21

Social Movements

DOUG McADAM
JOHN D. McCARTHY
MAYER N. ZALD

The field of collective behavior and social movements has drawn the attention of sociologists from the earliest years of the discipline to the present time. Interest in the field, however, has hardly been constant, tending instead to wax and wane partly in response to the level of movement activity in society. In view of this relationship, it is hardly surprising that the field has experienced a renaissance in the last decade and a half. The political and social turbulence that shook the United States and many European countries after 1960 caught many in the sociological community off guard and triggered a new round of theorizing and research on social movements. In summarizing the current state of the field we will pay special attention to this new body of work.[1] In doing so, however, we will try to show how some of the newer work is continuous with earlier perspectives. Only by combining the broad conceptual foci of the newer and older approaches can we hope to produce a full understanding of movement dynamics.

Before turning to a brief discussion of the earlier perspectives, one other qualifying remark is in order. Review essays are, by their very nature, difficult to write. The breadth and diversity of topics in any field pose a challenge to those who would attempt to summarize the field in a single article. Our task is made all the more difficult by the range of phenomena lumped together under the heading of social movements. These include phenomenon as diverse as public interest lobbies (e.g., Common Cause, Sierra Club), full-scale revolutions (e.g., Nicaragua, China, etc.), and religious movements (e.g., People's Temple, Nichiren Shoshu). To simplify our task somewhat, we will not attempt to devote equal attention to the full range of movement types. Instead, consistent with our work, the text discussion will tend to focus on political reform movements, to the neglect of revolutions and religious movements. The topics we address, however, should be relevant to those who study all manner of social movements.

The Field in 1970

A student approaching the field of social movements in 1970 confronted a smorgasbord of theoretical perspectives and empirical foci. There

was the *collective behavior* approach with its roots in the "Chicago School." Perhaps the most influential progenitor of this approach was Robert Park (1967; Park and Burgess, 1921), who had himself been heavily influenced by the French analyst of crowds, Gustave Le Bon (1960). However, it remained for one of Park's students, Herbert Blumer (1946, 1955), to systematize this perspective in a series of reviews that elaborated its substantive and empirical elements. With a heavy emphasis upon the emergent character of collective behavior and social movements, the perspective was in turn elaborated by a still later generation of theorists including Turner and Killian (1957, 1972, 1986) and Lang and Lang (1961). Though ostensibly in the same tradition, Neil Smelser's important book (1962) moved the field away from the emphasis on process so evident in earlier work and toward a social structural conception of movements as a response to strain.

The *mass society* approach emerged from debates about the rise of authoritarian and totalitarian regimes and was resonant with certain assumptions of the early "cold war" period. Though ostensibly macrosociological in its focus, some of the many variants of this approach stressed the theoretical importance of personal psychology or micro-social relations in understanding mass movements (Arendt, 1951; Hoffer, 1951; Selznick, 1952). On the other hand, Kornhauser (1959) based his version of this model on a macrosociological analysis of the relation of elites to masses. But the ultimate focus of his attention remained the atomized individual.

Relative deprivation represented a third perspective on social movements that received considerable support during this period. As formulated by its chief proponents (Aberle, 1966; Davies, 1963, 1969; Feieraband, Feieraband, and Nesvold, 1969; Geschwender, 1964; Gurr, 1970), relative deprivation theory attributed activism to the perception—often triggered by a shift in reference group—that "one's membership group is in a disadvantageous position, relative to some other group" (Gurney and Tierney, 1982, p. 34).[2] Relative deprivation was, of course, an advance over absolute deprivation theory, which saw grievances in isolation from a group's position in society.

Finally, there was the *institutional school* (Perrow, 1979), patterned after the earlier work of Max Weber and (Gerth and Mills, 1946) Roberto Michels (1959). Analysts in this tradition typically focused upon the evolution of a particular social movement organization. So

Gusfield (1955) analyzed the Women's Christian Temperance Union, Messinger (1955) the Townsend Movement, Selznick (1952) the American Communist Party, and Zald and his colleagues (Zald and Denton, 1963) the Young Men's Christian Association. Typically the structure and goals of a movement organization were seen as shifting over time in response to external environmental factors. Zald and Ash (1966) synthesized this tradition in an influential article that argued that movement organizations might develop in a variety of ways, undermining the heretofore dominant view emphasizing the inevitability of "oligarchization" in the evolution of movements and movement organizations.

Reflecting on the state of the field prior to 1970, one is struck by two points. First, there existed surprisingly little intellectual conflict between the proponents of the four major perspectives we have outlined.[3] Second, and perhaps accounting for the lack of conflict, except for the institutional school, the major perspectives shared two important emphases: They tended to stress micro-level over macro-level processes and to focus most of their attention on the question of movement emergence.[4]

Micro Focus of Analysis

Despite the many differences between the perspectives sketched above, the underlying focus of attention was similar in all but the institutional school. Ultimately, the impetus to collective action was to be found at the micro level with the individual as the appropriate unit of analysis. Disagreement arose only over the identification of those individual characteristics thought to be causally significant. Collective behavior theorists tended to emphasize the role of emergent norms and values in the generation of social movements. For mass society theorists it was the feelings of "alienation and anxiety" engendered by "social atomization" (Kornhauser, 1959, p. 32). Finally, relative deprivation theory took its name from the psychological state thought to trigger social protest. Ultimately, then, the origin of social movements tended to be explained by reference to the same dynamics that accounted for individual participation in movement activities.[5] Both phenomena had their origins in social psychological or normative processes operating at the micro-

sociological or individual levels. Macropolitical and organizational dynamics were underplayed.

Focus on Movement Emergence

The other emphasis shared by most of the earlier perspectives was a preoccupation with the emergent phase of collective action. It was unusual, except among proponents of the institutional school, to find anything written by sociologists prior to 1970 on the development of a movement over time. Collective behavior theorists tended to debate the precise mix of factors that produced the social movement in the first place. Neil Smelser's (1962) "value-added" theory of collective behavior is but the most explicit of these schemes. However, on the dynamics of movement growth and decline, Smelser and the other collective behavior theorists were notably silent. So too were "classical" theorists (McAdam, 1982) in general. Like the collective behavior theorists, proponents of the mass society and relative deprivation models were less concerned with the movements themselves than those features of the pre-movement period that gave rise to the movement. For mass society theorists' interest centered on the massification of society and the feelings of alienation this produced.

In contrast, relative deprivation theorists focused their attention on a variety of economic dynamics—absolute gains, gains coupled with the failure to realize any progress relative to some reference group, and so forth—thought to produce the motivation to engage in collective action. Once again, however, none of the versions of the theory evidenced any interest in movements once they had emerged.

To a new generation of sociologists, the many popular and clearly political movements of the 1960s and 1970s seemed incompatible with and poorly explained by the traditional perspectives on social movements. In turn, this perceived lack of fit sparked a renaissance in the sociological study of social movements, triggered initially by a critical rethinking of the dominant theories in the field.

The theories were criticized on both theoretical and empirical grounds by many movement analysts (Aya, 1979; Gamson, 1975; Jenkins and Perrow, 1977; McAdam, 1982; McCarthy and Zald, 1973, 1977; Oberschall, 1973; Rule and Tilly, 1975; Schwartz, 1976;

Shorter and Tilly, 1974; Tilly, 1978). The effect of these critiques was to shift the focus of movement analysis from microsocial-psychological to more macropolitical and structural accounts of movement dynamics.

The principal new theoretical perspectives to emerge from recent research and writing in the field are the resource mobilization and political process models. In contrast to earlier classical formulations, both perspectives attribute rationality to movement participants and posit a fundamental continuity between institutionalized and movement politics. The differences between the two models, then, are ones of emphasis and empirical focus. *Resource mobilization* theorists tend to emphasize the constancy of discontent and the variability of resources in accounting for the emergence and development of insurgency (see McCarthy and Zald, 1973, 1977; Oberschall, 1973). Accordingly, a principal goal of their work is understanding how emergent movement organizations seek to mobilize and routinize—frequently by tapping lucrative elite sources of support—the flow of resources, which ensures movement survival.

Though not incompatible with the resource mobilization perspective, the *political process* model represents a somewhat different approach to the study of movement dynamics. As formulated by its chief proponents (McAdam, 1982; Tilly, 1978), the approach emphasizes (a) the importance of indigenous organization, and (b) a favorable "structure of political opportunities" (Eisinger, 1973) far more than do resource mobilization theorists. Both are seen as necessary if a group is to be able to organize and sustain a successful social movement.

The effect of these new perspectives has been to shift the focus of movement scholarship away from the microdynamics of movement emergence to a broader macroanalysis of the processes that make for stability and change in the evolution of movements. While a positive development, this broadening of the frame for movement analysis has at times threatened to replace the conceptual orthodoxy of the classical perspectives with another tailored to the assumptions of the newer models. This would accomplish little. Rather, in our view, any complete account of social movements must do two things. First, it must take into account processes and variables operating at the *macro* and *micro* levels of analysis. Second, it must shed light on the dynamics that account for stability and change in mature movements as well as the processes that give rise to those movements in the first place. Combining these two foci produces

the following two-by-two conceptualization of the field:

	Emergence	Maintenance/Change
Macro		
Micro		

We will use this basic schema as the organizing framework for the paper. The advantage of doing so is that virtually all research and theorizing on social movements can be incorporated into one of the four cells of the table. By working our way through each of the four cells, then, we will review most of the major work in the field.

The problem with this conceptual frame is that it leaves the links between the macro and micro levels of analysis unexamined. This deficiency is shared by the field as a whole. Historically, researchers and theorists have tended to address one of the four topics shown in the table without regard to the links between the topics. We are particularly interested in developing conceptual bridges between movement dynamics that operate at the micro and macro levels. Reflecting a desire to redress what they see as the new macro bias in movement theory, several authors (Jenkins, 1983, p. 527; Klandermans, 1984, pp. 583-584) have recently voiced calls for the development of a new and viable social psychology of collective action. While we agree with their assessment of the current macro bias in the field, we are not persuaded that a reassertion of the social psychological is the best way to redress this imbalance. Such an assertion reifies the micro/macro distinction and reinforces the notion that the two constitute distinct levels of analysis. In our view, what is missing is not so much a viable social psychology of collective action—the broad contours of which already exists in the literature—but intermediate theoretical "bridges" that would allow us to join empirical work at both levels of analysis. With this in mind, we will structure the article

in the following way: After summarizing the literature on macro and micro emergence, we will discuss several promising conceptual bridges that might allow us to better understand the links between macroprocesses and individual actors during the period of movement emergence. We will then do the same for the later stages in a movement's development. The primary focus of this latter discussion will be on social movement organizations (SMOs) and their efforts to mediate between changing macroconditions and the ongoing micro challenges of member recruitment and resource mobilization.

Macro Theory and Research on Movement Emergence

The recent renaissance in movement scholarship has resulted in the accumulation of an impressive body of theory and research on the macro-level correlates of collective action. Given the dominance of more micro-level conceptions of social movements in the various classical models, this development has been particularly welcome. But in proposing an explicitly macro conception of movement emergence, the newer scholarship has merely returned to a theoretical tradition with a long and rich history in European social thought. European social theorists have long sought to locate the roots of collective action in broad social, demographic, economic, and political processes. The prototypical version of this form of analysis is the Marxist one, which focuses upon the central importance of developing economic contradictions in industrial societies that create pools of discontented workers ripe for collective mobilization. But competing versions of this form of analysis focused, as well, upon the importance of urbanization, industrialization, and bureaucratization in creating the macro conditions necessary for collective action. In contrast, American scholarship prior to 1970 was far more micro in focus than its European forebears. Yet even this tradition was not totally devoid of consideration of macro conditions. For example, Davies's (1963) "J-curve" version of relative deprivation is argued at the macro level of analysis, purporting to meld the analyses of Marx and de Toqueville into a synthetic macro account of the emergence of revolutions. And while Neil Smelser's analysis emphasizes the social-psychological importance of "generalized beliefs," he also notes the role played by such macro conditions as "structural strain," and the absence of social control in the generation of collective action. Finally, while the

work of the "mass society" theorists is intended to explicate the psychology of movement participation, much of its analytic focus remains pitched at the macro level.

So more recent work at the macro level is not discontinuous with American work of the recent past and the earlier European work upon which it draws. As a consequence some of the macro factors we shall discuss in passing have a long history of serious attention by movement analysts. Others, however, are of more recent origin as serious contenders for understanding the emergence of collective action and social movements. In the following section we will attempt to summarize what strikes us as the major empirical themes that run through this recent literature.

Macro Political Conditions

One of the major contributions of the recent paradigm shift in the field of social movements has been the reassertion of the political. In the United States, both the resource mobilization and political process perspectives locate social movements squarely within the realm of rational political action. So too does the European literature on "new social movements."[6] However, as Tilly and others have sought to remind us, this form of political action is itself historically specific. It is only against the backdrop of the modern centralized state that we begin to see the emergence of what Tilly has called the "national social movement." This is not to say that collective action was absent prior to the rise of the modern state, but that the form and focus of that action was very different. Specifically, collective action tended to be localized, reactive, and small in scale in feudal and semifeudal societies. But as the locus of power, privilege, and resources shifted to these large centralized states, the scope and focus of collective action expanded as well. As Bright and Harding (1984, p. 10) note, "A concept of state making involves not only state initiatives and the reaction of social groupings to them, but also social mobilizations which target the state and trigger responses by its governors." This observation places the contemporary analysis of collective behavior and social movements in a historical context and also highlights the continuities between institutionalized and movement politics. If most movements represent a form of political action, it is only logical that as the locus of power shifts to the centralized state, movements would also become larger and more national in scope. In our view, social movements are simply

"politics by other means," oftentimes the only means open to relatively powerless challenging groups. As such, social movements should be as responsive to the broad political trends and characteristics of the regions and countries in which they occur as are institutionalized political processes. Recent research in the field suggests as much.

STRUCTURE OF POLITICAL OPPORTUNITIES

Within the context of nation states considerable evidence now exists suggesting the crucial importance of changes in the "structure of political opportunities" (Eisinger, 1973) to the ebb and flow of movement activity. By structure of political opportunities we refer to the receptivity or vulnerability of the political system to organized protest by a given challenging group. Characteristically challengers are excluded from any real participation in institutionalized politics because of strong opposition on the part of most polity members. This unfavorable structure of political opportunities is hardly immutable, however. In so saying, our

> attention is directed away from systems characterizations presumably true for all times and places, which are basically of little value in understanding the social and political process. We are accustomed to describing communist political systems as "experiencing a thaw" or "going through a process of retrenchment." Should it not at least be an open question as to whether the American political system experiences such stages and fluctuations? Similarly, is it not sensible to assume that the system will be more or less open to specific groups at different times and at different places [Lipsky, 1970, p. 14]?

The answer to both of Lipsky's questions is yes. Challenging groups can count on the political systems they seek to influence being more or less vulnerable or receptive to challenge at different points in time. These variations in the structure of political opportunities may arise in either "bottom-up" or "top-down" fashion. In the first case, the political leverage available to a particular challenger is enhanced by broad political, economic, or demographic processes outside of the direct control of polity members.

For example, Jenkins and Perrow (1977) attribute the success of the farm workers movement in the 1960s to "the altered political environment within which the challenge operated" (p. 263). The change, they contend, originated "in economic trends and political

realignments that took place quite independent of any 'push' from insurgents'' (p. 266). In similar fashion, McAdam (1982) has attributed the emergence of widespread black protest activity in the 1950s and 1960s in part to several broad political trends—expansion of the black vote, its shift to the Democratic Party, postwar competition for influence among emerging Third World nations—that served to enhance the bargaining position of civil rights forces. Improved political opportunities may also result from top-down efforts at political sponsorship by elite groups. In his analysis of the emergence of the contemporary environmental movement, Gale (1986, p. 208) notes the importance of the development of a "political system that included agencies already sympathetic to the movement." Indeed, with increased historical perspective has come the realization that the ascendant liberal-left coalition of the 1960s created a broad political context facilitating the emergence of a wide variety of leftist movements.

These last two examples illustrate the ways in which polity members may encourage activism through various forms of sponsorship. But, quite apart from the intention of elite groups, the very structure of a political system may encourage or discourage activism. For example, Nelkin and Pollack (1981) demonstrate that the cycle of protest against nuclear power in West Germany was quite different than the one in France even though the two movements looked very much alike in their early stages. The existence of manifold procedures of review nested in governmental agencies provided substantial opportunities for continuing protest in Germany that were far less available in France, where the movement quickly atrophied. Kitschelt (1986) expands this analysis to include Great Britain and the United States with similar conclusions.

REGIME CRISES AND CONTESTED POLITICAL ARENAS

Related to, yet distinct from, the expansion and contraction in political opportunities are regime crises and general contests for political dominance within a particular region or country. Both situations translate into a net gain in political opportunity for all organized challengers. In this sense the result is the same as in the cases discussed in the previous section. The difference stems from the conditions giving rise to the improved bargaining situation confronting the challenger. In the previous sec-

tion, we cited instances in which various processes increased the leverage of a particular challenger without affecting the systemwide distribution of political power. By contrast, regime crises or periods of generalized political instability improve the relative position of all challengers by undermining the hegemonic position of previously dominant groups or coalitions.

Despite this difference, both situations are expected to stimulate a rise in social movement activity. Certainly the literatures on regime crises and major contests for political dominance support this assumption. Shorter and Tilly (1974), for example, marshal data to show that peaks in French strike activity correspond to periods in which competition for national political power is unusually intense. They note that "factory and white-collar workers undertook in 1968 the longest, largest general strike in history as student unrest reopened the question of who were to be the constituent political groups of the Fifth Republic" (p. 344). Similarly, Schwartz (1976) argues that a period of political instability preceded the rise of the Populist Movement in the post-Civil War South. With the Southern planter aristocracy and emerging industrial interests deadlocked in a struggle for political control of the region, a unique opportunity for political gain was created for any group able to break the stalemate. To this list of well-researched examples one might also add the generalized political instability in Germany during the 1920s as the condition that made possible the Nazis' rise to power. Similar periods of political unrest also preceded the rise of totalitarian movements in Portugal (Schwartzman, in press) and Italy during the 1920s.

More generally, both Skocpol (1979) and Habermas (1973, 1976) have argued for a strong link between different types of regime crises and the generation and expansion of collective action. For Skocpol, the roots of revolution are to be found in major regime crises, typically set in motion by military losses and fiscal overextension. Habermas, on the other hand, locates the impetus to collective action in the chronic "legitimation crisis" confronting the modern capitalist state. He argues that the modern capitalist state is forced by the contradictions inherent in the system to engage in various forms of ideological socialization designed to legitimate the system in the eyes of the citizenry. One of the unintended consequences of these efforts is the generation of material expectations among many groups in society that the system will never be able to meet. Encoded in this failure to realize these expectations, then, is an ever

greater likelihood of popular discontent and protest against the system.

ABSENCE OF REPRESSION

Another macro-political factor often associated with the rise of a social movement is the absence or relatively restrained use of repressive social control by movement opponents. Smelser (1962) was one of the first theorists to emphasize the importance of this factor. While analytically distinct from the previous two conditions, the absence of repression frequently occurs in conjunction with both of these factors.

In a situation where expanding political opportunities have significantly improved the bargaining position of a particular group, movement opponents are likely to exercise more restraint in dealing with the challenger. Unlike before, when the powerless status of the challenger made it a relatively "safe" target, its improved position now increases the risk of political reprisals against any who would seek to repress it. Thus repression is less likely to be attempted even in the face of an increased threat to the interests of other groups. This argument figures prominently in McAdam's (1982, pp. 87-90) account of the rise of the civil rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s. Using the annual number of lynchings as a crude measure of repression, he has documented a significant decline in lynching during the period (1930-1955) when black political fortunes were on the rise nationally. The suggestion is that the growing political power of blacks nationally increased the South's fear of federal intervention and thus restrained the use of extreme control measures. In turn, this restraint created a more favorable context in which blacks could mobilize.

Recourse to repressive measures is also likely to decline during regime crises as the coercive capacity of the state deteriorates. Skocpol (1979) places great stress on this dynamic in her analysis of revolution, arguing that it is the collapse of the state as a repressive agent that sets in motion widespread collective action. One need look no further than Iran under the Shah for a recent example of this. As the crisis in Iran deepened, the Shah's ability to utilize the repressive measures he had once used so successfully declined rapidly. When, at last, large segments of the armed forces abandoned the regime, the last restraints on mobilization were removed foreshadowing the Shah's ouster. A similar dynamic seems to have been played out in the Philippines in the month before Marcos's departure, as well as in Nicaragua in the period prior to the overthrow of the Somoza regime.[7]

WELFARE STATE EXPANSION AND THE RISE OF "NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS"

One final political factor that has been linked to the generation of social movements is the penetration of the state into previously private areas of life. This factor has primarily been stressed by proponents of the *new social movements* approach (see Klandermans, 1986; Melucci, 1980, 1981), and is often couched in terms of a broader Marxist view of the state. While there are nearly as many versions of new social movement theory as there are variations on the resource mobilization perspective, we can identify various themes that show up with great regularity in the writings of those working in this tradition.

Perhaps the most straightforward of those themes is simply that the new social movements —principally the women's, environmental, and peace movements—represent a reaction to certain modernization processes in late capitalist societies. Among the authors stressing this idea are Brand (1982), Melucci (1980) and Van der Loo, Snel, and Van Steenbergen (1984). Of the processes thought to be productive of these new movements, none would appear to have received as much attention as what has been termed the "politicization of private life." The argument here is straightforward. The contradictions inherent in postindustrial capitalist economies have forced the state to intervene in previously private areas of life. The state is required to do so both to underwrite the process of capital accumulation (O'Connor, 1973) as well as to satisfy needs no longer satisfactorily addressed by an ailing market economy. In turn, new social movements have emerged in response to this unprecedented state penetration into various private spheres of life. In this view, movements as diverse as the women's, environmental, and gay rights campaigns can be seen as efforts to regain control over decisions and areas of life increasingly subject to state control.

The rise of these movements has been accompanied, or in some formulations triggered, by the rise of new values (Inglehart, 1977). Born of popular discontent with the nature of postmodern society, these new values are seen as providing the ideological and motivational backdrop for the emergence of the new social movements. Among the new values thought to characterize the postmodern age are a desire for community, self-actualization, and personal, as opposed to occupational, satisfaction. Empirically, other value changes noted by researchers include a decline in the traditional work ethic, and an erosion of conventional middle-class values

as regards work and family life (Brand, 1982; Oudijk, 1983).

All of the processes reviewed above have a kind of reactive quality to them. That is, the rise of postmodern values and the new movements thought to embody those values are typically described as reactions to the dissolution throughout Europe of more traditional ways of life following World War II. In this sense, it may be more accurate to classify the new social movements as "reactive" rather than new movements in any strict sense. There is, however, one final group of new social movement theorists who link the rise of these movements less to any collective reaction against modernization than to the frustration of new material and status aspirations that have accompanied the rise of the modern welfare state (see de Geest, 1984; Hirsch, 1980). As the state has come to penetrate more and more areas of life, it hasn't simply disrupted older ways of life, but also created new status groups who are dependent upon it for the satisfaction of a wide range of material and status needs. The failure to satisfy those needs has, in the view of these authors, contributed to the rise of these new social movements.

Macro Economic Conditions

Quite apart from the important influence of broad political processes, certain strictly economic characteristics of the larger society would seem to exert an independent influence on the likelihood of movement emergence.

PROSPERITY AS PRE-CONDITION OF SOCIAL MOVEMENT ACTIVITY

Much early theorizing about social movements centered on the relationship between collective action and economic conditions. Such theorizing was evident at both the micro and macro levels. At the micro level it was assumed that the most deprived individuals would be the most likely to participate in movements. Second, it was expected that massive growth in societal wealth would dampen the need for social movement activity. Both of these general assumptions appear to be contradicted by empirical evidence. The most deprived appear unlikely to sustain more than momentary insurgency, and, other things being equal, general societal prosperity seems often to be related to a rise in social movement activity. Several factors would seem to explain this latter relationship. First of all, wealthy societies tend to produce the general conditions that favor the emergence of newly organized collectivities. The growth of rapid communication, the expansion of the intellectual classes (Zald and McCarthy, 1977), and the development of new social technologies increase the level of grievance production in a society. Though such a state of affairs may not guarantee the success of social movement efforts, it can be expected to increase their relative frequency. So, indirectly, expanding wealth has led to expanding social movement activity (McCarthy and Zald, 1973). Prosperity may also encourage a rise in movement activity through two other, more direct, processes.

Wealthy societies may create the opportunities for entrepreneurs of grievances to attempt to develop new social movement products. This approach has been labeled the "entrepreneurial theory of social movements" (Jenkins, 1983). It has been shown useful in understanding the emergence of the "public interest movement" (Berry, 1977; McFarland, 1976, 1984), aspects of the "environmental movement" (Simcock, 1979; Wood, 1982), and the National Welfare Rights Organization (Bailis, 1974; West, 1981). Indeed, such an approach to understanding the generation of social movement activity has begun to be codified by theorists under the label of "social marketing." These analysts attempt to determine the most auspicious conditions under which the marketing of social causes may be successful (Fox and Kotler, 1980; Kotler and Zaltman, 1971).

In an ironic variation on Ronald Reagan's "trickle down" economics, general societal prosperity may also serve to promote collective action by raising the level of resources available to support such action. Those who provide such resources from outside of the aggrieved group have been called "conscience constituents" (McCarthy and Zald, 1973). Many movements in the recent period, such as animal rights and prolife, have been staffed and funded exclusively by conscience constituents. In addition, massive external resources have flowed into many movements ostensibly led by members of the deprived group. The civil rights movement, for instance, benefited by large flows of external resources, though assessments of the timing of such flows (McAdam, 1982) suggest that they followed the emergence and major growth of this movement rather than preceding and generating it. Jenkins and Eckert's (1986) analysis of the role of private foundations in the funding of civil rights groups supports this conclusion. In a wide variety of ways, then, wealth and the resources that accompany that wealth

would seem to increase rather than dampen the prospects for successful collective action.

Macro Organizational Conditions

Another contribution of the recent scholarship on the macro-level dynamics of collective action is the accumulation of evidence attesting to the importance of broad organizational factors in the genesis of movements. Macro-political and economic processes may create the opportunity for successful collective action, but often it is the internal structure of the population in question that determines whether this opportunity will be realized.

ECOLOGICAL CONCENTRATION

One such characteristic is the degree of geographic concentration in the residential or occupational patterns of a group's everyday lives. Geographic concentration has the important effect of increasing the density of interaction between group members, thereby facilitating recruitment. This may help to explain the oft-noted relationship between urbanization/industrialization and collective action. Traditionally, movement theorists sought to explain this relationship on the basis of the presumed psychological tensions generated by rapid social change (see Kornhauser, 1959, pp. 143-58). It would seem more likely, however, that the impetus is more structural/organizational than psychological in nature. By creating ecologically dense concentrations of relatively homogeneous people, urbanization would seem to increase the structural potential for collective action. Several scholars (McAdam, 1982, pp. 94-98; Wilson, 1973, pp. 140-151) have advanced this argument with respect to the civil rights movement. In this view the rural to urban migration of blacks within the South greatly enhanced the prospects for collective action by transforming an impoverished, geographically dispersed mass into an increasingly well-organized urban population.

In his analysis of the "youth ghetto," John Lofland (1969) makes use of the same idea, arguing that large concentrations of young people around university campuses increases the likelihood of all manner of youth movements. Similarly, John D'Emillio (1983) has argued that the mass concentrations of servicemen during World War II had the effect of creating large homosexual populations in certain U.S. cities. In turn, these incipient gay communities were in the forefront of gay rights organizing in the

late 1960s. Finally, Nielsen (1980) has noted the importance of ecological concentration in his account of the recent spate of ethnic separatist movements in Europe.

Other authors have attributed a similar effect to industrialization, arguing that the strike as the prototypical "modern" form of collective action was made possible by the ecological concentration of large numbers of economically homogeneous workers in large factories (see Foster, 1974; Lincoln, 1978; Lodhi and Tilly, 1973; Shorter and Tilly, 1974). As the Tillys explain, "urbanization and industrialization . . . are by no means irrelevant to collective violence. It is just that their effects do not work as . . . [traditional] theories say they should. Instead of a short-run generation of strain, followed by protest, we find a long-run transformation of the structures . . . of collective action" (Tilly, Tilly, and Tilly, 1975, p. 254).

LEVEL OF PRIOR ORGANIZATION

The level of prior organization in a given population is also expected to enhance the prospects for successful collective action. Certainly this is the important implication of a number of significant analyses of movement emergence. Oberschall (1973), for instance, has proposed a theory of mobilization in which he assigns paramount importance to the degree of organization in the aggrieved group. In her analysis of the emergence of the contemporary women's movement, Jo Freeman (1973) focuses special attention on several processes occurring in the early 1960s that left women with the stronger organizational "infrastructure" needed to generate and sustain collective action. Morris's analysis (1984) of the emergent phase of the civil rights movement stresses, above all else, the strength and breadth of indigenous organization as the crucial factor in the rapid spread of the movement. Consistent with Morris's analysis, McAdam (1982) has linked the emergence of the civil rights movement to a period of institution building in the black community that afforded blacks the indigenous organizations—black churches, black colleges, local NAACP chapters—out of which the movement grew and developed. Based on these studies, one would expect that the greater the density of social organization, the more likely that social movement activity will develop. This hypothesis can be used not only to predict variation in mobilization between groups within a society, but between societies as well.

Differences in the *types* of organizations active during particular eras is expected to corre-

spond to shifts in the organizational locus of movement activity. Focusing only on the United States, it is clear that changes in the relative strength of various types of organizations is a common occurrence. So veterans' organizations form in waves, leaving some cohorts relatively unorganized. Burial societies have declined with the growth of the welfare state. PTAs grew commensurate with the growth of mass education. Finally, political parties have declined in the face of the broad substitution of mass-media political advertising for grass roots party organizing (Polsby, 1983).

Cross-national differences in type of organizations can also be linked to variation in the forms of collective action that predominate in various societies. For instance, union membership is much lower in the United States than in most Western European nations. This may help to explain why working class movements have historically—and especially since 1940—played less of a role in politics in this country than in most European nations.

On the other hand, the United States is especially dense in religiously based social organization compared with Western European nations and Japan, and this density has not lessened either with economic growth or other forms of secularization. Religious group membership is the most common form of associational membership in the United States. It is hardly surprising, then, that many mass movements have been organizationally rooted in churches. Such movements would include the abolition movement, the second Ku Klux Klan, the prohibition movement, the civil rights movement and the prolife movement (Zald and McCarthy, 1987), to say nothing of the countless religious movements to arise in the U.S.

ABSENCE OF CROSS-CUTTING SOLIDARITIES

It isn't simply the ecological concentration of groups or density of formal organizations that enhances the prospects for collective action. Just as important as the internal organization of the population in question, is the extent and strength of its ties to other groups in society. To the extent that these ties are strong and numerous, the likelihood of a social movement arising would seem to be diminished. This is an old idea that is embedded in pluralist and mass society (Kornhauser, 1959) perspectives, deriving in turn from de Tocqueville's analysis of the French Revolution. It deserves, however, to survive the decline of these two perspectives.

This factor may help account for the sizable opposition encountered by the women's move-

ment among married women in the United States. The point is, women are not only geographically dispersed in society, but linked to men through a wide variety of social, political, and economic ties. These ties, then, give many women more of an interest in emphasizing the cooperative rather than the conflictual aspects of their relationships with men. This is all the more likely to be true when the net effect of those links is to make women financially dependent on men. Efforts to create groups or communities free from male influence, such as consciousness-raising groups or feminist communes, attest to the seriousness of the problem as well as the attempts of feminists to deal with it.

On the other hand, groups that are not well linked to other segments of society may find themselves at an advantage when it comes to organizing for collective action (Oberschall, 1973, pp. 118-124). The advantages of isolation are twofold. First, the absence of ties to other groups minimizes the effect that appeals to loyalty might have in the case of better integrated antagonists. Second, under conditions of real separation, the target group may lack the minimum ties required to threaten political or economic reprisals as a means of controlling the movement. The ability of southern blacks, farmworkers, students, and the untouchables in India to organize successful movements may owe in part to the benefits of this type of segregation.

Micro Theory and Research on Recruitment to Activism

Companion to the macro question of *movement emergence* is the micro question of *individual recruitment* to activism. Just as one might ask what broad political, economic, or organizational factors make a movement more likely in the first place, so too can one seek to identify those micro-level factors that lead an individual to get involved in collective action. Clearly, the two questions are closely related. Obviously no movement will take place unless individuals choose to become involved. At the same time, a lot of what prompts an individual to get involved is the sense of momentum that an already existing movement is able to communicate. Thus the two processes—movement emergence and individual recruitment—are expected to go hand in hand. It is important to keep in mind, though, that they remain two separate processes. Explaining why an individual

comes to participate in collective action does not suffice as an account of why a particular movement emerged when it did. By the same token, knowing what processes produced a movement tells us little about the factors that encouraged particular individuals to affiliate with that movement. In this section we intend to stay focused on these latter factors. They can be grouped into two general categories. The traditional dominance of social psychological perspectives in the study of collective behavior and social movements has left us with an extensive empirical literature on the *individual* correlates of movement participation. At the same time, the recent popularity of the resource mobilization and other "rationalist" perspectives on social movements has served to stimulate a new body of research on the *micro-structural* dynamics of recruitment to action.

Individual Accounts of Activism

Among the topics that have most concerned researchers in the field of social movements is that of differential recruitment (Jenkins, 1983, p. 528; Zurcher and Snow, 1981, p. 449). What accounts for individual variation in movement participation? Why does one individual get involved while another remains inactive? Until recently, researchers have sought to answer these questions on the basis of individual characteristics of movement activists. The basic assumption underlying such accounts is simply that it is some attribute of the individual that either compels participation or, at the very least, renders them susceptible to movement recruiting appeals. This assumption has informed most individually based motivational accounts of participation in political or religious movements (see Block, Haan, and Smith, 1968; Braungart, 1971; Feuer, 1969; Glock, 1964; Klapp, 1969; Levine, 1980; Rothman and Lichter, 1978; Toch, 1965). Such accounts can be differentiated on the basis of those attributes of the individual that are held to be significant in producing activism. These would include psychological, attitudinal, and rational choice explanations of participation.

PSYCHOLOGICAL ACCOUNTS OF ACTIVISM

Many individual motivational accounts of activism identify a particular psychological state or characteristic as the root cause of participation. The emphasis is on character traits or stressful states of mind that dispose the individual toward participation.

But while the underlying model remains the same, the specific characteristics identified as significant by proponents of these approaches vary widely. As an example, the cluster of personality traits known as authoritarianism have been argued to serve as an important precipitant of involvement in social movements (Adorno and Frenkel-Brunswick, 1950; Hoffer, 1951; Lipset and Rabb, 1973). So too has the desire to achieve "cognitive consistency" in one's attitudes, values, or behavior. Drawing on theories of cognitive consistency (Rokeach, 1969), this account of individual activism is based on the idea that "when people become conscious of inconsistency, it is in their psychological self interest to change . . . members of a social movement represent a special case: they have recognized inconsistencies that other people do not acknowledge and that are institutionalized in society" (Carden, 1978). Another variation on this theme has movement participants being drawn disproportionately from among the marginal, alienated members of society (see Aberle, 1966; Klapp, 1969; Kornhauser, 1959). In this view it is the individual's desire to overcome his or her feelings of alienation and achieve the sense of community they lack in their life that prompts them to participate in collective action. In the same vein, Lewis Feuer (1969) sought to explain student activism on the basis of unresolved Oedipal conflicts between male activists and their fathers.

Of all the versions of this model, however, perhaps none has generated as much research attention as the theory of relative deprivation. The theory holds that it is an unfavorable gap between what a person feels he or she is entitled to and what, in fact, they are receiving that encourages activism. The underlying motivation for participation, however, is not so much the substantive desire to close the gap. Whether framed as an extension of the frustration-aggression hypothesis (Davies, 1963, 1969; Feieraband, Feieraband, and Nesvold, 1969; Gurr, 1970) or grounded in the literature on cognitive balance (Geschwender, 1968; Morrison, 1973), the theory assumes "an underlying state of individual psychological tension that is relieved by SM participation" (Gurney and Tierney, 1982, p. 36).

For all their apparent theoretical sophistication, empirical support for all of these individually based psychological accounts of participation has proved elusive. Summarizing his exhaustive survey of the literature on the relationship between activism and various psychological factors, Mueller (1980, p. 69) concludes that "psychological attributes of individuals,

such as frustration and alienation, have minimal direct impact for explaining the occurrence of rebellion and revolution per se." Echoing this view, Wilson and Orum (1976, p. 189) offer a similar assessment of the empirical record. "We conclude," they say, "that the many analyses . . . of collective actions during the past decade, impress upon us the poverty of psychology; or, at the very least, the limitations of psychology" (p. 189).

ATTITUDINAL CORRELATES OF ACTIVISM

Similar to the logic of the psychological models reviewed above, attitudinal accounts of activism locate the roots of participation squarely within the individual actor. The claim is simple enough: Activism grows out of strong attitudinal support for the values and goals of the movement. Such accounts were especially popular as applied to student activism in the late 1960s and early 1970s. According to this view, the actions of student radicals were motivated by their desire to actualize the political values and attitudes of their parents (see Block, 1972; Flacks, 1967; Keniston, 1968).

To their credit, the advocates of this approach have rejected the somewhat mechanistic psychological models of activism sketched earlier. In their place, they have substituted a straightforward behavioral link between a person's political attitudes and participation in collective action. Unfortunately, this conceptual advance has not produced any corresponding improvement in predictive power at the empirical level. Based on his analysis of 215 studies of the relationship between individual attitudes and riot participation, McPhail (1971) concludes that "individual predispositions are, at best, insufficient to account" for participation in collective action.

In general, the discrepancy between attitudes and behavior has been borne out by countless studies conducted over the years. In summarizing the results of these studies, Wicker (1969) offered what remains the definitive word on the subject. Said Wicker, there exists "little evidence to support the postulated existence of stable, underlying attitudes within the individual which influence both his verbal expressions and his actions" (p. 75).

Does this mean that attitudes are totally irrelevant to the study of individual activism? Certainly not. Rather, their importance has been overstated in many accounts of movement participation. In our view, attitudes remain important insofar as they demarcate a "latitude of rejection" (Petty and Cacioppo, 1981) within

which individuals are highly unlikely to get involved in a given movement. That is, certain prior attitudes will virtually preclude a segment of the population from participating in even the mildest forms of activism. However, in the case of most movements the size of the pool of recruits—the "latitude of acceptance"—is still many times larger than the actual number of persons who take part in any given instance of activism. Klandermans and Oegema (1984) provide an interesting illustration of the size of these respective groups in their study of recruitment to a major peace demonstration in the Netherlands. Based on before-and-after interviews with a sample of 114 persons, the authors conclude that 26% of those interviewed fell within the "latitude of rejection" as regards the goals of the demonstration. That left nearly three-quarters of the sample as potentially available for recruitment. Yet only 4% actually attended the rally. It is precisely this disparity between attitudinal affinity and actual participation that, of course, requires explanation. One thing seems clear, however; given the size of this disparity, the role of individual attitudes (and the background factors from which they derive) in shaping activism must be regarded as fairly limited. If 96% of all those who are attitudinally available for activism choose, as they did in this case, not to participate, then clearly some other factor or set of factors is mediating the recruitment process.

SUDDENLY IMPOSED GRIEVANCES

A special set of circumstances that may encourage a larger number of people to act on their attitudinal dispositions follows from the imposition of what Edward Walsh (1981) has called "suddenly imposed grievances." The concept is intended to describe those dramatic, highly publicized, and often unexpected events—manmade disasters, major court decisions, official violence—that serve to dramatize and therefore increase public awareness of and opposition to particular grievances. As an example of this process, Walsh (1981) cites and analyzes the generation of antinuclear activity in the area of Three Mile Island following the accident there.

Nor is Walsh's the only example of this process. Bert Useem's (1980) analysis of the antibusing movement that developed in Boston during the mid-seventies leaves little doubt that the resistance was set in motion by a highly publicized court order mandating busing. Molotch (1970) documents a similar rise in protest activity among residents of Santa Barbara, California, in the wake of a major oil spill there. Even

rising national opposition to the Vietnam War in the late 1960s can be interpreted within this framework. The war itself can be seen, as it was at the time, as a series of suddenly imposed grievances—higher draft quotas, the "secret" bombing of Cambodia, the killing of students at Kent State, the elimination of student deferments—each of which in turn fueled growing protest against the war.

RATIONAL CHOICE ACCOUNTS OF ACTIVISM

Many social movement theorists have posited the assumption that individuals are calculating actors who attempt, within the bounds of limited rationality, to judge the potential costs and benefits of various lines of action (see Friedman, 1983; Oberschall, 1973). As regards movement participation, the argument is straightforward. If the costs of participation are seen as extremely high, then many potential recruits are expected to choose another course of action. Alternatively, if the anticipated benefits of activism are high, then participation is the likely result.

It is this assumption that underlies the important work of Mancur Olson (1965). Olson's contention is that rational calculation would lead few actors to choose collective action as a means of obtaining public goods, since they could expect to obtain those goods whether they were active or not. He goes on to explore two conditions under which collective behavior can nevertheless be expected. These conditions involve the provision of selective incentives to increase the rewards of those engaging in collective action, and the sanctions on nonparticipants for their failure to participate. Others have explored additional factors that may alter the risk and reward matrices actors use to choose from among various courses of action, or undermine the salience of such narrowly economic cost-benefit calculations. The former include Oliver's work (1984) on the relationship between cost calculations and the numbers of people involved in actions or movements. An example of the latter would be Fireman and Gamson's work (1979) on the conditions under which group solidarity may be expected to override simple cost-benefit calculations. Another example would be Friedman's work (1988) on structural conditions—particularly contextual uncertainty—that serve to undermine the basis of rational calculus and thereby increase the likelihood of collective action. Finally, several large membership surveys suggest that solidary and purposive incentives are more important in explaining participation in a variety of voluntary associations

(Knoke, 1986) and in the major national environmental groups (Mitchell, 1979) than are selective incentives. Mitchell argues further that the threat of "public bads" may be far more important in motivating some forms of activism than is the provision of "public goods," as conceived by rational choice theorists.

Micro-Structural Accounts of Activism

The increasing influence over the last decade of resource mobilization, political process, and other more political or structural perspectives on social movements has led to growing dissatisfaction with the individual accounts of activism. The argument is that people don't participate in movements so much because they are psychologically or attitudinally compelled to, but because their structural location in the world makes it easier for them to do so. It matters little if one is ideologically or psychologically disposed to participation if he or she lacks the structural vehicle that could "pull" them into protest activity.

Consistent with this line of argument, a number of recent studies have demonstrated the primacy of structural factors in accounting for activism (Fernandez and McAdam, 1987; McAdam, 1986; McCarthy, 1987; Orum, 1972; Rosenthal et al., 1985; Snow, Zurcher, and Ekland-Olson, 1980). Specifically, at least four structural factors have been linked to individual participation in movement activities.

PRIOR CONTACT WITH A MOVEMENT MEMBER

The factor that has been shown to bear the strongest relationship to activism is prior contact with another movement participant (Briet, Klandermans, and Kroon, 1984; Gerlach and Hine, 1970; Heirich, 1977; McAdam, 1986; Orum, 1972; Snow, Zurcher, and Ekland-Olson, 1980; Von Eschen, Kirk, and Pinard, 1971; Zurcher and Kirkpatrick, 1976). Bolton (1972, p. 558), for example, found that "most recruits" into the two peace groups he studied "were already associated with persons who belonged to or were organizing the peace group, and were recruited through these interpersonal channels." Similarly, Snow's (1976) analysis of the recruitment patterns of 330 members of the Nichiren Shoshu Buddhist movement in America revealed that 82% had been drawn into the movement by virtue of existing ties to other members. In a study of all applicants to the 1964 Mississippi Freedom Summer project, McAdam (1986) found twice as many participants to have

"strong ties" to other volunteers than did applicants who withdrew in advance of the campaign. The fact that these "withdrawals" were indistinguishable from actual participants in their level of attitudinal support for the project only serves to underscore the relative importance of attitudinal versus micro-structural factors in recruitment to activism. These findings are very much in accord with those reported by Snow, Zurcher, and Ekland-Olson (1980) in their important survey of the empirical literature on movement recruitment. Of the nine empirical studies reviewed in their article, all but one identified prior interpersonal contact as the single richest source of movement recruits.[8]

MEMBERSHIP IN ORGANIZATIONS

Another micro-structural factor that has been linked to individual activism is the number of organizations the potential recruit belongs to. Belonging to a number of organizations may encourage activism in a variety of ways. In view of the well-documented association between organizational participation and feelings of personal efficacy (see Sayre, 1980; Neal and Seeman, 1964), it may simply be that those who are organizationally active are more likely to regard activism as potentially effective and therefore worth participating in. Or it may be that involvement in an organization increases a persons chances of learning about movement activity. Movement organizers have long appreciated how difficult it is to recruit single, isolated individuals and therefore expend most of their energies on mobilizing support within existing organizations. This tendency means that "joiners" are more likely to be aware and therefore "at risk" of being drawn into movement activities.

The final explanation for the link between organizational participation and activism represents a simple extension of the factor discussed in the previous section. To the extent that membership in organizations expands a person's range of interpersonal contacts, it also increases their susceptibility to the kind of personal recruiting appeals that have been shown to be so effective in drawing people into movements.

Regardless of the mix of factors accounting for the relationship, the empirical evidence for its existence is clear. Orum (1972, p. 50), for example, found a consistent positive relationship between involvement in the black student sit-in movement and number of campus organizations the student belonged to. McAdam's (1986) data on applicants to the Freedom Summer project showed participants to have higher rates of organizational membership than nonparticipants. Several other studies report similar findings as well (see Barnes and Kaase, 1979; Von Eschen, Kirk, and Pinard, 1971; Walsh and Warland, 1983).

HISTORY OF PRIOR ACTIVISM

Though the relationship between activism at different points in time has not been studied much, the limited evidence that is available strongly supports the idea that a history of prior activism increases the likelihood of future activism. For instance, in their laboratory simulation of micro mobilization, Gamson, Freeman, and Rytina (1982) found that those individuals who had previously been involved in some form of collective action were more likely to be involved in "rebellious" groups. McAdam's follow-up study of the Freedom Summer applicants produced two pieces of evidence linking prior and subsequent activism. First, those who participated in the project had higher levels of prior civil rights activism than those who withdrew from the project (1986, pp. 81-82). Second, among the strongest predictors of current activism among the applicants was their level of activism between 1964 and 1970 (McAdam, 1988).

Three factors would seem to account for the positive relationship between prior and subsequent activism. The first is simply "know-how" or previous experience. To the extent that one is familiar with a particular form of social behavior, it makes sense that they would be more likely to engage in it. Some may gain this familiarity from sources other than direct experience, but experience is by far the most important teacher of such skills. Individuals who have engaged in collective action in the past can be expected to be more likely to possess the knowledge required to do so in the future.

A second explanation for the positive effect of movement participation on subsequent activism centers on role theory and the process by which we learn any new social role. The point is, "activist" is as much a social role as "college student," "sociologist," or any other role one could think of. Part of what happens in the course of movement activities, then, is that the new recruit is gradually socialized into this role (Lofland, 1977). The longer they stay in the movement, the greater the importance they are likely to ascribe to the role of "activist." As one accords any role greater importance, the desire to act out the role also increases, so that subsequent activism becomes a means of confirming or reinforcing an important part of one's identity.

A third way of accounting for the persistence of activism over time is to focus upon the "sunk social costs" that have been expended in any long-standing line of action. Becker (1963) uses this notion to understand such lines of action as behavioral "careers," whether deviant or legitimate. One can be thought to invest time, energy, relationships, as well as more tangible resources in pursuing activism. The costs of exit from such a line of action are thus substantial, thereby encouraging continued adherence to the role.

BIOGRAPHICAL AVAILABILITY

To this point we have emphasized the importance of various structural links between the potential recruit and movement in trying to account for individual activism. What this view omits is the biographical context in which this contact occurs. Quite apart from the "pull" exerted by these links, the biographical circumstances of a person's life may serve to encourage or constrain participation in important ways. The concept of "biographical availability" is intended to capture this impact and can be defined simply "as the absence of personal constraints that may increase the costs and risks of movement participation such as full-time employment, marriage, and family responsibilities" (McAdam, 1986, p. 70).

McCarthy and Zald (1973) appear to have been the first to note the effect of such constraints on the patterning of collective action. Their observations concerning the unusually high numbers of students and autonomous professionals who are active in movements reflected a clear understanding of the way biography constrains activism. Snow and Rochford (1983, p. 3) found that "a substantial majority of [Hare] Krishna recruits had few countervailing ties which might have served to constrain their participation in the movement." In his recent book on the Hare Krishna, Rochford (1985, pp. 76-84) provides additional data bearing on this issue. Finally, in his study of recruitment to the Freedom Summer project, McAdam (1986, p. 83) notes the degree to which his subjects were "remarkably free of personal constraints that might have inhibited participation."

Macro-Micro Bridges in Movement Emergence

How do we go about linking these two distinct literatures on movement emergence? That there must be a link between the two should be obvious. While broad political, economic, and organizational factors may combine to create a certain "macro potential" for collective action, that potential can only be realized through complex mobilization dynamics that unfold at either the micro or some intermediate institutional level. At the same time, these mobilization processes are clearly a collective, rather than an individual phenomena. That is, we are convinced that movements are not aggregations of discontented *individuals*. True to our designation, collective action is a profoundly *collective* phenomenon, not only once under way but in its genesis as well. Individual rebels did not take to the street and somehow come together on their way to the Boston Tea Party. Rather, we expect that the decision itself was framed and reached collectively. The point is, we can no more build social movements from the individual up than down from some broad societal process. We believe the real action takes place at a third level, intermediate between the individual and the broad macro contexts in which they are embedded. In the remainder of this section we will attempt to describe this intermediate level and account for its significance in the process of movement emergence. Just how does the assessment and translation of macro events into micro mobilization take place during the emergent phase of collective action?

Micro-Mobilization Contexts

The key concept linking macro- and microprocesses in movement emergence is that of the *micro-mobilization context*. A micro-mobilization context can be defined as any small group setting in which processes of collective attribution are combined with rudimentary forms of organization to produce mobilization for collective action. Several examples of such settings will help to clarify the concept. Perhaps the most obvious example is that of the extant political group. Unions, for instance, serve as the existing context in which grievances can be shared and translated into concrete forms of action. Nor is it only the entire union that can serve in this capacity. Subgroups within a union, organized informally on the basis of seniority or along task, racial, or even friendship lines may provide a basis for mobilization independent of the broader union context. This is often what happens in the case of wildcat strikes, or in instances where small, informally organized groups of workers become active in other movements. An example of the latter would be the "hardhat

marches" organized in the early 1970s by construction workers supporting the war in Vietnam.

This example of "extracurricular" mobilization can apply to nonpolitical groups as well. That is, groups organized for ostensibly nonpolitical purposes can serve as the settings within which attribution and organization come together to produce collective political action. Several authors have, for example, noted the importance of black churches as collective settings in which early civil rights organizing took place (see McAdam, 1982; Morris, 1984; Oberschall, 1973, pp. 126-127). Curtis and Zurcher (1973, p. 56) assign similar importance to a variety of "nonpolitical" organizations—but especially "fraternal/service" groups—in their analysis of the emergence of a local antipornography movement in Texas. Finally, Snow and Marshall (1984) document the important organizational role played by mosques in the early days of the Iranian Revolution.

Micro-mobilization may also take place in smaller, informal groups of people. For instance, friendship networks have been known to furnish the crucial context for micro mobilization. Perhaps the best-known example of this is the case of the four Greensboro A&T students who precipitated the 1960 black student sit-in movement with a demonstration that originated in informal "bull sessions" in one another's dorm rooms. Similarly, Sarah Evans (1980) locates the roots of the women's liberation movement in informal networks of women who had come to know one another in the context of civil rights and New Left organizing. Even participation in the urban riots of the 1960s has been seen as growing out of this type of informal group. Wilson and Orum (1976, p. 198) write: "Many analysts have found themselves baffled by the riots of the 1960s; explanations presumed to work, such as those based on conventional psychological theories do not. On the basis of our limited experience with and observations of these events, it appears to us that social bonds alike, i.e. friendship networks, drew many people to become active participants."

Despite these differences in the size and degree of formal organization of these various collective settings, all serve to encourage mobilization in at least three ways. First, they provide the context in which the all-important process of collective attribution can occur. We will discuss this process in greater detail later in this section. For now we need only note its significance in the generation of social insurgency. Broad macroprocesses only create a more or less favorable opportunity for collective ac-

tion. Mediating between opportunity and action are people and the subjective meanings they attach to their situations. As Edelman (1971, p. 133) has pointed out: "Our explanations of mass political response have radically undervalued the ability of the human mind . . . to take a complex set of . . . cues into account [and] evolve a mutually acceptable form of response." This process must occur if an organized protest campaign is to take place. The important point for our purpose is that the potential for this process occurring is greatest in the type of contexts we have been discussing.

Second, these settings provide the rudiments of organization—leaders, whether formally designated or not, communication technologies, and so on—needed to translate attributions into concrete action. It is not enough that people define situations in new and potentially revolutionary ways; they must also act on these definitions to create a movement. These contexts provide the established roles and lines of interaction necessary for action to unfold.

Finally, in these collective settings are to be found the established structures of solidary incentives on which most social behavior depends. By "structures of solidary incentives" we refer to the myriad interpersonal rewards that attach to ongoing participation in any established group or informal association. It is expected that these incentive structures will solve or at least mitigate the effects of the "free-rider" problem (Fireman and Gamson, 1979).

First discussed by Mancur Olson (1965), the "free-rider problem" refers to the difficulties insurgents encounter in trying to convince participants to pursue goals whose benefits they would derive even if they did not participate in the movement. When viewed in the light of a narrow economic calculus, movement participation would indeed seem to be irrational. Even if we correct for Olson's overly rationalistic model of the individual, the "free-rider" mentality would still seem to pose a formidable barrier to movement recruitment. The solution to this problem is held to stem from the provision of selective incentives to induce the participation that individual calculation would alone seem to preclude (Gamson, 1975, pp. 66-71; Olson, 1965).

Within established groups, however, the need to provide selective incentives would appear to be substantially reduced. These groups already rest on a solid structure of solidary incentives that insurgents can attempt to appropriate by defining movement participation as synonymous with group membership. If this effect is successful, the myriad incentives that have

heretofore served as the motive force for participation in the group will now be transferred to the movement. This spares insurgents the difficult task of inducing participation through the provision of new incentives of either a solidary or material nature.

For all these reasons then, informal groups or associational networks such as those discussed earlier are expected to serve as the basic building blocks of social movements. In effect, they consititute the "cell structure" of collective action. However, this still leaves the issue of micromacro bridges unexamined. How do these mobilization contexts serve to link the macro and micro factors discussed earlier?

MACRO-DETERMINANTS OF MICRO-MOBILIZATION CONTEXTS

What we have termed micro-mobilization contexts can be thought of as a dense network of intermediate-level groups and informal associations. The density of such networks, however, varies both between and within groups in society. Some groups appear as a veritable lattice work of such groupings, while others are handicapped by what McCarthy (1987) has termed "infrastructure deficits." In turn, the level of infrastructure in a given population is itself shaped by the type of macro factors discussed earlier. Broad macroprocesses, such as industrialization, urbanization, mass migration, and the like, largely determine the degree to which groups in society are organized and the structure of that organization. The extent and structure of that organization in turn imply very different potentials for collective action.

To illustrate the ways in which broad societal dynamics shape the level of social organization and therefore the potential for collective action of various groups, we have selected three examples for further discussion. In all three cases, the rise of new social movements has been linked by analysts to macro-level processes that left particular groups in a much stronger organizational position to launch collective action.

CHANGES IN THE STATUS OF WOMEN AND THE EMERGENCE OF THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

Feminist movements have emerged at various times in Western nations during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The most recent wave of feminist movements has attracted extensive attention and analysis by feminists and social movement scholars. Most of these accounts begin with a macroanalysis of the changing

status of women in modern Western industrial nations. For instance, Jo Freeman writes, "The effects of women moving into paid employment —on women, the economy, the family, and a host of other institutions—have been a major source of strain to which the feminist movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have been one response" (Freeman, 1975). Several authors have carried this theme a step further and analyzed the development of gender conflict in the workplace as a function of the clash of traditional and modern conceptions of the female role. Weinstein (1979), for example, shows how the massive movement of women into full-time employment has clashed with long-standing conceptions of "women's duties" to produce mini-feminist revolts in many offices and other work settings. In effect, the gender revolution in work has left women in a stronger organizational position to challenge traditional gender roles. Just as industrialization served to concentrate the urban proletariat in neighborhoods and factories from which they could launch collective action, the entrance of large numbers of women into paid employment has had a similar effect. Grouping women of considerable education and ambition together in gender-restrictive work settings has created a socially and politically volatile situation especially ripe for collective action. Pharr (in press) has noted the same dynamic in the Japanese workplace, where female workers have resisted pressure to be both modern employees and traditional women.

It is interesting that the same type of analysis has been used to account for the emergence of a variety of movements that have emerged in opposition to the feminist movement (i.e., Conover and Gray, 1983; Luker, 1984). Such reactionary movements include the anti-ERA and prolife movements. These movements are seen as emerging out of the pools of traditional women threatened by the lifestyles and politics of modern, employed, professional women. Like those who have studied the origins of modern feminism, analysts of these various countermovements have sought to understand their origins in relation to fundamental changes in the organization of women's lives.

MASS HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE RISE OF THE "NEW CLASS"

Observers of changes in the class structure of modern societies have not ignored the massive growth in higher education and the political consequences thought to stem from it. The growth in numbers of young people enrolled in

higher education is a worldwide phenomenon, and is led by trends in the United States where close to 50% of high school graduates go on to spend some time in college. Two lines of analysis have emerged from these observations that have important implications for an understanding of the emergence and development of contemporary social movements. These lines of analysis have focused on the formation of large ecological concentrations of students, and the rise of a large and increasingly homogeneous class of professional/technical workers. Both of these emergent groupings are seen as important in macro accounts of new collective action and social movements.

Large concentrations of physically mature students housed in institutions of higher education for longer and longer periods of time are seen as producing the organizational potential for chronic student movements. This potential is exacerbated by economic trends that impinge upon the future prospects of cohorts of students (Kriesi, 1985). Those American analysts who have sought to understand the origin of student movements here (i.e., Flacks, 1967) have generally produced quite similar macroanalyses as those Europeans who have focused upon the general rise of "new social movements" (Klandermans, 1986). Both accounts see macrosocial changes creating increasingly large, well-organized concentrations of students whose potential for collective action, even if it has presently waned, remains high.

In addition, these institutions of higher education produce trained "experts" who are coming to dominate employment in the service sector and professions of modern industry. Their training, it is alleged (i.e., Bruce-Briggs, 1979), creates progressive values and shared life circumstances that mark them as a "new class." Much debate has raged over the substantive sentiments of this group (see Brint, 1984) and their potential to be a progressive political force (see Gouldner, 1976). Some have argued that occupations within the "new class" can be productively conceived of as professional social movements whose goal is the creation, expansion, and defense of markets for their services (McAdam and McCarthy, 1982). Others have argued that this "new class" remains too diffuse and politically heterogeneous to constitute a serious source of new social movements. Both sides of the debate, however, betray the same logic in their analysis. Each seeks to understand the political potential of emerging work groups on the basis of macro-level changes in the structure of modern employment. In doing so, they are merely contributing to the oldest and richest research tradition in the study of movement emergence.

The nineteenth century was dominated by accounts of the rise and fall of social movements as a response to the massive social and economic upheavals occasioned by the Industrial Revolution (i.e., Marx, 1958). Indeed, the idea of a "general social movement" was derived from the rise of the movements of the working classes (Blumer, 1955; Tilly, 1984). To understand the rise of such a movement, one was led to analyze the shifts in the economic class structure of changing societies. So, too, do modern scholars seek the macro correlates of the rise of newer social movements in the changing social groupings that emerge from changes in the patterning of work and education in modern industrial society.

MASS MIGRATION AS AN IMPETUS TO MOVEMENT EMERGENCE

One final example of the link between broad macroprocesses and rise of social movements concerns the role of mass migration in creating new groups with the organizational potential for successful collective action. Two examples will serve to illustrate the relationship. The first concerns the effect of urbanization (and industrialization) on the locus and form of collective action in nineteenth-century Europe. As the Tillys have painstakingly documented in *The Rebellious Century* (1975), the rise of urban-based movements during this period was largely a response to migration processes that concentrated large numbers of the emerging working class into organizationally dense urban neighborhoods.

Blacks in the American South were party to a similar process. As long as blacks were subject to the extremely repressive system of social control on which Southern agriculture was founded, their concentration in the South and relative isolation from whites was never effectively translated into a strong network of intermediate association. Nor was it fear alone that produced this failure. More to the point, white planters, fearing "their" charges, forcibly discouraged the development of independent black institutions. Even the one exception to this rule, the black church, achieved independence only after an early history of "benevolent sponsorship" by white planters intent on civilizing the "natives."

The collapse of King Cotton, however, changed the situation drastically. Spurred by the collapse, the general pattern of rural-to-urban migration within the South freed blacks from the extreme forms of social control they had previously been subject to. In the relatively safe environs of the urban South, segregation and residential concentration served to produce a full flowering of independent black institutions—churches, colleges, political organizations—that would later play midwife to the civil rights movement (McAdam, 1982; Morris, 1984).

MICRO-DYNAMICS WITHIN MICRO-MOBILIZATION CONTEXTS

To this point our evaluation of the significance of micro-mobilization contexts has only focused attention on the macro side of the equation. That is, we have linked the presence and strength of these contexts to some of the macroeconomic and organizational factors discussed earlier. But we have not yet explained their role in the generation of mobilization at the micro level. In our view, the significance of these contexts derives from the established organizational and interpersonal settings they afford insurgents. Within these settings, any number of processes crucial to micro mobilization take place. In the following pages we will identify three such processes.

FRAME ALIGNMENT AND THE PROCESS OF COLLECTIVE ATTRIBUTION

For all the recent emphasis on macro-political or other structural "determinants" of social movements, the immediate impetus to collective action remains a cognitive one. As Gamson, Fireman and Rytina's recent book (1982) makes abundantly clear, successful collective action precedes from a significant transformation in the collective consciousness of the actors involved. Analysts as diverse as Marx (1958), Edelman (1971), Smelser (1962), Turner and Killian (1972) and McAdam (1982) have noted the importance of this process while using a variety of concepts—"class consciousness," "generalized beliefs," "cognitive liberation"—to describe it. Recently, however, Snow and his colleagues (1986) have refined and extended our understanding of the cognitive basis of collective action by proposing a typology of "frame alignment processes" by which activists seek to construct legitimating accounts to support their own and others' activism. New movements always entail some break with established behavioral routines. In order to overcome people's natural reluctance to break with these routines, ideological rationales must be fashioned that legitimate the movement's behavioral proscriptions. Snow and his colleagues distinguish four distinct frame alignment processes—frame bridging, frame amplification, frame extension, and frame transformation—by which these rationales are constructed.

It is important to recognize, however, that these processes "are overwhelmingly not based upon observation or empirical evidence available to participants, but rather upon cuings among groups of people who jointly create the meanings they will read into current and anticipated events" (Edelman, 1971, p. 32). The key phrase here is "groups of people." That is, the chances of frame alignment occurring are assumed to be greatest in precisely the kind of collective settings we've called micro-mobilization contexts. In the first place, groups—whether formal or informal—are the repositories for the existing frames that are often the raw materials for the various frame alignment processes. For example, established churches provide a rich and detailed "worldview" or frame that can be used to encourage activism by any movement that succeeds in appropriately this frame for its own uses. Accounting for the rapid spread of movements as diverse as the civil rights movement (McAdam, 1982, pp. 129-130), the Moral Majority (Snow et al., 1986, pp. 468) and the Iranian Revolution (Snow and Marshall, 1984) become fairly easy when one realizes how effectively the leaders of these movements tied the behavioral requirements of the new movement to the legitimating frame of an established religion.

Even in those rare instances where new frames are constructed from scratch—frame transformation, to use the term proposed by Snow and his coauthors—it is hard to see how the process could occur anywhere but in an established collective setting. Even in the unlikely event that a single person were to generate such a frame, his or her isolation would almost surely prevent its spread to the minimum number of people required to afford a reasonable basis for mounting successful collective action. More to the point, perhaps, is the suspicion that under such conditions, the process of frame transformation would never occur in the first place. The consistent finding linking feelings of efficacy to social integration supports this judgment (Neal and Seeman, 1964; Pinard, 1971; Sayre, 1980). In the absence of strong interpersonal links to others, people are likely to feel powerless to change their own lives, let alone the fundamental way they view the world.

To this finding one might add the educated supposition that what Ross (1977) calls the "fundamental attribution error"—the tendency of people to explain their situation as a function of individual rather than situational factors

—is more likely to occur under conditions of personal isolation than under those of integration. Lacking the information and perspective that others afford, isolated individuals would seem especially prone to explain their troubles on the basis of personal rather than "system attributions" (Ferree and Miller, 1985).

The practical significance of this distinction comes from the fact that only system attributions afford the necessary rationale for political movements. For analysts of such movements, then, the key question becomes what social circumstances are productive of "system attributions" or the construction of frames that attribute significance to political processes outside the individual? Following Ferree and Miller (1985, p. 46), the likely answer is that "without a homogeneous, intensely interacting group . . . people are unlikely to recognize that their private troubles are reflections of public issues rather than personal flaws." In our terms, the chances of any form of frame alignment occurring would seem greatest in the type of micro-mobilization context described earlier. These settings also provide a favorable context for a second important social psychological process.

VALUE EXPECTANCY AND THE AGGREGATION OF CHOICE

Should any frame legitimating activism come to be widely shared within a particular population, the chances of collective action occurring are substantially improved. This still tells us nothing about whether a given member of that population will take part in any resulting action. To better understand that process we need a model of individual decision making. Through his application of value expectancy theory to the phenomenon of individual activism, Klandermans (1984) has provided us with such a model. At the heart of his model is a view of the individual as a rational, calculating actor weighing the costs and benefits of activism. The key point, though, is that these anticipated costs and benefits are not independent of the individuals' assessment of the likely actions of others. Instead, the perceived efficacy of participation for the individual will depend upon the following three sets of expectations they bring to the decision-making process:

(1) expectations about the number of participants;

(2) expectations about one's own contribution to the probability of success;

(3) expectations about the probability of success if many people participate (Klandermans, 1984, p. 585).

Individual activism, then, is most likely to occur in a situation where the individual has high expectations on all three of these counts.

As useful as Klandermans's application of value expectancy theory is, it nonetheless tends, as most choice theories do, to divorce the individual actor and the subjective utilities that shape his or her choices from the collective settings in which these utilities are derived. This is not to deny that the individual remains the ultimate locus of choice processes. At the same time the generation of expectancies on which choice depends remains a profoundly social process requiring attention to and information about other relevant actors. The significance of these micro-mobilization contexts, then, stems in part from the ready access to information they afford members. Imagine two students trying to decide whether or not to attend an anti-apartheid rally to be held on campus. Imagine further that one of the students lives in a dorm and is a member of several political groups on campus, while the other commutes to school and is not a member of any campus groups. Irrespective of their attitudes concerning the South African social and political situation, which of the two students is more likely to attend the rally? Probably the student who is more integrated into campus life. Why? There are several reasons, but among the most significant is the fact that our prospective activist is involved in several collective settings—the dorm and political groups—that favor the generation of high expectations concerning the prospects for successful group action. To the extent that others in either setting are giving indications that they are going to attend the rally, the likelihood that our potential recruit will go are increased as well.

But it isn't just that these collective settings encourage choices favoring participation. In addition, they serve as contexts within which these individual choices can be aggregated into a collective plan of action. It isn't enough that individual actors choose to participate in activism. Their choices must then be combined with those of others in such a way as to make group action possible. Micro-mobilization contexts provide the setting within which this aggregation process can occur.

RESOURCE MOBILIZATION

It isn't simply choices, however, that are aggregated in these micro-mobilization contexts.

The significance of these settings is as much organizational as social psychological. Micro-mobilization contexts serve as the organizational "staging ground" for the movement. It is within these contexts that a wide variety of resources essential to collective action are mobilized. Three resources in particular are worth noting.

I. MEMBERS

If there is anything approximating a consistent finding in the empirical literature, it is that movement participants are recruited along established lines of interaction. The explanation for this consistent finding would appear to be straightforward: The more integrated the person is into the aggrieved community, the more readily he or she can be mobilized for participation in protest activities. As Gerlach and Hine argue, "no matter how a typical participant describes his reasons for joining the movement, or what motives may be suggested by a social scientist on the basis of deprivation, disorganization, or deviancy models, it is clear that the original decision to join required some contact with the movement" (Gerlach and Hine, 1970, p. 79). The significance of micro-mobilization contexts stems from the fact that they render this type of facilitative contact more likely, thus promoting member recruitment.

II. COMMUNICATION NETWORK

Micro-mobilization contexts also constitute a communication network or infrastructure, the strength and breadth of which largely determine the pattern, speed, and extent of movement expansion. Both the failure of a new movement to take hold and the rapid spread of insurgent action have been credited to the presence or absence of such an infrastructure. Freeman has argued that it was the recent development of such a network that enabled women in the 1960s to create a successful feminist movement where they had earlier been unable to do so:

> The development of the women's liberation movement highlights the salience of such a network precisely because the conditions for a movement existed *before* a network came into being, but the movement didn't exist until afterward. Socioeconomic strain did not change for women significantly during a 20-year period. It was as great in 1955 as in 1965. What changed was the organizational situation. It was not until a communications network developed among like-minded people beyond local boundaries that the movement could emerge and develop

past the point of occasional, spontaneous uprising [Freeman, 1973, p. 804].

Conversely, Jackson et al. (1960) document a case in which the absence of a readily cooptable communication network contributed to "The Failure of an Incipient Social Movement." The movement, an attempted property tax revolt in California, failed, according to the authors, because "there was no . . . preestablished network of communication which could be quickly employed to link the suburban residential property owners who constituted the principal base for the movement" (Jackson et al., 1960, p. 38).

These findings are consistent with the empirical thrust of studies of cultural diffusion, a body of literature that has unfortunately been largely overlooked by movement analysts despite its relevance to the topic. To our knowledge, only Maurice Pinard (1971, pp. 186-187) has explicitly applied the empirical insights of this literature to the study of social movements. He summarizes the central tenet of diffusion theory as follows: "The higher the degree of social integration of potential adopters, the more likely and the sooner they will become actual adopters . . . on the other hand, near-isolates tend to be the last to adopt an innovation" (1971, p. 187). The applicability of this idea to the study of social insurgency stems from recognition of the fact that a social movement is, after all, a new cultural item subject to the same pattern of diffusion or adoption as other innovations. Indeed, without acknowledging the theoretical basis of his insight, Oberschall has hypothesized for movements the identical pattern of diffusion noted earlier by Pinard: "The greater the number and variety of organizations in a collectivity, and the higher the participation of members in this network, the more rapidly and enduringly does mobilization into conflict groups occur" (Oberschall, 1973, p. 125).

Oberschall's statement has brought us full circle. Our brief foray into the diffusion literature only serves to amplify the basic argument by placing it in a theoretical context that helps explain the importance of micro-mobilization contexts in the generation of insurgency. The linkages characteristic of such groups facilitate movement emergence by providing the means of communication by which the movement, as a new cultural item, can be disseminated throughout the aggrieved population.

III. LEADERS

All manner of movement analysts have asserted the importance of leaders or organizers

in the generation of social insurgency. To do so requires not so much a particular theoretical orientation as common sense.

The existence of established groups within the movement's mass base ensures the presence of recognized leaders who can be called upon to lend their prestige and organizing skills to the incipient movement. Indeed, given the pattern of diffusion discussed in the previous section, it may well be that established leaders are among the first to join a new movement by virtue of their central position within the community. There is in fact some empirical evidence to support this. To cite only one example, Lipset, in his study of the Socialist C.C.F. party, reports that "in Saskatchewan it was the local leaders of the Wheat Pool, of the trade-unions, who were the first to join the C.C.F." His interpretation of the finding is that "those who are most thoroughly integrated in the class through formal organizations are the first to change" (1950, p. 197). Regardless of the timing of their recruitment, the existence of recognized leaders is yet another resource whose availability is conditioned by the degree of organization within the aggrieved population.

Micro-mobilization contexts, then, are the primary source of resources facilitating movement emergence. These groups constitute the organizational context in which insurgency is expected to develop. As such, their presence is as crucial to the process of movement emergence as a conducive political environment. If one lacks the capacity to act, it hardly matters that one is afforded the chance to do so.

Movement Maintenance and Change

Although collective action is expected to develop within micro-mobilization contexts, rarely are movements able to rely on them for their survival. It must be remembered that in most cases these micro-mobilization contexts may be little more than informal friendship networks, ad hoc committees, or loosely structured coalitions of activists. Such groups may function as the organizational locus of early mobilizing efforts, but rarely as permanent movement organizations.

For the movement to survive, pioneering activists must be able to create a more enduring organizational structure. Efforts to do so normally entail the creation of formal social movement organizations (SMOs) to assume the centralized direction of the movement previously

exercised by informal groups. Hereafter, the crucial task of mediating between the larger macro environment and the set of micro-dynamics on which the movement depends will fall to these SMOs. The challenge that confronts the SMO is not fundamentally different from the one that confronts any formal organization. At the macro level, the SMO must negotiate a niche for itself within the larger organizational environment in which it is embedded. This usually entails the negotiation and management of a complex set of relationships with other organizational actors representing the movement, the state, countermovements, the media, and the general public. How well the SMO manages the contradictory demands imposed by these groups will have a lot to do with the way the movement develops over time.

The movement and the SMOs that increasingly represent it face a challenge at the micro level as well. As organizations, SMOs must continue to mobilize the resources—members, money, and so on—they need to survive. Of necessity, this latter goal involves the SMO in a continuous process of micro mobilization. Converts must be sought, resources acquired, and the commitment of members maintained.

This micro challenge is no less important to the course of movement development than the macro challenge sketched earlier. One of the principal ways SMOs seek to mediate these twin challenges is through the selection of goals and tactics. As regards the larger macro environment, choices about either goals or tactics are likely to reflect calculations concerning the anticipated reactions of other organizational actors. At the same time, the internal resource needs of the SMO will also shape programmatic and tactical decisions. In effect, goals and tactics are the principal tools an SMO uses to shape its external environment while simultaneously attending to the ongoing demands of micro mobilization. In the remainder of this chapter, we will discuss all of these dynamics in more detail. Before we do so, however, we will want to know a good bit more about SMOs and the forms they typically take.

Social Movement Organizations

Movement organizations are usually the carriers of the mature movement. They serve to aggregate people and resources in the service of the "cause." While much movement activity may occur outside of SMOs by individuals and groups with little or no affiliation with the

SMOs, the formal movement groups attempt to remain the command posts of movements.

The acronym SMO entered the social movement literature through the analysis of Zald and Ash (1966). There it referred to the carrier organizations of social movement aims, and was seen to vary between inclusive and exclusive forms. This distinction captures the extent of involvement and commitment to the organization on the part of the typical member. Much research has focused on organized social movement forms since then, and a wide variety of dimensions of SMO structure have been explicated. The use of the denotation, however, remains vague. Let us here summarize the various organizational forms to which it has been applied.

John Lofland has developed a census of what he calls movement organization local forms. The types of SMO locals he identifies are: (1) associations sustained by volunteers, (2) bureaus employing staffers, (3) troups deploying soldiers, (4) communes composed of family members, (5) collectives consisting of cooperating workers, and (6) utopias populated by utopians. The array of forms is ordered in terms of increasing scope of involvement, and thus mirrors the Zald and Ash distinction between inclusive and exclusive SMO forms. There has been extensive analysis of these various forms. Some of the best-known analyses are those of Gamson (1975), Kanter (1972) and Curtis and Zurcher (1973). This array of forms appears to vary between the poles of intensity and extensity. Those forms that demand the most of members have the most difficulty gaining large numbers of members, and those forms that demand the least are capable of generating the widest support.[10] What constitutes the most local level of analysis here is a function of the focus of research. So Ronald Lawson (1983) described what he calls BOs (building organizations) and NOs (neighborhood organizations) in his account of the organizational structure of the tenants' movement in New York City.

Movement locals may be disconnected organizations laboring in isolation toward their social change goals. Or they may be linked to other local organizations through a variety of organizational mechanisms. Or they may be linked to higher level organizations, or some combinations of these. The most general types of forms here are federation structure, chapter structure, and what Gerlach and Hine (1970) call reticulate, segmentary, decentralized structure. Snow (1986) provides an example of the latter type of structure in his analysis of the Nichiren Shoshu movement in the United States.

A quite modern form of the SMO is the professional social movement organization (PSMO) originally identified by McCarthy and Zald (1973):

Professional social movements are characterized by:

(1) A leadership that devotes full time to the movement.
   (a) A large proportion of resources originating outside of the aggrieved group that the movement claims to represent.
(2) A very small or nonexistent membership base or a paper membership (membership implies little more than allowing name to be used upon membership rolls).
(3) Attempts to impart the image of 'speaking for a potential constituency.'
(4) Attempts to influence policy toward that same constituency. [p. 20].

Purely PSMOs communicate with adherents or members through the mails or the mass media. They link people together through very weak networks of communication (see McCarthy, 1987). But in fact there are few pure cases of this form, and many recent analyses of PSMOs have revised and extended the earlier statements about it. Common Cause, for instance, evolved into a mixed form with many vigorous local chapters, though its central still mirrors the PSMO form (McFarland, 1984). The Pennsylvanians for a Biblical Majority (Cable, 1984) shows a PSMO form at the state level, but through telephone trees, which link local congregational members whose churches support the PSMO, look more like a federation of the reticulate, segmentary, decentralized form.

Troyer and Markle (1983) describe ASH, an anti-smoking group, as a prototype of the PSMO form. Tierney (1982) describes the "battered women movement" at the local level as a professionalized movement, and views its vulnerability to cooptation as an important consequence of its lack of a beneficiary constituency that supports the movement. Johnston (1980) reviews the early history of Transcendental Meditation (TM) in the United States, and found elements of a PSMO, but other elements that lead him to term it a "marketed social movement."

Another interesting form of movement organization is what Morris (1984) has termed the "movement halfway house." "A movement halfway house is an established group or organization that is only partially integrated into the

larger society because its participants are actively involved in efforts to bring about a desired change in society . . . What is distinctive about movement halfway houses is their relative isolation from the larger society and the absence of a mass base" (p. 139). Such institutions may serve as repositories of information about past movements, strategy and tactics, inspiration and leadership. They are especially important during lulls in social movement activity. Many of these halfway houses appear to be rooted in religious communities such as the Fellowship of Reconciliation (Robinson, 1981), The American Friends Service Committee (Jonas, 1971), and the Catholic Worker (Miller, 1974).

ORGANIZATIONAL TRAJECTORIES

An earlier literature emphasized the process of institutionalization as the inevitable outcome of movement development. What Zald and Ash (1966) labeled the Weber-Michels model of routinization and oligarchization was the dominant image of the trajectory of SMOs. Zald and Ash argued that the model was limited and that a more inclusive and dynamic model of organization-environment relations allowed one to expect a variety of other SMO trajectories, including demise, radicalization, schism, and movement organization becalmed. The Weber-Michels model suffered from the tyranny of the iron cage. As one adopts an organization-environment model for the study of ongoing movement development, it becomes apparent that SMOs exist in a larger macro environment that greatly constrains their actions. The net impact of these constraints is never so simple as to yield a single outcome—such as institutionalism—in the case of all SMOs. Rather, at the macro level, we are encouraged to analyze the process of movement development as turning on a complex process of interaction between SMOs and a variety of other organizational actors. The structural impact of this interaction process is expected to vary from SMO to SMO.

Macro Development: SMOs and the Larger Organizational Environment

At the macro level, the emergence of a social movement depends on informal collections of activists recognizing and exploiting the unique opportunity for collective action afforded them by shifting political, economic and demographic conditions. Once in place, however, the movement and the specific SMOs that are its carriers face a very different challenge. They now con-front an established organizational environment aware of, and frequently hostile toward, the new movement. Just how successfully these SMOs negotiate this organizational environment will largely determine the ultimate fate of the movement. Among the specific actors SMOs are likely to confront in this process are competing SMOs, the state, countermovements, and the media.

MOVEMENT INDUSTRIES

Social movement industries (SMIs) comprise all SMOs pursuing relatively similar goals. Although SMOs in a given SMI may differ in tactics and may compete for resources and leadership, they may also cooperate. Under precisely what conditions we can expect competing SMOs to cooperate is an important question movement researchers have yet to answer.

A number of hypotheses about movement industries can, however, be stated. For instance, as demand for a movement expands, the number and size of SMOs should also increase. As an SMI expands, the member SMOs are likely to try to "product differentiate" their goals and tactics so as to ensure a distinctive niche for themselves within the movement. So far, no scholars have sought to test these hypotheses. Systematic studies of particular SMIs have also been rare. However, Conover and Gray (1983) present an excellent analysis of the movement/countermovement industries that have emerged around the issues of woman's rights and the family. Aldon Morris (1984) and Steve Barkan (1986) have addressed the interorganizational relationships and competition and cooperation of groups in the civil rights movement. Both examine the interplay of SCLC and the NAACP, and then, as the movement grew, the interplay of SNCC, CORE, and other groups. Finally, Staggenborg (1986), in a detailed analysis of the prochoice movement, has shown the importance of the prolife countermovement in shaping the interorganizational relations and growth of prochoice forces.

One especially promising topic in the study of SMIs is the analysis of what has been termed radical flank effects" (Haines, 1984). The concept is used to describe one effect that often follows from the presence of "extremist" SMOs within the same movement with other more "moderate" groups. As Haines (1984) shows in his analysis of changes in the funding of the major civil rights organizations, such a situation is likely to redound to the benefit of the moderate SMOs. In effect, the presence of "extremists" encourages funding support for the "moderates" as a way of undercutting the influence of the radicals. A similar dynamic may also characterize state/movement relations. Increasingly, the demands of movements are being adjudicated by representatives of the state. To respond to a movement, these representatives must focus on the movement leaders and organizations that seem to speak for the movement and yet who are reasonable coalition partners. In such a situation, the presence of "extremist" SMOs can actually help to legitimate and strengthen the bargaining hand of more moderate SMOs. Though not planned in most cases, these dynamics would appear to have important implications for the trajectory and success of the movement.

STATE/MOVEMENT RELATIONS

The central importance of the modern sate has made it a key target for most political movements. Therefore, any analysis of change or stability in political movements must couple efforts to study the ways in which movements seek to influence or overthrow states with an assessment of state efforts to control, channel, repress, or facilitate movements. The increasing volume of studies of this type has moved social movement analysis much closer to, or perhaps even made it a part of, political sociology, where Rudolph Heberle (1951) thought it should be nearly four decades ago. In the following three sections, we will attempt to delineate three topics that illustrate the increasingly close connection between much movement analysis and the field of political sociology.

THE STATE AS CONTROL AGENT

The control of social movements may, of course, involve persons other than state authorities. The employer who frowns upon, or dismisses, employees perceived to be overly active in social movement activity is part of the social control environment of a social movement, even if not a part of the state apparatus. Obviously, a movement's opponents will be implicated in efforts to control, or even destroy, the movement. The responses of friends and family to participation in social movements can also be seen as part of the micro context of social control. The individual activist's risk-reward calculus is expected to reflect this broad set of relations.

At the same time, however, the status of the modern state as the institutional embodiment of elite interests often puts state authorities in the position of having to defend those interests against the competing claims of challenging groups. This, coupled with the state's historic monopoly on the legitimate use of violence, often makes it the key actor in an analysis of the social control of political movements.

The efforts of authorities to control movements include general policies that apply to all movements as well as specific actions directed at particular movements or groups. In the former category are state policies regulating the forms of association, tax advantages, and tactics available (e.g., the legal status of boycotts, strikes, curfew regulations) to movements. The latter category includes activities by authorities to control or inhibit specific movements, their organizations, adherents, and leaders. FBI surveillance, denial of loans to student activists, attempts to deny nonprofit status to specific organizations, and application of restraint of trade legislation to the NAACP in Mississippi are examples of specific policies aimed at particular movements.

General state policies grow out of the specific histories of particular polities. The relative size of the social movement sector in any given society is at least in part a function of the types of general policies in place. Obviously, authoritarian, totalitarian, and pluralist democracies can be expected to differ greatly in the general policies that inhibit or facilitate SMO formation and tactics. All that seems clear. What is less clear are the conditions under which the specific attempts of authorities to control or facilitate a movement (a) are likely to occur and (b) be effective. The problem is, as Lipsky (1968) has so ably argued, that the analysis of protest as a political resource (and implicitly authority as a political response), cannot just examine the direct linkages and cost-benefit conditions imposed by movements on authorities, and posed by authorities on movements. Instead, one must also examine the reaction and perceptions of bystander publics and reference elites. These perceptions and reactions are often filtered through the media. "Repression works," says Charles Tilly. To this must be added: under some conditions and not others. Indeed, attempts at repression may release "repression fallout" (Hancock, 1975). Systematic, sustained, unbridled repression works in the short run. But regimes—especially ostensibly democratic ones—can rarely buy social peace for long periods of time by recourse to repression. Even in the short run, the use of repression may trigger a positive response to the movement from previously neutral or only mildly sympathetic bystander publics (Turner, 1969).

By its own actions, the movement helps to condition the response of third parties and thus

to encourage or discourage state repression. McAdam (1982) offers several examples of this dynamic in his analysis of the shifting fortunes of the civil rights movement between 1960 and 1970. In the early sixties, civil rights forces—especially Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference—were able to provoke violence on the part of Southern authorities, thus generating enormous sympathy and support for the movement among the media and general public. One effect of this support was to raise the costs of repression to prohibitive levels, thus reducing the level of official control efforts. In contrast, the rhetorical militance of various black power groups during the late sixties alarmed the general public, allowing state authorities to repress these groups with relative impunity.

In modern society, however, control over social movements is never a matter of repression alone. In addition, there are various forms of control embedded in the normal legal/bureaucratic routines of society. In this country, these include various rules and regulations whose enforcement is the responsibility of such agencies as the Internal Revenue Service, the U.S. Postal Service, and many state and local agencies set up to evaluate the "public-regardingness" of social movement organizations (Wolfson, 1987). For many SMOs, a particularly salient example of this type of bureaucratic control are the rules governing tax exempt status. The tax and fundraising advantages of the designation "nonprofit" are sufficiently attractive to many SMOs as to encourage them to modify their programs so as to attain this status (McCarthy and Britt, in press). The moderating effect of such efforts is obvious.

In addition, authorities often exercise covert surveillance in their attempts to control social movements. But the process of surveillance, too, has risks. Undercover agents may be coopted by the movement. They may even stimulate or contribute to movement activity. Gary Marx (1974, 1979) has done more than anyone else to show the dynamics of infiltration in modern American movements. But similar problems have also been documented, almost as an aside, in Victoria Bonnell's (1984) study of worker participation in revolutionary activity in Russia. She shows how the level of police infiltration facilitated movement activity in prerevolutionary Russia.

THE STATE AS FACILITATOR

We have already noted that in the attempt to control movements through surveillance, government intrusion may actually facilitate movement activity. Beyond such indirect facilitation authorities may directly fund agencies and programs that are carriers of movement goals. Indeed, a major part of the Reagan agenda seems to have involved the "de-funding of the Left." For example, Himmelstein and Zald (1984) have shown that part of the Reagan Administration's attack on the social sciences was related to their perception that social scientists were part of the political "left." More generally, James T. Bennett and Thomas J. DeLorenzo (1985) have documented numerous case studies of government funding of liberal partisan politics.

There is, of course, an analytic and definitional issue here. When is government funding and agency activism part of the bureaucratic and routine operation of government, and when is it aimed at aiding social action? In practice the question may not have an either/or answer. Grants from the National Institute for Drug Abuse can fund organizations that offer routine services and promote social change activity. The National Highway Transportation Safety Agency can fund SMOs that work for social change on the drinking and driving issues. As social movement analysis intersects with political sociology, the distinction between social movements and pressure groups becomes less relevant (see Useem and Zald, 1982). Gamson (1975) has examined the process by which a challenging group gains standing in the polity. In this, he focuses both upon gaining access to government, and achieving substantive gains. In his empirical work, Gamson ends up treating access the same as gaining official recognition as a legitimate representative of the aggrieved group. But in his theoretical discussion, access is in fact a continuum along which the challenging groups achieves greater and greater penetration of government agencies. Movements do not end when their representatives take power; instead, they are transformed. Government officials may operate routinely to deliver substantive benefits to movement constituents or work with movement groups in and out of government to change official policy and procedures. Different agencies and branches of government may support specific social movement goals. Thus the social movement and countermovement activities may occur more or less within government itself. Richard Gale (1986) has documented the extent to which the environmental movement and its opposition were both represented in different agencies of the federal government.

DIVISIONS WITHIN THE STATE

As the Gale example illustrates, it would be a mistake to see the various components of the state as always acting in consort either to oppose or support a movement. More recent scholarship on state/movement relations has instead focused on divisions within the state and the movement's efforts to exploit these divisions. For example, scholars of the American civil rights movement (Barkan, 1985; Bloom, 1986; Garrow, 1978; McAdam, 1982, 1983) have demonstrated the necessity of examining the interplay of different branches and geographical units of government in accounting for the success or failure of movement campaigns. Southern sheriffs and voter registrars were restrained by federal laws and Justice Department suits. Governor Orville Faubus of Arkansas was constrained by President Eisenhower's calling out of the National Guard in the Little Rock school desegregation crisis. This is not to say that federal authorities were aggressive advocates of movement goals. On the contrary, federal support was forthcoming only on those occasions when movement forces were able to provoke Southern authorities into well- publicized and extreme violations of black civil rights. Nonetheless, as Garrow (1978), Hubbard (1968), and McAdam (1982, 1983) have shown, this characteristic response was enough to give movement forces the leverage they needed to achieve significant civil rights gains.

Similarly, different branches of government may be at odds with one another or may afford movements better or worse opportunities to pursue their goals. In a system of divided power, the legislative, executive, and judicial branches operate under different procedural and substantive norms and have different constituencies. Barkan (1985), Handler (1978), and Balbus (1973), have plowed new territory in showing how courts/juries and judges, and criminal and civil procedures may be used to facilitate or impede social movement goals. Barkan illuminates how juries may nullify formal law to impede authority, thus promoting social movements. Moreover, he shows how trials may be used as media events in order to publicize movement goals. Balbus shows how the courts may undercut police efforts to control participants during civil disorders. Rather than the courts aiding the control effort, judicial procedures and the political economy of courts may restrain their use as agents of repression. Handler illuminates the conditions under which SMOs may or may not be effective in seeking judicial redress of their grievances. Courts are limited in the remedies they can impose. If the movement is seeking major substantive changes, courts are not especially useful. Moreover, SMOs must command legal resources for long periods of time, if they are to pursue legal remedies against well-organized, well-funded opponents.

COUNTERMOVEMENTS

By challenging existing institutional arrangements, social movements invite opposition. To the extent that opposition takes on an organized, relatively enduring character, we can say that a countermovement has developed. The composition of the countermovement will depend to a large degree on the nature and extent of the threat posed by the original movement. Revolutionary social movements attempt to drastically alter state policies or to overthrow regimes. In such cases, the state itself becomes the countermovement. But most social movements do not represent regime challenges; their goals are far more limited. They threaten some groups or classes and not others. The result is often a contest among groups for specific policy outcomes and generalized political influence. Should a countermovement arise in this situation, it is bound to be more limited in scope and membership than those that arise to challenge revolutionary movements.

Observers of the civil rights, antiwar, and feminist movements, among others, have sought to analyze the emergence of these more limited movements. More generally, Clarence Lo (1982) and Tahi Mottl (1980) have attempted to describe the typical features of the countermovement. Countermovements develop in segments of the population whose ways of life, status, and rewards are challenged by the movements. It has been traditional to see movements as progressive forces, and countermovements as reactionary. But such labeling serves little analytic purpose and may be contradicted in fact. What is most interesting about countermovements is that they attempt to capture the high ground from movements. Sometimes they succeed; sometimes they fail. Zald and Useem (1987) describe the interactive dance between movement and countermovement. They seek to explain why countermovements vary in the speed and strength of their mobilization, and to identify the types and range of conflicts between the movement and countermovement. Depending upon the timing of mobilization, countermovements may spend most of their time attempting to undo the effects of the

movement without actually engaging the movement in battle. Such conflicts can be said to be "loosely coupled" in time and arena.

McAdam (1983) analyzed movement-countermovement interaction by demonstrating the succession of tactics that occurred in the civil rights movement. Using *New York Times* newspaper reports, McAdam shows how the pace of movement activity rose with the introduction of new tactical forms and then declined as the opposition developed effective tactical counters to defuse the impact of novel movement tactics. No doubt McAdam has understated the richness of the tactical repertoire of the civil rights movement during this period (Morris, 1984). Nonetheless, his represents a crude first attempt to map the chesslike interaction that characterizes movement-countermovement relations. As much as any other set of relations, it is these that shape the trajectory of the original movement.

THE MEDIA AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES

While we have previously noted the importance of "frame alignment" and "collective attribution" as processes crucial to the generation of collective action, it is not true that the movement's cognitive challenge ends during its emergent phase. The creation of a revolutionary consciousness hardly ensures the survival of this consciousness over time. One need only point to the extinction of radical feminism in this country after the Civil War and again following the passage of the suffrage amendment to realize how tenuous political consciousness is. The cognitive challenge confronting insurgents only begins with the emergence of the movement. For the movement to succeed, it must be able to generate support among authorities, sympathy among bystanders and, most important, an ongoing sense of legitimacy and efficacy among movement cadre and members. Invariably, this requirement implicates the movement in an ongoing cognitive struggle with movement opponents over the meaning of various actions and events. Prochoice advocates seek to depict prolife activists as dangerous extremists threatening human life by their attacks on birth control clinics. In turn, prolifers, through "educational" materials, such as the controversial film, *The Silent Scream*, attempt to portray prochoice activists as insensitive murderers. What is at stake is nothing less than the popular perception of reality. This struggle presents one of the clearest examples of the ways in which the ongoing development of a movement turns on the ability of SMOs to successfully

translate macroprocesses into micro outcomes. The micro outcome in this case is public opinion formation and the reinforcement of member commitment through the manipulation/creation of meaning structures. We will turn to this process in the next section. Our concern here is with the macro companion to this process—namely, the systematic attempts of SMOs to exploit the media and existing communication technologies in an effort to bring their "message" to various audiences.

COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES

Some means of communication are centrally important to generating collective action in settings that require linking individuals who do not typically find themselves in face-to-face interaction with each other. In modern society, most movements are of this variety. Increasingly, then, movements have come to depend upon and to be shaped by the means of communication available to them. The costs and accessibility of such technologies may influence the prospects for mobilization as well as the public's response to mobilization appeals. Let us review several of the more recent technological innovations in communication that have had important effects upon movement attempts to disseminate information as a way of influencing movement adherents and bystander publics.

The telephone has recently come into wide use by social movement activists. Telephone networks are widely used to inform SMO members and movement adherents about events and in organizing collective behavior among them. The low costs of telephone service and its wide accessibility mean that this technology is useful to all but those movements drawn from among the poorest groups in modern America. The significance of telephone technology for collective action may, however, be generally restricted to the United States. The fact that most nations, including many wealthy nations, do not possess phone systems as accessible as this one, has interesting comparative implications for understanding collective action in the United States and elsewhere. The ability to mobilize many adherents of a social movement in a very short period of time can depend upon it. The use of such telephone nets by antinuclear activists to block the so-called "White Trains" carrying nuclear warheads is an example of one use of this technology. Cable (1984) describes the heavy use of this technology by a state Moral Majority SMO. This technology allows for the relaying "instruction" to adherents concerning

future collective actions, a process some collective behaviorists regard as critical to the understanding of those actions (McPhail and Wohlstein, 1983).

Direct mail technologies are also coming to be widely used by social movement activists. The use of these techniques is described in great detail by Sabato (1981). They have been used, in this context, primarily to generate resources for SMOs and to activate social movement adherents. A secondary benefit is that they may educate nonadherents on social movement issues. Thus far, the empirical literature on SMO use of direct-mail techniques would seem to support several conclusions. First, the technique is seen as especially useful in mobilizing resources and collective action among adherent pools that are not highly structured into preexisting infrastructures (McCarthy, 1987). Such techniques would also seem to be more useful in permanent organizations rather than temporary campaigns (Sabato, 1981). Finally, Hadden and Swan (1981) found the effectiveness of direct mail appeals to be enhanced when combined with television programming by evangelists.

MASS MEDIA

Television and newspapers constitute the central mass media in modern societies, and as such, play an important role in movement efforts to attract members, discredit opponents and influence the state and the general public. Typically, however, these media are more, or at least as, available to movement opponents as they are to the movement itself. This is especially true when the state itself opposes the aims of the movement. In most cases, then, movements cannot count on routine access to the media, nor editorial sympathy when coverage is forthcoming. Instead, they must exploit the "normal procedures" of these media in order to gain unpaid access as a means of relaying their message to a mass public. This has served to encourage attempts to understand what subset of potential events become "news." In turn, this has prompted researchers to move in two directions simultaneously. Some analysts have sought to understand the internal structure and logic of specific media organizations. Among the specific topics studied by researchers in this tradition are patterns of media ownership, the socialization of newspersons and routine decision making in media organizations. Gans (1979) provides a useful review of much of this research.

But the creation of news is clearly an interactive process. Recognition of this fact has prompted other researchers to study the various ways in which movements attempt to attract and then shape the editorial tone of media coverage (see Gitlin, 1980; Molotch, 1979; Molotch and Lester, 1974, 1975). As a general rule, these studies have tended to point up the difficulties inherent in courting the media. To cite one such difficulty, movements must prove "newsworthy" if they are to attract the attention of the media. This oftens puts a premium on illegal, violent, or otherwise extreme forms of action. At the same time, these forms of action are likely to frighten the public, antagonize authorities, and discourage supporters. As yet, however, little in the way of systematic analysis intended to tease out these dynamics has been undertaken.

The same can be said for efforts to study the complex and often contradictory patterns of interaction that develop between the movement and the full range of organizational actors touched on here. Suffice it to say that the contradictory demands inherent in the single media example noted above are multiplied many times over when all of the parties to the ongoing conflict are taken into account. One very challenging, and potentially valuable direction for future research, then, would entail the explication of the complex and changing relationships between these various actors over the life of specific movements.

Micro Processes in Movement Development

At the macro level, the task facing SMO's is managing the conflicting demands and interests of the groups that comprise the movement's organizational environment. But that is only half the story. To remain viable, these SMOs must also be able to retain the ideological loyalty and resource support of some constituency. To do so involves them in a series of important micro-level processes. One of these processes—the production and manipulation of meaning structures—has already been mentioned. But the production of meaning isn't the only ongoing problem SMOs must solve. They must also routinize the flow of resources and members into the movement if it is to remain a strong and viable force for social, political, or personal change.

The Ongoing Production and Maintenance of Meaning and Ideology

While a discussion of communication technologies highlights the ways in which movement activists seek to manipulate and shape the understanding of events, such a discussion leaves the microdynamics of this process unexamined. While a full-blown, dynamic theory of this process is beyond the scope of this chapter, we can review some of the more interesting recent conceptual and empirical work that has been done on the topic.

The new theories of social movements have been accused of deemphasizing the importance of meaning and ideology, or taking them for granted at any historical moment (i.e., Mueller, 1984). But historians, speech analysts, and some sociologists have continued to wrestle with ways of conceptualizing and empirically assessing the importance and relevance of meaning and ideology to social movements, social movement activists, social movement adherents, SMOs, and SMIs.

Of the four major theoretical perspectives on social movements and collective behavior available in the late 1960s, only that of collective behavior took meaning and ideology very seriously in attempting to understand social movement processes. Especially as developed and elaborated by Park (1967), this perspective attended to the centrality of the mass media and "publics" in understanding the development of social movements. The central insight underlying this view was that consensus could develop from the mediated process of information flow as well as from face-to-face interaction. Gouldner (1976) has summarized this perspective cogently:

Historically speaking, then, a 'public' consists of persons who habitually acquire their news and orientation from impersonal mass media where they have available to them diverse information and orientation diffused by competing individual entrepreneurs or corporate organizations, and when this diversity increases *talk* among those sharing news but seeking consensus concerning its meaning. That is a bourgeois public [p. 96] . . . Ideologies serve to mobilize 'social movements' within publics through the mediation of newspapers and other media. Movements are sectors of the public committed to a common project and to a common social identity . . . News generates ideology centered social identities which, in turn, are now media constructed and defined. Thus social movements in the modern world are both ideology—and news constructed [p. 100].

Some analysts have focused upon the pre-existing structures of meaning in publics. It is widely noticed, for instance, that most individuals do not possess anything like a well-articulated "ideology," even among the most literate segments of a population. This has led to employing such concepts as "organic" or "popular" ideology for talking about collective meanings among mass publics (i.e., Rude, 1980). Public opinion polling has allowed for the extensive mapping of support for particular social movements, both at single points in time and over time as well. This allows the size of "adherent pools" available to various movements to be crudely estimated (see McCarthy, 1987; Mueller, 1983; Wood and Hughes, 1984). It leads, also, to attempts to understand the conceptual frames that characterize mass publics as they process the competing information bombarding them as regards any controversial social issues (i.e., Gamson, 1984).

Most recent analyses of the construction of meaning in social movements has been consistent with this approach, though some analysts have tended to emphasize more directly the competition and conflict between the purveyors of dominant understandings of social issues and those social movement activists presenting alternative understandings. In attempting to explain why so little collective action occurs, analysts of a variety of persuasions opt for the conclusion that meaning in publics is dominated by resource rich elites who exert control over the grammar and plot line of public discourse. Those operating from Marxist perspectives call such a state of affairs *ideological hegemony* (i.e., Garner, 1977), while pluralists label similar processes symbolic reassurance (i.e., Edelman, 1964, 1971, 1977).

Several processes, however, can be identified that tend to undercut elite interpretations of meaning. These processes involve the media and the intelligentsia as well as SMOs. Many analysts have noted how the mass media, and especially television, tend to focus upon disruption and violence in social life. This proclivity gives social movement activists the opportunity to gain some access to the media in their attempts to generate countermeanings in mass publics (Lipsky, 1968). Those who have been called "organizational intellectuals" (Zald and McCarthy, 1975) may also disseminate countermeanings through their positions in universities and other work settings. These intellectual workers have also been labeled the "new class" by analysts

(i.e., Brint, 1984; Bruce-Briggs, 1979) who see them as central to the generation of counter-meanings in modern industrial settings.

But it is the activities of the social movement activists themselves that are especially crucial to an understanding of how new meanings and ideologies are developed, packaged, and disseminated. Sociologists are only now beginning to study how these processes work. Perhaps the most promising framework for analyzing these processes is one outlined by Snow and his colleagues (1986) and reviewed earlier in our discussion of "frame alignment." Borrowing the term "frame" from Erving Goffman (1974), the authors describe and elaborate a typology of "frame alignment processes" by which SMOs seek to bring the beliefs and attitudes of potential recruits into sync with the ideological frame of the movement. "The basic underlying premise is that frame alignment, of one variety or another, is a necessary condition of [movement] participation . . . and that it is typically an interactional and *ongoing* accomplishment" (p. 464; emphasis ours). The key word here is *ongoing*. For the later stages of collective action, the important thrust of this chapter is to alert movement scholars to the crucial microprocesses that SMOs must engage in if they are to retain the cognitive and ideological loyalties of movement members.

If sociologists are relative latecomers to the study of processes such as those described by Snow and his colleagues, speech communication analysts have made them a significant focus of research for some time. One especially productive area of scholarship has taken movement rhetoric as a topic for systematic analysis. Simons and his colleagues have exhaustively summarized this body of work (Simons, 1970, 1981). Utilizing a conceptual approach quite compatible with recent approaches in social movement analysis, which he calls the "requirement-problems-strategies approach," the various rhetorical tasks confronting movement activists are systematically explored. He says,

Ideally, a full-blown theory of the rhetoric of social movement should specify the argument and appeals available to movement rhetoric for each of the tasks they characteristically confront. Likewise, a full *history* of movement rhetoric would identify time-specific, place specific, or even movement-specific repertoires. What we already know is that some argumentative patterns appear unchanging and, hence, are highly predictable [Simons, Mechling, and Schreier, 1985, p. 95].

The tasks that have been explored by these many rhetorical scholars are the rhetoric of mobilization, the rhetoric of external influence, and the rhetoric of counterinfluence. Each of these tasks are then broken down into more detailed rhetorical tasks for systematic analysis of meaning and its consequences.

So while some recent movement analysis has downplayed meaning in understanding social movement processes, the outlines of a micro-sociological literature on these topics has already begun to emerge. This literature should enable researchers increasingly to address systematically the dynamics and effects of meaning-making activity by social movement activists (i.e., Mueller, 1984).

Resource Maintenance

The challenge facing mature movements is not simply a cognitive or ideological one. Like all organizations, the SMOs that come to dominate a movement in its later stages must be able to establish routine flow of resources into the organization in order to survive. To solve the resource problem, the SMO can choose to emphasize either one of two problematic sources of support. Either it can seek to obtain most of its resources from among its grassroots base or from sources outside its natural "beneficiary constituency" (McCarthy and Zald, 1973). Either strategy represents a calculated gamble.

The downside of the grassroots strategy is straightforward. To the extent that the movement's natural constituency is poor and relatively powerless, any SMO that emphasizes grassroots support is likely to share in its supporters' poverty. Moreover, the meager resource base available to it is likely to make it necessary for the "grassroots SMO" to engage in a near continuous round of resource-generating activities just to survive. The implications of this pattern for program development are sobering.

Just as sobering are the potential dangers establishing primary resource linkages to groups outside the movement's mass base. The lure of such linkages should be obvious. In contrast to the all too often impoverished mass base, external groups—especially those of the elite variety—tend to be resource rich. At the same time, external groups do not share the same level of concern or self-interested commitment to the goals of the movement as the movement's beneficiary constituency. This means that external support is likely to prove more fleeting and more politically conditioned than grassroots support. The latter characterization highlights the

very real dangers of cooptation and control inherent in the establishment of external support linkages. Such ties grant considerable control over movement affairs to the source from which the resources are obtained. Of course, the control embodied in these support linkages need not be exercised in any particular case. If the movement organization uses the resource(s) in a manner consistent with the interests of its sponsor(s), then support is likely to continue without interruption. The establishment of external support linkages threatens, then, to tame the movement by encouraging insurgents to pursue only those goals acceptable to external sponsors. The latter course of action may ensure the survival of the movement—or at least of its organizational offshoots—but only at the costs of reducing its programmatic effectiveness.

Sustaining Member Commitment

Besides mobilizing resources and attracting new recruits, movements must also strive to retain the energies and loyalties of old members. Failing this, the movement is likely to lack the continuity in personnel required to sustain an ongoing campaign of social and political change. This necessity highlights the efforts of SMOs in the same-meaning production processes discussed earlier. Obviously, if members come to feel that the goals of the SMO are no longer compatible with their own values, they are likely to defect. Thus the various "frame alignment processes" discussed by Snow et al. (1986) are as applicable to veteran activists as new recruits. Ongoing efforts to negotiate a reasonable fit between the attitudes of members and the official "party line" of the SMO is central to the process of sustaining commitment.

This process is not simply an ideological one, however. It is a tactical one as well. Presumably, most activists are attracted to a given SMO in part because they expect it to be an effective agent for social, political, or personal change. If, within a reasonable period of time, the organization fails to fulfill its implicit charge to action, it is likely to lose the support of a significant portion of its membership. This is especially true in the case of political movements. As Alinsky (1971) was keenly aware, nothing sustains the commitment of activists, nor draws others to a political movement, quite like victories. At least as regards collective action, the bandwagon effect is very real. The leaders of political SMOs must therefore be attuned to the ways in which strategy and tactics can be manipulated to reinforce the resolve of their troops.

Selection of Goals and Tactics

In the face of the severe macro pressures and micro challenges confronting movements, SMOs face an uphill battle to survive, let alone change existing social, political, or economic arrangements. At the same time, SMOs are not entirely powerless in the face of these twin sets of constraints. Perhaps the most powerful weapons they have at their disposal are the goals they choose to pursue and the tactics they utilize in this pursuit. Both may be used to attract new recruits, persuade authorities, neutralize opponents, and gain access to the media. In effect, an SMO uses its goals and tactics to mediate between macro-environmental pressures and the challenges of micro mobilization. Let us discuss each of these objectives in a bit more detail.

At the macro level, SMOs find themselves confronting a wide range of organizations with very different interests vis-a-vis the movement. Some, representing countermovements or segments of the elite, would like to see the movement destroyed or at least tamed. Other groups may be allies of the movement. Still others have yet to take a decisive stance either for or against the movement. The media are often among these "neutral third parties."

These groups play a decisive role in shaping the choices SMOs make regarding goals and tactics. In choosing between all tactical and programmatic options open to them, SMOs typically weigh the anticipated responses of these various groups and seek through their choices to balance the conflicting demands of the organizational environment in which they are embedded.

At the micro level, the strategic choices made by SMOs must serve still other functions. SMOs must balance the need to respond to macro-level pressures from other organizations with the micro-level need to maintain the strength and viability of the organization. It matters little if one has attracted media attention if, in the process, one has also antagonized support and jeopardized the flow of resources to the organization. This appears to have happened in the case of various Black Power groups in the late 1960s. While the rhetorical militance and radical goals of the groups assured them media attention, the message embodied in their actions frightened potential supporters and encouraged official repression. Any number of such strategic dilemmas confront SMOs as they seek both to adapt to and shape the ongoing macro- and microenvironments they confront.

This environment perspective on SMOs leaves the question of the efficacy of various goals or tactics unanswered. In point of fact, little

systematic evidence on the question has yet been gathered by scholars. To our knowledge, only William Gamson (1975) has sought to assess the effect of goals and tactics on an SMO's long-range chances of success. His findings are interesting, if not entirely unexpected. As regards goals, Gamson found that single-issue SMOs had higher success rates than groups that pursue many goals (pp. 44-46). In addition, groups whose goals required the "displacement of antagonists" were less likely to be successful than those whose goals did not (pp. 41-44). The one counterintuitive finding concerned the apparent tactical advantage of employing force or violence in pursuit of movement goals. Those groups who did so had significantly higher success rates than those who refrained from using force or violence in pursuing their aims (chap. 6).

Our discussion of the efficacy of goals and tactics leads logically to yet another neglected topic in the study of social movements. Presumably, most movements set out to accomplish certain objectives. Rarely, however, have movement scholars sought to assess how effective movements are in achieving their ends. Nor have researchers been any better about studying the impact of collective action on society as a whole or on those who participated in the movement. We will close our chapter with a brief discussion of the neglected topic of movement outcomes.

The Outcome of Social Movements

The interest of many scholars in social movements stems from their belief that movements represent an important force for social change. Yet demonstrating the independent effect of collective action on social change is difficult. Snyder and Kelly (1979) attempt to lay out a systematic framework for the empirical evaluation of such effects, but their evidentiary requirements are generally beyond the means of most researchers in all but a few narrow instances.

Some work has been done trying to untangle the independent effects of collective action, however. Perhaps the most systematic attempt to isolate the effects of organized social movements is that of Gamson (1975). He shows that for a large sample of SMOs in the United States, winning acceptance by authorities was substantially more likely than achieving their stated goals, suggesting that in the American case, cooptation is the model response of authorities to the efforts of challenging groups. Murray Edelman argues this position directly (1964, 1977) when he attempts to demonstrate that the normal response to insurgent action is symbolic

reassurance, typically in the form of the establishment of a state agency responsible for tending the concerns of the insurgents through symbols rather than material rewards.

A number of researchers have attempted to trace the effects of several recent movements in the United States upon the creation of specific social policies. Among the movements studied have been the women's movement (Freeman, 1975), the civil rights movement (Burstein, 1985, Button, 1978) and the environmental movement (Mitchell, 1981). But collective action may also have the effect of stalling new public policy innovations. Nelkin and Pollack (1981) have shown such effects for the movement against nuclear power, and Turk and Zucker have shown the effects of organized minority efforts on attempts to reduce local welfare services (1984, 1985).

Another attempt to assess the effect of collective action on public policy has centered on the question of whether or not the general turbulence of the 1960s resulted in material gains through the welfare system. This literature was inspired by the work of Piven and Cloward (1971). The debate between various researchers seems to suggest that there was no direct local effect of the extent and seriousness of civil disorders upon relief levels, but that indirect effects worked through the federal level of authority in producing the possibility that states with many affected cities could more vigorously expand welfare services (Albritton, 1979; Issac and Kelly, 1981; Schram and Turbett, 1983).

The focus of research on social movement outcomes has tended to focus on changes in legislation or governmental policy. Of late, however, researchers have begun to shift attention toward other more indirect outcomes of movement action. Such outcomes include changes in the perceptions of mass publics, the creation of cohorts committed to activist careers, and the creation of countermovements.

The "social constructionists" have regularly pointed to the importance of collective action in producing shifts in public perception of social issues. For example, Troyer and Markle (1983) show how the efforts of the antitobacco social movement were important in changing public perspectives on this issue as well as directly affecting social policy at the federal level. Gusfield (1981) recounts the development of the idea of the "killer drunk" and its subsequent incorporation into the contemporary movement against drinking and driving. This movement in turn has altered public perceptions in such a way that with little political conflict, the legal age for drinking alcoholic beverages has, in many states, been raised to 21 years.

Carol Mueller (1984) demonstrates how the women's movement has had massive indirect effects upon the political behavior of women who have had little direct involvement in the movement themselves. These effects work through the shifting understandings of what women are capable of doing and also altering the opportunities for political action on the part of women. So the majority of the women now entering the formal political process have not been "organized by feminists" in the sense that they took part in activities organized by feminist SMOs, yet one can make the case that the movement has been important in providing the opportunity for them to enter the formal political process. Marx and Wood (1975) note that an important indirect effect of certain protest activities is the diffusion of tactical models so that new forms may be taken up by widely dispersed groups. Tilly (1979) discusses the general process of the diffusion of such "repertoires of contention" through time and space.

Another legacy of social movements is the ongoing patterns of activism they may inspire in their key activists. Some "survivors" may even remain active through long cycles of movement decline to nourish and support a new influx of activists in another day. This is the story that Rupp and Taylor (1987) tell about the feminist movement during the 1950s in the United States. Or activists may take up other causes. So the defectors from one movement may be the seedbed for the emergence of newer movements during the later cycles of collective action. McAdam (1988) demonstrates this pattern for many of the earliest white activists in the civil rights movement, many of whom went on to play pioneering roles in the women's, antiwar, and student movements. Or the leaders of such movements may utilize their organizational skills in other contexts when other political opportunities present themselves. For instance, many former civil rights activists have become political functionaries in a number of local political systems such as Atlanta and the District of Columbia. The penetration of the political system by former activists can be expected to have social policy consequences relevant to earlier movement goals.

Another frequent outcome of collective action is the mobilization of specific countermovements or generalized political resistance to the aims of the original movement. In some cases, the level of resistance may be great enough to set in motion a significant and prolonged shift in the direction of electoral and policy outcomes. The generalized "law and order" backlash nurtured by the Republican right in the late sixties may well be an example of this phenomenon. The conditions under which these antagonistic and unintended consequences are likely to occur are as yet unclear and thus merit additional systematic study.

Conclusion

In the preceding pages we have tried both to review recent and earlier work on social movements and to sketch a comprehensive framework for organizing theory and research in the field. Specifically, we have argued that a complete understanding of social movements requires that researchers (a) distinguish between the emergent and later developmental phases of collective action, and (b) seek during both to link processes at the macro and micro levels by means of the intervening organizational bridges crucial during each. In our view a wide variety of informal, yet existing, associations of people provide the collective settings within which movements emerge. The significance of these micro-mobilization contexts derive from their potential for translating macro-structural opportunities for action into specific micro-mobilization dynamics.

The need for similar mediating structures hardly ends with the onset of collective action. Instead, formal social movement organizations (SMOs) are expected to develop to fill the ongoing need for an organizational bridge between the larger political and social environment and the specific constituencies the movement must mobilize if it is to succeed. How well SMOs are able to reconcile the pressures of their macroenvironment with the ongoing demands of micro mobilization will largely determine the movement's chances of success.

Besides shaping this view of collective action this review has also served to alert us to several underdeveloped areas of research and theorizing on the dynamics of collective action. We will conclude, then, by sketching what we see as three of the most glaring deficiencies in the literature and the research strategies that might address them.

The first concerns our relatively underdeveloped state of knowledge about the dynamics of collective action past the emergence of a movement. The sensitive reader was no doubt struck by the greater length and coherence of the section of the chapter dealing with the emergence of collective action. We simply have theorized more and amassed more empirical evidence concerning the early stage of a social movement. By comparison, we know comparatively little

about the dynamics of collective action over time. Specifically, we see a need for the creation of more systematic theoretical frameworks for studying movements over time. While we have a number of specific theories of movement emergence, we lack for any comparable theory of movement development. Instead, what we have is a growing body of empirical studies on various aspects of movement growth. As yet, however, we do not have a broad theoretical frame to help organize and bring coherence to this collection of discrete studies. The development of such a theory or theories would contribute greatly to our understanding of the dynamics of social change as well as to movement theory.

A comparable situation confronts us in the study of individual activism. While there are several theoretical accounts of recruitment to collective action, we boast no real theory of the effect of movement participation on the individual. Theories of conversion or adult political socialization may afford us some useful models for constructing such a theory, but to date no one has taken the time to do so. Nor have there been many good longitudinal or follow-up studies of activists completed that might aid in the development of such a theory. If we want to better understand the ongoing dynamics of individual activism, such a theory and a body of systematic empirical studies to "test" it are a must.

Finally, we come away convinced that the real action in social movements takes place at some level intermediate between the macro and micro. It is there in the existing associational groups or networks of the aggrieved community that the first groping steps toward collective action are taken. It is there that the decision to embed the movement in more formal movement organizations is reached. And it is there, within the SMOs themselves, that the strategic decisions are made that shape the trajectory of the movement over time. Most of our research has missed this level of analysis. We have focused the lion's share of our research energies on the before and after of collective action. The "before" research has focused on the macro and micro factors that make movements and individual activism more likely. The "after" side of the research equation is composed of the few studies that focus on the outcomes of collective action. But we haven't devoted a lot of attention to the ongoing accomplishment of collective action. How do macro and micro propensities get translated into specific mobilization attempts? What are the actual dynamics by which movement activists reach decisions regarding goals and tactics? How concretely do SMOs seek to recruit new members? To answer these questions, what is needed is more systematic, qualitative fieldwork into the dynamics of collective action at the intermediate meso level. We remain convinced that it is the level at which most movement action occurs and of which we know the least.

NOTES

1. In recent years a number of useful surveys of the new scholarship on social movements have been produced. Among the best of these are those by Gusfield, 1978; Jenkins, 1983; Marx and Wood, 1975; Morris and Herring, in press; and Zurcher and Snow, 1981.

2. For critical reviews of this perspective, see Deutscher, 1973, and Gurney and Tierney, 1982.

3. Besides these four major perspectives, there were two others that also had some influence on the field. The first of these is the natural history approach, as represented by the works of scholars such as Crane Brinton (1968) and L. P. Edwards (1927). The central idea underlying work in the natural history tradition is that movements—and especially revolutions—betray a consistent pattern of development often involving a set number of stages through which they inevitably pass. In the past 20 years, movement scholars have overwhelming rejected this idea, viewing movements as less stagelike than highly variable in their patterns of development. The second perspective not discussed in the text was the psychoanalytic approach. In works such as those by Adorno et al. (1950), Freud (1955), Lowenthal and Guterman (1949), and Martin (1920), scholars tried to account for individual participation in episodes of collective behavior or social movements on the basis of various dynamics and factors embedded in classical psychoanalytic theory. Once again, this research tradition has not been carried forward by many scholars working in the field today.

4. The study of collective behavior and social movements up until this time was primarily a "textbook" enterprise. Some rich case studies, however, were available and some of the best are difficult to place within one or another of the traditions we have outlined here. These include S. M. Lipset's Agrarian Socialism (1950), C. Eric Lincoln's Black Muslims in America (1961), and Nathan Glazer's The Social Bases of American Communism (1961). See Gusfield (1978) for a review of the major empirical monographs on social movements up to this time.

5. A few of the earlier theorists did take issue with these micro-level explanations of movement emergence. In particular, Turner and Killian (1956, 1972, 1986) have long been critical of those who would explain movements on the basis of individual states of mind.

6. For an introduction to the "new social movements" literature, see Klandermans, 1986.

7. We must not forget, however, that there are conditions under which repression may in fact spur collective action rather than inhibit it. This seems to have been the case in a variety of peasant movements (Wolf, 1969; Womack, 1969), as well as of some of the collective action described by the Tillys (1975) during the "rebellious century."

8. In point of fact, subsequent research on the Hare Krishna movement, the one exception cited by Snow, Zurcher, and Ekland-Olson (1980), revealed that a sizable proportion of its membership was also recruited through existing networks, especially as the movement matured (Rochford, 1982).

9. A case can also be made for a special "life transition" version of the basic argument outlined above. The claim is that some combination of geographic, social (e.g., divorce), or occupational transition in a person's life may provide an especially fertile biographic context for activism. The problem with this view is that while such transitions may well reduce the pressure of biographical constraints, they also tend to rob a person of the kind of personal contacts that normally draw people into movements. However, where transitions are not accompanied by any consequent loss of personal contacts, the result may well be an increased likelihood of participation. For example, McAdam (1986) found that graduating seniors had higher rates of participation in the Freedom Summer project than any other group of applicants. In this case, the freedom that came with graduation, coupled with the rich interpersonal/organizational context of campus life, may well have made seniors uniquely available for participation.

10. For an interesting discussion and theoretical elaboration of this point, see Snow, Zurcher, and Ekland-Olson, 1980, pp. 796-798.

REFERENCES

Aberle, David. 1966. *The Peyote Religion Among the Navajo*. Chicago: Aldine.

Adorno, T. W., E. Frenkel-Brunswick, D. J. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford. 1950. *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Aguirre, B. E. 1984. "The Conventionalization of Collective Behavior in Cuba." *American Journal of Sociology* 90: 541-566.

Albritton, Robert B. 1979. "Social Amelioration through Mass Insurgency? A Re-examination of the Piven and Cloward Thesis." *American Political Science Review* 73:1003-1011.

Alinsky, Saul. 1971. *Rules for Radicals*. New York: Random House.

Arendt, Hannah. 1951. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Aya, Rod. 1979. "Theories of Revolution Reconsidered: Contrasting Models of Collective Violence." *Theory and Society* 8:39-99.

Bailis, Laurence. 1974. *Bread or Justice*. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Balbus, Isaac. 1973. *The Dialectics of Legal Repression*. New York: Russell Sage.

Barkan, Steven E. 1985. *Protesters on Trial: Criminal Justice in the Southern Civil Rights and Vietnam Antiwar Movements*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

———. 1986. "Interorganizational Conflict in the Southern Civil Rights Movement." *Sociological Inquiry* 56:190-209.

Barnes, Samuel H. and Max Kaase. 1979. *Political Action*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Becker, Howard S. 1963. *Outsiders*. New York: Free Press.

Bennett, James T. and Thomas J. DiLorenzo. 1985. *Destroying Democracy: How Government Funds Partisan Politics*. Washington, DC: Cato Institute.

Berry, Jeffery M. 1977. *Lobbying for the People*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Block, Jeanne H. 1972. "Generational Continuity and Discontinuity in the Understanding of Societal Rejection." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 22:333-345.

———, N. Haan, and B. M. Smith. 1968. "Activism and Apathy in Contemporary Adolescents." In *Understanding Adolescence: Current Developments in Adolescent Psychology*, edited by James F. Adams. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bloom, Jack. 1986. "Class, Race and the Civil Rights Movement: The Changing Political Economy of Racism." Unpublished manuscript, University of Indiana, Gary.

Blumer, Herbert. 1946. "Collective Behavior." Pp. 167-219 in *A New Outline of the Principles of Sociology*, edited by A. M. Lee. New York: Barnes and Noble.

———. 1955. "Social Movements." Pp. 99-220 in *Principles of Sociology*, edited by A. M. Lee. New York: Barnes and Noble.

———. 1969. "Collective Behavior." In *Principles of Sociology*, edited by A. M. Lee. New York: Barnes and Noble.

———. 1976. "Relative Deprivation, Rising Expectations, and Black Militancy." *Journal of Social Issues* 32:119-137.

Bolton, Charles D. 1972. "Alienation and Action: A Study of Peace Group Members." *American Journal of Sociology* 78:537-561.

Bonnell, Victoria E. 1984. *Roots of Rebellion: Workers' Politics and Organizations in St. Petersburg and Moscow, 1900-1914*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Brand, K. W. 1982. *Neue Soziale Bewegungen, Entstehung, Funktion und Perspektive neuer Protestpotentiale, eine Zwischenbilanz*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Braungart, Richard G. 1971. "Family Status, Socialization and Student Politics: A Multivariate Analysis." *American Journal of Sociology* 77: 108-129.

Briet, Martien, Bert Klandermans, and Frederike Kroon. 1984. "How Women Become Involved

in the Feminist Movement." Presented at the annual meetings of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, San Antonio, Texas.

Bright, Charles and Susan Harding. 1984. *State Making and Social Movements*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Brint, Steven. 1984. " 'New Class' and Cumulative Trend Explanations of the Liberal Political Attitudes of Professionals." *American Journal of Sociology* 90:30-71.

Brinton, Crane. 1968. *The Anatomy of Revolution*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Bruce-Briggs, B., ed. 1979. *The New Class*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Burstein, Paul. 1985. *Discrimination, Jobs and Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Button, James W. 1978. *Black Violence*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Cable, Sherry. 1984. "Professionalization in Social Movement Organizations: A Case Study of Pennsylvanians for Biblical Morality." *Sociological Forces* 7:287-304.

Carden, M. L. 1978. "The Proliferation of a Social Movement." *Research in Social Movements, Conflict, and Change* 1:179-196.

Conover, Pamela Johnston and Virginia Gray. 1983. *Feminism and the New Right: Conflict over the American Family*. New York: Praeger.

Curtis, Russell L. and Louise A. Zurcher, Jr. 1973. "Stable Resources of Protest Movement: The Multi-organizational Field." *Social Forces* 52: 53-60.

Davies, James C. 1963. *Human Nature in Politics: The Dynamics of Political Behavior*. New York: John Wiley.

———. 1969. "The J-curve of Rising and Declining Satisfaction as a Cause of Some Great Revolutions and a Contained Rebellion." In *Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

de Geest, A. 1984. "Nieuwe Sociale Bewegingen en de Verzorgingsstaat." *Tijdschrift Voor Sociologie* 5:239-267.

Deutscher, Irwin. 1973. *What We Say/What We Do*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

D'Emillio, John. 1983. *Sexual Politics, Sexual Communities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Edelman, Murray. 1964. *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

———. 1971. *Politics as Symbolic Action*. New York: Academic Press.

———. 1977. *Political Language: Words that Succeed and Policies that Fail*. New York: Academic Press.

Edwards, L. P. 1927. *The Natural History of Revolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Eisinger Peter K. 1973. "The Conditions of Protest Behavior in American Cities." *American Political Science Review* 67:11-28.

Evans, Sarah. 1980. *Personal Politics*. New York: Vintage Books.

Fainstein, Norman I. and Susan S. Fainstein. 1974. *Urban Political Movements: The Search for Power by Minority Groups in American Cities*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Feieraband, Ivo, Rosalind Feieraband, and Betty Nesvold. 1969. "Social Change and Political Violence: Cross National Patterns." Pp. 497-595 in *Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives*, edited by Hugh David Graham and Ted Robert Gurr. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Ferree, Myra Marx and Frederick D. Miller. 1985. "Mobilization and Meaning: Toward an Integration of Social Movements." *Sociological Inquiry* 55:38-51.

Fernandez, Roberto and Doug McAdam. 1987. "Multiorganizational Fields and Recruitment to Social Movements." In *Organizing for Social Change: Social Movement Organizations Across Cultures*, edited by Bert Klandermans. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Feuer, Lewis. 1969. *The Conflict of Generations: The Character and Significance of Student Movements*. New York: Basic Books.

Fireman, Bruce and William H. Gamson. 1979. "Utilitarian Logic in the Resource Mobilization Perspective." Pp. 8-45 in *The Dynamics of Social Movements*, edited by Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.

Flacks, Richard. 1967. "The Liberated Generation: An Exploration of the Roots of Student Protest." *Journal of Social Issues* 23:52-75.

Foster, John. 1974. *Class Struggle and the Industrial Revolution: Early Industrial Capitalism in Three Towns*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Fox, Karen F. and Phillip Kotler. 1980. "The Marketing of Social Causes: The First 10 Years." *Journal of Marketing* 44:22-33.

Freeman, Jo. 1973. "The Origins of the Women's Liberation Movement." *American Journal of Sociology* 78:792-811.

———. 1975. *The Politics of Women's Liberation*. New York: David McKay.

———. 1979. "The Women's Liberation Movement: Its Origins, Organization, Activities and Ideas." In *Women: A Feminist Perspective*, edited by Jo Freeman. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

Freud, Sigmund. 1943. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, edited by J. Strachey et al. London: The Hogarth Press.

Friedman, Debra. 1983. "Why Workers Strike: Individual Decisions and Structural Constraints." Pp. 250-283 in *The Microfoundations of Macrosociology*, edited by Michael Hechter. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

———. 1988. "Uncertainty as a Precondition for Strikes." Unpublished manuscript, University of Arizona.

Gale, Richard P. 1986. "Social Movements and the State: The Environmental Movement, Counter-

Movement, and Governmental Agencies." *Sociological Perspectives* 29:202-240.

Gamson, William. 1975. *The Strategy of Social Protest*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

———. 1984. "Political Symbolism and Nuclear Arms Policy." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Antonio, Texas.

———, Bruce Freeman, and Steven Rytina. 1982. *Encounters with Unjust Authority*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

Gans, Herbert. 1979. *Deciding What's News*. New York: Pantheon.

Garner, Roberta. 1977. *Social Movements in America*. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Garrow, David J. 1978. *Protest at Selma*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gerlach, Luther P. and Virginia H. Hine. 1970. *People, Power, and Change: Movements of Social Transformation*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Gerth, Hans and C. Wright Mills. 1946. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Geschwender, James. 1964. "Social Structure and the Negro Revolt: An Examination of Some Hypotheses." *Social Forces* 43:250-256.

———. 1968. "Explorations in the Theory of Social Movements and Revolution." *Social Forces* 47:127-135.

Gitlin, Todd. 1980. *The Whole World is Watching*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Glazer, Nathan. 1961. *The Social Bases of American Communism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Glock, Charles Y. 1964. "The Role of Deprivation in the Origin and Evolution of Religious Groups." Pp. 24-36 in *Religion and Social Conflict*, edited by R. Lee and M. Marty. New York: Oxford University Press.

Godwin, R. Kenneth and Robert C. Mitchell. 1984. "The Implications of Direct Mail for Political Organizations." *Social Science Quarterly* 65: 829-839.

Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gouldner, Alvin W. 1976. *The Dialectic of Ideology and Technology: The Origin, Grammar and Future of Ideology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gurney, J. N. and K. T. Tierney. 1982. "Relative Deprivation and Social Movements: A Critical Look at Twenty Years of Theory and Research." *Sociological Quarterly* 23:33-47.

Gurr, Ted. 1970. *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gusfield, Joseph. 1955. "Social Structure and Moral Reform: A Study of the Women's Christian Temperance Union." *American Journal of Sociology* 61:221-232.

———. 1978. "Historical Problematics and Sociological Fields: American Liberalism and the Study of Social Movements." *Research in Sociology of Knowledge, Science and Art* 1: 121-149.

———. 1981. *The Culture of Public Problems: Drinking and Driving and the Symbolic Order*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Habermas, Jurgen. 1973. *Legitimation Crisis*. Boston: Beacon.

———. 1976. *Communication and the Evolution of Society*. Boston: Beacon.

Hadden, Jeffrey K. and Charles E. Swann. 1981. *Prime Time Preachers: The Rising Power of Televangelism*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Haines, Herbert H. 1984. "Black Radicalization and the Funding of Civil Rights: 1957-1970." *Social Problems* 32:31-43.

Hancock, Kelly. 1975. "From Innocence to Boredom: Revolution in the West." Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.

Handler, Joel. 1978. *Social Movements and the Legal System*. New York: Academic Press.

Heberle, Rudolph. 1951. *Social Movements: An Introduction to Political Sociology*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Heirich, Max. 1977. "Changes of Heart: A Test of Some Widely Held Theories of Religious Conversion." *American Journal of Sociology* 83: 653-680.

Himmelstein, Jerome and Mayer N. Zald. 1984. "American Conservatism and the Funding of Art and Science." *Sociological Quarterly* 54: 171-187.

Hirsch, F. 1980. *Die Soziale Grenzen des Wachstums Ein Okenomische Analyse der Wachstumskrise*. Hamburg: Reinbek.

Hobsbawm, E. J. 1965. *Primitive Rebels*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Hoffer, Eric. 1951. *The True Believer: Thoughts on the Nature of Mass Movements*. New York: New American Library.

Hubbard, Howard. 1968. "Five Long Hot Summers and How They Grew." *Public Interest* 12:3-24.

Inglehart, R. 1977. *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Issac, Larry, and William R. Kelly. 1981. "Racial Insurgency, the State, and Welfare Expansion: Local and National Level Evidence from the Postwar United States." *American Journal of Sociology* 86:1348-1386.

Jackson, Maurice, Eleanora Peterson, James Bull, Sverre Monson, and Patricia Richmond. 1960. "The Failure of an Incipient Social Movement." *Pacific Sociological Review* 31:35-40.

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

———. and Craig M. Eckert. 1986. "Channeling Black Insurgency: Elite Patronage and Professional Social Movement Organizations in the Development of the Black Movement." *American Sociological Review* 51:812-829.

Jenkins, J. Craig and Charles Perrow. 1977. "Insurgency of the Powerless: Farm Workers' Movements (1946-1972)." *American Sociological Review* 42:249-268.

Johnston, Hank. 1980. "The Marketed Social Movement: A Case Study of the Rapid Growth of TM." *Pacific Sociological Review* 23:333-354.

Jonas, Gerald. 1971. *On Doing Good: The Quaker Experiment*. New York: Schribner's.

Kaase, Max and Samuel H. Barnes. 1979. "In Conclusion: The Future of Political Protest in Western Democracies." Pp. 523-536 in *Political Action*, edited by Samuel H. Barnes and Max Kaase. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Kanter, Rosebeth M. 1972. *Commitment and Community: Communes and Utopian Sociological Perspective*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Keniston, Kenneth. 1968. *Young Radicals*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Kitschelt, Herbert P. 1986. "Political Opportunity Structures and Political Protest." *British Journal of Political Science* 16:57-85.

Klandermans, Bert. 1984. "Mobilization and Participation: Social-Psychological Expansions of Resource Mobilization Theory." *American Sociological Review* 49:583-600.

———. 1986. "New Social Movements and Resource Mobilization: The European and the American Approach." *Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters* 4:13-37.

———. and Dirk Oegema. 1984. "Mobilizing for Peace: The 1983 Peace Demonstration in the Hague." Presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, San Antonio, Texas.

Klapp, Orrin. 1969. *Collective Search for Identity*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Knoke, David. 1986. "Incentives in Collective Action Organizations." Unpublished manuscript, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Kornhauser, William. 1959. *The Politics of Mass Society*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Kotler, Philip and Gerald Zaltman. 1971. "Social Marketing: An Approach to Planned Social Change." *Journal of Marketing* 35:3-12.

Kriesi, Hanspeter. 1985. *Bewegung in der Schweizer Politic Fallstudien zu Politischen Mobilierungsprozessen in der Schweiz*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag.

Lang, Kurt and Gladys Lang. 1961. *Collective Dynamics*. New York: Crowell.

Lawson, Ronald. 1983. "A Decentralized but Moving Pyramid: The Evolution and Consequences of the Structure of the Tenant Movement." Pp. 119-132 in *Social Movements of the Sixties and Seventies*, edited by Jo Freeman. New York: Longman.

Le Bon, Gustave. 1960. *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*. New York: Viking Press.

Levine, E. M. 1980. "Rural Communes and Religious Cults: Refugees for Middle-Class Youth." *Adolescent Psychiatry* 8:138-153.

Lincoln, C. Eric. 1961. *Black Muslims in America*. Boston: Beacon.

Lincoln, J. R. 1978. "Community Structure and Industrial Conflict." *American Sociological Review* 43:199-220.

Lipset, Seymour M. 1950. *Agrarian Socialism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 1960. *Political Man*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

———. and Earl Rabb. 1973. *The Politics of Unreason: Right-Wing Extremism in America, 1790-1970*. New York: Harper & Row.

Lipsky, Michael. 1968. "Protest as a Political Resource." *American Political Science Review* 62:1144-1158.

———. 1970. *Protest in City Politics*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Lo, Clarence Y. H. 1982. "Counter-Movements and Conservative Movements in the Contemporary U.S." *Annual Review of Sociology* 8:107-134.

Lodhi, A. Q., and Charles Tilly. 1973. "Urbanization, Criminality and Collective Violence in Nineteenth Century France." *American Journal of Sociology* 79:296-318.

Lofland, John. 1969. *Deviance and Identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

———. 1977. *Doomsdaycult*. New York: Irvington.

———. 1982. "Crowd Lobbying: An Emerging Tactic of Interest Group Influence in California." California Government Series II. Davis: Institute of Government Affairs, University of CA.

———. 1985. *Protest: Studies of Collective Behavior and Social Movements*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

———. and Michael Fink. 1982. *Symbolic Sit-ins: Protest Occupation at the California Capital*. Washington, DC: University Press of America.

Lowenthal, L. and N. Guterman. 1949. *Prophets of Deceit: A Study of the Techniques of the American Agitator*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Luker, Kristin. 1984. *Abortion and the Politics of Motherhood*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Marsh, Alan. 1977. *Protest and Political Consciousness*. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.

———. and Max Kaase. 1979. "Measuring Political Action." In *Political Action*, edited by Samuel H. Barnes and Max Kaase. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Martin, E. D. 1920. *The Behavior of Crowds*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Marx, Gary. 1969. *Protest and Prejudice*. New York: Harper & Row.

———. 1974. "Thoughts on a Neglected Category of Social Movement Participant: The Agent Provocateur and the Informant." *American Journal of Sociology* 80:402-402.

———. 1979. "External Efforts to Damage or Facilitate Social Movements: Some Patterns, Ex-

planations, Outcomes, and Complications." Pp. 94-125 in *The Dynamics of Social Movement*, edited by Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.

——— and James Wood. 1975. "Strands of Theory and Research in Collective Behavior." *Annual Review of Sociology* 1:363-428.

Marx, Karl. 1958. "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte." In *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Selected Works*. Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House.

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

——— 1983. "Tactical Innovation and the Pace of Insurgency." *American Sociological Review* 48: 735-754.

——— 1986. "Recruitment to High-Risk Activism: The Case of Freedom Summer." *American Journal of Sociology* 92:64-90.

——— 1988. *Freedom Summer. The Idealists Revisited*. New York: Oxford University Press.

——— and John McCarthy. 1982. "The Professional Project: The Invention of Work Through Collective Action." Presented at the annual meetings of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, San Francisco.

McCarthy, John D. 1987. "Pro-Life and Pro-Choice Mobilization: Infrastructure Deficits and New Technologies." Pp. 49-66 in *Social Movements in an Organizational Society*, edited by Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

——— and David Britt. In press. "Adapting Social Movement Organizations to External Constraints in the Modern State: Tax Codes and Accreditation." In *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change*, edited by Louis Kriesberg. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

McCarthy, John D., Mark Wolfson, David P. Baker, and Elaine M. Mosakowski. In press. "The Founding of Social Movement Organizations: Local Citizens' Groups Opposing Drunken Driving." In *Ecological Models of Organization*, edited by Glenn R. Carroll. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

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

——— 1974. "Tactical Consideration in Social Movement Organization." Presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, Totonto.

——— 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 82:1212-1241.

McFarland, Andrew F. 1976. "The Complexity of Democratic Practice within Common Cause." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Political Science Association.

——— 1977. *Public Interest Lobbies*. Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute.

——— 1984. *Common Cause: Lobbying in the Public Interest*. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.

McPhail, Clark. 1971. "Civil Disorder Participation: A Critical Examination of Recent Research." *American Sociological Review* 36:1058-1073.

——— 1985. "The Social Organization of Demonstrations." Presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, Washington, DC.

——— and Ronald F. Wohlstein. 1983. "Individual and Collective Behaviors within Gatherings, Demonstrations and Riots." *Annual Review of Sociology* 9:579-600.

McQuail, Denis. 1985. "Sociology of Mass Communication." *Annual Review of Sociology* 11:93-111.

Melucci, Alberto. 1980. "The New Social Movements: A Theoretical Approach." *Social Science Information* 19:199-226.

——— 1981a. "New Movements, Terrorism and the Political System: Reflections on the Italian Case." *Socialist Review* 56:97-136.

——— 1981b. "Ten Hypotheses for the Analysis of New Movements." Pp. 173-194. in *Contemporary Italian Sociology*, edited by D. Pinto. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Messinger, Sheldon L. 1955. "Organizational Transformation: A Case Study of a Declining Social Movement." *American Sociological Review* 26:3-10.

Michels, Robert. 1959. *Political Parties*. New York: Dover.

Miller, William D. 1974. *A Harsh and Dreadful Love: Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker Movement*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Mitchell, Robert C. 1979. "National Environmental Lobbies and the Apparent Illogic of Collective Action." Pp. 87-121 in *Collective Decision-Making Applications from Public Choice Theory*, edited by Clifford S. Russell. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

——— 1981. "From Elite Quarrel to Mass Movement." *Society* 18:76-84.

Molotch, Harvey. 1970. "Oil in Santa Barbara and Power in America." *Sociological Inquiry* 40: 131-141.

——— 1979. "Media and Movements." Pp. 71-93 in *The Dynamics of Social Movements*, edited by Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.

——— and Marylin Lester. 1974. "News as Purposive Behavior: On the Strategic Use of Routine Events, Accidents and Scandals." *American Sociological Review* 39:101-112.

——— 1975. "Accidental News: The Great Oil Spill as Local Occurrence and National Event." *American Journal of Sociology* 81:235-260.

Morris, Aldon. 1984. *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement*. New York: Free Press.

——— 1986. "Birmingham Confrontation Reconsidered: An Analysis of Tactical Dynamics." Unpublished paper, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

——— and Cedric Herring. In press. "Theory and Research in Social Movements: A Critical Review." In *Political Behavior Annual*, edited by Samuel Long. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Morrison, Denton. 1973. "Some Notes Toward Theory on Relative Deprivation, Social Movements, and Social Change." Pp. 103-116 in *Social Movements: A Reader and Source Book*, edited by R. R. Evans. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Mottl, Tahi L. 1980. "The Analysis of Counter-Movements." *Social Problems* 27:620-635.

Mueller, Carol. 1983. "In Search of a Constituency for the New Religious Right." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 47:213-229.

——— 1984. "Women's Movement Success and the Success of Social Movement Theory." Presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, San Antonio, Texas.

Mueller, Edward N. 1980. "The Psychology of Political Protest and Violence." In *Handbook of Political Conflict*, edited by Ted Robert Gurr. New York: Free Press.

Neal, Arthur G. and Melvin Seeman. 1964. "Organization s and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis." *American Sociological Review* 29:216-226.

Nelkin, Dorothy and Michael Pollak. 1981. *The Atom Besieged*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Nielsen, F. 1980. "The Flemish Movement in Belgium after World War II." *American Sociological Review* 45:76-94.

Oberschall, Anthony. 1973. *Social Conflict and Social Movements*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

O'Connor, James. 1973. *The Fiscal Crisis of the State*. New York: St. Martin's.

Oliver, Pamela. 1984. "If You Don't Do It, Nobody Will. Active and Token Contributors to Local Collective Action." *American Sociological Review* 49:601-610.

Olson, Mancur, Jr. 1965. *The Logic of Collective Action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Orum, Anthony M. 1972. *Black Students in Protest*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

Oudijk, Corrine. 1983. *Sociale Atlas van de Vrouw. Sociale en Culturele Studies 3, Sociaal Culturele Planbureau*. Den Haag: Staatsuitgeverij.

Park, Robert E. 1967. *On Social Control and Collective Behavior*, edited by Ralph H. Turner. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

——— and Ernest W. Burgess. 1921. *Introduction to the Science of Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Perrow, Charles. 1979. *Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Persky, Stan. 1981. *At the Lenin Shipyard*. Vancouver, British Columbia: New Star Books.

Petty, R. E. and J. T. Cacioppo. 1981. *Attitudes and Attitude Change: The Social Judgement-Involvement Approach*. Dubuque, IA: W. C. Brown.

Pharr, Susan J. In press. *Status Politics in Japan*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pickvance, C. G. 1975. "On the Study of Urban Social Movements." *American Sociological Review* 23:29-49.

Pinard, Maurice. 1971. *The Rise of a Third Party: A Study in Crisis Politics*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward. 1971. *Regulating the Poor*. New York: Pantheon.

Polsby, Nelson W. 1983. *Consequences of Party Reform*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Robinson, Jo Ann Ooiman. 1981. *Abraham Went Out: A Biography of A. J. Muste*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Rochford, E. Burke. 1982. "Recruitment Strategies, Ideology, and Organization in the Hare Krishna Movement." *Social Problems* 29:399-410.

——— 1985. *Hare Krishna in America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Rokeach, Milton. 1969. *Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rosenthal, Naomi, Meryl Fingrutd, Michele Ethier, Roberta Karant, and David McDonald. 1985. "Social Movements and Network Analysis: A Case Study of Nineteeth-Century Women's Reform in New York State." *American Journal of Sociology* 90:1022-1055.

Ross, Lee. 1977. "The Intuitive Psychologist and His Shortcomings: Distortions in the Attribution Process." In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 10, edited by L. Berkowitz. New York: Academic Press.

Rothman, Stanley and S. Robert Lichter. 1978. "The Case of the Student Left." *Social Research* (Autumn):535-609.

Rude, George. 1980. *Ideology and Popular Protest*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Rule, James and Charles Tilly. 1975. "Political Process in Revolutionary France: 1830-1832." Pp. 41-85 in *1830 in France*, edited by John M. Merriman. New York: New Viewpoints.

Rupp, Leila and Verta Taylor. 1987. *Survival in the Doldrums: The American Women's Rights Movement, 1945 to 1960*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sabato, Larry J. 1981. *The Rise of Political Consultants*. New York: Basic Books.

Sayre, Cynthia Woolever. 1980. "The Impact of Voluntary Association Involvement on Social-Psychological Attitudes." Presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, New York City.

Schneider, Joseph W. 1985. "The Constructionist View." *Annual Review of Sociology* 11:209-229.

Schram, Sanford F. and J. Patrick Turbett. 1983. "Civil Disorder and the Welfare Explosion: A Two-Step Process." *American Sociological Review* 48:408-414.

Schwartz, Michael. 1976. *Radical Protest and Social Structure*. New York: Academic Press.

Schwartzmann, Kathleen C. In press. *Coalitions in*

Crisis: Breakdown of the First Portuguese Republic. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.

Selznick, Philip. 1952. *The Organizational Weapon.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Shorter, Edward and Charles Tilly. 1974. *Strikes in France, 1830-1968.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Simcock, B. L. 1979. "Developmental Aspects of Antipollution Protest in Japan." *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change* 2:83-104.

Simons, Herbert W. 1970. "Requirements, Problems, and Strategies: A Theory of Persuasion for Social Movements." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56:1-11.

———. 1981. "The Rhetoric of Political Movements." Pp. 417-444 in *Handbook of Political Communication,* edited by Dan Nimmo and Keith Sanders. Beverly Hills: Sage.

———, E. W. Mechling, and H. Schreier. 1985. "Function of Communication in Mobilizing for Collective Action from the Bottom Up: The Rhetoric of Social Movements." In *Handbook of Rhetorical and Communication Theory,* edited by C. Arnold and J. Bowers. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Smelser, Neil. 1962. *Theory of Collective Behavior.* New York: Free Press.

Snow, David A. 1976. "The Nichiren Shoshu Buddhist Movement in America: A Sociological Examination of its Value Orientation, Recruitment Effors, and Spread." Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms.

——— 1986. "Organization, Ideology and Mobilization: The Case of Nichiren Shoshu of America." In *The Future of New Religious Movements,* edited by D. G. Bromley and P. E. Hammond. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.

——— and Susan Marshall. 1984. "Cultural Imperialism, Social Movements, and the Islamic Revival." Pp. 131-152 in *Social Movements, Conflicts and Change,* vol. 7, edited by Louis Kriesberg. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Snow, David A. and E. Burke Rochford, Jr. 1983. "Structural Avialabilty, the Alignment Process and Movement Recruitment." Presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, Detroit.

Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford, Jr., Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review* 51:464-481.

Snow, David A., Louis A. Zurcher, Jr., and Sheldon Ekland-Olson. 1980. "Social Networks and Social Movements: A Microstructual Approach to Differential Recruitment." *American Sociological Review* 45:787-801.

Snyder, David and William R. Kelly. 1979. "Strategies for Investigating Violence and Social Change: Illustrations from Analyses of Racial

Disorders and Implications for Mobilization Research." Pp. 212-237 in *The Dynamics of Social Movements,* edited by Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.

Staggenborg, Suzanne. 1986. "Coalition Work in the Pro-Choice Movement: Organizational and Environmental Opportunities and Obstacles." *Social Problems* 33:374-390.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1982. "Social Movements, Resource Mobilization and Reform during Cycles of Protest." *Western Studies Program Project, Social Protest and Policy Innovative Work,* Paper -1. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

Tierney, Kathleen J. 1982. "The Battered Women Movement and the Creation of the Wife Beating Problem." *Social Problems* 29:207-220.

Tilly, Charles, 1975. *The Formation of National States in Western Europe.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

——— 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

——— 1979. "Repertories of Contention in America and Britain, 1750-1830." In *The Dynamics of Social Movements,* edited by Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.

———, ed. 1984. "Social Movements and National Politics." In *Statemaking and Social Movements,* edited by Charles Bright and Susan Harding. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

———, Louis Tilly, and Richard Tilly. 1975. *The Rebellious Century, 1830-1930.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Toch, Hans. 1965. *The Social Psychology of Social Movements.* Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Touraine, Alain. 1981. *The Voice and the Eye: An Analysis of Social Movements.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Traugott, Mark. 1985. *Armies of the Poor.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Troyer, Ronald J. and Gerald E. Markle. 1983. *Cigarettes: The Battle over Smoking.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University.

Turk, Herman and Lynne G. Zucker. 1984. "Majority and Organized Opposition: On Effects of Social Movements." Pp. 249-269 in *Social Movements, Conflict and Change,* edited by Louis Kriesberg. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

——— 1985. "Structural Bases of Minority Effects on Majority-Supported Change." *Social Science Quarterly* 66:365-385.

Turner, Ralph. 1969. "The Public Perception of Protest." *American Sociological Review* 34:815-831.

——— and Lewis Killian. 1957. *Collective Behavior.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

——— 1972. *Collective Behavior,* 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

——— 1986. *Collective Behavior,* 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Useem, Bert. 1980. "Solidarity Model, Breakdown Model, and the Boston Anti-busing Movement." *American Sociological Review* 45:357-369.

——— and Mayer Zald. 1982. "From Pressure Group to Social Movement: Efforts to Promote Use of Nuclear Power." *Social Problems* 30: 144-156.

Van der Loo, Hans, Erik Snel, and Bart Van Steenbergen. 1984. *Een Wenkend Perspectief? Nieuwe Social Bewegingen en Culturele Veranderingen.* Amersfoort: De Horstink.

Von Eschen, Donald, Jerome Kirk, and Maurice Pinard. 1971. "The Organizational Substructure of Disorderly Politics." *Social Forces* 49:529-544.

Walsh, Edward J. 1981. "Resource Mobilization and Citizen Protest in Communities Around Three Mile Island." *Social Problems* 29:1-21.

——— and Rex H. Warland. 1983. "Social Movement Involvement in the Wake of a Nuclear Accident: Activists and Free Riders in the Three Mile Island Area." *American Sociological Review* 48:764-781.

Weinstein, Deena. 1979. *Bureaucratic Opposition.* New York: Pergamon.

West, Guida. 1981. *The National Welfare Rights Movement.* New York: Praeger.

Wicker, Allan. 1969. "Attitudes vs. Action: The Relationship of Verbal and Overt Behavioral Responses to Attitude Objects." *Journal of Social Issues* 25:41-78.

Wilson, Kenneth L. and Anthony M. Orum. 1976. "Mobilizing People for Collective Political Action." *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 4:187-202.

Wilson, William J. 1973. *Power, Racism and Privilege.* New York: Free Press.

Wolf, Eric. 1969. *Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century.* New York: Harper & Row.

Wolfson, Mark. 1987. "An Analysis of the Regulation of Social Movement Organizations and Industries." Presented at the annual meetings of the Eastern Sociological Association, Boston.

Womack, John, Jr. 1969. *Zapata and the Mexican Revolution.* New York: Knopf.

Wood, Michael and Michael Hughes. 1984. "The Moral Basis of Moral Reform: Status Discontent vs. Culture and Socialization as Explanations of Antipornography Social Movement Adherence." *American Sociological Review* 49:86-99.

Wood, P. 1982. "The Environmental Movement." Pp. 201-220 in *Social Movements,* edited by J. L. Wood and M. Jackson. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Zald, Mayer N. and Roberta Ash. 1966. "Social Movement Organizations: Growth, Decay and Change." *Social Forces* 44:327-341.

Zald, Mayer N. and Patricia Denton. 1963. "From Evangelism to Social Service: The Transformation of the YMCA." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 8:214-234.

Zald, Mayer N. and John D. McCarthy. 1975. "Organizational Intellectuals and the Criticism of Society." *Social Service Review* 49:344-362.

——— 1987. "Religious Groups as Crucibles of Social Movements." Pp. 67-96 in *Social Movements in an Organizational Society,* edited by Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Zald, Mayer N. and Bert Useem. 1987. "Movement and Countermovement Interaction: Mobilization, Tactics and State Involvement." Pp. 247-272 in *Social Movements in an Organizational Society,* edited by Mayer N. Zald and John D. McCarthy. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Zukier, Henri. 1982. "Situational Determinants of Behavior." *Social Research* 49:1073-1091.

Zurcher, Louis A. and R. George Kirkpatrick. 1976. *Citizens for Decency: Antipornography Crusades as Status Defense.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Zurcher, Louis A. and David A. Snow. 1981. "Collective Behavior: Social Movements." In *Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives,* edited by Morris Rosenberg and Ralph H. Turner. New York: Basic Books.