

Constructing "Social Change" through Philanthropy: Boundary Framing and the Articulation of Vocabularies of Motives for Social Movement Participation*

Ira Silver, *Northwestern University*

I embrace Mills's (1940) conception of motives to offer new insight into an old question: why do people join social movements? I draw upon ethnographic research at the Crossroads Fund, a "social change" foundation, to illustrate that actors simultaneously articulate two vocabularies of motives for movement participation: an instrumental vocabulary about dire, yet solvable, problems and an expressive vocabulary about collective identity. This interpretive work is done during boundary framing, which refers to efforts by movements to create in-group/out-group distinctions. I argue that the goal-directed actions movements take to advance social change are shaped by participants' identity claims. Moreover, it is significant that Crossroads constructs its actions and identity as social movement activism, rather than philanthropy. This definitional work suggests that analyzing the category *social movements* is problematic unless researchers study how activists attempt to situate themselves within this category. Hence, methodologically attending to organizations' constructions of movement status can theoretically inform research which essentially takes social movements as a given, in exploring their structural components.

As it approached 6:00 P.M. on the day of the Crossroads Fund's final meeting of its spring grantmaking cycle, I must not have been the only person wondering why this process took so long. The meeting had begun at 8:00 A.M., and certainly after ten hours—I thought to myself—we should have been able to complete the foundation's businesses of awarding approximately a dozen grants to community organizations working for social change in metropolitan Chicago.

Twice a year, the board and staff of Crossroads, part of a fourteen-member consortium of social change foundations called the Funding Exchange, culminate their grantmaking process with these lengthy meetings. This process illustrates both how Crossroads frames its "social change" ideology and how actors collectively identify with it. Since Crossroads's interpretive work hinges on its grantmaking, it is no wonder that these meetings take so long!

Crossroads constructs "social change" by erecting boundaries between its goals and those of foundations it oppositionally defines as "traditional." Social change philanthropy, thus, entails practices that Crossroads delineates as distinct

within Chicago philanthropy. Even though Crossroads is legally a foundation, through its demarcation of boundaries, the board and staff come to regard their work as social movement activism rather than philanthropy. Crossroads's ideological work can, hence, be construed as *boundary framing*, which involves a social movement's strategic efforts to situate itself on an ideological turf it regards as fundamentally oppositional to that of specified nonmovement actors (Hunt, Benford, and Snow 1994, pp. 193-194).

In this paper, I draw upon ethnographic data to explore two boundary framing processes at Crossroads.¹ *Boundary framing about grantmaking substance* involves efforts by Crossroads to define its problem-area for funding. It distinguishes between social services, which many foundations fund, and community organizing, which few others support. *Boundary framing about grantmaking structure* is Crossroads's effort to distinguish itself from all other local foundations, because its grantmaking decisions are made by a diverse group of activists recruited from the types of community organizations that Crossroads funds, rather than by politically lesser informed elites.

I argue that during boundary framing actors simultaneously articulate two vocabularies of motives for movement participation: an *instrumental* vocabulary about dire, yet solvable, problems and an *expressive* vocabulary about collective identity. Activists construe their goal-oriented actions as continually aligned with, and fueled by, identity claims. This argument elucidates the taken-for-granted notion that people join movements to effect social change. Such a notion begs the question, "What is social change?" I argue that "social change" is as much about who movement actors are as what they do and that these meanings jointly motivate participation. In exploring what "social change" means to those who work for it, I outline a new direction for integrating cultural and structural approaches to social movements.

Theoretical Framework

Scholars borrow the term *frames* from Goffman (1974) to refer to the models that movement actors construct to guide and give meaning to their actions (Benford 1993a, 1993b; Benford and Hunt 1992; Binder 1993; Gerhards and Rucht 1992; Hunt et al. 1994; Snow and Benford 1988, 1992; Snow, Rochford Jr., Worden, and Benford 1986; Swart 1995; Tarrow 1992; Zuo and Benford 1995). In particular, Snow and Benford (1988) document that movements produce collective action frames by diagnosing problems, proposing solutions, and motivating collective action.

Research on framing is part of a trend away from *resource mobilization* theory, which explores structural factors that give rise to movement formation (e.g., Gamson 1975; Jenkins and Perrow 1977; McCarthy and Zald 1973, 1977; Oberschall 1973), and toward a greater consideration of social-psychological

questions. The other area where social constructionists critique resource mobilization theory for rendering the interests of movement participants to be unproblematic is the literature on collective identity (e.g., Cohen 1985, p. 688-690; Friedman and McAdam 1992; Gamson 1992, pp. 53-54; Hunt 1991; Hunt and Benford 1994; Johnston, Larana, and Gusfield 1994; Melucci 1985, 1989, 1995; Stoecker 1995; Taylor and Whittier 1992). This *new social movements* research does not contend that structural and cultural approaches to movements are mutually exclusive but that greater attention must be given to reality construction occurring within movements (Buechler 1993; Ferree and Miller 1985; Klandermans 1984).

Some leading proponents of these two constructionist "camps" propose a holistic conception of the interpretive work of social movements. Hunt et al. (1994) link boundary framing and collective identity formation by examining three sets of *identity fields* in which framing processes are salient. The first is the field of protagonists who advocate for movement beliefs. The second field consists of those identified as antagonists to the movement. And the third group consists of neutral and uncommitted audiences to movement activity. From this analysis the authors argue that boundary framing is central to the formation and maintenance of collective identities, which enable movement actors to distinguish themselves from nonmovement adversaries (Hunt et al. 1994, pp. 186, 195).

The significance these researchers attribute to collective identity is its emergence "in a dynamic, almost recursive fashion" during boundary framing (Hunt et al. 1994, p. 203). In his analysis of the vocabulary of motives actors construct to explain movement participation, Benford (1993a) infers that collective identity has an additional importance, yet one which neither he alone nor he and his collaborators explicate. Benford draws upon Mills's (1940) notion that motives are not fixed psychological states but vary according to how people linguistically impute them across contexts. Hence, people articulate different *vocabularies* of motives, depending on the character of a situation. Benford explores a vocabulary about micromobilization: motives that movement actors construct to justify their resonance with collective action frames and to galvanize the interest of new participants. These motives are instrumental in that they pertain to both a movement's diagnosis of harm and its prognosis for change. They refer specifically to (1) the severity of the problem, (2) the sense of urgency, (3) the efficacy of taking action, and (4) the propriety of taking action (Benford 1993a, pp. 201-208).

One conclusion Benford draws is that this instrumental vocabulary of motives fosters an expressive result: movement participants embrace collective identities (Benford 1993a, p. 210). Although this conclusion has considerable merit, it requires further analysis since Benford does not consider the multiple contexts in which movement actors make motivational claims. My study of Crossroads

reveals that the collective action context Benford explores can be subsumed under boundary framing, where movement participants construct two distinct vocabularies of motives. One is instrumental and the other expresses who they are collectively. While Hunt et al. explore this second context, they do not specifically address motives for movement participation. Indeed, they introduce their discussion of boundary framing by stating simply that it occurs in "the course of framing diagnoses, prognoses, and motives" (Hunt et al. 1994, p. 193). Thus, in viewing collective identity as significant because of how it emerges during boundary framing, they do not additionally consider its motivational importance.

My agenda in examining Crossroads's boundary framing is to conceptually expand upon these two earlier framing analyses. Incorporating Mills's notion of motives into a systematic study of boundary framing elucidates how actors account for their movement participation. I have divided the rest of this paper into three parts. In the first two, I draw on the Crossroads case to illuminate concretely how boundary framing occurs. I then revisit the preceding discussion and argue that during boundary framing movement actors construct both an instrumental and an expressive vocabulary of motives justifying their movement participation. They align identity claims with their goal-oriented actions, which means that identity claims continually shape the "social change" actions of movements.

Boundary Framing about Grantmaking Substance

Crossroads struggles to construct clear and consistent boundaries between funding "social change" and "social services." Its efforts derive from the larger Funding Exchange critique that little philanthropy supports social movement organizations of any kind, and an even smaller percentage supports community organizing. The book *Robin Hood Was Right*, which can be considered a definitive guide to the tenets of social change philanthropy, reported that only 2.8 percent of annual contributions to American philanthropy in 1974 went to social change projects (Vanguard Public Foundation 1977). Craig Jenkins (1989a) concurred with this finding in a study he subsequently published in a condensed form (Jenkins 1989b) in *Grantseekers Guide*, a resource widely referred to by donors, staffs, board members, and grantees in the Funding Exchange network. He reported that although foundation funding of social movements increased during the 1960s and early 1970s, at its peak in 1977 it still comprised just .69 percent of total foundation giving, and only .24 percent of all total giving. From 1953–1980 only 131 of the more than 22,000 active grantmaking foundations in the United States funded organizations working for social change. Of this total, just 16.6 percent went to community organizing. The largest portion (43 percent) went to organizations comprised of trained professionals doing advocacy work, and the rest to education and research.

Crossroads's efforts to differentiate "social change" from "social services" are illustrated by a discussion that took place at the grantmaking committee screening meeting about the organization, Women in Need (WIN). Consider, first, the text of a memorandum distributed at the meeting which reported the staff's earlier recommendation not to consider WIN for funding:

Founded in 1990, WIN's goal is to empower abused women by providing crisis intervention, legal advocacy, translation, emergency safe places, and community education and outreach. The request is for support of its public awareness campaign. *Social Service Organization*. (Crossroads Fund 1994a, p. 3)

The discussion went as follows:

Angela: About WIN, maybe this is an area we should consider getting involved in because they are addressing a very serious need.

Liz: We supported them in their early days because of what you just said. At the time, they indicated that they were moving from services to organizing, but since then they have had to expand their services exclusively.

Robert: But could they be encouraged to resubmit, because we ought to be funding organizations like these?

Sandy: We funded them before, but they are not organizing and are like many other organizations helping battered women. It does not really fit our guidelines.

At this same meeting several committee members had questions about the proposal submitted by South Side Center (SSC), an organization attempting to foster economic development in an impoverished, predominantly African American community just south of Chicago. After discussing the proposal at length, committee members agreed that it clearly contained a social-service agenda, yet wondered whether this was an example where services would become a vehicle for community empowerment. Therefore, SSC was given a site visit, at which time Stephanie asked its members to articulate their political vision and how they involved members of the community in effecting social change.

Crossroads is particularly concerned about a prospective grantee's political vision and community involvement. Comments and questions raised during the grantmaking committee screening meeting about groups recommended for site visits reflect these concerns. For Congregations United, the comments were "Couldn't get a clear understanding of how other community folks are involved in its development, especially since this organization is still in the process of defining its agenda." For The Resource Center, some questions were "Does the leadership come from the community? How do residents participate in decision making?" The chief question for All Concerned was: "How does membership have input and hold leadership accountable? (Crossroads Fund 1994b).

Answers to questions regarding a prospective grantee's community involvement and political vision figured strongly in the different funding decisions made about WIN and SSC. While there was initially debate at the grantmaking committee screening meeting about whether WIN should be site visited, the committee reached a consensus that the organization had become too focused on providing services to battered women and had not developed the vision necessary to go the crucial next step: organizing these women to devise strategies for resisting future occurrences of domestic violence.

SSC, on the other hand, was site visited and eventually awarded Crossroads's top grant of \$7,000. The site visit team was convinced that SSC involved community residents in efforts to become better educated about resources that could improve their economic conditions. The team strongly concurred that the SSC representatives it met with attached thoughtful political analysis to their work. After the site visit, Liz told the others, "this is a good example of how services transform into community organizing." Stephanie similarly reported at the board's final grantmaking meeting:

We walked in [to the site visit] with lots of questions, and we walked out very enthusiastic. They are doing true grassroots economic development. We discussed how they think about and frame their work. They do not talk about social change, but that's what they're doing. Our impression is that citizens do not have the opportunity to voice concerns about the community. They get tremendous input from the residents of South Side from surveys. They see the big need in the community as jobs.

In light of these comments, the board agreed that the site visit had affirmatively answered many of the grantmaking committee's questions about SSC's political vision and constituency involvement. The only question that now remained, raised by Robert, concerned SSC's other fundraising: "Since economic development is a hot issue right now, to what extent can they latch onto more mainstream funds?" Without hesitation, Liz responded:

South Side is very poor. This is a very non-traditional mode of doing economic development. There's no partnership with a bank or some investment entity. So because of that, they would have a difficult time approaching other foundations.

Liz' response produced a consensus that Crossroads award SSC its top grant.

These different fates of WIN and SSC reveal how Crossroads frames its grantmaking substance to encompass community organizing rather than social services. Crossroads constructs this distinction because there is relatively little money available in Chicago for organizing, while many foundations fund services. Crossroads's agenda, however, is not only to carve out a distinct funding niche but moreover to legitimize community organizing to traditional foundations. Liz cited how Crossroads has accomplished such leveraging:

There are clear examples of the way traditional philanthropy has embraced social change work. For example, tenant management—the epitome of self-determination. Before Vincent Lane came to the Chicago Housing Authority, I'd say at least nine or ten years ago, Crossroads supported Resident Management Association. After we supported them, and other foundations like us began to as well, and talking with folks in traditional philanthropy, and after [former Secretary of Housing] Jack Kemp hopped on the bandwagon, traditional philanthropy ate up resident management. Now, there's no reason for us to support it anymore.

Crossroads considers leveraging possibilities within its boundary framing of grantmaking substance. Thus, WIN was not funded because the board determined that its social-service agenda already appealed to traditional foundations. Hence, a Crossroads grant was unnecessary for it to build a funding résumé to legitimize itself to these other funders. Crossroads gave a similar account for not funding Library Supporters (LS), a coalition of sixty library "friends" groups throughout Chicago formed to resist cuts in the budgets of neighborhood libraries. At its screening meeting, the grantmaking committee recommended a site visit but questioned how these friends groups attracted members and how accountable the LS board was to the communities it served. After its meeting with LS board members, the site visit team was divided about whether to recommend this organization to the board for funding.

Although doubts were raised at the final grantmaking meeting about the efficacy of LS's organizing efforts, what produced the consensus not to fund were these doubts combined with questions regarding LS's other fundraising. Many board members felt that in its site visit LS did not adequately articulate why its work was controversial, which could then explain why it had not had much success in obtaining traditional foundation support. At this point in the meeting, one of the site visit team members spoke up. Robert claimed that although LS's work might not appear controversial, this coalition still had difficulty obtaining other sources of funding because

There is in existence a group called Library Friends (which seeks to improve the quality of the main Harold Washington Library downtown) where most of the big money goes. This group (LS) is not in opposition to them, but rather their focus is on branch libraries. Because Library Friends exists, the foundations and corporations can say that they support libraries. They're not going to give to both causes.

After much discussion, Jane expressed a view that the board ultimately embraced in its decision not to fund LS:

For me, this does not feel like a good fit. It's more of a mainstream cause. They have not explored all of the other avenues of funding. I know this is an issue, but I do not think it is *our* issue. (her emphasis)

The different destinies of LS, SSC, and WIN within Crossroads's grantmaking process illustrate that one way Crossroads frames "social change" is by comparing the particular community needs it funds with those targeted by traditional

foundations. Through this comparison, Crossroads construes its grantmaking boundaries as simultaneously distinct and fluid. On the one hand, Crossroads attempts to distinguish between its funding of "organizing" and the "service" work supported by traditional foundations. On the other hand, Crossroads also keeps this boundary partially open because of the possibility that some of its grants might become legitimate models for other foundations to emulate.

Boundary Framing about Grantmaking Structure

Crossroads constructs "social change" not only through the substance of its funding but also by its grantmaking structure. It distinguishes itself from all Chicago foundations because its grants are made by a board of philanthropically disempowered activists recruited from the diversity of community organizations it funds, rather than by elites. A board member who is executive director of a Crossroads grantee organization articulated the distinction between these two grantmaking models:

I've had experience with both kinds of foundations, so I'm speaking from experience. For example, we [her organization] got a site visit from this one foundation. To one of their donors, we were just this exotic bunch. That grabbed her attention more than the different ways we sought to organize and use their funds. They [traditional philanthropists] want to give money and they like being on boards because it gets them noticed. They like others to know that they are helping poor people. With Crossroads, that's never been my experience.

The 1992 Funding Exchange Annual Report (p. 3) documents that because activist grantmaking empowers groups historically underrepresented on foundation boards, it is—like the needs it funds—a measure of "social change":

With the participation of those historically denied power and resources—women, people of color, lesbians and gay men, the poor and working class, and the physically challenged—on the staff, the board, and donor level, we think and act differently from traditional foundations. Decisions are made by those most likely to want to change and [who] know what groups will be best in effecting it.

Crossroads's board members claim that activist grantmaking enables them to be more accountable to their grantees than traditional, elite-controlled foundations typically are:

The problem with [traditional] philanthropy is that too often foundations set the issues for the community, rather than taking the issues from the community. Battered women was sexy a few years ago. Now violence is. Usually the problem with traditional philanthropy is that they like to support projects, and not give money to cover general operating costs. That, to me, says something about trust and giving groups the opportunity to have flexibility. Not only does traditional philanthropy support projects, but those initiatives also often come from the foundations themselves.

Another person commented that the concept of funding organizing hinges on allowing communities to determine their own funding needs:

[Crossroads's] concept of giving is about empowerment, not about telling people about what they have to do. In most cases, groups would pull back their money if they do not agree with the [grantee] organization. We do not want control over the grantee organization. We do not tell them what to do. I do not buy the concept of pulling back money. I believe in community organizing: the people who live in the area decide what we're going to do.

These accountability claims illustrate the intersection between Crossroads's two boundary framing processes. Crossroads constructs activist grantmaking as preferential to elite grantmaking models because it better ensures that community organizations not only receive grants but do so largely on their own terms. Site visits provide evidence of Crossroads's objective to allow prospective grantees to define agendas, which Crossroads only subsequently considers for funding. Consider that after the SSC site visit, the Crossroads team not only felt enthusiastic about the organizing SSC was doing but was particularly impressed that in articulating its political vision it did not employ a rhetoric commonly used in discussions of community development. Stephanie's comment, "I thought it was a really good example of talking to someone who does not share the same language of the Left," suggested that the site visit team was prepared to evaluate SSC according to its efforts to work toward constituency-driven goals rather than toward goals designed to fit preexisting foundation criteria.

The intersection between Crossroads's two boundary framing processes is illustrated by a discussion at the final grantmaking meeting about Crossroads's longstanding policy not to decline funding to an organization solely because it previously received a Crossroads grant. Robert claimed that those grantees who, over a period of several years, could not obtain other funding should either not be eligible for a top grant or should no longer be funded at all. There was complete agreement among the rest of those at the meeting that Crossroads should not alter its existing policy. Moreover, the substantial time devoted to this topic illustrated a concerted effort not simply to refute Robert, but to manufacture boundary frames about the intersection of Crossroads's grantmaking substance and structure: its accountability to grantees. The discussion went as follows:

Ann: Last time we agreed that if [organizations] qualified under our budget guidelines and couldn't get more traditional funding, we should continue to fund them.

Liz: I think last time we conferred that because we've given extended support does not mean that will stop. We do not have a cutoff policy, period.

Abigail: I think we should continue funding some groups, but there should be new groups each time.

Mary: Many of our repeat funders have been taking new and innovative directions, so it's really a tough one for me.

Stephanie: If they're meeting our criteria for funding and raising other funds, then we should not be like other foundations and cut them off.

Robert: I agree with a fair amount that's been spoken, but occasionally groups come around that have not progressed, and despite our being their sole support, that's not healthy. I think that we need to look at the level of funding that we've recently made, because if we continue funding an organization at our top level—well, I'd like to spread the money around.

Sandy: In response to Robert, I want to remind you as a board not to come into a meeting with a prejudice based on an earlier grant a group has gotten.

Ann: Our public display of our priorities is our grants. I want to separate out our priorities as an organization from the histories of particular organizations [that we fund]. What I feel strongly about is that in the final analysis, I want us to think of the roster of grants as a public display of our political analysis. Therefore, whether a group gets repeated funding is for us irrelevant.

The objections raised in response to Robert's recommendation illustrate the boundaries differentiating Crossroads's "social change" philanthropy and the "traditional" philanthropy practiced by mainstream foundations. These comments suggest that Crossroads's framing of social change would be undermined if radical organizations had to moderate their goals to obtain foundation funding. Hence, the decisiveness of the board's response to Robert is illustrative of the central boundary framing problem Crossroads confronts: how to practice philanthropy which minimizes hierarchical distinctions between funder and grantee, philanthropy which does not moderate movement goals but takes its goals from the movements it funds. Cutting off funds to grantees who have controversial agendas thus risks their subjecting themselves to the threat of having those agendas coopted in order to get funding.

Conclusions

In constructing boundary frames, Crossroads's board and staff articulate two vocabularies of motives for participating in social change philanthropy. The first involves framings about the need to fund community organizing, given the dearth of such funding within Chicago philanthropy. Crossroads claims the problem to be traditional foundations' lack of accountability to their grantees, as evidenced by the dual absence of funding decisions made by, and in the interests of, community activists. Crossroads's solution is activist grantmaking, which ensures that

funding goes to community organizing and, in the process, attempts to mitigate power imbalances between Crossroads and its grantees. This vocabulary of motives is instrumental in that it encompasses framings of a defined problem and a proposed solution, in the vein that Benford (1993a) documents for the nuclear disarmament movement. The difference is that here I am subsuming collective action framing under the broader analytic lens of boundary framing.

I refer to instrumental motives as comprising a *single* vocabulary, in contrast to Benford's conceptualization, in order to differentiate them from an expressive vocabulary. Crossroads's board and staff not only see social change philanthropy as instrumental in fulfilling an important need, but they also claim that as activists they are more committed to the issues they fund than are the elites who sit on the grantmaking boards of traditional foundations. Thus, "social change" entails both being accountable to the needs of activists and having a funding agenda driven by these activists' own collective interests.

Hence, I have extended Benford's (1993a) analysis of instrumental motives by exploring how movement actors articulate them as they make "us/them" distinctions. Moreover, I have shown that boundary framing equally involves the construction of collective identity claims. But these claims are not solely a by-product of boundary framing, as Hunt et al. (1994) argue. Rather, they additionally constitute an entire vocabulary of motives inspiring people to join movements in the first place. Thus, I embrace a central component of new social movements theory: that collective identity is a first-order concern for contemporary movements.

It is important to distinguish between these vocabularies of motives since social movements concern themselves with twin, though intertwined, tasks. First, they work toward solving problems which often directly affect movement participants yet which extend well beyond them. Second, in the process of targeting these problems, they work on themselves too. Indeed, collective identity work is inextricably embedded within the social changes Crossroads strives to implement through its grantmaking. Each grant decision involves discussions of how Crossroads's board and staff collectively see themselves in relation to what they fund. This fusion of instrumental and expressive motives is illustrated by Ann's previously quoted comment: "What I feel strongly about is that in the final analysis, I want us to think of the roster of grants as a public display of our political analysis."

Thus, collective identity formation is part and parcel of social movement action. Actors articulate these two vocabularies of motives jointly in the course of their movement participation. The goal-directed actions they take to advance social change are shaped by their own identity claims. My findings, therefore, elucidate the taken-for-granted notion that people join movements because they want to effect social change. I argue that "social change" is as much about who

social movement actors are as what they do and that these meanings both motivate their participation.

Yet these meanings are not unproblematic. Crossroads's ongoing efforts to construct its work as social movement activism rather than philanthropy illustrate that an organization's position within movements is continually constructed. This notion has not been sufficiently highlighted by previous research on "social change" foundations. While Odendahl (1990) characterizes these foundations as offering alternatives to elite grantmaking models, she does not explore the movement implications of an organization's construction of itself as "alternative." Ostrander (1995), in her ethnography of Haymarket People's Fund, examines how social change philanthropists work to become insiders to the movements they fund rather than remain politically uninvolved outsiders. She suggests that structural distinctions between funders, as movement outsiders, and grantees, as movement insiders, must neither be assumed nor taken for granted. Yet she does not extend her argument a step further by proposing a clearer conception of what a "social movement" is and thus a conception of how scholars might assess whether this is a meaningful category for their investigation.

Consider the following comparison as a way to illustrate my extension of Ostrander's argument. While probably few scholars would question the "movement" status of SNCC during the 1960s, a foundation's claims to such status appear much more opaque because of funders' structural tendencies to "channel" or moderate movement goals (see Haines 1984, 1988; Jenkins and Eckert 1986; McAdam 1982; Piven and Cloward 1977). However, a crucial similarity between SNCC and Crossroads lies in the work each does to define a "social change" agenda. Although much of this definitional work is hidden from the eye of the casual observer and taken for granted by activists, it is done in conjunction with what is more typically thought of as the actual social change work movements do.

While this study has shown that definitional work is an essential component of movement agendas, such work is generally overlooked by research which implicitly renders social movements objective and unproblematic in its attempts to explore their structural components. Hence, at a fundamental level such research agendas are counterintuitive. They analyze "social movements" without reflexively considering whether, in fact, that is a category actors use to define themselves. Or, if it is, then these accounts miss the important work actors do to frame their agendas in that way.

Jenkins's (1989a, 1989b, in press) research on social movement funding illustrates this shortcoming. He looks at changes during the past several decades in funding to organizations working for social change. In categorizing which organizations do social change and which do advocacy, education, or research, he does not critically analyze how these categories themselves are constructed

between funding and grantee organizations. My data, in contrast, show that whether an organization that submits a grant proposal to Crossroads does or does not do "social change" can only be assessed subjectively, by whether Crossroads ultimately funds that proposal.

Hence, my research problematizes the category *social movements*. Since it is unclear what constitutes a social movement apart from how actors attempt to situate themselves within movements, studies of a movement's structure require interpretive analysis. To be sure, resource mobilization remains an important perspective for examining movements' strategic tactics to maximize resources and for explaining why movements succeed or fail. Moreover, resource mobilization research continues to provide valuable information about relationships between funding organizations and movement goals. Yet such research would prove even more theoretically fruitful if integrated with the type of interpretive analysis done in this paper.

ENDNOTES

*Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Sociological Society, Chicago, April 1995; the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Washington, D.C., August 1995; and the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York City, August 1996. I am grateful for the helpful comments offered by Bernard Beck, Nicola Beisel, Robert Benford, Arlene Daniels, Kenneth Dauber, Scott Hunt, Aldon Morris, Susan Ostrander, David Pellow, David Shulman, Arthur Stinchcombe, and two anonymous reviewers. I particularly thank the board and staff of the Crossroads Fund for making this study possible.

¹I observed one of Crossroads's two annual grantmaking cycles and conducted twenty-one focused interviews (Merton and Kendall 1946). I interviewed all three staff members, five former board members, twelve current board members, and one donor not on the board. Fifteen informants were women, and six were men. Racially, they identified as follows: thirteen Whites, three African Americans, one biracial, two Latinos, one Arab American, and one Asian American. For confidentiality, I have changed all names. Grantmaking cycles begin with Crossroads staff reviewing about fifty proposals and eliminating those that do not match formal funding guidelines. This list is sent to the grantmaking committee for approval and/or discussion about why rejected organizations should remain under consideration. At this screening meeting, the grantmaking committee elects to site visit organizations whose proposals appear viable for funding and declines funding to the rest. This meeting is followed by a period in which every prospective grantee is visited. After all the site visits, the board meets for an entire day. Through a lengthy process of consensus decision making, it determines those organizations that most clearly match Crossroads's funding priorities. These are awarded grants.

REFERENCES

- Benford, Robert D. 1993a. "You Could Be the Hundredth Monkey": Collective Action Frames and Vocabularies of Motive Within the Nuclear Disarmament Movement." *The Sociological Quarterly* 34(2):195-216.

- _____. 1993b. "Frame Disputes Within the Nuclear Disarmament Movement." *Social Forces* 71(3):677-701.
- Benford, Robert D., and Scott A. Hunt. 1992. "Dramaturgy and Social Movements: The Social Construction and Communication of Power." *Sociological Inquiry* 62:36-55.
- Binder, Amy. 1993. "Constructing Racial Rhetoric: Media Depictions of Harm in Heavy Metal and Rap Music." *American Sociological Review* 58:753-767.
- Buechler, Steven M. 1993. "Beyond Resource Mobilization? Emerging Trends in Social Movement Theory." *The Sociological Quarterly* 34:217-235.
- Cohen, Jean L. 1985. "Strategy or Identity: New Theoretical Paradigms and Contemporary Social Movements." *Social Research* 52(4):663-716.
- Crossroads Fund. 1994a. "Staff Decline Recommendations For Spring 1994 Grant Cycle."
- _____. 1994b. "Notes from Staff Review/Spring 1994 Grant Cycle."
- Ferree, Myra Marx, and Frederick D. Miller. 1985. "Mobilization and Meaning: Toward an Integration of Social Psychological and Resource Perspectives on Social Movements." *Sociological Inquiry* 55(1):38-61.
- Friedman, Debra, and Doug McAdam. 1992. "Collective Identity and Activism: Networks, Choices, and the Life of a Social Movement." Pp. 156-173 in *Frontiers of Social Movement Theory*, edited by Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Funding Exchange Annual Report. 1992. New York: The Funding Exchange.
- Gamson, William A. 1975. *The Strategy of Social Protest*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.
- _____. 1992. "The Social Psychology of Collective Action." Pp. 53-76 in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Gerhards, Jurgen, and Dieter Rucht. 1992. "Mesomobilization: Organizing and Framing in Two Protest Campaigns in West Germany." *American Journal of Sociology* 98:555-595.
- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Haines, Herbert H. 1984. "Black Radicalization and the Funding of Civil Rights: 1957-1970." *Social Problems* 32(1):31-43.
- _____. 1988. *Black Radicals and the Civil Rights Mainstream, 1954-1970*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Hunt, Scott A. 1991. *Constructing Collective Identity in a Peace Movement Organization*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
- Hunt, Scott A., and Robert D. Benford. 1994. "Identity Talk in the Peace and Justice Movement." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 22:488-517.
- Hunt, Scott A., Robert D. Benford, and David A. Snow. 1994. "Identity Fields: Framing Processes and the Social Construction of Movement Identities." Pp. 185-208 in *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*, edited by Enrique Larana, Hank Johnston, and Joseph R. Gusfield. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Jenkins, J. Craig. 1989a. "Social Movement Philanthropy and American Democracy." Pp. 292-214 in *Philanthropic Giving: Studies in Varieties and Goals*, edited by Richard Magat. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1989b. "Foundation Funding of Social Movements (Revisited)." Pp. 1-10 in *Grantseekers Guide*, edited by Jill R. Shellow and Nancy C. Stella. Mt. Kisco, NY: Moyer Bell Limited.
- _____. In Press. "Channeling Social Protest: Foundation Patronage of Contemporary Social Movements." In *Private Action and the Public Good*, edited by Walter Powell and Elisabeth Clemens. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Jenkins, J. Craig, and Craig M. Eckert. 1986. "Channeling Black Insurgency: Elite Patronage and Professional Social Movement Organizations in the Development of the Black Movement." *American Sociological Review* 51:812-829.

- Jenkins, J. Craig, and Charles Perrow. 1977. "Insurgency of the Powerless: Farm Worker Movements (1946-1972)." *American Sociological Review* 42:249-268.
- Johnston, Hank, Enrique Larana, and Joseph Gusfield. 1994. "Identities, Grievances, and New Social Movements." Pp. 3-35 in *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Klandermans, Bert. 1984. "Social Psychological Expansions of Resource Mobilization Theory." *American Sociological Review* 49:583-600.
- McAdam, Doug. 1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McCarthy, John, and Mayer Zald. 1973. *The Trend of Social Movements: Professionalization and Resource Mobilization*. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press.
- _____. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements." *American Journal of Sociology* 82:1212-1341.
- Melucci, Alberto. 1985. "The Symbolic Challenge of Contemporary Movements." *Social Research* 52(4):789-816.
- _____. 1989. *Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- _____. 1994. "A Strange Kind of Newness: What's 'New' in New Social Movements." Pp. 101-130 in *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*, edited by Enrique Larana, Hank Johnston, and Joseph Gusfield. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Merton, Robert King, and Patricia L. Kendall. 1946. "The Focused Interview." *American Journal of Sociology* 51:541-547.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1940. "Situating Actions and Vocabularies of Motive." *American Sociological Review* 5(6):904-913.
- Oberschall, Anthony. 1973. *Social Conflict and Social Movements*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Odendahl, Teresa. 1990. *Charity Begins at Home: Generosity and Self-Interest among the Philanthropic Elite*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ostrander, Susan. 1995. *Money for Change: Social Movement Philanthropy at Haymarket People's Fund*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Piven, Francis Fox, and Richard Cloward. 1977. *Poor People's Movements*. New York: Pantheon.
- Snow, David A., and Robert D. Benford. 1988. "Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization." Pp. 197-217 in *From Structure to Action: Comparing Social Movement Research Across Cultures*, edited by Bert Klandermans, Hanspeter Kriesi, and Sidney Tarrow. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- _____. 1992. "Master Frames and Cycles of Protest." Pp. 133-155 in *Frontiers of Social Movement Theory*, edited by Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford Jr., Steven K. Worden, and Robert Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review* 51:464-481.
- Stoecker, Randy. 1995. "Community, Movement, Organization: The Problem of Identity Convergence in Collective Action." *The Sociological Quarterly* 36:111-130.
- Swart, William J. 1995. "The League of Nations and the Irish Question: Master Frames, Cycles of Protest, and 'Master Frame Alignment.'" *The Sociological Quarterly* 36(3):465-481.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 1992. "Mentalities, Political Cultures, and Collective Action Frames: Constructing Meanings Through Action." Pp. 174-202 in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Taylor, Verta, and Nancy E. Whittier. 1992. "Collective Identity in Social Movement Communities: Lesbian Feminist Mobilization." Pp. 104-129 in *Frontiers of Social Movement Theory*, edited by Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Vanguard Public Foundation. 1977. *Robin Hood Was Right: A Guide To Giving Your Money for Social Change*. San Francisco, CA.
- Zuo, Jiping, and Robert D. Benford. 1995. "Mobilization Processes and the 1989 Chinese Democracy Movement." *The Sociological Quarterly* 36(1):131-156.

Copyright of Sociological Inquiry is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.