

## CHAPTER 25

# The Enduring Vitality of the Resource Mobilization Theory of Social Movements

JOHN D. MCCARTHY AND MAYER N. ZALD

It is now just over three decades since the initiation of the research and writing that came to be called resource mobilization theory (RMT). Developed during a period of heightened activism and social movement participation, it grew out of our sense that the then extant theories and approaches did not well explain the levels of mobilization and the trends that were occurring in an affluent American society. One line of those earlier theories focused on the role of grievances and deprivation in triggering social movements. But should not the level of grievances and deprivation and consequently the number of social movements be going down as society becomes more affluent? Nor did others of the available theories do very well at explaining the large number of movements and high level of mobilization of the period.

Beginning as an attempt to provide a set of answers to that seeming paradox, we developed a fairly general but partial theory of social movement growth and decline and the relationship of growth and decline to movement structure and differentiation. The intellectual roots of RMT lie in our own background in the then current organizational and economic theories that critiqued simple notions of rationality and made it clear that self-interest alone was an inadequate basis to account for the contribution of effort to the pursuit of the collective goods that social movements seemed to be involved in. The theory took an entrepreneurial–organizational approach to movements and generated a set of topics, propositions, and hypotheses that had been little investigated in prior research and certainly had not been organized in that way before. Although the theory was stated in fairly general terms, as if it could be applied to most societies, especially industrialized societies, it was in fact designed to focus on the dynamics and trends of social movements in contemporary American society. Stated another way, the scope conditions were not well articulated.

---

We thank Pat Gillham, Debra Minkoff, and Jackie Smith for providing useful comments on earlier drafts.

---

JOHN D. MCCARTHY • Department of Sociology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802.    MAYER N. ZALD • Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109.

*Handbook of Sociological Theory*, edited by Jonathan H. Turner. Kluwer Academic / Plenum Publishers, New York, 2002.

RMT developed as one among several related attempts to understand collective action and social movements that shared problematics and broke with earlier traditions. Anthony Oberschall, Charles Tilly, William Gamson, Pam Oliver, Gerald Marwell, and others, though differing with each other in important ways, also shared some common assumptions. They differed, for instance, in how much they focused on the conditions for individual mobilization and participation, the extent to which they took an organizational or political process approach, how much they focused on the Olsonian problem of the provision of collective goods, and so on. As is evidenced in the essays in Zald and McCarthy (1979), the results of a conference held in 1977, on the one hand, there already was an awareness that a new paradigm or approach (which came to be called the resource mobilization/collective action program) was developing, and on the other there were substantial differences within the program. (The political process approach associated with Charles Tilly came to be called RMI, while our entrepreneurial/organizational approach was called RMII.) Jenkins (1985) provides a systematic account of the differences between these two variants of RMT.

Over this 30-year period, there has been a vast flowering of research on social movements and collective action. Some substantial portion of that research, especially that conducted by sociologists and political scientists, has drawn on the formulations of RMT scholars as it attempted to “test” these formulations or use them to explain phenomena of interest in specific movements, collective action events or event sequences. For instance, we have identified more than 150 doctoral dissertations that make explicit reference to resource mobilization in their abstracts. (It is not always clear from the abstracts which variant or combination of variants of RMT they are using.) We have identified more than 600 articles that make reference just to the foundational articles (McCarthy & Zald, 1973, 1977) of RMII. Most of the publications are in sociology or political science, but one also finds work in journals related to specific social movements and/or professions (e.g., public health, natural resources and environmental studies, gender studies). Some of these works confirm original hypotheses or expectations and others criticize RMT or combine it with other perspectives or theoretical approaches, for instance new social movement theory. Some attempt to adjudicate among variants. Moreover, as we have continued writing and doing research and as we have listened to the critics of RMT, we have changed our position on many of our original assumptions or ways of thinking. But we have never attempted to restate the theory or to directly respond to the criticisms of the theory that have emerged. Restricting ourselves to our own formulation of the RM program, this chapter summarizes the original theory and core assumptions, examines the analytical and conceptual problems that emerged, and assesses the trends in research and research findings that bear on the main hypotheses. In no way a complete summary of research, it will allow us to isolate some important problems that deserve future attention. The next section states the background assumptions, the implicit scope conditions, and the core assumptions and propositions of the original theory. The second section directly addresses conceptual criticisms and reviews research as it bears upon major components of the theory. The third section locates RMII in its relationship to complementary and competitive approaches.

### **ASSUMPTIONS, SCOPE CONDITIONS, AND ORIENTING PROPOSITIONS**

Social movements can be defined as mobilized or activated (effective) demand (preferences) for change in society. This definition is not fully accepted in the larger community of scholars, or even among the community of scholars that constitute the RMT community. Nevertheless, it is useful for RMII because it focuses on how and why demands are generated

and how social movement organizations (SMOs), whether small and informal or large and more formal, are generated and organized. Central to RMT is some notion of increasing or decreasing demand for movement activity and social change and some notion of SMO stimulation of demand, organizational growth, decline, and adaptation as demand increases or decreases. [Effective demand is different from grievances or preferences in that it focuses on resources available to pursue (purchase, extend effort) wants, rather than on grievances or preferences alone.] Moreover, as demand increases and as the overall movement meets with responses from the larger society and polity, the possibilities for SMO differentiation increases. All the SMOs relating to a SM can be thought of as an industry (SMI), with attendant goal and tactical differentiation and internal competition and conflict. There may be few or many SMs and SMIs in a society at any one point in time. All the SMs and SMIs may be considered a social movement sector (SMS). One important issue is what accounts for the size and orientation(s) of the SMS (Garner & Zald, 1985).

### **Background Assumptions and Scope Conditions**

Four background assumptions or contrasts set off RMT from earlier traditions or approaches in social movement theory. (1) Contrasted with theories that attempted to predict mobilization levels directly from “frustration” or deprivation, RMT argues that the amount of mobilization or movement participation cannot be predicted directly from the level of deprivation or grievances. Participation involves expenditures of time, energy, and money and populations with few resources are less able to act on grievances or perceived injustices. (2) Some earlier theories had argued that participation in movements was a form of irrational and pathological behavior: at the individual level it was an expression of personal alienation and/or pathology; at the societal level, a result of isolated, uprooted, and unattached behavior. RMT treats social movement participation as normal behavior, emerging out of biographical circumstances, social supports, and immediate life situations. (3) Most prior theories located the resources that were mobilized largely or completely within the aggrieved or beneficiary constituency. RMT locates resources in the larger society, including governmental and religious institutions, and in conscience constituencies, groups that support the movement’s goals, even though its members do not receive the direct output of the policy/political changes that the movement advocates. (4) Prior theories of social movements focus largely on the interaction of movement and authorities, with the movement attempting to raise the costs to authorities or drawing attention to the legitimacy of their claims. RMT draws attention to the role of the media in mediating between the movement and bystander publics. Thus, movement and authorities are both caught in a larger contest for support of bystander publics and reference elites.

**SCOPE CONDITIONS.** RMT grew out of an empirical stocktaking of trends in the dynamics of social movements in the United States. Although it was stated in quite general terms, seemingly applicable to social movements in any society, it had implicit and explicit scope conditions that limited its “untranslated” applicability. Among the most important of these scope conditions are the following: (1) Societies have voluntary association traditions. Individuals can choose to affiliate and participate in voluntary associations and knowledge of how to organize them is fairly widespread. (2) Freedom of speech and freedom of assembly are normatively accepted, even if not universally applied. (3) There is a mass media and it is fairly open to reporting grievances and protest. (4) The electoral system is so structured that small groups have little chance of gaining legislative office. Thus, mobilization and action outside of the electoral system is encouraged.

RMT can and has been applied in situations where these conditions do not hold. For instance, RMT has been used to analyze social movements in authoritarian regimes and in societies without voluntary association traditions. Other versions of RMT (Oberschall, Tilly) are not dependent on these scope conditions. Yet, it is clear that our version was formulated with these conditions in mind and the propositions we developed and the objects of analysis that were chosen took these scope conditions as shaping the parameters in which analysis took place.

**ORIENTING PROPOSITIONS.** RMT is a middle-ranged theory that develops propositions about the interrelationship between demands for change (i.e., sentiments, preferences, tastes, values, grievances), costs and benefits of attempting to realize those demands, SMOs and technologies of mobilization and protest, SMIs, and the SMS. Here we present the core concepts of the theory and selected propositions.

*Demands, Costs and Benefits, and Resources.* SMs draw on the sentiment/preference pool in the larger society. Sentiment or preference pools vary in the number of people who share the grievance or sentiment and the intensity with which those sentiments for change are held. Over time the size and intensity of the preference pool changes as issues and problems succeed each other on the public agenda. Of course, for some parts of the population, the preference structure may be relatively stable, even while the size of the sentiment pool in the rest of the society may fluctuate. (For example, the grievances and preferences of the African-American community may be relatively stable on civil rights issues, even while the rest of the society may have fluctuations in the level of concern.) Issue entrepreneurs (politicians, journalists, ministers, SMO leaders, public intellectuals, and so on) attempt to define the issues for specific and general audiences. If they are successful, they enlarge and intensify the sentiment pool,<sup>1</sup> that is, they increase the number of people committed to a demand/preference for change and intensify the commitment to the issue of those who already share that preference.

Having a preference for change, or having a grievance or sense of injustice, does not automatically translate into action to rectify the grievance. Action occurs in the context of the life situation of the potential participant and in the context of competing commitments, social supports, costs, and resources. Competing commitments may include commitments to work, to family, and to educational goals that may inhibit participation. Individuals differ in the resources that they command relevant to a movement's tasks and the extent to which those resources (skills, money, time, and status) can be put in the service of the movement. Individuals with discretionary time and money, for whatever reason, and with few competing commitments, are more likely to act on their preferences to participate in movement activities. Similarly, if others in one's life space share values and grievances and participate in movement-related activities, social costs of participation are lowered. Conversely, if there are few supports for participation, we would expect lower rates of acting on preferences.

The resources social movements draw on come from many sources. Specific resources, such as labor, facilities, and money, may be supplied by individuals who are part of the presumed beneficiary base of the movement—members of the group whose claims of injustice or deprivation are to be rectified. Or they may come from conscience constituencies—others in the society who believe in the rightness of the cause, even though they themselves and their friends and relatives will not directly benefit from the changes advocated. Money, labor, and

<sup>1</sup>RMT originally included notions of issue entrepreneurship in the definition of grievances and the proffering of solutions and pathways of action. But we did not have available the language of framing to examine the ways in which symbols were used to package diagnoses and prognoses as was later developed by Snow and Benford (1988, 1992).

facilities also may be made available through institutional channels, such as church bodies, philanthropic foundations, and government programs. There also are general infrastructural resources that may be available to movements that effect their ability to mobilize. The development of the mass media, of cheaper and more rapid transportation means, of postal systems, and of electronic communication systems (faxes, internet) affect mobilization costs.

*Social Movement Organizations: Structure, Technologies, and Professionalization.* SMOs are relatively formal organizations that develop to manage the interdependencies of adherents and activists committed to the movement. If a movement effort endures beyond a single event and links several networks of adherents and activists, a more or less formal organization (at a minimum a mailing list, a name, and a set of controllers of the mailing list and attendant resources) is likely to develop. Although many SMOs may be relatively small, enduring movements with substantial number of adherents may develop larger SMOs that link adherents in different locales and even countries.<sup>2</sup>

Activists, acting on their own, as members of networks, or as self-identified agents of SMOs, attempt to transform bystander publics into sympathizers and sympathizers into adherents (contributors of money and labor). Cadre, the activists who devote the most time, money, and energy to the organization, are drawn from the ranks of adherents to an SM. They also may be drawn from the ranks of cadre and adherents of previous movements and ideologically related activities. Thus, as a new focused movement emerges, it can draw on adherents of prior movements or ideologies that are less active and “hot” at the present time.

As SMOs grow larger and command larger resource flows, they are likely to develop cadre and staff that devote considerable amounts of time to the SMO. Indeed, professionalization may occur in that cadre may develop skills specific to leading and managing SMOs such that careers in a specific SMI or related organizations and industries may develop. A number of structural/institutional problems also may emerge as SMOs become larger and less transient. These include the relationship of cadre to adherents and how choices are made about programs, tactics, and goals, the relationships of central offices to chapters or local groups, and the extent to which SMOs operate in conformance with accounting and other standards that constrain organizations in general and the nonprofit/social movement sector.

SMOs combine resources to attempt to accomplish social change. Thus, two interlinked sets of repertoires or technologies can be thought to be employed. Technologies of mobilization include techniques for recruiting adherents—members who contribute money through direct mail and telephone campaigns, participants in demonstrations and marches, and recruits to cells for illegal and terroristic activities. Technologies of protest range from relatively peaceful and legal activities, such as speaking to public gatherings, marches and demonstrations, and lobbying efforts. They extend further to such activities that may be legal or illegal, such as boycotts, sit-ins, and other blockades of “normal” civil activity, to illegal activity such as property damage, murder, arson, and theft. The two kinds of technologies may be interlinked in that the protest or change activity, when visible, affects bystanders’ and sympathizers’ readiness to become adherents. On the other side, the kinds of mobilization technologies that are utilized may bring in adherents with different kinds of commitments to protest activities, shaping the tactical repertoires of SMOs.

<sup>2</sup>Zald and Ash (1966) first introduced the acronym of SMO in 1966. Their analysis had used an organization–environment framework, which then was current in organizational theory, to explicate the dynamics of organizational adaptation. In particular they asked how and when SMOs were able to avoid the tendencies to bureaucratization and conservatism that had been predicted by Michels and Weber. RMT tended to assume their analysis and did not pay much attention to organizational dynamics.

In modern societies, which are usually large with dispersed communities, the conditions and injustices that SMs wish to rectify are not directly experienced or perceived by bystanders. Similarly, bystander publics do not directly perceive the actions of SMOs and SM activists. Instead, mass media (print, television, and radio) filter perceptions through their reporting routines and the images that they convey. The amount, substantive content, and biases of media coverage is a complex resultant of the range of events and newsworthy stories in the larger society, the competitive situation of the media, and the professional commitments and expectations of media staff. Since enlarging sentiment pools depends at least in part on this indirect filtering, SMOs and SM cadre are dependent on and strategically attempt to shape the amount and nature of media coverage of the movement. Reference elites and authorities, too, are affected by filtered perceptions of the movement and its causes. And authorities may also attempt to shape and limit media coverage.

*Social Movement Industry (SMI) and Social Movement Sector.* As the sentiment pool expands, as more people support the movement, and as more resources are available for mobilization, the number of SMOs increase and they differentiate in terms of ideological/constituency constellation and in terms of the functional niche that they occupy. If the sentiment pool was fully homogeneous, fewer SMOs might be founded, but SMOs are created to gather up the resources of segments of the pool that differ in the extremity of their diagnoses and in their commitments to different kinds of tactics and program. In turn, those SMOs encourage the segmenting and fragmenting of the sentiment pool.

All of the SMOs that share a general movement goal can be thought of as an industry. SMOs within an industry cooperate, compete, and conflict with one another. They come together for some shared purposes either of protest or of collective representation, they compete for resources from sympathizers and adherents, and they conflict over leadership of the movement as a whole, over who should represent the movement to authorities and the larger public. Moreover, as more resources are available, specialization of function may occur. Some SMOs may become information-gathering organizations, provide legal services, or lobbying services to other SMOs committed to the broad general goals.

There may be several social movements at varying degrees of mobilization at any one time in a society, or there may be none. Societies differ in the extent to which they encourage and facilitate social movements. All the SMIs in a society can be conceived as the social movement sector. The size and orientation of the SMS is a function of the amount of resources devoted to social change (whatever its substantive focus, either left or right), the associational supports provided by the larger society, the pluralistic or authoritarian orientation of the state, and the relationship of the movement sector to the political party space. The size and shape of the SMS varies between nation-states and over time within them.

These are the core conceptual components of RMII. Over the past 20 years RMII has been used in several ways. Sometimes it has been used to provide a recipe list of topics to be examined as scholars studied the growth and transformation of specific movements, for instance, studies of the environmental movement, or of specific conflicts, for instance, the battle over North American Free Trade Association (NAFTA). Sometimes it has been used to point to topics that had not been studied in earlier approaches. This has been especially the case with studies of the relationship of external funding to movement growth and directions, but also to studies of professionalization and mobilization technologies. In still other cases, there has been a direct attempt to test specific hypotheses stated in the 1977 article by McCarthy and Zald. RMII has been subjected to substantial critique and also has been used in conjunction with other theoretical formulations. In the next section we attempt to summarize our current understanding of the status of the theory and of the research surrounding it.

## TOWARD A REFORMULATION OF RESOURCE MOBILIZATION II: A SELECTIVE REVIEW OF RESEARCH AND CRITICISM

Over the last 25 years a substantial number of theoretical critiques and a vast number of empirical studies have appeared that bear on central issues posed by the RM approach. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to systematically review this extensive body of scholarship. What we wish to accomplish is more modest. We will revisit several of the central questions posed by the RMII approach and consider them in the light of subsequent criticism and research.

Six key questions that are central to the original RMII focus will help us structure our review of several main lines of critique and subsequent research bearing on issues they raised. These are: (1) what are the main explanatory elements of the micromobilization of SMO activism; (2) what resources are important for SMOs, where do those resources come from (internal or external sources), and what role do they play in organizational dynamics; (3) what are sentiment pools, what accounts for changes in their size, and are SMO and SMI recruitment dynamics more or less important than sentiment pool size in accounting for rates of micromobilization, SMO founding rates, and SMO, SMI, and SMS growth; (4) what is the impact of SMO capacity (density) on protest extent, form, and likelihood of disruptiveness; (5) what are the historically specific and universal patterns of SMO life cycles and SMO population dynamics and how can they be accounted for; and (6) what are the key dynamics of SMIs and the SMSs and how can they be accounted for?

The ratios of theoretical criticism, systematic research attention, and theoretical elaboration to one another in subsequent work addressed to the six questions have varied considerably. We attempt to honor those ratios in our discussion. A number of critiques of RMII have emphasized our blind spots and omissions.<sup>3</sup> We will return to those in the conclusion to this section.

As we have implied a core assumption of RMII is that understanding SMO processes is a key to accounting for social movement ebbs and flows. Central to such understanding is to know how SMOs are formed and how their leaders think strategically about how to establish stable resource flows in order to survive. These organizations are not committed to making a profit to survive but pursuing public goods. Nevertheless, many of them find it necessary to confront the dilemmas of establishing stable resource flows in order to maintain themselves. We made a number of claims about these processes. But we were mostly speaking out of ignorance about their empirical scope conditions because we did not possess anything like a census of SMOs that would allow us to describe their demography, although we did make strong claims about the increasing number of professionalized ones. We now can specify more clearly the demography of the US SMS. We begin by doing so in order that we can nest our discussion of our six key questions more securely.

### **Toward a Demography of the US SMS**

**SMI AND SMS SIZE.** It has been only recently that researchers began to document in fuller detail the size and shape of segments of the US SMS. While the task of completing an adequate census of SMOs for any SMI and therefore the entire sector is fraught with obstacles,<sup>4</sup> we now

<sup>3</sup>The most important of these are that we deemphasize political and cultural processes.

<sup>4</sup>SMOs are a subset of nonprofit organizations in the United States, but are not required to register with the IRS unless they seek special tax status as formal nonprofits. As a consequence, many, especially small local, SMOs do not

have a number of very useful SMI wide estimates of the number of SMOs (Mitchell et al., 1992). For instance, based on Internal Revenue Service (IRS) 990 registrations, Brulle (1996, 2000) estimates that in 1990 there were more than 15,000 US environmental organizations. This is surely an underestimate, since many local volunteer-led social movement groups do not register with the IRS.<sup>5</sup> A group of researchers led by Collwell and Bond (1994) estimated that the US peace movement consisted of at least 7,700 organizations in 1988 (Edwards & Marullo, 1995; Edwards, 1994; Marullo, Pagnucco, & Smith, 1996) and an independent estimate by Lofland (1993) put the number at 8,000. Both estimates are especially helpful because they are not confined to SMOs of large size and broad geographic scope and therefore can demonstrate that as for economic organizations (as with firms, sole proprietorships, and partnerships) most SMOs are small and local. We do not have such well-documented estimates for other US SMIs.<sup>6</sup> But if these numbers are at all indicative of other well-established SMIs, including victim's rights, antitoxic, community empowerment, gay and lesbian, racial and ethnic, prolife and prochoice and animal rights SMIs, it is not difficult to suggest that there are at least several hundred thousand US SMOs.<sup>7</sup> This is an enormous number of organizations seeking social change.<sup>8</sup>

**SMS DEMOGRAPHY.** Based on these attempts to provide a census of two important SMIs, what can we say about the demography of the SMS? There are four theoretically important dimensions along which distinct SMOs can vary. These main SMO demographic variables are: (1) the extent to which the leadership is volunteer or is paid; (2) the geographic scope of operations (local versus state and/or national); (3) whether the SMO has any members and if so whether the members are individuals or other organizations (or some combination of the two); and (4) whether the SMO is a stand alone or is affiliated in any way with a network of groups.

The vast majority of SMOs rely on volunteer leaders, are small and locally based, and are what Lofland and Jamison (1985) call association locals. Most are independent groups, although some are linked to broader umbrella organizations. The evidence presented by Edwards (1994) indicated that about half of the local peace groups were affiliated with other groups. A surprisingly large proportion of small local associations are led by paid staff, if the peace movement SMI is any indication: about one third of the local peace groups had reported paid staff. At the local level there also are many service/advocacy organizations (e.g., health clinics and shelters) closely associated with broader movements such as the women's<sup>9</sup> and gay rights movements. These are nowhere near as numerous as associations and are typically led by paid staff. Nor are the associations that are organizations of organizations, such as the many congregation-based community organizations, as numerous as association locals (Delgado,

---

register. Methods for finding these unregistered groups are costly and unreliable (see McCarthy & Castelli, 2000). Until recently, the IRS nonprofit information system as well has not been easily accessible.

<sup>5</sup>Edwards (1994) provides evidence for SMOs in the peace movement in 1988 that about 20% of the groups identified were not registered. See also McCarthy, Britt, and Wolfson (1991) and D. H. Smith (1997).

<sup>6</sup>See also Rucht (1989) on the German and French environmental SMIs and Kriesi (1996) on the French, German, Dutch, and Swiss new social movement SMIs.

<sup>7</sup>This compares with estimates of the total number of religious congregations in the United States of 300,000 and the total number of about 20 million economic organizations, and one million formally registered nonprofit organizations, an unknown subset of which are SMOs (Hodgkinson and Weitzman, 1996).

<sup>8</sup>Note that we have not included patriot groups, radical right-wing groups, fundamentalist religious groups, or right-to-bear-arms groups. Social movement scholars have, in general, ignored such groups, instead focusing the bulk of their research attention upon SMOs with which they sympathize.

<sup>9</sup>Martin (1990) calls attention to this class of SMOs noting that they have been ignored for the most part both by organizational and social movement analysts. See also, Ferree and Martin (1995).

1994)<sup>10</sup> but they may be more common than most analysts have assumed. One sample of local SMOs seeking to empower poor communities found, for instance, that about 10% of them were based on a membership made up primarily of other organizations, while another 10% included both individual and organizational members (McCarthy & Castelli, 1994). Minkoff (personal communication) reports that 21% of the white women's SMOs she has analyzed elsewhere (1995) are composed of organizational members. The census of SMOs in the peace movement showed that only about 25% of the small, mostly local groups, relied exclusively on individual rather than other organizations as members (Edwards, 1994).

The minority of SMOs whose geographic scope of operations is broader than local communities typically have larger annual budgets than locally based ones and are far more likely to be led by paid staff (Edwards, 1994). Some of them include other organizations as well as individuals as members, some have exclusively organizational members, and some have no individual members. Walker's (1991) evidence for Washington-based citizens groups with members shows that while a slim majority rely exclusively on individual members, the rest rely wholly or in part on organizational members. His data also show that a subset of these nonlocal organizations has state and/or local affiliates in some federated arrangement and that citizens' groups are more likely than other Washington-based groups to have state or local chapters. Finally, that evidence shows that those SMOs derive only about a third of their resources from membership dues of any kind, while about another third of their aggregate revenue flow comes from grant sources (individual, foundation, and government).

**CHANGING SM SECTORAL DEMOGRAPHY.** What can we say about the changing demography of the sector? We know more about the nonlocal part of the sector than the local part. There is evidence of high mortality rates among local associations, but the majority of them appear able to survive downturns in movement fortunes (Edwards & Marullo, 1995). Some of the forms that have received attention, for example, feminist service organizations and congregation-based organizations, appear to have grown in numbers over recent decades and to have established stable resource bases (e.g., Martin, 1990; Rogers, 1990). Because of the difficulties of enumerating this part of the SMS to which we have already alluded, it is not possible to develop credible estimates of its trajectory. This is evident, for instance, in Robert Putnam's (2000) difficulty in accounting trends in the SMS that are consistent with his broader claims of a decline of local association participation in the United States in recent decades.

Trends in the size and demography of the national-level SMS are more easily documented.<sup>11</sup> Beginning in the 1960s, the national SMS grew at a vigorous pace, faster than other national noneconomic organizational sectors (Walker, 1983, 1991) and has continued to grow at such a pace into the 1990s (Baumgartner & Leech, 1998; Berry, 1999). The size of the SMS at the state level appears to have stabilized in recent years (Gray & Lowrey, 1996). Minkoff's (1995) analyses of racial-ethnic and women's SMOs show a trend toward a greater proportion of national-level groups being advocacy groups as a result of both the founding of new groups and the adoption of an advocacy strategy by formerly service groups.

**THE TRANSNATIONAL SOCIAL MOVEMENT SECTOR.** Finally, a number of scholars (J. Smith, 1997; Smith et al., 1994, 1998; Young, 1992; Young et al., 1998) have begun to estimate

<sup>10</sup>There are other local forms that have received attention, such as communes and what Lofland and Jamison (1985) call cell locals and sect locals, but these are quite rare ones in most movements. The affinity group form, however, plays an important role in the emergent anti-globalization movement (Gillham & Marx, 2000; Smith, 2001).

<sup>11</sup>We assume that most of the citizen's groups studied by Walker (1991) and most of the advocacy groups included in Minkoff's (1995) analyses are SMOs.

the size and demography of transnational social movement organizational (TSMO) sector. This work shows that rapid growth has occurred in the sector since the 1970s, led by a proliferation of environmental TSMOs. TSMOs are more likely to enroll organizational than individual members than is the case for equivalent national level SMOs, and, in the case of the environmental movement, trend evidence suggests that the growth of the transnational sector led growth in national SMIs (Frank et al., 1999).

### **Micromobilization: Explaining Activism**

The broader collective action research program, of which RM can be considered a part, has maintained a central focus on understanding the conditions surrounding individual mobilization.<sup>12</sup> Among a population of sympathizers who share the concerns of a movement, why do some participate while others do not? Our approach to this question was embedded in the empirical puzzle we had identified, namely that while individual participation appeared to be declining, the vitality of social movement groups appeared to be increasing.<sup>13</sup> This paradox led in two theoretical directions: the exploration of both organizational processes and individual processes that might help to resolve it.

RMII stressed the supply side far more than had our RMI compatriots—how extensive and active are the mobilizing vehicles whose aim it is to turn bystanders into adherents and adherents into organizational constituents—in contrast to the demand side—what are the conditions that motivate individuals to respond positively to organized attempts to engage them in social change efforts.<sup>14</sup> The supply of opportunities for activism depends first on the vitality of mobilization efforts. Are sympathizers asked by SMO representatives to do anything? But it also depends on what potential activists are asked to do, where and when they are asked to do it, and what sort of mobilizing vehicle asks them to do it. Much more attention subsequently has been focused on the demand side of this equation than the supply side. We first take up the supply side in order that we can put the overemphasis on the demand side and our own conceptualization of it into theoretical and empirical context. Subsequent research has reinforced the importance of the supply of opportunities for explaining the extent of activism and specified the dimensions of activism with more clarity.

**SUPPLY OF ACTIVIST OPPORTUNITIES.** As mundane as it may first appear, one of the most important predictors of collective action by individuals is whether or not adherents are *asked* to participate (Oliver & Marwell, 1992) by joining an SMO (Snow et al., 1980) and/or by taking part in a protest event (Brady et al., 1995; Klandermans & Oegema, 1987). SMOs provide such opportunities for activism by structuring collective action.<sup>15</sup> It follows, then, that the more SMOs that are attempting to engage adherents in collective action by supplying them opportunities to do so the more of it can be expected to take place, other things being equal.

<sup>12</sup>Indeed, Lofland (1996) claims that studies of individual mobilization make up the largest segment of collective action research in recent years.

<sup>13</sup>Robert Putnam's assessment of the decline of social capital in the United States echoes our original statement of the puzzle. Our approach, unlike his, did not lament the conclusion that the rise of new, less participatory forms of SMOs could account for the paradox. This is the result of the fact that our approach was animated by a concern for purposive, mostly political outcomes. See Edwards and Foley (1997).

<sup>14</sup>This distinction between demand and supply remained implicit in our early statements, but has been subsequently more clearly articulated by Finke and others (Finke & Stark, 1992; Finke et al., 1996; Warner, 1993) for religious groups and Klandermans (1998) for social movements.

<sup>15</sup>Some collective action emerges, of course, with little or no such organized leadership. See Useem (1998).

The kinds of things that adherents are asked to do—*the forms of activism*—vary considerably in their duration and the amount of effort they require. Giving money and signing a petition require little effort and imply no long term involvement, while both membership and leadership in SMOs implies longer involvement, the latter requiring greater effort. Civil disobedience may require great effort for a very short period of time. Klandermans (1997) persuasively argues that different explanations are required to account for why individuals are more or less likely to engage in each of these forms of activism. SMO leaders' mobilization calculations depend on understandings of the organizational strategies necessary to supply opportunities for these various forms of activism (Oliver & Marwell, 1992). We will come back to this issue below when we visit issues of organizational processes and dynamics.

**ADHERENT DEMAND FOR PARTICIPATION.** In attempting to account for variable levels of rank and file activism the RMII approach emphasized primarily what has come to be called biographical availability (McAdam, 1988). This concept focuses on how conditions of work, family, and schooling make classes of potential participants more or less available to invest time and more or less capable of investing material resources in social movement activity. Availability was stressed over motivation (the purposive incentive) or the social benefits of participation (solidary incentives). In addition we suggested that significant amounts of SMO participation took the form of paid employment.

We acknowledged the important link between broader organizational participation and social movement activism, which has been consistently reaffirmed by subsequent research (e.g., Verba et al., 1995). Subsequent research (e.g., Snow et al., 1980), however, has shown the crucial importance of social network connections between activists and potential activists in accounting for the likelihood of opportunities for participation.

The general RM program, including our version of it, has been roundly criticized for adopting the unrealistic social psychological assumptions of rational choice theory in explaining social movement activism (Turner, 1981; Ferree & Miller, 1985; Ferree, 1992; Perrow, 1979; Buechler, 1993). We did subsequently take Mancur Olson's theory of public goods seriously as we continued to attempt to make sense of organizational and social movement activism trends, although we were not aware of his work when we completed our original formulation. In thinking about material incentives we began and remain convinced that it is more useful to focus on how the costs of activism inhibit it (ranging from the kind we mentioned above through state repression) rather than how selective incentives facilitate it. We saw an important role for solidarity incentives in understanding especially the ongoing volunteer participation of small cadres of activists. But we are not now and never have been orthodox rational choice theorists.

There is, however, a sense in which the approach was nested in a concept of rational action, one that has rarely been recognized by critics and therefore not been the subject of critique.<sup>16</sup> In addition to accounting for individual activist participation, the approach requires an account of organizational emergence as well as of strategic decision making by SMO leaders and cadre. We drew on Stinchcombe's (1965) ideas about the emergence of new organizational populations, but were almost silent, at least theoretically, on the issue of strategic decision making. In fact, we took for granted Herbert Simon's (1947; March & Simon, 1958) then-predominant formulation of the concept of bounded rationality. Along with Simon we assumed that organizational decision makers attempt to make rational decisions among a

<sup>16</sup>Ralph Turner (1981) both recognizes the utility of Simonian concepts of bounded rationality and satisficing for the RMI approach and criticizes us for not explicitly and sufficiently deploying them.

limited set of available choices while being constrained by a narrow set of assumptions about how things can be accomplished as well as assumptions about logic of chains of means/ends rationality. Our lack of systematic attention to a theoretical logic of strategic decision making by SMOs represented a serious lacuna in RMII, but one that has begun to be filled as a younger generation of SM scholars have engaged in ongoing dialogue with theorists of complex organizations. We return to these developments below.

The lines of critique that have been more telling in demonstrating the shortcomings of the approach are those that emphasize the collective nature of collective action participation. RMII ignored the jointness of social movement participation, as well as perceptions of its jointness. One line of this analysis has yielded a vigorous research literature based on formal modeling of collective action. Pam Oliver (1993) summarizes its main patterns:

First, models with quite different assumptions about individual decision processes and quite different assumptions about interdependence and coordination mechanisms all tend to yield predictions of thresholds and discontinuities, and predictions of internal divisions of labor within collectivities. Something like “critical mass” phenomena seem endemic to collective action. Second, the degree of group heterogeneity always changes results, but its effects vary: Sometimes it promotes action and sometimes it inhibits it. (pp. 292–293)

Another strand of this line of critique is based on empirical studies of collective action participation draws on “expectancy theory.” Bert Klandermans (1997) summarizes its conclusions when he says:

[O]rganizers of protest movements cannot assume that success expectations will arise spontaneously; such expectations must be constructed socially, in interactions among potential participants. Hence, these expectations are in a sense self-fulfilling: the greater the number of individuals who believe collective action will be successful, the more likely it is that mass action will materialize and that authorities will have to respond. If no one person believes collective action will be successful, mass action becomes impossible. (p. 28)

This line of criticism and the research it has inspired make an important contribution to both expanding the understanding the condition of individual participation as well as the logic of SMO strategic decision making.

In conclusion let us recall our brief description of the demography of the SMS in the United States along with Klandermans’ argument that different accounts of different kinds of participation are needed. First, it seems increasingly clear that significant numbers of SMO leaders and cadre are paid for their efforts. No special theory of collective action participation appears necessary to explain this. Second, a significant number of SMOs have other organizations as members. We need a theory of organizational decision making to account for organizational participation, not a theory of individual activism. Third, many SMOs have no members and do not deploy adherents in collective action. As a consequence, a theory of micromobilization is irrelevant to many, increasingly important, domains of collective action.

### **Resources: What Are They? What Role Do They Play?**

We began by pointing to the importance of material resources, labor, and legitimacy as key factors in understanding how social movement organizations use them to turn preference pools or solidary groups into challenging groups and then how the more general availability of resources figure in efforts by groups to pursue challenges. A number of critics have emphasized how little attention we paid to thinking about the concept of resources beyond the three

we named and especially our emphasis on material over human resources (Cress & Snow, 1996; Oliver & Marwell, 1992; Turner, 1981). Gamson (1987) called this inattention the “soft underbelly of the theory” (p. 1), noting that our attention was instead devoted to how resources were used. We were indeed almost silent on the key concept of resources. We had been deeply influenced by William Gamson’s (1968) *Power and Discontent* where he developed a convincing brief for assessing the power of groups through their control of slack resources. We followed him [as did Charles Tilly (1978) in *From Mobilization to Revolution*] by emphasizing the use of resources rather than developing a more sophisticated conception of kinds of resources, which groups control which kinds, and their fungibility and transferability.

RMI emphasized instances of the transfer of resources from advantaged to disadvantaged groups, suggested that such transfers were not uncommon, and argued that they are central to modern resource mobilization processes. In this we differed from our RM compatriots. Most focused primarily on the mobilization of resources within solidary groups and how such groups use resources in attempting to exert influence. Or they have ignored the issue of the source of resources. Thinking about resource transfers across group boundaries leads directly to the need for a typology of kinds of resources, their fungibility, the symmetry of their fungibility, and the legitimacy of their transfer. Subsequent SM analysts have devoted relatively little attention to the conceptualization of categories of resources. Tilly (1978), for instance, appropriates the standard categories used by economists, “land, labor and capital” (p. 69). A few analysts, however, have attempted to more clearly articulate kinds of resources. Oliver and Marwell (1992) focus their attention primarily on money, labor, and what they call action technologies. These come in two varieties: production technologies (aimed at goal achievement) and mobilization technologies (aimed at mobilizing resources). Cress and Snow (1996) developed a typology of kinds of resources generated out of a thick description of the mobilization of resources by local homeless insurgent groups. The four resource types they identify include moral (equivalent to the loan of legitimacy), material (including many in-kind resources), human (equivalent to labor for Oliver and Marwell), and informational (close to Oliver and Marwell’s action technologies). With minor exceptions (e.g., Oliver & Marwell, 1992), no systematic attention has been paid by SM analysts to questions of resource fungibility.<sup>17</sup>

**MOBILIZING LABOR AND MONEY.** Resources may be controlled by individuals, networks, organizations, and states. We think of money as the most fungible of resources, although Zelizer (1994) shows that even its fungibility is in many instances socially constrained. So money can be converted to labor, land, and maybe even under the right circumstances human, cultural, and social capital. But labor may not, in the short run, be convertible into human capital, as when an SMO needs an accountant, but only high school volunteers are available

<sup>17</sup>There have been important developments in other parts of the discipline toward the conceptualization of a more sophisticated range of resource types (Shanahan & Tuma, 1994; Tilly, 1998). Beyond land labor and capital, we now have rich conceptualizations available and measurement armies working to specify the distribution of human capital, social capital and cultural capital across, and even more specific subtypes of each, e.g., “civic skills” as a form of human capital (Verba et al., 1995). There are technological resources, which are independent of the others, those most familiar to SM analysts being protect and organizational repertoires. It appears that there are enough giants’ shoulders to stand on now in order to develop a typology of kinds of resources. Christian Lahusen’s (1996) analysis of the combination of financial resources and celebrity in the production of cause music concerts goes some way in specifying a typology of resources broader than land, labor, and capital. Other useful discussions of social movement resources include Gamson et al. (1982); Jenkins and Perrow (1977); Knoke (1989, 1990); and Lofland (1996).

for work.<sup>18</sup> On the other hand, congregation-based Industrial Areas Foundation groups seem to be successful in turning the paid labor of organizers through a long process, employing a widely available social technology, into social capital (Rogers, 1990).

Thinking of labor as a resource is the flip side of thinking about the supply of activism. At the local, grass-roots level of associations led by volunteers, labor is a key social movement resource (McCarthy & Wolfson, 1996). As the scope of SMO foci expand beyond local communities, material resources become more important, and SMO labor is more likely to be purchased than to be volunteer (McCarthy, 1997). Groups with money can buy specialized labor. Mobilizing labor is labor intensive and so is supervising it. The control of some kinds of resources is inherently more exclusive, such as money and land, than it is of others, such as resource aggregation technologies like direct mail techniques.

**MOBILIZATION OF EXOGENOUS RESOURCES.** In general, there has been little criticism of our claims about the importance of resources for understanding collective action by formally organized social movement actors. Cress and Snow (1996), for instance, suggest that these claims are now pretty much taken for granted. Subsequent research has provided us with more evidence about the flow of types of exogenous resources to SMOs and the timing of those flows, though there has been little attention to the causes of variability in the flows. We know most systematically about the flow of money to national-level SMOs and the least about the transfer of information and moral legitimacy. The mobilization of exogenous human resources by SMOs is captured by our concept of conscience constituents and remains common, especially for movements aimed at changing the conditions of the most impoverished.<sup>19</sup>

National SMOs are highly likely to have received financial support from institutional sources such as foundations, governmental agencies, and other citizens groups (Walker, 1991). National SMOs are highly likely to receive a significant proportion of financial support from such sources and at the same time remain dependent on their original supporters that provided start-up support. Wealthy individuals are an important source of start-up support for national citizen's groups, a pattern that Walker (1991) interprets as suggesting that individuals are more likely to make risky investments in new national SMOs, while institutional supporters are inclined to provide support for established, more legitimate ones.

We do have some systematic empirical work on the transfer of resources through the money provided by foundations for social change efforts. Craig Jenkins has been tracking these patterns over the last five decades (Jenkins & Halci, 1999). That evidence demonstrates an increasing flow of financial resources to SMOs from foundations, the early manifestations of which were a central hinge to the original RMI articulation. As well, this evidence shows major shifts in which of the SMIs are most privileged by the flow of foundation material resources. The early dominance of the civil rights SMI in the 1960s has been eclipsed by the environmental and local community organizational SMIs by the 1980s.

It is clear that there exists a large flow of informational resources to SMOs from sources specializing in information dissemination. Among movement leaders such resource transfers are commonly known as "technical assistance." For instance, reports by the leaders of a sample of local groups working to empower poor communities (McCarthy & Castelli, 1994) indicate that more than two thirds of them used some technical assistance in a typical year.

<sup>18</sup>Oliver and Marwell (1992) offer a cogent discussion of the question of the question of fungibility of labor and money in the social movement context.

<sup>19</sup>McAdam's (1988) study of northern, white college students participation in Freedom Summer dramatically illustrates this process.

These included professional services such as accounting and grant writing, advice about recruiting, help in assessing organizational effectiveness, and substantive issue research. These informational resources were supplied, some gratis and some paid for, but typically at deep discounts by governmental agencies, religious organizations, foundations, and organizations established specifically to provide technical assistance to particular SMIs. Morris (1984) described several such organizations that provided assistance for civil rights SMOs. Similar institutions exist in many other SMIs (Edwards & McCarthy, 1992). Little systematic attention has been paid to the transfer of such informational resources, unfortunately, since they can be expected to be consequential in shaping SMO structure and process thereby homogenizing SMS fields.

**EVIDENCE ON THE TIMING AND DIRECTION OF RESOURCE FLOWS.** We were interpreted as having made strong claims about the consequences of the timing of outside financial resource to the dynamics of the southern civil rights movement (SCRM; McAdam, 1982, p. 124). We had implied that the vitality of the SCRM was the result of exogenous resources, especially financial ones from foundations. Subsequent research has shown that foundation resource flows to civil rights SMOs, which started to become plentiful in the 1960s, were inspired by the vitality of the indigenous elements of the movement, rather than having initially facilitated them (Jenkins & Eckert, 1986). Later work (Jenkins & Halci, 1999) suggests as well that the same pattern holds in the United States for peace movements of the 1960s and 1970s, the women's movement, and the environmental movement: increases in the flow of foundation support followed spikes of indigenous protest. The pattern does not hold, however, for the consumer rights/government accountability movement, one that has staged very little public protest. The bulk of foundation support has been directed toward the most professionalized advocacy organizations, by 1990 more than three quarters of the 88 million dollars that was supplied to the SMS (Jenkins & Halci, 1999). Susan Ostrander (1995, 1999) has provided thick descriptions of the tensions inherent in such resource relationships between foundations and SMOs.

The pattern of the timing and direction of resource flows from the US federal government to SMOs of the movement against drunk driving and the antismoking movement suggests a somewhat different, more clearly interactive, process. Following the emergence of a few fledgling groups of local anti-drunk-driving activists, the National Highway Safety Transportation Agency, and later the National Organization of Victim Assistance encouraged the formation and supported the ongoing operations of the many small local SMOs through technical assistance and grants (Ross, 1992; McCarthy & Harvey, 1989). Weed (1995) calls NOVA (National Organization of Victim Assistance) a centralized resource agency, facilitating a common frame of reference through conferences and flow of support for local victim services, and the National Victim Center he calls a meshing organization aimed at networking the more than 3500 local victim groups. The 1984 VOCA (Victims of Crimes Act) provided block grant funds for local victim assistance, some of which found their way to local victim advocacy groups, including anti-drunk-driving groups.

A similar pattern is seen in the efforts of a number of US federal health agencies by indirectly supporting professional advocacy antismoking SMOs and also aggressively attempting to form local citizens groups with a series of grants funneled through university public health departments (Wolfson, 2000). The national level antismoking groups were highly professionalized, as were state level efforts. Wolfson suggests that, similar to the pattern seen in other SMIs for foundations, the government resources were allocated to the least confrontational SMOs. (See also Bennett & DiLorenzo, 1985.)

**COMMUNITY RESOURCES AND MOBILIZATION.** We also made strong claims that linked the general availability of community resources with the likelihood that SMOs would be mobilized, other things being equal. Subsequent research bears on those claims suggesting that resource availability does facilitate collective action, but that the processes are more complicated than we had suggested. For instance, the research of Snow et al. (2000) shows that homeless protest activity is strongly related to the level of United Way contributions and total transfer payments in a community. Research reported by Khawaja (1994) shows that under certain conditions protest activity over time on the West Bank is related to variations in GDP per capita—increases in indigenous resources are related to higher rates of protest. Other research (McCarthy et al., 1988) shows that the wealthier a US county, the earlier a local anti-drunk-driving activist group appeared. Debra Minkoff's (1999) time series analysis of nonlocal women's and racial ethnic SMOs, however, suggests a more complicated dynamic. There the level of societal resource availability (per capita income) is shown to be more important in accounting for the ongoing vitality of SMOs than it is in explaining rates of the founding of new SMOs (Minkoff, 1999). Amenta and Zylan (1991) show, on the other hand, that the lower a state's per capita income the greater the number of local Townsend Movement groups per capita.

**ORGANIZATIONAL RESOURCES AND SURVIVAL.** Given the increasing dependence of many national SMOs on resources of the federal government, the Reagan presidency provided a natural experiment in how the instability of material resources can affect SMO operations since it took office committed to defunding what it perceived as "leftist" SMOs. Two studies provide us insight on this process.

The first is that of Jack Walker (1991). Surveys of Washington-based citizens groups in 1980 and 1985 allow a comparison of how that category of groups responded to the decline in governmental support of their activities. First, almost none of the groups went out of existence. The aggregate response was to seek more diverse sources of funding. The groups most heavily dependent on government funds were forced to reduce their staff size, inevitably creating an impact on their ability to advocate. At the same time they stepped up their efforts to generate support from constituents through membership dues.

The second relevant study is Doug Imig's (1996) case study of six national antipoverty advocacy groups. He examined their ability to maintain stable levels of funding during the early Reagan period when federal grant funds available to such organizations fell by 58%. The three groups dependent mostly on government funds lost support and it severely affected their ability to devote resources to advocacy, but they each diversified their lines of financial support rather quickly, in the process redefining their strategic approach. The three privately funded groups expanded their resource base as well as their advocacy efforts during the period, as the period saw a 75% increase in available grant funds.

A study of mortality among peace movement SMOs (Edwards & Marullo, 1995) is consistent with this pattern. It shows that, with other relevant factors taken into account, neither the size of an organization's budget nor its membership size was related to its likelihood of going out of existence between 1988 and 1992. This was true for both small local as well as large national peace groups. In contrast, for both local and national groups indications of an SMO being granted wide legitimacy by the actions of other groups, indicated by entering into alliances with them, was one of the strongest predictors of a group's survival. J. Smith (1997) reports a similar pattern for the transnational SMOs she investigated. While the resource of organizational legitimacy is substantially more difficult to assess than those of labor and money, these results suggest that the legitimation of organizations by other organiza-

tions acts a resource and is quite common (as was also shown in Snow and Cress's study of local homeless SMOs (Cress & Snow, 2000)). Increased empirical and theoretical attention needs to be paid to legitimation as an organizational resource.

### Sentiment Pools

We employed the concept of sentiment pools to refer to reservoirs of support for changes in the structure of society (Zald & McCarthy, 1987). Our use is parallel to the use of the concepts of taste and preference by economists, and like them we took sentiment structures mostly as given. We focused our attention instead on the tasks confronting SMO activists of turning bystanders into adherents and adherents into constituents, or as these processes are now widely called, consensus mobilization and action mobilization (Klandermans, 1997).

Our approach did not conceive of the availability of sufficient preferences for change as problematic, and hence, outside the scope of the theory. More problematic we thought was how to make sense of the variable rates at which such preferences result in action mobilization given the fact that those rates are almost always incredibly low. The resulting shift in focus of attention away from the factors shaping the size and substantive content of sentiment pools remains at the same time one of the great strengths of RMII, but also one of its most important limitations. This element of the approach has not in itself drawn much sustained criticism other than as part of broader attacks on its pervasive economic assumptions (e.g., Turner, 1981; Perrow, 1979; Ferree, 1992). By ignoring how sentiment pools come about and change, they remain detached from historical, cultural, and political processes. As a result the theory remains blind to the broader structural processes that produce the raw material of sentiment structures that provide the mobilization opportunity structure to SMO activists at any particular historical time and place. Our attention to the efforts of SMO activists to expand their own pools of supporters, while aimed at understanding the role of one important factor in explaining their size, does not substantially undermine the strength of this line of criticism.

One of us (Zald, 2000) recently has argued that the concept of ideologically structured action (Dalton, 1994) can be usefully deployed to generate an account of the structure and processes of change within and among clusters of societal preferences for social change. Ideologically structured action is behavior shaped by ideologically charged beliefs, factual and evaluative, about both the ends of action and the means of action. Ideology, in turn, is generated out of a complex process of cultural and historical development. A focus on the ideological basis of sentiment pools has several advantages. Ideology ties to culture and discourse (Steinberg, 1999) and therefore sentiments and sentiment pools would no longer be treated as isolated from processes of cultural and discourse change. Moreover, since ideologies are learned and transmitted, it is possible to study the socialization processes through which sentiments are learned, adopted, and reinforced (Sherkat, 1998; Sherkat & Blocker, 1994), rather than focusing just on the sentiment preferences of already-socialized late adolescents and adults.

Subsequent research has stressed more strongly than we did that the social organization of sentiment pools is as important as their size and intensity in understanding the likelihood of their implicit aggregate social change demand resulting in collective action (e.g., McAdam, 1982; McCarthy, 1987; McAdam et al., 1988). Such work, however, has not typically developed accounts of the shifting nature of the sentiments that cohere within social infrastructures. As a consequence this line of analysis does little to blunt the force of the line of criticism we have described.

In the end, however, even if an adequate approach is developed to understanding the nature and evolution of sentiment structures, the question still remains whether the approach is very useful in accounting for the size, shape, and evolution of particular SMIs and/or the SMS. One of our boldest claims was to suggest the possibility that it would not be very helpful. The basic argument in support of the claim, which we did not articulate very clearly, includes three assertions. First, the supply side is more important than the demand side in explaining collective action. Second, accounting for the evolution of the population of organizations that make up particular SMIs and the SMS is necessary in order to explain the vigor of the supply side. Third, those explanations depend on organizational logics that are not very directly coupled with the nature of citizen demand for social change. While very difficult to test directly, we remain convinced that organizational logic is more important in explaining the dynamics of the population of lead organizations in the SMS—the fortune 500 of SMOs—than are the size of the sentiment pools.

### **Organizational Processes and Dynamics**

In spite of RMIs being widely seen as characterized primarily by a focus on organizational dynamics (Jenkins, 1983), our inattention to these dynamics, as we concentrated on how SMOs gather resources and longer run trends in MO transformation, was an important weakness of the original statements. While a comprehensive statement of SMO change processes remains to be accomplished, many colleagues have made the dynamics of organizational adaptation a central focus of their work, thereby strengthening this strand of a RM approach. These newer strands of research are in dialogue with current theoretical debates among organizational researchers and generally adopt one or another variant of an “open-systems” perspective that stresses the crucial importance of environmental factors on organizational transformation (Scott, 1998).

Both neo-institutional (DiMaggio, 1991; Fligstein, 1990) and ecology (Carroll et al., 1988) theorists of organizations emphasize the role of the surrounding environment of political, economic, and professional organizations in understanding the dynamics of organizational populations. And, movement researchers have begun to employ the concept of “organizational fields,” for instance, to analyze the structure of inter-organizational networks within SMIs. For instance, Brulle and Caniglia (1999) show how the flows of foundation funds to environmental SMOs shapes the ongoing relationships among them.

We had, of course, stressed the increasing professionalization of social movement activism. This process characterizes the nature of SMO work in that it has become increasingly organized into career forms with apprenticeships and hierarchies of expertise and skill. The process seems dependent on the availability of stable employment in the SMS, which has clearly increased dramatically over the last three decades, but is by no means an inevitable product of the expansion of paid positions. While this process has not drawn systematic research attention, strong examples of the process continue to present themselves. For instance, the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF), the direct progeny of Saul Alinsky’s community-organizing efforts, in recent years has structured the work of its paid staff organizers into a stable career form. Potential organizers are hired for probationary terms, are trained in apprenticeship situations, and their work is closely evaluated. A candidate who survives the probationary period then begins a career of organizing with an established hierarchy of positions that can be achieved through seniority and performance. As well, regular employees become eligible for standard group health coverage and participation in a group retirement

plan. The National Organizers Alliance, a group that has begun to bring together activists doing work similar to that of the IAF organizers, now offers health and retirement plans to their members in an effort to make career employment a more attractive alternative.

As activist labor becomes professionalized, it can be expected to affect both who is hired to lead an SMO as well as its internal operations. Swanson (1996) has shown that when local anti-drunk-driving groups began to hire paid staff—by 1989 more than 25% of the groups had done so—they were more likely to hire people based on their professional credentials than on their victim status that had been one of the key status requirements for the original founders of chapters. Similarly, Weed (1995) shows in the results of a survey of paid activists in the crime victim advocacy movements that more than one third of them have professional degrees and that advertisements for new victim advocate positions are likely to include requirements for professional degrees. He says:

Victim advocacy or providing victim services has become a paid career, partly because of the development of stable formal-participatory agencies. These occupational positions allow for the development of specialized skills that go along with the commitment to the moral ideals of the movement. (Weed, 1995, p. 117)

Another key form of organizational adaptation that has received research attention includes features of internal structure. First is the ongoing concern with the classic dimension of the oligarchization of SMOs. The little work of which we are aware on the question pretty much reinforces the general conclusions of the earlier paper by Zald and Ash (1966). Both Minkoff (1999), in her study of the changing nature of the population of racial-ethnic and women's SMOs in the United States, and Rucht (1999), in his study of the evolution of dissident groups in Berlin during the transition to reunification, are consistent. They show no inevitable shift toward conservatism of goals or tactics through time and suggest that the patterns of change they uncover are in important part contingent on environmental factors.

A second important dimension is the level of formalization of organizational structure. Some movement scholars have continued to insist that movement groups are less highly structured than other group forms (e.g., Rothschild-Whitt, 1979). This may still be so in the aggregate, but there is strong evidence that many SMOs are quite highly structured and that the tendency toward being formalized is associated with finances and formal registration with the state. Edwards (1994) shows, for instance, that for peace movement organizations, having a large budget, being formally incorporated, and being registered as a federally approved nonprofit organization are each strongly related to whether or not the SMO has in place formal operating procedures. It has been shown elsewhere (McCarthy et al., 1991; Cress, 1997) that registration as a nonprofit and being incorporated are very common across a range of small local SMIs.

These studies are based on cross-sectional evidence, but it seems reasonable to assume that as an SMO increases the size of its budget it is increasingly likely to become formalized and professionalized. In her rich case study of the SMOs of the prochoice movement, Staggenborg (1988, 1991) has described this process in detail. In the face of prolife mobilization following *Roe v. Wade*,

On the national level, movement leadership began to become more professionalized and movement organizations began to formalize their structures. Paid staff, rather than volunteer activists, slowly began to assume leadership of pro-choice movement organizations. As they did so, the movement organizations gradually developed more formal divisions of labor and operating procedures. (1991, p. 63)

These transformations of the national level organizations, however, allowed one of the groups to direct extensive resources toward successful grass-roots mobilization of local chapters.

A third important dimension of organizational structure relevant for an important subset of SMOs is represented by the formal relationship between local groups and state or national umbrella groups. The variety and consequences of these relationships have not been the focus of much research, but it is clear that certain structures that tie local with non-local SMOs may create great tension and conflict between them (Oliver & Furman, 1989), may make them dependent and less likely to survive (Weed, 1991), and may facilitate their ability to mobilize local adherents (McCarthy & Wolfson, 1996).

SMOs may also adapt their strategic repertoires over time. Minkoff's (1995, 1999) examination of such change among ethnic-racial and women's SMOs over recent decades and her results also challenge the image that formalized, bureaucratized SMOs are lethargic. In fact, the older, larger, and more professionalized SMOs are the most likely to make major changes in their strategic repertoires, even though such changes are relatively uncommon.

### **Social Movement Industry and Sector**

We defined a social movement industry as all of the SMOs that have as their goal the attainment of the broadest preferences of a social movement, and the social movement sector as the aggregate of all the SMIs in a society. We did so with the intention of moving the focus of analysis away from individual organizations and their transformations, which had been the traditional focus of SMO studies, and toward the dynamics of organizational populations. We assumed that one of the important environmental elements that shape the structure and processes of individual SMOs will be their natural organizational competitors as well as the broader social change organizational field within which they operate. Garner and Zald (1985) later sketched out in greater detail the potential of such a theoretical approach. This strand of RMII remains in our view one of its potentially most theoretical useful ones, yet it has attracted almost no criticism and has not been the focus of much subsequent research attention. Della Porta and Rucht (1995) come closest in their discussion of the family of left-libertarian SMIs in Germany and Italy, 1965–1990; however, they were not interested in mapping the total SMS.

As we noted in our discussion above, a number of scholars have attempted to map particular national SMIs (e.g., Kriesi, 1996), but we have as yet no very comprehensive map of a national SMS. This incomplete picture is the result of the difficulties of developing a comprehensive census of SMOs in a society that we discussed above, as well as the relative neglect by social movement scholars of reactionary movements. For instance, the US prolife movement, one of the most vital and variegated ones to have mobilized over recent decades, has drawn very little systematic research attention by social movement scholars (but, see Meyer & Staggenborg, 1996, for an exception). Debra Minkoff (1998, forthcoming) has devoted the most systematic attention to both deepening the conceptualization of the US SMS and designing an attempt to survey all of its national level SMOs.

Several key questions that should animate a research agenda on SMIs and in aggregate the SMS are first their size as well as how diverse they are along the key demographic dimensions we introduced earlier. Ultimately, the more interesting questions concern the transformation of industries and sectors and their impacts on other societal domains. Subsequent research and theoretical debate among organizational sociologists has provided useful tools for pursuing these questions. First is the idea of a population of organizations (e.g., Hannan & Freeman, 1982) that are directly analogous to SMIs. Organizational ecologists have been looking at very diverse populations of organization and in the process developing both theories about how their composition changes as well as methods for analyzing such changes.

They stress the importance of patterns of the formation of new organizations (births) and patterns of organizational demise (deaths and mergers) on the changing composition of organizational populations. Following Stinchcombe (1965), they tend to assume that organizations, once founded, establish standard ways of operating and are quite resistant to structural change and goal transformation. Such an assumption, of course, contradicts the classic emphasis on goal transformation in SMOs, but it provides a powerful alternative account of how populations of SMOs may be transformed over time. Institutional analysts generally (e.g., DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) and institutional analysts of SMO structures in particular (e.g., Clemens, 1996, 1997) in contrast stress environmentally driven mechanisms of organizational change, assuming that organizations are quite adaptable. As far as we know, only Debra Minkoff's (1999) work on the transformation the national ethnic-racial and women's movement organizations in the United States provides a systematic effort to assess these two accounts of SMI transformation. That research suggests that the pattern of organizational births and deaths among the SMOs of these SMIs is far more important in accounting for its general transformation away from services toward advocacy than are processes of organization change. The 1955 to 1985 period was one of rapid organizational formation in these SMIs, as Minkoff notes, and consistent with other attempts to map the population of citizens movement groups (Walker, 1991). As a result, we might expect that as such populations stabilize in size, as analyses of other kinds of organizational populations indicate inevitably happens, the relative importance of organizational change in contrast to patterns of SMO birth and death in explaining population transformation might be altered.

Several studies provide comparisons of a number of "new social movement" SMIs across European nations, thereby providing us a systematic look at differences in size and organizational diversity. These efforts (Kriesi, 1996; Rucht, 1989, 1996) look at a variety of SMIs, including women, environmental, peace, and gay rights, across some subset of France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Switzerland. The general picture that emerges is that the total mobilization of the new social movement SMIs can vary dramatically in size across nations. For instance, in general the rate of mobilization in France is quite low. Second, the relative mix of mobilization among SMIs can vary dramatically across countries. For instance, the gay rights movement is weakly mobilized in Switzerland. Third, while the range of organizational forms represented in each SMI may be roughly equivalent across nations, the relative mix of organizational forms within each SMI can vary dramatically across nations, especially the variable strength of grass-roots local groups and national level SMOs.

Research on the US civil rights movement (McAdam, 1982; Morris, 1984; Haines, 1988) has provided us with very thick descriptions of its organizational diversity and provided us with several strong hypotheses. The first, consistent with what we have called a supply side argument, is that the more SMOs there are and the more diverse the mix of organizational forms, the greater the rate at which the SMOs of a movement will be able to mobilize adherents. Staggengborg's (1991) work on mobilization within the prochoice movement also is consistent with these expectations. The second is that in addition the more diverse a movement is in the tactics and goals that animate its SMOs the greater the rate at which adherents will be mobilized. As well, diversity of goals and tactics within an SMI may increase the impact of the less confrontational SMOs that seek less radical social change.<sup>20</sup>

Techniques for analyzing hypotheses like these concerning the transformation of populations of SMOs are now available (Minkoff, forthcoming). What we lack to make much

<sup>20</sup>Gamson's (1975) findings for a sample of national SMOs from across the SMS is consistent with this argument, although it is based only on a set of less confrontational SMOs from a variety of SMIs.

research progress are widely available sources of information that will allow us to characterize such populations through time. The lack of such evidence has clearly hindered thinking about transformation processes across SMIs and the comparisons of SMSs across nations.

### **The Impact of Organizational Capacity on Protest**

Public protest is an important tactical form widely utilized by social movement activists. While our original focus on protest participation emphasized the demand side, especially through the heightened availability of some groups such as Students for Mobilization, the approach clearly led to expectations about the relationship between organizational growth and protest. The greater the organizational capacity of an SMI, the more able it will be to generate large-scale and as well as sustained campaigns of protest events. Piven and Cloward (1977) have strenuously challenged this implication of the theoretical approach, arguing that SMOs get in the way of the wildfire spread of protest rather than facilitate it and water down the tactics and demands of participants. For them, SMOs only normalize protest. On the other hand, many scholars have accepted the proposition. The claim is especially difficult to assess directly since it requires evidence of variable protest intensity, assessments of the extent to which protest events are staged by SMOs, and movement or adherent organizational capacity either over time or across communities.

Some research bears on the claim, but no study includes all of the relevant variables that would allow a strong test of it. Koopmans' (1995) evidence on German protest between 1965 and 1989 shows that about one half of them involved no SMO sponsor. On the other hand, McCarthy and colleagues found that more than 75% of the large protests held in Washington, DC, in 1982 and 1991, had an official SMO sponsor. Khawaja (1994) found, in his time series study of protest by Palestinians on the West Bank between 1976 and 1985, that the presence of organizational sponsors of protest events increased their intensity.

The staging of large public protests by SMOs, however, is not simply a process where organizations mobilize individuals, both their members and sympathizers. Much of the time it is more a process of what Gerhards and Rucht (1992) have called "mesomobilization." They carefully monitored the staging of two large multiissue protest events in Berlin, demonstrating that the organizational capacity of various sympathetic SMIs was an important indicator of the makeup of the organizational structure of the large coalition that mobilized individuals for the events.

Given a number of the trends in SMO form and operation we have described above, there is good reason to expect that protest events staged by SMOs will be less confrontational over time in the United States and that the increasing professionalization of the SMS will serve to routinize public protest (McCarthy & McPhail, 1998; Meyer & Tarrow, 1998). However, the emerging wave of anti-globalization protests suggests that the late 20th century détente between authorities and protest groups in the United States may be a short-lived one (Gillham & Marx, 2000; Smith, 2001). Koopmans' (1995) German data suggest that protest mounted by formal SMOs are far less confrontational and violent, and that the same pattern holds for Dutch protest between 1975 and 1989. Low levels of organization among the protesters marked the more violent and confrontational protests.

In the most rigorous test of the claim, Minkoff (1997) examined the impact of women's and ethnic-racial SMO capacity, what she has subsequently called "organizational potential" (Minkoff, forthcoming), on the level of protest around women's and racial-ethnic issues. Her

results are consistent with the claim: increases in protest potential are associated with later increases in protest.

### **Underemphasis on Cultural and Political Processes**

**A BLINDNESS<sup>21</sup> TO THE ROLE OF CULTURE IN SOCIAL MOVEMENT PROCESSES.** Critics have taken our silence about culture as what in fact was an unintended lack of appreciation for its role. RM has taken probably the greatest amount of criticism for this silence. Beginning with Turner's (1981) measured brief that a balanced theoretical approach to understanding social movements not abandon the concept of ideology, through those of recent critics (e.g., Jasper, 1997; Buechler, 1993, 2000) inspired by the broader cultural turn who have argued that cultural processes be privileged over the material and organizational, the refrain has continued. Part of the explanation of our silence was strategic. By ignoring cultural processes, we were able to put in the foreground organizational and macroenvironmental processes.

But we had been steeped in the "social construction of social problems" theoretical tradition (Schneider, 1985) and we took it for granted, which also was important in explaining our silence. We assumed that the processes of the social construction of grievances, loyalty, and partisanship were central to understanding the mobilization of solidary groups. Those approaches include the role of agency and depend on contests between social actors and are the direct theoretical ancestors of the strategic framing approach. We will return to how RM articulates with strategic framing in the next section.

Our blind spot was more in what Rucht (1996) calls the cultural context. RMT, like much of sociology before Geertz, before Foucault, and before structuration and practice theory treats social structure and social relations as somehow analytically separable from culture. The intellectual strategy was to treat patterns of social relations and social organization as somehow separate from the meanings and rhetorics that constituted, defined, and symbolized them. In explaining movements, aspects of culture were treated as parameters or as ad hoc scope conditions, rather than as constitutive of the forms of social organization and tactics of protest. Tilly's (1979) concept of a repertoire of contention is an important milestone in the beginning of RMT to recognize cultural processes. Repertoires are invented, learned, and diffused. As they spread across populations within a nation or culture and between nations and cultures, they are adapted to local contexts and are assimilated to cultural understandings. Social movements are embedded in a larger cultural context of the appropriateness and meaning of forms of mobilization and of protest expression. How the shift to a more integrated view of culture and social structure works out in the case of RMT is yet to be fully determined (but see Polletta, 1999; Sherkat, 1998).

**AN UNDERDEVELOPED ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE OF POLITICAL OPPORTUNITY.** Starting with Chick Perrow's (1979) early and trenchant critique of us through Herb Kitschelt's (1991) more recent one, a number of critics have pointed out that our early statements, for the most part, ignored the role of political processes. This was in contrast to the more central role they were accorded in the early statements of Tilly (1978), Oberschall (1973), and Gamson (1975). Of course, we took the thrust of the statements of our theoretical RM compatriots seriously, and our early statements made clear that we believed that a comprehensive theory of move-

<sup>21</sup>Gamson (1987) called culture a blind spot in the RMII approach.

ment processes would include a strong element of political process. Their muscular, emergent sketches of the political process approach also were a taken-for-granted backdrop to our early statements. Anyone who knew Zald's work on the political economy of organizations would have appreciated the centrality of political process background meta-assumptions for what we were about. [The Epilogue to the Vanderbilt Conference volume (Zald & McCarthy, 1979), for instance, claimed that RM approaches brought the study of social movements back into the mainstream of political sociology.]

Political process approaches have become increasingly influential in movement scholarship, providing the dominant image for thinking about movement emergence and trajectories in the last decade. Its leading scholars have pioneered a research methodology—protest event analysis—that has become a major force in the empirical study of movement processes. In the next section we attempt to nest RM and RMII in this broader trend of theoretical and research development.

### **THE PLACE OF RMII IN THE CONSTELLATION OF SOCIAL MOVEMENT RESEARCH**

It is clear that RMII developed a set of concepts and research questions that have been useful to a generation of scholars. It has been subject to lively debate and criticism, has suggested research questions and hypotheses, and has led to more nuanced and complex views of the social movement world. During this period complementary and supplementary frameworks have been proposed that either offered alternative accounts of social movement activity, were useful additions, or posed fundamental challenges to the framework. Here we briefly examine three lines of theoretical development that have been extremely important for the contemporary study of social movements: political process and opportunity models, framing and culture, and new social movement theory. It is impossible for us to give a full sense of the development of each of these approaches or theories; rather, we focus on what we see as their distinctive contributions and on their relationships to RMII.

#### **Political Process Models (PPM)**

As we noted in the first section of the chapter, a political process or political opportunity variant of the RM/CA program already was being articulated when the program was first coming together. Implicit in the early work of Gamson but explicitly developed by Tilly, Jenkins, Perrow, and later McAdam, the political process model differs from RMII. It takes as its focal concerns the ways in which state actions and the possibility of influencing state action provide opening or closing for social movement action. State policies and actions directly threaten or benefit specific groups in society. State action facilitates or discourages groups and the organized claimants that speak for groups or causes. Changes in regimes through electoral or other means, changes in potential coalitions, and changes in the governmental agenda—executive, legislative and judicial—lead SMOs, activists, and others to perceive the possibility of new opportunities for action or new threats to their well-being. Moreover, different kinds of political structures are more or less open to organized political action.

It may well be the case that the political process approach has become the more prominent of the variants spawned by the RM/CA approach. Much research and writing has

taken place that critiques, builds on, and tests political process assumptions. McAdam (1996) provides a consolidated statement of the status of the concept of political opportunity and structure, and Tarrow (1998) provides an overview of social movement theory and research through the lens of a political process point of view. In 1999, *Sociological Forum* published a number of critiques of political process approaches and concepts, as well as replies to those critiques.

From our point of view, the central difference of political process approaches from RMII is that they properly locate a central role of the state and political action as the source of both collective and individual costs and benefits and the threat or promise of future costs and benefits. Thus, changes in political opportunities lead to changes in the perception of risk/reward ratios for activists. Such changes lead to perceptions of hope that encourage action or despair that discourages action. They lead to a sense of outrage that sharpens the sense of grievance and the reward/righteousness of acting in behalf of a cause. In our view, this is a correct and important specification of RM/CA for the very large category of political movements. It deserves the attention it has received.

There are other differences between RMII and PPM that to us seem less central. For instance, it is the case that RMII has focused more on the role of money and its mobilization and on techniques of mobilization by SMOs. PPM theorists have focused on the role of interpersonal networks as the base of mobilization. RMII has more to say about movements in the doldrums and in decline than PPM. Yet, these differences are not integral to the approaches and reflect the personal tastes, intuitions, and bets of the scholars associated with each of the approaches, rather than we think a fundamental disagreement about assumptions or concepts.

## Framing and Culture

RMII arose partially as a reaction to grievance- or deprivation-based approaches. Both as a rhetorical strategy of distinguishing RMII from these approaches and as a way of sharpening the focus on mobilization both grievances and their articulation were largely ignored. In the long run, this distancing could not hold. First, it is clear that sharp changes in “objective” conditions and their purported connection to social policies and governmental relations shift perceptions in the costs and benefits of social arrangements and the readiness of populations to respond to demands for change. So, on an empirical basis, RMII overstated its case: grievances matter; the question is when and how do they matter? Second, it is clear that SMO leaders, issue entrepreneurs, and cadres spend a good deal of time attempting to define the issues, to define what is wrong with the system, and what kinds of policies would rectify the grievances. Moreover, they do this in a competitive context where other SMOs, issue entrepreneurs, and cadre are competing for attention.

Drawing on developments in cognitive psychology that focused on how individuals develop metaphors and packages of related cognitive elements to interpret the world they live in, William Gamson and his collaborators developed a form of script analysis to examine how people come to understand social issues on the public agenda. But Gamson’s approach was not especially focused on how SMOs and their leaders attempted to use scripts and metaphors to mobilize resources. David Snow, Robert Benford, and their collaborators took this as a central problematic. Starting from Goffman’s gestalt-related notion of a “frame,” Snow and Benford examined how SMOs and their leaders used diagnostic frames as techniques for mobilizing resources, especially from individuals, and how they framed courses of action for the move-

ment. In the process they developed a number of subsidiary concepts, such as frame resonance and frame amplification to account for the ways in which frames did or did not appeal to different population and the ways in which frames could change over time. (A number of papers on framing processes and a critique of the research tradition can be found in a special issue of *Sociological Quarterly*, 1998.)

Framing processes are used to mobilize new recruits to a movement, to sustain and motivate current adherents, and to appeal for change in the larger society. They compete for attention. Consisting of root metaphors and elaborated rationales, they can be thought of as symbolic resources. They are employed by leaders to mobilize other resources, to appeal to bystanders, and to attempt to convince authorities. But, as noted in our discussion of the problem of defining resources, frames as resources have special problems. Nevertheless, in our view, framing processes are a central component of the strategic action of SMOs and their leaders.

Frames are largely symbolic and draw on a larger cultural stock of symbols and their meanings. Part of culture and developing culture, frames may be more or less embedded in historical ideologies. The analysis of frames and of scripts owed more to social and cognitive psychology than they did to the analysis of culture. The study of social movements has had an opening to cultural approaches. Clearly, the larger culture provides the pool of symbols and cultural assumptions that movement members share; moreover, movements develop their own cultures and the symbols and assumptions developed within movements feed back on the cultural stock of the larger society. What is not yet clear is how cultural analysis complements RMT. Or does it supplant and contain it? (See Polletta, 1999; Adams, 1999, for a discussion of relevant issues in how cultural analysis reveals problems in structuralist and rational choice type approaches.)

## **New Social Movement Theory**

Many of the specific movements that developed in advanced industrial nations as well as elsewhere in the world in the late 1960s and 1970s, such as gay rights, peace, women's, and environmental movements, seemed different from earlier movements in at least two ways. First, they were not easily arrayed or contained in a left–right continuum as earlier movements could be, nor did they align with established political parties arrayed on that continuum. Second, and especially relevant to discussions about the choice of concepts and analytic focus of social movement theory, the new social movements (NSMs) seemed to be much more about the development of personal and collective identities, the development of lifestyles, holistic ideologies, and personal consciousness. This is in contrast to earlier movements that were about the achievement of well-articulated goals that could be shown to grow out of well-defined interests. Stated another way, both PPM and RMI largely assumed interests and identities; movements were about realizing the goals that stemmed from identities and interests. The new social movements seemed to be operating at a different level—defining identities, developing collective awareness and solidarity, formulating and developing ways of life to go with the new identities.

Of course, many of the NSMs had parallels in earlier movements. After all, peace movements often have emerged as wars were threatened. Yet, recent peace movements went beyond critiquing specific war threats to developing antisystemic ideologies of the nation-state and capitalism that focused on a different worldview. So, too, at least part of the environmental movement developed a holistic ideology challenging the consumption orientation of modern

society and developing an environmentalist ideology and identity that argued for a transformed way of living.

Scholars in Western Europe such as Alain Touraine and Alberto Melucci made the transformation of meaning, worldview, and identity central to their analysis of contemporary movements.<sup>22</sup> Melucci especially raised the possibility that NSMs reflected a transformation of advanced industrial societies that somehow permits and encourages a focus on lifestyle definition and identity that was not possible at earlier stages of industrialization and modernization.

From our point of view, NSMs are not truly different from earlier movements. After all, NSMs all engage in political action and all face problems of resource mobilization and of using and coming to grips with political opportunity structures. Nevertheless, NSM theory points to a set of issues that were largely outside of the purview of RMT: collective interests presume collective identity and individual identity. Older social movements, the ones related to class, economic position, and race, for instance, may appear to have clear interests and unproblematic collective identities. But in their own histories, the making of those identities, the forging of a sense of solidarity and the definition of interests in relationship to those identities has been problematic. Class identities and collective programs were emergent, not automatically realized.

If identity formation, consciousness raising, and solidarity occurred outside of the purview of movement mobilization and political action, there would be a better case for treating NSM theory as a separate kind of theory. However, we would argue that at least in part identity formation and solidarity emerge in struggle. As Mary Bernstein (1997) has shown for the case of the gay and lesbian rights movement the aspects of identity that are emphasized in the movement are at least in part shaped by the vicissitudes of movement mobilization and political dialogue.

Although standing in different relationship to RMII, NSM theory, framing, and culture, and PPM together with RMII raise an interrelated set of research questions that vastly expand the original agenda of the RMT program of research. At this time, even though some attempts have been made to bring these streams of research and theorizing together (McAdam, McCarthy, & Zald, 1996; Melucci, 1996; Tarrow, 1998; Della Porta & Diani, 1999), a concise and widely accepted comprehensive paradigmatic formulation has yet to emerge. But a lively set of debates and research questions remain.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In *Opening Pandora's Box*, Gilbert and Mulkay (1984) trace the process by which a new and provocative theory in chemistry that has few supporters becomes widely accepted and acclaimed, even while the reasons for its acceptance and acclaim are seen variously by different chemists. RMII was once a new and provocative theory of social movements. In the intervening years, it has led to a substantial body of research, has been very useful in the framing of specific research questions and guiding research programs, and has been subjected to substantial criticism. It is no longer that brash and provocative theory. In some cases it has been found inadequate, some would even say wrong in its emphases.

<sup>22</sup>Initially, scholars in the United States were less likely to see the new movements as different in kind from earlier movements in part, we suspect, because the United States has provided fertile ground for a plethora of movements relatively unconnected to the left-right continuum. As a result, their novelty was less apparent.

In this chapter we have summarized the original assumptions, core concepts, and orienting propositions of RMII. We then attempted to summarize the state of research and theorization that has followed on the original statement. There remains a substantial agenda suggested by RMII that deserves attention. There are great domains of research questions that have been barely explored.

Nevertheless, RMII is no longer setting the agenda for many younger scholars. In some cases, RMII has become the routine grounds of a research tradition that barely recognizes its own routine grounds. In other cases, the lessons of RMII are ignored. We believe that scholars who ignore those lessons will recreate the errors of earlier theories. Resources matter, they are variable, they come from a variety of sources, and this variety creates problems and contradictions for organizations. SMOs matter and SMOs must be analyzed as entities and as components of SMIs. Societies differ in their support of movements and movement like activities. That seems to us to be enough for one paradigm.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, J. (1999). Culture in rational-choice theories of state formation. In G. Steinmetz (Ed.), *State/culture: State formation after the cultural turn* (pp. 98–122). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Amenta, E., & Zylan, Y. (1991). It happened here: Political opportunity, the new institutionalism, and the Townsend movement. *American Sociological Review*, 56, 250–265.
- Baumgartner, F. R., & Leech, B. L. (1998). *Basic interests: The importance of groups in politics and in political science*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bennett, J. T., & DiLorenzo, T. J. (1985). *Destroying democracy: How government funds partisan politics*. Washington, DC: Cato Institute.
- Bernstein, M. (1997). Celebration and suppression: The strategic uses of identity by the lesbian and gay movement. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103, 531–565.
- Berry, J. M. (1999). *The new liberalism: The rising power of citizen groups*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Brady, H. E., Verba, S., & Lehman Scholzman, K. (1995). Beyond SES: A resource model of political participation. *American Political Science Review*, 89, 271–294.
- Brulle, R. J. (1996). Environmental discourse and social movement organizations: A historical and rhetorical perspective on the development of U.S. environmental organizations. *Sociological Inquiry*, 65, 58–83.
- Brulle, R. J. (2000). *Agency, democracy and nature: The U.S. environmental movement from a critical theory perspective*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Brulle, R. J., & Schafer Caniglia, B. (1999). Money for nature: A network analysis of foundations and environmental groups. Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association. Chicago, IL.
- Buechler, S. M. (1993). Beyond resource mobilization theory? Emerging trends in social movement theory. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 34, 217–235.
- Buechler, S. M. (2000). *Social movements in advanced capitalism: The political economy and cultural construction of social activism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Carroll, G. R., Delacroix, J., & Goodstein, J. (1988). The political environments of organizations: An ecological view. *Research on Organizational Behavior*, 10, 359–392.
- Clemens, E. S. (1996). Organizational form as frame: Collective identity and political strategy in the American labor movement, 1880–1920. In D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy, & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings* (pp. 25–226). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Clemens, E. (1997). *The people's lobby: Organizational innovation and the rise of interest group politics in the United States, 1890–1925*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Collwell, M. A., & Bond, D. (1994). *Peace movement organizations: The 1988 and 1992 surveys*. San Francisco: Institute for Nonprofit Management, University of San Francisco.
- Cress, D. M. (1997). Nonprofit incorporation among movements of the poor: Pathways and consequences for homeless social movement organizations. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 38, 343–360.

- Cress, D. M., & Snow, D. A. (1996). Mobilization at the margins: Resources, benefactors, and the viability of homeless social movement organizations. *American Sociological Review*, *61*, 1089–1109.
- Cress, D. M., & Snow, D. (2000). The outcomes of homeless mobilization: The influence of organization, disruption, political mediation, and framing. *American Journal of Sociology*, *105*, 1065–1104.
- Dalton, R. J. (1994). *The green rainbow: Environmental groups in Western Europe*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Delgado, G. (1994). *Beyond the politics of place: New directions in community organizing in the 1990s*. Oakland, CA: Applied Research Center.
- Della Porta, D., & Rucht, D. (1995). Social movement sectors in context: A comparison of Italy and West Germany, 1965–90. In J. C. Jenkins & B. Klandermans (Eds.), *The politics of social protest* (pp. 229–272). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Della Porta, D., & Diani, M. (1999). *Social movements: An introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- DiMaggio, P. J. (1991). Constructing an organizational field as a professional project: U.S. art museums, 1920–1940. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 267–292). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organization fields. *American Sociological Review*, *48*, 147–160.
- Edwards, B. (1994). Semiformal organizational structure among social movement organizations: An analysis of the U.S. peace movement. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, *23*, 309–333.
- Edwards, B., & Foley, M. W. (1997). Social capital and the political economy of our discontent. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *40*, 669–678.
- Edwards, B., & Marullo, S. (1995). Organizational mortality in a declining social movement: The demise of peace movement organizations in the end of the cold war. *American Sociological Review*, *60*, 908–927.
- Edwards, B., & McCarthy, J. D. (1992). Social movement schools. *Sociological Forum*, *7*, 541–550.
- Ferree, M. M. (1992). The political context of rationality: Rational choice theory and resource mobilization. In A. Morris & C. McClurg Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers of social movement theory* (pp. 29–52). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ferree, M. M., & Miller, F. (1985). Mobilization and meaning: Toward an integration of social psychological and resource perspectives on social movements. *Sociological Inquiry*, *55*, 38–61.
- Ferree, M. M., & Yancey Martin, P. (1995). *Feminist organizations: Harvest of the new women's movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Finke, R., & Starke, R. (1992). *The churching of America, 1776–1990: Winners and losers in our religious economy*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Finke, R., Guest, A. M., & Stark, R. (1996). Mobilizing local religious markets: Religious pluralism in the empire state, 1855 to 1865. *American Sociological Review*, *61*, 203–218.
- Fligstein, N. (1990). *The transformation of corporate control*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Frank, D. J., Hironaka, A., Meyer, J., Schofer, E., & Tuma, N. B. (1999). Rationalization and organization of nature in world culture. In J. Boli & G. M. Thomas (Eds.), *Constructing world culture: International nongovernmental organization since 1875* (pp. 81–99). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gamson, W. A. (1968). *Power and discontent*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Gamson, W. A. (1975). *The strategy of social protest*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Gamson, W. A. (1987). Introduction. In M. N. Zald & J. D. McCarthy (Eds.), *Social movements in an organizational society* (pp. 1–14). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Gamson, W. A., Fireman, B., & Rytina, S. (1982). *Encounters with unjust authorities*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Garner, R., & Zald, M. (1985). The political economy of social movement sectors. In G. D. Suttles & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *The challenge of social control: Citizenship and institution building in modern society* (pp. 119–145). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Gerhards, J., & Rucht, D. (1992). Mesomobilization: Organizing and framing in two protest campaigns in West Germany. *American Journal of Sociology*, *98*, 555–595.
- Gilbert, G. N., & Mulkay, M. (1984). *Opening pandora's box: A sociological analysis of scientists' discourse*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Gillham, P. F., & Marx, G. T. (2000). Complexity and irony in policing and protesting: The World Trade Organization in Seattle. *Social Justice*, *27*, 212–236.
- Gray, V., & Lowrey, D. (1996). *The population ecology of interest representation: Lobbying communities in the American states*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Haines, H. H. (1988). *Black radicals and the civil rights mainstream, 1965–70*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.

- Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1977). The population ecology of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82, 929–964.
- Hodgkinson, V., & Weitzman, M. S. (1996). *Nonprofit almanac, 1996–1997*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Imig, D. R. (1996). *Poverty and power: The political representation of poor Americans*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Jasper, J. M. (1997). *The art of moral protest: Culture, biography and creativity in social movements*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jenkins, C. (1983). Resource mobilization theory and the study of social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9, 527–553.
- Jenkins, J. C., & Eckert, C. M. (1986). Channeling black insurgency: Elite patronage and professional social movement organizations in the development of the black movement. *American Sociological Review*, 51, 812–829.
- Jenkins, J. C., & Halci, A. (1999). Grassrooting the system? The development and impact of social movement philanthropy, 1953–1990. In *Philanthropic foundations: New scholarship, new possibilities* (pp. 229–256). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Jenkins, J. C., & Perrow, C. (1977). Insurgency of the powerless: Farm workers' movements (1946–1972). *American Sociological Review*, 42, 249–268.
- Khawaja, M. (1994). Resource mobilization, hardship, and popular collective action in the West Bank. *Social Forces*, 73, 191–220.
- Kitschelt, H. (1991). Resource mobilization theory: A critique. In *Research on Social Movements: The state of the art in Western Europe and the USA* (pp. 323–354). Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.
- Klandermans, B. (1997). *The social psychology of protest*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Klandermans, B., & Oegema, D. (1987). Potentials, networks, motivations and barriers: Steps toward participation in social movements. *American Sociological Review*, 52, 519–531.
- Knoke, D. (1989). Resource acquisition and allocation in U.S. national associations. *International Social Movements Research*, 2, 129–154.
- Knoke, D. (1990). *Organizing for collective action: The political economies of associations*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Koopmans, R. (1995). *Democracy from below: New social movements and the political system in West Germany*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Kriesi, H. (1996). The organizational structure of new social movements in a political context. In D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy, & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures and cultural framings* (pp. 152–184). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lahusen, C. (1996). *The rhetoric of moral protest: Public campaigns, celebrity endorsements and political mobilization*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Lofland, J. (1993). *Polite protesters: The American peace movement of the 1980s*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Lofland, J. (1996). *Social movement organizations: Guide to research on insurgent realities*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Lofland, J., & Jamison, M. (1985). Social movement locals: Modal membership structures. In J. Lofland, *Protest: Studies of collective behavior and social movements* (pp. 201–238). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: Wiley.
- Martin, P. Y. (1990). Rethinking feminist organizations. *Gender and Society*, 4, 182–206.
- Marullo, S., Pagnucco, R., & Smith, J. (1996). Frame changes and social movement contraction: US peace movement framing after the Cold War. *Sociological Inquiry*, 66, 1–28.
- McAdam, D. (1982). *Political process and the development of black insurgency, 1930–1970*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- McAdam, D. (1988). *Freedom summer*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McAdam, D. (1996). Conceptual origins, current problems, future directions. In D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy, & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings* (pp. 23–40). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1988). Social movements. In N. Smelser (Ed.), *Handbook of sociology* (pp. 695–737). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (Eds.). (1996). *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, J. D. (1987). Pro-life and pro-choice mobilization: Infra-structure deficits and new technologies. In M. N. Zald & J. D. McCarthy (Eds.), *Social movements in an organizational society: Collected essays* (pp. 49–66). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- McCarthy, J. D. (1997). The globalization of social movement theory. In J. Smith, C. Chatfield, & R. Pagnucco (Eds.),

- Transnational social movements and global politics: Solidarity beyond the state* (pp. 243–259). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- McCarthy, J. D., & Castelli, J. (1994). *Working for justice: The campaign for human development and poor empowerment groups*. Washington, DC: Life Cycle Institute, The Catholic University of America.
- McCarthy, J. D., & Castelli, J. (forthcoming). Studying non-profit advocacy organizations. In P. Flynn & V. Hodgkinson (Eds.), *Studying the impact of the nonprofit sector: An agenda for research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McCarthy, J. D., & Harvey, D. (1989). Independent citizen advocacy: The past and the prospects. In *The Surgeon General's Workshop on Drunk Driving: Background Papers* (pp. 247–260). Office of the Surgeon General, U.S. Public Health Service. Washington, DC: Department of Health and Human Services.
- McCarthy, J. D., & McPhail, C. (1998). The institutionalization of protest in the United States. In D. S. Meyer & S. Tarrow (Eds.), *The social movement society: Contentious politics for a new century* (pp. 83–110). Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield.
- McCarthy, J. D., & Wolfson, M. (1996). Resource mobilization by local social movement organizations: Agency, strategy and organization in the movement against drinking and driving. *American Sociological Review*, *61*, 1070–1088.
- McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1973). *The trend of social movements in America: Professionalization and resource mobilization*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
- McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, *82*, 1212–1241.
- McCarthy, J. D., Wolfson, M., Baker, D. P., & Mosakowski, E. (1988). The founding of social movement organizations: Local citizens' groups opposing drunken driving. In *Ecological models of organizations* (pp. 71–84). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- McCarthy, J. D., Britt, D. W., & Wolfson, M. (1991). The institutional channeling of social movements by the state in the United States. *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change*, *14*, 45–76.
- Melucci, A. (1996). *Challenging codes: Collective action in the information age*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Meyer, D. S., & Staggenborg, S. (1996). Movements, countermovements, and the structure of political opportunity. *American Journal of Sociology*, *101*, 1628–1660.
- Meyer, D. S., & Tarrow, S. (1998). A movement society: Contentious politics for a new century. In D. S. Meyer & S. Tarrow (Eds.), *The social movement society: Contentious politics for a new century* (pp. 1–28). Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield.
- Minkoff, D. (1995). *Organizing for equality: The evolution of women's and racial ethnic organizations in America, 1955–1985*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Minkoff, D. (1997). The sequencing of social movements. *American Sociological Review*, *62*, 779–799.
- Minkoff, D. (1999). Bending in the wind: Strategic change and adaptation by women's and racial minority organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, *104*, 1666–1703.
- Minkoff, D. (forthcoming). Macro-organizational analysis. In B. Klandermans & S. Staggenborg (Eds.), *Methods in social movements research*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mitchell, R. C., Mertig, A. G., & Dunlap, R. E. (1992). Twenty years of environmental mobilization: Trends among national environmental organizations. In R. E. Dunlap & A. G. Mertig (Eds.), *American environmentalism: The U.S. environmental movement, 1970–1990* (pp. 11–26). Philadelphia: Taylor and Francis.
- Morris, A. D. (1984). *The origins of the civil rights movement: Black communities organizing for change*. New York: Free Press.
- Oberschall, A. (1973). *Social conflict and social movements*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Oliver, P. (1993). Formal models of collective action. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *19*, 271–300.
- Oliver, P., & Furman, M. (1989). Contradictions between national and local organization strength: The case of the John Birch Society. *International Social Movements Research*, *2*, 155–177.
- Oliver, P. E., & Marwell, G. (1992). Mobilizing technologies for collective action. In A. D. Morris & C. McClurg Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory* (pp. 251–272). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ostrander, S. A. (1995). *Money for change: Social movement philanthropy at Haymarket People's Fund*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ostrander, S. A. (1999). When grantees becomes grantors: Accountability, democracy and social movement philanthropy. In *Philanthropic foundations: New scholarship, new possibilities* (pp. 257–270). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Perrow, C. (1979). The sixties observed. In *The dynamics of social movements* (pp. 192–211). Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers.
- Piven, F. F., & Cloward, R. (1977). *Poor people's movements*. New York: Pantheon.

- Polletta, F. (1999). Snarls, quacks, and quarrels: Culture and structure in political process theory. *Sociological Forum*, 14, 63–70.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Trends in civic engagement and social capital*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rogers, M. B. (1990). *Cold anger: A story of faith and power politics*. Denton, TX: University of North Texas Press.
- Ross, H. L. (1992). *Confronting drunk driving: Social policy for saving lives*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Rothschild-Whitt, J. (1979). The collectivist organization: An alternative to rational-bureaucratic models. *American Sociological Review*, 44(August), 509–527.
- Rucht, D. (1989). Environmental movement organizations in West Germany and France: Structure and interorganizational relations. *International Social Movements Research*, 2, 61–94.
- Rucht, D. (1996). The impact of national context on social movement structures: A cross-movement and cross-national comparison. In D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy, & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings* (pp. 185–204). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Rucht, D. (1999). Linking organization and mobilization: Michel's iron law of oligarchy reconsidered. *Mobilization: An International Journal*, 4, 151–169.
- Schneider, J. W. (1985). Social problems theory: The social constructionist view. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 11, 209–229.
- Scott, W. R. (1998). *Organizations: Rational, natural and open systems*, 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Shanahan, S. E., & Brandon Tuma, N. (1994). The sociology of distribution and redistribution. In N. Smelser & R. Swedberg (Eds.), *The handbook of economic sociology* (pp. 733–765). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sherkat, D. E. (1998). What's in a frame: Towards an integrated social psychology of social movements. Unpublished paper, Department of Sociology, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN.
- Sherkat, D. E., & Blocker, J. T. (1994). The political development of sixties' activists: Identifying the influence of class, gender, and socialization on protest participation. *Social Forces*, 76, 1087–1115.
- Simon, H. A. (1947). *Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making process in administrative organization*. New York: Macmillan.
- Smith, D. H. (1997). The rest of the nonprofit sector: Grassroots associations as the dark matter ignored in prevailing "flat earth" maps of the sector. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 26, 114–131.
- Smith, J. (1997). Characteristics of the modern transnational social movement sector. In J. Smith, C. Chatfield, & R. Pagnucco (Eds.), *Transnational social movements and global politics: Solidarity beyond the state* (pp. 42–58). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Smith, J. (2001). Globalizing resistance: The battle of Seattle and the future of social movements. *Mobilization*, 6, 1–19.
- Smith, J., Pagnucco, R., & Romeril, W. (1994). Transnational social movement organizations in the global political area. *Voluntas*, 5, 121–154.
- Smith, J., Pagnucco, R., & Lopez, G. (1998). Globalizing human rights: Report on a survey of transnational human rights NGOs. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 20, 379–412.
- Snow, D. A., & Benford, R. D. (1988). Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization. *International Social Movement Research*, 1, 197–217.
- Snow, D. A., & Benford, R. D. (1992). Master frames and cycles of protest. In A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory* (pp. 133–155). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Snow, D. A., Cress, D. M., Soule, S. A., & Baker, S. G. (2000). An event history analysis of homeless protest, 1980 to 1991: An assessment of strain, resource mobilization, political opportunity, and threshold theories. Unpublished paper. Tucson, AZ: Department of Sociology.
- Snow, D. A., Rochford, E. B., Jr., Worden, S. K., & Benford, R. D. (1986). Frame alignment process, micromobilization, and movement participation. *American Sociological Review*, 51, 464–481.
- Snow, D. A., Zurcher, L. A., & Eckland-Olson, S. (1980). Social networks and social movements: A microstructural approach to differential recruitment. *American Sociological Review*, 45, 787–801.
- Staggenborg, S. (1988). The consequences of professionalization and formalization in the pro-choice movement. *American Sociological Review*, 53, 585–606.
- Staggenborg, S. (1991). *The pro-choice movement: Organization and activism in the abortion conflict*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Steinberg, M. W. (1999). The talk and back talk of collective action: A dialogic analysis of repertoires of discourse among nineteenth-century English cotton spinners. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105, 736–780.
- Stinchcombe, A. L. (1965). Social structure and organizations. In J. G. March (Ed.), *Handbook of organizations* (pp. 142–193). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Swanson, D. H. (1996). *An exploration of the causes and consequences of professionalization: Anti-drunken driving citizens' groups*. Washington, DC: Department of Sociology, Catholic University of America.

- Tarrow, S. (1998). *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tilly, C. (1978). *From mobilization to revolution*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tilly, C. (1979). Repertoires of contention in America and Britain, 1750–1830. In M. N. Zald & J. D. McCarthy (Eds.), *The dynamics of social movements: Resource mobilization, social control and tactics* (pp. 126–155). Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.
- Tilly, C. (1998). *Durable inequality*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Turner, R. H. (1981). Collective behavior and resource mobilization as approaches to social movements: Issues and continuities. *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change*, 4, 1–24.
- Useem, B. (1998). Breakdown theories of collective action. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 215–238.
- Verba, S., Lehman Schlozman, K., & Brady, H. E. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Walker, J. (1983). The origin and maintenance of interest groups in America. *American Political Science Review*, 77, 390–406.
- Walker, J. L., Jr. (1991). *Mobilizing interest groups in America: Patrons, professions and social movements*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Warner, S. R. (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.
- Weed, F. J. (1991). Organizational mortality in the anti-drunk-driving movement: Failure among local MADD chapters. *Social Forces*, 69, 851–868.
- Weed, F. J. (1995). *Certainty of justice: Reform in the crime victim movement*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Wolfson, M. (2000). *The fight against big tobacco: The movement, the state, and the public's health*. New York: Aldine, de Gruyter.
- Young, D. R. (1992). Organizing principles for international advocacy associations. *Voluntas*, 3, 1–28.
- Young, D. R., Koenig, B. L., Najam, A., & Fisher, J. (1999). Strategy and structure in managing global associations. *Voluntas*, 10, 323–343.
- Zald, M. N. (2000). Ideologically structured action: An enlarged agenda for social movement research. *Mobilization: The International Journal*, 5, 1–17.
- Zald, M. N., & Ash, R. (1966). Social movement organizations: Growth, decay and change. *Social Forces*, 40, 327–340.
- Zald, M. N., & McCarthy, J. D. (Eds.). (1979). *The dynamics of social movements: Resource mobilization, social control, and tactics*. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.
- Zald, M. N., & McCarthy, J. D. (1987). *Social movements in an organizational society*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Zelizer, V. A. R. (1994). *The social meaning of money*. New York: Basic Books.