ties are crucially important in the process of recruiting individuals to participate in social movements. Individuals rarely participate in protest and other political activities unless they are explicitly asked to do so (Klandermans 1997; Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995).

Social ties are clearly important for mobilization, but some individuals are better at recruiting than others. There have been numerous studies that show that the presence of a network tie to someone already engaged in a movement is one of the strongest predictors of individual participation in the movement (Fernandez and McAdam 1988; Gerlach and Hine 1970; Gould 1990; Marwell, Oliver, and Prahl 1988; McAdam 1986; McAdam and Paulsen 1993; Nepstad and Smith 1999; Passy and Giugni 2001; Snow et al. 1980; Von Eschen 1971). And friends or acquaintances are likely, in most circumstances, to be especially effective recruiters.

Context

In addition to the individual and interpersonal factors discussed, the context of mobilization is important, as some locations are more conducive to social movement mobilization than others. Such facilitative locales have been termed "free spaces" (Evans and Boyte 1986), which Polletta (1999) defines as the small-scale settings within a community or movement that are removed from the direct control of dominant groups, are voluntary, and generate the cultural challenge that precedes or accompanies political mobilization. Movements need safe spaces where

occupants enjoy some protection from authorities and enemies. These spaces give activists protection from state surveillance or repression, and segregated or partially autonomous institutions can shield them from interference by authorities. Such spaces could include student lounges and hangouts, union halls, and tenant associations (Fantasia and Hirsch 1995), which allow for the growth of movements and for mobilizing participants.

Zhao's (1999) research on the prodemocracy student movement in Beijing highlights the importance of safe or free spaces to the rise of that movement. Specifically, he shows that the various universities in Beijing provided safe spaces and common areas that facilitated student aggregation and mobilization, largely because these areas were relatively protected and encompassed much of the students' everyday spatial routines (Zhao 1999). This empirical example clearly illustrates how spatial context can matter in creating an environment that is conducive, or prohibitive, for movement recruitment and mobilization.

Through an analysis of these four categories of variables (social psychological, biographical, social ties, and context), we assess the extent to which past findings on differential recruitment in other populations are consistent with patterns of differential recruitment and participation among the homeless.

DATA AND METHODS

The data were collected in the early 1990s through 400 structured interviews with homeless individuals in three cities: Detroit, Philadelphia, and Tucson. The homeless are a challenging population to study, as it is nearly impossible to assemble a representative sample of them because they generally do not have addresses or telephones and are often quite mobile. We thus took several measures—at the city and individual level—to increase the probability of approximating a reasonable sample of the homeless.[3]

At the city level, several factors influenced the selection of Detroit, Philadelphia, and Tucson as our interview sites. First, we wanted to select cities that were the sites for previous or ongoing ethnographic research on the viability and outcomes of homeless social movement organizations (see Cress and Snow 1996, 2000), which was the case with each of the three cities. This ethnographic research ensured that we had a working understanding of the situation of the homeless in those cities. Second, we thought it important that the interview sites included cities in which the National Union of the Homeless (founded in 1986) was present, because prior research had suggested that its presence facilitated homeless mobilization, although in varying degrees. The National Union was present in each of the three cities but was headquartered in Philadelphia and had its strongest presence there, followed by Detroit and Tucson. Third, we wanted some variance across the cities in terms of regional location, population, and rate of homelessness.

At around the time of the research, Detroit, in the Midwest, was the seventh largest U.S. city and had a homeless rate of 12.2 per 10,000 residents; Philadelphia, in the Northeast, was the fifth largest city and had a homeless rate of 32.3; and Tucson, in the Southwest, was the thirty-fifth largest city and had a homeless rate of 27.2. Although there is no consistently significant variation in all three dimensions

across the three cities, there is significant variation in at least two of the dimensions. Detroit and Philadelphia, for example, differ regionally and in homeless rate, even though they are close in size; while Tucson differs significantly from Detroit in all three dimensions and from Philadelphia in two dimensions and only marginally in homeless rate. We considered these differences acceptable criteria for city selection since each of the cities met the two previously discussed criteria. When comparing our sample of homeless individuals to the national homeless population (estimated by Burt 1992:Appendix A), we find that our sample closely mirrors the national homeless population (for more information, see Table 2).[4]

At the individual level, within each of the cities, we used a purposeful sampling strategy aimed at capturing maximum variation in the population. Maximum variation sampling is used to "discover the diversity or range of the phenomena of interest" and pushes the researcher to examine cases that are beyond the most convenient contexts (Lofland et al. 2006:91–93). Previous or ongoing research (Rosenthal 1994; Snow and Anderson 1993; Wagner 1993) informed our understanding of the places where the homeless spend time and the lifestyle differences associated with these various sites. With this in mind, we ensured that there was a diversity of individuals and niches represented in each city's sample in order to most accurately represent the diversity of the homeless population. More concretely, we interviewed homeless individuals in shelters, soup kitchens, drop-in centers, parks, on the street, and in subways.

The first data were collected in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in December 1991. The respondents were interviewed in the downtown area in parks, the subway, and two different shelters (N = 101). The second set of data was collected in Detroit, Michigan, in February 1992 (N = 162). Due to the extreme cold weather, respondents were mainly interviewed at a shelter drop-in center. This facility was an ideal location for interviewing, as individuals used it to wait out the weather all day playing cards and watching television. Even more significantly, the facility functioned as the base of a rotating shelter system. Each day hundreds of homeless people congregate at the center to catch buses to different shelters. They had to check in at the drop-in center first or they would lose their bed for the night. Because of the severe winter weather in Detroit, many of the homeless used shelters each night rather than sleep outdoors, so the drop-in center served a variety of homeless each day. The third site was Tucson, Arizona, where respondents were interviewed in March 1992 in parks, a soup kitchen, and a shelter (N = 137).[5]

Dependent Variable

Participation. Participation was measured by asking individuals how many meetings or events they had attended. Individuals who had never attended a meeting or event were coded as "nonparticipants" (0). Those who had attended one event or meeting were coded "one-time participants" (1), and those who had attended two or more events or meetings were coded "multiple-time participants" (2). This distinction between "one-time" and "multiple-time" is somewhat arbitrary, of course, but it does parse further the dependent variable and thus enables us to compare not only participants and nonparticipants but also those who have participated in

varying degrees.[6] In turn, this analysis yields a more nuanced understanding of the predictors of varying levels of participation in social movements.

Independent Variables

Social-Psychological. Strain is measured in both absolute and relative terms. As shown in Table 1, absolute strain includes a scale of questions concerning the basic necessities of life: ability to find a place to sleep, food to eat, and clothes to wear. Relative strain indicates relative levels of satisfaction with the safety, privacy, amount of space, and protection from weather at one's sleeping place. Both of these scales range from 1 (*no strain*) to 10 (*high strain*).

The attributions of the interviewees were also assessed. Respondents were asked if they thought that individuals have the right to a home and a job. The sum of these two variables yields a "rights" scale, ranging from 0 (*has rights*) to 10 (*no rights*). Individuals were also asked about the extent to which homelessness is the choice of individuals or the result of structural constraints. Seven questions were summed to create this "structure/agency" scale that ranged from 0 (*all agency*) to 10 (*all structure*).

Collective orientations in terms of collective identity and collective efficacy were also measured in the survey. Individuals were asked the extent to which they felt they had things in common with other homeless people, with responses being either "not much" (0) or "a lot" (1). Collective efficacy was assessed by asking individuals about their perception of the efficacy of the protest events. Those who said that the events worked to educate the public or help themselves or others were coded as *high collective efficacy* (1), and individuals who felt that the protest did not make a difference were coded *low collective efficacy* (0).

Biographical Availability. Biographical availability was assessed with three separate questions: if the homeless lived with a spouse, had children, and the number of days a week they worked. These questions were added together to create a scale ranging from 0 (*biographically available*) to 10 (*biographically unavailable*).

Social Ties. Social ties were measured with three different variables. First, the number of homeless ties is the sum of the number of homeless friends with whom they had been in contact in the past month. Domiciled ties are a sum of the number of domiciled friends and family with whom they had been in contact in the past month. Both of these are count measures, with those responding that they have ten or more friends or family coded as 10. In addition, individuals were asked if they had been invited to a meeting or an event. These two questions were added together to create a dummy variable with 0 indicating that they had not been invited to either an event or a meeting.

Context. In order to assess the role of context, individuals were asked where they were invited to attend a protest event or organizational meeting. Those who were asked to participate when in shelters were compared with those who were invited in a public location outside of the shelter.[7] (For standard deviation and mean values of the independent and dependent variables, see Appendix A.)

TABLE 1

Operationalization of Variables

	Operationalization
Absolute Strain	Respondents were asked three separate questions on if they ever have problems finding a place to sleep, food to eat, and clothes to wear. For each question, respondents could select that it was usually, sometimes, rarely, or never a problem. Responses were summed and rescaled from 0 (*no strain*) to 10 (*high strain*).
Relative Strain	Respondents were asked their relative levels of satisfaction with the safety, privacy, amount of space, and protection from the weather of the place where they slept. Responses for each question ranged from 1 (*very dissatisfied*) to 6 (*very satisfied*). All questions were summed and rescaled from 0 (*no strain*) to 10 (*high strain*).
Rights	Based on two questions: "Every person in our country has a right to have a place to stay" and "in this country, people have a right to a job." There were five possible responses ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Answers were summed and the scale ranged from 0 (*has rights*) to 10 (*no rights*).
Structure/ Agency	Scale of seven questions about the extent to which homelessness is the choice of individuals or the result of structural constraints. Responses were summed to seven dichotomous variables and rescaled to 0 (*all agency*) to 10 (*all structure*).
Collective Identity	Respondents were asked, "Do you feel that you have a lot in common with other homeless?" Possible responses were "yes" or "no." Individuals who said they did not have a lot in common with other homeless were coded *low collective identity* (0), which was the reference category.
Collective Efficacy	Individuals were asked how effective they think that mobilization and protest events are. Individuals who said that the events were important because they help others and themselves or they educate the public were compared with individuals who said that they did not think that these events made a difference or were important.
Biographical Availability	Scale of three measures: "Are you currently living with a spouse?" (0/1 - *no/yes*), "Are you currently living with any children, either of your own or children you've acted as a parent for?" (0/1 - *no/yes*), "During the last week, how many days a week did you work?" (count, 0 to 7). Days a week were rescaled to 0-1 and summed with the other two variables. This sum was rescaled from 0 (*biographically available*) to 10 (*biographically unavailable*).
Homeless Ties	"How many of your friends are homeless?" A count of friends with those who have ten or more coded as 10.
Domicile Ties	"In the past month, how many different nonhomeless friends did you have contact with?" and "In the past month, how many nonhomeless family members did you have contact with?" Each variable was a count, and these variables were summed with those having ten or more coded as 10.
Invited	"Have you ever been invited to participate in a meeting, rally, demonstration, sit-in, or other event for the homeless?" Dichotomous choice—*invited* (1) versus *not invited* (0).

(*Continued*)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

	Operationalization
Source of Invitation	If they had participated in a meeting, rally, demonstration, sit-in, or other event for the homeless and were invited to attend (did not attend on their own without an invitation), "who invited you to participate?" Individuals invited by organizational members were compared with individuals invited by friends.
Location of Invitation	If they had been invited to an event, "where did you get invited to participate?" Individuals who were asked in public places were compared with individuals who were asked in shelters.
Participation	Sum of "In the past year, not including protest events, about how many homeless organization meetings have you been to?" and "In the last year, not including organizational meeting, about how many protest events have you been to?" *No events* (0), *one event* (1), *two or more events* (2).

Analytic Procedures. First, we examine the role of social psychological, biographical, social ties, and contextual variables on whether an individual has ever engaged in protest activity related to homelessness. As our dependent variable is dichotomous, we use logistic regression models in which coefficients are estimated using maximum likelihood methods and are interpreted as the change in log odds resulting from a one-unit change in the independent variable. We include variables in blocks: strain and attribution variables, collective identity and efficacy, biographical availability, and social ties.

Second, we assess the role of these variables in predicting the level of participation for those who have been involved, comparing those who participated at a high level of frequency, attending two or more events or meetings, and those who did not participate at all with those who participated at a low level of intensity, attending one event or meeting. This comparison process enables us to assess which variables affect an individual becoming a participant and which affect increased frequency of participation once involved. We used a multinomial logistic regression model to test this relationship, as our dependent variable has three categories which we think are both quantitatively and qualitatively different. We control for ethnicity, time on the streets, mental illness, and city in all of our models.

FINDINGS

Descriptive Characteristics

Table 2 presents the sample sociodemographic characteristics and compares them with both the national population and the national homeless population as estimated by Burt and her associates (Burt et al. 2001). Looking first at the overall homeless sample for the three cities, we see that 85.0 percent of the sample is male. This is consistent with past work, which finds that there are many more men than women living on the street (Burt et al. 2001). The majority of the respondents are black (67.6 percent), and about a quarter are white (27.4 percent). The mean age of the respondents is 34.9 years. Most individuals have attended some high school (32.9 percent) or are high school graduates (40.6 percent), while only 19.7 percent of the respondents had

TABLE 2

Sociodemographic Comparison of National Population, National Homeless Population, and Sample Population

Variable	National Population[a]	National Homeless Population[b]	Study Sample			
			Total	Philadelphia	Detroit	Tucson
Gender						
Male	48.7	80.0	85.0	65.7	87.0	97.1
Female	51.3	20.0	15.0	34.3	13.0	2.9
Ethnicity						
White	71.6	48.0	27.4	1.0	8.6	69.9
Black	12.0	40.0	67.6	99.0	90.7	16.9
Hispanic	8.8	9.0	3.5	—	0.6	9.6
Other	7.6	2.0	1.2	—	—	3.7
Age (Mean)	32.8	35.8	34.9	31.2	35.6	36.9
Education						
Less than 8 years	22.4	10.0	6.2	1.0	5.6	11.0
9 to 11 years		40.0	32.9	44.1	34.6	22.8
High school graduate		31.0	40.6	42.2	37.7	42.6
Some college	56.3	14.0	15.5	9.8	17.9	17.6
College graduate	21.3	6.0	4.2	2.0	4.3	5.9
Marital status						
Married	61.9	9.0	5.5	8.8	3.7	5.1
Widowed	7.6	5.0	1.7	—	—	5.1
Separated	—	37.0	13.7	15.7	14.8	11.0
Divorced	8.3		21.9	6.9	18.5	37.5
Single	22.2	49.0	56.1	66.7	63.0	40.4
Living with children on streets	49.0	10.0	8.2	23.5	1.9	4.4
Time on street (mean)				6 months a year	3 to 6 months	6 months a year
Participation						
None				46.1	34.6	65.4
One time				30.0	45.0	17.6
Multiple times				23.9	20.4	17.0

[a] All national population statistics derived from the Census Bureau (1990).

[b] National homeless population data derived from *Over the Edge: The Growth of Homelessness in the 1980s*, by Martha R. Burt (1992), and represent the homeless population in 1987 in order to provide the best comparison with our sample, which was collected in 1991–1992.

attended some college or are college graduates. Most of the respondents were unattached, either single (56.1 percent) or divorced/separated (35.6 percent), and an overwhelming majority neither had nor lived with children (91.8 percent).

Table 2 shows that our sample closely mirrors the national homeless population. In particular, the gender, education, marital status, presence of children, and mean age of our sample are similar to these characteristics in the national homeless population. There are, however, more African Americans and fewer whites in our sample, which is a product of the large number of African Americans in the homeless population in Detroit and Philadelphia.

Model 1: Predictors of Participation

When comparing, in Table 3, individuals who participated in protests or movement events with those who did not, we find that our overall model is significant and highly explanatory (Model = 233.401, Significance = 0.000, Nagelkerke's R^2 = 0.529). In this overall model, absolute and relative strain, collective identity, collective efficacy, and whether the individual was invited are all, on their own, significantly related to participating in protest events. There are three main sets of findings in these models.

First, absolute and relative strains are significant predictors of social movement participation. When examining the role of absolute strain, we see that individuals with higher levels of strain are more likely to participate in a protest event or activity. Each one-unit increase in either absolute or relative strain, which is measured on a ten-point scale, increases one's chance of participating by a factor of 1.306 or 1.309, respectively.[8] While strain has not been a consistent predictor of participation in other populations, strain among the homeless is relatively high, as the condition of homelessness itself is an indication of acute strain. In this way, it could be that strain becomes a significant predictor of protest only when it is at extreme levels. As most work on social movement participation examines populations that face relatively lower levels of strain, this relationship was not clear in past work. Examining this unique population, therefore, allows us to illuminate the role of strain. Future work could assess the role of strain in predicting participation in similarly deprived groups, such as migrant day laborers, or in the homeless population in other countries.

Second, collective efficacy, identity, and whether an individual was invited are all strong positive predictors of engagement, as expected. For example, those who feel that they share things in common with other individuals who are homeless are 3.155 times more likely to participate in a protest event or activity than those who do not feel this sense of collective identity. In addition, individuals who are invited to participate in a protest are 4.660 times more likely to do so than those who are not invited. But, most significantly, individuals who said they think protest events educated the public and/or are beneficial to themselves and others were 7.316 times more likely to participate in an event than those who felt that these events did not make a difference. These results are as predicted, in light of past research in this area. But it is important to note the remarkable strength of these relationships.

Finally, biographical availability and social ties, which are often important predictors of participation in other populations, are not significant in this population.

TABLE 3

Model 1: Logistic Regression—Comparison of Nonparticipants and Participants

	Model A		*Model B*		*Model C*		*Model D*		*Full Model*		
	B	*SE*	*B*	*SE*	*B*	*SE*	*B*	*SE*	*B*	*Odds*	*SE*
Social psychological											
Absolute strain	0.139*	0.058							0.267**	1.306	0.082
Relative strain	0.138*	0.063							0.269**	1.309	0.081
Rights	–0.069	0.079							–0.126	0.882	0.108
Structure/agency	0.013	0.100							0.042	1.043	0.127
Collective identity			0.941***	0.279					1.149**	3.155	0.371
Collective efficacy			1.890***	0.427					1.990***	7.316	0.575
Biographical availability					–0.149	0.092			–0.066	0.936	0.144
Social ties											
Homeless ties							0.049	0.053	–0.047	0.954	0.085
Domicile ties							–0.023	0.051	–0.088	1.092	0.076
Invited (*no* = 0)							1.287***	0.229	1.539***	4.660	0.366
Control variables											
Time on streets	–0.058	0.056	0.003	0.056	–0.027	0.048	–0.043	0.051	–0.052	0.949	0.075
Ethnic minority (1)	0.052	0.438	0.074	0.395	0.266	0.328	0.175	0.344	–0.198	0.820	0.578
Mental illness	–0.201	0.920	–0.157	0.445	–0.101	0.349	–0.098	0.36	0.041	1.042	0.548
Philadelphia	–0.714*	0.342	–1.078**	0.324	–0.709***	0.272	–0.864*	0.281	–1.051*	0.350	0.452
Tucson	–0.957*	0.444	–1.289**	0.385	–1.235***	0.322	–1.130*	0.337	–0.935	0.393	0.578
Constant	0.527	0.529	–0.726	0.446	0.439	0.344	–0.182	0.373	–0.760	0.468	0.744
Goodness of fit	348.246		376.614		507.849		473.677			233.401	
Significance	0.010		0.000		0.000		0.000			0.000	
Nagelkerke R^2	0.105		0.463		0.129		0.225			0.529	

*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$.

As hypothesized, the distinctive nature of this population alters the effect of these variables. We argue that general models of participation, which find that social ties are crucial predictors of differential recruitment, rest on certain microlevel assumptions, such as the importance and persuasive nature of social ties for individuals. The homeless tend to have tenuous social ties because of the uncertainties of street life, frequent mobility around cities, and a pattern, for many, of cycling on and off the street. For these reasons, social ties do not predict participation in this population in the same way as they do in other populations. In effect, it is not simply the number of ties an individual has, but the strength and significance of those ties. As the homeless, in general, have more tenuous ties, a higher number of such ties are not predictive of engagement in social movement activities.

Model 2: Predictors of Levels of Participation

Table 4 reports the results from the multinomial logistic regression analysis examining the effect of the three groups of variables on whether an individual

TABLE 4

Multinomial Logistic Regression Model: Predictors of Frequency of Participation in Social Movement Activities

	Nonparticipants vs. One-Time			*One-Time vs. Multiple-Time*		
	B	*Odds*	*SE*	*B*	*Odds*	*SE*
Intercept	–20.053			1.872		
Social psychological						
Absolute strain	0.169*	1.184	0.099	–0.102	0.903	0.090
Relative strain	–0.011	0.989	0.103	0.013	1.013	0.094
Rights	0.143	1.154	0.142	0.081	1.084	0.125
Structure/agency	–0.131	0.877	0.154	–0.213	0.808	0.143
Collective identity	0.616	1.852	0.459	0.111	1.117	0.420
Collective efficacy	0.040	1.041	0.010	0.865*	2.375	0.425
Biographical availability	–0.362*	0.696	0.197	0.158	1.171	0.190
Social ties						
Homeless ties	0.003	1.003	0.105	–0.010	0.990	0.090
Domiciled ties	0.105	1.111	0.099	0.085	1.089	0.090
Invited (*no* = 0)	2.044***	7.721	0.469	–0.405	0.667	0.435
Control variables						
Time on streets	–0.082	0.921	0.091	–0.012	0.988	0.085
Ethnic minority (1)	–1.441	0.237	0.795	–1.216	0.296	0.802
Mental illness	–0.071	0.931	0.081	–0.011	0.989	0.103
Philadelphia[1]	–0.296	0.744	0.562	0.635	1.887	0.518
Tucson	–1.209	0.298	0.787	–0.671	0.511	0.795
Model			371.659			
Significance			0.000			
Nagelkerke R^2			0.552			

Note: Reference category is one-time participants (those who went to one event or activity).

[a] Philadelphia and Tucson are compared with Detroit.

*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$.

participated and, if so, how many times. In this model, one-time participants are the reference category, enabling us to contrast one-time and multiple-time participants as well as one-time and nonparticipants. The overall model is significant and has a high level of explanatory power (Model = 371.659, Significance = 0.000, Nagelkerke's R^2 = 0.552). In addition to the significance of the model as a whole, we find that absolute strain, biographical availability, collective efficacy, and invitations to participate are all, on their own, significantly related to whether an individual attended an event and at what frequency. It is important to note, however, that the variables that predict becoming a one-time participant are not the same as those that predict becoming a multiple-time participant.

When comparing nonparticipants with one-time participants, there are three main groups of findings. First, individuals who feel more absolute strain are more likely to participate in one protest event or activity. A one-unit increase in an individual's feeling of strain increases his or her chance of participating in one protest event by a factor of 1.184. Note, however, that when comparing individuals who participated in one event with those who participated in two or more events, the role of strain is reversed; individuals who experience less strain are more likely to participate in two or more events, although this relationship is not statistically significant. When comparing the one-time and multiple-time participants, a one-unit increase in strain is associated with a decreased chance of participating by a factor of 0.903. It thus seems clear that feeling higher levels of strain leads individuals to participate in one event but that these high levels of strain inhibit an individual from participating more actively and in a more sustained way. This may be because higher levels of strain require individuals to allocate their attention and energy to day-to-day survival needs. Examining the different frequencies of participation after initial engagement in a social movement allows for a more nuanced understanding of the role of strain in predicting participation.

Second, individuals who are invited are more likely to participate in one event or activity. This relationship is strong; those who are invited are 7.721 times more likely to participate in one event than to not participate at all. But whether one is invited is not a significant predictor in the comparison between one-time and multiple-time activists. These findings show that invitations are needed for the first foray into activism, but after individuals have participated in one event, they no longer need explicit invitations to participate in additional events. This makes sense since multi-event participation suggests increasing commitment, which means that these individuals are likely to be more cognizant of movement activities and events.

Finally, those who are more biographically unavailable are more likely to participate in one event or activity. A one-unit increase in biographical availability, in terms of days of the week working and living with a spouse and children, is associated with a decreased chance of participating by a factor of 0.696. The resources with which this biographical unavailability is associated (such as money from work and social support from spouse and children) increase one's ability to participate, even if one has less free time. However, biographical availability does not appear to be relevant to multiple-time participation.

When comparing those who participated in two or more events with those who participated in one event only, the role of strain differs, as noted above. In addition

to the role of strain, however, the only variable that predicts participation in multiple events (as opposed to one-time only) is collective efficacy. Individuals who have higher levels of efficacy are 2.375 times more likely to participate in multiple events. Despite the fact that collective efficacy does not predict one-time participation in social movements, it is a strong predictor of who will engage in two or more events. It is possible that efficacy is increased during the course of participation, such that, all else being equal, individuals participating in their first social movement event or activity may gain feelings of efficacy that enhance the prospect of their subsequent participation.

In terms of the control variables, we see some differences in participation by city, with individuals from Detroit being more likely to participate in social movement events than individuals from Tucson or Philadelphia. This is likely due to a combination of factors. We know from past and current research that much of the recruiting of homeless participants happens in the context of service provision. The homeless in Tucson are much less likely to be in shelters due to the weather and the relative scarcity of shelters in Tucson compared to the other cities. Furthermore, in both Philadelphia and Tucson, the population is spread out across a wide geographical area, which limits the potential for recruitment as well as a potential participants' ability to attend an event. In contrast, Detroit has a centralized drop-in center that serves as the base of a rotating shelter system. It also provides a place for the homeless to sit, watch TV, and socialize. Because homeless individuals must check in at the drop-in center to receive a shelter assignment and because of the likelihood of potential participants spending time there, the drop-in center provides a perfect location to reach large numbers of homeless people on a daily basis. Furthermore, other social service agencies are centrally located near the drop-in center, which increases the potential for both recruitment and the ability to attend events in Detroit.

Recruitment Source and Place

Table 5 presents data on the source and context of initial recruitment or invitations to participate. Consistent with the bulk of the literature on movement recruitment, we find that being invited is an important predictor of movement participation among the homeless. We also assess the role of the source and place of the invitation to participate, but neither can be assessed in the regression analyses because the *N*s became too small to be able to assess their significance. Instead, we use correlations to assess the role of these variables.

These analyses reveal that the source of the invitation is significantly correlated with participating in social movement activities (Tau-B = 0.262, Significance = 0.000). Here, we find that individuals who were asked to participate by organizational members were more likely to participate than those who were asked by friends. In addition, place of invitation is significantly related to participation, with individuals asked to participate in public places much more likely to engage than those asked in shelters (Tau-B = 0.151, Significance = 0.000).

The overwhelming majority of the literature finds a strong relationship between recruitment by friends and acquaintances, particularly in relatively safe places,

and actual engagement in social movements. It is clear that the lack of significance of friends as recruiters in this population is related to the tenuous nature of friendships among the homeless, as discussed above.

There have been a few other studies that have also shown that friendship ties are not always significant and that their significance is related to the characteristics of the population in question. For example, Snow et al. (1980) found that Hare Krishna recruits were only occasionally recruited through social networks. This was due to the exclusive nature of Hare Krishna, which made it more difficult to recruit people who were involved in broader networks, rather than isolated individuals. Diani and Lodi (1988) also found a different weight of organizational versus private networks as facilitators of adhesion to political ecology and conservation groups. The significance of these different routes to participation was partly based on the character of the group in question and whether it was mainstream or more critical. These studies add additional credence to our claim that the characteristics of the population significantly affect the strength and direction of our commonly held predictors of social movement engagement.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This article examines the puzzle of homeless mobilization. Through an analysis of interviews with 400 homeless individuals in Detroit, Philadelphia, and Tucson, we assess the extent to which four groups of factors—social psychological, biographical availability, social ties, and context—account for participation in this population. Our results suggest that we should use caution when applying general models of participation to all populations. For example, we show that the role of certain variables, including strain, biographical availability, and social ties, differ in this population.

Collective identity and efficacy are important predictors of engagement in social movement activities and the level of engagement once one is involved. Those who feel that they have more in common with other homeless individuals are more likely to engage in activism. This is consistent with past work on other populations

TABLE 5

Percent of Those Invited Who Participated by Source and Place of Invitation

		Context–Place		
		Public (N = 54)	*Shelter (N = 128)*	*Total*
Source	Friend/acquaintance			
		74%	45%	56%
	(*N* = 84)	(24/34)	(21/47)	(45/81)
	Organizational member			
		95%	83%	85%
	(*N* = 105)	(19/20)	(67/81)	(86/101)
	Total	80%	69%	
		(43/54)	(88/128)	

(Klandermans and de Weerd 2000; Liss et al. 2004; Simon et al. 1998). In addition, those who feel that protest is effective at achieving goals of education and social change are more likely to engage in activism and to participate frequently once involved. These findings are as expected.

It is interesting to note that the role of efficacy is most important in differentiating one- and multiple-time participants. So while one-time participants did not differ from nonparticipants in terms of feelings of collective efficacy, those who participated in multiple events felt much more efficacious than those who participated only once. Apparently, the process of participation may generate a sense of efficacy, which in turn increases the likelihood of repeated participation.

There has been a tendency in much work over the last thirty years to discount the role of strain in predicting protest. In contrast, we find that individuals who experience more strain, whether absolute or relative, are more likely to participate in protest events. This relationship is more clearly illuminated when we compare those who participated once with those who participated in multiple events. When we specify the model in this way, we find that feeling higher levels of strain increases the likelihood of individuals participating in one event but that increased levels of strain appear to inhibit an individual from participating more actively and in a more sustained way. We thus hypothesize that felt strain may heighten one's sense of grievance, making one susceptible to initial recruitment invitations, but that such strains, especially if they escalate, may work against the prospect of repeated participation because of the need to channel one's time and energy to subsistence activities. This hypothesis, and the findings on which it is based, suggests that the ability to delineate the extent of an individual's participation allows for a more nuanced understanding of the role of strain in predicting social movement participation.

The role of biographical availability also operates in an interesting way. In this analysis, we find that those who are more biographically available are, in fact, less likely to participate in one protest event, although this variable is not associated with multiple-event participation. This can be explained when we take into account the additional resources that work and social ties likely afford individuals who are less biographically available. For example, individuals with jobs and those with ties to a spouse and children have access to resources such as child care, money, and organizing skills, which past work shows are key predictors of engagement in social movements (Dalton 2002; Verba and Nie 1972). The increased resources associated with having a spouse and working could counter the negative effects of reduced biographical availability in terms of time and energy (Nepstad and Smith 1999).

In most work on differential recruitment, having social ties with friends and family are significant and important predictors of engagement. In this analysis, however, neither the number of ties an individual has with other homeless individuals nor with domiciled family or friends is related to engaging in activism or the frequency of engagement once involved. This finding suggests that the nature of the population under analysis is very important. As noted earlier, homeless individuals tend to have unstable and fleeting relationships with one another on the streets, and this could contribute to the relatively insignificant role of these relationships in predicting activism among the homeless.

As predicted, those who are invited to participate in protest events and meetings are more likely to do so. This is consistent with much past work on social movement mobilization (Diani 2004; Klandermans 1997; Verba et al. 1995). The source of the invitation is also an important predictor of its success: 85 percent of individuals asked to participate by unknown organizational members went to a protest or meeting as opposed to 56 percent of those asked to attend by friends. This runs counter to what most work on networks and recruitment would lead us to expect—that social ties to individual recruiters who are friends or acquaintances make it more likely that individuals will respond positively to their invitations to participate in social movement activities. However, it also matters that the individual recruiter is knowledgeable about the movement or organization and exudes a degree of enthusiasm or commitment. And it is perhaps for these reasons, along with the previously noted tenuous street ties of most homeless individuals, that members of homeless movement organizations who were often domiciled were the most effective recruiters.

Also notable in our analysis is that the place of invitation to participate is significantly related to its chance of success, with individuals invited to an event or meeting in a public place more likely to go than those invited in a shelter (which is relatively more private). While this is consistent with past work which highlights the importance of "safe" spaces away from institutional constraints, it also suggests that the construction of a space as safe is highly dependent on the intersection of population and context.

Past work on shelters finds that they are highly regulated and allow for relatively little autonomy on the part of their residents (Burns 1998; Dordick 1997; Stark 1994). Shelters are somewhat akin to total institutions (Goffman 1961) in that they regulate the sleeping, eating, and recreation patterns of their residents. So although shelters are "private" in the sense that only the homeless are admitted, they are highly regulated and monitored and therefore do not provide free spaces that are autonomous from authorities, which we noted earlier has been found to be very important for mobilization. In contrast, some of the public places in which the homeless hang out do constitute free spaces of sorts that make them more congenial to movement recruitment because of two intersecting factors: They are spaces that are usually less regulated and closely monitored than shelters, and they are places with which the homeless are familiar because they are part of their daily, spatial routines. For these reasons, certain public spaces, which may not be conducive to the recruitment of other populations, are experienced differently by the homeless who reside in public contexts most of the time.

While some of the findings of this research confirm our general predictions about who is most likely to engage in protest, this study also prompts us to use caution when applying these general models to new populations. These general models rely on certain microlevel assumptions about the role of strain, social ties, and biographical availability that are not supported in the homeless population. Therefore, before applying these general models of participation, we should assess the microlevel features of the population in question. For example, by examining the nature of social ties within the group, the freedom of movement for members, the level of strain, and the resources among the population, we can adjust our expectations of how generalized models of participation can be applied.

The homeless as a group highlight the importance of taking the population under study into consideration. From a political sociology standpoint, the homeless occupy essentially the lowest positions of power and prestige in society and therefore have potentially the most to gain and the least to lose by engaging in protest that challenges the legitimacy of the political system as a whole and the distribution of resources within it. The homeless population is therefore an important test case of certain theories of differential recruitment, such as strain theory and resource mobilization theory. In particular, the importance of strain as a factor predicting protest among this population in comparison with other populations underscores the significance of examining this unique group.

In sum, this study highlights both the special features of the homeless population and the general importance of taking the population in question into consideration. Indeed, the findings and analysis call for greater caution about presuming a general theory or model of movement participation or about the existence of a set of correlates that predict participation across all movements. Instead, it may be better to presume, as a default proposition, that the varying circumstances of the everyday lives and the structural location of different populations are likely to affect the prospect of participation in different ways.

Acknowledgments: The research was supported in part by a grant from the National Science Foundation (SES 9008809, David A. Snow, principal investigator). We would like to thank Rima Wilkes, the members of the University of California–Irvine Social Movement and Social Justice workshop group, Dan Cress for his work on the larger project, and the anonymous reviewers of *Sociological Perspectives* for their useful comments on earlier versions of this article.

APPENDIX A

Mean and Standard Deviation of All Scales

	Range	*M*	*SD*
Social psychological			
Absolute strain	0–10	2.930	2.446
Relative strain	0–10	3.884	2.001
Rights	0–10	1.645	1.728
Structure/agency	0–10	1.225	1.427
Collective identity	0–1	0.260	0.439
Collective efficacy	0–1	0.642	0.480
Biographical availability	0–10	0.627	1.227
Social ties			
Homeless ties	0–10	1.115	2.153
Domicile ties	0–10	2.430	2.301
Source of invitation	0–1	0.676	0.471
Invited	0–1	0.479	0.500
Context			
Location of invitation	0–1	0.333	0.478
Participation			
Participation	0–2	0.888	0.922

NOTES

1. As a population, the homeless appear to have much to gain and little to lose by participating in protest events aimed at improving their condition. From the perspective of a cost-benefit assessment, this makes participation appear more likely. In fact, with so little to lose and potentially so much to gain, we might expect that this group would be very likely to engage in protest behavior. The benefits of participating in a protest include the potential efficacy of collective action, improved chances of making changes to the condition of homelessness, and the social pressure of friends and family to participate if they are already involved. There are, however, costs to participation. For example, there is a risk of potentially alienating social ties if one devotes less time to marital, parental, or employment responsibilities. In addition, there could be social risks if family and friends are not supportive of collective action. Finally, the time and attention paid to activism lessens time available for subsistence activities, which is a great cost to homeless individuals who are often without food, clothing, and shelter.
2. Not all social movements make external attributions. For example, self-help groups and many religious movements are predicated on internal attributions.
3. The homeless are one example of a "hidden population." Hidden populations are particularly difficult to study because no sampling frame exists and public acknowledgement of membership in the population is less likely because it involves stigma, potential punishment, or other problems. Heckathorn (1997) has developed a technique called Respondent-Driven Sampling to deal with some of the problems inherent in the study of hidden populations. Respondent-Driven Sampling extends chain-referral methods of sampling by employing a dual system of structured incentives to overcome some of the deficiencies that can arise in these samples. For more information on these techniques, see Heckathorn (1997, 2002).
4. It should be noted that large urban settings are probably more conducive to homeless mobilization than are smaller and nonurban settings, because of the larger homeless base and broader resource opportunities found in large cities. While our sample does reflect the larger national homeless population, it is not possible to assess the potentially unique character of mobilization among the homeless in smaller cities or nonurban settings.
5. Each interview lasted approximately forty minutes and the respondents were paid $5. Doing face-to-face interviews allowed us to explore complex topics and minimized missing data as questions could be clarified. In addition, the interview methods removed potential problems related to subject literacy and errors related to question sequencing or exclusion. The survey consisted primarily of questions on each of the four groups of independent variables and social movement participation.
6. Social movement participation can involve a range of activities. In this analysis, we examine attendance at meetings and participation in rallies, demonstrations, sit-ins, or other events for the homeless. Individuals can participate in other ways, such as by contributing money, becoming an official member, speaking to others about an event, or inviting others to an event. These alternative forms of participation are not examined in this analysis but should be the basis of future work. In addition, in this analysis, we compare individuals who have never participated in an event or meeting with individuals who have participated once or multiple times in either of these ways. This is an improvement over past work that simply compares participants and nonparticipants. Future work, however, could examine the different ways that individuals participate and compare those who engage in meetings with those who participate in demonstrations, rallies, or sit-ins.

7. The location of invitation is only one element of context. Other additional variables that could be examined in future research include characteristics of the cities, states, or countries in which the mobilization occurred. In addition, future research could examine the context of the protest event itself, including how easy it was to access the location of the event.
8. For simplicity of comparison and understanding, the numbers reported in the text are the odds of participating. They are based on the B values presented in the tables and are calculated as exp(B).

REFERENCES

Barkan, Steven E., Steven F. Cohn, and William H. Whitaker. 1995. "Beyond Recruitment: Predictors of Differential Participation in a National Antihunger Organization." *Sociological Forum* 10:113–34.

Beyerlein, Kraig and John R. Hipp. 2006. "A Two-Stage Model for a Two-Stage Process: How Biographical Availability Matters for Social Movement Mobilization." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 11:219–40.

Bradley, Christopher and Dennis J. Cole. 2002. "Causal Attributions and the Significance of Self-Efficacy in Predicting Solutions to Poverty." *Sociological Focus* 35:381–96.

Bramson, Leon. 1961. *The Political Context of Sociology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Buechler, Steven M. 2004. "The Strange Career of Strain and Breakdown Theories of Collective Action." Pp. 47–66 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kreisi. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Burns, Bobby. 1998. *Shelter*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Burt, Martha R. 1992. *Over the Edge: The Growth of Homelessness in the 1980s*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

———, Laudan Y. Aron, and Edgar Lee, with Jesse Valente. 2001. *Helping America's Homeless: Emergency Shelter or Affordable Housing?* Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Cable, Sherry. 1992. "Women's Social Movement Involvement: The Role of Structural Availability in Recruitment and Participation Processes." *Sociological Quarterly* 33:35–50.

Census Bureau. 1990. "Statistical Abstract of the United States." Retrieved February 1, 2007 from http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/.

Cress, Daniel M. and David A. Snow. 1996. "Resources, Benefactors, and the Viability of Homeless Social Movement Organizations." *American Sociological Review* 61:1089–109.

Cress, Daniel M. and David A. Snow. 2000. "The Outcomes of Homeless Mobilization: The Influence of Organization, Disruption, Political Mediation, and Framing." *American Journal of Sociology* 105:1063–104.

Dalton, Russell J. 2002. *Citizen Politics: Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. New York: Chatham House Publishers/Seven Bridges Press.

Davies, James C. 1962. "Toward a Theory of Revolution." *American Sociological Review* 27:5–19.

DeVerteuil, Geoffrey, Matthew Marr, and David A. Snow. 2006. "Sustaining Environments, Adaptation, and Resistance: Place Dependent Experiences of Homelessness in Los Angeles." Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Diani, Mario. 2004. "Networks and Participation." Pp. 339–59 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kreisi. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

——— and Giovanni Lodi 1988. "Three in One: Currents in the Milan Ecology Movement." *International Social Movement Research* 1:103–24.

——— and Doug McAdam, Eds. 2003. *Social Movements and Networks: Relational Approaches to Collective Action*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dixon, Marc and Vincent J. Roscigno. 2003. "Status, Networks, and Social Movement Participation: The Case of Striking Workers." *American Journal of Sociology* 108:1292–327.

Dordick, Gwendolyn A. 1997. *Something Left to Lose: Personal Relations and Survival among New York's Homeless*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Evans, Sara M. and Harry Chatten Boyte. 1986. *Free Spaces: The Sources of Democratic Change in America*. New York: Harper & Row.

Fantasia, Rick and Eric L. Hirsch. 1995. "Culture in Rebellion: The Appropriation and Transformation of the Veil in the Algerian Revolution." Pp. 144–62 in *Social Movements and Culture*, edited by H. Johnston and B. Klandermans. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ferree, Myra Marx and Frederick D. Miller. 1985. "Mobilization and Meaning: Some Social-Psychological Contributions to the Resource Mobilization Perspective on Social Movements." *Sociological Inquiry* 55:38–61.

Fernandez, Roberto M. and Doug McAdam. 1988. "Social Networks and Social Movements: Multiorganizational Fields and Recruitment to Mississippi Freedom Summer." *Sociological Forum* 3:357–82.

Freeman, Jo. 1975. *The Politics of Women's Liberation: A Case Study of an Emerging Social Movement and Its Relation to the Policy Process*. New York: McKay.

Gecas, Viktor. 2000. "Value Identities, Self-Motives, and Social Movements." Pp. 93–109 in *Self, Identity, and Social Movements*, edited by S. Stryker, T. J. Owens, and R. W. White. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gerlach, Luther P. and Virginia H. Hine. 1970. *People, Power, Change: Movements of Social Transformation*. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.

Geschwender, James A. 1968. "Explorations in Theory of Social Movements and Revolutions." *Social Forces* 47:127–35.

Goffman, Erving. 1961. *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.

Gould, Roger V. 1990. *Social Structure and Insurgency in the Paris Commune, 1871*. Dissertation sociology, Harvard University.

Gurr, Ted Robert. 1970. *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Heckathorn, Douglas D. 1997. "Respondent-Driven Sampling: A New Approach to the Study of Hidden Populations." *Social Problems* 44(2):174.

———. 2002. "Respondent-Driven Sampling II: Deriving Valid Population Estimates from Chain-Referral Samples of Hidden Populations." *Social Problems* 49(1):11–34.

Hunt, Scott A. and Robert D. Benford. 2004. "Collective Identity, Solidarity, and Commitment." Pp. 433–57 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kreisi. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Kitts, James A. 1999. "Not in Our Backyard: Solidarity, Social Networks, and the Ecology of Environmental Mobilization." *Sociological Inquiry* 69:551–74.

Klandermans, Bert. 1997. *The Social Psychology of Protest*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.

———. 2004. "Social Movements and Networks: Relational Approaches to Collective Action." *American Journal of Sociology* 109:1237–38.

——— and Dirk Oegema. 1987. "Potentials, Networks, Motivations, and Barriers—Steps Towards Participation in Social-Movements." *American Sociological Review* 52(4):519–31.

——— and Marga de Weerd. 2000. "Group Identification and Political Protest." Pp. 68–90 in *Self, Identity, and Social Movements*, edited by S. Stryker, T. J. Owens, and R. W. White. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lane, Robert Edwards. 1962. *Political Ideology: Why the American Common Man Believes What He Does*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Lee, Barrett and Townsand Price-Spratlen. 2004. "The Geography of Homelessness in American Communities: Concentration or Dispersion?" *City and Community* 3:3–27.

Liss, Miriam, Mary Crawford, and Danielle Popp. 2004. "Predictors and Correlates of Collective Action." *Sex Roles* 50:771–79.

Lofland, John, David A. Snow, Leon Anderson, and Lyn H. Lofland. 2006. *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*, 4th edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Marwell, Gerald, Pamela E. Oliver, and Ralph Prahl. 1988. "Social Networks and Collective Action: A Theory of the Critical Mass." *American Journal of Sociology* 94:502–34.

Marx, John and Burkart Holzner. 1977. "Social Construction of Strain and Ideological Models of Grievance in Contemporary Movements." *Pacific Sociological Review* 20:411–38.

Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. [1848] 1954. *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Chicago: Henry Regnery/Gateway.

McAdam, Doug. 1986. "Recruitment to High-Risk Activism: The Case of Freedom Summer." *American Journal of Sociology* 92:64–90.

———, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald, Eds. 1996. *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

——— and Ronnelle Paulsen. 1993. "Specifying the Relationship between Social Ties and Activism." *American Journal of Sociology* 99:640–67.

McPherson, J. Miller, Pamela A. Popielarz, and Sonja Drobnic. 1992. "Social Networks and Organizational Dynamics." *American Sociological Review* 57:153–70.

Melucci, Alberto, John Keane, and Paul Mier. 1989. *Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Menec, Verena H. and Raymond P. Perry. 1995. "Reactions to Stigmas: The Effect of Targets' Age and Controllability of Stigmas." *Journal of Aging and Health* 7:365–83.

Miller, Arthur H., Patricia Gurin, Gerald Gurin, and Oksana Malanchuk. 1981. "Group Consciousness and Political Participation." *American Journal of Political Science* 25:494–511.

Morris, Aldon 1981. "Black Southern Student Sit-in Movement: An Analysis of Internal Organization." *American Sociological Review* 46:744–67.

Nepstad, Sharon E. and Christian Smith. 1999. "Rethinking Recruitment to High-Risk/Cost Activism: The Case of Nicaragua Exchange." *Mobilization* 4:25–40.

Oegema, D. and Bert Klandermans. 1994. "Why Social-Movement Sympathizers Don't Participate—Erosion and Nonconversion of Support." *American Sociological Review* 59(5):703–22.

Oliver, Pamela. 1984. "'If You Don't Do It, Nobody Else Will': Active and Token Contributors to Local Collective Action." *American Sociological Review* 49(5):601–10.

Passy, Florence and Marco Giugni. 2001. "Social Networks and Individual Perceptions: Explaining Differential Participation in Social Movements." *Sociological Forum* 16:123–53.

Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward. 1977. *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Polletta, Francesca. 1999. "'Free spaces' in collective action." *Theory and Society* 28:1–38.

Rochford, E. Burke, Jr. 1985. *Hare Krishna in America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Rohlinger, Deana A. and David A. Snow. 2003. "Social Psychological Perspectives on Crowds and Social Movements." Pp. 503–27 in *Handbook of Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives*, edited by J. DeLamater. New York: Kluwer-Plenum.

Rosenthal, Robert. 1994. *Homeless in Paradise: A Map of the Terrain*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Seeman, Melvin. 1981. "Intergroup Relations." Pp. 378–410 in *Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives*, edited by M. Rosenberg and R. H. Turner. New York: Basic Books.

Shlay, Anne B. and Peter H. Rossi. 1992. "Social-Science Research and Contemporary-Studies of Homelessness." *Annual Review of Sociology* 18:129–60.

Simon, Bernd, Michael Loewy, Stefan Sturmer, Ulrike Weber, Peter Freytag, Corinna Habig, Claudia Kampmeier, and Peter Spahlinger. 1998. "Collective Identification and Social Movement Participation." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74:646–58.

Snow, David A. and Leon Anderson. 1993. *Down on their Luck: A Study of Homeless Street People*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

——— and Pamela E. Oliver. 1995. "Social Movements and Collective Behavior: Social Psychological Dimensions and Considerations." Pp. 571–99 in *Sociological Perspectives on Social Psychology*, edited by K. S. Cook, G. A. Fine, and J. S. House. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

——— and James Shockey. 1998. "Report on Tucson's Homeless Population, 1997-1998." Tucson, AZ: Community Services Department.

———, Sarah A. Soule, and Dan M. Cress. 2005. "Identifying the Precipitants of Homeless Protest Across 17 US Cities, 1980 to 1990." *Social Forces* 83:1183–210.

———, Sarah A. Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi, Eds. 2004. *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

———, Louis A. Zurcher, and Sheldon Ekland-Olson. 1980. "Social Networks and Social Movements: A Microstructural Approach to Differential Recruitment." *American Sociological Review* 45:787–801.

Stark, Louisa R. 1994. "The Shelter as a 'Total Institution': An Organizational Barrier to Remedying Homelessness." *American Behavioral Scientist* 37:553–62.

Stryker, Sheldon, Timothy J. Owens, and Robert W. White. 2000. *Self, Identity, and Social Movements*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Useem, Bert. 1998. "Breakdown Theories of Collective Action." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24:215–38.

Van Dyke, Nella and Sarah Soule. 2002. "Structural Social Change and the Mobilizing Effect of Threat: Explaining Levels of Patriot and Militia Organizing in the United States." *Social Problems* 49:497–520.

Verba, Sidney and Norman H. Nie. 1972. *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality*. New York: Harper & Row.

———, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Von Eschen, Donald. 1971. "Organizational Substructure of Disorderly Politics." *Social Forces* 49:529–44.

Wagner, David. 1993. *Checkerboard Square: Culture and Resistance in a Homeless Community*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Wilkes, Rima 2004. "First Nation Politics: Deprivation, Resources, and Participation in Collective Action." *Sociological Inquiry* 74:570–89.

Wilson, John. 1973. *Introduction to Social Movements*. New York: Basic Books.

Wiltfang, Gregory L. and Doug McAdam. 1991. "The Costs and Risks of Social Activism: A Study of Sanctuary Movement Activism." *Social Forces* 69:987–1010.
Wong, Yin-Ling Irene and Irving Piliavin. 1997. "A Dynamic Analysis of Homeless-Domicile Transitions." *Social Problems* 44:408–23.
Wright, James D. 1989. *Address Unknown: The Homeless in America*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
Wright, Talmadge. 1997. *Out of Place: Homeless Mobilizations, Subcities and Contested Landscapes*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Zhao, Dingxin. 1999. "Ecologies of Social Movements: Student Mobilization During the 1989 Pro-Democracy Movement in Beijing." *American Journal of Sociology* 103:1493–529.