The Missing Link in the Spread of Mobilization for Protest. Asking Others.

Stefaan Walgrave

Abstract

Mobilization for protest occurs in interpersonal networks. Being asked is a key determinant of participation, but research has neglected the flip side: asking others. The study shifts the attention to the active part of micro mobilization and examines which prospective participants are most likely to ask others to participate and whom they ask. Drawing on a novel dataset including evidence on more than ten thousand participants in fifty demonstrations across Europe, I find that activists who are committed to the demonstration's cause (willing to spread mobilization) and who are part of participation-friendly networks (able to spread mobilization) are the most active recruiters. But asking others is also dependent on being asked: participants who are recruited via weak ties are more active recruiters themselves.

Mobilization for protest, just as for any other social activity, is a process of diffusion. People *are* mobilized and, in turn, they mobilize *others*. Mobilization messages are received and they are forwarded to other people. This paper deals with the spread of mobilization messages within interpersonal networks. The idea is that potential activists both act as passive message receivers as they act as active message generators. Individuals are knots in numerous micro networks connecting people and groups, and they process, filter, retain or pass on mobilizing information.

Social movement and political participation scholars established for a long time that the micro networks in which people are embedded are key in understanding mobilization for political

participation in general and for movement participation (protest) in particular (see among many others: McAdam, 1988, Verba et al., 1995, Knoke, 1990, Lim, 2008). There is quite some evidence on receiving participation requests (being asked) available. This work showed that being asked is a strong predictor of movement participation; most people who participate in a protest event have been asked by others (see for example: Schussman and Soule, 2005).

However, to what extent and under which circumstances incoming mobilization messages are passed on by prospective activists to other potential participants has not been studied. We lack basic knowledge about the determinants of making personal participation invitations to others and about whom prospective participants tend to invite. Social movement scholars have focused on the being asked part, the passive side of mobilization, and neglected the active part of the diffusion of protest, asking others to participate. If people were only mobilized while not mobilizing others in turn, mobilization would peter out quickly after one 'round' of asking and many people would not be reached. As important for the diffusion of mobilization as the process of being asked, is the asking part. Why do people who are planning to take part in a protest event start asking other people in their environment to participate and whom do they ask? In line with Schussman & Soule's (2005) contention that mobilization is a multi-staged process, I argue that a full account of how mobilization spreads, requires evidence not only on being asked but also on asking others. While Schussman & Soule show that being asked acts as an intermediary step, this paper adds the next step of mobilization: asking others. In short, the study represents a first attempt to shift attention to the 'asking others'-part in the spread of mobilization.

The paper presents novel data—comparing across issues, movements and countries—on the micro level mobilization process gathered through survey interviews of more than ten thousand participants in fifty protest demonstrations (2008-2011) in eight European countries. The design draws on effective participants only and does not include non-participants. I cannot

tell whether people had not shown up if they had not been asked or if they had been asked by other people than they were. But that is not my aim. Previous work has already dealt amply with the effectivity of being asked and substantiated that being asked is crucially important for effective participation (see for example Verba et al., 1995: 135). For tackling the asking others part in the spread of mobilization, including non-participants is less necessary.

If we assume that prospective participants only start asking other people when they have decided by themselves to attend the event, the self-selection problem of having only effective participants is less of a problem for the second step in the spread of mobilization. I argue that it is likely that the asking others is mainly done by people who effectively attend themselves. Obviously, this assumption does not always hold. People who plan to attend and have asked other people may not show up eventually because they have been withheld for practical reasons. Also, individuals may ask other people even if they are unsure about their own participation; in fact, their effective participation may be dependent on the (positive) response of the people they asked. By and large, though, it is plausible that a large majority of the people who ask other people to participate in a protest event, are planning to participate themselves (and do eventually show up). Some selection bias remains as some asking others is done outside the pool of effective participants, but I contend that it is small. If it is true that most participation requests are made by people who are committed to participate themselves it makes no sense to start tackling the asking others puzzle drawing on a sample of participants *and* non-participants. Therefore, this study compares the asking others behavior of effective participants in fifty demonstrations in Europe.

I engage in answering the following research questions: *which prospective participants are most likely to ask others to participate* and *whom do they ask?* I find that motivation and capacity determine to what extent prospective participants ask others to participate. People who are committed to the demonstration's cause (*willing* to spread mobilization) and people who are

3

part of participation-friendly networks (*able* to spread mobilization) are more active recruiters than others. On top of the effect of motivation and capacity, I find that asking others is dependent on being asked. By whom people are asked to participate affects whom people themselves invite to take part. The chance that a prospective participant himself becomes an active recruiter for the action event is determined by whom he was asked. More concretely, people who are asked to participate by someone they do not know well (weak tie) tend to pass on that invitation to more different people than people who are asked to participate by a close family member or friend (strong tie). Especially participants who have been asked by a member of an organization turn out to be the most active recruiters themselves. The findings suggest that informal mobilization by SMOs via the micro networks of their members is a powerful mechanism generating micro 'waves' of mobilizing messages through various interpersonal connections.

The importance of being asked

Why are networks crucial for mobilization? Because they increase the chance that people are asked to participate (Verba et al., 1995). Via their personal relations, people are connected to opportunities for participation offered by social movement organizations. Students of social movements have called this the 'recruitment function' of social networks (Passy, 2001). Of course, people come to know about an upcoming event via other channels as well—via the mass media, for example, or via formal information they directly get from an organization—but convincing and activating people to participate, especially for relatively costly activities like participating in a protest demonstration, mostly happens via direct interpersonal contact and calls (Klandermans and Oegema, 1987). In their seminal *Voice and Equality* Verba and colleagues contend that there are three determinants of political participation: willing (agreeing with the

cause), being able (having the necessary time and resources), and being asked (Verba et al., 1995: 3). They show that, in the US context, there is a substantial effect of being asked. When people are asked, the odds of participating go up considerably: "*Any attempt to understand the roost of participation must take into account the impact of requests from others.*"(Verba et al., 1995: 138)

The idea that being asked is, if not an absolute precondition then in any case is a strong predictor has been widely adopted and confirmed by social movement scholars studying involvement in social movements and protest participation. McAdam & Paulsen (1993: 647), for example, in their model of differential recruitment, state that for any mobilization the first step is that "*... the individual must be the object of a recruiting appeal*". Similarly, Klandermans and Oegema (1987, Klandermans, 2004) state that only individuals who are 'targeted by mobilization attempts' eventually participate in effect (see also Snow et al., 1980 for an overview of the older literature on the importance of networks for mobilization, Gould, 2003).

Probably the most systematic and direct study of the importance of being asked has been undertaken by Schussman & Soule. Using the same US dataset as Verba & co, Schussman & Soule (2005: 1086) directly measure whether individuals have been asked to participate and confirm that: "*Individuals rarely participate in social movement activities (such as protest) unless they are asked to do so*". They nicely show that the variables that are traditionally expected to impact the odds of participation, most particularly organizational membership, only exert an *indirect* influence on effective participation. Being a member of networks increases the chance of being asked but it does not directly affect the chance of participation, only indirectly via the increased chance of being asked.

By whom are people asked to participate? Extant work demonstrates that potential participants are mostly being asked by people whom they know personally, by people who belong to their interpersonal network, who are part of their circle of close family, further

relatives, friends, acquaintances, colleagues or co-members of an association or club. The being asked occurs in micro networks. There still is debate about what kind of network connection is most effective in bringing about effective social movement participation. Most scholars hold that strong ties rather than weak ties are effective for activating participants (see for example: McAdam and Paulsen, 1993, McAdam, 1986, Klandermans and Oegema, 1987, Gerlach and Hine, 1970, Somma, 2009, Passy, 2001). Passy, for example, argues that strong ties, loaded with trust and familiarity, reduce the uncertainty of participation so that the intensity of the subsequent activism grows (Passy, 2001). But Lim (2008) recently argued that the strength of the tie between recruiter and potential recruit in itself does not affect the odds of participation. Rather it is connection, via associational ties more than via other ties that lead to participation.

The short overview makes it clear that we know quite a bit about whether, by whom, and with what effect potential participants are being asked to participate in a social movement or protest event. Note that the scope of the available evidence on being asked, in effect, remains limited as five of the studies cited above rely on the same Verba et al's US 1990 Civic Participation Study data (Lim, 2008, Somma, 2009, Brady et al., 1999, Schussman and Soule, 2005, Verba et al., 1995). Strikingly, though, why potential participants in turn ask *other* potential recruits to participate still is unknown and we also know little about whom prospective participants invite to join. I am not aware of any study that empirically considers the asking others behavior of prospective participants (see Gould, 2003 for a theoretical account). Only the foundational studies of Verba and colleagues provide indirect information about whom asks others to participate, but their information is collected via questioning people who have *been* asked rather than via direct surveys of the askers themselves (Verba et al., 1995, Brady et al., 1999). Verba et al. thus look at the recruiters through the eyes of their recruits; their evidence on

the recruiters is scant and indirect. They lack data, for example, about the motives of the recruiters and rely on imputed preferences.

If being asked is such an important precondition for participation, then the asking of others deserves full attention of social movement scholars. For each participant that is being asked, there logically is another participant that made the request. In a sense, students of social movement have only studied half of the interpersonal mobilization process, namely the receptive and passive part. They seem to have ignored the initiating and active part. If people were only asked and never passed on these invitations to participate to others, mobilization would be short-breathed and never be able to reach out beyond the directly and formally embedded constituency. Yet, we know for a fact that this not the case. Mobilization sometimes *does* spread through networks as a running fire jumping from one network to another, and very often mobilization does *not* remain confined to one wave but proceeds in ongoing chains of being asked and asking. Without this contagion process, large mobilizations would simply be impossible as only movement members and their direct contacts would be reached. To mobilize widely, social movements not only need formal channels for 'en bloc recruitment' (Oberschall, 1973), they also need to rely on their members to bring the message across to other groups and non-members. Members are the rank-and-file 'marketers' of SMOs. Therefore, in the next section I theorize about what makes prospective participants likely to invite other people and about whom they tend to ask.

Who asks whom

My account of asking others draws on three basic propositions. Asking others is determined by motivation, capacity, and compatibility. The first proposition departs from the idea

that asking others to participate is putting your neck out. By asking others one publicly displays endorsement of a cause and one comes out as a supporter of a movement. Not all targets of a recruiter may react positively, some may disagree with the cause, some may change their opinion about the recruiter accordingly, or some may even react in a hostile way to an invitation to participate. So, asking others comes with a cost and not all potential participants are prepared to bear that cost. It depends on the *motivation* of the potential recruiter.

Second, prospective participants should not only be willing to bear the cost and risk of recruiting, they need to be structurally able to ask others. *Capacity* is the second determinant of asking others. It comes in different guises. To start with, not every potential activist has the same amount of structural connections with others enabling him to ask others to participate. Also, recruiters are not very likely to put much effort in mobilizing others that may not be willing to participate anyway, Brady et al. (1999: 154) speak of recruiters for political action as 'rational prospectors' trying to optimize their recruitment efforts. Whether recruiters can single out other potential participants that are willing to participate depends on the information they have about the background, previous participation, attitudes, and preferences of potential recruits. Hence, information as well affects a prospective participant's capacity to recruit. This information is, amongst others, generated by political interactions with others (Lim, 2008). Expected success in recruiting others, finally, not only depends on the information one has about these others but also on the impact one may exert on the people one asks.

Third, invitations to others are not independent of the participation invitations received from others. Inviting others is consequential. One of the potential consequences of both being asked and of asking others is that the recruiter and his recruit attend the event together. This implies that passing on an invitation to participate will be targeted specifically to those others that are 'socially compatible' with a participant's own recruiter. Also, the level of intimacy and trust

implied in the being asked message has an effect on which other people a prospective participant will ask himself. In other words: asking others is determined by being asked because of *compatibility* between the recruiter and the recruit.

Ironically, the presented account of asking others thus boils down to a statement that is almost identical with Verba et al.'s (1995: 3) famous quote about participation in political activities itself: prospective participants solicit others to participate because they *want* (motivation), because the *can* (capacity) and because they are *being asked* (compatibility). Based on these three general principles, I derive six hypotheses on whom asks whom.

Some activists are more committed to a cause and more motivated to take part in protest actions than others. This strong motivation results in a larger willingness to mobilize others. Highly motivated activists are more prepared to run the risk/bear the cost of being ignored, laughed at, attacked, stigmatized etc by their recruitment targets or bystanders. Added to that, motivated activists are more likely than less motivated ones to know more other potentially willing activists. So, they have more chances of being successful recruiters having more suitable potential targets (see Verba et al., 1995 for a discussion of the causal order between recruitment and motivation). Hence the first hypothesis: *More motivated participants are more active recruiters than less motivated participants* (H1).

Some prospective activists know a lot of other people that may be willing to join, others may not. Knowing a lot of people that are willing to join consists of two things: knowing a lot of people and knowing that they may be willing to join. Hence, recruitment ability has a structural embeddedness aspect and an aspect of being informed about the preferences, political attitudes, and past political behavior of others. In operational terms, both aspects are merged in associational networks. Prospective activists who are more embedded in associations of any kind know, more than potential activists without such associational connections, more other people.

Also, associationally embedded activist may have more information about the political stances and protest willingness of these others than non-associationally active as political issues are a frequent topic of discussion in associations. This leads to the second hypothesis: *More associationally embedded participants are more active recruiters than less associationally embedded participants* (H2).

The capacity to recruit others not only depends on associational embeddedness. Some people talk a lot about politics with others while others do not. If you interact frequently on politics with friends, relatives or colleagues the likelihood that you know others (your collocutors) who share the same cause as you and who would be willing to join, increases. Talking politics does not increase your chance of knowing many people but it increases the chances of knowing the politics of the people around you. Hence a third hypothesis: *Participants who discuss politics more frequently are more active recruiters than participants who talk less about politics* (H3).

If it is true that participants do not like their recruitment efforts to be in vain and avoid being confronted with negative or hostile reactions of others, we expect them to mainly target those other people of which they expect the highest success rate and from whom they do not run the risk of getting unpleasant reactions. Again, this is a matter of information about the political beliefs, attitudes and behavior of potential recruits. Yet, it also is a matter of the strength of the tie one has with a potential recruit (Granovetter, 1973). If one has a strong tie with another person, for example a close friend, one probably knows the political predispositions of this other person but one also knows that asking this close person to participate will on average result in a higher success chance than asking a less well-known person. Indeed, in line with what has been found regarding the effect of being asked on effective participation, I argue that strong ties lead to more compelling and more difficult to ignore appeals to participate. It is more difficult to refuse a favor

to a close friend than it is to a distant acquaintance (Gould, 2003: 241). Brady et al. (1999: 155) speak of the 'leverage' a recruiter has on his recruit: "*Since the desire to please, or not to offend, cements social relationships, friends also command a kind of leverage... Focussing on targets to whom they are close is an efficient strategy for rational prospectors*". Added to that, the chance of getting disagreeable reactions are smaller since potential close tie targets are not willing to imperil a close relationship by reacting in a hostile way. So, information density and success chance are higher, and the hostility risk is smaller, when recruiting a strong tie relationship. These expectations can be formalized in a fourth hypothesis: *Participants tend to recruit more frequently people with whom they have strong ties than people with whom they share weak ties* (H4).

The asking behavior of soon-to-be participants is also affected by the kind of people the recruiters themselves have been invited by. Invitations to join are primarily passed on to those others who are similar to one's own recruiters. Following the compatibility proposition, asking others mirrors being asked. For example, people who are asked by friends are predominantly asking other friends rather than, for instance, relatives or close family members. People try to avoid mixing their different social circles when protesting as this may make the actual participation with all those different companies at the same time a little complicated socially. Hence the hypothesis: *Participants tend to ask potential recruits resembling their own recruiters* (H5).

Being asked affects asking others also in a second way. Work on being asked concluded that the more dense, strong and primary the relationship between recruiter and recruit, the larger the chance that the recruit participates and the more intense his subsequent participation (McAdam and Paulsen, 1993, Passy, 2001). This seems to go against Granovetter's initial (1973) idea that weak ties are more important than strong ties for the spread of mobilization (but see:

Granovetter, 1978). However, the present study does not deal with a recruit's own recruitment but with a recruit's own recruiting. I expect weak ties to play a different role in this respect: being asked to participate by someone with whom one does not have a strong personal connection incites potential participants more to become active recruiters than being asked by someone with whom participants do share a close relationship. There are several reasons to expect this pattern.

Participation invitations by a distant source are easier to redirect it to a wide variety of potential participants—including other weak tie contacts but also strong tie connections—than invitations from a close and intimate origin. It is easier to 'downgrade' or 'internalize' invitations provided by strangers to primary contacts than it is to 'upgrade' or 'externalize' information generated by close people to more distant contacts whom one may not know very well and with whom one does not have a trusting or caring relationship. In other words, the information and requests being shared in primary relationships is more intimate and requires more trust making it less likely that it spreads out of the primary circle reaching more different people. The information and the requests being shared with secondary relationships is more factual, less loaded with mutual trust and intimacy, and can thus more easily be passed on. Also, prospective participants ask other people to participate probably partly because they want to participate in the company of that other person. If we accept that individuals like the company of people with whom they hold primary relationships, than the chances are larger that participation requests would be mainly downgraded from secondary to primary relationships instead of the other way around. If you are asked by a person you do not know well—and that you may not even like— you tend to ask other people to join you whom you do know well and like. But if you are asked to participate by and plan to do so with someone you know very well, why would you still ask other people to join? You already have found good companionship. This leads to the sixth hypothesis:

Being asked by a weak tie relation leads to more active recruitment than being asked by a strong tie relation (H6).

Data and Methods

Data comes from the XXX project. This project gathers systematic data on protest participants in seven European countries (Belgium, Italy, Netherlands, UK, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland). Relying on the protest survey methodology of sampling and questioning participants in protest events, between 2009 and 2011, 10,790 participants in fifty protest demonstrations were surveyed (for more details about protest surveying, see Walgrave and Verhulst, 2011). Table A1 in the appendix summarizes the evidence. Demonstrations did not yield equal amounts of completed questionnaires, but I do not weigh the data for sample size nor for country. The dataset includes 11 demonstrations in Spain, 10 in the UK, 9 in the Netherlands, 7 in Belgium, 6 in Sweden, 4 in Italy, 2 in Switzerland and 1 in Denmark. The largest group of demonstrations (labeled 'austerity' in Table A1) deals with budget cuts, austerity measures, with the banking crisis, and with European budget regulations (N=19). Then follow a good deal of May Day events (N=11). Next are demonstrations dealing with climate change or with the energy issue (N=7), then events related to nationalism, regionalism or the reform of the state (labeled 'state reform')(N=6), then anti-racist or anti-fascist events (N=4), women demonstrations (N=2) and, finally, a single (N=1) anti-abortion event. My sample of demonstrations may not be a perfectly representative sample of all the demonstrations occurring in these countries during the 2009-2011 period, but it certainly forms a good sample of the larger demonstrations. In most countries, *all* large protest events in the research period were covered. Although ideally one would have wanted to have more right-wing events like anti-immigrant protests in the sample, the

13

select demonstrations display a large variety of causes, issues and movements. The evidence presents a tough test for any general pattern of asking others. I do not put forward expectations about differences between countries or issues but will check whether the found patterns hold across issue type and country.

Each of the fifty demonstrations was surveyed using the same questionnaire. It contained a question about asking others (and analogical questions about being asked) that forms the dependent variable in this paper. After asking the respondents by whom they had been asked to participate, they were asked: *"Which people did you yourself ask to participate?"* followed by seven closed answer categories of which people could tick as many as applied: (1) *No‑one*, (2) *Partner or family*, (3) *Friends*, (4) *Relatives*, (5) *Acquaintances*, (6) *Colleagues/fellow students*, and (7) *Co‑members of an organization of which I am a member*. The questions about being asked presented identical answer categories. The asking others question was turned into a scale measuring the *intensity* of recruitment (additive scale summing the number of different types of other people a participant had asked to participate not including the 'no-one' category; 0-6). The being asked question was converted in a scale measuring the *strength* of the tie between the recruiter and the recruit (recode: No-one=1, Partner/family=2; Friends=3; Relatives=4; Colleagues=5; Acquaintances=6; Co-members=7). Question wording and answer categories of all other variables (tapping motivation, capacity, and being asked) and of all controls (demographics, general political attitudes, and past political behavior) are presented in Table A2 in appendix.

Analysis

A first bit of evidence regards the category of people prospective participants are soliciting. H4 stated that because of better information, lower cost and more leverage, potential

14

participants mostly invite strong tie relations to join them in protest participation. Strong ties are characterized by a large amount of time spent together, a strong emotional intensity, the intimacy of the interactions, and a high reciprocity of the 'services' rendered (Granovetter, 1973: 1361). Of all kinds of people the respondents could tick as having invited to take part, two types stand out as strong cases of strong ties: partner/family and friends. The data substantiate that prospective participants indeed most frequently invite partner/family and friends to join: 39.3 per cent says to have invited friends, 27.6 per cent partner/family. Categories of people with whom respondents have weaker ties, such as co-members (15.1%), acquaintances (17.4%) and relatives (12.7%) are significantly less invited to participate. Colleagues/fellow students (23.8%) score in between. Note that people probably have less family members and less friends than they know acquaintances and have relatives. So even although they hold more weak ties than they have strong ties, they tend to solicit more frequently people with whom they hold strong ties. Hypotheses 4 gets support from the data, there is a strong tie tendency in the spread of mobilization.

H5 claimed that, due to the compatibility of their social circles, participants tend to pass on invitations to similar kinds of people they were invited by. Being asked by friends leads to asking friends, being asked by relatives leads to asking relatives etc. To test this hypothesis, in Table 1, I calculate the share of each category of asking others within each category of being asked.

<div align="center"><Table 1 about here></div>

The evidence supports the hypothesis. Comparing shares of participants across a row, one can observe that the matching (shaded) cell, containing participants who were asked by a certain type of other and themselves did ask the same type of other, is the largest in each row in six of the seven cases. For example, people who stated that they were asked by no-one tend more than

<div align="center">15</div>

people who were asked by any other category to pass on the invitation to participate to no-one else (28.5%). There is only one exception to the overall pattern: participants asked by relatives (36.0%) and acquaintances (35.5%) tend to ask their partner/family more than people who told they had been asked by their partner/family. The reason may simply be that people who are asked by their spouse cannot asked their spouse in turn; so the nuclear family simply is too small to pass on information. In a series of seven binomial logistic regressions we tested whether the specific category of people participants were asked by affects the identical specific category of people participants asked themselves (no/yes), while controlling for all other variables. Results (not shown in table) do confirm that being asked affects asking others: in each model the specific being asked coefficient is a significant, and the strongest, predictor of asking similar others, except for the partner/family model. By and large, Hypothesis 5 is corroborated, there is a mirroring mechanism at work.

The four other hypotheses can all be tested at the same time in a single regression model with the intensity of a prospective participant's recruitment efforts as dependent variable. As stated, the measure of intensity of recruitment is a simple sum scale of the different types of people a prospective participant has asked. Participants who state to have asked partners/family members, friends, relatives, acquaintances, colleagues/fellow students, *and* co-members get a score of six, participants who declare not to have asked anybody, get a score of zero. Respondents who did not tick any of the answer categories get a score of zero as well. Note that the measure taps both the intensity as the diversity of the recruitment efforts—I lack direct information on the amount of different individuals that were asked or on the repetitiveness of these requests. Remember that the strength of the tie between the recruit (respondent) and the recruiter was constructed based on a recoding of the being asked variable. Respondents who did not tick any of the answer categories for the being asked question were considered as missing for

the strength of tie variable. Table 2 presents the results of a linear regression model with the recruitment intensity of prospective participants as the dependent variable.

<Table 2 about here>

H1 stated that highly motivated participants would be more willing to bear the cost of asking others and running the risk of being ignored or getting negative reactions. The model in Table 2 contains three variables tapping motivation. Two of the three are significant predictors of recruitment intensity. Both effects are substantial and figure among the strongest variables in the model. We measure motivation directly by asking participants how 'determined' they were to participate but also indirectly by asking them when they decided to participate. This second measure taps motivational strength, highly motivated people decide earlier, but it also measures something else. People who make up their mind long before the demonstration have more time to ask others to participate (which is capacity and not motivation). Imagine a participant who decides the day of the demonstration itself that he will take part in it; he has then very little time to approach others to join. A third motivational variable is not a significant predictor of recruitment activity: participants who say they identify strongly with one of the organizations staging the event are not more frequent recruiters. In general, more motivated people invite other people more frequently to join than less motivated people. Hypothesis 1 gets support.

H2 expected that recruitment efforts would be a function of the structural capacity of a participant to recruit others. Knowing a lot of people, and having information about the politics of these people, increases the chance of being an active recruiter. Two variables in the model tap structural embeddedness: the number of (active) associational memberships and the number of organizations one was actively involved in during the last 12 months. The first is a robust predictor of recruitment intensity, the second fails to reach significance—but in a model without

associational membership organizational involvement *is* a significant predictor of recruitment efforts. Hypothesis 2 can be maintained.

H3 held that the capacity to recruit depends on political interactions with other people. If one talks frequently with others about politics one is informed about the political convictions of these others and can gauge the odds that they would participate if asked. In other words: to ask one must talk. The evidence corroborates Hypothesis 3, the coefficient is positive and significant. Talking politics leads to inviting others to take part in politics.

H6, finally, stated that by whom people are asked to participate affects their own recruitment intensity. The weaker the tie through which they were activated, the more other people they tend to solicit. The reason for expecting this effect is the social incompatibility between people's different circles and the fact that non-intimate information from weak ties can more easily be internalized into primary relations than vice versa. In order to test this contention, the model incorporates a measure of the tie strength of the connection with the asking source. Since other variables in the model amply control for organizational membership I can be confident that the potential effect of a weak tie participation invitation is not an effect from organizational membership but a proper effect of being asked by a weak tie (in a formal and thus also an organizational context). The data support the expectation. Being asked by a weak tie is a significant predictor of recruitment intensity. If people are asked by someone they do not know very well (weak tie) in a (more) formal context, the probability that they will ask many other people to participate, increases. Hypothesis 6 gets confirmation.

Some socio-demographics affect the intensity of asking others as well. There is a substantial effect of age. Younger participants are much more active recruiters than older people. Highly educated are more active recruiters than lower educated. Full employment decreases recruitment activity but the effect is small. Sex has no effect. Finally, the four control variables

18

do not exert any influence on the intensity of asking others although the left-right self-placement approaches significance—left-wing protesters are slightly more active recruiters than right-wing protesters.

To test whether the effects of motivation, capacity and tie strength found in the aggregate hold across countries and across issues, I ran the same regression again for the demonstrators of all seven countries separately (I dropped Denmark since we only had one demonstration there) and for the demonstrators on all six issues separately (I dropped anti-abortion as it only counted one demonstration). Summary results only containing significance levels are presented in Table 3.

<Table 3 around here>

Results show that most of the found effects in the aggregate model with a very large N are quite robust and hold across countries and across issues when tested in separate models with often much smaller N's. Motivation—motivational strength and/or decision timing—affects recruitment intensity in all countries and for all issues. The effects of capacity—structural embeddedness and talking politics—are a little less consistent but in most countries and for most issues at least one of the capacity variables yields a significant effect. Tie strength as well matters in two-third of the models suggesting that in most cases weak tie invitations lead to more active subsequent recruitment. Among the socio-demographics, age stands out as a very strong and consistent predictor of recruitment activity in all models. Younger people are much more active recruiters than older. The rest of the socio-demographics and the controls yield a scattered and inconsistent picture.

Comparing across countries and issues, my account of recruitment activity as being explained by motivation, capacity, and ties works better in some countries and for some issues than for others. Overall, it performs best in Belgium, Spain, Sweden, and the UK. Especially in

Switzerland—with an especially low N for a regression with 15 independent variables—the three factors do not perform very well. Considering issue differences, my account appears to do well for austerity, May Day, climate and state reform demonstrations but less so for anti-racist protest and for women's demonstrations. So, there are interesting differences between countries and issues. It goes beyond the aim of the study to explain these inter-country and inter-issue differences, but the two issue types for which the logic of recruitment seemed to be different are anti-racism and women. This may not be a coincidence as these demonstrations are typically set up by the so-called 'new social movements'. The events staged by more traditional groups appear to better follow the logic of motivation, capacity and tie strength.

The comparisons show that asking others and the dynamics of recruitment is a complex and context-dependent phenomenon. Not all effects play out to a similar extent in the different countries and for the different issues. In some countries motivational factors seem to matter relatively more (e.g. UK), in other countries the capacity to recruit is the relative key factor (e.g. Belgium), while in still others ties seems to play a relatively larger role (e.g. Italy). The same applies to issues with some demonstrations for which the spread of mobilization seems to depend mainly on motivations (e.g. climate), others for which capacity matters relatively more (May Day), and still others for which ties is a particularly strong factor (e.g. state reform).

Wrapping up, my contention that spread of mobilization via asking others is determined by the motivation of the recruiters, by their capacity to invite others, and by whom they themselves were drawn into the demonstration, seems to hold the track. All hypotheses received support from the evidence. Mobilization spreads via asking others—the flip side of being asked—and this asking others is patterned and does not occur randomly. Motivation, capacity and ties lead to a process in which three diffusion mechanism are at work: people ask their nears to take part (privatization), they tend to ask the same type of people than they were asked by

(mirroring), and they tend to forward weak tie invitations to strong tie relations (internalization). These three mechanisms of privatization, mirroring and internalization are taking place at the same time. There are differences between demonstrations regarding their relative prevalence but they all occur to some extent in most cases. Hence, the overall picture of the spread of mobilization is thus one in which mobilization mostly occurs in participants' primary circles. Activation (being asked) by a formal and weak tie is typically processed and forwarded to people being more close in one's interpersonal network. Activating messages are seldom 'upgraded' or 'externalized' to people who are more distant and with whom one has a weaker tie than with the individual one got the invitation from.

Conclusion

The study aimed to shift the focus to the active part of the spread of mobilization via interpersonal networks. Current social movement scholarship predominantly tackles the passive part of the process—the fact that many people *are* asked to take part. This extant work overwhelmingly supports the idea that being asked is a crucial variable predicting protest and movement participation. This paper contended that being asked is only half of the story. If being asked is so important then asking others must be as well. Prospective participants *are* not only mobilized, they also mobilize *others* themselves. If that were not the case mobilization would die out quickly and massive mobilizations would be exceedingly rare. For mobilization to spread it requires both people who are passive and are asked as it requires people who are active and ask others. I examined the determinants and patterns of asking others based on novel evidence on the micro mobilization process of ten thousand participants in fifty protest demonstrations in Europe.

In a nutshell, recruitment happens mainly by participants who are more motivated, by participants who have the structural and informational capacity to recruit others, and by participants who were asked themselves by a weak tie relationship. These three effects lead to mechanisms of privatization (activists asking their primary relationships), mirroring (activists asking the same kind of people they were asked by), and internalization (activist passing on weak tie invitations to strong tie invitees). This account of inter-personal recruitment held in different countries and applied to different issues, increasing the chance that the findings highlight a general pattern.

The most striking finding relates to the internalization mechanims: recruitment spills over from weak ties to strong ties or, in other words, from formal networks to informal ones. Most importantly, the internalization process also leads to more intense recruitment. Activists who are being asked by someone with which they hold weak ties—they know this person from work or from school, they know this person not really well (acquaintance), or they have met this person through an organization—tend to be more intense and active recruiters. In contrast, being asked to participate by significant others or primary relations—spouses, kids, close family, or friends—generates less subsequent recruitment activity. If people are asked by primary relations they mostly extend the invitation to other primary relations; if they are asked by secondary relations, on the other hand, they tend to extend the invitation to *both* other secondary as to their primary relations.

This finding complements previous work showing that being asked by a strong tie relation increases the chances of one's own participation more than being asked by weak tie relations. I showed that potential recruiters indeed tend to shoot for their strong ties. Although maybe not so effective in convincing people to take part themselves, the study showed that weak tie and formal interpersonal recruitment is crucial to the success of a mobilization campaign as it stimulates the

spread of participation invitations across and through micro networks. Hence, the limited effect of organizational mobilization found in previous work must be put in perspective. Organizations, or formal contexts for that matter, are effective because their members amplify the call for participation broader and beyond truncated networks so that more people are eventually reached. This pleads for more attention to the double role organizations play in mobilization. On the one hand they, often not in a face-to-face way but formally, mobilize their members and other people via posters, ads, flyers, media appearances etc. On the other hand, organization members act as informal marketers and recruiters in their interpersonal micro networks. My evidence suggests that this second role may be of substantial importance. If mobilization occurs completely outside of organizations and formal contexts, it reaches out less far. This is not the case just because organizations have many members in many different interpersonal networks but because the asking process in a formal context itself generates more recruitment spin-offs. It generates larger micro 'waves' of recruitment than informal recruitment.

Taken together, this leads to what looks like a paradox of micro mobilization. Asking others with whom a recruiter shares close ties is more effective than asking weak tie relations because the chance is larger the target decides to join (this is what extant work on being asked has found). Yet, at the same time, asking others with whom one has weak ties, although with a smaller chance of being successful, leads, *if* successful (the recruit decides to join) to a potentially larger effect because the recruit will most likely turn out to become a more active recruiter himself extending the mobilization message to more different other people (this is what this study on asking others added). In sum, the evidence confirms Granovetter's (1973, 1978) idea that weak ties are primary sources for diffusion but less for persuasion.

The study has a number of weaknesses that may be repaired in future research. First, it only draws on participants and does not compare participants with non-participants. Although I

argued in the beginning that the bulk of the asking others is probably done by people planning to participate, it is likely that some people ask others while not attending themselves. These non-attending askers are not in my sample. It is hard to say to what extend the results are affected by this selection bias. It may be the case that the non-attending askers are less motivated (which is why they do not show up eventually). It may be the case that they have on average less information about other potential participants (so that their recruitment efforts fail more often and that they more frequently decide not to participate themselves after all). Future studies may include non-participants in the design to tease this out but the major drawback, I expect, is that the number of recruiters among the non-participants will be very small.

Second, the study contained no information regarding the channels through which people were invited or invited others to participate. The current proliferation of digital channels and social online networks may affect the amount, target, and effect of asking others. I expect that a message on a Facebook page is less consequential while targeting much more people than a face-to-face conversation that may be more compelling but at the same time also more demanding. In other words, asking others can take many forms and happen via different media and it would be interesting to take that into account in future studies. The fact that we found, for example, that youngsters are systematically more active in recruiting others may be due to their stronger online presence and digital network activity.

Third, I only dealt with one type of protest: taking part in peaceful demonstrations in a non-threatening context (established European democracies). Other sorts of social movement activities (e.g. direct action) in other contexts (e.g. under authoritarian regimes) may be characterized by different patterns. The literature provides a few examples of how different types of political participation are differently affected by being asked (Verba et al., 1995, Lim, 2008). I expect that the same factors—motivation, capacity and ties—would play a role for asking others

24

in these other cases as well but their relative weight may be different. For instance, motivation and strong ties may be more important when actions are risky and costly.

Finally, an important avenue for further research is to make better use of the comparative character of the data to theorize more systematically about the differences between countries, between issues, and even between demonstrations. I only showed in this paper that the basic pattern holds across countries and issues but, in the meantime, stumbled on notable differences. It is plausible that meso level variables, such as the strength of the organizations staging the demonstrations, the size of the demonstration, or the expectation that a demonstration may become violent and/or be repressed, have an effect on, or are affected by, the individual-level recruitment of other participants.

References

Brady, H. E., Schlozman, K. L. & Verba, S. (1999) Prospecting for Participants: Rational Expectations and the Recruitment of Political Activists. *American Political Science Review,* 93**,** 153-168.

Gerlach, L. & Hine, V. (1970) *People, Power, and Change: Movements of Social Transformation,* Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill.

Gould, R. V. (2003) Why do networks matter? Rationalist and structuralist interpretations. IN Diani, M. & McAdam, D. (Eds.) *Social movements and networks. Relational approaches to collective action.* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Granovetter, M. (1973) The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology,* 78**,** 1360-1380.

Granovetter, M. (1978) Threshold Models of Collective Behavior. *American Journal of Sociology,* 78**,** 1420-1443.

Klandermans, B. (2004) The demand and supply of participation: social psychological correlates of participation in social movements. IN Snow, D. A., Soule, S. A. & Kriesi, H. (Eds.) *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements.* Blackwell.

Klandermans, B. & Oegema, D. (1987) Potentials, Networks, Motivations and Barriers: Steps Towards Participation in Social Movements. *American Sociological Review,* 52**,** 519-531.

Knoke, D. (1990) Networks of Political Action: Toward Theory Construction. *Social Forces,* 68**,** 1041-1063.

Lim, C. (2008) Social Networks and Political Participation: How Do Networks Matter? *Social Forces,* 87**,** 961-982.

McAdam, D. (1986) Recruitment to High-Risk Activism: The Case of Freedom Summer. *American Journal of Sociology,* 92**,** 64-90.

McAdam, D. (1988) Micromobilization Contexts and the Recruitment to Activism. IN Klandermans, B., Kriesi, H. & Tarrow, S. (Eds.) *From Structure to Action.* Greenwich, JAI-Press.

McAdam, D. & Paulsen, R. (1993) Specifying the Relationship between Social Ties and Activism. *American Journal of Sociology,* 99**,** 640-667.

Oberschall, A. (1973) *Social conflict and social movements,* Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall.

Passy, F. (2001) Socialization, Connection, and the Structure/Agency Gap. A Specification of the Impact of Networks on Participation in Social Movements. *Mobilization,* 6**,** 173.

Schussman, A. & Soule, S. A. (2005) Process and Protest: Accounting for Individual Protest Participation. *Social Forces,* 84**,** 1083-1108.

Snow, D. A., Zurcher, L. A. & Ekland-Olson, S. (1980) Social networks and social movements: a microstructural approach to differential recruitment. *American Sociological Review,* 45**,** 787-801.

Somma, N. M. (2009) How strong are Strong Ties. The Conditional ffectiveness of Strong Ties in Protest Recruitment Attempts. *Sociological Perspectives,* 52**,** 289-308.

Verba, S., Schlozman, K. & Brady, H. (1995) *Voice and Equality. Civic Voluntarism in American Politics,* Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

Walgrave, S. & Verhulst, J. (2011) Selection and Response Bias in Protest Surveys. *Mobilization,* 16**,** 489-500.

Figures and Tables

Table 1: Effect of Being Asked on Asking Others (N=10,790)

Being Asked by… →	No-one	Partner/ family	Relatives	Friends	Acquaintances	Colleagues/ students	Co-members	Average
Asking Others (in %) ↓								
No-one	*28.5*	10.4	5.3	9.0	5.8	6.6	6.2	14.3
Partner/family	28.6	*32.1*	36.0	30.4	35.5	22.3	26.7	27.5
Relatives	12.0	13.8	*39.1*	14.8	20.5	12.5	14.3	12.7
Friends	33.9	39.8	54.9	*62.3*	64.3	47.0	40.4	39.3
Acquaintances	14.7	16.5	26.0	25.0	*51.2*	23.8	23.5	17.4
Colleagues/fellow students	17.4	17.1	22.9	27.5	34.2	*57.6*	34.6	23.8
Co-members	10.5	9.8	14.1	15.1	26.9	20.7	*32.5*	15.1
N	3,405	1,351	419	2,204	687	1,361	2,837	
% of total	31.6	12.6	3,9	20.4	6.4	12.6	26.3	

Note: percentages in the table do not add up to 100% because of multiple response.

Table 2: OLS Regression of Intensity of Asking Others

	Unstandardized B	S.E.	Standardized Beta	Significance
Motivation				
Motivational strength (weak-strong; 1-5)	.318	.023	.176	.000
Participation decision timing (late-early; 1-4)	.209	.018	.145	.000
Organizing SMO identification (low-high; 1-5)	.032	.017	.024	.061
Capacity				
Associational membership (weighed number; 0-26)	.049	.006	.110	.000
Organizational involvement (frequency; 0-4)	.033	.020	.023	.108
Talking politics (frequency; 1-5)	.134	.023	.078	.000
Being Asked				
Asked by… Tie Strength (strong-weak; 1-7)	.071	.006	.129	.000
Socio-demographics				
Sexe (female)	.016	.032	.006	.610
Age (year born)	.021	.001	.224	.000
Education (low-high; 1-8)	.037	.011	.040	.000
Employment (fulltime; no-yes)	-.065	.031	-.023	.038
Controls				
Organizing SMO membership (no-yes)	-.020	.037	-.007	.596
Demonstration participation frequency (low-high; 1-5)	.022	.024	.011	.360
Political interest (low-high; 1-4)	-.016	.027	-.008	.568
Left/Right self-placement (left-right; 0-10)	-.015	.008	-.022	.061
(Constant)	-42.997	2.126		.000
N	6,796			
Adj. R²	.187			

Table 3: Separate OLS Regressions of Intensity of Asking Others – Summary of Significance

	BE	NL	IT	SP	CH	SW	UK	Austerity	May Day	Climate	State Reform	Racism	Women
Motivation													
Motivational strength (weak-strong; 1-5)	***	***	**	***	ns	***	***	***	**	***	***	**	ns
Participation decision timing (late-early; 1-4)	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	ns	***
Organizing SMO identification (low-high; 1-5)	*	ns	ns	*	ns	ns	ns	ns	*	ns	ns	ns	ns
Capacity													
Associational membership (weighed number; 0-26)	***	ns	ns	***	ns	**	***	ns	***	***	***	ns	**
Organizational involvement (frequency; 0-4)	*	**	ns	ns	**	ns	ns	*	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Talking politics (frequency; 1-5)	**	**	ns	***	ns	***	ns	***	***	ns	*	ns	ns
Being Asked													
Asked by… Tie Strength (strong-weak; 1-7)	*	ns	***	***	ns	**	**	***	***	*	***	ns	ns
Socio-demographics													
Sexe (female)	**	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Age (year born)	***	***	***	***	**	***	***	***	***	***	***	**	**
Education (low-high; 1-8)	ns	ns	ns	**	ns	ns	ns	**	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Employment (fulltime; no-yes)	ns	ns	ns	ns	*	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	*
Controls													
Organizing SMO membership (no-yes)	**	ns	ns	*	ns	ns	***	**	ns	ns	ns	*	ns
Demonstration participation frequency (low-high; 1-5)	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	*	ns	*	ns	ns
Political interest (low-high; 1-4)	*	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Left/Right self-placement (left-right; 0-10)	ns	ns	ns	ns	*	**	**	ns	ns	***	ns	ns	ns
N	1,017	1,270	458	1,754	208	620	1,292	2,342	1,096	1,437	1,208	316	214
Adj. R²	.189	.212	.257	.184	.222	.216	.197	.194	.230	.167	.206	.170	.275

Note: * p<.05; ** p<.01; ***p<.001

Appendix

Table A1: Surveyed demonstrations (2009-2011)

	N	Country	Issue
'TUC's March for the Alternative: Jobs, Growth, Justice (London)	214	UK	Austerity
1 Mei Mars (Antwerp)	216	BE	May day
1st May, Labour Day (Barcelona)	180	SP	May day
Against Labor Law (Madrid)	308	SP	Austerity
Against racist politics (Stockholm)	193	SW	Anti-racism
Against the Europe of Capital, Crisis and War (Barcelona)	77	SP	Austerity
Anti-nuclear demonstration (Stockholm)	283	SW	Climate
Beat The Heat (Utrecht)	270	NL	Climate
Celebration May Day (Vigo)	66	SP	May day
Climate Change (Brussels)	334	BE	Climate
Climate March (Copenhagen)	242	DE	Climate
Demonstration Against Abortion (Madrid)	302	SP	Abortion
Demonstration against language decree (Santiago de Compostela)	324	SP	State reform
Demonstration against the new labour law (Santiago de Compostela)	168	SP	Austerity
Euromayday (Milan)	126	IT	May day
For employment, not capital reforms. Defend Our Rights (Vigo)	168	SP	Austerity
Fund Our Future: Stop Education Cuts (London)	147	UK	Austerity
General Strike (Florence)	234	IT	Austerity
Knowledge crisis (Den Haag)	280	NL	Austerity
Don't let education drain (Amsterdam)	161	NL	Austerity
March for Work (Brussels)	129	BE	Austerity
Marcia Perugia-Assisi (Assisi)	173	IT	Austerity
May 1 March, Left Party (Stockholm)	167	SW	May day
May 1 March, Social Democratic Party (Stockholm)	176	SW	May day
May 1st Demonstration (Zurich)	135	CH	May day
May Day (Florence)	110	IT	May day
May Day (Left Party) (Malmö)	142	SW	May day
May Day (SAP/LO) (Malmö)	97	SW	May day
May Day Labour March (London)	178	UK	May day
Million Women Rise (London)	178	UK	Women
National Climate March (London)	243	UK	Climate
National Climate March 2010 (London)	360	UK	Climate
NL cries out for culture (Amsterdam)	174	NL	Austerity
NL cries out for culture (Utrecht)	171	NL	Austerity
No Government, Great Country (Brussels)	365	BE	State reform
No to Austerity (Brussels)	144	BE	Austerity
No to Hate Crime Vigil (London)	169	UK	Anti-racism
Non-Profit Demonstration (Brussels)	200	BE	Austerity
Not in Our Name (Brussels)	202	BE	State reform
Pension demonstration (Rotterdam)	294	NL	Austerity
Real Democracy Now! (Madrid)	350	SP	State reform
Strong together for public employment (Den Haag)	339	NL	Austerity
Enough of nuclear energy (Amsterdam)	173	NL	Climate
Second Student National Demo (London)	98	UK	Austerity
Self-determination is democracy (Barcelona)	301	SP	State reform
Stop racism and exclusion (Amsterdam)	124	NL	Anti-racism
Take Back Parliament (London)	351	UK	State reform
Unite Against Fascism National Demo (London)	189	UK	Anti-racism
We are a nation, we decide (Barcelona)	309	SP	State reform
World March of Women (Bern)	150	CH	Women
Total	10.790		

Table A2: Independent and Control Variables

Variable	Question wording	Answer categories
Motivation		
Motivational strength	*'How determined were you to participate in the demonstration?'*	1. Not very 2. Rather 3. Somewhat 4. Quite 5. Very much
Participation decision timing	*'When did you make a firm decision to participate in the demonstration?'*	1. The day of the demonstration 2. A few days before the demonstration 3. A few weeks before the demonstration 4. Over a month ago
Organizing SMO identification	*'To what extent do you identify with any organization staging the demonstration?'*	1. Not at all 2. Not very much 3. Some what 4. Quite 5. Very much
Capacity		
Associational membership	*'If you have been involved in any of the following types of organizations in the past 12 months, please indicate whether you are a passive member or an active member? If you are a member of several organizations of the same type, tick the highest or most 'active' category.'*	1. Church or religious organization 2. Trade union or professional association 3. Political party 4. Women's organization 5. Sport or cultural organization 6. Environmental organization 7. Lesbian or gay rights organization 8. Community or neighborhood association 9. Charity or welfare organization 10. Third world, Global Justice or Peace organization 11. Anti-racist or Migrant organization 12. Human or civil rights organization 13. Other (additive scale of all memberships whereby passive (and financial) membership counts for '1' and active membership counts for '2'; scale 0-26)
Organizational involvement	*'During the last twelve months, in how many different organizations have you actively participated?'*	1. None 2. In 1 3. Between 2–3 4. In more than 3
Talking politics	*'When you get together with your friends, relatives or fellow workers, how often do you discuss politics?'*	1. Never 2. Rarely 3. Sometimes 4. Fairly often 5. Very often

Being Asked		
Asked by … Tie Strength	*'Which of the following people specifically asked you to take part in the demonstration. I was asked by...'*	1.No-one 2.Partner or family 3.Friends 4.Relatives 5.Colleagues/fellow students 6.Acquaintances 7.Co-members of an organization of which I am a member
Socio-demographics		
Sexe	*'Are you...?'*	1.Male 2.Female
Age	*'In which year were you born?'*	Year
Employment	*'What is your employment situation? I work fulltime (including maternity leave or other temporary absence)'*	0. No 1. Yes
Education	*What is the highest level of education that you completed? If you are a student, at what level are you studying?*	1.None, did not complete primary education 2.Primary or first stage of basic 3.Lower secondary or second stage of basic 4.Upper secondary 5.Post-secondary, non-tertiary 6.First stage of tertiary 7.Second stage of tertiary 8.Post tertiary (PhD)
Control variables		
Organizing SMO membership	*Please list the main organizations staging this demonstration... Are you a member of any of these organizations?*	1.No/Don't know/Not sure 2.Yes
Demonstration participation frequency	*'How many times have you in the past taken part in a demonstration, during the last 12 months?'*	1.Never 2.1 to 5 times 3.6 to 10 times 4.11 to 20 times 5.21+ times
Left-Right self-placement	*'In politics people sometimes talk of "left" and "right". Where would you place yourself on this scale, where 0 means the left and 10 means the right?'*	Scale 0-10, Left-Right
Political interest	*'How interested are you in politics?'*	1.Not at all 2.Not very 3.Quite 4.Very