

Why Do Some Leaders Work Harder than Others?

The Role of Gender, Grievance, Biographical Availability, and Bureaucratic Complexity

Cassandra Rasmussen Dorius and John McCarthy

The Pennsylvania State University

*working paper

6/29/2009

Abstract

This study is one of the first to systematically consider variation in effort among activist leaders in social movement organizations. We develop and test theoretical accounts of activist participation to predict weekly effort among local anti-drunk driving chapter leaders, including measures of chapter structure (e.g., bureaucratic complexity and the diversity of victim support activities) and individual leader characteristics (e.g., objective grievance, employment, marital status, number of children, and gender). Taken together, our models explain over 43% of the variation in reported weekly leadership effort. Further analyses reveal that gender almost wholly conditions the effect of bureaucratic complexity on leadership effort so that increasingly complex chapter structures are associated with substantial increases in work hours for women, but not for men. We conclude by pondering whether the strong effect of grievance and gender on how much work leaders do in this movement is a general one or is particular to victim-oriented and female dominated movements and/or movements at the peak of their influence like this one.

Manuscript word count= (10,681 including references, minus abstract and title page)

Why Do Some Leaders Work Harder than Others?

The Role of Gender, Grievance, Biographical Availability, and Bureaucratic Complexity

Introduction

Why do citizens participate in collective action? The question has motivated a substantial and diverse research effort since the rebirth of social movement scholarship three decades ago (Lofland 1995). Most of that work attempts to account for who becomes an activist, failing to distinguish between those who participate now and again from those who are more regularly active. Studies that attempt to describe and account for the variation in the extent of participation by those who have already become activists are relatively rare. And, studies that attempt to account for who becomes an activist leader and/or that examine *variation in the amount of effort leaders devote to leading* are, as far as we can determine, non-existent. If this is a fair representation of current scholarship on activism, then the lack of attention to leadership activism is puzzling since few would doubt the central importance of activist leaders in both creating the organizational vehicles for collective action as well as facilitating subsequent collective action by members (Oliver & Marwell 1992; Morris & Staggenborg, 2004).

In an effort to fill this lacuna in past research, we develop a set of theoretical expectations about the variation in weekly labor grassroots activist leaders provide to their organizations based upon a synthesis of past research on activist participation (Klandermans 1998; 2004). We then test these theoretical expectations with an analysis of indicators of chapter structure (e.g., bureaucratic complexity and diversity of victim services) and individual leader characteristics (e.g., grievance level, gender, employment status, educational attainment, marital status, number of school age children, and age) on the amount of effort leaders reported each week. Our evidence was gathered from more than 350 presidents of local chapters of Mothers Against Drunken Driving (MADD) and Remove Intoxicated Drivers (RID). This is an especially appropriate sample for investigating

leadership effort because the estimates of hours worked per week vary quite dramatically among the sample; 25% of the leaders reported devoting less than 5 hours a week to their leadership activities while 43% indicated devoting more than 16 hours a week to being leaders, equivalent to holding a part-time job, and 19% reported spending more than 30 hours a week on average, almost equivalent to holding a full time job. As well, a little over half of chapter leaders were victims of drunk driving while the rest were not, providing an ideal opportunity to assess the impact of experiencing an objective grievance upon leader effort. Whether our findings about the impacts of these factors are general or germane only to leaders in victim-oriented movements like this one is a question we will address in our conclusion.

After first describing the activist leaders who are the focus of our attention here, we nest our research question--*how to best explain variation in the number of hours local leaders spend leading their group in a typical week*--in the theoretical discourse about how to account for activist participation in social movements. We then extend those explanations to the question of leadership effort, suggesting that theories applicable to the general membership may be adapted to account for variation in levels of effort by leaders. We conclude our theoretical arguments by bringing the question of gender to the foreground, suggesting that women may be expected to respond to organizational context in distinctive ways that contrast with men's typical responses.

The Activist Leaders of MADD and RID

Beginning in the late 1970s and gaining momentum over the next decade, the social movement opposed to drinking and driving had spawned more than 450 local chapters by 1985, with the vast majority of groups affiliated with Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD). Fewer groups were associated with Remove Intoxicated Drivers (RID), which had begun earlier than MADD but remained far more decentralized with its national offices providing fewer chapter services and less support than did MADD (McCarthy and Wolfson, 1996; McCarthy, Wolfson and Harvey, 1987;

Weed, 1990). The impetus for establishing these groups in one's community was rather broad. Most commonly the chapters were formed by citizens who happened to have been victims of drunk driving, and sometimes around existing community groups that supported the movement's agenda—such as church congregations—and even by clusters of co-workers with the help of their employers. Regardless of the circumstances that brought the founding members to together, once they established a chapter they more or less closely followed standard procedures in selecting a president to oversee the day-to-day operations of the group and to coordinate with the national office¹. Since most of the MADD and RID chapters had only been in existence for a few years when they were surveyed in 1986, over two-thirds (71%) of the chapter presidents had been one of the founders of their local group with most able to glean experience in operating an organization from activism in other community groups. In fact, 75% of the presidents reported current participation in up to three other community organizations during the year we contacted them, with most participating in groups broadly defined as church, welfare, civic, political and/or school.

Consistent with the public image of the movement and reinforced by the name of the dominant federation of groups, MADD, over three-quarters of the presidents were women and slightly over half of the leaders had a school aged child in the home. And in line with victim's organizations more generally, the national face of this movement was dominated by self-identified "victims" such as Candy Lightner, the founder of MADD, who lost a daughter to a drunk driver. At the chapter level, however, only a little more than fifty percent of the presidents were victims as strictly defined by movement members as a person who had themselves been (8%) or had a close relative (44%) who was injured or killed by a drunk driver. The local groups these leaders headed were, for the most part, rather modest enterprises. They reported an average membership of about

¹ Interestingly, presidents in chapters that organized around an existing group (and therefore built upon prior institutional and human resource knowledge as well as pre-established bureaucratic structures) worked a similar number of hours each week and led groups with a similarly complex organizational structure as presidents who led chapters not organized around an already established group.

125 people (median = 35, with 80% reporting less than 100 members) and a mailing list with about 275 names². The median annual revenue of these groups was less than \$1,500, and there was an average of about 50 aggregate hours of volunteer effort a month, and less than twenty members in attendance at typical chapter meetings. However, there was great variation among the groups, with some of them being relatively inactive while others showed signs of great vitality.

The chapters focused their efforts on three primary kinds of activities that they defined as public awareness (including many kinds of activities to bring the issue of drunk driving to wider public attention), legislative action, and victim support activities. Of these three activities, victim support tended to be the most labor and time intensive. And, even though chapters varied widely in their monthly effort in this area, most groups experienced great pressure to provide resources for such activities, often because of the inevitable interactions between chapter leaders and each new cohort of local victims who sought relief for their personal grief resulting from drunk driving incidents. Groups developed distinctive profiles for dealing with such potential case loads such as informal counseling with new victims, taking on longer term management of specific victim cases as they worked their way through the court system, as well as the development and management of victim support groups. Beyond the burden of managing the day to day activities of their local chapters, presidents found the provision of victim support activities to be an especially time consuming and emotionally demanding set of tasks³.

² Later in the 1980's when MADD was very actively pursuing telemarketing campaigns to raise resources for their work, they reported more than 5 million contributors to the organization and the mailing lists grew quickly.

³ Around the time of the survey, a national director of victim services was hired to interview hundreds of DUI victims and develop a unified system for providing support (<http://www.madd.org/About-us/About-us/History.aspx>, 25th Anniversary). Two decades later, the victim support services offered by MADD were administered largely at the national level in the form of an advice hotline where victims speak with trained advocates, an informational website with a chat room for victims, and access to information regarding legal support for bereavement, injury, justice advocacy, and financial recovery after victimization (see <http://www.madd.org/Victim-Services.aspx>). Because the chapter presidents in our study were developing and implementing grassroots approaches to victim services without professional support, it is likely that the effort required to maintain victim support services was greater at this time than for any subsequent wave of MADD leaders.

The data we draw upon to assess our theoretical expectations pertain to the activities of local anti-drunk driving groups for the year of 1985⁴. By then the movement against drinking and driving was thriving in several countries, including the United States, Canada, and Great Britain (Rock 1988a; 1988b). In the U.S., the movement had achieved wide national recognition as part of a broader victim's rights movement that was integral in passing the *Federal Victim and Witness Protection Act* (Marion 1995; Weed 1995) and in institutionalizing a "victim's bill of rights" in more than 30 states (Weed 1995). Furthermore, the group was tied to the successful passage of over 130 state-level anti drunk driving laws and in raising the federal minimum drinking age to 21 (<http://www.madd.org/About-us/About-us/History.aspx>) At the time of the survey the movement was at or near its peak and enjoyed tremendous political success and organizational legitimacy. Over the next two decades, however, the leadership directives would be debated, professionals would come to replace many grassroots activist leaders, and the number of local groups would decline 33% by 2008 (authors calculations, <http://www.madd.org/Local-Chapters.aspx>). Whether the findings we report here are limited to only to victim's movements or are in some way shaped by chapter leaders having worked in the midst of a movement at the peak of its influence are questions we will consider in our conclusion.

Theoretical Accounts of Activist Participation

Among a population of sympathizers (both victim beneficiary constituents and conscience constituents) who share the concerns of a movement, why do some participate while others do not? Recent theoretical and empirical efforts to answer this question tend to stress either the *structural approach*—how extensive and active are the mobilizing vehicles (through their representatives)

⁴ As will become clear below our analyses depend upon cross-sectional data, while our theoretical arguments make strong assumptions about causal direction. These are most plausible for individual level characteristics, but more tenuous for contextual characteristics. For contextual characteristics, reciprocal directionality is probably the most plausible assumption. We attempt to address these issues with control variables that will be discussed at the appropriate point in our paper.

whose aim it is to turn bystanders into adherents and adherents into organizational constituents, in contrast to the *individual attributes approach*—what are the personal characteristics that motivate individuals to respond positively to organized attempts to engage them in social change efforts⁵. The availability of opportunities for activism depends first upon the vitality of mobilization efforts that are tied to the structure of an organization itself. Are sympathizers asked by individual activists and SMO representatives to do anything? But it also depends upon what potential activists are asked to do, where and when they are asked to do it, and what sort of activist or organizational representative does the asking. To date, substantially more research attention has focused upon individual characteristics than upon the contextual features of social movement organizations (Schussman & Soule 2005).

And as we have noted, little of the past work regardless of its theoretical bent has tried to account for variation in activist effort, and none have attempted to explain, as far as we are aware, variation in leader's time investments. We believe that all of these questions can be addressed by jointly assessing the structural and individual level accounts of activism—what do citizens bring to the civic arena (individual) and what contextual forces (structure) shape the way these things determine whether they participate, and if they do, how extensive is their participation?

Leading Individual Level Accounts. Individual level accounts are designed to explain who participates in social movements and often focus upon the stable personal characteristics of potential activists, such as their gender, level of formal education, their feelings of efficacy, their ideological commitments and the extent to which they experience grievances central to the movement's goals. While the last three factors are considered components of **cognitive availability** for participation, it is also important to consider whether people are **biographically available** to participate (McAdam 1986). This is usually assessed in terms of the opportunities and constraints associated with work and

⁵ This distinction is also widely articulated as demand and supply accounts of social and activist participation by Finke and others (Finke, et al., 1996; Warner, 1993) for religious groups and Klandermans (1998; 2004) for social movement mobilization.

family life, such as the number of children a person has, their marital status, job demands, and the amount of free time available, all of which are thought to increase or decrease the likelihood that potential activists who are personally motivated and asked to participate will actually do so.

Extensive research has evaluated the utility of a wide range of individual level explanations of who participates. Overall, the pattern of results across these factors is mixed, although findings consistently demonstrate very weak predictive power for almost all individual level indicators. This is likely a result of the basic fact that very few potential activists ever actually participate in a social movement while the pool of those predisposed to do so by their personal characteristics is typically quite large⁶.

Leading Structural Accounts. The key mechanisms for structural accounts of participation are the extent to which potential activists have social network connections to ongoing mobilization efforts and whether or not they are personally contacted and asked to participate. Activist leaders supply potential activists with opportunities to participate by contacting them (Schussman & Soule 2005). Each of these factors has a strong impact on a potential activist's likelihood of becoming a participant. While those who are cognitively (through efficacy, ideology, or experiencing a felt grievance) and biographically most available for participation should be more likely to respond to appeals to participate, the predictive power of structural level factors usually outweighs the importance of individual level attributes. It is the historically specific contingencies that provide opportunities to participate that seem most important here. That is, particular movements emerge and their emissaries reach out to mobilize potential activists through a variety of channels putting a small sub-set of citizens at substantially higher risk of being asked to participate, which in turn predicts involvement in movement activities.

⁶ For example, Kilpatrick and colleagues (1990) estimated that in the late 1980s 1.6% of the adult U.S. population were victims of drunken driving deaths and that another 2.8% of the adult population reported having had a friend die in a drunk driving incident. Thus the pool of potential recruits for the movement was enormous while the actual number of activists was rather small.

Extending Structural and Individual Accounts to Explain the Effort of Leaders

These two alternative, but complimentary approaches have been widely used to explain whether potential activists cross the threshold of participation, but have rarely been used to explain *how active* participants are once they become engaged. There are, however, some exceptions (Wiltfang & McAdam 1991; Barkan, Cohn, & Whitaker 1995; Cohn, Barkan, & Halteman 2003; Passy & Giugni 2001). These several studies seek to explain the variation in effort that rank and file activists devote to the Sanctuary Movement, Bread for the World, and the Swiss Solidarity Movement. In each case the average level of effort reported by activists is quite modest. The studies show, in contrast to the recruitment to activism literature, that measures of commitment to a movement's concerns and grievances (cognitive availability) do a better job of predicting level of effort, but that biographical availability, measured by extent of family obligations and competing demands of full-time work, have rather little explanatory power. We suspect this latter finding is linked to the truncated range of effort seen among these activists—since most of them devote very little time to their respective movement the competing demands of home and work life have very little effect on their level of participation. The studies also show that micro-structural network links to other movement activists, a contextual feature of individual environments, continue to have significant explanatory power.

We want to explain in this research, however, the level of effort expended by an activist leader, in contrast to that of one of her volunteer activists, as she orchestrates the many tasks that are embodied in her leadership role. Leaders ask potential activists to become active and try to motivate existing activists to become more active among the many other things they may do (Oliver & Marwell 1992). But being a leader means you are the asker, not the one who is asked.

Is there a functional structural equivalent of leaders being asked to participate? We argue that organizational vitality, in this case tapped by general bureaucratic complexity and, for local groups

concerned with drunk driving, the diversity of victim support services offered by a group, functions to create a series of pressures that expand or contract the amount of effort a leader is expected to devote to her leadership activities. The more bureaucratically complex a group is in terms of recruiting and fielding many volunteers, engaging in wide contacts with other groups in its community, sustaining a large number of task committees, and meeting with other officers quite regularly, the more the demands on its leader's time can be expected to rise. As well, to the degree that a group takes on labor intensive tasks related to its social change goals—in this case providing more or less diverse and extensive victim support services such as putting an emphasis of victim assistance, working with specific victim cases, and developing victim support groups, a leader's responsibilities can be expected to escalate. To the extent that this logic is convincing, then, we would expect the necessities of leadership of the most active local groups to impel their leaders to devote more time to leading. This leads us to our first set of hypotheses:

H1 Structure: Bureaucratic complexity is positively related to presidents' weekly leadership effort.

H2 Structure: Victim support services are positively related to presidents' weekly leadership effort.

In addition to our structural hypotheses, we believe there are individual-level characteristics which can also be useful in predicting leadership effort. Specifically, we expect that weekly effort will be influenced by a President's cognitive availability (measured here as objective victim status or 'objective grievance') and biographical availability (measured as work and family obligations and gender). In terms of cognitive availability, we anticipate that leaders who are more strongly motivated by having been a victim will, all other things being equal, devote more effort to their leadership activities than those who are not victims. For anti-drunk driving activists, being a victim means that oneself, or one's spouse, child, or another close relative has been killed or seriously

injured by a drunk driver⁷. Many social movement analysts suggest grievances that stem from personal victimization (known as objective grievances) are often the motivations for people's initial involvement in social movement organizations (Gurr 1970; Klandermans 1997; Piven & Cloward 1977) because "Felt injustice is at the root of any protest" (Klandermans 1977:205). A key cognitive process underlying the transformation of objective grievance into action rests upon the understanding that personal troubles are the result of public problems, and a corollary belief that these public problems can be solved through activism (see McCarthy 1994). Yet, as we have noted, most of those who experience appropriate grievances do not get involved in social movements in the first place, so the role of grievances in explaining who crosses the threshold of any participation has received little empirical support. What is explored for the first time in this paper, however, is whether or not objective grievances—when they are widely understood as grievances—predict levels of effort among leaders *already deeply immersed in a movement*.

The focus on objective grievance as the key component of cognitive availability is an unusual feature of this study given that most research on activism assesses cognitive availability as a subjective grievance which may motivate people who are not directly victimized, as well as those who are, to act collectively because of their concern about a particular social issue. Through the indicator of victim status, this research evaluates the role of objective grievance directly. Past work here is scarce but suggests the important role of victimization as an objective grievance. For example, Jennings provided evidence that the level of activism by rank and file members of the AIDS movement is significantly associated with the "number of close contacts who had died of

⁷ We do not distinguish here between types of victims (e.g, between self versus relatives or between which relatives, spouse vs. children, or between ages of children). Although Weed (1990; 2005) has demonstrated that victim leaders who are victims by virtue of having children victimized appear to have the highest status within the movement against drinking and driving. We return to this issue in our analyses.

AIDS or who were HIV positive” (Jennings, 1999:1)⁸. This reasoning leads us to our third hypothesis:

H3 Individual: Personal grievance stemming from drunk driving victimization is positively related to presidents’ weekly leadership effort.

A second important component of individual level factors is how a President’s biographical availability influences her weekly labor contribution. There are two relevant but conflicting views to be considered here. The first approach relies on a widely held economic perspective that suggests that people must substitute time in one arena for time in another. According to this *time-constraint approach*, people who are married, have children, or are employed outside the home have more demands placed on their time by these obligations than those who are unmarried, have no children, or are unemployed (Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, & Robinson 2000; Coltrane 1996). The more time-constrained an individual, the less ability he or she will have to participate in other activities, including volunteer work (Hook 2004). This expectation flows from Becker’s *time availability hypothesis* which suggests that because people are limited by family and work needs, individuals must act rationally to allocate their time in the most effective manner possible (Becker 1981; Huber & Spitze 1983). When applied to social movement activism, a time-constraint approach can be used to think about how time is allocated to movement labor when it conflicts with actual or perceived work and family responsibilities. Because volunteer activities come in addition to the performance of work and family roles (Gerstel 2000) it is often found that as the number of responsibilities in the home or office increase the amount of movement participation decreases (Corning & Myers 2002; Hook 2004; McAdam 1986; Wall 1995). Given this perspective, we would expect that leadership effort will decrease as family and work obligations increase regardless of any structural pressures for

⁸ Jennings (1999: 1) finds that the “number of close contacts who had died of AIDS or who were HIV positive” experienced by activists in that movement was the best predictor of “the number of specific political activities they had performed in the AIDS issue domain.”

more extensive effort. Squeezing out an hour or two a week to devote to activism seems possible no matter how busy a person's life, but finding an extra 15 to 20 hours a week is likely far more constrained by one's available time. We build our fourth hypothesis on this substitutive notion that for every hour spent at work there are fewer hours to be spent in leadership effort:

H4 Individual: The amount of time spent in work outside the home is negatively related to presidents' weekly leadership effort.

In direct contrast to the substitutive approach used to predict biographical availability in terms of work involvement is a perspective that has been employed to understand volunteering effort among couples. The *complementarity theory* predicts that family obligations implicit in one's marital status may actually facilitate greater volunteer effort, especially if the volunteer work is important to activities and functions of the family (Rotolo & Wilson 2006). This view relies on the notion that spouses complement one another in their volunteer work outside the family, and that when one spouse volunteers the other is more likely to volunteer as well (Freeman 1997). This perspective is rooted in *social cohesion theory* which suggests that people are strongly influenced by those with whom they are intimate and "through a process of mutual socialization, spouses come to think [and act] alike about volunteerism" (Rotolo & Wilson 2006:306). Because family members have similar exposure to drunken driving victimization it is very likely that they have together developed a shared grievance and activist ideology which may lead to mutually reinforcing the motivation for volunteering. Furthermore, families are likely to be actively involved with a president's weekly leadership activities in the local Chapters because the movement is a nurturing, victim-based one that is primarily led by women and incorporates a family-friendly organizational form. For example, many anti-drunk driving groups "operate out of a leader's home and are typically quite small, labor intensive, and leader-centered projects where the children are often included in the day-to-day work of the movement" (McCarthy 1994). Given the shared grievance, high levels of spousal homophily,

and the relatively non-bureaucratic organizational form, it can be expected that the families of chapter presidents hold similar views about the importance of the organizational work. As a result, we believe that time spent in presidential duties may instead be complementary to family roles and obligations, rather than a substitution or distraction from them. This leads to our fifth hypothesis:

H5 Individual: Family demands such as being married and having children are positively related to presidents' weekly leadership effort.

A final individual factor affecting biographical and cognitive availability is the gender of a leader. While feminist scholars have paid quite extensive attention to the role of gender in feminist movements, very few social movement researchers have incorporated gender into their analyses of activism as more than a control variable, with some notable exceptions (Adams 2002; Einwohner, Hollander, & Olson 2000; Einwohner 1999; Taylor 1999; McAdam 1992). The present study allows us the opportunity to address women's participation in a movement led mostly by women, but one that is not typically thought to be a part of the feminist movement⁹. Given the strong nurturing focus of this movement, the family friendly organizational form, as well as the gendered identifier of the lead federation as 'mothers' we believe that, all else being equal, women leaders are likely to become more invested than men in these groups and will therefore spend more time each week tending to their leader duties.

H6 Individual: Female presidents will devote more time in their weekly leadership efforts than male presidents.

⁹ Popierlarz (1999) differentiates between gender-segregated voluntary associations where either gender comprises 90% or more of the total membership and gender-integrated voluntary associations where women make up between 11-89% of the membership. By this criterion our activist leaders are part of a gender-integrated movement which happens to be female dominated.

In addition to its possible direct effect on weekly effort, it is plausible that gender may interact with other factors that drive leaders' levels of participation. Because gender embodies learned attitudes and behaviors which differ for men and women it is reasonable to assume that gendered realities may influence the relationship between participation and the other key variables such as work and family constraints, grievances, and organizational complexity in unique ways. As noted by McAdam, "Given the male/female differences in socialization and the powerful ways that differences in gender-based behavioral expectations and opportunities get embedded in social structure, why should we presume that males and females experience any social phenomenon in the same way?" (1992:1215).

While research on activism provides only a few hints about how the gender of an activist interacts with other factors that produce levels of activism, a large literature exists on volunteering which offers strong support for our general expectations about such interactions. For example, Rotolo (2000) found that a volunteer's decision to join or leave a volunteer association is gendered and is tied to life cycle transitions such as getting married and having children. Similarly, Musick and Wilson (2008) reported that gender consistently influences the number and type of groups people join across a variety of studies. Specifically, women are more likely than men to volunteer and to be involved in more associations than men. Part of the gender difference in volunteering has been traced to the interaction between sex and several key factors, such as: (1) women are less likely than men to hold blue collar jobs which are tied to the lowest overall rate of volunteering, (2) women are more likely than men to be recruited to organizations of all types, and (3) women are more likely to attend church where a substantial portion of volunteering occurs. Underlying each of these findings is the supposition that men and women are socialized to different ideas about their caregiving roles and responsibilities in society (Musick & Wilson 2008). Further, while men may focus on employment as the key to fulfilling their role of family provider, women may turn to volunteering because it reinforces the feminine goals of being nurturing, compassionate, and self-sacrificing (Musick &

Wilson 2008). Finally, Scott argues that when women volunteer they are able to extend their idealized role of wife and mother into the public arena, and thus retain their sense of femininity while justifying their time away from children and home (1991).

These studies of volunteering in America, of course, do not explore levels of participation among leaders, but we believe they offer important clues as to how gender may interact with other factors that influence social movement participation. For example, it is likely that number of children in the home will influence men and women's social movement participation much as it does their volunteering. The time constraint approach suggests that men's volunteer effort may not be as heavily affected by the number of children in a household as that of women because women perform more child-related duties than men (West & Blumberg 1990). In addition, women are less likely than men to view their housework as discretionary (Hook 2004), and as such, even when men and women have an equal number of responsibilities in the home women may be more likely than men to curb their weekly volunteer effort in order to fulfill these obligations".

Beyond the potential interaction of gender with other individual level attributes, it is equally plausible that gender will interact with structural characteristics of collective action environments, consistent with a research literature we will describe below. For instance, women may be more likely than men to increase their weekly effort in the face of more complex organizational structures because they tend to lead organizations in different ways than do men. Finally, given the female dominance of this movement the men who become leaders may be quite different, and less energetic, than men who become leaders of male dominated movements.

This leads us to our final hypothesis:

H7 Interaction: Gender will interact with each of the independent variables to predict higher levels of Presidents' weekly leadership effort for women rather than men. Specifically, female presidents who experience higher levels of bureaucratic complexity, victim support services, personal grievance, marriage and children in the home will have higher levels of

weekly leadership effort than male presidents who experience similar conditions.

Furthermore, as the amount of time spent working outside the home increases, female presidents will increase their weekly leadership effort at a higher rate than male presidents.

Data Collection and Measurement

The data used in the following analyses come from a survey of anti-drunk driving activists who were the leaders of MADD and RID groups known to be in existence in 1985. The investigators designed a self-administered survey schedule which dealt with substantive questions about each organization, its members, its activities, the extent and scope of its community involvement, and the leaders themselves. The survey was mailed to the president of each group, as identified in the census of 458 groups. Follow-ups were made by telephone and through the mail. These procedures resulted in relatively complete responses from 370 local groups, comprising a 78% response rate (see McCarthy et al. 1987; McCarthy 1994; McCarthy & Wolfson, 1996 for more details). Respondents were asked to report details of their chapter activities for the 1985 year.

As noted previously, at the time of the survey seventy-nine percent of the leaders were women, with average tenure as president of about two years (see Table 1 for a more complete description of the president's characteristics). Most presidents worked full time (59%), were married (85%), and had school-aged children in the home (54%). Leaders tended to have some college experience (mean of 14.7 years education) and were on average about 44 years of age. Most groups depended exclusively on volunteer labor and typically operated from the president's home. And, although the founders of anti-drunk driving organizations are most often people with little or no previous experience in mounting citizen's advocacy campaigns (McCarthy et al. 1987), most (75%) were actively involved at the time of the survey in an average of two other community organizations in addition to the chapter they oversaw. Interestingly enough, this profile of activist leaders parallels to a large extent the findings of decades of research exploring the social characteristics of the typical

volunteer (Musick & Wilson, 2008), except for the fact that these leaders' volunteer effort far exceeds that of the typical volunteer.

Table 1: Characteristics of Chapter Presidents Affiliated with the Movement Against Drinking and Driving, 1986

Dependent Variable

The MADD and RID chapter presidents reported very high levels of weekly labor which ranged from 2.5 to 33 hours per week, with a mean of 15 hours worked per week. Their reports serve as our dependent variable in the analyses and our measure of leadership effort. To put this level of effort in context we note that while about 75% of these leaders reported spending more than three hours a week in their Chapter activities an Independent Sector Report for the same year (1986) estimated that only 20% of a national sample of U.S. adults reported spending that much time in any volunteer activities. In fact, most Americans donated much less time than this to volunteer work. Analysis from the 1985 American Time Use Survey suggests that on average, Americans spent about one hour per week in all organizational activities combined, including political, union, and/or social movements (Bianchi, Robinson, & Milkie 2006). —Of course the vast majority of Americans were not leaders of voluntary associations, and so we would expect them to volunteer much less time than the chapter presidents who are not only activists, but the leaders of other volunteers.

Independent Variables

The key independent variables in our analysis consist of measures of the structural characteristics of the local groups and the individual attributes of the leaders. Table 2 provides descriptive information on both types of measures as well as the bivariate correlations between each measure and presidents' weekly effort.

Structural Characteristics: Bureaucratic Complexity is a standardized and summed scale of four variables that tap into the organization demands of a particular chapter, including the number of volunteer hours that must be supervised each month, the number of committees formed by the group, the frequency of chapter meetings, and a constructed variable of the reported proportion of contacts with a list of a wide variety of existing community groups. The alpha reliability for this scale is .6010¹⁰. *Victim Support Services* is a standardized and summed scale of three items regarding the amount of victim services provided to the community, including whether or not the chapter has an emphasis on victim assistance, whether the group works with specific victim cases, and whether the chapter has developed victim support groups. The response categories for these questions were 0=none to 3=a great deal. The alpha reliability for this scale is .8329. For both measures of organizational context, we also evaluated the adequacy of the measures and their theoretically chosen indicators by conducting individual unrotated principal-component exploratory factor analyses in STATA. For both scales, the created factors patterned as predicted by our expectations and displayed reasonable eigenvalues and factor loadings; bureaucratic complexity had an eigenvalue of 1.83 and factor loadings that ranged from .58 to .73 while victim support services had an eigenvalue of 2.25 and factor loadings that ranged from .80 to .92.

Individual Attributes: Victim Status was the primary measure of cognitive availability and was assessed with a single question that asked whether or not the leader was a victim or victim's relative, as was the common nomenclature for the term 'victim' among participants of this movement (victim=1, non-victim=0). As shown in Table 1, 56% of the leaders report being a victim of drunk

¹⁰ While the models presented here use the constructed measure of bureaucratic complexity we have described, the four individual components were evaluated separately for the final models presented in Table 3 (Tables available from the senior author by request). Overall, the model results were surprisingly robust whether the constructed scale or individual items of bureaucratic complexity were included, with no changes between models in the pattern of association, size of coefficients, or level of significance for all of the independent variables. However, the model fit was poorer for the analyses that utilized the four separate measures. Furthermore, when a 3-item scale was constructed for the most influential items, the scale reliability coefficients and eigenvalues were lower. Given the robustness of the model findings, we chose to use the 4-item scale so that results are more easily compared with the victim services construct.

driving. For practical purposes, our measure of victim status is a proxy for cognitive grievance and will be evaluated as such in the final models¹¹. Biographical availability for participation was measured with four separate items, including: employment status (0=not employed, 1=part time employment, 2=full time employment), marital status (1=married, 0=not married), the number of school aged children living in the home (reported range from 0 to 3), and gender (1=female, 0=male).

In addition to these items we considered several other individual characteristics in our models, including race, age, education, the number of children of any age, the number of very young children, and broader constructions of marital status (including divorced, separated, and widowed). However, none of these measures improved model fit or explained any unique variance in leadership effort. As a result they were dropped from the final models.

Control Measures: Because our data is cross-sectional we cannot statistically establish the order of effects we have posited from structural and individual characteristics to weekly effort, and since over two-thirds of the presidents are founders, there may be a legitimate question about whether founders are responsible for determining both the scope of a group's operation (structure) as well as the number of hours she worked per week. If this is the case, then the associations between bureaucratic complexity and victim support services and the dependent measure may be spurious¹².

¹¹ While victim status is not predictive of who is a chapter leader (roughly equal size groups among presidents), victimization appears to influence the type of work presidents do. Overall, victims provide an average of 6 extra hours of work per week. And, victims report significantly higher likelihood of presiding over groups that provide victim support services and more bureaucratic complexity. In work not presented here (available by request from the senior author), we found that victims worked more hours than non-victims when their groups provided a higher number of victim support services. Furthermore, in a three way interaction we found that women who are victims are more likely than male victims to increase their weekly effort when faced with extensive victim support services, and both men and women tend to work longer hours when they are victims compared with non-victims.

¹² While we acknowledge the difficulty of establishing causal direction, preliminary analyses suggest that the path between structural characteristics and leadership effort is not conditioned by founding status. While founders and non-founders have mean differences in weekly effort, with founders working more hours (15.4) compared with non-founders (13.6), these differences are not statistically significant in bivariate models, conditional models that include all structural and individual level characteristics, or in two-group mean-comparison t-tests. Furthermore, when we test the possibility of a link between founding status and both bureaucratic complexity and victim support services we find that founding status is *not* a significant predictor of either of the outcomes in bivariate models or two-group mean comparison t-tests, nor does it moderate the relationship between the structural characteristics and weekly effort.

Consistent with this concern, we include in each model a control measure establishing whether the president was one of the founders of her local group (founder =1, non-founder =0).

A second control is the level of activity presidents reported in community groups during the previous year beyond their work in the anti-drunk driving movement (e.g., church, civic, fraternal, political, and social groups). This is an important control since involvement in other areas of social and political activity can be thought to constrain the amount of time and effort available for leadership activities. *Other activism* is measured in four categories of 1=not at all active through 4=very active. The level of activity in other organizations was, as might be expected, quite high with 75% of the sample reporting being somewhat or very active in other groups.

Gender Interactions: We created six gender interaction terms to evaluate the possibility that gender may interact with structural and individual characteristics in predicting weekly effort. A gender value of 1 for women was multiplied by each of the following variable values to create gender interaction terms to be included in the final model: bureaucratic complexity, victim support services, victim status, employment, marital status, and number of children.

Table 2: Variable Descriptions and Correlations with Presidents' Weekly Effort

Results

Table 3 displays the results from a series of nested ordinary least squares regression analyses designed to answer the central question posed in this paper, *Why do some victim movement activist leaders work harder than others?* In a stepwise fashion we evaluate the unique influence of structural characteristics (Model 1) and individual attributes (Model 2) on leadership effort. Then, we combine the elements of the two models to compare their relative influence to one another (Model 3). Finally, we consider gender as a moderator of the link between measures of structural characteristics and individual attributes and weekly effort (Model 4). The non-italicized coefficients in Model 4 are

the reported coefficients for the full model which includes the gender*bureaucratic complexity interaction. The italicized coefficients are bivariate associations between the specified interaction terms and the dependent variable, controlling for all other relevant structural and individual characteristics included in the full model. These italicized coefficients are presented in their bivariate form because there is no significant interaction of gender with the effects of the independent variable on weekly effort.

Since the metric for the dependent variable in all models is the number of hours worked per week by activist leaders, the intercept reflects the average effort, in hours, after controlling for each of the indicators in the model. In Model 1, for example, leaders work an average of 16.2 hours per week when controlling for the structural conditions of the chapter. And, both increases in bureaucratic complexity and victim support independently predict increases in the number of hours volunteered per week. Specifically, a one standard deviation unit increase in bureaucratic complexity is associated with a little more than a 5 hour a week increase in volunteer effort after controlling for victim support and founding status. This finding is consistent with our first hypothesis that for chapters where leaders report more structural complexity (e.g., have more meetings, more committees, more volunteer hours to oversee, and increased contact with outside groups) tend to have presidents who work more hours per week. There is a similar finding for victim support services. As predicted by hypothesis two, there is a positive and significant association between victim support services and presidents' volunteer effort per week. For every one standard deviation unit increase in victim support services (e.g., increases in victim assistance, help with victim cases, and the development of victim support groups) there is an associated 4 hour increase in weekly leadership effort, after controlling for bureaucratic complexity and founding status. The adjusted R squared for Model 1 indicates that the structural measures explain nearly 32% of the variation in weekly leadership effort. And, if a leader was presiding over a group that was both more complex (+1sd) and provided more extensive victim services (+1sd) than the average group, we would expect

them to be volunteering almost 25 hours per week, which is equivalent to holding a demanding part time job. Comparing the standardized betas in Model 1 we see that victim support services and bureaucratic complexity are roughly equal in importance when trying to understand a president's weekly labor, and both are about three times more influential than founding status and president's other activism in predicting weekly effort.

Model 2 (of Table 3) assesses the influence of individual characteristics on weekly leadership effort and explains about 18% of the variation in the dependent measure. A comparison of the standardized beta coefficients indicates that presidents' employment status is the most important individual characteristic in predicting weekly effort followed closely by victim status, and then much less so by president's gender and marital status. Overall, most of the individual attributes display associations with leader effort that are in the direction and magnitude anticipated from our theoretical discussions and previous research. For example, our third hypothesis predicted that personal grievance would be strongly and positively related to weekly effort and our findings support this notion with victims working, on average, over five additional hours per week compared with non-victims, even after controlling for all other leader characteristics. This is an important finding because it suggests that while objective grievance may not be a useful predictor of initial activism as we have suggested above, it may be a powerful influence on how much work leaders perform once they are deeply embedded in a movement. Also conforming to expectations are the findings related to our fourth hypothesis—as employment obligations increase there are significant declines in weekly activist effort. In fact, for each increase in employment status from not employed to employed part-time, and from part-time work to full-time work there are associated decreases in weekly effort of a little over three hours, after controlling for all other individual characteristics. Taken together, these results indicate that full-time workers spend about 6 ½ fewer hours per week leading their local chapters than their counterparts who are not employed.

Unlike the results for grievance and employment, the findings related to marital status and children in the home were unexpected in terms of direction and magnitude. Drawing on the complementarity theory, we hypothesized (H5) that weekly effort would be positively associated with marital status and the number of children in the home. In contrast to that theoretical expectation, marital status had a significant and negative association with work hours, such that married presidents worked about 3 hours less per week than their non-married counterparts. While unexpected, this finding may still be relevant to our conceptualization of complementarity in that the negative effect of marital status may simply be an indicator of spousal involvement in the movement relieving some of the leadership burden, and thus requiring fewer hours of labor by the president. Because we do not have a measure of spousal support in our data, we are unable to determine whether this finding supports a complementarity approach or if it is better explained by an economic substitution perspective. This alternate approach suggests that people who are married volunteer less time because they choose not to substitute finite family hours for volunteer hours. Although we can make no definitive claims either way, a substitutive approach appears less plausible given that the interaction between gender and marital status presented in Model 4 is not significant—meaning that marriage does not influence work hours differently for men and women, a finding that stands in contrast to the time constraint hypothesis which suggests women are much more constrained by family demands, such as marriage and children, compared with men.

A similarly unexpected finding is seen for the number of children in the home; rather than having a positive association with work hours, as suggested by hypothesis five, the presence of children in the home has no discernable impact on presidents' effort inconsistent with both the substitutive and complementarity approaches.

In line with hypothesis six, we find that women work an average of 3 hours more per week than their male counterparts, holding all other individual attributes constant. Given that the majority of the local groups are female dominated and 'mother' oriented it may be that women are simply

more comfortable than men with working within this organizational structure. Nevertheless, this finding coincides with the widespread belief among many activist women that they do the bulk of the work in activist organizations. This is in contrast with the few studies we cited earlier that fail to show any gender effect on the amount of effort rank and file activists report devoting to movement activities.

Table 3: Nested OLS Models of Structural Characteristics and Individual Attributes on Presidents' Weekly Effort

Model 3 (of Table 3) compares the relative influence of structural characteristics and individual attributes on presidents' weekly labor. Given that the variance explained by the structural level model—in terms of the adjusted R²—was nearly twice as large as that explained by the individual level model, it is not surprising that the standardized beta coefficients for the combined analyses indicate that bureaucratic complexity and victim support services have the greatest impact on weekly effort, followed closely by presidential employment status and then trailed by grievance, gender and marital status. In the full model the number of children in the home remained an insignificant predictor of weekly effort while founding status and president's other organizational activity both significantly predicted the number of hours worked per week. Taken together, the structural and individual characteristics do an impressive job of explaining leadership effort for these chapter presidents. In fact, the adjusted R² for Model 3 indicates that a sizeable 42% of the variation in leaders' weekly labor can be explained by considering the simultaneous influence of structural and individual characteristics, a notable improvement over either model run separately. Interestingly, the key variables that were significant in lower order models remained significant in the full model and, with the exception of grievance, retained similar magnitude of effects.

The final model (Model 4) in Table 3 illustrates the importance of gender as both a direct and moderating influence on leadership effort¹³. We assessed the effect of the gender interactions for each of our independent variables on leaders weekly effort and found only one of them to be significant in the full model, that between bureaucratic complexity and gender. The findings show that the strength of the effects of bureaucratic complexity on work hours is almost wholly conditioned by the gender of the chapter president. That is, when bureaucratic complexity increases by one standard deviation for male presidents there is almost no increase in leadership effort. Conversely, when bureaucratic complexity increases by one standard deviation unit for female presidents there is a corresponding increase in weekly effort of about 5 hours. The difference in slopes between men and women is graphically displayed in Figure 1. When bureaucratic complexity is at its mean, women volunteer about three hours a week more than men, controlling for all other variables in the model. When bureaucratic complexity is low (one standard deviation below the mean), men and women have nearly identical rates of weekly effort, just below 12 hours a week, controlling for all other variables. Most interestingly, when bureaucratic complexity is high (one standard deviation above the mean), women work nearly 7 hours more than men each week. The comparison of men and women's slopes in this interaction suggests that rising bureaucratic

¹³It is important to consider whether gender can be adequately addressed with the data at hand. Given the relatively small universe of anti-drunk driving groups and the minority of male leaders in the sample it is important to verify that the basic requirements for multivariate models are met with this data. We have performed several statistical tests which confirm the sample size is adequate for the multivariate models we ran, including the interactions described in hypothesis 7. Furthermore, we employed several types of sensitivity analysis to verify that the results related to gender were not an artifact of the sample. First, we conducted a DF beta test of the full model in STATA which provided a measure of the influence of each observation on the entire model before and after excluding each case. After removing outliers, the models were rerun. The results were similar in significance, direction, and size of coefficients to the original model, suggesting that the regression results are robust and are not due to anomalies in the sample. A second form of DF beta was run on the interaction term itself. Similar to before, the constrained model was nearly identical to the original, and the interaction term remained significant, suggesting that the relationship between gender and bureaucratic complexity was not being overly influenced by a few odd cases. And finally, we ran a set of robust regression analyses to verify that there are no outliers which are influencing the coefficients themselves. The robust model results also suggest that original regression results are robust and the findings are not due to outliers in the sample.

complexity has an exponential effect on increasing women's work hours while only slightly bumping up men's leadership effort.

Because the level of effort among movement leaders has not been previously investigated, we proceed with little guidance about how we should interpret these gendered findings. There is, however, a possible explanation given in research on leadership styles more generally, which suggest that women are more sensitive to the pressures of leadership created by highly complex bureaucratic structures. In an exhaustive meta-analysis of twenty-eight studies of gender and leadership style, Eagly and Johnson (1999) found consistent differences between men and women in whether they lead their organizations in a *democratic* (allow subordinates to participate in decision making) or *autocratic* (discourage subordinates from participating in decision-making) manner. Women were consistently more democratic than men, even though most of the studies were done in highly bureaucratic organizations. The authors reasoned that in such settings one might expect organizational role demands to dampen any gender differences stemming from gender role socialization. Even in those settings, however, gender differences remained strong. Their findings suggest that women, though their distinctive choice of leadership style, may need to devote greater effort than men as the bureaucratic complexity of their groups increases. We will revisit this possibility in our conclusion.

Figure 1. Presidents' Work Hours and the Bureaucratic Complexity * Gender Interaction

In addition to gender, founding status was an important predictor of weekly effort in our models. Notice that in Model 1, president's founding status has a statistically significant and noticeable impact on president's effort, as it does in both Model 3 and 4. This strongly suggests that there is some direct effect of being a founder on both the extent of victim activities of a group as well

as its level of bureaucratic complexity. By including founding status in the models, however, we have held constant such effects¹⁴.

Summary and Discussion

We were motivated in these analyses by one major question: why do some victim movement leaders work harder than others? And, we hoped more specifically to understand the unique role of gender in answering that question. While we hypothesized grievance affects, we were surprised by their magnitude and robustness in predicting leadership effort. Our analyses have produced what we judge to be quite dramatic findings, and we will begin by summarizing them. Then move on to place this movement and its leaders in the broader social context with the aim of trying to specify the scope of our findings. First, of course, our findings are specific to small local groups. But, might we expect to discover similar patterns for leaders in other local social movements? We clearly recognize that the movement against drinking and driving, a victims movement, differs in important ways from more traditional class, ethnic, regionally, and identity based social movements. And, it is a movement led mostly by women, though it is not a feminist movement. And, finally, given that our data was collected from leaders when the movement was ascendant, we will ask how we might we expect that historical moment as well as the several other distinguishing features of this movement to limit the generality of our central findings?

We attempted to answer our central question through a multivariate examination of seven hypotheses derived from structural and individual level theoretical accounts of activist participation. Our full model explains over 43% of the variation in reported weekly leadership effort and showed that some of the theoretically relevant constructs had a negative impact on weekly leadership effort

¹⁴ The there is no significant bivariate relationship between founding status and weekly effort, so we examined all of the possible interaction effects between founding status and the other independent variables, one by one, for Models 3 and 4. We found none of them to be significant. This further buttresses our suspicion that by controlling for founding status we are able to discern the direct effect of structural context upon the weekly effort of presidents, controlling for the impact of a founder upon each of these features of a local chapter.

(e.g., employment status and marital status), some had a positive influence (e.g., bureaucratic complexity, the provision of victim support services, victim status, and being female), and some had no influence at all (e.g., the presence of children in the home). And while measures of structural complexity had more impact than measures of individual attributes, we found evidence that both of these clusters of factors had noticeable effects upon how hard a leader worked. We believe this is the first systematic assessment of the correlates of variation in activist leadership effort.

Second, we were motivated by the question of whether the gender of a leader had an independent impact upon effort, and whether gender interacted with any of the other variables shown to be related to activist effort. We found that, net of all other factors, female leaders worked harder than male leaders, and we also discovered a strong and significant interaction between gender and bureaucratic complexity suggesting that gender had both a direct and a multiplicative effect on the effort of leaders in this movement.

The movement aimed at curtailing drinking and driving was founded and led by women during its first decade (the 1980's) in the midst of which we surveyed its local leaders. It is reasonable to ask whether the strong differences we uncovered between male and female leaders (that the women work harder and are more heavily influenced by context) would hold up had we surveyed leaders of a predominantly male led local movement. There are a variety of reasons why we might doubt their generality, maybe the most plausible being that males who become active and choose to lead in female dominated groups are an unusual group of men, maybe men who are more comfortable with female leaders, and hence we may be seeing merely the effects of selection. Whether or not this is the case, however, there is strong evidence to suggest that more than 40% of local voluntary associations are female dominated, defined as those with at least 90% of their members being women (Popielarz 1999). Consequently, even if our findings are only applicable to female dominated local social movement groups, this includes a significant proportion of them. But, a recent survey of leaders of local Sierra Club groups around the United States also found female

leaders to report volunteering more hours a month than male leaders (Andrews, forthcoming) in a movement with more gender integrated membership and leadership, making up more than 30% of local voluntary associations by Popielarz's estimate (1999: 242). So, while we cannot rule out the importance of selection effects with our data, it appears that the scope of the gender effects we have uncovered may be quite broad.

Now, let us reconsider our finding that gender interacts with bureaucratic complexity to condition its impact on leadership effort. Recall our discussion of male and female leadership styles. We have no independent indicator of how these leaders interacted with the volunteers who helped them carry out the many tasks of their local groups. But a large number of studies (Eagly & Johnson 1999) suggest that there are consistent differences between men and women in how they approach their leadership roles. Women tend to adopt more democratic and consultative leadership styles, and men more autocratic, non-consultative styles. Remember that most of these anti-drunk driving groups were modest enterprises which had not been in existence for very long when the leaders were surveyed. And while MADD and RID provided some guidelines for chapter operation, those guidelines were not very extensive, nor did they have much to say about how to lead. In more laissez-faire settings like these, then, in contrast to the highly authoritarian settings studied in earlier research (Eagly & Johnson 1999), we would expect the personal inclinations of leaders about how to lead to be more likely to translate into actual leadership styles than in more rigid bureaucratic settings and in larger organizations. Consequently, we should expect that gender related leadership styles should predominate in settings like this one. In addition, we reasoned that democratic, consultative styles should be more labor intensive—it should take more time to consult with volunteers about how to proceed than to issue orders about how to do so. This chain of reasoning provides us a strong interpretation of the interaction we found between gender and bureaucratic complexity—the more complex and vital a group, the greater the labor necessary to lead it when leading in a democratic fashion. Whether or not our interpretation of this finding is a reasonable one or that it has any

generality awaits future research. We suggest that there exists great promise in extending the pioneering work we have reported here on variations in activist leadership effort, and that especially great promise lies in comparisons between predominantly female lead movements with those led predominantly by men.

As well, recall that we surveyed these leaders about five years after the movement emerged, and that many of them were among the founders of their local group. And, at the time we surveyed them the movement was growing rapidly, enjoyed the public support of the popular President, Ronald Reagan, and was achieving wide success on a number of legislative and organizational fronts. In our analyses we have controlled for the effects of whether a leader was a founder, but we have no way of determining whether leaders are more highly motivated or motivated by different factors when a movement is ascendant than later when it becomes more routinized, or when it is in decline. Although, researchers typically study social movements during their ascendant phases and this research is no exception.

And finally, the movement against drinking and driving is widely recognized as a “victim rights” movement (Weed 1995), and, as we have shown had broad representation of victims among its leaders and members, although large numbers of leaders and members are not victims, motivated by sympathy with the cause of their group. Recall, that our findings show that being a victim in contrast to a sympathizer does indeed have an important impact upon level of effort for our leaders. As we noted in our initial discussion, one’s level of grievance is typically a weak predictor of crossing the threshold to activism simply because there are usually many people with grievances and very few activists. We also pointed to some research that suggests modest impacts of grievances on volunteer activist effort in the low range of activism where low costs and low time investments do not vary substantially. But, if the patterns we have uncovered for the anti-drunk driving activist leaders are general to other victim’s movements, direct experience with a movement’s foundational objective grievance appears to be a powerful motivator of effort. Interestingly enough, while social

movement researchers have devoted extensive work to understanding the framing of grievances (Snow 2004, there exists no well accepted typology of grievances that would allow us to theoretically differentiate victim grievances (like drunk driving, AIDS, and crime victim-hood) from others like those resulting from strong sympathy for environmental protection or from category membership in ethnic and identity based movements like gay rights and African American civil rights. Did black leaders in the civil right movement put in more effort than white leaders? Do gay activists work harder for their local groups than straight activists in the gay movement? Pondering the generality of our finding that victim leaders work harder than non-victim leaders lead us to raise these questions, one we are unable to answer with our data, and one that awaits the study of leadership in local movement groups based in other types of grievance.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. 2002. "Gender and social movement decline - Shantytown women and the prodemocracy movement in Pinochet's Chile." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 31:285-322.
- Andrews, Kenneth T. 2009. Personal communication with second author.
- Barkan, Steven E., Steven F. Cohn, and William H. Whitaker. 1995. "Beyond Recruitment: Predictors of Differential Participation in a National Antihunger Organization." *Sociological Forum* 10:113-134.
- Bianchi, Suzanne M., Melissa A. Milkie, Liana C. Sayer, John P. Robinson. 2000. "Is Anyone Doing the Housework? Trends in the Gender Division of Household Labor." *Social Forces* 79 (1): 191-228.
- Bianchi, Suzanne M., John P. Robinson, & Melissa A. Milkie 2006. *Changing Rhythms of American Family Life*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Becker, Gary S. 1981. *A Treatise on the Family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. P.237-256
- Cohn, Steven F., Steven E. Barkan and William A. Halteman. 2003. "Dimensions of Participation in a Professional Social-Movement Organization." *Sociological Inquiry* 73:311-337.
- Coltrane, Scott. 1996. *Family Man: Fatherhood, Housework, and Gender Equity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Corning, Alexandra F. and Daniel J. Myers. 2002. "Individual Orientation Toward Engagement in Social Action." *Political Psychology* 23:703-729.
- Eagly, Alice H. and Blair T. Johnson. 1990. "Gender and Leadership Style: A Meta-Analysis." *Psychological Bulletin* 108:233-256.
- Einwohner, Rachel L., Jocelyn A. Hollander, and Toska Olson. 2000. "Engendering Social Movements: Cultural Images and Movement Dynamics." *Gender and Society* 14:679-699.
- Einwohner, RL. 1999. "Gender, class, and social movement outcomes - Identity and effectiveness in two animal rights campaigns." *Gender and Society* 13:56-76.
- Freeman, R. 1997. "Working for nothing: They supply of volunteer labor." *Journal of Labor Economics*, 15:140-167.
- Gerstel, N. 2000. "The third shift: Gender and care work outside the home." *Qualitative Sociology* 23:467-483.
- Gurr, Ted Robert. 1970. *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hook, Jennifer L. 2004. "Reconsidering the Division of Household Labor: Incorporating Volunteer Work and Informal Support." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66:101-117.
- Huber, Joan and Glenna Spitze. 1983. *Sex Stratification: Children, Housework, and Jobs*. New York: Academic Press, Inc.

- Independent Sector. 1986. *Giving and Volunteering in the United States: Findings from a National Survey*. Washington, DC: Independent Sector.
- Jennings, M. Kent. 1999. "Political Response to Pain and Loss: Presidential Address, American Political Science Association, 1998." *American Political Science Review* 93(1):1-13.
- Klandermans, Bert. 1997. *The Social Psychology of Protest*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.
- Klandermans, Bert. 2004. The Supply and Demand of Participation: Social Psychological Correlates of Participation in Social Movements." Pp. 360-379 in Snow, David A, Sarah A. Soule and Hanspeter Kriesi. (eds.). *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Marion, Nancy E. 1995. "The Federal Response to Crime Victims, 1960-1992." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 10(4):419-436.
- McAdam, Doug. 1986. "Recruitment to High-Risk Activism: The Case of Freedom Summer." *The American Journal of Sociology* 92:64-90.
- . 1992. "Gender as a Mediator of the Activist Experience: The Case of Freedom Summer." *The American Journal of Sociology* 97:1211-1240.
- McCarthy, John D. 1994. "The Interaction of Grass-roots Activists and State Actors in the Production of an Anti-Drunken Driving Media Attention Cycle." Pp. 133-67 in *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*. Enrique Larana, Hank Johnston and Joseph Gusfield eds. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- McCarthy, John D., Mark Wolfson and Debra S. Harvey. 1987. *Chapter Survey Report*. Washington DC: Life Cycle Institute, Catholic University of America.
- McCarthy, John D. and Mark Wolfson. 1996. "Resource Mobilization by Local Social Movement Organizations: The Role of Agency, Strategy and Structure." *American Sociological Review* 61:1070-1088.
- Morris, Aldon D. and Suzanne Staggenborg. 2004. "Leadership in Social Movements." Pp. 171-196-152 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.
- Misick, Marc A. and John Wilson. 2008. *Volunteers: A Social Profile*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Oliver, Pamela E. and Gerald Marwell. 1992. "Mobilizing Technologies for Collective Action." Pp. 251-272 in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*. Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller, eds. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Passy, Florence and Marco Giugni. 2001. "Social Networks and Individual Perceptions: Explaining Differential Participation in Social Movements." *Sociological Forum* 16:123-153.

- Piven, Francis Fox and Richard Cloward. 1977. *Poor People's Movements: Why they Succeed, How they Fail*. New York: Pantheon.
- Popielarz, Pamela A. 1999. "(In)Voluntary Association: A Multilevel Analyses of Gender Segregation in Voluntary Organizations." *Gender and Society* 13 (2):234-250.
- Rock, Paul. 1988a. "Governments, Victims and Policies in Two Countries." *British Journal of Criminology* 28:44-66.
- Rock, Paul. 1988b. "On the Birth of Organizations." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 13:359-384.
- Rotolo, Thomas. 2000. "A Time to Join, A Time to Quit: The Influence of Life Cycle Transitions on Voluntary Association Membership." *Social Forces* 78(3):1133-1161.
- Rotolo, Thomas and John Wilson. 2006. "Substitute or Complement? Spousal Influence on Volunteering." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 68(2): 305-319
- Scott, Ann Firor. 1991. *Natural Allies: Women's Associations in American History*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Schussman, Alan and Sarah A. Soule. 2005. "Process and Protest: Accounting for Individual Protest Participation." *Social Forces* 84(2):1083-1108.
- Snow, David A. 2004. "Framing Processes, Ideology, and Discursive Fields." Pp. 380-412 in Snow, David A, Sarah A. Soule and Hanspeter Kriesi. 2004. *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Taylor, Verta. 1999. "Gender and Social Movements: Gender Processes in Women's Self-Help Movements." *Gender and Society* 13:8-33.
- Wall, Glenda. 1995. "Barriers to individual environmental action: the influence of attitudes and social experiences." *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 32:465-489.
- Weed, Frank J. 1990. "The Victim-Activist Role in the Anti-Drunk Driving Movement." *Sociological Quarterly* 31:459-473.
- Weed, Frank J. 1995. *Certainty of Justice: Reform in the Crime Victim Movement*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Weed, Frank J. 2005. "The Position of the Victim-Activist in Crme Victim Service Organizations." *The Social Science Journal* 42:97-105.
- West, Guida and Rhoda Lois Blumberg. 1990. *Women and Social Protest*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 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.

Table 1. Characteristics of Chapter Presidents Affiliated with the Movement Against Drinking and Driving, 1986

Characteristic		MADD/RID Sample
Gender	% female	79.00%
Employment, FT	% full time	59.30%
Employment, Any	% any work	66.50%
Education	Mean years	14.7 years
Marital Status	% Married	85.10%
Young Kids at Home	% with kids 5 or less	42.30%
Victim/Victim's Relative	% victim	56.00%
Tenure in Social Movement	mean months	31.3 months
Activism Level	% Very Active	42.7
Labor, est mean	Mean weekly hours	15.0 hours
Labor, above 3 hrs	% > 3 hours per week	76%
Founder	% yes	71.00%
Time as president	Mean Months	20.2 months

Table 2. Variable Descriptions and Correlations with Presidents' Weekly Effort

	Min	Max	Mean	SD	Bivariate Correlation	
Dependent Variable						
President's estimated labor hours per week	2.50	32.50	14.84	10.93	1.000	
Structural Characteristics of the SMO						
<i>Bureaucratic Complexity</i>						
Standardized, summed scale of 4 items (below)	-1.85	1.56	0.00	0.67	0.455	****
Estimated hours for all volunteers, per week	0	400	95.33	120.91	0.313	****
Proportion of existing groups in contact	0	1	0.69	0.20	0.412	****
Number of committees	0	8	1.81	2.08	0.248	****
How often do you meet per year?	0	40	7.46	5.58	0.268	****
<i>Victim Support Services</i>						
Standardized, summed scale of 3 items (below)	-1.45	1.47	0.00	0.87	0.466	****
Emphasis on victim assistance (none- great deal)	0	3	1.73	0.98	0.444	****
Work specific victim cases (none- great deal)	0	3	1.75	1.06	0.396	****
Develop victim support groups (none- great deal)	0	3	0.99	1.04	0.369	****
Individual Attributes of the Presidents						
President's victim status (1=victim)	0	1	0.56	0.50	0.271	****
President's employment status (none, PT, FT)	0	2	1.12	0.91	-0.302	****
President's marital status (1=married)	0	1	0.84	0.36	-0.082	
President's number of children under 18	0	3	0.92	1.04	-0.113	**
President's gender (1=female)	0	1	0.79	0.40	0.252	****
Controls						
President's founding status (1=founder)	0	1	0.71	0.45	-0.074	
President's other activism (none-very active)	1	4	3.05	1.03	-0.080	

****Correlation is significant at the 0.001 level (2-tailed). ** = 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 3. Nested OLS Models of Structural and Individual Characteristics on Presidents' Weekly Effort with Gender Interactions Included

	Model 1 <i>N</i> = 354		Model 2 <i>N</i> =354		Model 3 <i>N</i> =354		Model 4 <i>N</i> =354	
Structural Features								
Chapter's Bureaucratic Complexity	5.311	****			4.980	****	0.821	
	(.3218)				(.3018)		(.0497)	
Chapter's Victim Support Services	4.219	****			3.698	****	3.600	****
	(.3321)				(.2911)		(.2834)	
Individual Attributes								
President's Victim Status			5.021	****	2.741	***	2.924	***
			(.2268)		(.1238)		(.1321)	
President's Employment Status			-3.346	****	-3.244	****	-3.192	****
			(-.2738)		(-.2654)		(-.2612)	
President's Marital Status			-3.062	**	-2.486	*	-2.216	
			(-.0978)		(-.0794)		(-.0708)	
President's # of Children Under 18			-0.338		0.157		-0.090	
			(-.0320)		(.0148)		(-.0084)	
President's Gender			3.072	**	2.169	*	2.576	**
			(.1131)		(.0798)		(.0948)	
Key Control Variables								
Founding Status	3.166	***	0.940		2.075	*	1.958	*
	(.1304)		(.0387)		(.0855)		(.0807)	
Other Activism	-1.098	**	-.766		-1.049	**	-1.130	***
	(-.1028)		(-.0718)		(-.0982)		(-.1058)	
Gender Interactions								
Gender * Bureaucratic Complexity							5.259	***
							(.2841)	
<i>Gender * Victim Support Services</i>							2.079	
							(.1443)	
<i>Gender * Victim Status</i>							2.796	
							(.1268)	
<i>Gender * Employment</i>							2.298	
							(.1863)	
<i>Gender * Marital Status</i>							2.900	
							(.1245)	
<i>Gender * # Children Under 18</i>							-.9308	
							(-.0851)	
Intercept	16.212	****	18.163	****	19.245	****	18.847	****
R2	0.3233		.1984		.4334		.4495	
Adjusted r2	0.3155		.1822		.4186		.4334	

****<.001 ***<.01 **<.05 *<.08

Standardized beta coefficients are in parentheses. Italicized gender moderation coefficients report the bivariate relationship of the gender interaction for the full model (complete model results for non-significant interaction findings are not reported).

