# Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews

**Social Movements, Organizations, and Fields: a Decade of Theoretical Integration**
Edward T. Walker

The online version of this article can be found at:

>> Version of Record - Sep 6, 2012

What is This?

# CRITICAL-RETROSPECTIVE ESSAYS

## Religion Contextualized

MICHELE DILLON
*University of New Hampshire*
*Michele.dillon@unh.edu*

The socio-political and cultural upheavals in the United States and the world since 2000 have pushed religion to the forefront of news headlines and public consciousness, but they have not ushered a paradigm shift in the sociology of religion. The classical Weberian secularization thesis postulating the differentiation of religion from other spheres and the concomitant decline of religious meaning and authority in individual lives and public culture still hovers in the background as the frame from within which many sociologists make sense of religion's societal presence. The prospect that a new paradigm was emerging in the early 1990s (Warner 1993) as a result of the increased prominence of the religious economy model (e.g., Finke and Stark 1992; 2002) did not fully eventuate. Nonetheless, its assumptions of a competitive religious marketplace characterized by nimble, entrepreneurial religious suppliers who cater to particular religious demands and create particular religious niches continue to energize many scholars who use it to explain certain socio-historical instances of religious pluralism and participation, or alternatively to contest or modify its claims.

Religion today presents a Janus-faced reality. This is especially so in the United States where its institutional presence is persistently strong, religious ideas and discourse actively permeate culture and politics, and a large majority of individuals anchor their identity in a religious or spiritual tradition. At the same time, religious beliefs, practices, and affiliations are fluid and malleable, religious authority is contested even by those who are among the most committed to church, and for many, religion is worn like

*Heaven's Kitchen: Living Religion at God's Love We Deliver*, by **Courtney Bender.** Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2003. 192pp. $20.00 paper. ISBN: 9780226042824.

*Congregations in America*, by **Mark Chaves.** Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004. 291pp. $29.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780674012844.

*Divided by Faith: Evangelical Religion and the Problem of Race in America*, by **Michael O. Emerson** and **Christian Smith.** Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2000. 212pp. $19.95 paper. ISBN: 9780195147070.

*An Awareness of What is Missing: Faith and Reason in a Post-Secular Age*, by **Jürgen Habermas**, et al. Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2010. 87pp. $14.95 paper. ISBN: 9780745647210.

*Vatican II: A Sociological Analysis of Religious Change*, by **Melissa J. Wilde.** Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007. 196pp. $42.00 cloth. ISBN: 9780691118291.

*America and the Challenges of Religious Diversity*, by **Robert Wuthnow.** Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005. 391pp. $29.95 paper. ISBN: 9780691134116.

a light cloak that can be discarded at will. Given that overall there has been much

steadiness in post-World War II trends in religious affiliation, the doubling by the late 1990s (from seven to fourteen percent) in the proportion of Americans expressing no religious preference was a startling discovery (Hout and Fischer 2002). This trend of disaffiliation has continued into the new century (The Pew Forum [2008] reports 16 percent as unaffiliated). It is not taken as evidence of secularization but as the outcome of the interplay between generational change and the tendency of political moderates to eschew claiming a religious affiliation given the politicization of religion by the Religious Right (Hout and Fischer 2002). The decline in religious affiliation in the United States, moreover, as has long been the case in far more secular Europe, has not displaced the personal meaningfulness of religious and spiritual beliefs. Enchantment continues; for many it is located in varied natural and metaphysical forces and for some it is blended with rather than confined or attached to mainstream institutionalized religious traditions.

The terrorist events of September 11, 2001, brought Islam to public prominence in the West and highlighted the complicated links among religion, geopolitics and terrorism. Since 9/11, there has been greater focus on the increased presence of minority religious populations in the West and the challenges encountered in publicly accommodating religious symbols and religio-cultural practices that are in tension somewhat with the secular principles institutionalized in Western states. These dilemmas and their resolution have been especially fraught in Western Europe (e.g., France has banned the wearing of the hijab in public places) but also raise questions about the acceptance of minority identities in pluralistic America. The increased awareness of Islam has not, however, changed the sociology of religion to any great extent. Some sociologists were writing about Islam and about religious violence prior to 9/11 and many, too, were actively studying religion's globalizing flows and processes (especially the impact of Asian religions and Latino religious practices in the United States). This focus has continued but is folded in more generally with already existing research programs rather than with so-called Islamification.

One notable shift post-2000 is Jürgen Habermas' new awareness of the cultural relevance of religion, a shift that revives interest in secularization processes, contexts, and limits. A preeminent social theorist, and a public intellectual who writes primarily from within the European context, Habermas is concerned about the derailing of the Enlightenment project of modernization, and the varied threats posed to deliberative democracy by the persistent economic and fiscal crises, depoliticization, and the threat posed to the dismantling of democracy in light of the rising power of supra-national institutions (e.g., EU, IMF). He is also particularly concerned by what he sees as the resurgence of religion, religious conflicts, and "the unsettling political role of religious communities" especially Islam and fundamentalist Christianity (2010: 19-20). Habermas' changing views of how mainstream religion might be incorporated into the public sphere are found in various essays, but a good book in which to encounter his new stance is *An Awareness of What is Missing* (2010). While in the past, Habermas was quite insistent that religion lacked the rational capacity to be admissible into the public sphere, he now views mainstream religion as a public resource that can aid in the revitalization of democracy and ontological security. For him, a "blinkered enlightenment" (2010: 18) unaware of a way forward from its defeatism and the social pathologies of late modernity, may benefit from religious-derived norms, ethical intuitions, and ways of coping. Thus he has postulated the notion of a post-secular society wherein religion's relevance is affirmed and incorporated into civil society, and its intuitions translated into a secular political discourse. Religion, however, is no panacea and it cannot be imported willy-nilly into the public sphere. Just as Habermas in the past showed a limited awareness of religion, his new position is also problematic because, indifferent to the empirical social realities of religion(s), he construes religion in very narrow, highly cognitivist, artificially demarcated, and undifferentiated terms. Notwithstanding these weaknesses, sociologists should to use their knowledge of religion to refine and incorporate Habermas' ideas about religion's relevance in the public sphere into the

development of an empirically engaged political sociology of religion.

The subfield's lack of a paradigm shift either before or after the turn of the twenty-first century should not be seen as evidence of theoretical inertia. Rather, most mainstream sociologists of religion are preoccupied with understanding relatively particularized puzzles and do so through a broad range of interesting qualitative and quantitative studies informed by middle-range theoretical analyses that have yielded an extensive body of empirical findings. The field is thriving, as evidenced by the substantial number of sociologists in the ASA religion section (approximately 672 members in 2011) making religion the 17th largest among ASA's 51 sections. Additionally, sociologists of religion participate in other professional associations focused on the study of religion including the Association for the Sociology of Religion, and the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, each of which hosts a well-attended annual conference and publishes a well-regarded peer-review journal. There is also a good deal of cross-national dialogue and engagement among sociologists of religion in these fora and through the International Society for the Sociology of Religion. Hence, sociologists of religion are attuned to relevant global issues and processes even as the interpretive and explanatory tasks and practical demands of research necessarily skew their work toward particularized intra-national contexts. Given sociologists' emphasis on the importance of understanding the context(s) in which social activity occurs, it makes sense that there is a tendency in research, especially on religion which is so context specific, toward privileging local over cross-national and global comparisons. Aggregate cross-national surveys can provide valuable findings. They tend, however, to limit their theoretical contribution by relegating important and substantively interesting national cases that deviate from a more general pattern to a jettisoned outlier status, rather than using them to reassess the theoretical questions at issue.

Sociology of religion is characterized by methodological diversity and theoretical openness. It has its own theoretical freight (secularization, religious economies) but also in recent years shows a greater willingness to actively engage with theorizing in other subfields and disciplines, and to push the boundaries as to what religion is and how it matters. These are strengths, rather than evidence that religion as an area of inquiry has an inherent paucity of theory and interesting questions in its own right. Looking back over the many impressive books published since 2000, it is hard to pick selectively and choose from an array of interesting, stimulating contributions. Two of the books I have chosen give full attention to the content of religious beliefs and the implications for weighty societal issues such as race and pluralism (Emerson and Smith, Wuthnow); another highlights how the content of religious doctrine can be strategically framed in order to forge political alliances amid geographical and theological diversity (Wilde); three spotlight various dimensions of the organizational structure of the religious institutional field (Emerson and Smith, Chaves, Wilde); one chronicles the meaningful religious, cultural, and political activities that occur in religious sites (Chaves); and another uncovers the meaningful religious activity that occurs in ostensibly non-religious sites (Bender). All are methodologically ambitious, empirically rigorous, theoretically rich, and well-written.

The centrality of religion in America's historical narrative means that it inevitably intersects with other core characteristics of American culture and social structure. Race, or what William Du Bois (1903: 54) infamously called ''the problem of the color line'' is one such force. Du Bois demarcated it as ''the problem of the twentieth century,'' and sociological research on race and the many facets of inequality suggests that this is also a, if not the, problem of the twenty-first century. Somewhat surprisingly, the racial dimensions of religious activity have been relatively under-studied by sociologists of religion, a gap that makes the insightful contribution of Michael Emerson and Christian Smith's book, *Divided by Faith: Evangelical Religion and the Problem of Race in America* (2000), all the more important. They take as their starting point the fact that the United States is a racialized society: ''a society wherein race matters profoundly for

differences in life experiences, life opportunities and social relationships....[and] that allocates differential economic, political, social and even psychological rewards to groups along [socially constructed] racial lines'' (2000: 7). Emerson and Smith present a broad historical overview from 1700 to 1964 highlighting how slavery and evangelical Christianity, the predominant theology among nineteenth-century American Protestants, actively contributed to creating racialized religion, an historical process that saw people shift from racially separate pews to racially separate churches, and to racially separate worship cultures and practices.

Today, the racialization of religion is seen both in the views of racial inequality expressed by ordinary white evangelical Protestants and importantly, beyond race per se, in the ways in which American religion is organized. *Divided by Faith*, therefore, not only historicizes the place of religion in America's racial context, but integrates micro and macro levels of analysis in its examination of the continuing racialization of religion. In looking at the puzzle of race and religion today, Emerson and Smith draw from a mix of data, including a survey of 2,500 Americans using random sampling methods, personal interviews with nearly 200 non-randomly chosen, mostly white evangelicals in 23 states, and secondary analyses of GSS and other survey data (pp. 18-19, 98), though the data do not crowd the book and this enhances the text's flow.

Evangelicals' views—their tendency to explain racial inequality in individualistic or motivational rather than structural terms, and to not see racism as a pressing issue— are according to Emerson and Smith, not indicative of prejudice but of culture. The cultural-theological tool-kit that white evangelicals carry is one which emphasizes individual freewill and accountability for one's choices, interpersonal relationality (including salvation only through a personal relationship with Christ), and antistructuralism, that is, the inability to perceive or unwillingness to accept social structural influences (pp. 76-77). This tool kit makes certain worldviews more culturally logical or ''normal'' than others. Thus, for many evangelicals, the race problem is not a race problem but a sin problem; as explained by

one interviewee: ''It's human nature to be a sinner...to be not as accepting of a black person'' (p. 78). And if evangelicals concede that institutions play a part in racial inequality it is not because laws and segregation impact blacks' opportunities; rather, it's because individual sinners work in institutions and in their sinfulness have and display bigoted attitudes (p. 79). Moreover, the glaring racial divide is accentuated rather than diminished among conservative Protestants. Compared to other blacks (and to white conservative Protestants), black conservative Protestants are less individualistic and more structural in the reasons they use to explain racial inequality, leading the authors to conclude that ''*conservative religion intensifies the different values and experiences of each racial group, thus sharpening and increasing the divide between black and white Americans*'' (p. 97).

The racialized gap in everyday experience that accounts for differences in individuals' knowledge of racism is largely structured and reinforced by the racially homogeneous social world that white evangelicals occupy (p. 80). Religion, notwithstanding its prophetic strands and emancipatory possibilities, is socially and historically structured. Thus in the United States, the historical racialization of religion structures, reinforces, and creates ongoing racial divisions. And, independent of race, Emerson and Smith argue that the overarching structure of American religion, in particular the strong tendency toward market segmentation and niche marketing that occurs in its pluralistic religious marketplace and the fact that different groups seek different (historically institutionalized and newly reimagined) worship styles, heightens the salience of racial boundaries and maintenance of the status quo (pp. 161, 166-168). In sum, while the ''problem of race'' has many roots and many institutional and cultural manifestations, religion is a key site through which its encrusted tenacity can be fruitfully studied because, as Emerson and Smith insightfully demonstrate, the macro-organization of the religious field and individuals' theological-cultural socialization and everyday experiences interpenetrate in multilayered ways that reinforce as well as create and expand racial boundaries.

Racial otherness is taking on an added dimension in the United States with the increasing racial and religious diversity of the population. As the Pew Forum has documented, immigration is adding more diversity to what has long been a diverse religious landscape such that today Buddhists, Muslims, and Hindus are more visible in several American cities and suburbs. This growing diversity, as Robert Wuthnow discusses in his important book, *America and the Challenges of Religious Diversity* (2005), poses significant cultural and practical challenges including the task of rethinking ''our national identity'' as a Christian nation and the need ''to face difficult choices about how pluralistic we are willing to be'' (2005: xv). Wuthnow provides a cogent historical account of the evolving understanding of religious freedom in American history, democracy and nation-building, and an interesting discussion of the American missionary movement as well as of the development of comparative religions as a scholarly field, as writers sought to ''identify universals in human experience'' (p. 25) even as ideas about American superiority, and the superiority of American Christianity, especially Protestantism, persisted (pp. 24-30).

Most of the book is devoted to probing what religious diversity means in America today and how pluralism is negotiated. Wuthnow uses multiple wells of primary data including a specially-designed national survey on religious diversity, in-depth interviews of Americans across the country, interviews with Christian pastors, interviews with leaders and members of Jewish, Muslim, Hindu, and Buddhist worship centers and organizations in purposefully selected metropolitan areas, and interviews with people in inter-religious marriages and with individuals involved in some aspect of interreligious leadership and work. Influenced by Weber, Wuthnow argues that the content of beliefs matters. How people think and what they believe about God, death, salvation, heaven, good and evil, and about their own and other religions impacts and complicates pluralism and specifically influences how individuals construe, evaluate, and interact with others. His findings demonstrate how complicated indeed is the crafting of a pluralistic society. Most notably,

Wuthnow's "exclusive Christians" though they acknowledge others' freedom to worship, are nonetheless guided by a more compelling conviction that "Christianity is the only way to have a true personal relationship with God." And allegedly mind-broadening experiences such as college education and overseas travel do not seem to dilute such exclusivist beliefs. Based on the experiences recounted in his interviews with American Hindus, Buddhists, and Muslims, Wuthnow concludes that coexistence rather than engaged pluralism is the de facto American lived reality, and he argues that ''the heart of the problem is ignorance on the part of the general population about even the rudimentary beliefs and practices of the newer minority religions'' (p. 74). Although he suggests that this ignorance may be similar to Americans' knowledge gap regarding geography, history and science, it may also reflect, he notes, ''the view that Christian truth is sufficient unto itself'' (p. 74). It is also apparent that this knowledge gap and by extension the understanding rather than mere tolerance of religious minority beliefs is unlikely to attenuate in the near-term. Wuthnow is particularly critical of the "insularity and largely ceremonialized contacts that characterize churches' responses to religious diversity" (p. 256), and he argues that pastors and "congregations could do a lot better than they currently are in providing interfaith opportunities capable of attracting a significant share of their members" (p. 233).

It is not evident, however, that more routine interfaith opportunities would make much difference to the fostering of interreligious understanding. Notwithstanding the empirically validated assumption that homogenized social worlds reinforce racial and other forms of prejudice and that everyday living amid diversity increases acceptance of diversity, some of Wuthnow's findings regarding religious inter-marriage give pause. Just as many Christian pastors use ''strategies of avoidance'' that enable them to disregard the local presence of temples, mosques, synagogues and their respective participants, interreligious couples tend to avoid discussion of thorny theological differences. They negotiate creative practical accommodations: Christian spouses of

Buddhists practicing meditation, Christian spouses of Muslims seeing Jesus as a prophet rather than a savior (p. 283), while largely remaining silent on the fundamental differences that lie beneath and inform their different particularized beliefs and practices. Despite the theological dilution that results (e.g., from seeing Jesus as prophet rather than savior), these adaptive solutions help stave off intra-couple and intra-family conflict and foster cultural diversity while reinforcing the privatization of faith.

Notwithstanding the political and cultural forces driving privatization and disaffiliation, faith for most Americans is still expressed through public participation in shared communal worship. This presents a methodological dilemma because although survey research is widely used by sociologists of religion, it is virtually all based on individual-level data. Yet group processes are core to sociology, and congregations as the paradigmatic unit of religious activity are composed of collectivities and group cultures. In the United States, moreover, more people belong to a congregation than to any other social organization, thus making congregations a core site of individual and group identity and practices. There are many excellent published ethnographies of congregations and parishes, but until Mark Chaves embarked on his ground-breaking National Congregations Study (NCS), our knowledge of congregations was on the one hand, highly particularistic (specific case studies) and on the other hand, largely generalized, superficial, and partial (e.g., based on official denominational lists of existing congregations/parishes and their summary characteristics). In contrast, Chaves devised a representative survey of congregations in America, interviewed a key informant in each, and linked Census tract data to each congregation to provide additional geographical and socio-economic context to his study.

*Congregations in America* (2004) provides extensively detailed information profiling congregational membership, leadership, finances, and worship, artistic and other cultural activities as well as patterns of congregational involvement in social services and political and civic activities. Writing at a time when politicians and others looked to faith-based organizations to fill the social service gaps in the wake of welfare reform, and despite the (still persistent) common presumption that churches are highly involved in social services, Chaves' study shows that the vast majority of congregations engage in social services only marginally; theologically conservative congregations do fewer of almost all types of social services (2004: 53 and later), and congregations with particularly high incomes tend to do less social service overall. Chaves underscores that congregations' social services, and especially those that go beyond emergency needs, are not an alternative to but complement and are dependent on collaborations with secular and government agencies (p. 78). In regard to political engagement, Chaves finds distinct patterns largely structured by religious tradition and race: conservative white Protestant congregations distribute (Christian right) voter guides; black Protestant congregations tend to register voters and open their homes to candidates; Catholic parishes tend to lobby elected officials and organize demonstrations and marches; and liberal Protestant congregations tend to organize discussion groups (p. 120).

Apart from comprehensive and policy-relevant findings, Chaves also fully engages with core theoretical debates in sub-fields beyond religion, especially sociology of culture, and sociology of organizations/organizational ecological processes. Take culture, for example. For many years, sociologists in ASA's culture section frequently discussed the challenges of meaning and measurement and what exactly a cultural repertoire is and does. Engaging with this literature, Chaves used the NCS to ask about twenty-nine worship elements (e.g., silent prayer, dance, personal greeting, communion, speaking in tongues; p. 132). Singing and sermons emerge as the most prevalent, but beyond simply listing the various elements (which is in itself an important contribution) Chaves examines how different subsets of elements are variously grouped together by different congregations in constructing their respective worship events (p.134); and following Bourdieu's lead, also presents a socio-demographic spatial matrix of variation in patterns of congregational worship practices (p. 138). While not all cultural repertoires can or should be quantified, Chaves' study points to the rich mix of

diverse cultural elements that are available to and used by individuals and collectivities in routine activities such as church participation.

People who do not know much about religion often assume that religious doctrines and institutions are immutable. Sociologists of religion know otherwise but they are less sure about how change occurs. Melissa Wilde's book, *Vatican II* (2007) asks a fundamental but difficult question to answer sociologically, regarding how institutional change occurred at the Catholic Church's Second Vatican Council (Vatican II, 1962-1965), a momentous event that saw Catholic Church leaders affirm among other changes, religious freedom, personal conscience, the separation of church and state, and the active participation of the laity in the life of the church. Rather than focusing as sociologists are wont to do on the effects of Vatican II, Wilde examines the event itself, and does a tremendous amount of historical digging to get at the on-the-ground deliberations informing the bishops' decision-making processes. She uses a wide variety of primary and secondary materials including transcripts of interviews conducted in the 1960s with more than eighty of the most important bishops and theologians at the Council, Vatican-archived documents from the Council including minutes from meetings, letters, other personal correspondence, and petitions; and she managed to secure the records of votes of the approximately 3,000 bishops who voted on the most contentious reforms. The vote tallies identified individual bishops and their dioceses, thus enabling Wilde to investigate intra-church national patterns that had previously been undocumented because the Vatican had made only aggregate vote summaries available to the public.

Having access to this national level data was of particular import to Wilde because she was interested in testing, among other theoretical assumptions, the contrasting implications of competitive and monopolistic religious environments. As Wilde notes, the diversity of the religious marketplace is the key independent variable in the religious marketplace model because it determines the amount of competition religious leaders feel. Yet as she also notes, most research invoking the marketplace thesis neglects to study how competition (market share) actually affects religious leaders (and instead focuses on correlations between pluralism and religious participation; 2007: 42-43), a task she takes on. Her detailed analysis and contextualization of bishops' voting records across a number of reforms, some that passed (e.g., religious freedom) and some that failed (e.g., elevation of the theological status of the Virgin Mary), brought forth interesting and nuanced patterns. Bishops from Catholic monopolistic environments in Europe (e.g., Spain, Italy) were predictably not open to change whereas those in pluralistic environments in Northern Europe (e.g., Germany) and North America, and those from the ''missionary'' countries of Africa (e.g., Kenya, Tanganyika) and Asia (e.g., India, Iraq, Korea), most of which supply-siders would identify as competitive environments, were open to change (p. 43). Latin American bishops, however, despite their monopoly status, were among the most progressive of all the bishops, a fact that contravenes the religious marketplace prediction (of lazy monopolies closed to change). Given this anomaly, as well as the evidence that progressive bishops from pluralistic environments were selectively more open to some progressive changes but not to others, Wilde looks to the varied cultural and socio-political contexts in which the bishops operated and the different organizational legitimacy concerns they confronted. She argues, for example, that church teaching prohibiting birth control was a moot issue at Vatican II largely because progressive bishops from North America and Northern Europe (despite pressure from their own laity) did not push for change because they did not feel any ecumenical pressure from their Protestant counterparts in their home countries to do so. Progressive Latin American bishops, on the other hand, did not advocate for change in its status because birth control was not readily available to anyone in their countries and, therefore, they saw no competitive advantage against Protestants in lobbying on the issue. Indian and other missionary country bishops were confronting legitimacy challenges over Catholic opposition to birth control due to concerns about excessive population growth in their countries. However,

although they were at the forefront of efforts to change church teaching, comparatively fewer in number, they did not make a strong attempt to mobilize support for change among other progressive bishops (pp. 121-124).

Wilde concludes that Vatican II's progressive outcomes cannot be explained by such traditional sociological factors as power, resources, interests, or even popular pressure (as the supply-side religious economy model would suggest) but by the ability of bishops to organize into clusters whose legitimation challenges resulted in their occupying differently structured religious organizational fields (p. 48)—some stable (e.g., United States, Germany), some in crisis (e.g., Latin America), some emerging (e.g., Africa, Asia)—and which coalesced to produce their shared stake in working toward progressive change in select doctrines while ignoring others. Wilde does not mention that her study also can be read as a real-time analysis of a trans-national institution, a domain of study that has garnered increased attention as a result of globalization. But this is another of the book's strengths, showing how a large transnational actor actually works, in unison, across national divides, and to effect outcomes that are implemented trans-nationally on the ground across many wide-ranging societal environments whose everyday lived realities are highly divergent, and yet with some global (universal Catholic) commonality.

Congregations and religious institutions are sites of wide-ranging sociologically interesting activity. A good deal of religious activity also occurs, however, in places and encounters where we might not typically expect it, given how disciplinary and institutional markers blinker our vision. Moving beyond circumscribed boundaries, sociologists of religion are giving increased attention to the manifold ways in which religious and spiritual meanings are entangled in everyday activities that on the surface suggest a different preoccupation. Courtney Bender's book, *Heaven's Kitchen: Living Religion at God's Love We Deliver* (2003), exemplifies this new direction in theorizing and research. Driven by the hunch that religion happens ''in the midst of other important things'' (2003: 22), Bender spent over a year

conducting intensive ethnographic research (including participant observation, interviews, informal conversations) at ''God's Love We Deliver'' (GLWD), a non-profit—and despite its name, a nonreligious—organization in New York City where staff (including paid chefs) and volunteers prepare daily meals and deliver them to approximately eight hundred homebound people with AIDS, some affluent, some poor. She spent three seven-hour days a week at the agency: cooking in the kitchen, delivering meals, organizing files, dispatching delivery volunteers, and generally helping out as needed (p. 143). Bender makes a strong case for the sociological value of ethnography as a means to get at how people construe and practice religion and the particularistic contexts in which they do so, and an equally strong case for studying religion in naturalistic settings beyond religious institutions and the home. Pushing conceptual boundaries as to how scholars think about religious and other differentiated institutional contexts, she makes the boldly refreshing claim that individuals might assign religious or spiritual meaning to certain secular activities that they find even more spiritually valuable than prayer or church attendance.

As Bender notes, doing a study of religion at a place where ostensibly not much religion happens, can be daunting. But she finds much to write about that has a lot to do with religion and its subtle relevance. The study's backdrop is the pluralism of GLWD and its kitchen: a nonreligious setting in the heart of a cosmopolitan city where staff and volunteers do not share and assume that they do not share a common religious affiliation or vocabulary. Central to Bender's inquiry is how people talk about things that they do not consciously share with others such as religion (p. 5), and she refutes empirically what she finds to be a largely misplaced concern, namely that particularistic religious language and references have declined or become diffused or diluted in pluralistic America (pp. 3-4; 136-137). Maintaining and bridging particularism amid pluralism is not easy. But Bender finds much dynamism and also a good deal of particularity in how religion and spirituality permeate the GLWD kitchen. For one volunteer

peeling carrots is a meditative act, for another work is prayer, for another who has spent a lifetime caring for others and being cared for, there is something inevitably spiritual about cooking. Some volunteers intentionally import their biographical history of mainstream church involvement and associated church-related experiences into the kitchen, others bring a more eclectic mix drawing on varied religious and spiritual teachings, some discover spirituality welling up unexpectedly and unannounced amid the drudgery and laughter in the kitchen, and still others find that the kitchen and the people gathered around come to constitute ''a little religious community'' (p. 65). These instances, as Bender notes throughout the book, challenge and stretch the institutional boundaries of where the religious and the non-religious is conscribed and thought to happen, and also challenge the traditional scholarly distinction between religion and spirituality.

Of further theoretical import central to and beyond religion, Bender shows how the complexity of religious talk is made possible and evolves. She argues that commonplace religious talk (conversational references to religious holidays, church activities, passing comments about religious figures and beliefs) is sociologically important because it allows people to assess their footing about whether they can talk about faith and say particular things about religion (p. 91). An offhand reference to choir practice, for example, can become the thread that allows others to make inferences about that person's actions and beliefs and then take steps toward further conversation (p. 22). Bender argues that it is precisely this sort of commonplace religious talk that makes difficult religious talk possible (p. 133). The everyday dialogue with another conveys certain fragments of information that can then be used subsequently to pursue other and more complicated conversational topics. Thus religious talk can ''happen'' without any direct reference to religious symbols but through indirect phrasing and allusions or patterned similarities (p. 109). Drawing on Mikhail Bakhtin's notion of ''double-voiced discourse'' as a sort of hybrid language which draws from various

vocabularies (pp. 108-109), Bender shows that double-voiced religious talk allows for communicating across difference. For example, how and why individuals express outrage can be framed by the sense of fairness and justice that comes from their religious identity and practice, or a volunteer's talk about ''good manners'' may be an expression of their particular religious-based sense of ''spiritual responsibility. . . and of the struggle to be gracious and giving toward others'' especially in situations where it becomes difficult to do so (p. 111). Bender concedes that it can be difficult to access double-voiced religious talk through observation alone, and that such particularized religious-based understandings may emerge at times only through interviews. She argues, nonetheless, that ''Talking with each other about religion, whether in double-voiced ways or in commonplace genres was itself a kind of religious practice'' (p. 115), imbued with social meaning about what matters, what is respectable, what or who can be parodied, and so on (p. 116). By the same token, she argues that the absence of direct talk about religion or spirituality (or of politics) in religious, spiritual, (and political) settings should not be a concern (p. 128) because ''absence of talk does not make an absence of practice.'' While she acknowledges that practice is more than mere talk, talk itself, she argues, is part of the practice of meaningful activity. Religious practice, therefore, is not confined to specific worship acts but encompasses the myriad ways in which particularistic religious and spiritual talk is negotiated and achieved across varied social interactions and contexts.

The six books highlighted in this essay point to some of the many dimensions of religious activity as an individual, collective, institutional, and cultural phenomenon; the multilayered ways in which religion penetrates other institutional domains; and how it intersects with nonreligious social and cultural practices while also retaining distinctive elements peculiar to the fact that religion involves distinctly religious beliefs and practices that cannot be reduced to or seen as proxies for other social processes. There are many pathways of inquiry that a sociologist of religion can fruitfully take in order to discover something worthwhile about the stability and fluidity, the weight

and the subtleness, of contemporary religion and in doing so also elucidate the encrusted and emergent character of more general societal and institutional processes. I invite all sociologists to take a look at the books noted here; the result of that effort should make readers think differently about religion, and perhaps prompt some to encompass it as a relevant dimension to their own analytical digging.

## References

Du Bois, W. E. B. 1903/1969. *The Souls of Black Folk*. New York, NY: New American Library. Introductions by Nathan Hare and Alvin Poussaint.

Finke, Roger, and Rodney Stark. 1992. *The Churching of America, 1776-1990: Winners and Losers in Our Religious Economy*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Finke Roger, and Rodney Stark. 2002. ''Religious Choice and Competition.'' *American Sociological Review* 63: 761-766.

Hout, Michael and Claude Fischer. 2002. ''Why More Americans Have No Religious Preference: Politics and Generations.'' *American Sociological Review* 67: 165-190.

Pew Forum on Religion and Public Life. 2008. *The U.S. Religious Landscape Survey: Religious Beliefs*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.

Warner, R. Stephen. 1993. ''Work in Progress Toward a New Paradigm for the Sociological Study of Religion in the United States.'' *American Journal of Sociology* 98: 1044-1093.

---

## Toward a More Eventful Environmental Sociology

THOMAS K. RUDEL
*Rutgers University*
*rudel@aesop.rutgers.edu*

Sociologists have long distinguished themselves from historians through an insistence that sociology focuses on recurrent activities that can be understood through analyses that deemphasize temporal fluxes.[1] Of course this description of sociology can easily be caricatured in a way that does not do justice to the nuance and subtlety of most of our arguments. It does however have a grain of truth in it. Much recent work in environmental sociology appears both ahistorical and decontextualized relative to work by environmental historians, geographers, and anthropologists. In the most common variant of this type of sociological work, the authors amass data from secondary sources, describe several competing but very general theoretical perspectives, and then analyze the data to find out which of the two perspectives receives support. All of this work proceeds with only minimal reference to the context or historical moment to which the data refer. In their detachment from particular contexts, these analyses

*Who Speaks for the Climate?: Making Sense of Media Reporting on Climate Change*, by **Maxwell T. Boykoff.** Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011**.** 228pp. $29.99 paper. ISBN: 9780521 133050.

*Environmental Inequalities Beyond Borders: Local Perspectives on Global Injustices*, edited by **JoAnn Carmin** and **Julian Agyeman.** Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2011. 303pp. $25.00 paper. ISBN: 9780262515870.

*Blowout in the Gulf: The BP Oil Spill Disaster and the Future of Energy in America*, by **William R. Freudenburg** and **Robert Gramling.** Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2010. 254pp. $10.95 paper. ISBN: 9780262517294.

*Shopping Our Way to Safety: How We Changed from Protecting the Environment to Protecting Ourselves*, by **Andrew Szasz.** Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2007. 323pp. $18.95 paper. ISBN: 9780816635092.

---

[1]   Sewell, William. 2005. *The Logics of History: Social Theory and Social Transformation*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

resemble the abstracted empiricism that Mills inveighed against so many years ago.[2]

To add value to socio-ecological analyses by environmental sociologists, it would seem important to pay renewed attention to the challenge of integrating unruly, disordered sequences of historical events into the recurrent social patterns that our training has taught us to emphasize. Otherwise we risk conveying to readers an unduly static impression of the dynamics that drive environment/society relations. Studies of "business as usual" conditions do not capture the ways in which single events or aggregations of events transform societies. This point is not exactly a new one (in fact this essay's title is cribbed from Sewell[3]), but it bears repeating, especially in a context when inertia appears to best describe the societal response to global warming.

How then might environmental sociologists incorporate historical events more fully into their analyses? Four recent and quite admirable contributions to environmental sociology offer examples about how we might incorporate the transformative impacts of historical events into analyses of environment/society relations.

## Shopping Our Way to Safety

In *Shopping Our Way to Safety: How We Changed from Protecting the Environment to Protecting Ourselves*, Andrew Szasz offers us a new way of looking at behaviors that seem "environmental" but differ from conventionally understood environmental activism. He distinguishes between environmentally-oriented activities which benefit an individual's personal environment and activities that benefit the larger environment in which we all live. The first category of activities includes eating organic food, drinking "purified" bottled water, and living in safe, crime-free suburban communities. In each instance, the individuals secure a safe product for consumption by themselves and their families. In providing these goods for their families, these

household heads pursue a strategy of inverted quarantine. They wall out potential environmental bads, the criminals, the dirty water, and the contaminated foods. Because this strategy protects by reducing exposure, Szasz refers to it as "inverted quarantine." It could also be construed as a kind of defensive environmentalist practice that benefits the immediate environments of individuals as opposed to the more common altruistic environmentalist practice that benefits the globe but not anyone of us in particular.

Szasz's conceptual work in *Shopping* represents an important contribution to environmental sociology. He goes on to argue in his book that privately-pursued strategies of inverted quarantine demobilize the larger polity. For example, if wealthy people can secure a private supply of potable water for themselves, they will not insist that local governments and water companies provide potable water to all of their users, which in turn will make it less likely that these organizations will provide the public good to their constituents. To make his case for the prevalence of the inverted quarantine strategy, Szasz provides short histories of the American move to the suburbs, adoption of bottled drinking water, and growing consumption of organic food. His purpose in these reviews is to establish that these practices of inverted quarantine are all increasing in frequency. He also reviews one completed episode of inverted quarantine, the frenzied construction of bomb shelters during the early 1960s. The case studies of the bomb shelter building spree, the move to the suburbs, the increased use of water in plastic bottles, and the growth in the popularity of organic foods all accomplish their primary goal, to establish the growing prevalence of inverted quarantine strategies in different fields of activity. The specific historical dynamics driving each trend do not, however, come through in a way that fully reinforces Szasz's central argument.

The first of the examples in the book, the bomb shelter panic of the early 1960s, illustrates the problem. With the Soviet acquisition of the atomic bomb in the late 1940s and the advent of intercontinental ballistic missiles during the 1950s, American policymakers began to discuss how it might be possible for at least some individuals and

---

2. Mills, C. Wright. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

3. Sewell, op. cit.

families to survive a cold war initiated nuclear exchange. Many of *Contemporary Sociology*'s older readers probably remember when, as children, we had to crawl under our school desks during air raid drills. At the same time civil defense authorities encouraged homeowners to construct and provision bomb shelters in their basements, all in an effort to somehow ensure the survival of the family in the aftermath of a nuclear blast. Popular alarm about impending nuclear attacks grew during the early 1960s with the continuing crisis over the status of Berlin and the Cuban missile crisis. Then, for reasons that Szasz does not describe, the arguments against building the bomb shelters, their ineffectiveness, their expense, and their seeming link to a more bellicose foreign policy, gradually began to win the day, but for reasons that are not clear. Bomb shelters really do embody ''inverted quarantine,'' but it is not clear why this strategy lost its appeal among the public.

Szasz's suburban example also seems compelling up until a certain historical point. He clearly demonstrates that the middle and upper classes succeeded in building a suburban bubble around their homes. The construction of the interstate highway system during the late 1950s and early 1960s made the move to the suburbs more possible, and the episodes of racial unrest in center cities during the early and mid-1960s made the move to the suburbs seem more desirable. More recently, evidence of increased residential segregation by class has emerged, reflecting perhaps the increased construction of gated communities during the 1980s and 1990s. Do these patterns indicate that the adoption of inverted quarantine strategies are driven primarily by growing inequalities within societies, which events like riots throw into bold relief? This line of reasoning seems plausible, but not complicated enough. For example, the practice of inverted quarantine among the upper classes could increasingly prevent the middle classes from doing likewise. In the New York metropolitan area, the creation of exclusive land use controls during the 1980s and 1990s by wealthy suburban residents reduced new home construction in the suburbs to the point where most new housing construction after 2000 occurred in the urban core in relatively poor places like Jersey City.[4] In effect, the efforts of the upper classes to wall themselves off from the rest of the world may have succeeded, at least around New York City, in increasing residential integration among the middle and lower classes.

Szasz's discussion about the growth in the consumption of bottled water and organic food again accomplishes his primary goal, which is to demonstrate that these consumer practices are indeed trending upward and that people adopt these practices in order to safeguard their young and themselves from various industrial contaminants in food and water. The difficulty with these narratives is that they do not attend to historical fluctuations in the consumption of both bottled water and organic foods. For example, the surge of interest in organic foods in California apparently followed three events that occurred one after another in the spring of 1989: the arrival of cyanide-laced grapes in the United States from Chile, the discovery of the pesticide Alar on apples that parents put in the school lunch boxes of their children, and the Exxon Valdez oil spill.[5] This dynamic suggests that inverted quarantine strategies can appear suddenly. What sorts of processes lead to their atrophy? More detailed historical work on these fluctuations would provide readers with a more tangible sense about the conditions that encourage and discourage inverted quarantine strategies. The more general point would be that more detailed historical narratives might both reinforce the central theoretical message in *Shopping* and embellish it, even with historical exceptions that prove the rule.

4  Rudel, T.K., Karen O'Neill, Paul Gottlieb, Melanie McDermott, Colleen Hatfield. 2011. ''From middle to upper class sprawl?: Land use controls and real estate development in northern New Jersey.'' *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*. 101(3):609–24. doi: 10.1080/00045608.2011.560062.

5  Friedland, William H. 2011. ''Changing Socio-Economic Structures and Globalization: Driving Forces for Social Change and Agrifood Social Movements.'' Paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society meetings, Boise, Idaho.

## Environmental Inequalities Beyond Borders

Recent research on the spread of the environmental justice movement around the globe has been enriched by techniques of narrative explanation typically used by historians. These analyses focus on sequences of events and demonstrate how "one thing leads to another" in struggles for environmental justice. Three contributions to *Environmental Inequalities Beyond Borders: Local Perspectives on Global Injustices*, edited by JoAnn Carmin and Julian Agyeman, do an exemplary job of integrating narrative explanations into analyses of popular struggles to curb industrial pollution in the Global South. Each one of these analyses, from Nigeria, Fiji, and Bulgaria, explains changes in the substance of the struggles from one historical phase to the next through a combination of shifts in the participating organizations that, coupled with prior events, explain historical turns in the substance of later struggles. The following paragraphs outline these narratives of political struggle.

An historical narrative of the struggle to reduce the exposure of the Ogoni people to flaring gases and oil spills in the Niger River delta of Nigeria recounts how democratization, political mobilization among the Ogoni, and publicity by international environmental NGOs led to a gradual increase in central government transparency and a commitment to devolve more funds to local and provincial governments. The local and regional governments do not appear to have used the additional funds to deliver services to their constituents, so basic injustices persist. By following the trail of money over time, the authors have underlined the pivotal role that local governments have recently come to play in curbing or continuing environmental injustices.

A second study of a mining enterprise and a bottled water company in Fiji narrates how the water company with a globally recognized brand name gradually came to recognize the importance of reaching out to local populations and providing them with potable water near the sources of water that the company bottled. The mining enterprise, located in close proximity to the water sources, had long resisted providing a supply of potable water to the miners' families. The sudden closure of the mine in 2006 and subsequent reopening in 2007 under new ownership spurred a local mobilization around the issue of clean water in the mining community which in turn brought to light the less-than-savory environmental practices of the bottling company. Intent on defending its brand name, bottle company executives created a program to help local communities acquire potable water.

A final narrative involves a comparative historical analysis of three post millennial proposals for gold mining in Bulgaria. Each project would have required the use of cyanide to separate the gold from the ore, and local residents expressed fears about the contamination of their ground water with cyanide. The struggles between the mining companies and community groups played out in a rapidly changing political context marked by the adoption of democracy in the early 1990s and accession to the European Community in 2007. Variations in the extent of local mobilization around the issue and an adept framing of the issue in a way that appealed to an ethnically-based political party led to variable outcomes in the three cases, but in two of the three cases the companies withdrew their plans for cyanide-based mining. Without testimony from company officials about the factors that persuaded them to abandon the mining projects, it is difficult to gauge the importance of the macropolitical changes in the eventual resolution of these conflicts, but it is hard to imagine successful popular resistance to these projects before 1989.

In all three cases, historical events played a crucial role in subsequent changes in local environment/society relations. Large changes, like democratization, mattered in two of the three cases while a seemingly inconsequential event, a change in the ownership of a mine, triggered the changes in the other case. In each instance an historical narrative, featuring events that transformed social structures as well as sociological tools like framing, were crucial in providing readers with insightful analyses.

## Who Speaks for the Climate?

Maxwell Boykoff's recent analysis of the media's coverage of climate change over the past two decades in *Who Speaks for the Climate?: Making Sense of Media Reporting on Climate Change* suggests other ways to incorporate historical events into sociological analyses. A content analysis of particularly salient articles in the press undergirds a narrative explanation of how, for example, beginning in 2005, the press began to make a concerted shift away from the canon of ''balanced'' reporting on climate change which had led to the biasing practice of pitting climate change denialists, with little or no evidence to support their views, against scientists who acknowledge change and base their conclusions on massive amounts of evidence. The practice of balanced reporting provided an outlier position, whose complete denial of climate change received an unduly prominent place in coverage of the issue. This privileging of the outliers only ended after several media outlets, like *USA Today*, proclaimed the issue of change or no change in the climate to be ''settled.'' To be sure, denialism lives on, but it does not do so because the press continues to set up head-to-head confrontations between denialists and representatives of the vast majority of scientists who acknowledge change. That practice, according to Boykoff, now occurs less frequently.

Some of the most trenchant of Boykoff's analyses rely heavily on quantitative measures. For example, fluctuations in the numbers of climate change articles in the tabloid press between 2000 and 2010 leads Boykoff to conclude that there were four peaks in press coverage of the climate issue between 2000 and 2010. The last of these peaks occurred in the run-up to the Copenhagen meetings of late 2009. These month-to-month fluctuations establish quite conclusively that climate change coverage is socially constructed. In other words, people do not just wait around for historically unusual weather before they begin reading and writing about climate change. Socially constructed events like the Copenhagen meetings of the IPCC can cause significant increases in press coverage of the issue.

Boykoff's analyses make it clear that numbers and event-rich environmental sociology are not inimical. Fluctuating counts of articles provide the basis for Boykoff's analysis about the circumstances in which the coverage of the climate change issue increases. Because these counts of climate change articles rise and fall in coverage as an event approaches in time and then recedes into the past, so the analysis contains a built-in historical dimension. Unlike so many numbers in cross-national number-crunching exercises, these numbers are not decontextualized. They are historized. The fluctuating counts of articles demonstrate a fluidity to press coverage of climate change that would be easy to miss given the salience of the fossil fuel companies' efforts to dismiss the issue.

Boykoff's analyses of changes in press coverage succeed in part because he uses theoretical work on issue arenas and the media to explicate recent patterns of media attention to global warming. His book contains, for example, an enlightening discussion of Anthony Downs' (1972) issue attention cycle and ways that it should be amended when applied to an issue like climate change. In sum, Boykoff's work walks a fine line. It demonstrates how coverage of climate change issues can be fluid at the same time that it brings to light recurrent patterns of communication in the debates about climate change.

## Blowout in the Gulf

*Blowout in the Gulf: The BP Oil Spill Disaster and the Future of Energy in America* by the late William R. Freudenburg and Robert Gramling focuses on one historical event, the huge oil spill that occurred at a British Petroleum drilling site in the Gulf of Mexico in 2010, and explains its origins and its implications for Americans. To accomplish this theoretical task, Freudenburg and Gramling undertake a coupled human and natural systems analysis (CHANS). They trace out how accidents of the natural (deposits of oil in certain places) combined with human inventions and geopolitical dynamics to create complex webs of interdependencies that the massive oil spill brought to light. For example, Freudenburg and Gramling establish how the broad

dispersion of oil deposits in limited pools almost guarantees that the communities that spring up above the deposits, like Pithole, Pennsylvania, will begin with a boom and end with a bust. Similarly, they recount how decisions by American elites in the years immediately after World War II to build the interstate highway system decentralized the American settlement pattern and committed us to a transportation system powered by a natural resource (oil) whose supply in North America we had begun to deplete at a rapid rate. These historical events set in motion a long-running political drama in which American politicians make repeated rhetorical commitments to achieving energy independence while our dependence on foreign sources of oil just continued to grow. This increasingly desperate search for new supplies of oil has led industry giants to the ends of the earth, like the still unexploited deposits beneath the deep waters of the ocean where BP was drilling when the blowout occurred.

This kind of CHANS argument features cascades of events that over time careen back and forth across the nature/society divide in a way that approximates, with allowances for a more loosely coupled system and a much larger scale, the technological interdependencies featured in Charles Perrow' work on normal accidents.[6] The argument unfolds as a narrative, but a socio-ecological logic ties together the events that cascade one after the other. It is not hard to imagine other CHANS analyses beginning from different kinds of global warming influenced events, like Hurricane Katrina, in the decades to come. In this sense the eventful environmental sociology produced by Freudenburg and Gramling in *Blowout in the Gulf* exemplifies the integration of unruly sequences of historical events with recurrent social patterns that should prove particularly useful to students of environment/society relations in the coming decades.

In different ways the four books under review here demonstrate in various ways the potential of a more historized environmental sociology. A more rigorously historical treatment in *Shopping* would have strengthened an already strong argument even further. More consistent attention to narratives of the events that transform environmental justice struggles, as in the *Borders* chapters, would make the transformative potential of the environmental justice movement clearer. The attention to the ebbs and flows of media attention to the climate change issue in *Who Speaks* underscores the capricious and uncertain course of press coverage. Finally, *Blowout in the Gulf* indicates in hindsight how predictable the disaster was, given BP's compromised record and how uncertain the exact circumstances of the blowout proved to be. Taken together, these historizing tendencies should produce an environmental sociology that, while less formulaic and theoretically concise, might succeed in conveying some of the contingencies that continue to characterize our course through nature as we careen towards a more somber, environmentally compromised future. This picture of society/environment systems in flux will not reassure readers, but it will ground them in an undeniably empirical way.

---

6   Perrow, Charles. 1999 (1984). *Normal Accidents: Living with High Risk Technologies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Social Movements, Organizations, and Fields: a Decade of Theoretical Integration

EDWARD T. WALKER[1]
*University of California, Los Angeles*
*walker@soc.ucla.edu*

*Challenging Operations: Medical Reform and Resistance in Surgery*, by **Katherine C. Kellogg.** Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2011. 230pp. $25.00 paper. ISBN: 9780226430034.

*Contention and Corporate Social Responsibility*, by **Sarah A. Soule.** Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009. 192pp. $25.00 paper. ISBN: 9780521727068.

*Fighting for the Future of Food: Activists versus Agribusiness in the Struggle over Biotechnology*, by **Rachel Schurman** and **William A. Munro.** Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2010. 262pp. $22.50 paper. ISBN: 9780816647620.

*Forging Gay Identities: Organizing Sexuality in San Francisco, 1950-1994*, by **Elizabeth A. Armstrong.** Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2002. 272pp. $30.00 paper. ISBN: 9780226026947.

*From Black Power to Black Studies: How a Radical Social Movement Became an Academic Discipline*, by **Fabio Rojas.** Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007. 279pp. $26.00 paper. ISBN: 9780801898259.

*Inventing Equal Opportunity*, by **Frank Dobbin.** Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009. 310pp. $24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780691137438.

*Market Rebels: How Activists Make or Break Radical Innovations*, by **Hayagreeva Rao.** Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008. 205pp. $24.95 cloth. ISBN: 9780691134567.

*Social Movements and Organization Theory*, edited by **Gerald F. Davis, Doug McAdam, W. Richard Scott,** and **Mayer N. Zald.** Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005. 434pp. $42.99 paper. ISBN: 9780521548366.

*Why David Sometimes Wins: Leadership, Organization, and Strategy in the California Farm Worker Movement*, by **Marshall Ganz.** New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2009. 344pp. $24.95 paper. ISBN: 9780199757855.

As Andrew Abbott (1992: 754) once argued in these pages, ''organization theory always seems like a picturesque Kuhnian subfield. Paradigms come and go. Controversy abounds. People argue about 'garbage cans' and 'populations of generalists'''. This interdisciplinary yet highly paradigm-driven body of scholarship was once dominated by attention to (boundedly rational) decision-making, efficiency, and tight coupling between organizational goals and procedures. It witnessed an almost revolutionary transformation during the Carter and Reagan administrations into a set of sometimes-competing, sometimes-orthogonal theoretical approaches, all of which emphasized environmental influences on the organization as a relatively open system. Loose coupling of elements came to be assumed, instrumental rationality was either pushed aside by analysts' scope conditions or framed as highly contingent upon context, and inter-organizational relationships became a central empirical focus.

Around the same time, social movement theory was undergoing a seismic shift in its own right. While organizational theorists were challenging the premises of Weberian rational systems models, social movement theorists were wrestling with the ghost of Durkheim found in theories of collective behavior. These emphasized the role of structural strain in producing the unstable psychological states then thought to be associated with collective action. Just as traditional theories of organization were making less sense in a context where companies and other organizations found themselves less autonomous and more at the mercy of the state and the professions, the suggestion that social movements were the result of structural strains in society did not resonate quite the same after the emergence of the Civil Rights, student, antiwar, and diverse identity movements of the long Sixties. Charles Tilly later distilled such criticisms in his (in)famous "Useless Durkheim" essay (Tilly 1981). Structural strains were replaced with concerns of resources, organization, political context, and the ability of collective actors to frame their message to both internal and external audiences. Analysts rediscovered the importance of Robert Michels' (1911) principle of an "iron law of oligarchy" for understanding movement organizations, while either accepting its main implications and suggesting that activists should focus more on disrupting established practices than building organizations (Piven and Cloward 1977) or instead by reworking its insights and integrating them with the ideas of Philip Selznick to offer a new open-systems model of social movement organizations (Zald and Ash 1966).

Although scholars going back to Oberschall (1972) and McCarthy and Zald (1973, 1977) have recognized the importance—and, indeed, necessity—of acknowledging organizational processes within social movements, the past two decades have found the favor more than amply returned by organizational theorists applying the frameworks of social movement theory to understanding organizational and institutional change, the emergence of new forms and institutions, and diffusion processes. Organizational theorists have, in fact, found much to like in the very ambiguity of how a "social movement" should be defined. On the one hand, the term directs attention to the ways that organized constituencies—as primary or secondary stakeholder groups—make claims upon business organizations from outside established channels of influence. On the other, social movement theory can also be applied in a more metaphorical sense to draw analytic attention to the ways that organizational change-agents mobilize resources, frame issues, and capitalize on opportunities made possible by the specific configuration of power and authority within an organization's "internal polity." Regardless of which of these two conceptualizations is employed (or both, as in Rao's *Market Rebels*, described below), the notion of an *institutional field* applies—whether as "fields," "sectors," or "populations" in organizational theory, or as "social movement industries," "arenas," or simply "social movements" on the other side—and has provided a fruitful linking mechanism between the viewpoints favored by each side.

The reasons behind this convergence reflect both the theory and the practice of social movements and formal organizations. With respect to theory, social movement perspectives offered partial solutions to the variety of puzzles that had preoccupied organizational theory since the 1970s in the traditions of organizational ecology, resource dependence theory, and the new institutionalism. For neo-institutional theory in particular—with its focus on how coercive, normative, and mimetic pressures in the institutional environment encourage organizational isomorphism—movement-based approaches provided a model that assumed a much greater role for agency, interest, and strategy than what was on offer in the dominant framework. Further, it could be used to elaborate upon the concept of "institutional entrepreneurship" and offer new insights into the resources, opportunities, and cultural frames necessary in order to build new institutions. Beyond the creation of new institutions, movement theories offered unique insights into the development of new organizational forms, a process that scholars previously saw as a result of technical innovation, exogenous shocks, creative destruction, or random variations selected for their environmental fitness; scholars therefore often

neglected the cultural and political institution-building work done by social entrepreneurs. De- and re-institutionalization processes were a lesser concern in neo-institutional theories of organizations, and social movement theories also offered a way to reintroduce strategic action into how scholars think about institutional contradiction, breakdown, and renewal.

In practical terms, the rise of SM/OT theories reflects the concurrence of a diverse set of sweeping social changes. Large multinational firms have become transnational polities in their own right, thus inviting challenge by principled actors seeking reforms in the corporate practices that shape communities and nations. Social movements have rooted themselves inside a variety of institutional homes in the post-Sixties era of protest. Indeed, such groups are very active now in challenging corporations and other organizations beyond the state and offering up alternative possibilities for how to structure new institutional fields (and restructure existing ones). Major corporations are responding to external movement pressures by emphasizing commitments to Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), creating new industries such as green energy markets, wind power, grass-fed beef, and sweatshop-free clothing. Empowered by the funds of large institutional investors, shareholder activists have made substantial inroads into companies. Whole industries are responding to both internal and external pressure with new models of transnational private regulation involving certifications through ISO 9000, Global Reporting Initiative, and various fair trade standards in coffee and other agricultural products. Nonprofits and civic groups are quite active in partnering with companies, and companies pay particular attention today to their position within local civic communities; for their part, many nonprofits and civic groups have imported practices of outcome measurement, accountability metrics, and other businesslike standards. Perhaps most significantly, companies themselves have, in the era of shareholder value capitalism, come to resemble relatively loose and social-movement like coalitions of actors in network forms of organization.

Given these theoretical and practical considerations, this essay emphasizes three central ways that social movement and organization theoretic approaches have been fruitfully integrated in sociological monographs published since 2000. I begin by describing efforts at conceptual integration, continue by reviewing significant works on how social movements accomplish institutional change and create new fields, and conclude by discussing the importance of understanding strategy in movement fields and reviewing potential areas of future research. Because this is more of an article-based rather than book-based literature, this review necessarily omits many of the most significant recent contributions in the field.[2]

## Theoretical Entrepreneurship

The full convergence of these two perspectives came about primarily during the past decade, although there were undoubtedly precursors to this line of thinking in early works by McCarthy and Zald (1973, 1977), Zald and Berger (1978), and in groundbreaking works by Clemens (1993, 1997) and Minkoff (1997, 1999). However, with the exception of Zald and Berger, earlier studies more often adapted the insights of organizational theory to social movement organizational processes. They tended not to consider how social movement theories can illuminate change processes in established fields including business, education, biomedicine, and other fields of organizational activity. Mayer Zald himself has written an interesting commentary on the "strange career" of this idea's trajectory from early inattention to its recent "resurrection" (Zald 2005).

Gerald Davis, Doug McAdam, Richard Scott and Zald's (2005) agenda-setting volume on *Social Movements and Organization Theory* helped to cement this emerging theoretical cross-pollination into a more fleshed-out agenda, and especially facilitated the diffusion of social movement perspectives into

2   This includes especially articles published in a special issue of *Administrative Science Quarterly* published in 2008, as well as a number of innovative articles working at this intersection which have appeared in the *ASR, AJS, ASQ,* AMJ, *AMR, Organization Science* and other leading journals in sociology and organizational studies. For a review, see King and Pearce (2010).

research on organizations. Many of these ideas were present in a number of other highly influential monographs published around the same time, including Hoffman's (2001) book of corporate environmentalism, Binder's (2002) study of social movement effects upon public school curricula, and Raeburn's (2004) research on gay and lesbian organizing within the *Fortune* 500. The framework of social movements within organizations was an idea whose time seemed to have arrived.

The volume by Davis and colleagues emerged from a long series of conversations among a network of leading scholars from both traditions going back at least to the late 1980s. As the volume's editors describe in the preface, a proposal for a conference along these lines was drafted by John McCarthy, McAdam, Zald, Woody Powell, and Neil Fligstein in 1989, but the request to Michigan's Interdisciplinary Committee on Organizational Studies (ICOS) was later turned down. The dialogue was revived when Davis and McAdam worked on a collaboration at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford in 1998, resulting in a seminal paper on how social movement theory could be applied fruitfully to the structure and evolution of network-based corporate forms in a postindustrial context (Davis and McAdam, 2000). Indeed, in that piece the authors argued that new forms of economic organization were "rendering traditional organizational theories less applicable to the realities of modern economic life" (ibid.: 231). In the same year—indeed, appearing directly adjacent to the former piece in the same issue of *Research in Organizational Behavior*—Rao, Morrill, and Zald (2000) published an article suggesting that understandings of organizations in markets should be viewed through the lens of social movement theory. They argued that the development of new organizational forms often involves a movement-like process in which collective actors first "de-institutionalize existing beliefs, norms, and values embodied in extant forms," and then work to "establish new forms that instantiate new beliefs, norms and values" (p. 240). These works, then, helped to inspire further entrepreneurship on the part of both movement and organizational scholars,

leading to conferences at the University of Michigan in 2001 and 2002. A selection of these submissions, as well as a few additional commissioned pieces, comprise the *Social Movements and Organization Theory* volume which has undoubtedly helped to set a new research agenda.

The volume itself contains a set of very strong contributions, and the summary essays that bookend the volume are especially valuable. These include an historical account of the evolution of these two traditions by McAdam and Scott, a provocative essay by John Campbell on shared mechanisms at work in both theoretical camps (and which, in my estimation, deserves to be assigned widely in graduate seminars in both social movements and organizational theory), and two concluding essays by Davis and Zald and Elisabeth Clemens. All of the chapters in the volume have considerable merits, and, indeed, many of the chapters have been cited widely in the seven years since the volume's publication. Certain themes appear consistently across chapters: the processes by which social movements contribute to the erosion or deinstitutionalization of established practices, thereby provoking institutional change (Michael Lounsbury, Maureen Scully and Douglas Creed), ways of conceptualizing institutionalization (Marc Schneiberg and Sarah Soule, Elizabeth Armstrong), reasons to reconsider how social movement organizations are structured (McCarthy, Jackie Smith), examinations of contradictory institutional logics (McAdam and Scott, Lounsbury, Smith), and some initial discussions of how elites promote or resist change (Timothy Vogus and Davis, David Strang and Dong-Il Jung, and Zald, Calvin Morrill, and Hayagreeva Rao).

Each of these themes—perhaps with the exception of the examination of elites, a topic to which I return in the conclusion—is found in a variety of strong SM/OT studies that have been published in the seminal period of the past decade.

## How Do Social Movements Destabilize Existing Institutions?

Social movement research has turned squarely toward the investigation of the

outcomes of movement mobilization, and the examination of change in institutional fields has made for an excellent venue in which to study such outcomes. Explicating change among firms and industries has been the dominant thrust of this body of work, but changes in other fields such as education and health care have also come to the fore.

One such standout study is Sarah Soule's *Contention and Corporate Social Responsibility* (2009), which makes a significant contribution to the SM/OT dialogue by examining how collective actors challenge corporations using tactics outside conventional channels of corporate influence. Central to this effort is Soule's distinction between the ''contentious politics'' framework favored by scholars of social movements (which emphasizes the crucial mediation of the state in collective action) and the ''private politics'' approach of management scholars such as David Baron (which draws attention to ''collective interactions between parties attempting to advance their interests that do *not* rely on the law, public order, or the state'' (p. 30, emphasis in original)). Soule's study creatively integrates insights from both, showing how inattention to the state is a limitation for private politics scholarship—a considerable volume of anticorporate protest also targets change in government policies—and yet the contentious politics literature also comes up short by neglecting to observe how corporations are, in many ways, polities of their own. She also argues that activists regularly shift the scale of their collective action either ''up'' (toward industries, nations, or even transnational contexts) or ''down'' (toward individual firms or local policies) for strategic reasons and/or in response to signals they receive about the existence of opportunities. Her empirical evidence relies upon a variety of sources: data on protest reported in *The New York Times* from 1960-1990 (the Dynamics of Collective Action data), evidence building from her earlier work on university divestment from Apartheid interests, and six case studies of protest against firms since 1990. The latter case studies include two each focused on anti-product campaigns, those that challenge a policy, and those that intend to tarnish a firm's reputation by suggesting negligence. Overall, she finds that activist campaigns do encourage greater corporate social responsibility, and that social movement campaigns often target both states and companies simultaneously in order to effect change through multiple means (see also Seidman 2007). Corporations seem to benefit by being the subject of protest, as Soule states clearly: ''while they may not acquiesce to all claims made on them by activists, they do change. Thus, we can think of social movements and anticorporate activists as important engines driving corporate innovation'' (p. 144).

Social movements also generate change in business practices by introducing new cognitive frames with which organizational actors must contend as they seek to legitimate new products and expand their operations. One of the best recent studies on how social movements affect whole industries (and the cultures surrounding and permeating them) is Rachel Schurman and William Munro's *Fighting for the Future of Food*. Studying the movement against agribusiness's use of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) in Europe and the United States, the book holds particular value for social movement scholars in how best to recognize exactly how ''movements matter.'' The dominant focus in movement outcomes research has been on policy attention and such observables as the holding of legislative hearings, the passage of bills, and/or actions taken to implement a law. Although this study does address such questions—finding that activists in Europe were often much more effective in reshaping the regulation of agribusiness than activists were in the United States—Schurman and Munro contend that one of the most meaningful ways that social movements effect change is through the introduction of *new cognitive categories*. Indeed, they note that ''the most profound impact of anti-biotech activism was to establish the distinction between genetically modified organisms and non-genetically modified organisms as the defining social and technical fact... [Greenpeace's term ''Frankenfoods'' helped] to define all GMOs as unnatural, uncontrollable, and ultimately unpredictable'' (p. 185). Thus, although one might argue that the industry ''won'' as GMO products have spread across

the globe at a rapid pace despite social movement activism, this rich study suggests a different conclusion. By paying attention to dynamic interactions between industries, activists, external events (e.g., climate change, rising world food prices), national and international NGOs, and states, Schurman and Munro show how movements reshape industries' self-definition, narrow their scope of culturally acceptable actions and technologies in some respects (while widening it in others), and successfully exploit conditions of uncertainty in institutional fields.

Social movements also have the capacity to bring about new institutional orders in a variety of settings beyond capitalist enterprises. Recent studies have called attention to movements' influence in fields as diverse as biomedicine, legal education, military, religious orders, and science.[3] Educational fields are often sites of contention, and Fabio Rojas' *From Black Power to Black Studies* (2007) shows how the social movement pressures of the Civil Rights Movement were incorporated into the university context in the form of new academic disciplines. Explicitly integrating social movement and organization-theoretic perspectives (and borrowing especially from the new institutionalism), Rojas deftly illustrates the analytic value of being somewhat more organization- rather than movement-centric. Utilizing a rich and diverse array of data sources, Rojas tracks the expansion of black studies from the Third World Strike at San Francisco State College in 1968 onward, first examining the durability of black studies programs in three cases in detail (University of Illinois-Chicago, University of Chicago, and Harvard). Next, he zooms out to look at the role of philanthropy in supporting such curricula, which he follows by providing a profile of the programs and faculty who staff them.

Rojas shows that bureaucratic contexts become more relevant for achieving institutional change after the initial protests die down, but the evidence he presents is not reducible to such a straightforward institutionalization story. Instead, Rojas prefers a more sophisticated conceptualization of movements and their organizational targets as existing in a process of mutual coevolution. As he argues, movement ideas within organizational fields "must be compatible with the practices stemming from the broader political culture and the movement that sponsored the institution. . . [but] new organizational forms, to be viable within the movement, must often have some appeal to the activists who created them. For these reasons, movement-inspired organizational forms are often hybrids combining new politics with old values" (p. 214). Thus, bricolage and recombination are central mechanisms in the generation of institutional change.

## Developing New Fields

Research at the SM/OT intersection over the past decade has accentuated not only how social movements facilitate deinstitutionalization and the breakdown of established understandings, but also how the production of new fields, the transposition of institutional logics, and the development of new forms takes place. This has been true both for those interested in studying social movement fields and also for those who look at new corporate forms, new industries, and new institutions outside the world of business.

On the movement side, Elizabeth A. Armstrong's groundbreaking *Forging Gay Identities* (2002) stands out for its cultural-institutional perspective on fields, which squares nicely with the political approach to understanding institutions earlier articulated by scholars such as Elisabeth Clemens and Neil Fligstein. Examining the development in San Francisco of historically specific identities and their evolution from the early ''homophile'' identity of the 1950s and early 1960s through the queer politics of the 1990s, Armstrong suggests that social movements are actors who create new fields and transform existing ones. Her thinking on the concept of institutionalization builds on both

---

[3] See, respectively, Banaszak-Holl et al. (2010), Epstein (1996, 2007), Klawiter (2008); Teles (2008); Katzenstein (1999); Moore (2008). Although not all of these studies are framed in terms of the integration of social movement and organizational theory, all provide provocative new approaches for making sense of how social movements disrupt institutionalized practices, generate innovations, and reorient institutional logics in diverse fields.

neo-institutional and social movement theories; a teachable point here is that movement scholars tend toward a somewhat naïve assumption that "the targeted field is institutionalized but the movement is not" (p. 13). In fact, just as neo-institutional theorists have noted about fields of formal organizations, institutionalization is a variable, contingent, and political *process* rather than a settled *outcome*. This is just as true for social movements as for established organizational fields, thus suggesting that analysts would do well to break down the division of labor in which movement theorists emphasize change while organizational theorists assert coherence and stability (ibid.). Further, and in accordance with this particular notion of institutionalization, her contribution goes beyond the dominant political process and resource mobilization traditions in social movement theory by finding a valuable role for organizations that are a part of the movement and yet are not explicitly political; the dominant template for these organizations was what she calls "gay plus one other function or identity" (p. 22). The formation of this field of organizations, which followed different political logics during distinct historical moments, reflected the "crystallization" of gay identities, yet this crystallization nonetheless remains dynamic, contested, and inherently contradictory.

New fields are also emerging among businesses, and indeed social movements can be seen as major forces behind organizational innovation. Exploiting the ambiguity of the concept of a social movement in a very effective fashion, Hayagreeva (Huggy) Rao's punchy and provocative *Market Rebels* (2008) examines how "activists" varying from product enthusiasts to grassroots organizers influence the development of new institutions. The book distills the fundamental insights of how six fields—the early automobile industry, beer brewing, French cuisine, contemporary *Fortune* 500 firms, chain stores of the 1920s, and German pharmaceuticals—found their innovations either buoyed or stymied by the mobilization of broadly-defined activist groups (respectively: amateur auto enthusiasts, microbrewers, advocates of Nouvelle Cuisine, shareholder activists, defenders of mom-and-pop stores, and anti-biotech activists). Building upon his earlier work in these and related areas, Rao shows, for example, that certification contests helped to legitimate the automobile and overcome early popular worries about safety and reliability. Then, following upon the collaborative work of Glenn Carroll on resource partitioning processes, Rao describes how microbrewers were able to exploit the concentrated market for beer by creating a new niche for craft-produced brews. Similar accounts are offered for French chefs and shareholder activists, but the cases of mobilization against chain stores and pharmaceutical firms both illustrate how activists impose constraints on activity in the marketplace. What makes this study so noteworthy is that it shows not only how activists delegitimate institutionalized practices and generate new institutions, but also how the study does so with attention to the political and power dynamics that operate within institutional fields. Thus, a significant secondary contribution of *Market Rebels* lies in Rao's description of targets' strategic responses to activists; Rao shows, for example, that target organizations sometimes engage in sophisticated countermobilization campaigns to fight back against activist groups. Chain stores in the 1920s organized a pro-chain store campaign in coalition with the farmers from whom they purchased agricultural goods (pp. 131–5). This strategic aspect of field politics offers an additional new path forward for research at this intersection.

While all of the studies described above have demonstrated the significant potential of utilizing movement frameworks for understanding institutional change, a limitation of much of this work is that most devote insufficient attention to the micro-level dynamics by which activist entrepreneurs induce change. Katherine Kellogg's *Challenging Operations* (2011) suggests that neo-institutional theories, dominant social movement perspectives, law and society theories, and sociological approaches to particular institutions (in her case, medicine) all come up short in making sense of the forces that have the power to either facilitate or thwart institutional change. Her study investigates

how, following the unsuccessful efforts of a medical reform coalition to lobby the federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) to impose limits on the number of hours worked by medical residents, the American Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) voluntarily instituted a requirement in July 2003 that surgical residents work no more than eighty hours per week. She investigates the implementation of these requirements at three hospitals, finding that two of the three failed to implement the new guidelines, often complying in only the most symbolic of ways or even actively falsifying their timesheets (p. 6). Machismo, status, and career concerns loomed large in the countermovement through residents' resistance to the new guidelines, and this was reinforced by a culture in which residents described themselves as ''Iron Men'' working in a bodily ''contact sport'' (pp. 64-66). In the successful case of ''Advent'' hospital, reformers succeeded in part because of the presence of ''transient reformers,'' labeled such because they were interns who were passing through the system and not themselves pursuing a career in general surgery (p. 169). Given this career trajectory, they were less vulnerable to the deleterious career consequences others could risk by supporting reform to work hours, and at this hospital they could also exploit the presence of other reformers in their internal coalition. The particular contribution of this study is that it shows clearly that social movement effects on organizations involve not just changing macro-level categories or institutional logics—nor merely forcing the passage of coercive new regulations—but require the face-to-face cultural work of strategically positioned actors within organizations in order to be effective. External forces may set the stage, but internal actors do the heavy lifting in order to translate mandates into real action.

The intricate interplay between external mandates and internal mechanisms of compliance is also on full display in Frank Dobbin's magisterial *Inventing Equal Opportunity* (2009). Unlike much other work at the intersection of social movements and organizational theory that often implicitly deemphasizes the state, Dobbin's study shows that the force of the state is a powerful mediator in the relationship between movements and organizational change. But, in accordance with his vast body of influential research on the topic, Dobbin makes plain that the fragmented nature of the U.S. state—characterized as it is by evolving interpretations of the law among both courts and agencies at multiple levels of government, each of which are themselves open to public challenge and contestation—generates a considerable degree of uncertainty for organizations. Social movements and organizational change, then, are linked in part through the uncertainty engendered by the legal and regulatory environment. But they are also connected in a deeper way through the work of internal activists who help to guide organizations' interpretations of the law. Such was the case among the HR/personnel professionals, Dobbin shows, in their interpretation of the equal opportunity mandates inherent in President Kennedy's 1961 executive order on affirmative action as well as the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In part as an effort to make elbow room for their own professional project, ''personnel experts promoted one round of compliance measures after another'' from writing corporate nondiscrimination policies in the 1960s to developing more formalized and equitable hiring and promotion processes in the 1970s (which he calls ''fighting bias with bureaucracy'' in Chapter Five). They then rebranded their efforts in terms of efficiency and ''diversity management'' during the challenging Reagan years, ultimately fighting for new work and family programs in the 1990s and 2000s (pp. 14–15). By the late 1970s, the HR profession had feminized; Dobbin argues that these (mostly white) women carried the antidiscrimination cause forward in a fashion similar to professional or insider activists in other domains, such as environmental engineers' work in promoting corporate environmentalism and reproductive healthcare providers' position within the women's movement (p. 9). Still, the tension between movement and institution is palpable throughout the book, and, although generally not described in these terms, *Inventing Equal Opportunity* offers a variety of rich examples of how institutionalization processes transform both social movements and their targets of change.

*Contemporary Sociology 41, 5*

## Playing the Field: Strategy and Skill

Social movements rely on resources and opportunities in their political environment in order to be effective, but this sort of environmental determinism has come under challenge. Indeed, there exist a variety of theoretically informative cases in which social movements have been effective in facilitating change despite severe limitations in resources and opportunities. A consistent irony in scholarship on social movements and collective action is that one of the most dynamic and transformative aspects of society is often converted by analysts into a set of economic, organizational, and political constraints that limit capacities for change. Responding to these concerns, a number of recent studies have drawn attention toward the role of strategic action within both movements and fields. Marshall Ganz's *Why David Sometimes Wins* (2009) is the most important recent contribution.[4]

Ganz is in a unique position to underscore the significance of strategy among movement organizations. Ganz was a volunteer in the Mississippi Summer Project of the Civil Rights Movement in 1964, followed by sixteen years of work devoted to organizing farmworkers alongside Cesar Chavez and the United Farm Workers (UFW). *Why David Sometimes Wins* is an augmented version of the doctoral dissertation Ganz completed in sociology after returning to Harvard, and this nicely crafted book distills a lifetime of knowledge about the strategies and contexts of grassroots organizing to provide new and fundamental insights into how social movements can be most effective. How was it, Ganz asks, that Chavez and the National Farm Workers Association (NFWA)—later to become the UFW—were able to wrest from agricultural firms the first substantial farm labor contract in California history, while their significantly more wealthy and (apparently) more powerful peer unions (the AFL-CIO and the Teamsters) were not? The political environment was the same for all three unions, and a simple resource mobilization hypothesis would predict that the NFWA would be much less likely to win than their richer rivals. Central to Ganz's answer is the notion of "strategic capacity," which he defines as a combination of the motivation of leaders, access to salient information, and the "robustness of [leaders'] reflective practice" (p. 14). Importantly, Ganz's study of farmworker mobilization recognizes that the agency of leaders is itself rooted in their biographies and the organizational structures in which they are manifested. Individual life narratives, the social network ties of leaders, and leaders' willingness to apply tactics in new and unfamiliar ways all figure prominently here. In addition, strategic capacity also requires deliberative processes that amplify diverse viewpoints, utilize heterogeneous sets of organizational resources, and maintain accountability structures that limit the negative influence of bureaucratic routinization and maintain openness to new practices. From the perspective of the SM/OT encounter, the evidence in *Why David Sometimes Wins* is complementary to the findings of Dobbin's *Inventing Equal Opportunity*: uncertainty is feared by organizations of all types, but can serve as a resource for making change possible (see also Schneiberg and Soule's chapter in the Davis et al. volume). Sustaining an internal dialogue that is open to all viewpoints requires, Ganz notes, a high tolerance for ambiguity, but can increase capacity for innovation. And entrepreneurs can channel that uncertainty into creative solutions and organizational change.

## New Directions

The integration of social movements and organizational theory has opened up a variety of productive lines of inquiry in the early years of the new century. Analysts have illustrated in diverse settings how social movements create uncertainty and deinstitutionalize established practices, and also how they resolve uncertainty through propagating new institutions and changing existing ones. Scholars are paying greater attention to questions of contingency, the cultural and political work necessary in order to generate institutions, and the transposition of institutional logics. The unique position of challengers with recognized standing in organizations is noted in these

---

[4]   But see also Fligstein & McAdam (2011) and Jasper (2006).

studies and in other recent works examining insider activism.[5] More nuanced frameworks are also being developed for conceptualizing the institutionalization of social movements. For institutional theorists in particular, social movement approaches have shifted attention toward interest and agency, long considered a blind spot.

Yet there are still new paths and opportunities available for the further integration of these perspectives (and their application to new fields of inquiry).

First and foremost, although recent works by Ganz, Jasper, and Fligstein and McAdam are helpful in recognizing the importance of strategic action within institutional fields, such an agenda is in need of even further elaboration. The politics of institutional fields involve not only the design of institutions in a fashion that favors the interests of incumbents while disadvantaging challengers, but they also involve ongoing negotiations between various players. These players, in turn, engage in strategic negotiation and power plays as they navigate the circumstances of changing environments. Some of the studies that I have described have recognized this, especially Rao in his discussion of pro-chain store mobilization and Kellogg in her detailed description of mobilization against reform in surgical practices.

Still, most scholarship at the intersection of social movements and organizational theory continues to view social movement actors through the lens of strategic action, while the organizations that movements target for change are often seen as strategic dupes left only with the option to either acquiesce or ignore the movement. But, as studies are beginning to show with greater attention, the targets of social movements have considerable strategic capacity of their own, and utilize their disproportionate resources to their advantage. Although it seems plausible that targets engage in strategic responses more on the basis of threats rather than opportunities, there are times when organizations including major corporations will go so far as to adopt social movement-like strategies of their own.

A further potential would be to integrate these new perspectives on organizational behavior with earlier literatures on the politics of the firm. Many of the studies described above suggest that although social movements engender political conflict within organizations, they eventually come into some sort of positive relationship with their targets of contention (whether as a ''loyal opposition'' for Rojas or as facilitators of innovation for Rao and Soule). Interestingly, these recent works suggest a rather different set of research questions than those found in studies of the politics of the corporation in the 1970s and 1980s. Such earlier studies, including many works by elite- and neo-Marxist theorists, emphasized the conditional power of large businesses to influence political decision-making through lobbying, electoral spending, inter-organizational network ties, and the like. Consistent with my earlier concern that strategic responses to social movement challenges are still largely missing from the dominant contemporary research frame (as is a more elaborate understanding of the role of elites in social movement fields), it seems long overdue to reintroduce the classic questions of political sociology into the SM/OT conceptual frame. Work by Mayer Zald and Michael Lounsbury (2010), Stephen Barley (2010), and myself (2009; forthcoming) all represent initial efforts in this direction, but much more work is needed.

Social movement approaches are also informing renewed interest among ecologists and institutionalists in the legitimation of institutional categories, which involve movement-like processes of mobilization, framing, and the endogenous evolution of collective identities and genres.[6] On the other side, there appear to be a variety of yet-untapped potentials to connect institutionalist notions of culture and legitimation with frame analytic models from social movement theory. Much as organizations are both constrained and enabled by institutional logics and cultural categories, social movement groups need to strategically frame their claims and position their identities relative to categorical reference groups

---

5   See especially Skrentny (2002), Banaszak (2010), and Katzenstein (1998).

6   See, for example, Hsu et al. (2010).

(these may often be others within the same Social Movement Industry). Here, scholars of contentious collective action could benefit by borrowing from those who have studied identities and categories among formal organizations. The extent to which a "categorical imperative" (Zuckerman 1999) exists among social movement organizations represents only one such possibility for further exploration.

There are also certain concepts from social movement theory that have not yet been successfully translated into theorizing organizational change, and foremost among these concepts is that of repression. The repressive capacity of the targets of social movements is an absolutely central topic for social movement scholars, but relatively little scholarship examines how non-state organizations repress activism through such tactics as firing activists, closing off spaces for activism through union-busting, and also through forms of "soft" repression such as public relations tactics or the facilitation of counter-movements. Although repression within non-state organizations is discussed in some part in the Kellogg, Soule and Rao books reviewed here (see also Walker, Martin and McCarthy 2008: 43–44), the topic of organizational repression of social movements deserves much greater attention.

The explosion of work on social movements and organizations is a testament to the remarkable set of institutional changes that are taking place in contemporary society. It also serves as evidence that perhaps these two literatures need not remain as separate as they have historically been. Yet, as Elisabeth Clemens (2005: 351) very poignantly put it in her concluding essay to the *Social Movements and Organization Theory* volume, the sort of boundary-blurring inherent in this scholarly integration can come with risks: "When tie-dyed activists and poor people's marches are central to the imagery of a theory, can that theory be transposed to corporate boardrooms and back offices without doing fundamental violence to our understanding of both phenomena?" Although studies applying social movement perspectives to organizations have not fully put this worry to rest, they have shown in myriad ways how the innovations and challenges brought forward by social movements can be translated and repurposed in facilitating organizational change.

## References

Abbott, Andrew. 1992. "An Old Institutionalist Reads the New Institutionalism." *Contemporary Sociology* 21(6):754–756.

Banaszak, Lee Ann. 2010. *The Women's Movement Inside and Outside the State*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Banaszak-Holl, Jane, Sandra Levitsky, and Mayer N Zald. 2010. *Social Movements and the Transformation of American Health Care*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Barley, Stephen R. 2010. "Building an Institutional Field to Corral a Government: A Case to Set an Agenda for Organization Studies." *Organization Studies* 31(6):777–805.

Binder, Amy J. 2002. *Contentious Curricula: Afrocentrism and Creationism in American Public Schools*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Clemens, Elisabeth S. 1993. "Organizational Repertoires and Institutional Change: Women's Groups and the Transformation of U.S. Politics, 1890-1920." *American Journal of Sociology* 98(4):755–798.

Clemens, Elisabeth S. 1997. *The People's Lobby: Organizational Innovation and the Rise of Interest Group Politics in the United States, 1890-1925*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Davis, Gerald F., and Doug McAdam. 2000. "Corporations, Classes, and Social Movements After Managerialism." *Research in Organizational Behavior* 22:193–236.

Epstein, Steven. 1996. *Impure Science: AIDS, Activism, and the Politics of Knowledge*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Epstein, Steven. 2007. *Inclusion: The Politics of Difference in Medical Research*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Fligstein, Neil, and Doug McAdam. 2011. "Toward a General Theory of Strategic Action Fields." *Sociological Theory* 29(1):1–26.

Hoffman, Andrew J. 2001. *From Heresy to Dogma: An Institutional History of Corporate Environmentalism*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Business Books.

Hsu, Greta, Özgecan Koçak, and Giacomo Negro (eds.). 2010. *Categories in Markets: Origins and Evolution*. Bradford, UK: Emerald Group Publishing.

Jasper, James M. 2006. *Getting Your Way: Strategic Dilemmas in the Real World*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Katzenstein, Mary Fainsod. 1998. *Faithful and Fearless: Moving Feminist Protest inside the Church and Military*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

King, Brayden G., and Nicholas A. Pearce. 2010. "The Contentiousness of Markets: Politics,

Social Movements, and Institutional Change in Markets.'' *Annual Review of Sociology* 36(1):249–267.

Klawiter, Maren. 2008. *The Biopolitics of Breast Cancer: Changing Cultures of Disease and Activism*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

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

McCarthy, John D., and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. ''Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory.'' *American Journal of Sociology* 82(6):1212–1241.

Michels, Robert. 1959 [1911]. *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy*. New York: Dover.

Minkoff, Debra C. 1999. ''Bending with the Wind: Strategic Change and Adaptation by Women's and Racial Minority Organizations.'' *American Journal of Sociology* 104(6):1666–1703.

Minkoff, Debra C. 1997. ''The Sequencing of Social Movements.'' *American Sociological Review* 62(5):779–799.

Moore, Kelly. 2008. *Disrupting Science: Social Movements, American Scientists, and the Politics of the Military, 1945-1975*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

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

Piven, Frances Fox, and Richard A Cloward. 1977. *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Raeburn, Nicole C. 2004. *Changing corporate America from Inside Out: Lesbian and Gay Workplace Rights*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rao, Hayagreeva, Calvin Morrill, and Mayer N. Zald. 2000. ''Power Plays: How Social Movements and Collective Action Create New Organizational Forms.'' *Research in Organizational Behavior* 22:237–282.

Seidman, Gay. 2007. *Beyond the Boycott: Labor Rights, Human Rights, and Transnational Activism*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Skrentny, John David. 2002. *The Minority Rights Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Teles, Steven M. 2008. *The Rise of the Conservative Legal Movement: The Battle for Control of the Law*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Tilly, Charles, and Charles Tilly. 1981. ''Useless Durkheim.'' Pp. 95–108 in Charles Tilly, *As Sociology Meets History*. New York: Academic Press.

Walker, Edward T. 2009. ''Privatizing Participation: Civic Change and the Organizational Dynamics of Grassroots Lobbying Firms.'' *American Sociological Review* 74(1):83–105.

Walker, Edward T. Forthcoming. *Grassroots for Hire: The Reshaping of Participation and Policy*. Cambridge University Press.

Walker, Edward T., Andrew W. Martin, and John D. McCarthy. 2008. ''Confronting the State, the Corporation, and the Academy: The Influence of Institutional Targets on Social Movement Repertoires.'' *American Journal of Sociology* 114(1):35–76.

Zald, Mayer N. 2005. ''The Strange Career of an Idea and its Resurrection.'' *Journal of Management Inquiry* 14(2):157–166.

Zald, Mayer N, and Roberta Ash. 1966. ''Social Movement Organizations: Growth, Decay and Change.'' *Social Forces* 44(3):327–341.

Zald, Mayer N., and Michael A. Berger. 1978. ''Social Movements in Organizations: Coup d'Etat, Insurgency, and Mass Movements.'' *American Journal of Sociology* 83(4):823–861.

Zald, Mayer N, and Michael Lounsbury. 2010. ''The Wizards of Oz: Towards an Institutional Approach to Elites, Expertise and Command Posts.'' *Organization Studies* 31(7):963–996.

Zuckerman, Ezra W. 1999. ''The Categorical Imperative: Securities Analysts and the Illegitimacy Discount.'' *American Journal of Sociology* 104(5):1398–1438.