Social Networks and Social Movements: Multiorganizational Fields and Recruitment to Mississippi Freedom Summer

Roberto M. Fernandez
Doug McAdam
University of Arizona

This study explores the role of multiorganizational fields in recruitment to social movements. We study applicants to the 1964 Mississippi Freedom Summer project from two sites: the University of California at Berkeley and the University of Wisconsin at Madison. Using network analysis, we develop a model of recruitment that predicts participation on the basis of the structural positions of individuals within the multiorganizational fields, as well as on the basis of individual background factors. We also study the role that the recruitment context plays, by comparing the results at these two universities. Independent of the individual background factors, structural position in the multiorganizational field predicts participation in Freedom Summer at Wisconsin, but not at Berkeley. The effects of individual background factors on participation are also contingent on the recruitment context. We discuss the theoretical implications of our results for the study of the effects of multiorganizational fields and recruitment contexts on participation in social movements.*

The concept of social networks is becoming increasingly important in the study of recruitment to social movements. Past studies in the resource mobilization approach to social movements (McCarthy and Zald, 1977; Jenkins, 1983) have focused on individuals and the processes by which they decide to engage in protest (see Fireman and Gamson, 1979). Dissatisfaction with these accounts of recruitment has led to the development of the network perspective (see Snow, Zurcher, and Ekland-

* The first author gratefully acknowledges the support of the Rockefeller Foundation and the University of Arizona Foundation in undertaking this research. The second author gratefully acknowledges the support of a Guggenheim Fellowship and a grant from the National Science Foundation. We would like to thank Ken Dauber, Roger Gould, Larry Radbill, Jim Shockey, David Snow, and Michael Sobel for their helpful comments and suggestions.

0884-8971/88/0303-0357$1.50

Olson, 1983). From this perspective, structural factors outside of individuals' control are seen to distinguish activists from nonactivists. For example, network contacts with recruitment agents may "pull" otherwise uninterested individuals into movements. A number of recent studies have demonstrated the decisive role of structural, rather than individual or attitudinal factors, in encouraging activism (Bolton, 1972; Fernandez and McAdam, forthcoming; McAdam, 1986; Morris, 1981, 1984; Orum, 1972; Rosenthal et al., 1985; Snow, Zurcher, and Ekland-Olson, 1980). Similar arguments have been made with regard to recruitment to religious movements (Harrison, 1974; Heirich, 1977; Stark and Bainbridge, 1980).

One of the more important structural factors studied has been the role of linkages among formal organizations (Curtis and Zurcher, 1973; Fernandez and McAdam, forthcoming; Rosenthal et al., 1985). The main point of this research is that social movement organizations do not exist in a vacuum: in many cases their social environment consists of other social movement organizations. Ties among these organizations are an important channel through which they mobilize resources, including one of their most valuable resources, personnel (see Perrow, 1970:101–107). Ties formed by overlapping memberships among organizations are seen as defining "multiorganizational fields" (see Curtis and Zurcher, 1973:53). This research has shown that position in the field can facilitate recruitment to social movements.

We focus here on the role of multiorganizational fields in recruitment to the 1964 Mississippi Freedom Summer project. Unlike past research in this area that discusses the role of the *number* of social movement organizations in which recruits are involved (McAdam, 1986; McCarthy and Zald, 1977:1218), our approach examines the effects of the *pattern* of overlapping organizational membership on recruitment. Using Breiger's (1974) method of analyzing overlapping organizational affiliations, we develop measures of structural positions in multiorganizational fields for applicants (both participants and nonparticipants) to the Freedom Summer project. We use these measures to answer the following question: does an individual's position in the multiorganizational field affect the likelihood that he or she will participate in the campaign?

Multiorganizational fields vary in the fine texture of their relations; the patterns of overlap among organizations are likely to be highly context-specific. These variations may have significant implications for recruitment. Little is known, however, about exactly how these variations in the structure of multiorganizational fields affect recruitment to social movements. To shed light on this issue, we study the role that context plays in recruitment by comparing models of the process at two sites: the University of California at Berkeley and the University of Wisconsin

at Madison. In particular, we address the question: does the recruitment context change the way in which individuals' structural positions in multiorganizational fields affect participation in Freedom Summer?

The 1964 Mississippi Freedom Summer campaign brought hundreds of primarily white, northern college students to Mississipipi for the summer to help staff freedom schools, register black voters, and dramatize the continued denial of civil rights to blacks throughout the South. The Freedom Summer campaign was both costly and risky. Volunteers were asked to commit an average of two months to a project that was to prove physically and emotionally harrowing for nearly everyone. Moreover, they were expected to be financially independent. Thus they were asked not only to give up their chance of summer employment elsewhere but to support themselves as well (for further description of the Freedom Summer campaign, see McAdam, forthcoming).

Prior to their participation in the campaign, all prospective volunteers were required to fill out detailed applications, providing information on, among other topics, their organizational affiliations, college activities, and reasons for volunteering. On the basis of these applications (and, on occasion, interviews), the prospective volunteer was either accepted or rejected. Acceptance did not necessarily mean participation, however: in advance of the summer, many of the accepted applicants informed campaign staffers that they would not be taking part in the project after all. Completed applications for all three groups—rejects, participants, and withdrawals[1]—now repose in the archives of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for the Study of Non-Violence in Atlanta and the New Mississippi Foundation in Jackson, Mississippi. These applications provide a unique source of archival data for assessing the relative importance of various factors in recruitment to high risk, high cost activism.

These data were collected during a relatively late phase of the Freedom Summer mobilization. It is important to note this because network factors are usually seen as crucial in the initial phases of the mobilization process (see Snow, Zurcher, and Ekland-Olson, 1980), drawing individuals into the movement and socializing them to share the movement's goals and ideologies. Because our data are for individuals who had already applied to participate in the Freedom Summer project, the measures of multiorganizational fields we derive below are only relevant to these applicants. One may imagine much broader fields—of

[1] Of the 1,068 applicants to Freedom Summer, only 55 were rejected. Seven hundred and twenty participated in the program, and 239 withdrew. The participation status of an additional 54 applicants could not be determined, and these cases have therefore been coded as missing. All of the applicants we analyze in this paper were either participants or withdrawals.

which those we identify in this paper are subsets—that would correspond to each university as a whole. The structure of such fields might have been crucial in the early phases of the recruitment process, that is, in getting individuals to apply to Freedom Summer. Unfortunately, our data do not allow us to study this earlier process and the corresponding broader multiorganizational fields from which potential applicants were drawn.

While our data cannot address the factors that attracted individuals to apply to the Freedom Summer project in the first place, they are ideally suited for studying the network or other factors that maintain commitment to the project among the set of applicants. Unlike much prior research, which studies activists *after* the onset of a campaign, our study provides data on individuals before their participation or nonparticipation. For this late stage of the recruitment process, we are able to identify the factors that distinguish between activists and nonactivists—that is, those who followed through on their intention to participate in the summer program and those who withdrew.

THE ACTIVIST CONTEXTS

University of California at Berkeley

When one thinks of the activism of the 1960s and especially of student demonstrations, the conflicts at the University of California at Berkeley stand out as a prime example. A mistake often made, however, is to assume that this era of conflict was inaugurated by the so-called Free Speech Movement that erupted on campus in the fall of 1964 (for descriptions of that movement, see Draper, 1965; Heirich, 1968; Lipset and Wolin, 1965). In fact, by the time the Free Speech movement got under way, the Berkeley campus had already been witness to nearly five years of sporadic activism. If Berkeley was in the forefront of student protest activity in the mid to late sixties, it was only because the ideological and organizational base for that activity had been laid earlier.

The foundation of the activist community at Berkeley was laid in 1957 with SLATE, the leftist student political party that would play a dominant role in campus politics throughout the sixties. The driving force behind SLATE was an undergraduate sociology major named Mike Miller. That Miller remained in 1964 a central figure in civil rights organizing at Berkeley and in the Bay area attests to the strength and continuity of the activist subculture on campus.

SLATE grew in size and strength in the period 1957–1960, helping to mobilize leftist political sentiment at Berkeley. But campus (and Bay area) activism took a quantum leap forward in the spring of 1960 through a series of demonstrations at the San Francisco City Hall protesting the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) hearings being held

inside. Hundreds of Berkeley students took part in the demonstrations; scores were arrested and others injured in what proved to be a forerunner of many later violent confrontations between police and students.

Nor did campus activism subside in the wake of the anti-HUAC demonstrations. Instead, the spread of the black student sit-in movement in the South (see Morris, 1981) galvanized and refocused the energies of Berkeley's activist community. After 1960, campus radicalism became increasingly identified with civil rights activity. In 1961, following a speech on campus, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) chairman, John Lewis, challenged the Berkeley activists to initiate civil rights activity of their own, as Michael Schwartz, a student at the time, has told the authors. In response, Mike Miller—then a graduate student—and others formed a university chapter of the Friends of SNCC. Later, another group of students established a campus chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE). Later still, active chapters of these same two organizations were organized in the city of Berkeley. By early 1963, then, the Berkeley community had emerged as a veritable hotbed of civil rights activity. To coordinate this activity, an Ad Hoc Committee Against Discrimination was created in the fall of 1963. It was this group that was to spearhead an escalating campaign of civil rights demonstrations in the months leading up to Freedom Summer. Virtually all of the Berkeley volunteers to the summer project were active in this campaign.

The beginning of the campaign, and the ostensible reason for founding the Ad Hoc Committee, was a series of demonstrations directed against a chain of drive-in restaurants that purportedly practiced discrimination in the hiring and promotion of black employees. "At Christmas students picketed Berkeley merchants who refused to sign a nondiscriminatory hiring agreement or to report the number of minority employees on their payroll each month" (Heirich, 1968).

In 1964 the Ad Hoc Committee threw its weight behind a "shop-in" campaign initiated by the San Francisco Chapter of CORE. The campaign brought pressure on a leading grocery chain to cease discriminatory hiring practices. This campaign was so effective that the chain signed a nondiscrimination agreement with CORE on March 2, 1964. Buoyed by this victory, about a hundred civil rights activists, including many from Berkeley, ignored a restraining order and that same night initiated picketing against the Sheraton-Palace Hotel in San Francisco. "In the next few weeks literally thousands of students took part. More than nine hundred persons were arrested in the various Sheraton-Palace demonstrations, including about two hundred students enrolled at the Berkeley campus" (Heirich, 1968:45). Of those Berkeley Freedom Summer applicants who listed their history of arrests on their applications,

nine of thirteen participants and one of four no-shows were arrested in those demonstrations. Before the spring semester ended, major campaigns involving many Berkeley students were also launched against an automobile dealer and the Bank of America (Meier and Rudwick, 1973). Both were charged with practicing discrimination in the hiring and promotion of blacks. As with the Sheraton-Palace demonstrations, these two campaigns were marked by mass arrests. (See accounts on the front pages of the *Daily Californian* [1964]: March 1, March 6, March 14, April 20.)

On the eve of Freedom Summer, the activist subculture at Berkeley was thus a community with a long and intense history of civil rights activism. Virtually all those Berkeley students who went to Mississippi were embedded in this community and a party to its history. As such, they stand in a very different relationship to the summer project than do those who applied from Wisconsin.

University of Wisconsin at Madison

The University of Wisconsin offers a marked contrast to Berkeley with regard to the level of leftist activism on campus during the period leading up to Freedom Summer. While the university had had its share of socialist and communist organizing during the thirties, leftist political activism was all but nonexistent on campus in the late fifties and early sixties. Although the Midwest is generally regarded (incorrectly) as the birthplace of a resurgent Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), Wisconsin was without a chapter of the organization until the spring of 1964. Even then, the chapter remained among the smallest and least active of the twenty-nine campus groups affiliated with the organization (Sale, 1973:122).

More relevant for our purposes is the absence of major civil rights organizing on campus. The university did not have a CORE chapter. Nor did Madison. There was no Friends of SNCC chapter in town either. The only civil rights group operating in the area was a small campus chapter of the Friends of SNCC. But even it had confined its activities to fundraising and sponsorship of an occasional speaker. As one of the Wisconsin volunteers told the second author in a recent three-hour interview (one of eighty that were conducted as a part of a follow-up study of all applicants to the summer project; see McAdam, forthcoming):

> There was little happening [on campus]. You know you'd read about Birmingham or wherever and you felt really out of it. . . . It felt very distant and you wanted to be where the action is [sic].

In contrast to Berkeley, then, the activist community at Wisconsin was small, untried, and not particularly well-organized. It is even ques-

tionable whether we can speak of an activist community at this time at Wisconsin at all. Certainly the network of activists that constituted the community was much less well-developed than at Berkeley. The contrast between the size, strength, and history of these two communities may hold the key to understanding the very different dynamics of Freedom Summer recruitment at Berkeley and Wisconsin.

DATA AND METHODS

We use methods of network analysis (see Burt, 1980) to define the multiorganizational field for applicants to Freedom Summer from Berkeley and Wisconsin. In each case, we define the network boundary as the university and the university city. There are two reasons for this. First, the university is the locus of the recruiting efforts for the project (see McAdam, forthcoming: Ch. 2). Second, this definition corresponds to the theoretical definition of a multiorganizational field given by Curtis and Zurcher (1973:53); specifically, multiorganizational fields occur within community settings.

By focusing on two universities, we limit the number of subjects in our study to the forty applicants from the University of California at Berkeley and the twenty-three applicants from the University of Wisconsin at Madison. While this restriction may seem unnecessary, it carries important benefits. In constructing networks, all possible relations among the applicants need to be coded. This number increases rapidly with the number of cases, so that network analyses of the kind presented here are not feasible for large numbers of cases. The small number of cases in this study has the advantage of allowing us to examine the role of little-studied small-group network processes in social movements (see Fine and Stoecker, 1985).

Having recorded the organizational affiliations for each of the applicants to Freedom Summer from the two universities,[2] we formed two people-by-organizational-affiliations matrices: twenty-three people by seventeen organizations for Wisconsin, and forty people by thirty-six organizations for Berkeley. Using Breiger's (1974) method of analyzing overlapping organizational affiliations, we reworked these matrices to reflect network relations among the set of applicants. For each school, we derive a people-by-people matrix (forty by forty for Berkeley; twenty-

[2] In keeping with the idea of the university as the social context of recruitment, we code only those organizations that are locally based, either on campus or in Berkeley or Madison. Extra-local organizations (e.g., the Democratic Party) were excluded from consideration. However, campus or local affiliates of national organizations (e.g., Young Democrats) were used in these analyses if respondents mentioned them explicitly.

three by twenty-three for Wisconsin) in which the entries are the number of organizations that each pair of individuals shares.[3]

These matrices reveal the structure of common memberships in local organizations; they show the links among individual applicants to Freedom Summer. Because these organizations are small, their members are likely to know one another. It is therefore reasonable to attribute social significance to these network relations. For example, relations among the actors might serve as communication channels that can be activated in helping social movement organizations mobilize resources. Whether or not these ties also reflect friendship or other interpersonal relations, at the very least they imply face-to-face encounters that are likely to be crucial in micromobilization (Gamson, Fireman, and Rytina, 1982:1–12). These interpersonal connections are likely to affect individuals' decisions to participate in collective action by exposing them to more social support for participation and raising the social costs of nonparticipation.

We characterize each individual's position relative to every other individual in the Berkeley or Wisconsin network using a measure of network "prominence" (see Knoke and Burt, 1983). Prominence is a measure of centrality (Bonacich, 1972; Knoke and Burt, 1983); it distinguishes among individuals who appear to be equally central (that is, who are tied to the same number of others in the network) on the basis of the centrality of the individuals to whom they are tied. As such, this measure does not reflect a simple attribute of each individual but is a function of the overall network in which each individual is embedded.[4]

We adopt prominence as our measure of centrality because we think that it is best suited for assessing the hypothesized interpersonal influences among the applicants to Freedom Summer. We have explored the efficacy of other conceptions of network centrality in other work (Fernandez and McAdam, forthcoming). Individuals who share the same number of organizational affiliations will not necessarily be equally central in the multiorganizational field, nor equally likely to participate in

[3] Note that the same data can be reworked into organization-by-organization matrices in which the entries reflect the number of people each pair of organizations shares; hence the duality of persons and groups (see Breiger, 1974). In the past (Fernandez and McAdam, forthcoming), we have argued that Curtis and Zurcher's (1973:53) definition of multiorganizational fields implies just such a duality: multiorganizational fields can occur at both the individual level, where organizations link people, and the organizational level, where people form the links among organizations. In this paper, we focus exclusively on one side of this duality, the individual-level. In our past work, we have also studied the organizational level field for Wisconsin (Fernandez and McAdam, forthcoming).

[4] Because each individual's prominence is weighted by every other individual's prominence, this measure is computed as a routine eigenvector problem where every individual's score is calculated simultaneously (see Knoke and Burt, 1983).

Freedom Summer. In terms of potential for mobilization, we think that sharing organizational memberships with individuals who are linked to more centrally located individuals in the network of overlaps is more important than sharing the same number of overlaps with people who are in the periphery of the network. Because they are linked to many people, more central individuals are more likely to experience social influences (costs for possible nonparticipation and benefits for participation) on their decisions to attend the program. Because these individuals experience the most social influences, they are also likely to be more committed to recruiting others. By virtue of being tied to many others, they are likely to exert a disproportionate influence on the decisions of those they are tied to *directly.* By weighting every link among individuals by the degree to which those individuals are themselves linked to others, we are also measuring indirect interpersonal influences among the applicants on the decision to participate.

Our dependent variable in these analyses is participation or nonparticipation in the summer project. Of the forty applicants from Berkeley, thirty-one actually participated in the program, and nine applicants withdrew. The corresponding numbers for Wisconsin are twenty-three applicants, ten participants, and thirteen withdrawals. We code activism as a dummy variable where a 1 indicates participation and 0 indicates withdrawal. For each school, we predict activism in two steps. First we use the prominence measure to examine the effects of structural position of individuals within the multiorganizational field. Then, after controlling for the effects of individual-level variables, we study the independent effects of structural position on individual activism.

On the basis of past research, the individual-level variables that we consider are applicants' parental income, years of education, gender (1 = male), past level of civil rights involvement, and major area of study (social science and humanities versus other). Parental income, gender, and years of education are likely to reflect individual constraints on activism. Students with low parental income are less likely to be able to go without a summer job (recall that Freedom Summer volunteers were not paid). Because of parental and peer sex-role expectations, we expect females to be less likely to participate in the Freedom Summer project than males. Also, following Orum (1972), who found that class standing was positively related to activism, we expect subjects who are more advanced in their educational careers to be more likely to attend Freedom Summer. This is because integration into the local activist community is likely to increase with class standing. We see past civil rights involvement as reflecting the individual's attitudinal affinity with the goals of the civil rights movement or previous integration into activist networks. Our hypothesis regarding major area of study is that social science and humanities majors are likely to be more socially con-

scious than business or natural science majors and will therefore be more likely to attend Freedom Summer.

With the exceptions of parental income and past civil rights activity, the coding of these variables is straightforward. Both participants and withdrawals were asked to list on their applications any previous civil rights activities they were involved in. We assigned a numeric value to each activity, reflecting its intensity relative to other forms of civil rights activism. The idea here is to distinguish between what Oliver (1984) has called token and active contributions to collective action. For example, participation in the Freedom Rides was assigned a score of 7, while contributing money to a civil rights organization was assigned a 1. We then assigned each subject the sum of the points for the reported activities.

Unfortunately, applicants were not asked about their parents' income, so we had to resort to a crude, indirect measure. Students were asked to provide the names and addresses of their parents on their applications. Using these addresses, we coded the median family income for the appropriate census tract, or for the city or county if the address was outside of a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. Only one applicant, who listed an overseas embassy as the parents' address (the father was a U.S. ambassador at the time), was not covered by this procedure. We coded this student's father's income from the State Department's 1964 Foreign Service List. Although these indirect measures are certainly less reliable than a direct measure of parental income, we used them because there were no alternatives.

ANALYSIS

The Multiorganizational Field: Berkeley

Table 1 presents the multiorganizational field for applicants to Freedom Summer from the University of California at Berkeley. The entries show the number of organizations in which each pair of individuals shares membership. The diagonal elements show the number of organizations to which each individual belongs.

Note that the applicants from Berkeley who attended Freedom Summer tend to be linked with one another: the most dense relations in the matrix are among these thirty-one participants. The density[5] for this region of the matrix is .166 (77/465 = .166), compared to .055

[5] Density is the number of ties among the individuals as a proportion of the number of possible ties. All that is distinguished is the presence or absence of a tie; the strength of the tie is irrelevant. For this reason, in computing density, the network is dichotomized as one or a greater number of ties = 1, zero = 0. For discussions of the network concept of density, see Burt (1980).

TABLE 1. Number of Organizational Ties Among Applicants to Freedom Summer from the University of California, Berkeley

		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0
1	.000	0 –
2	.455	2 1 – – – – 2 – 2 1 – – – 1 – – – – – – – – – 1 – 1 1 – 1 – – – – – 1 1 1 – – –
3	.543	3 – 1 – – 2 – 2 – 1 – – 2 – – – 1 – – – – – 1 1 1 1 – 1 – – – – – 1 1 – 1 – –
4	.000	2 –
5	.229	1 – – 1 – 1 – 1 – – 1 – – – 1 – – – – – – – 1 1 –
6	.000	0 –
7	.065	2 – – – 1 – 1 – – – – –
8	.684	3 – 3 1 1 – – 2 – – – 1 – – – – – 1 1 2 1 – 1 – – – – – 1 1 1 – – –
9	.062	3 1 –
10	1.000	6 2 1 – – 2 – – – 1 1 – – – 1 2 1 3 1 – 1 – – – – 2 1 1 1 – –
11	.515	4 – – – – – – – 1 – – – 1 1 – 3 – – – – – – – 2 – 1 1 – –
12	.242	2 – – 1 – – – 1 – – – – – – – 1 1 –
13	.000	0 –
14	.000	5 –
15	.560	4 – – – 1 – – – – – 1 1 1 1 – 1 – – – – – 1 1 – – – –
16	.000	1 –
17	.000	1 –
18	.000	1 – 1
19	.229	1 – – – – – – 1 1 –
20	.220	2 – – – 1 1 – 1 –
21	.013	1 – – – – 1 –
22	.000	1 –
23	.000	0 –
24	.209	1 1 – 1 –
25	.537	4 – 1 1 – 1 –
26	.242	2 1 –
27	.683	4 –
28	.304	3 – 1 –
29	.000	0 –
30	.288	2 –
31	.000	0 –
32	.000	0 –
33	.000	0 –
34	.000	1 –
35	.606	5 1 – 1 –
36	.273	1 –
37	.183	1 –
38	.250	2 –
39	.000	0 –
40	.000	1 –

NOTE: Persons 1 through 31 attended Freedom Summer; 32 through 40 did not. The second column contains network prominence scores for each individual. Diagonal elements indicate the number of organizations that each person belongs to. Dashes indicate absence of organizational ties.

(2/36 = .055) for relations among the withdrawals and .122 (34/279 = .122) for relations between the set of participants and withdrawals. By way of comparison, over 14 percent of all possible ties are found in the network overall: the density for the entire network is .145. The difference in density of ties between participants and nonparticipants (.111) would lead us to expect that network factors will predict participation in Freedom Summer for applicants from Berkeley.

The second column, showing the network prominence scores, summarizes the position of each individual in the network. The measure varies between zero and one, with one assigned to the most prominent person in the network. The person labeled 10 is the most prominent in the Berkeley network. This person belongs to six organizations. As we mentioned above, however, prominence is a function not simply of the *number* of organizations an individual belongs to, but of the *pattern* of overlap with other people in the network. For example, although person 14 belongs to five organizations, he or she receives a prominence score of zero because none of these organizations serves as a link to other applicants. In marked contrast, person 10 shares membership in at least one organization with more than half the participants (sixteen of thirty-one) and half the applicants (twenty of forty) to Freedom Summer. Simple inspection shows that many of these ties are with the next most prominent people in the network and that many of them (as those with persons 8, 27, and 35) involve joint membership in multiple organizations.

If we trace the organizational overlaps for the most prominent people in the network, we find that these links tend to be among the same people. For example, person 27 shares organizations not only with person 10, but with persons 8, 15, and 35 as well. All of these people are quite prominent in the network. The majority of the overlaps tend to occur among participants to Freedom Summer.

While there is a tendency for the most prominent people to be participants, there are also many exceptions to this pattern. Among the participants, eleven are structural isolates, that is, they do not share organizational memberships with any of the other applicants. Of those eleven isolates, six did not report any organizational affiliations (they have zeros on the diagonal). The other five people report some organizational affiliations, but they have none in common with the other applicants. If structural position were the only variable determining participation in Freedom Summer, then these eleven people would be "mistakes," that is, none of them should have attended the summer program.

There are "mistakes" in the other direction as well. Of the nine nonparticipants, only five are structural isolates, and three of these do not report any organizational affiliations. Among the four nonisolates, person 35, who is tied to many of the most prominent participants, is

among the most prominent people in the network. The other nonisolate nonparticipants also show many links to participants, albeit not the most prominent ones. Here too, these results militate against the idea that structural position is the sole determinant of participation in Freedom Summer.

The Multiorganizational Field: Wisconsin

Table 2 presents the multiorganizational field for applicants from the University of Wisconsin at Madison. Because we have analyzed the structure of this matrix elsewhere (see Fernandez and McAdam, forthcoming), we will only highlight the major findings and the contrast with Berkeley here. As with Table 1, each entry in the matrix denotes the number of organizations in which each pair of individuals shares membership, with the diagonal representing the number of organizations to which each person belongs. The individuals labeled A to J all participated in Freedom Summer, while those labeled K to W withdrew.

The overall density of network relations for Wisconsin (.083) is much lower than the overall density for Berkeley (.145 or 75 percent higher). The lower density of ties at Wisconsin is consistent with our supposition that the activist community at Wisconsin was much less well-developed than the community at Berkeley at this time.

Further, as for Berkeley, network ties among the withdrawals from Freedom Summer are less dense than either those among the participants or those between the participants and withdrawals. The density for those participating in Freedom Summer is .200 (9/45 = .200), while the density for withdrawals is .026 (2/78 = .026); the density of ties between the participants and withdrawals is .077 (10/130 = .077). The contrast in density between participants and withdrawals is somewhat larger for Wisconsin (.174) than Berkeley (.111). While the density among participants is higher at Wisconsin (20 percent versus 16.6 percent), the densities in the other regions of the network (between participants and withdrawals and among withdrawals) are both larger for Berkeley. The proportion of relations that involve nonparticipants is, therefore, substantially higher at Berkeley than at Wisconsin. The activist community at Berkeley is clearly the better-integrated group. The network of organizational overlaps at Berkeley appears, however, to integrate nonparticipants better than the network at Wisconsin. This leads us to think that structural position in the network is likely to be a stronger predictor of participation in Freedom Summer at Wisconsin than at Berkeley.

If we consider the prominence scores, we find that, with some notable exceptions, there is a tendency for the more prominent individuals in the multiorganizational field to be participants in the Freedom

TABLE 2. Number of Organizational Ties Among Applicants to Freedom Summer from the University of Wisconsin, Madison

		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W
A	.000	0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
B	.000		0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
C	.000			1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
D	.970				3	–	1	–	1	2	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	1	–	–	–
E	.000					0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
F	.910						3	–	–	1	1	–	–	–	1	–	–	1	–	–	1	–	–	–
G	.000							0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
H	.549								2	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
I	.970									2	2	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	–	–	1	–	–	–
J	1.000										3	–	–	–	–	–	1	1	–	–	1	–	–	–
K	.000											0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
L	.000												0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
M	.000													1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
N	.170														1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
O	.000															0	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
P	.194																3	–	1	–	–	–	–	–
Q	.883																	1	–	–	1	–	–	–
R	.036																		2	–	–	–	–	–
S	.000																			0	–	–	–	–
T	.883																				3	–	–	–
U	.000																					1	–	–
V	.000																						0	–
W	.000																							1

NOTE: Capital letters denote individuals. Persons A through J attended Freedom Summer; K through W did not. The second column contains network prominence scores for each individual. Diagonal elements indicate the number of organizations that each person belongs to. Dashes indicate absence of organizational ties.

Summer project. The four most prominent people in the network (J, D, I, and F) all participated in Freedom Summer. As the entries in the matrix show, these individuals all shared organizational affiliations. Persons J and D both belonged to three organizations, two of which they shared. Both of these were civil rights organizations: Congress on Racial Equality (CORE) and the University of Wisconsin Friends of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). Person I belonged to two organizations, both of which were among those that D and J shared. Person F was a member of three organizations but shared membership in only one organization with each of the other three prominent individuals.

It is again clear that participation in Freedom Summer is not *only* a function of structural position in the multiorganizational field. There are many exceptions to the tendency for the participants to be more central than the withdrawals. Persons A, B, C, E, and G are all participants in Freedom Summer, but they are all isolates. On the other hand, persons Q and T are two of the most prominent, and they withdrew.

The Berkeley and Wisconsin results together suggest that structural position in the multiorganizational field is likely to predict participation in Freedom Summer. Because nonparticipants are relatively better integrated into the multiorganizational field at Berkeley, we expect this effect to be weaker at Berkeley than at Wisconsin. That there are exceptions at both schools to the pattern of more central individuals participating in Freedom Summer, however, suggests that there are other determinants of activism besides structural position in the multiorganizational field.

Models Predicting Activism

There may be individual background characteristics that explain the relationship between network prominence and activism. We test this hypothesis by controlling for a number of individual background characteristics in a model that predicts participation in Freedom Summer.[6]

Table 3 presents descriptive statistics for variables in our model. The mean on the dependent variable shows that over three-quarters (77.5 percent) of the applicants from Berkeley eventually participated in the Freedom Summer campaign. In contrast, less than half (43.5 percent) of the applicants from Wisconsin attended the summer program.

[6] Because the dependent variable is dichotomous (that is, participation in Freedom Summer versus not), we use techniques of logistic regression analysis (see Hanushek and Jackson, 1977: Ch. 7). Ordinary least squares regression estimates may result in estimates that are out of the zero-one interval. A logit specification provides a solution to this problem.

The two schools show differences on the independent variables as well. Berkeley applicants' parental income, at least as it has been measured by our proxy, is about $2,000 more than the parental income of Wisconsin applicants. Because we think that a higher family income serves to facilitate participation in Freedom Summer, this pattern is consistent with the higher rate of participation among the Berkeley applicants. If we examine the last two panels of Table 3, however, we find that there is very little difference between the mean family income for Wisconsin's participants and withdrawals, and that for Berkeley the mean is larger for withdrawals than for the participants.

The mean level of past activism is substantially higher for participants than withdrawals: at both schools, past activists are more likely to attend Freedom Summer. There are also differences between participants and withdrawals with regard to gender. On average, males at Berkeley are only slightly more likely to attend Freedom Summer than females; however, the sex difference in participation is quite large for Wisconsin. Although the proportion male is only slightly higher for Wisconsin when we consider all the applicants, *none* of the female applicants from Wisconsin participated in the Freedom Summer campaign.

Note, finally, that the mean level of network prominence is higher in Wisconsin than in Berkeley. There is also more spread in distribution of prominence at Wisconsin than at Berkeley. Dividing the standard deviation by the mean (the coefficient of variation) for the two schools shows that variation in prominence is greater at Wisconsin than at Berkeley (1.453 versus 1.298). Moreover, the difference in network prominence between participants and withdrawals is considerably greater for Wisconsin than for Berkeley. This is consistent with our hypothesis that network prominence is likely to be a more important determinant of participation at Wisconsin than at Berkeley.

The analyses presented in Table 4 confirm this result. Table 4 shows the results of logistic regressions predicting participation for Berkeley and Wisconsin, with prominence as the independent variable.[7] For both schools, the effect of prominence on the probability of participation is positive.[8] A comparison of both the Delta P parameters (analogous to

[7] For each school, we present the raw logistic regression coefficient and two transformations of this effect, denoted "Delta P" and "Elasticity" in the tables. Delta P is analogous to an unstandardized regression coefficient; it shows the change in the probability of participation resulting from a unit increase in the independent variable (see Petersen, 1985). The elasticity expresses the change in the probability in percentage form; it is the percent change in the probability of participation resulting from a percent change in the independent variable. For qualitative variables such as gender, a percent increase is meaningless. For this reason, the elasticities for dummy variables are placed in parentheses.

[8] As our data comprise the population of applicants from Berkeley and Wisconsin, we

TABLE 3. Means and Standard Deviations for Variables Predicting Freedom Summer Participation for Applicants from Berkeley and Wisconsin

	Berkeley (N = 40)		Wisconsin (N = 23)	
	Mean	St. Dev.	Mean	St. Dev.
Both Participants and Withdrawals:				
Participation in Freedom Summer	.775	.418	.435	.496
Income (in 1000s)	10.191	4.746	7.963	2.697
Education	15.575	1.278	15.000	1.624
Gender (1 = male)	.625	.484	.696	.460
Past Activism	7.625	7.082	6.000	6.592
Major (1 = Soc. Sci. or Hum.)	.600	.490	.435	.496
Prominence	.201	.261	.285	.414
Participants:	(N = 31)		(N = 10)	
Income (in 1000s)	9.951	4.334	8.160	2.226
Education	15.648	1.311	14.203	1.550
Gender (1 = male)	.610	.488	1.000	0
Past Activism	8.648	7.139	8.100	8.602
Major (1 = Soc. Sci. or Hum.)	.578	.494	.600	.490
Prominence	.231	.272	.440	.482
Withdrawals:	(N = 9)		(N = 13)	
Income (in 1000s)	11.016	6.197	7.811	3.093
Education	15.331	1.223	15.620	1.451
Gender (1 = male)	.667	.471	.460	.498
Past Activism	4.111	5.947	4.381	4.209
Major (1 = Soc. Sci. or Hum.)	.667	.471	.309	.462
Prominence	.149	.209	.171	.322

eschew statistical significance tests. In conceiving of the data in this manner, however, we lose the ability to generalize our findings about the individuals to other settings. Since we do not think it is reasonable to conceive of this process at a purely individual level (note that the network they are embedded in is a collective property of the setting), we think that the units that one needs to theorize about are the settings themselves. From this perspective, this paper is a detailed analysis of two case studies. Readers should not be misled by the fact that we have some quantitative data on subunits; our analyses run all the risks that case studies normally run in terms of the representativeness of the findings. We will address the issue of the representativeness of these findings in subsequent work by analyzing data on Freedom Summer participation in other recruitment contexts.

TABLE 4. Logistic Regression Analyses Predicting Participation in the Freedom Summer Project for Berkeley and Wisconsin

	Berkeley (N = 40)			Wisconsin (N = 23)		
	Coeff.	Delta P[a]	Elasticity[b]	Coeff.	Delta P[a]	Elasticity[b]
Prominence	1.481	.163	.070	1.731	.378	.279
Constant	.964			−.763		
Mean of the Dependent Variable	.775			.435		
−2Log-Likelihood	41.846			28.886		
Pseudo-R-square[c]	.019			.083		

[a]Change in probability resulting from a unit change in the independent variable (Petersen, 1985:131).
[b]Percent change in the probability resulting from a percent change in the independent variable.
[c]Calculated as (Lc − Lm)/Lc where Lc and Lm are the log-likelihood statistics for equations with just the constant and the substantive model respectively.

unstandardized regression coefficients) and the elasticities shows, however, that structural position in the network is a much stronger predictor of participation for applicants from Wisconsin than Berkeley. The pseudo R-square measure (see Aldrich and Nelson, 1984) confirms this: network prominence explains less variation at Berkeley (.019) than at Wisconsin (.083). Interestingly, the constants indicate that structural isolates (individuals who are not connected in the network and are coded zero prominence) at Wisconsin are not likely to attend Freedom Summer, but that isolates at Berkeley are likely to participate in the program. No doubt this latter finding is due to the very high rate of participation at Berkeley.

Table 5 introduces controls for a number of variables that might explain participation in Freedom Summer. For each school, equation 1 contains only the individual-level variables, while equation 2 adds the network prominence measure. Examining equation 1 for the two schools, we find that all the individual-level variables in the model explain much less variation in the probability of participation at Berkeley than at Wisconsin (the pseudo R-squares are .103 and .520, respectively). With the exception of dummy variables for gender and major, the relative strength of the effects is the same at Berkeley and Wisconsin. For both schools, the elasticities show that education has the strongest effect, past activism the next strongest, and parental income the least. There are important differences between the two schools, however.

TABLE 5. Logistic Regression Analyses Predicting Participation in the Freedom Summer Project for Berkeley and Wisconsin (Elasticities for dummy variables in parentheses)

	Berkeley (N = 40)						Wisconsin (N = 23)					
	Equation 1			Equation 2			Equation 1			Equation 2		
	Coeff.	Delta P[a]	Elasticity[b]	Coeff.	Delta P[a]	Elasticity[b]	Coeff.	Delta P[a]	Elasticity[b]	Coeff.	Delta P[a]	Elasticity[b]
Income (in 1000s)	−.040	−.007	−.090	−.040	−.007	−.090	.064	.016	.288	.099	.024	.446
Education	.130	.022	.456	.220	.225	.771	−.745	−.167	−6.316	−.889	−.194	−7.537
Gender (1 = male)	−.421	−.082	(−.059)	.343	−.065	(−.048)	11.419	.565	(4.490)	12.816	.565	(5.039)
Past Activism	.121	.020	.208	.107	.018	.184	.236	.059	.800	.018	.004	.061
Major (1 = Soc. Sci. or Hum.)	−.369	−.071	(−.050)	−.266	−.046	(−.036)	−1.422	−.278	(−.349)	−.699	−.158	(−.172)
Prominence				1.304	.152	.062				4.986	.556	.804
Constant	−.190			−1.920			−.883			.933		
Mean of the Dependent Variable	.775			.775			.435			.435		
−2Log-Likelihood	38.267			37.820			15.126			12.784		
Pseudo R-square[c]	.103			.113			.520			.594		

[a]Change in probability resulting from a unit change in the independent variable (Petersen, 1985:131).

[b]Percent change in the probability resulting from a percent change in the independent variable.

[c]Calculated (Lc − Lm)/Lc where Lc and Lm are the log-likelihood statistics for equations with just the constant and the substantive model respectively.

First, the substantive effects of the independent variables tend to be much larger for Wisconsin than Berkeley. For example, controlling the other factors in the model, a one-thousand-dollar increment in parents' income raises the probability of participation by almost two points (.016) at Wisconsin. A comparable increase in income slightly lowers the probability (−.007) at Berkeley. These findings are consistent with the slight differences in mean parental income we noted in Table 3.

Although the difference is in the opposite direction, we find the effect of years of education is also much stronger at Wisconsin than at Berkeley. For every percent increase in years of education, the probability of participation increases almost half a percent at Berkeley (elasticity = .456). This is consistent with our hypothesis that people who are further along in their educational careers are more likely to be able to take a summer away from their studies to attend Freedom Summer. In striking contrast, at Wisconsin, a similar increase in education results in over a 6 percent *decrease* in the probability of participation.

When we examine gender differences, we find that the results for Berkeley are inconsistent with our hypothesis. When the other variables in the model are controlled, females are slightly more likely to attend Freedom Summer than males. In contrast, at Wisconsin males are much more likely to attend Freedom Summer, even after other factors are controlled.

The results for equation 1 also show that the direct effect of past activism is much stronger at Wisconsin than at Berkeley. This is somewhat surprising in light of the similarity of the two schools in terms of the differences in mean levels of past activism for participants and withdrawals. Finally, contrary to our expectations, social sciences and humanities majors at both schools are less likely than other majors to attend Freedom Summer. Here, too, the effect is much stronger for Wisconsin than Berkeley.

Equation 2 adds the network prominence measure to the model. For both schools, the pseudo R-square increases when the prominence measure is added. The size of this increase is moderate for Wisconsin (.520 versus .594) but trivial for Berkeley (.103 versus .113). When we examine the parameters for prominence for the two schools, we find that for Berkeley the effect of prominence is among the weakest of those reported (elasticity = .062), while at Wisconsin prominence is one of the strongest effects in the model (elasticity = .804). These results are consistent with our predictions that network factors are likely to be more important for Wisconsin than for Berkeley. But what is even more interesting is that, for Wisconsin, the direct effect of network prominence is larger than the gross effect (.804 versus .279). Controlling individual-level variables enhances the effect of prominence for applicants from Wisconsin, but not Berkeley. Why individual-level variables tend

to suppress the relationship between prominence and participation for Wisconsin is unclear. As we will show, however, this is not the only way the individual-level variables and prominence affect one another in the Wisconsin data; the effects of some of the individual-level variables are also modified when network position is controlled.

For Berkeley, the introduction of the network prominence measure changes the effects of the individual-level variables very little. Only the effect of education changes when network prominence is controlled: individuals who are further along in their educational careers are then even more likely to attend Freedom Summer.

In contrast, controlling network prominence changes a number of the effects in the model for Wisconsin. First, the effect of parental income becomes stronger. Apparently, network prominence suppresses the effect of socioeconomic factors on the probability of participation in Freedom Summer. Why this is the case is unclear. Second, the effect of the major becomes weaker. Part of the tendency for social science and humanities majors to be less likely to attend Freedom Summer is explained by position in the multiorganizational field. Third, the effect of years of education becomes stronger. Students who are more advanced in their educational careers are even less likely to participate in Freedom Summer when their position in the multiorganizational field is taken into account.

Finally, the tendency for people who have been active in civil rights protest to participate becomes nil once structural position is controlled.[9] This result is especially intriguing when we consider that past activism is likely to indicate individual propensities toward civil rights activism. If this is true, then this result suggests that for applicants from Wisconsin, the effects of these individual propensities are mediated by network position. This would imply that individuals with histories of civil rights activism are more likely to attend Freedom Summer because their choices of organizational affiliations place them in more prominent positions in the network. However, highly active individuals who are not prominent are not very likely to go to Freedom Summer. In other words, at least for applicants from Wisconsin, structural position in the multiorganizational field is likely to be a product of individuals' interests in civil rights activities, but these interests are not converted into a propensity to participate in Freedom Summer, except by virtue of such network positions. Prominence in Wisconsin's multiorganizational field,

[9] This same finding surfaced in our other work in a differently specified model (Fernandez and McAdam, forthcoming). The most important difference is that we did not use a parent income proxy in those analyses. That network prominence remains an important predictor of participation for Wisconsin in this model suggests that socioeconomic factors do not account for the effect of structural position that we reported there.

therefore, not only increases the chances of participation in Freedom Summer, but also serves to channel individual propensities toward civil rights activism, converting these propensities into collective action (for a detailed discussion of this point, see Fernandez and McAdam, forthcoming).

DISCUSSION

This paper has explored the role of structural position within a multiorganizational field in recruitment to social movements. Using data for applicants from two universities, we developed a model of recruitment that uses structural position to predict participation in the Freedom Summer project.

The results of this model have several important implications. First, they lend support to the notion that while structural availability is an important determinant of participation in social movements, the effects of structural and other variables on participation are contingent on the recruitment context. For one of the two sites we studied, the University of Wisconsin at Madison, the role of structural position in the multiorganizational field is quite strong. In addition to having an independent effect on the probability of participating in Freedom Summer, structural position also tempers the effects of some of the individual-level variables and enhances the effects of others. We could find no evidence of these processes working at the University of California at Berkeley, however: both the gross and net effects of structural location in the network were small. Structural position in the multiorganizational field has a measurable impact on the probability of participating in the Freedom Summer campaign, then, but this effect depends on the recruitment context.

Second, these analyses suggest the complex interplay between structural position and individual-level background factors in producing activism. In addition to having an independent effect on the probability of participating in Freedom Summer, structural position in the Wisconsin network also tempers the effect of individuals' past civil rights activism. That we find little evidence of this pattern at Berkeley indicates that the recruitment context affects not only the kinds of social influences that serve to maintain commitment to the movement, but also the manner in which these social influences combine with individual-level factors to predict participation. The recruitment context appears to change the way in which structural and other factors affect participation in Freedom Summer.

Which facets of the overall structural context of recruitment have these far-reaching consequences? With only two contexts, any description of the role of recruitment context is highly speculative. Nevertheless, we offer some tentative hypotheses.

We think that the key difference between the Berkeley and Wisconsin recruitment contexts is the history of civil rights activism at the two campuses. It is important to remember that Berkeley applicants exhibited relatively little variation in participation in Freedom Summer: the norm was to attend. The Berkeley applicants were relatively homogeneous with respect to some of the independent variables as well. Probably one of the most important of these was the setting in which they were recruited. At Berkeley, there was little need for anything else to reinforce the initial impulse to apply to the program; the activist subculture provided reinforcement on an almost daily basis. In contrast, Wisconsin lacked an intense activist community with a tradition of civil rights protest. The Freedom Summer recruitment was consequently less successful there. The Freedom Summer applicants from Wisconsin were the pioneers of civil rights protest on campus. They did not engage in these early efforts as solitary individuals, however: commitment to the Freedom Summer campaign was apparently maintained by integration in a campus- and community-based organizational network.

Against this background, the structure of the multiorganizational field at Berkeley may be seen as a result of the ongoing civil rights activities there. As we observed earlier with regard to Wisconsin, it is likely that individuals' organizational affiliations are a function of their propensity toward civil rights protest. Seen in this way, the structure of the multiorganizational field is a macro-outcome of these individual choices: the dense network of shared organizations is a result of the long history of civil rights protest at Berkeley. The success of the civil rights movement at Berkeley produced a multiorganizational field that was dense, well-integrated, and (compared to Wisconsin) relatively homogeneous. It is not surprising, therefore, that network factors are not able to distinguish participants from withdrawals at Berkeley.

The results are consistent with a conception of recruitment contexts as the residue of a protest culture. This residue is not neutral in its effects; it forms the basis of subsequent mobilizations by affecting the actions of potential recruits. The effects of the context can be felt at both the individual level, perhaps by raising the social costs of nonparticipation in a movement and the benefits of participation, and the group level, by affecting the number and form of interactions among potential recruits. For these reasons, the context is likely to exert an important influence on all the processes involved in the Freedom Summer recruitment, including those related to the structural variables.

If our description of the recruitment context as a residue of past activism is correct, then time becomes an important variable for understanding the nature of recruitment to social movements. This is not surprising, for the time-dependent nature of social movements has long been recognized. It is possible that the residue of the protest culture

might have operated quite differently at an earlier point in the Freedom Summer recruitment. Network factors may have played an important role at an earlier phase. The already well-developed organizational network, a result of the extraordinary level of civil rights activity on the Berkeley campus, might have served an important communication function, thereby encouraging people to apply. This is consistent with the results of a classic study of diffusion of innovation (Coleman, Katz, and Menzel, 1966), which shows that network effects are important during the early phases of the diffusion process in distinguishing adopters from nonadopters, but that these effects dissipate toward the end of the process. If this is the case, then by studying this late phase of the Freedom Summer recruitment we will have missed the effect of these networks. Unfortunately, we do not have available any data that would allow us to test this intriguing hypothesis.

While we cannot test hypotheses about the earlier phase of the recruitment process, we will be able to bring more data to bear on the questions that motivated this paper, for we are in the process of obtaining and coding data to determine the multiorganizational fields for respondents from other colleges and universities. Our conjectures in these matters are supported so far, however, by the qualitative information we have on the history of activism at these two universities. As more cases become available, we will be able to develop a full contextual model of participation in Freedom Summer. Such a model should allow us a better specification of the complex interrelationships between structural factors and recruitment contexts in their effects on participation in social movements.

REFERENCES

Aldrich, John H. and Forrest D. Nelson
1984 Linear Probability, Logit, and Probit Models. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Bolton, Charles D.
1972 "Alienation and action: A study of peace group members." American Journal of Sociology 78:537–561.

Bonacich, Phillip
1972 "Techniques for analyzing overlapping memberships." In Herbert L. Costner (ed.), Sociological Methodology 1972: 176–185. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Breiger, Ronald L.
1974 "The duality of persons and groups." Social Forces 53:181–189.

Burt, Ronald S.
1980 "Models of network structure." Annual Review of Sociology 6:79–141.

Coleman, James S., Elihu Katz, and Herbert Menzel
1966 Medical Innovation: A Diffusion Study. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill.

Curtis, Russell L. and Louis A. Zurcher, Jr.
1973 "Stable resources of protest movements: The multiorganizational field." Social Forces 52:53–60.

Draper, Hal
1965 Berkeley: The New Student Revolt. New York: Grove Press.

Fernandez, Roberto M. and Doug McAdam
Forthcoming "Multiorganizational fields

and recruitment to social movements." In Bert Klandermans (ed.), Organizing for Social Change: Social Movement Organizations Across Cultures. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Fine, Gary Alan and Randy Stoecker

1985 "Can the circle be unbroken? Small groups and social movements." Advances in Group Processes 2:1–28.

Fireman, Bruce and William A. Gamson

1979 "Utilitarian logic in the resource mobilization perspective." In Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy (eds.), The Dynamics of Social Movements: Resource Mobilization, Social Control, and Tactics: 8–44. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.

Gamson, William A., Bruce Fireman, and Steven Rytina

1982 Encounters with Unjust Authority. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Hanushek, Eric A. and John E. Jackson

1977 Statistical Methods for Social Scientists. New York: Academic.

Harrison, Michael L.

1974 "Sources of recruitment to Catholic Pentecostalism." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 13:49–64.

Heirich, Max

1968 The Beginning: Berkeley, 1964. New York: Columbia University Press.

1977 "Change of heart: A test of some widely held theories of religious conversion." American Journal of Sociology 83:653–680.

Jenkins, Craig

1983 "Resource mobilization theory and the study of social movements." Annual Review of Sociology 9:527–553.

Knoke, David and Ronald S. Burt

1983 "Prominence." In Ronald S. Burt and Michael J. Minor (eds.), Applied Network Analysis: 195–222. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lipset, Seymour M. and Sheldon Wolin

1965 The Berkeley Student Revolt. New York: Doubleday Anchor.

McAdam, Doug

1986 "Recruitment to high-risk activism: The case of Freedom Summer." American Journal of Sociology 92:64–90.

Forthcoming The Idealists Revisited: The Personal and Societal Consequences of Mississippi Freedom Summer. New York: Oxford University Press.

McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald

1977 "Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory." American Journal of Sociology 82:1212–1241.

Meier, August and Elliott Rudwick

1973 CORE, A Study in the Civil Rights Movement, 1942–1968. New York: Oxford University Press.

Morris, Aldon D.

1981 "Black southern student sit-in movement: An analysis of internal organization." American Sociological Review 46:744–767.

1984 The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change. New York: Free Press.

Oliver, Pamela

1984 "'If you don't do it, nobody else will': Active and token contributors to local collective action." American Sociological Review 49:601–610.

Orum, Anthony

1972 Black Students in Protest: A Study of the Origins of the Black Student Movement. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

Perrow, Charles

1970 "Members as resources in voluntary organizations." In W. R. Rosengren and M. Lefton (eds.), Organizations and Clients: Essays in the Sociology of Service: 93–116. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.

Petersen, Trond

1985 "A comment on presenting results from logit and probit models." American Sociological Review 50:130–131.

Rosenthal, Naomi, M. Fingrutd, M. Ethier, R. Karant, and D. McDonald

1985 "Social movements and network analysis: A case study of nineteenth-

century women's reform in New York state." American Journal of Sociology 90:1022–1054.

Sale, Kirkpatrick

1973 SDS. New York: Random House.

Snow, David A., Louis A. Zurcher, Jr., and Sheldon Ekland-Olson

1980 "Social networks and social movements: A microstructural approach to differential recruitment." American Sociological Review 45:787–801.

1983 "Further thoughts on social networks and social movements." Sociology 17:112–120.

Stark, Rodney and William Sims Bainbridge

1980 "Networks of faith: Interpersonal bonds and recruitment to cults and sects." American Journal of Sociology 85:1376–1395.