THE ROOTS AND LEGACIES OF THE AMERICAN 1960s

NEH Summer Seminar for College Teachers

The popular view of the "60s phenomenon" in the U.S. holds that the turbulence of the era arose quickly and unexpectedly out of the staid conformity of the 1950s. Commentators grope to "explain" the origins of the period by reference to such disparate causes as the assassination of JFK, fears of the threat of nuclear annihilation, the rise of permissive child-rearing practices, or even the availability of "the pill." These "explanations" appeal because they are simple, straightforward, and dramatic. But they are also profoundly ahistorical, substituting a kind of journalistic identification of popular causes for a more systematic examination of the historical trends that converged to produce the era's distinctive features. This summer seminar will focus specific attention on those long-term political, demographic, economic, and cultural trends which seem especially significant in accounting for the general turbulence of the 1960s. For more information write to:

Doug McAdam
Department of Sociology
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721

"IF I HAD A HAMMER": THE CHANGING METHODOLOGICAL REPERTOIRE OF COLLECTIVE BEHAVIOR AND SOCIAL MOVEMENTS RESEARCH*

John T. Crist and John D. McCarthy†

During the 1970s a theoretical shift occurred in social movement and collective behavior scholarship. Movement was away from grievances, relative deprivation, and interactional processes and towards organizational, structural, and political factors. Dramatic changes in the research methodologies were also associated with the shift. We explore those changes with a systematic comparison of research articles in major U.S. journals of sociology before and after the theoretical realignment. Between the early 1960s and the recent period, research designs became far more diverse, supplanting the earlier methodological hegemony of survey designs. Researchers increasingly utilized units of analysis other than individuals and employed mobilizing and political opportunity structures as key independent variables.

> It sometimes even happens that a conspicuously successful technique in some area of behavioral science is not only identified with "scientific method," but comes to be so mechanically applied that it undermines the very spirit of scientific inquiry. . . . I call it the *law of instrument*, and it may be formulated as follows: Give a small boy a hammer, and he will find that everything he encounters needs pounding.
>
> —Abraham Kaplan, *The Conduct of Inquiry*

Fifteen years ago the Report of the Committee on Basic Research in the Behavioral and Social Sciences of the National Academy of Sciences observed that "the history of the social and behavioral sciences has been one of constant interaction between improvements in measurement and improvements in theory" (Adams, Smelser, and Treiman 1982: 22). There have been distinct eras in the development of North American sociology each characterized by a unique methodological orientation. Hedley (1993) identifies three such eras—early (until 1939), middle (1940-1969), and recent (1970 to present)—and describes their methodological orientations by reference to evidence from elite journal publications. Journal publications in the first era relied heavily upon the "time-honored technique of rational speculation" (Hedley 1993: 123) for their methodology.

Profound changes occurred within the methodological repertoire of sociologists during the 1950s (Coleman 1991; Hedley 1993), which included the ascendance of survey research, the elaboration of techniques for statistical analysis, and the increasing availability of data collected by bureaucratic organizations. National surveys were facilitated by the development of a truly national infrastructure within the U.S. during the mid-century. As a result, they provided new opportunities for social research. The emergence of national markets for consumption, national communications grids (telephone lines, radio and television broadcasting), improvements and

*The authors wish to thank the following colleagues for providing critiques of earlier drafts of this paper: David Baker, Bob Edwards, Hank Johnston, John Lofland, Susan Olzak, Dieter Rucht, and the anonymous reviewers of this journal.

†John T. Crist is a Program Officer at the United States Peace Institute. John D. McCarthy is Professor of Sociology at the Catholic University of America

innovations within transportation, all blended to create an extra-local infrastructure which permitted direct electronic communication with large numbers of individuals in relatively brief periods of time, the basic recipe for survey research.

During the 1940s and 1950s especially, a network of university-based survey research centers was constructed from federal and corporate sources where the techniques of random probability sampling were perfected to improve the reliability of market data and public opinion polls. This was the great "watershed" of American sociology. Social research underwent "a shift in the unit of analysis . . . from the community to the individual." The earlier drive to study "communities, organizations, or social subsystems was overwhelmed by the greater statistical rigor of characterizing 'populations' and analyzing behavior of individuals as 'independently drawn' members of the population" (Coleman 1986: 1315). Against such a well-funded and popular contender, other methodologies within sociology provided little competition to survey research, which rapidly diffused throughout the discipline as the most useful and the most scientific methodology. In fact, the National Academy of Sciences observed that the "sample survey has become for some social scientists what the telescope is to astronomers, the accelerator to physicists, and the microscope to biologists—the principal instrument of data collection for basic research purposes" (Committee on Science and Public Policy 1969: 2). Hedley (1993: 125) reports that just over a third of the sixty-four "research and empirical" articles published in the *American Journal of Sociology* and the *American Sociological Review* in 1950 relied upon interviews and questionnaires, making surveys the single most popular quantitative research strategy. Because of the pervasiveness of the survey strategy, it is no surprise that seventy percent of the research reports adopted the individual as the unit of analysis.

The 1970s saw the beginning of a "long dark night of contracting opportunities" for American sociology (D'Antonio 1994: 100). The federal government cut back its funding of social research, which turned sociologists toward cheaper, more efficient ways to collect data. The use of survey research designs declined markedly, giving way to a variety of other data sources. In fact, the statistical tools developed to analyze the data collected by survey researchers have persisted and diffused more thoroughly among sociologists than the survey design itself. Using the *Social Science Citation Index* to map connections between specialties, Crane and Small show that "the most quantitative areas dominated the discipline in the early seventies," and that the "less quantitative fields . . . were considerably smaller and presumably less influential" (1992: 216).[1]

More than any other single development, the appearance of the computer on American campuses during the 1960s facilitated the popularity of quantitative methodology among social scientists. Computers reduced the costs of collecting, managing, storing, and analyzing data; and thus "opened many possibilities for new forms of analysis" (Mullins 1973: 142). They reduced the time it took to calculate measures of association from days and weeks to seconds and minutes, and enabled the diffusion and application of much more sophisticated statistical techniques. Though "a great deal of faddism in statistical methods" (Turner and Turner 1990: 176) occurred during this time, statistical analysis has persisted as the basis for the bulk of published research in the major journals. Turner and Turner also observe that there was a fundamental change, brought on by the funding crisis under the Nixon Administration, in the requirements for access to academic positions in sociology: "The main means of competing under the new circumstances was not so much the collection of huge amounts of new data, but rather the refinement of techniques for analyzing existing data or data collected for other purposes." (1990: 177).

[1] There was widespread intellectual and bureaucratic warfare over the reorientation of the discipline toward quantitative methodologies as well, especially at the University of Chicago during the 1950s and elsewhere in the 1960s. Turner and Turner note that the "most ardent advocates of statistical methods were, in several cases, involved in particularly brutal efforts to eliminate the opposition and define it as 'unprofessional' or incompetent" (1990: 173). The success of quantitative methods within American sociology was by no means a simple matter of natural progression.

It has been argued, as well, that "the improvement of data represents the major area of advance" in sociology after 1970 (Adams, *et. al.* 1982: 22). There is now a wealth of data collected for other purposes available in convenient electronic form from a variety of institutions and organizations: The Bureau of the Census (and other Government agencies) and the National Opinion Research Center release their data in packages designed for micro-computer use; NEXUS makes the full text of newspaper and periodical publications available for electronic searches as far back as the early 1970s. The National Archives and Records Administration has expanded its electronic records division substantially in the past ten years and maintains thousands of statistical and other records available to scholars free or for nominal fees (Hirtle 1995). In the U.S., almost no major organization is without a system for computerized record management, and huge numbers of minor organizations now utilize them. Some of these records are more readily available to scholars than others, but once access is obtained, secondary data sets now present fewer technological difficulties for most scholars than thirty years ago—the mainframe and micro-computer revolution has provided a variety of affordable, user-friendly, and powerful software for the management and analysis of data, including the standard statistical packages, text-managers, programs for machine-readable events coding, and qualitative data analysis.

The greater variety in data sources and analysis techniques occurred alongside the fragmentation of sociology into dozens of specialties and a resulting contraction of the intellectual core of the discipline. Collins argues that the comparatively rapid growth in the number of sociologists since the 1970s—from about 2,500 to over 10,000—altered "the structure of the intellectual field" (1986: 1339) and set in motion a process of differentiation which fragmented the discipline into a loose coalition of research specialties without a clearly defined central core. The American Sociological Association has adapted to this fragmentation by developing a constellation of specialty "sections", each of which serves as "an organizational base for a heterodox movement or specialty distant from the 'mainstream' that nevertheless wishes to preserve its claim on legitimacy as part of sociology" (Turner and Turner 1990: 156).

METHODOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS OF A THEORETICAL REORIENTATION

Against this backdrop, a lively community of scholars of collective behavior and social movements (hereafter CBSM) began to coalesce as the number of social movements proliferated in the late 1960s and 1970s. Crane and Small, in their study of research specialties within sociology since the 1970s, locate the study of social movements in a nexus of related topics (industrialization, revolution, Marxist class analysis) which constitute the single "largest sociology specialty" (1992: 223) as measured by shared citations in journal publications. Only during this most recent phase of sociology's development has the study of social movements and collective behavior gained widespread recognition as a "central subfield of the discipline" (Kurtz 1992: 67). The intellectual debates which resulted in a theoretical shift in this sub-field during the 1960s and 1970s have been thoroughly cited, summarized and analyzed (for the most important work in this regard, see Marx and Wood 1975; McAdam 1982; Morris and Herring 1987; Jenkins 1983; McAdam, McCarthy and Zald 1993).

Nowhere in the "sprawling, diffuse, and inchoate" (Lofland 1994: 17) literature of social movements is there much attention paid to the major changes in research methodology which accompanied the theoretical reorientation. However, in their effort to chronicle the beginnings of that reorientation during the 1960s and 1970s, Marx and Wood (1975) emphasized several issues that had decisive implications for research design. First, they criticized the frequency with which scholars conceptualized the study of collective behavior primarily as that of the psychological states of individuals. Second, they welcomed the adoption of an "organization perspective" (p. 366) to social movements. Third, they criticized the popularity of static taxonomies of movements, riots, crowds, and mobs, noting that, "Chief among [their] difficulties are the frequent failure to indicate

how definitions can be operationalized . . ." (p. 368), which, in turn, undermined the ability to verify (or falsify) empirical claims. Their review portrayed a sub-discipline only just beginning to address methodological issues seriously.

The many reviews since have emphasized theoretical approaches, rather than the underlying methodological imperatives that accompany theories. Fundamentally, the theoretical reorientation of social movement research, the shift from mental states to social structures—necessitated a shift in its primary unit of analysis. Survey methodology had been the dominant strategy for data collection, and it was very suitable for a research agenda which analyzed the psychology and behavior of individuals. But movement organizations and large classes of collective action events were not as amenable to the then standard survey methods.

Just such limitations led Coleman to observe in 1969 that the study of social conflict, collective behavior, and social movements "generally languishes in large part because of the absence of appropriate methods" (1969: 105). But, by 1983 Aguirre and Quarantelli (1983) could cite numerous examples of innovation and advances in methodology. They noted that these compensated for the "problems of sampling, subject availability, and research instrument reactivity [that] limit the usefulness of such standard research techniques as interviews and questionnaires" (p. 197) in the study of social movements and collective behavior, or in any other field that examines "unpredictable, transitory, fluid, diffuse, complex, and uncontrolled" phenomena (p. 195). They cited a diverse set of precedents in the published record of the sub-field, almost all of which date the emergence of innovative methodological strategies during the late 1970s and early 1980s—McPhail and Wohlstein's use of videotape for studies of the assembling process (1977, 1982), Johnson and Feinberg's computer simulations of crowd behavior (1977), Snow and Phillips use of newspaper accounts (1980) to evaluate Lofland and Stark's theory of religious conversion, and Gamson, Fireman and Rytina's adaptation of laboratory experiment techniques to field settings in the study of conformity and rebellion (1982).

Two works did not make Aguirre and Quarantelli's list in 1983, but have since proven to be milestones of methodological innovation in the CBSM literature: Tilly, Tilly and Tilly's (1975) study of collective violence in Europe remains one of the first and most comprehensive models of newspaper-based research on events. McAdam's (1983) analysis of protest events among American blacks, 1930-1970, also uses newspapers to measure attributes of collective action over time, while incorporating public opinion surveys, church membership records, SMO archival material, and Supreme Court records into the analysis. It is a very good example of the eclectic use of data sources which, as we shall see, characterizes CBSM research in the 1980s and 1990s.

DATA AND METHODS

A disciplinary sub-field may be distinguished on methodological grounds by the depth and breadth of research repertoires utilized by its scholars. Each research project requires a series of interrelated decisions about the proper ways to structure inquiry. The most important choices involve the unit of analysis, the research design, the data sources, the dependent variables, and the independent variables.[2] For each task, the diversity of options available to scholars constitutes a repertoire with which theoretical problems may be confronted. Publication in an elite journal within a discipline stamps the discipline's seal of approval upon an item in a repertoire. Such approval

[2] Not all studies are quantitative, and not all quantitative studies model variables in an equation. We use "dependent" and "independent" variables in the broadest sense here: the objects which are studied, analyzed, or explained; and the concepts, measures, or forces which influence those objects.

indicates its legitimacy as an option for researchers and provides a precedent which may be used to justify further research and publication. Following this logic we decided to systematically examine a sample of journal articles in order to chronicle the changing repertoire of methodological approaches within the CBSM research community.

Articles were collected from four major American sociology journals: *The American Journal of Sociology*, *The American Sociological Review*, *Social Forces*, and *Sociological Quarterly*.[3] All volumes between the years 1960-65 and 1980-93 were consulted.[4] We were most concerned with comparing a sample of publications before and after the broader disciplinary methodological shift and the narrower sub-field theoretical shift had occurred. Journal articles provide a convenient sampling frame for just such an analysis. The resulting data set encompasses much of the finest scholarly work available in the sub-field. It is not, of course, a completely satisfactory profile of the opus of CBSM research. In order to compile such a sample, we would need to examine conference paper submissions and presentations, textbooks, scholarly books, dissertations, rejected journal submissions, unpublished manuscripts, occasional papers, etc. There are many reasons to expect that such publication venues would yield a somewhat different picture of CBSM research. Clemens, Powell, McIlvaine and Okamoto (1995: 442-450), for instance, outline the consequences of "alternative selection regimes" on who and what gets published by journal editors and book publishers: "[B]ooks and journals do not differ markedly in terms of subject category; their primary point of divergence is in method and evidence" (1995: 479).

Unfortunately, to reconstruct an accurate sample of the full scope of CBSM research between the 1950s and 1990s would be a daunting task. Although our sample of articles does not exhaust the possible publication venues, we agree with Peng that journal publications "are a dependable index of the scope and strength of the academic effort" in a sub-discipline (1994: 101), even if they privilege certain methodologies over others.

In their thirty-four year sample (1949-83) of CBSM articles, Morris and Herring (1987) demonstrate that the theoretical reorientation was well advanced in journals by the late 1970s. Still, the latter half of the 1960s began to see many publications critical of earlier theories—Zald and Ash's work on SMOs (1966), Gamson's *Power and Discontent* (1968), Tilly's work on collective violence in Europe (1968), and the *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (1968). Nevertheless, we are confident that 1960-65 represents a publication record for a period preceding the reorientation.

We included any article for which the primary research agenda was the study of at least one social movement or collective protest, or in which protest figured prominently as an explanatory variable. Like Morris and Herring, one of our most troublesome tasks "involved deciding which activities traditionally studied by collective behaviorists (e.g., panics, fads, crazes, revolutions, riots, religious cults) to include" (1987: 179). In most cases, the decision to include an article was judged by the title—the remainder were included based upon the description of the content in the abstract. We cast the net widely. If the title and abstract framed its purpose as contributing to the literature on social movements and collective behavior, then it was accepted into the sample.

Another difficult set of decisions was created by articles that included movement-related variables that did not make explicit reference to CBSM theory. Generally, we judged the

[3] In the interest of comparability between the pre- and post-shift eras, we chose journals which had published continuously between 1960 and 1993. Thus, *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change*, first published in 1978, was not included in our analyses.

[4] Initially, these years were chosen to allow for a comparison of research conducted during the pre-shift era, that is, before the debates about resource mobilization, etc., had changed.

significance of those variables in the context of the article in order to make a decision to include. For instance, research on the correlates of union membership qualified an article for inclusion, but the mere appearance of union membership as a predictor in a regression equation did not. Generally, research which included labor strike variables as predictors was included. Problematic decisions made up less than five percent of articles considered for inclusion in the data set. Book reviews and research notes were excluded.

Details about the research design, dependent and independent variables, and data sources were culled from the data and methods portions of each article, although a few papers required more extensive reading. Statistical analyses were coded by consulting the most sophisticated charts, tables, graphs, and figures employed throughout the article. For efficiency's sake, we recorded only a limited number of multiple research strategies included in each study: up to two methodologies, up to three statistical techniques, up to five dependent variables, up to ten independent variables, up to four data sources (one for the dependent variable, three for the independent).

COMPARISONS BETWEEN CBSM RESEARCH PERIODS

We present the results of our analyses by comparing the 1960-65 period with the 1980-86 and the 1987-1993 periods. In doing so, it will become evident that the pace of many of the changes we identify has quickened in the most recent, 1987-1993, period. The number of articles published in the four journals for each period indicates that the rate of publication of CBSM articles, as indexed in the four journals, differs dramatically between the three periods sampled, with an average of 6.3 articles per year in the 1960 to 1965 period, 8 per year between 1980 and 1987, and 13.4 between 1987 and 1993.[5]

Temporal and Spatial Breadth of Studies

Table 1 indicates that on two basic criteria, the historical period of a study and its time span, researchers are expanding the scope of their studies. First, scholars are reaching further back in time to test propositions about social movements. The latter half of the twentieth century remains the most popular period of study, but research is no longer as restricted to the twentieth century as it was in the early 1960s. Nearly one in five scholars now studies movements that occurred before the twentieth century. Second, the length of time studied by scholars in our sample has lengthened. The modal average in the early 1960s was between 1 and 10 years—90% covered 10 years or less in the life of a movement, and none reached beyond 100 years.

The increasing popularity of event-history analysis (EHA) among movements researchers accounts in some measure for the use of wider time spans. EHA improves upon the static depiction of time effects in time-series regression by modeling the impact of the cumulative sequence of events upon subsequent rounds of collective action (Olzak 1989). In addition, much research has been done on cycles, surges, and waves of collective protest events (Tarrow 1982; Lofland 1993; Kriesi, Koopmans, Duyvendak, and Giugni, 1995; Koopmans, 1995) which necessitate longer time spans of analysis.

All other things being equal, a wider geographic scope of a research tradition can be expected to improve its generalizability. Among other things, cross-national research designs help test the vigor of theoretical propositions by comparing their worth in diverse settings. The same can be said for a pool of single-nation studies that draws from many nations, rather than few. Table

[5] These figures include all articles collected for each time period. In many tables, subsets of the articles have been excluded for purposes of analysis. Consult Table 4 for the appropriate Ns.

Table 1. Temporal and Spatial Feature Comparisons of CBSM Journal Research Articles, 1960-65, 1980-86, 1987-93 (percentages)

Feature	1960-65	1980-86	1987-93
Era of Study			
1950-present	83	67	65
1900-1949	14	13	18
Pre-1900	3	20	17
N	(29)	(46)	(78)
Time Span of Study*			
1 year or less	38	35	25
> 1 year to 10	52	35	28
> 10 years	10	30	47
N	(29)	(46)	(76)
National Scope of Study*			
One Nation	94	96	67
Multi-nation	6	4	33
N	(32)	(53)	(80)

Note: Chi-Square for panel comparison = p. < .05.

1 shows that the percentage of cross-national studies undertaken by scholars has grown dramatically in the most recent period. During each of the first two periods under study, the journals published two cross-national studies: in 1960-65, a study with two countries and a study with three represented; and in 1980-86, a study with seventy-one countries and a study for which the N was not determinable. In the 1987-93 period, however, thirteen cross-national studies were published. The mean number of countries in studies of this latter period was thirty-five, with a range from two to 130. The large increase is no doubt partially a result of data increasingly made available by international organizations.

Nevertheless, the most frequent choice for scholars in the sample remains one-country studies. Single-country studies in the 1980-93 period are twice as likely than in the earlier period to examine a movement located elsewhere than the North American continent. The majority of these articles examine European movements. Though there are marginal changes in the breadth of geography represented in the post-shift research, there has been no change since the early 1960s in the percentage of studies which cover North America or Europe exclusively. That figure remains at ninety percent, which starkly contrasts with Bollen, Entwistle, and Alderson's estimate that only thirty-four percent of journal articles in macrocomparative sociology study the "first world" exclusively (1993: 329).

Movement Focus

Table 2 depicts changes in the social movements chosen for study by movement scholars. The civil rights movement was the single most frequently studied movement in journals in the pre-shift era as well as in the 1980-86 period. Throughout the period under study, the civil rights movement and the labor movement together account for about one third of all movements journal publications. Most recently (since 1987), however, research attention to the civil rights movement has waned. Articles on the labor movement are more common than any other movement in the most recent period.

Table 2. Type of Movement Comparisons in CBSM Journal Research Articles, 1960-1965, 1980-86, 1987-93 (percentages)[a]

Movement	1960-65	1980-86	1987-93
Labor	13	16	18
Peace	--	5	10
Women	3	7	7
Black	24	21	12
Revolution	6	5	11
Other[b]	29	32	25
No Movement	26	13	18
N	(38)	(56)	(94)

Notes: [a]Up to two movements were coded for each article. As a result, percentages may not add to 100 .
[b]This category includes social movements among peasants, poor people, populists, senior citizens, and students, along with the environmental, anti-drinking and driving, and anti-colonial movements, and research on cults and voluntary associations. Each item in this category comprised four or less of the entire data set.

Units of Analysis

Theories specify or imply the most appropriate units for sampling and analysis in social research. As noted above, the most frequent criticism of relative deprivation theories was lodged against their preoccupation with individual level variables, and especially the habit of making inferences about social structure by reference to opinions and attitudes. Has there been a shift away from individual level analysis? Most certainly there has.

In the 1960-5 period, individuals constituted the sampling unit in over half of the journal publications (see Table 3). That figure has dropped to about a third of all studies in the post-shift era, with a steady decline from the first half of the 1980s (41%) to the most recent period (32%). Moreover, recent research has been just as likely to study the behavior of individuals and their structural availability as it has their attitudes, opinions, feelings, or grievances.

Some have argued that research has suffered from an overemphasis on the organization as the embodiment of social movements (Scott 1990). Surprisingly, our sample records a drop in the percentage of studies that adopt either the social movement or the SMO as the unit of analysis. In fact, we conclude from Table 3 that diversification of the unit of analysis best describes the pattern of reorientation over the past thirty years. Researchers today have a multiplicity of options

Table 3. Sample Feature Comparisons of CBSM Journal Research Articles, 1960-65, 1980-86, 1987-93

Sample Feature	1960-65	1980-86	1987-93[a]
Sampling Unit (percentages)[a]			
Individuals	56	41	32
SMs and SMOs	26	19	21
Events	7	7	15
Localities	4	17	16
Other[b]	7	17	17
N	(24)	(42)	(82)
Sample Size			
Mean	781	821	1,508
Median	120	303	100
Largest	8724	12,000	68,374
Standard Deviation	1912	2168	7813
N	(24)	(39)	(79)

Notes: [a]Chi-Square analysis was not significant ($p > .05$) for the comparison between each row and all other categories combined. Analysis excludes articles (e.g., theory pieces) for which a sampling unit was not relevant.
[b]"Other" category includes units of analysis which were either idiosyncratic or which did not appear in each period. Examples include journal issues, court cases, industrial sectors, labor negotiations, and occupations.

for sampling and analysis—events, SMOs, localities, time, and individuals—that are sustained by a substantial body of highly esteemed research. This represents a marked expansion of the choices facing researchers in the early 1960s. In addition, it is worth noting that the size of samples utilized by social movements researchers has increased substantially between the first and last periods.

Research Design

Table 4 compares the range of research/analytic design options used by CBSM scholars over the past 30 years. During the 1960-65 period, theoretical articles constituted the most common analytic approach, followed by individual survey designs and non-quantitative historical ones. If the theory articles are excluded from the analysis more than fifty percent of the research papers published in the four journals utilized survey designs, consistent with our expectations about the dominance of such designs during the 1960-65 period.

The diversity of research designs used during the subsequent periods expanded considerably. Event-history designs became the most widely used, while survey and non-quantitative, historical ones remained in wide use. The increasing diversity is also seen in the "other" category which includes a wide range of designs, such as simulations, experiments and organizational censuses (i.e., surveys of populations of organizations). We also find that for each of the most frequent units of analysis in post-shift research (individuals, movements, events, and localities), a wider range of methodologies has been employed to observe, measure, and analyze them.

Table 4. Research Designs of CBSM Journal Articles, 1960-65, 1980-86, 1987-93 (percentages)[a]

Research Design	1960-65	1980-86	1987-93
Theory	32	10	7*
Individual Survey	29	21	19
Event-History	3	23	25*
Historical (Quantitative)	13	11	11
Historical (Non-Quantitative)	24	29	20
Fieldwork (Observation)	13	11	11
Other[b]	3	11	19*
N	(38)	(56)	(94)

Notes: [a]Each category includes publications in which the methodology was employed either as a primary or a secondary tool. As a result the percentages do not add up to 100.
[b]Includes mathematical or computer simulation of data, laboratory experiments, focus groups, literature reviews, and censuses of organizations.
*Chi-Square analysis using this row as a comparison with all other categories combined = p. < .05.

Data Source.

Table 5 displays the data sources used by CBSM researchers over the three periods. Consistent with earlier results, survey sources predominated during the 1960-65 period. Government data sources were the next most commonly used during that period.

On the other hand, research during the later periods draws more heavily upon government archives and much more heavily on the archives of non-governmental organizations (mostly SMOs, the UN, and the World Bank). The availability of a data set, or the ease with which it may be assembled and analyzed, is often its most attractive feature, especially for scholars who are not affiliated with research organizations or do not have access to student labor.

Table 5: Research Data Sources of CBSM Journal Research Articles, 1960-65, 1980-86, 1987-93 (percentages)[a]

Data Source	1960-65	1980-86	1987-93
Government Archive	27	33	32
Non-Government Archive	4	12	27*
News Media	4	14	14
Survey	50	20	22*
Secondary Evidence[b]	12	18	30
Other[c]	15	16	19
N	(26)	(51)	(88)

Notes: [a]Up to four sources were recorded for each article. As a result, percentages do not add to 100.
[b]Includes articles which relied primarily or only upon secondary literature (such as narrative histories and journal publications) for evidence about particular movements and events.
[c]Refers primarily to mathematical and computer simulation and laboratory experiments.
*Chi-Square analysis using this row as a comparison with all other categories combined = p. < .05.

Table 6. Dependent and Independent Variable Comparisons of CBSM Journal Research Articles, 1960-65, 1980-86, 1987-93 (percentages)[a]

Variables	1960-65	1980-86	1987-93
Dependent Variable			
Events[b]	19	28	36
Cognitive[c]	19	16	15
Mobilizing Structures[d]	19	10	32 **
Outcomes[e]	12	22	13
Constituents[f]	19	20	18
Opportunities[g]	--	2	2
Independent Variable			
Events[b]	--	10	24*
Cognitive[c]	19	26	27
Mobilizing Structures[d]	23	28	44*
Outcomes[e]	4	--	--
Constituents[f]	12	12	21
Opportunities[g]	23	53	51*
Demographic (n.e.c.)[h]	23	16	15
Class, Education (n.e.c.)[i]	27	26	16
N	(26)	(51)	(88)

Notes: *Chi-Square analysis using this row as a comparison with all other categories combined = p. > .05.
**Chi-Square analysis using this row as a comparison with all other categories combined = p. > .01.
[a]Up to five dependent and ten independent variables were coded for each publication. As a result, percentages do not add to 100. The strength and significance of independent variables in statistical models were not recorded. Analysis excludes theoretical articles for which dependent and independent variables were irrelevant.
[b]Event variables describe characteristics of events—number, frequency, size, magnitude, timing, duration, or sequence.
[c]Cognitive variables describe the psychological states of individuals, including their level of dissonance, status deprivation, expectations, perceptions of events, political attitudes, ideology, perceptions of costs and risks associated with behavior, and the way they frame events or social issues. This category also includes socio-economic measures which were deployed as stand-in variables for the psychological states and grievances of individuals.
[d]Mobilizing structures describe the characteristics of formal or informal organizations and networks that comprise a social movement. These include aspects of their structure, leadership profile, recruitment strategies, tactics, resources, alliances, network density, group solidarity, prior history of organizing, membership size, group and organizational formation, and other similar attributes.
[e]Outcomes describe the success or failure of a social movement, its effectiveness, impact, or any intended and unintended consequences resulting from its activities, especially policy changes, concessions from opponents, or new advantages and benefits won for its constituencies.
[f]Constituents variables describe the behavior of or behavioral constraints upon individuals within social movements, including their structural availability for recruitment, their previous activities, their ties to other organizations and individuals.
[g]Opportunities describe aspects of the political, economic, or social environment which are constraints upon or incentives for mobilization. They include the structure of the state or opponents which the movement confronts, the extent of social control strategies against a movement, the level of support for movement goals within external constituencies, and aspects of movement constituencies which enhance or limit their power and resources (like position in social structure, the strength of the economy, or changes in population).
[h]Demographic, n.e.c. refers to variables that describe sociological attributes of movement constituents like race, age, sex, and marital status, and which are not classified elsewhere in the coding scheme. In most cases, these variables were not considered central to the theoretical propositions at hand, except as appropriate analytical controls.
[i]Class and education, n.e.c. variables describe the income, education, and occupation of movement constituents and are not classified elsewhere in the coding scheme. These variables are not considered central to the theoretical propositions at hand, except as appropriate analytical controls.

News media sources (mostly the press) find expanded use throughout the period. The emergence of event-history techniques, and the consequent reliance upon media "traces" (McCarthy, McPhail, and Smith 1995) of events, account for the increase in use. We also note the expected decline in the use of survey sources, in spite of the widespread availability and use of the General Social Survey data sets. Finally, CBSM researchers use secondary literature much more frequently in the recent period than in 1960-65. Innovations in macro-comparative analysis partially account for the increase in the use of secondary literature.

Overall, the range of data sources employed by sociologists in CBSM research has expanded in the recent era. Moreover, sociologists are now more likely to combine data sources in their analyses. For instance, the percentage of studies that cite two or more distinct data sources for their independent variables increases substantially in the latest period: 21% in 1960-65, 17% in 1980-86, and 31% in 1987-93.

Dependent and Independent Variables

Table 6 displays the dependent and independent variables used in CBSM research articles over the three periods. It demonstrates clearly that, at the most general level, the object of explanation by social movement research has remained stable over the past thirty-five years. It is surprising to note just how many research articles sought to explain mobilizing structures in the 1960-65 period, a time when the prevailing theoretical orientation de-emphasized organizations, networks and structures—eighteen percent included them as dependent variables. In fact, the percentage of articles that included mobilizing structures during 1980-86 as dependent variables (nine percent) was half that of the earlier period. Only in the more recent period (post-1987) have mobilizing structures become a prominent subject for explanation.

Besides mobilizing structures, the frequency and character of collective events is the only domain that has shown any large increase in focus of explanation among scholars. These patterns lead us to conclude that the theoretical battles of the 1970s revolved much more around *how* aspects of movements were to be explained, and much less around *which* aspects needed to be explained.

Consistent with this conclusion, there have been dramatic changes in the kind of independent variables employed by post-shift researchers. Most striking is the wide deployment of both political opportunity and mobilizing structures as explanatory variables. Substantially more than half of journal publications now use an indicator of one or another of these.

Table 7: Statistical Analysis Technique Comparisons of CBSM Journal Research Articles, 1960-65, 1980-86, 1987-93 (percentages)[a]

Statistical Technique	1960-65	1980-86	1987-93
Descriptive	54	29	23*
Measure of Association	23	16	17
Statistical Modeling	8	47	61*
Other[b]	--	6	14
N	(26)	(51)	(88)

Notes: [a]Up to three statistical techniques used were coded for each article. As a result, percentages may not add to 100. Analysis excludes articles (e.g., theory pieces) for which statistical techniques were irrelevant.

[b] Category includes techniques such as factor analysis.

*Chi-Square analysis using this row as a comparison with all other categories combined = p. > .05.

Statistical Analysis Techniques

Following the broader developments in the discipline, statistical modeling techniques have prevailed in the journals we sampled, as can be seen in Table 7. Descriptive statistics dominated in the 1960-65 period, while over half of the studies which employed any statistical technique in the most recent period used some sort of modeling technique, ranging in sophistication from ordinary least squares to hazard models and event-history techniques. As the pattern in Table 7 demonstrates, this is a decisive shift from the early 1960s. Regression analysis emerged as the most popular statistical technique in the post-shift era, especially in the 1987-93 period, when about half of the pieces presented or referred to regression equations.

SUMMARY AND INTERPRETATION

Comparing the elite journal production of CBSM scholars in the recent period with the earlier, 1960-65, period reveals a number of stark patterns. Researchers have increasingly included time as a variable in their designs, expanding the temporal scope of studies. As well, cross-national comparative designs are now more likely to be used. This trend, however, has in only rare instances led to the inclusion of nations other than western industrial ones, buttressing doubts that research and theory based upon a narrow range of core national settings can be generalized to peripheral and semi-peripheral states (Aguirre, forthcoming).

In contrast with the earlier period when the civil rights movement was the primary focus of attention, the most recent period witnessed attention to a much wider range of movements. As a result, we are led to characterize it as the "post-civil rights" period in CBSM theory and research. There is little question that the massive amount of research on the U. S. civil rights movement had a major impact upon the theoretical reorientation in CBSM studies, but there are important ways in which it differed from many subsequent U. S. movements, "new social movements," and movements in non-western settings. The expanded diversity of substantive focus, then, has begun to allow researchers to refine in diverse substantive materials the theoretical lessons learned from the civil rights movement.

The later period can also be characterized as one in which the diversity of units of analysis, research designs and data sources have simultaneously expanded. Individuals are less likely to be units of analysis, and there has been an associated decline in the use of survey designs. This shift has been accomplished by the creative refinement of methods of collection and reduction of data drawn from other sources, especially archival and newspaper records.

Mirroring changes in the discipline, a major shift from the use of descriptive statistics to statistical modeling can be seen across the periods we observe here. Associated with that shift has been a widening of the number and range of independent variables typically included in any study. Even though mobilizing structures and political opportunity variables have become pervasive in explanatory models in the latest period, a wide variety of other independent variables is also usually included. The dramatic shift in the methodological repertoire of CBSM researchers has not, however, been accompanied by much change in the theoretical object of explanation—the dependent variables used by CBSM researchers have remained more or less stable during the period studied.

How shall we make sense of the rapid change in the methodological repertoire? CBSM researchers work within the context of the wider discipline, adapting instruments of the larger methodological tool bag to their own use. The methodological shift clearly mirrors larger trends in the discipline that we described in our introduction. CBSM researchers have borrowed methodological innovations from a variety of other fields and quickly set new standards of methodological sophistication for its scholarship: event-history designs (a blending of the strike literature and quantitative social history) and the population ecology design (imported from the

ociology of organizations) are the most recent examples. At the same time, however, there has een methodological innovation by CBSM researchers, most clearly seen in the development of laborated methods for the retrieval and reduction of newspaper records for studying protest events Olzak 1989).

Some of the most dramatic shifts in the methodological repertoire we have described ost-date the theoretical shift in the CBSM field documented by Morris and Herring (1987), uggesting that debates about theory were responsible for the methodological shift. There is no loubt that the expanded diversity of methodological tools employed by CBSM researchers has been nspired, to some extent, by the theoretical shift. The time-lag, however, is also partially the result f the interval required to translate a revised theoretical focus into actual research, as well as the nterval required to move research results into publishable form.

We are inclined to see the recent methodological and theoretical shifts within the CBSM ommunity of scholars as tightly reciprocal, since methods and theory are, as our textbooks onstantly remind us, closely intertwined. Led by numerous and thorough analyses of the civil ights movement, CBSM scholars simultaneously reemphasized collective processes and sought new esearch instruments to explore them.

The shift away from individuals as units of analysis and the associated shift away from eavy reliance upon survey designs—both of which we demonstrate here—are distinctive nethodological trends fostered by strong theoretical arguments. But these also mirror broader rends in the discipline where labor markets, occupational categories, states, and nations have ecome increasingly popular units of analysis in other sub-disciplines. We suspect that, as a onsequence, a more adequate account of the CBSM theoretical reorientation would look beyond he theoretical boundaries of the small community within which it has occurred.

REFERENCES

Adams, Robert McCormick, Neil J. Smelser, and Donald J. Treiman, eds. 1982. *Behavioral and Social Science Research: A National Resource*. Report of the Committee on Basic Research in the Behavioral and Social Sciences, National Research Council. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Aguirre, Benigno E. forthcoming. "Collective Behavior and Social Movement Theory." In *Essays in Honor of E. L. Quarantelli*. R. Dynes and K. Tierney, eds. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press.

Aguirre, Benigno E. and E. L. Quarantelli. 1983. "Methodological, Ideological, and Conceptual-Theoretical Criticisms of the Field of Collective Behavior: A Critical Evaluation and Implications for Future Study." *Sociological Focus* 16: 195-216.

Bollen, Kenneth A., Barbara Entwistle, and Arthur S. Alderson. 1993. "Macrocomparative Research Methods." *Annual Review of Sociology* 19:321-51.

Clemens, Elisabeth S., Walter W. Powell, Kris McIlvaine, and Dina Okamoto. 1995. "Careers in Print: Books Journals and Scholarly Reputations." *American Journal of Sociology* 101: 433-494.

Coleman, James S. 1986. "Social Theory, Social Research, and Theory of Action." *American Journal of Sociology* 91: 1309-1335.

_____. 1969. "The Methods of Sociology." Pp. 86-114 in *A Design for Sociology: Scope, Objectives and Methods*. Robert Bierstedt, ed.. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Sciences.

Collins, Randall. "Is 1980s Sociology in the Doldrums?" *American Journal of Sociology* 91: 1336-55.

Committee on Science and Public Policy. 1969. "The Behavioral and Social Sciences—Outlook and Needs: A Report." Behavioral and Social Sciences Survey. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences.

Crane, Diana, and Henry Small. 1992. "American Sociology since the Seventies: The Emerging Identity Crisis in the Discipline." Pp. 197-234 in *Sociology and Its Publics: The Forms and Fates of Disciplinary Organization*. Terence C. Halliday and Morris Janowitz, eds. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Edwards, Bob, and Sam Marullo. 1995. "Organizational Mortality in Declining Social Movement: The Demise of Peace Movement Organizations in the End of the Cold War Era." *American Sociological Review* 60: 908-927.

Gamson, William A. 1965. *Power and Discontent*. Homewood, Ill: Dorsey Press.

Gamson, William A., Bruce Fireman, and Steve Rytina. 1982. *Encounters With Unjust Authority*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

Hargens, Lowell L. 1988. "Scholarly Consensus and Journal Rejection Rates." *American Sociological Review* 53: 139-51.

Hedley, R. Alan. 1994. "How Do You Know? Epistemological Aspects of Sociology." In *The Annals of the International Institute of Sociology*, New Series, Volume IV. Proceedings of the XXXI Congress. Plenary Sessions on One Hundred Years of Sociology: Retrospect and Prospect. The Sorbonne, Paris, June 21-25, 1993.

Hirtle, Peter B. 1995. "The National Archives on the Information Superhighway." *The Record: News from the National Archives and Records Administration* 1(January): 6-8.

Jenkins, Craig. 1983. "Resource Mobilization Theory and the Study of Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology* 9: 527-553.

Johnson, Norris R., and William Feinberg. 1977. "A Computer Simulation of the Emergence of Consensus in Crowds." *American Sociological Review* 42: 502-21.

Kaplan, Abraham. 1964. *The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology for Behavioral Science*. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

Koopmans, Ruud. 1995. *Democracy from Below*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Kriesi, Hanspeter, Ruud Koopmans, Jan Willem Duyvendak, Marco G. Giugni. 1995. *New Social Movements in Western Europe*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kurtz, Lester R. 1992. "War and Peace on the Sociological Agenda." Pp. 61-98 in *Sociology and Its Publics: The Forms and Fates of Disciplinary Organization*. Terence C. Halliday and Morris Janowitz, eds. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lofland, John. 1993. "Theory-Bashing and Answer-Improving in the Study of Social Movements." *The American Sociologist* 24: 37-58.

_____. 1993. *Polite Protesters: The American Peace Movement of the 1980s*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Marx, Gary T., and James L. Wood. 1975. "Strands of Theory and Research in Collective Behavior." *Annual Review of Sociology* 1: 363-428.

McAdam, Doug. 1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____. 1994. "Culture and Social Movements." Pp. 36-57 in *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*. Enrique Laraña, Hank Johnston, and Joseph R. Gusfield. Philadelphia, eds. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald. 1993. "Social Movements." In *Handbook of Sociology*, ed. Neil J. Smelser.

McCarthy, John D., Clark McPhail, and Jackie Smith. forthcoming. "Images of Protest: Selection Bias in Media Coverage of Washington Demonstrations." *American Sociological Review*.

McCarthy, John D., and Mayer N. Zald. 1973. *The Trends of Social Movements in America: Professionalization and Resource Mobilization*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

McPhail, Clark, and R. T. Wohlstein. 1982. "Using Film to Analyze Pedestrian Behavior." *Sociological Methods and Research* 10: 347-75.

Morris, Aldon, and Cedric Herring. 1987. "Theory and Research in Social Movements: A Critical Review." In *Annual Review of Political Science*. Samuel Long, ed. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Mueller, Carol McClurg. 1992. "Building Social Movement Theory." Pp. 3-25 In *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Mullins, Nicholas C. 1973. *Theories and Theory Groups in Contemporary American Sociology*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Ogburn, William F. 1964. "Statistical Trends." In *On Culture and Social Change: Selected Papers of William F. Ogburn*, Otis Dudley Duncan, ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Olzak, Susan. 1989. "Analysis of Events in the Study of Collective Action." *Annual Review of Sociology* 15: 119-41.

Peng, Yali. 1994 "Intellectual Fads in Political Science: The Case of Political Socialization and Community Power Studies." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 27: 100-108.

Scott, James C. 1990. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Seidelman, Raymond. 1985. *Disenchanted Realists: Political Science and the American Crisis, 1884-1984*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Shweder, Richard A., and Donald W. Fiske. 1986. "Introduction: Uneasy Social Science." In *Metatheory in Social Science: Pluralisms and Subjectivities*, Donald W. Fiske and Richard A. Shweder, eds. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Snow, David, and C. L. Phillips. 1980. "The Lofland-Stark Conversion Model: A Critical Reassessment." *Social Problems* 27: 430-47.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1982. *Struggling To Reform: Social Movements and Policy Change During Cycles of Protest*. Western Societies Papers, No. 15. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Studies in International Affairs.

Tilly, Charles. 1968. "Collective Violence in European Perspective." Pp. 4-45 in *The History of Violence in America*, H. G. Davis and T. R. Gurr, eds.. New York: Praeger Press.

Tilly, Charles, Louise Tilly, and Richard H. Tilly. 1975. *The Rebellious Century, 1830-1930*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Turner, Stephen Park, and Jonathan H. Turner. 1990. *The Impossible Science: An Institutional Analysis of American Sociology*. Sage Library of Social Research 181. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publication.

Wilson, John. 1973. *Introduction to Social Movements*. New York: Basic Books.

Wohlstein, R. T. 1977. "Filming Collective Behavior and the Problem of Foreshortened Perspective: A Corrective Method." *Studies in the Anthropology of Visual Communication* 4: 81-85.

Zald, Mayer N., and Roberta Ash. 1966. "Social Movement Organizations: Growth, Decay and Change." *Social Forces* 44: 327-41.

ANXIETY AND THE SUCCESSFUL OPPOSITIONAL CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIETAL REALITY: THE CASE OF KOR

*Helena Flam**

Based on narrative interviews and textual materials, the oppositional life world of the Workers' Defense Committee (KOR) in pre-Solidarity Poland is analyzed. In response to oppositional anxieties, KOR activists developed their own sub-universe of meaning. This was a social construction which, elaborated in response to the repressive Polish state, was much more extensive than a typical Western collective action frame. It helped place KOR at the vanguard of the developing opposition. Most importantly, KOR's sub-universe of meaning positioned it to lay claim to charismatic leadership and to occupy the top strata in a new hierarchy of social status. Both these claims were central in its successful mobilizing efforts.

This article analyzes the "oppositional reality" of the pre-Solidarity opposition in Poland, its relationship to competing social realities, and its mobilizing consequences. It focuses on the Workers' Defense Committee, or KOR, which formed in 1976 as the first intelligentsia-worker oppositional alliance in Eastern Europe. It differed from Hungarian, Czechoslovak, and East German dissident groups in that it was not confined to a narrow group of intellectuals, but evolved into a broadly mobilizing oppositional movement (Skilling 1989: 45, 178, 182-185). It represented the first large social movement to challenge the legitimacy of the communist party. In many ways it set the stage for the emergence of the Solidarity movement.

In the pages that follow I will trace out the substance of KOR's oppositional reality and show that it was in part a reaction to the anxiety and fears of activism under a repressive and moribund system. Yet to analyze KOR's symbolic reality is much more than to present a phenomenology of high-risk activism. By understanding the universe of meaning shared by KOR's members we are provided nothing less than the answer to why it was so successful. My analysis will show an *affinity* between a specific type of the oppositional sub-universe of meaning and a successful claim to charismatic authority and societal status. As a bidder for charisma in a corrupt and crisis-ridden "communist" society, KOR offered a new ethics of absolute morality, an ennobling "civilizing" mission; but also, heeding Polish geo-political realities, a compromise-oriented stand. Its alternative concept of social honor "turned the communist system of status on its head." Because KOR's members came to occupy the pinnacle of social honor based on a new world view, a new ethical code, and a series of surpassed qualifying tests, KOR could break the inertia of Polish society and challenge the established power on radically different terms.

MOBILIZATION, SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONISM AND REPRESSION

This article explores a movement-initiated construction of reality and, arguably, could draw on the frame analysis approach to social movements. In social movement theory, this relatively recent approach has been developed with the intention of providing analytical space for

*Helena Flam is Professor of Sociology at the University of Leipzig.

© *Mobilization: An International Journal, 1996 1(1): 103-121*