

including businesses, industry associations, and universities. A synthesis of “social movements and organizational theory” (Davis et al. 2005) represents a deeper dialogue between these two subfields, which has the potential to generate new insights into the processes of organizing for change.

SEE ALSO: Civil Rights Movement; Collective Action; Collective Identity; Culture, Social Movements and; Framing and Social Movements; Institutional Theory, New; Mobilization; New Left; Oligarchy and Organization; Organizations, Voluntary; Political Opportunities; Political Process Theory; Resource Mobilization Theory; Social Change; Social Movements; Social Movements, Networks and; Social Movements, Participatory Democracy in; Social Movements, Recruitment to; Social Movements, Strain and Breakdown Theories of

REFERENCES AND SUGGESTED READINGS

- Clemens, E. S. (1997) *The People's Lobby: Organizational Innovation and the Rise of Interest Group Politics in the United States, 1890–1925*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Davis, G., McAdam, D., Scott, W. R., & Zald, M. (Eds.) (2005) *Social Movements and Organization Theory*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Freeman, J. (1972) The Tyranny of Structurelessness. In: Jaquette, J. (Ed.), *Women in Politics*. Wiley, New York.
- Gamson, W. (1975) *The Strategy of Social Protest*. Wadsworth, Belmont, CA.
- McAdam, D. (1982) *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930–1970*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- McCarthy, J. D. & Zald, M. N. (1977) Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory. *American Journal of Sociology* 82: 1212–41.
- Michels, R. (1962 [1911]) *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracies*. Free Press, New York.
- Minkoff, D. C. (1999) Bending with the Wind: Strategic Change and Adaptation by Women's and Racial Minority Organizations. *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 1666–703.
- Olson, M. (1965) *The Logic of Collective Action*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Piven, F. F. & Cloward, R. A. (1979) *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*. Vintage, New York.
- Polletta, F. (2002) *Freedom Is an Endless Meeting: Democracy in American Social Movements*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

social movements

James M. Jasper

Although scholarly definitions vary, common usage portrays social movements as sustained and intentional efforts to foster or retard social changes, primarily outside the normal institutional channels encouraged by authorities. *Sustained* implies that movements differ from single events such as riots or rallies. Their persistence often allows them to develop formal organizations, but they may also operate through informal social networks. *Intentional* links movements to culture and strategy: people have ideas about what they want and how to get it, ideas that are filtered through culture as well as psychology. Movements have purposes, even when these have to do with transforming members themselves (as in many religious movements) rather than the world outside the movement. *Foster or retard*: although many scholars have a Whiggish tendency to view movements as progressive, dismissing regressive efforts as countermovements, this distinction seems arbitrary and unsustainable (not to mention the unfortunate effect that different tools are then used to analyze the two types). *Non-institutional* distinguishes movements from political parties and interest groups that are a more regular part of many political systems, even though movements frequently create these other entities and often maintain close relationships to them. Most movements today deploy some tactics within mainstream institutions, and non-institutional protest is itself often quite institutionalized. Unsurprisingly, each of these claims about social movements has been subject to controversy and differences in emphasis.

UNDERSTANDING DISCONTENT

Theories of discontent have always reflected the historical forms protest was taking at the time, as well as each writer's own sympathies and political participation. In seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Europe, the collective expression of discontent was primarily understood through the lens of legitimate sovereignty. Economic and social dimensions of the emerging nation-state were not yet distinguished from the political, so protest both took the form of and was seen as a political act. The concept of the social movement was not yet possible. Contract theory, a primarily normative discourse, allowed thinkers such as Hobbes to argue against the legitimacy of most resistance to the state, and others such as Locke to defend revolutionary action in the face of predatory rulers. Thinkers of the time hardly noticed the activities of the lower classes.

With accelerated urbanization in the nineteenth century, European intellectuals increasingly took alarm at the regular rebellions of artisans, developing the concept of the mob to explain and disparage them. Crowds came to be seen as a form of madness that caused individuals to act differently than they would when alone – a view crystallized by Gustave Le Bon in the 1890s. Although based on little empirical research, the crowd image remained vital to a number of thinkers in the early twentieth century, including Durkheim, Freud, Weber, and Parsons. Only revolutionaries such as Marx viewed urban mobs favorably, wrongly insisting that they were part of the proletariat who would usher in a just society in the form of socialism (instead, most were the old working class of artisans whose way of life was disappearing).

More sophisticated versions of crowd theory appeared in the mid-twentieth century, largely in response to communism and fascism. Until the late 1960s, the dominant view of protest overemphasized the non-institutional dimension, lumping movements together with fads, panics, and other collective behavior. Explicitly or implicitly, crowds remained the heart of this vision: the kernel on which other forms of collective behavior were somehow built. Most analysts, drawing from Le Bon, feared crowds and movements and portrayed them pejoratively, although occasional interactionists pointed to

their creativity instead (in a fruitful tradition stretching from Robert Park to Ralph Turner and Lewis Killian, and on through recent theorists such as David Snow and John Lofland). How movements were sustained and what were their goals received less attention, and only occasionally did theorists link movements to social change.

Suddenly everything changed. In the mid-1960s, social movements were everywhere, populated no longer by a dangerous working class but by familiar middle-class faces. In retrospect we can see various roots of this new activism: the emergence of a British and later an American new left; increasing international attention to the US Civil Rights Movement especially after the student sit-ins of 1960; the 1964 confrontation that spawned the Berkeley free speech movement; anti-colonial movements and revolutions around the globe. Theories soon appeared that were sympathetic to protestors.

An organizational or structural paradigm, steeped in Marxism, dominated research from the 1970s to the late 1990s, highlighting the sustained dimension of movements by portraying them as linked to the core political and economic institutions and cleavages of society. No longer grouped with fads, social movements were now nearly indistinguishable from political parties. They were thought to reflect deep structural interests, especially class but also gender, race, and (eventually) sexual preference. Structural assumptions discouraged the asking of “why” questions, as a desire for change or inclusion was assumed. So although movements were recognized as purposive, their purposes were taken for granted rather than empirically investigated. Attitudes and grievances assumed to be ever present were dismissed as causal factors of any importance. The essential question about movements was how they could overcome repression, especially by the state, in order to further their (already existing) interests. They were seen as insurgents or challengers, outsiders trying to gain entry into existing politics. (Scholars disappointed by the failure of most movements of the 1960s focused naturally on the structural constraints that they had faced.)

An American version of the new paradigm emphasized finances, often mobilized by paid, professional activists. Organizations require financial support, and the easiest way to attract

this is by appealing to the privileged in society. Another is by gathering small donations from a large number of sympathizers, especially through direct mail. In the 1960s, a large social movement sector developed, with well-developed techniques for gathering funds, organizing shows of public support, and pressuring legislators (McCarthy & Zald 1977). These developments suggested a model of movements as similar to firms in markets, competing with one another for funds, members, and attention. This research tradition is often referred to as resource mobilization due to its emphasis on funding.

Another version of the structural paradigm focused on interactions between movements and the state, on the assumption that the state was usually the opponent as well as judge (under the Marxist assumption that states are instruments of the ruling class). Often dubbed "political process," this tradition emphasized the need for elite allies, cracks in state repression, state crises, and other windows of opportunity in the political environment. This perspective especially fit (because it was largely derived from) the study of European labor and American civil rights movements: efforts at inclusion by well-defined groups that lasted for decades. In Europe a more comparative version developed, highlighting ongoing state structures (Kriesi et al. 1995). Despite its healthy focus on a movement's external environment, this approach modeled that environment as a structure (open or closed, for example) rather than an arena of diverse strategic players, as relationships rather than interactions.

Alain Touraine and his many students crafted a different version of the structural paradigm, linking contemporary movements to social structure instead of concentrating on organizational forms. Whereas the central conflict of industrial societies, Touraine (1978) argued, pitted labor against capital in a struggle over the distribution of material goods, post-industrial societies saw conflicts over cultural understandings, especially the direction in which society's increasing self-control would take it. The technocrats of capital and government sought profit and efficiency, while protestors saw these as mere means to the deeper ends of cultural identities and political rights. Touraine's vision helped scholars recognize the

significance of new movements such as ecology, feminism, or gay rights, invisible under traditional structural models. More recently, Touraine has admitted that Europe and the United States have become new kinds of capitalist societies more than the post-industrial societies he had prophesied. The technocrats won.

Alongside these macrosocial visions there emerged a more individualistic view of movements which were redefined accordingly as collective action. Rooted in neoclassical micro-economic theory, Mancur Olson (1965) and others cast doubt on the sustainability of movements, precisely by emphasizing the intentions of potential participants whose rationality consisted of constantly calculating whether to participate based on costs and benefits to themselves as individuals. Olson left little room for the attractions of collective solidarity and other incentives besides material benefits. As others have filled in some of these gaps, deriving solutions to the free-rider problem, the rational choice approach has become less and less distinct. Many of the solutions are the organizational challenges emphasized by the mobilization and process traditions.

At the turn of the millennium, the structural, Tourainian, and rational choice approaches faced deep problems, and appeared in articles most often as whipping boys for proffered alternatives. The main lacuna of all three was an inattention to cultural meanings, the socially constructed purposes and identities of social movement groups. Even Touraine, who emphasized struggles over cultural meanings rather than material rewards, too often derived those meanings from his theory of historical change rather than empirically from the movements themselves.

Accordingly, beginning in the late 1980s, considerable research and theory addressed the cultural dimensions of movements. Two concepts, frames and collective identity, dominated these efforts. David Snow, Rob Benson, and a series of collaborators did the most to theorize the nature of rhetorical frames, especially those used by activists to recruit others to their cause.

Inspired by identity politics in the United States, in the 1990s the concept of collective identity was increasingly used to get at cultural meanings not already covered by frames. At first, collective identities were seen as a

mobilizing rhetoric built upon a structural position or discrimination, a form of cognitive liberation (McAdam 1982). Individuals imagined themselves members of some larger community, in whose name they acted. Only later was it realized that movements themselves can foster identities without any preexisting structural similarities – and identities can even form around movements, specific tactics such as non-violence, or particular organizations (Jasper 1997). It also took time for scholars to recognize that emotional solidarities are just as important to identities as cognitive categories are.

Clearly and narrowly defined, frames and identities are important tools in our conceptual repertoire for understanding social movements, but there are additional ways to get at meanings (Jasper 1997; Goodwin & Jasper 2006). Analyses of ritual or of media coverage draw on well-established fields of anthropology and media studies. Narrative has also become popular, as stories are an important part of meetings and self-images in social movements. Although traditional narrative theory emphasizes the structuring plots of stories, others highlight the social context of storytelling. Rhetoric, which takes off from this latter point, highlights the interplay of orator and audience, building in not only interaction but intention and emotion. Like framing, naming is a key part of making sense of the world and of persuading others.

Emotions are a central component of culture, playing a role in all social movements. Basic affects like love and hate can pull a movement together or tear it apart. Reactive emotions such as anger, fear, and shock provide raw materials that organizers must transform into moral indignation. Moods such as resignation or cynicism can discourage recruits, just as those of confidence or exhilaration can attract them perhaps through the interaction rituals Collins (2001) describes. Emotions even figure in the outcomes of movements, which frequently aim to transform sensibilities such as compassion or justice.

EMERGENCE

The initial stirrings of a social movement are poorly understood. Given the sensibilities, ideas, values, and allegiances mixed together

in different population segments, how does necessarily limited attention come to be focused on one set of issues rather than others? A newsworthy event or death of a loved one may shock people into attention. The zeitgeist may shift slightly, in an enormously complex way, bringing attention and sympathy to new arenas. News coverage also influences our emotional and moral attention. Typically, a small network of would-be leaders manages to set aside their normal lives to craft appeals to these understandings to recruit like-minded others (or they may be movement professionals whose work is to stimulate protest). Little is known about the first stirrings of a movement.

In contrast, extensive research has examined how individuals are recruited to an emerging or ongoing movement. Early arguments, focusing on individual psychology, had suggested that alienated, insecure, or dogmatic individuals joined social movements. The structural paradigm dismissed such speculation in favor of factors like biographical availability: the lack of spouse, children, or demanding jobs that frees people for the time commitment of participation. But the most important factor in explaining who joins and who does not may be whether the potential recruit already knows someone in the movement. In many movements, a majority of participants are recruited this way (Snow et al. 1980). In a process Anthony Oberschall dubbed bloc recruitment, entire networks can be coopted for new purposes, such as the fundamentalist congregations that became part of the movement to stop the Equal Rights Amendment for American women.

Researchers also turned their attention to the messages transmitted across networks, in other words the cultural aspects of recruitment. Snow and his co-authors suggested that recruiters and potential participants had to align their frames to achieve a common definition of a problem and prescription for solving it, with Snow and Benford (1992: 137) defining a frame as an interpretive schema that simplifies and condenses the world out there by selectively punctuating and encoding objects, situations, events, experiences, and sequences of actions within one's present or past environment. Although originally used to focus on the strategic and rhetorical interaction between organizers and recruits, frames have more often and

less usefully been analyzed as static bundles of meanings that either work or do not work.

Recruitment requires more than cognitive agreement between organizers and their audiences. At least as important are the moral visions and emotions that propel people into action. Fear and anger must be transformed into indignation and outrage. Moral shocks are one way that people are drawn into action: when they learn something about the world that outrages them, discovering that the world is not as they had thought (Jasper 1997). The shock may come from a public event such as *Roe v. Wade* or from private sources like the death of a child through corporate negligence. These shocks can be so strong that people seek out protest groups even in the absence of social network ties. Emotions are an essential component of culture, and culture is an essential part of recruitment, whether it operates through social networks or other media.

In addition to people (both leaders and followers), an emerging movement usually needs some infrastructure to carry out its activities. It requires basic means of communication and transportation: a bullhorn to address a large crowd, a fax machine or Internet access to reach supporters, carpools to get people to a rally. It may also need a large meeting room. Financial support allows organizers to purchase what they need. In what was perhaps the high water mark of mobilization theory, Morris (1984) demonstrated the many contributions that black churches and other institutions made to the American Civil Rights Movement, from networks of preachers throughout the South and beyond to meeting halls in which ideas could be aired. Churches also provided cultural meanings, for instance Bible stories and religious songs, that could be used to convey the movement's message to a wide variety of Southern blacks.

In the late twentieth century, transnational social movements and their organizations spread rapidly in a world of globally improving communication and transportation (Keck & Sikkink 1998). It was hard to understand these international networks through the structural paradigm's focus on preexisting interests in a relatively homogeneous and well-networked population. This new work on globalization

also portrays a world of many different kinds of players – local, national, and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs), assorted state agencies, international institutions such as the United Nations or International Monetary Fund, diverse funding sources, various kinds of publics in complex interaction. Some perceive a shift in conflicts from institutions whose members are nation-states (World Bank, World Trade Organization, UN) to a more participatory public sphere of NGOs that cooperate directly as well as through the older organizations. The exchange of information and ideas lies at the heart of these newer networks.

DYNAMICS

But what do movements do? Tilly (1978) suggests that a society contains a repertoire of collective action, from which protestors inevitably draw, depending on local senses of justice, the daily routines and social organization of the participants, their prior experience with collective action, and the repression they are likely to face. Most social movements in a society will conduct the same activities, since that is what they have learned to do through trial and error. New tactics, outside the repertoire, may take opponents and authorities by surprise, but protestors themselves may bungle them due to lack of experience and know-how. At the extreme, those who face extreme surveillance and few legal rights are restricted to weapons of the weak such as sabotage, pilfering, poaching, or even jokes and gossip (Scott 1985).

The organizational forms which movements adopt have attracted much attention, perhaps because they are central to a structural paradigm. Piven and Cloward (1977) dissented from the common view that protest groups should accumulate resources, suggesting instead that these distract attention from the best strategy of downtrodden groups, radical insurgency and disruption. An organization, they warn, can all too easily begin to view its own perpetuation and expansion as goals alongside its original purpose. Others have countered that professionalized organizations can stimulate grassroots activity, and that they can allow movement ideas

to survive long periods when they are out of favor. Jasper (2004) prefers to see the building of a stable protest organization as a dilemma, with risks and benefits to both doing it and not doing it.

What kind of organization to construct is another important strategic choice. Drawing on institutional theory, Clemens (1993) shows that organizational form is itself a message, presumably for both members and outsiders. In the American labor movement of the 1890s, fraternal forms of organizing downplayed economic interests and political confrontation, while more military forms like Coxey's Army elicited violent repression. Organizational forms, like other tactical choices, are a fundamental part of shaping a collective identity.

Most protest groups contain rival factions, which may have different goals or different tastes in tactics (Jasper 1997). Factions may develop as newcomers join a movement, demanding internal as well as external changes. Movements may grow more radical because new recruits want more action, or have identities based on being radical, although the structural account emphasizes rebuffs by the state as the key source of radicalization. Radical flanks can have advantages as well as disadvantages. Radical actions and ideas attract media attention, and sometimes garner quick concessions from opponents or authorities. Among disadvantages, foremost is the possibility that radicals will pull an organization or movement apart or that it will attract repression fatal to the cause.

Less research has addressed other features of what movements actually do on a daily basis: how they make decisions about tactics, seek allies, struggle with factions and unruly individuals, and balance their appeals to a number of different audiences. The structural emphasis on external allies and resources left little theoretical space to see how insurgents actually operated, especially when they had few resources. (Although Touraine, by bringing together representatives of different factions in a movement, was able to recreate their internal conflicts in his "sociological interventions.") Even the poorest can often generate internal resources, and most try to accumulate whatever resources they lack at the beginning of a conflict. Even without money and the resources it buys,

protestors can still be creative, doing things that catch their opponents off guard or take advantage of legal and political opportunities.

In a critique of classic research on organizing, Ganz (2000) derived a number of factors that made the United Farm Workers more inventive than its predecessors and rivals. These include leaders with diverse experience, salient local knowledge, personal commitment, diverse network ties (including strong ties to constituencies), and a diverse tactical repertoire. Organizations, Ganz found, were more creative when they had regular meetings open to diverse perspectives and with the authority to make decisions, had diverse resources (especially flowing up from the constituency itself), and were accountable to each other but also their constituencies. Democratic or entrepreneurial selection of leaders worked better than more bureaucratic processes.

Under the influence of recent theories of agency, organizations can be seen as strategic players in fields of conflict with a range of other players, rather than reified as a movement facing either the state or a political environment. That environment is recognized as a farrago of friends, foes, bystanders, regulators, and others, each with its own goals, means, and internal conflicts. States and movements are both fanciful metaphors covering a variety of players. A more strategic perspective has the potential to explore the boundaries between movements and other political phenomena, finding both similarities and differences across institutional spheres.

In this strategic perspective Jasper (2004) highlights the choices that individuals and groups face by naming a range of dilemmas confronting movements, indeed all strategic players. Naughty or Nice, for example, gets at the diverse effects of disruption or violence, which are often widely unpopular but may inspire a panicked response and yield a quick victory. In the Extension Dilemma, organizers must decide how large a coalition or group to build: bigger ones have more resources at their disposal, but often at the expense of a consensus around goals or a clear collective identity. An emphasis on tradeoffs or choices like these is one way to insist on the agency of social movements even in the face of structural constraints.

EFFECTS

The effects of movements on policy, society, and culture have always interested scholars, as they provide much of the inspiration for studying movements in the first place. Scholars frequently exaggerate the impact of the movements they have spent so much time studying, especially as there are so many definitions and types of success to which to turn. Research in this area has also tended to have a normative flavor, as Whiggish scholars seek sources of progressive social change.

Gamson (1975) pointed to two forms of success: benefits for a movement's constituency and recognition for the protest group itself. The latter was based on a structural image of challengers attempting to gain access to a polity closed to them. An impact on public policy is the central or ultimate goal of many movements, but this effect is often hard to observe because politicians frequently deny it even while they sometimes advance a movement's goals. And indeed, a movement's effect is often to sensitize other actors in a political arena. Kriesi et al. (1995: 212) list internal impacts of identity and organization, and external impacts of four types: procedural, substantive, structural, and sensitizing.

Many factors determine a movement's influence. Rochon (1990: 108) lists size, novelty, and militancy, oddly ignoring resources. Size matters because it may affect resources, but also because in democracies protestors are also voters. Novelty gains media attention and discomfites opponents. Militancy, for instance violence and disruption, may also catch opponents and authorities off guard, but it runs the risk that the latter will organize a repressive strategy capable of suppressing the movement. This is Jasper's Naughty or Nice dilemma. Militancy, like most risky strategies, generally succeeds when a goal can be attained quickly and irreversibly.

All strategic choices can have ramifications. Social movements borrow heavily from each other, not least because activists often move from one to another. This is one reason that movements so often appear in waves, as a frame or tactic proves useful to a number of them. (Although the stronger concept of a cycle, in which one stage leads to the next, seems to have

overreached the evidence.) Elisabeth Clemens showed that the early women's movement, by choosing one form of organization rather than another, often inspired changes in government as well. These groups introduced organizational logics from one sphere of life into another, inserting economic, charitable, and fraternal models into politics, and thereby helping to create today's pattern of interest group politics. New tactics spread rapidly.

Even when social movements have little impact on the world around them, they almost always affect their own members. A number of scholars have traced the consequences of participation in protestors' later lives, especially those active in the 1960s. Far from growing more conservative as they aged, this generation has maintained left-leaning sympathies and a well-documented inclination toward activism.

METHODS OF RESEARCH

Most studies of social movements, whether quantitative or qualitative, have been case studies. As with those who do area studies, scholars of movements must devote enormous time to mastering the diverse phenomena that comprise any social movement, usually composed of many diverse groups, different kinds of members, various kinds of tactics and events, interactions with a number of other strategic players, and so on. On the positive side, there is frequently a ready audience for reports on the many social movements that help compose our political landscape. On the negative, the same case is often used to develop new theories and concepts as well as to try them out empirically. For instance, every scholar who has written about political opportunities has discovered a different list of them, making it hard to discern the scope conditions of any of them.

Some scholars have tried to avoid this difficulty by looking at events instead of movements. Originally deployed in the study of riots, the use of events as units of analysis was especially helpful in the historical understanding of strikes and other contentious events for which newspaper reports but not richer information were available. Waves of events are useful for seeing the main product of organizing efforts, and for relating these activities to

other political variables. The strength of this approach lies in tracking developments over time and checking correlations of protest with other variables such as unemployment or grain prices, but it remains largely wedded to newspaper accounts.

Protest events are hardly the only unit to be studied. Individuals can be interviewed in depth or randomly surveyed. Researchers can participate themselves, gaining introspective insights not otherwise available and which may be the most effective means for understanding emotions and some strategic choices. Organizations can be studied through a variety of methods, and the interplay of organizations is especially amenable to comparative analysis. Other methods are available for examining networks of individuals or organizations. All of the above can be studied through historical archives as well as contemporary means of gathering data. Computer simulations have also been used to test a number of impressions about movement organization. Gamson (1992) used focus groups to powerfully show the raw cultural materials available for organizing, the commonsense understandings that are as important as media framings of events. Fortunately, the study of social movements has proven open to a variety of techniques rather than being wedded to any kind of methodological purity (Klandermans & Staggenborg 2002).

To conclude, research into social movements shifts focus as movements themselves develop. Nineteenth-century riots inspired crowd theories. After mid-twentieth-century battles with fascism and communism, western analysts turned to mass society theories to explain political movements they feared. In the 1960s, sympathy for middle-class movements, especially of students who would later become academics, encouraged portraits of protestors as rational. A number of culturally oriented movements in the 1970s, often labeled new social movements to contrast them with the labor movement, helped to spawn cultural theories. Global networks of activists have inspired globally oriented theories. Future transformations will no doubt give us new portrayals and theories that we cannot yet imagine.

SEE ALSO: Civil Rights Movement; Collective Action; Collective Identity; Contention,

Tactical Repertoires of; Crowd Behavior; Culture, Social Movements and; Emotions and Social Movements; Framing and Social Movements; Gender, Social Movements and; Global Justice as a Social Movement; Identity Politics/Relational Politics; Mobilization; Moral Shocks and Self-Recruitment; New Left; New Social Movement Theory; Political Opportunities; Political Process Theory; Pro-Choice and Pro-Life Movements; Rational Choice Theories; Resource Mobilization Theory; Revolutions; Riots; Social Change; Social Movement Organizations; Social Movements, Biographical Consequences of; Social Movements, Leadership in; Social Movements, Networks and; Social Movements, Non-Violent; Social Movements, Participatory Democracy in; Social Movements, Political Consequences of; Social Movements, Recruitment to; Social Movements, Relative Deprivation and; Social Movements, Repression of; Social Movements, Strain and Breakdown Theories of; Transnational Movements

REFERENCES AND SUGGESTED READINGS

- Clemens, E. S. (1993) Organizational Repertoires and Institutional Change: Women's Groups and the Transformation of American Politics, 1890–1920. *American Journal of Sociology* 98: 755–98.
- Collins, R. (2001) Social Movements and the Focus of Emotional Attention. In: Goodwin, J., Jasper, J. M., & Polletta, F. (Eds.), *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Gamson, W. A. (1975) *The Strategy of Social Protest*. Dorsey, Homewood, IL.
- Gamson, W. A. (1992) *Talking Politics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Ganz, M. (2000) Resources and Resourcefulness. *American Journal of Sociology* 105: 1003–62.
- Goodwin, J. & Jasper, J. M. (2006) The Cultural Approach to Social Movements. In: Klandermans, B. & Roggeband, C. (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Movements*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Jasper, J. M. (1997) *The Art of Moral Protest*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Jasper, J. M. (2004) A Strategic Approach to Collective Action: Looking for Agency in Social Movement Choices. *Mobilization* 9: 1–16.
- Keck, M. E. & Sikkink, K. (1998) *Activists Beyond Borders*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.

- Klandermands, B. & Staggenborg, S. (Eds.) (2002) *Methods of Social Movement Research*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Kriesi, H., Koopmans, R., Duyvendak, J.-W., & Giugni, M. (1995) *New Social Movements in Western Europe*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- McAdam, D. (1982) *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930–1970*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- McCarthy, J. D. & Zald, M. N. (1977) Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory. *American Journal of Sociology* 82: 1212–41.
- Morris, A. D. (1984) *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement*. Free Press, New York.
- Olson, M. (1965) *The Logic of Collective Action*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Piven, F. F. & Cloward, R. (1977) *Poor People's Movements*. Vintage, New York.
- Rochon, T. R. (1990) The West European Peace Movement and the Theory of New Social Movements. In: Dalton, R. & Küchler, M. (Eds.), *Challenging the Political Order*. Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Scott, J. C. (1985) *Weapons of the Weak*. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Snow, D. A. & Benford, R. B. (1992) Master Frames and Cycles of Protest. In: Morris, A. D. & Mueller, C. M. (Eds.), *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Snow, D. A., Zurcher, L. A., Jr., & Ekland-Olson, S. (1980) Social Networks and Social Movements: A Microstructural Approach to Differential Recruitment. *American Sociological Review* 45: 787–801.
- Tilly, C. (1978) *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Touraine, A. (1978) *La Voix et le regard*. Seuil, Paris.

social movements, biographical consequences of

Silke Roth

Personal and biographical effects belong to the unintended consequences of social movements. Participation in social movements changes people's lives, while social movements aim at social change (or its prevention), and even affect the lives of those who did not get involved in movements and countermovements.

A biographical perspective on social movements makes clear that social change and personal change are inextricably linked.

Biographical consequences of social movements can be observed at the micro, meso, and macro levels. The effects at the micro level concern the impact of movement participation on activists' life courses, the individual level of participants in movement activities. As numerous studies show, activists tend to remain committed to social change goals they pursue in social movements and that this commitment has significant effects in their work lives, political attitudes, and personal relationships (Evans 1979; Andrews 1991). Based on research on participants of the New Left, Giugni (2004: 494) summarizes the effects as follows: the former activists continue to hold leftist attitudes, define themselves as "liberal" and "radical," and remain active in social movements and other forms of political activity. They tend to be concentrated in teaching and other "helping" professions, have lower incomes than their age peers, and are more likely to have experienced an episodic or non-traditional work history. Furthermore, they are more likely to have divorced, married later, or remained single than their age peers. In addition, gender differences can be observed. For example, the participation in the Freedom Summer campaign of 1964 had different impacts on male and female life courses. Compared to their peers, male volunteers had jobs with less stability, prestige, and income, while female volunteers were less likely to be married or have children than their peers (McAdam 1992). Andrews (1991) found that lifelong commitment to socialism gave interviewees a purpose in life.

At the meso level, biographical consequences concern how social movements and movement organizations are shaped by the membership. Activists develop *tastes for tactics* (Jasper 1997), which have an impact on the participation in social movements and movement organizations as well as on the tactics employed and coalitions and networks formed. Roth (2003) argued that activists form bridging organizations in order to reconcile competing political identities that evolved in political socialization processes through the participation of social movements. Activists often move from one movement to the other and contribute to diffusion of strategies,