

SOCIOLOGY REFERENCE GUIDE

THEORIES OF SOCIAL
MOVEMENTS

THE EDITORS OF
SALEM PRESS

SOCIOLOGY REFERENCE GUIDE

THEORIES OF SOCIAL
MOVEMENTS

The Editors of Salem Press

SALEM PRESS

Pasadena, California • Hackensack, New Jersey

Published by Salem Press

Copyright © 2011 by Salem Press

All rights in this book are reserved. No part of this work may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without written permission from the copyright owner except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews or in the copying of images deemed to be freely licensed or in the public domain.

ISBN: 978-1-42983-472-8

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Indexing Subjects

1. Social Movements 2. Sociology

First Edition

Contents

Introduction	1
Narrative & Social Movements	3
Four Stages of Social Movements	14
Types of Social Movements	26
Major Social Movements	37
The Gay Rights Movement	46
The Women's Rights Movement	56
Social Movements & Violence	66
Mass Society Theory	77
New Social Movement Theory	88
Relative Deprivation Theory	100
Resource Mobilization Theory	111
Structural-Strain Theory	122
Value-Added Theory	134
Framing Theory	145
Terms & Concepts	156
Contributors	165
Index	167

Introduction

Among the more influential factors of society's progressive nature is the ability for social movements to inspire, enact, and administer change. However, behind each of history's most significant social movements reside layers of theory discovered only through the rigors of sociological research.

The Sociology Reference Guide series is designed to provide a solid foundation for the research of various sociological topics. This volume presents a series of essays that cover an assortment of social movement theories as they apply to sociology.

This collection begins with an essay by Jonathan Christiansen that discusses the relationship between narrative and social movements. He points out that the "function of storytelling and narrative within social movements [is] to create collective identity, to frame movement origins, and to deal with movement setbacks and defeats." Christiansen also discusses the four stages of social movements: emergence, coalescence, bureaucratization, and decline. Simone I. Flynn continues with an analysis of the different models of social movements, including the alternative, redemptive, reformative, revolutionary, new social movement, and the economic classification models. An overview of major social movements is then provided by Ruth A. Wienclaw and Alexandra Howson. In their essay, they outline the initial development of such movements, their political and legal goals, and their ability to bring about social change within a society. Carolyn Sprague

gives two specific examples in her examination of the Women's Rights Movement and the Gay Rights Movement, and Christiansen reenters the conversation with a review of violence in relation to social movements.

Flynn also furthers the scope of this collection with a series of essays on the theories behind the study of social movements. In his discussion of mass society theory, Flynn offers information on the history and concepts of the theory as well as its main contributors and criticisms. When analyzing the new social movement theory, Flynn uses its perspective to observe the environmental movement. The benefits and shortcomings of the relative deprivation theory and resource mobilization theory are also discussed. According to the author, "resource mobilization theory argues that social movements succeed through the effective mobilization of resources and the development of political opportunities for members." The reference guide concludes with essays on the structural-strain theory; value-added theory; and the development, elements, and applications of framing theory.

Because social movements continue to steer society in different directions, both current sociological theories as well as those that have yet to be discovered will be of the utmost importance. This volume will provide readers with an overview of prevailing social movement theories. Complete bibliographic entries follow each essay and a list of suggested readings will locate sources for advanced research in the area of study. A selection of relevant terms and concepts and an index of common sociological themes and ideas conclude the volume.

Narrative & Social Movements

Jonathan Christiansen

Overview

Everybody loves a good story, it seems, and social movement participants are no exception. Just like any social institution, stories are present within and about social movements and their participants. Although stories may often seem casual or inconsequential they are often imbued with deeper meaning and interpreted differently, depending on the situation in which they are told, or whom they are told by or about. Social movement activists are fond of storytelling, whether in front of other activists, to potential allies or for the public. In fact, movement activists and adherents are often told to “tell their story” in an effort to garner public support or sympathy (Leondar-Wright, 2008; Polletta 1998, 2006). Because of the popularity and widespread presence of storytelling and narrative devices in social movements, sociologists interested in social movements and other political processes have begun to look more closely at how, why and when stories are used and to what effect.

Why is it important to understand the relationship between narrative and social movements? As scholars have focused more attention on how societies change and what role social movements play in either helping or hindering that change, they have discovered many mechanisms at play that contribute to the success or demise of social movements. For many years sociologists focused on the seemingly negative psychological traits

of social movements and other collective behavior (e.g. Le Bon, 1896; Hopper, 1950). Later, as the civil rights, anti-war and other movements of the 1960's and 70's gained more attention, scholars began to focus attention on the more instrumental aspects of social movements – that is, the way movements carried out campaigns in a rational and organized manner (e.g. McCarthy & Zald, 1977). This approach was a turn from the previous approach, which emphasized the more emotional and psychological aspects of social movement mobilization. With this came the focus on the rationality of social movements as actors within the socio-political realm. Although these approaches moved the field of collective behavior and later social movement studies forward in many ways, later critics argued that they focused too much on the rational aspects of social movements and their adherents at the expense of emotional and cultural elements. Narrative analysis of social movements is part of this new focus on the emotional and cultural. In order to understand the relationship between social movements and narrative it is important to understand the terms.

What is a Social Movement?

Social movements have a long history throughout the world. Social movement activity follows closely the rise of democratic representation in the United States and England in the late 1700s. Thus, they are highly associated with democratic societies. This does not mean that Social movements are limited to democratic societies. In fact, they have also been associated with the process of democratization in many societies and are also present in more authoritarian societies (Tilly, 2004). Social movements, then, occur in a wide variety of societies. They can be local in purpose, such as a movement against the construction of a toxic waste dump in a neighborhood, or they can be national or even international in focus. Social movements are also broad in their aim. Some may seek to reform an existing political system, while others may aim to halt change. On the other hand, some are not political at all and instead may seek cultural or individual change. Still others may seek revolutionary change on both a political and social/cultural level.

Despite the differences in types of social movements there are also many similarities. Some key similarities between all social movements that have been noted are:

- The campaign, all movements carry out sustained actions with an orientation towards specific goals
- Social movement repertoires, a standard set of actions that are used by social movements i.e. protests, rallies, etc. and
- Displays of worthiness, unity, numbers and commitment (WUNC). WUNC displays are carried out by social movements and social movement organizations (SMOs) in order to legitimize themselves in the eyes of potential adherents and target authorities (Tilly, 2004).

A social movement can be thought of as an informal set of individuals and/or groups that are “involved in confliction relations with clearly identified opponents; are linked by dense informal networks; [and] share a distinct collective identity” (della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 20).

What is Narrative?

Storytelling is often used in place of the word narrative. Although sometimes distinction is made between the two, they are also regularly used interchangeably. Sometimes narrative may refer to a wider set of storytelling devices beyond simple oral storytelling. For example, a narrative can be told through a visual display such as through comics or art, whereas a story is usually spoken by a narrator to an audience. Specifically, a narrative entails three important elements:

- A plot, which “seeks time and place specific connections between events” (Polletta, 1998, p. 421),
- Point of view, which means they must be told from a certain perspective –either the stories tellers, or someone else’s, but they cannot be events placed outside of a perspective.
- A degree of ambiguity or “fundamental indeterminacy, a key question that cannot be answered or even formulated, a ‘complex word’ or concept whose meaning remains ambiguous” (Polletta, 1998, p. 440).

These three elements are essential for a story. Narrative, on the other hand, often refers not just to stories but also the way a story is told including

the devices used to tell a story. A story telling device refers to the way language, pictures etc. are used to tell a story. For example, a story may use a common cultural or linguistic stereotype -- or trope -- to stand in for a complex set of ideas. The use of tropes can simplify storytelling and also define the term of the thing being described. There are many types and uses of tropes, especially by social movements, which help to simplify the message of social movements as well as define the terms of debate; similar to the way that framing within social movements is used.

Further Insights

The Use of Narrative within Social Movements

Scholars have identified many ways in which narrative occurs and functions within social movements. Social movement actors tell stories and use story telling devices to their advantage. Sometimes stories are deployed strategically and other times they are used unconsciously, but they almost always carry meaning which can be interpreted and analyzed.

Narrative & Collective Identity

An important element of any social movement is the creation of a collective identity. Mellucci (1995) explains, "collective identity is an interactive and shared definition produced by several individuals...and concerned with the orientations of action and the field of opportunities and constraints in which the action takes place" (p. 44). In other words, collective action is the way a group of people understands their shared environment and how they should act collectively within that environment. An important part of the process of collective identity is the making of shared meanings. When individuals come together from many different places and backgrounds it is often difficult to know from where each individual understands the world around them. Thus, part of the work of social movements is to help create a sense of shared meaning; that is, to ensure that everybody involved in a given movement is understanding the situation, or conflict, in the same way.

Storytelling is one way movements can create this shared sense of meaning and thus, a collective identity. When activists tell stories of collective actions they define the antagonists and the protagonists or the "we" and the "them." Glover (2004) notes that activists "... who identify with a story

about the [group], 'step into the story, recreate the world it presents, and retain the experience. They make the story their own'" (p. 48). Similarly, Linde (2001) notes that an organization uses "narrative to create and reproduce its identity by the creation and maintenance of an institutional memory" (p. 1). Social movement organizations and informal groups behave in much the same way. Stories are told of actions and opponents which then create a sense of the group's values and goals and guides how people should relate to one another within the group and towards opponents or targets of the group or movement. Christiansen (2009) found that members of a social movement organization told stories which helped build a sense of collective identity. These stories helped members understand themselves and their actions within the movement by reinforcing desired movement tactics and helping to orient members ideologically. Stories do not only forge shared identity, they also explain from where the movement comes.

Origin Stories

Social movements and social movement organizations often tell stories of their emergence. These stories are not simple stories of how the group or movement came to be. Stories of beginnings are often used strategically and may embellish or omit in order to create a more cohesive or meaningful narrative.

As is often the case things do not just appear out of nowhere. There is usually some precursor to any movement, but it is often difficult for activists and scholars alike to pinpoint a movement's origins (Polletta, 1998). The stories that activists tell are often a good starting point for analysis of movements. With regards to movement origin stories, Polletta (1998) points out that "social movement ... often deny their pasts" meaning they often deny that they are part of a longer movement or a result of long-term organizational practices. Often times, for example, movements are able to take advantage an opportunity because there are long standing organizations and dedicated activists available to mobilize.

A good example of this is the story of the origins of the civil rights movement. Polletta (1998) points out that the American civil rights movement is often described as beginning with Rosa Parks' refusal to give up her seat to a white man on a city bus, which then sparked the Montgomery Bus boycott.

Parks was portrayed as a simple seamstress worn out from a hard day's work. When asked why Parks refused to give up her seat she is famously quoted as saying "I was just tired." This became a powerful collective action frame. A collective action frame defines a situation as problematic and gives people a sense that a problem is something that can be overcome through concerted efforts, therefore leading to collective action. Civil rights advocates took this to be representative of African American's sentiments at the time and it motivated civil rights activists to action. As Polletta (1998) points out however, Rosa Parks had been a long time civil rights advocate and was, in fact, a secretary at the local NAACP and had been to trainings at a prominent activist training center.

Polletta (1998, 2006) found a similar simplification of the origin story with regards to the outbreak of the mass sit-ins which swept across the south in the late 1960s. Many of the adherents, who were local university students, described the sit-ins as spontaneous both to fellow activists and local media. It was described by the student activists as "like a fever." This expression, or narrative trope ("It was like a fever"), captured the spontaneity and contagiousness of the sit-ins as they were described. Thus, stories are often told not as a way to necessarily describe the events but to explain the events in a sensible and meaningful way. They are also attempting to create a sense of a unique and definable starting point which is important not only for stories, but also the movements. Polletta (1998) explains, "Movement stories of origin are, on this view, strategic bids for public sympathy and identification. But activists may also deny their forerunners in order to establish their own collective identity, their own distinctiveness from what has come before" (p. 427). Movement stories of origin not only create a sense of collective identity, they also help to differentiate themselves as a new and unique movement - one that is not stale and old but young and vibrant and full of possibilities.

Narrative & Movement Continuity

Narrative not only defines a movement's origins, but also helps to sustain movements through hardships. Narratives can provide a story to explain setbacks as part of a larger trajectory of the movement. If movements are able to frame their setbacks as mere bumps in the road rather than as disasters, they are more likely to survive them. Polletta (1998) describes how the Solidarity movement in Poland successfully took advantage of "the

Catholic trope of the successive stations of the 'via dolorosa' – or stations of the cross (p. 432). The movement uses the trope on one of their posters. The poster shows a red line which juts up in several spots, like a heartbeat, with the year of previous uprisings above the heartbeats. This emphasized the continuity of the movement and the setbacks were seen as successes – each leading closer to the presumed final victorious uprising (Polletta, 1998, p. 432). The movement is seen as carrying on a long tradition because it is able to tap into this narrative trope of suffering and rebirth.

Similarly, Glover (2004), in a study of a grassroots association, notes that stories told about a personal hardship in relation to the goals of the group became a powerful symbol for the group. Thus the personal became the collective, and the story became a stand which represented what the group was up against.

While some movements may deny their beginnings through the use of narrative, others use narrative to connect themselves to the past. Narratives can serve as what Rupp and Taylor (1987) refer to as abeyance structures. Narratives can be thought of as carrying abeyance cultures. Polletta (1998) notes that “during periods of political quiescence, institutions that are somewhat insulated from the direct surveillance of authorities preserve not only activists’ tactical know-how and personnel networks but stories of past victories, defeats, and continuing struggle” (p. 433). Christiansen (2009) notes that group stories connected movement members not only to past victories but also placed members within an ideological and tactical trajectory. Members of a group with diminished capacity told stories that connected themselves with a more victorious past. They saw themselves as carrying on a long tradition of beliefs and innovative tactics. Stories, then, are one way in which movements and movement groups are able to sustain themselves through difficult periods as well as through long periods of demobilization. They also carry with them ideologies and practices over time which activists can use to build collective meaning.

Narrative & Policy Making

Social movements are, of course, usually interested in changing government policy. Social movement narratives are also seen in this realm. Leonard-Wright (2008) notes that stories are often used to build sympathy and support for movement causes. She notes that as an activist, she would en-

courage storytelling when activists met with government representatives. Stories are meant to put a human face on the policies that are being discussed. As she notes though, these stories often backfire and policy makers find personal fault within the stories. Similarly, during the United States' wars against Vietnam and Iraq, anti-war soldiers who had returned from combat organized testimonies in which they told stories about their experiences during combat. The stories were meant to turn the public and politicians against the war by humanizing the war.

Polletta (1998; 2006) also notes the relationship between social movement stories and policy makers. She analyses the stories that are told about the civil rights movements by members of congress. She finds that civil rights stories are told mostly by African American politicians and mostly on occasions of commemoration. She finds that instead of stories leading to practical policy decisions they are actually often left out of policy discourse. Stories of movements within the policy making realm define movements by how and when they are used. Instead of integrating social movement stories into policy making discourse, the stories are left to the realm of commemoration, which clearly defines the stories as outside of the formal policy making realm. Social movements, then, are not only physically left outside of formal politics, but are discursively excluded as well. Social movement storytelling can be a powerful way to humanize policy, but on the other hand, stories are often left out of specific policy making discourse.

Viewpoints

Limitations of Narrative Analysis

Narrative analysis of social movements is a good tool for understanding their internal functioning. It is also helpful in understanding how social movements interact with groups and people outside of the social movement. There are limitations, however, to the usefulness of narrative analysis. There are also limitations to the use of narrative and storytelling within social movements.

Narrative analysis – the analysis of social movement stories and storytelling – is limited in that it often gives little attention to the larger structures within which social movements operate. For example, a movement may

tell stories of victories against a past enemy, but it does little to explain why a government has decided to focus its repression on a specific movement. While narrative analysis could conceivably lead to some understanding of this situation it would need to be understood within other theories of social movement mobilization and repression. Resource mobilization theory and other political process models are still useful tools for understanding these larger structures.

The use of narrative within social movements is also sometimes problematic. Narrative is seen as a certain type of discourse, and stories are interpreted as being false or only representing one view of an event (Polletta, 1998; 2006). As such, stories are often not taken seriously by policy makers or are left out of policy making discourse. Narrative may also limit peoples' understandings of events since, as they frame the events, they define the "us vs. them" boundaries and the ways they and/or their group fits into the collective story. Scholars using narrative analysis must be careful to notice the positionality of the storyteller, the audience, and even the scholar examining the narrative (Glover, 2004; Polletta, 2006). Narrative is best understood as one tool at the disposal of social movements and social movement scholars. It has benefits and drawbacks and must be used in combination with other tools.

Conclusion

Social movements use narrative in a number of ways. It is important for scholars to understand the ways narrative is used in order to more fully understand how social movements operate. Narratives are told either through oral storytelling or through other narrative devices such as tropes. These tropes can be used to condense and bundle multiple ideas and meanings into a single bundle such as a phrase, image or word. These tropes make storytelling easier, but also leave certain things out and can function to define the thing they are describing.

Narrative is used within social movements to create collective identity. Stories create for movement members a sense of belonging to a group and place of the member in relation to the group. Narrative also defines the origins of the movement, and also connects movements to other past movements and victories. The use of narrative can be an important way

for movements to overcome setbacks or maintain identity, ideology and tactical know-how over time. Narrative also shows up with regard to social movements and policy making. Oftentimes movements tell stories to humanize policy decisions, but they are also of limited use within this realm. Policy discourse and narrative are seen as two separate forms of discourse. The discourse separates social movements from the policy realm. Despite the usefulness of narrative analysis there are still drawbacks. Narrative can be of limited use in understanding the structures within which movements operate. The field of social movement narrative analysis is still relatively new and will benefit from further exploration.

Bibliography

- Christiansen, J. (2009). "We are all leaders": Anarchism and the narrative of the Industrial Workers of the World. *Working USA: The Journal of Labor and Society*, 12(3), 387-401.
- della Porta, D. & Diani, M. (2006). *Social movements: An introduction* (2ndEd). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Glover, T. (2004). Narrative inquiry and the study of grassroots associations. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary & Nonprofit Organizations*, 15(1), 47-69. Retrieved Feb. 3, 2010 from EBSCO online database Academic Search Complete <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=12817950&site=ehost-live>
- Leondar-Wright, B. (2008). How effective is personal storytelling? Strategic insights from social movement theory. *Peacework*, 389. Retrieved Feb. 3, 2010 from <http://www.peaceworkmagazine.org/how-effective-personal-storytelling-strategic-insights-social-movement-theory>
- Linde, C. (2001). Narrative in institutions. In, D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, and H. E. Hamilton, Eds. *The handbook of discourse analysis*, 518-35. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Melucci, A. (1995). The process of collective identity. In, Johnson, H. & B. Klandermans, Eds. *Social movements and culture*. 85-106. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Polletta, F. (2006). *It was like a fever: Storytelling in protest and politics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- (1998). Contending stories: Narrative in social movements. *Qualitative Sociology*, 21(4), 419-46. Retrieved Feb. 3, 2010 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=11302640&site=ehost-live>
- Rupp, L. J. & Taylor, V. (1987). *Survival in the doldrums: The American Women's Rights Movement, 1945 to the 1960s*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tilly C. (2004). *Social Movements 1768-2004*. Boulder: Paradigm.

Suggested Reading

- Armstrong, E. A. & Crago, S. M. (2006). Movements and memory: The making of the stonewall myth. *American Sociological Review* 71(5): 724-751. Retrieved Feb. 3, 2010 EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=23164561&site=ehost-live>
- Davis, J. E. (2002). Narrative and social movements: The power of stories. In, J. E. Davis (ed.), *Stories of change: Narratives and social movements*. 3-30. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Linde, C. (2000). The acquisition of a speaker by a story: How history becomes memory and identity. *Ethos* 28, 608-32.
- Reicher, S. (1996). The Battle of Westminster: Developing the social identity model of crowd behaviour in order to explain the initiation and development of collective conflict. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26(1), 115-134. Retrieved February 15, 2010 EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=14160256&site=ehost-live>
- Couto, R. (1993). Narrative, free space and political leadership in social movements. *The Journal of Politics*, 55 (1), 57-79. Retrieved Feb. 3, 2010 from EBSCO online database Academic Search Complete <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=9306165380&site=ehost-live>
- Wertsch, J. (2008). The narrative organization of collective memory. *Ethos* (00912131), 36(1), 120-135. Retrieved Feb. 3, 2010 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=31520761&site=ehost-live>

Four Stages of Social Movements

Jonathan Christiansen

Overview

There have been many social movements throughout history that have dramatically changed the societies in which they occurred. There have been many failed social movements as well. Throughout the history of the United States alone there have been a number of important and notable social movements. These movements have varied widely in their ideologies; some movements have been revolutionary in their aims, some have advocated reforms to the existing system, and others still have been conservative in their orientation and have worked to oppose changes in society. Social movements have varied in scope as well. For example, many movements are limited to local policies while others have been international in their focus. Despite all of the differences in social movements though, there are important analytic similarities that sociologists have distinguished, especially with regard to the life cycle of a social movement.

Because social movements have led to so many dramatic changes in societies around the globe, scholars have spent a great deal of time trying to understand where they come from, who participates in them, how they succeed, and how they fail. Much of what they have discovered is that social movements do not just happen; they require many resources and have many stages through which they develop. In other words, people do not simply suddenly become upset with a policy or even a ruling system

and then instantly form a social movement with a coherent ideology that is capable of holding mass demonstrations or overthrowing an existing power structure. Instead, social movements grow through four stages. Examining these stages of social movements has enabled sociologists to better understand social movements in general, despite variances in movement ideology and scope.

What is a Social Movement?

Defining what, exactly, a social movement is can be difficult. It is not a political party or interest group, which are stable political entities that have regular access to political power and political elites; nor is it a mass fad or trend, which are unorganized, fleeting and without goals. Instead they are somewhere in between (Freeman & Johnson, 1999). Some characteristics of social movements are that they are “involved in conflictual relations with clearly identified opponents; are linked by dense informal networks; [and they] share a distinct collective identity” (De la Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 20). Social movements, then, can be thought of as organized yet informal social entities that are engaged in extra-institutional conflict that is oriented towards a goal. These goals can be either aimed at a specific and narrow policy or be more broadly aimed at cultural change.

To early scholars, collective action was inherently oriented towards change. Some of the earliest works on social movements were attempts to understand why people got caught up in collective action or what conditions were necessary to foment social movements. These works were rooted in theories of mass society. Mass society theory was concerned with the increasing industrialization of society, which many felt led to a sense of alienation among individuals as traditional social structures and support networks broke down. The study of social movements as specific social processes with specific patterns emerged from this field of study.

Four Stages of Social Movements

One of the earliest scholars to study social movement processes was Herbert Blumer, who identified four stages of social movements' lifecycles. The four stages he described were: “social ferment,” “popular excitement,” “formalization,” and “institutionalization” (De la Porta & Diani 2006, p.150). Since his early work, scholars have refined and renamed

these stages but the underlying themes have remained relatively constant. Today, the four social movement stages are known as:

- Emergence,
- Coalescence,
- Bureaucratization, and
- Decline.

Although the term decline may sound negative, it should not necessarily be understood in negative terms. Scholars have noted that social movements may decline for several reasons and have identified five ways they do decline. These are

- Success,
- Organizational failure,
- Co-optation,
- Repression, or
- Establishment within mainstream society (Macionis, 2001; Miller, 1999).

Stage 1: Emergence

The first stage of the social movement life cycle is known as the emergence, or, as described by Blumer, the “social ferment” stage (De la Porta & Diani, 2006). Within this stage, social movements are very preliminary and there is little to no organization. Instead this stage can be thought of as widespread discontent (Macionis, 2001; Hopper, 1950). Potential movement participants may be unhappy with some policy or some social condition, but they have not taken any action in order to redress their grievances, or if they have it is most likely individual action rather than collective action. A person may comment to friends and family that he or she is dissatisfied with conditions or may write a letter to the local newspaper or representative, but these actions are not strategic and not collective. Further, there may be an increase in media coverage of negative conditions or unpopular policies which contributes to the general sense of discontent.

This early stage can also be considered within a specific social movement organization (SMO). A social movement organization is an organization

that is or has been associated with a social movement and which carries out the tasks that are necessary for any social movement to survive and be successful. An example of a social movement organization is the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), which was one of the many social movement organizations that organized during the American Civil Rights Movement. Within the emergence stage, then, an SMO and its members serve as agitators. Agitators raise consciousness around issues and help to develop the sense of discontent among the general population.

An example of this stage would be the early 1950's for the Civil Rights Movement. There was, of course, among the African-American population in the South, a general and long standing sense of discontent. Further, there were SMOs such as the NAACP that provided agitation, but were not yet organizing the mass and continued actions that came to later characterize the Civil Rights Movement. It was not until after the *Brown v. the Board of Education* Supreme court decision (1954), which outlawed segregation in Public schools, and following the arrest of Rosa Parks in Montgomery, Alabama for refusing to comply with segregation laws on city buses by giving up her bus seat to a white man, that the American Civil Rights Movement would proceed to the next stage – coalescence.

Stage 2: Coalescence

At this next stage in the life cycle, social movements have overcome some obstacles which many never overcome. Often, social unrest or discontent passes without any organizing or widespread mobilization. For example, people in a community may complain to each other about a general injustice, but they do not come together to act on those complaints and the social movement does not progress to the next level. Stage two, known as coalescence, or the “popular stage,” is characterized by a more clearly defined sense of discontent. It is no longer just a general sense of unease, but now a sense of what the unease is about and who or what is responsible. Rex D. Hopper (1950), in examining revolutionary processes, states that at this stage “unrest is no longer covert, endemic, and esoteric; it becomes overt, epidemic, and exoteric. Discontent is no longer uncoordinated and individual; it tends to become focalized and collective” (p. 273). Further he states “this is the stage when individuals participating in the mass behavior of the preceding stage become aware of each other” (p. 273). At this point leadership emerges and strategies for success are worked out.

Also, at this stage mass demonstrations may occur in order to display the social movement's power and to make clear demands. Most importantly this is the stage at which the movement becomes more than just random upset individuals; at this point they are now organized and strategic in their outlook.

The American Civil Rights Movement again provides a good example. After the initial emergence, the movement began a series of high profile campaigns, which sought to highlight the plight of African Americans in the segregated South. These campaigns included the Montgomery Bus Boycott and lunch counter sit-ins in which black students would sit down at segregated counters and wait to either be served or be dragged out by the police. These events galvanized support for the movement and displayed the brutality to which white segregationists would resort in order to protect the status quo. At this point too, prominent leaders of the movement begin to emerge, such as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. After many years of successful, but hard fought campaigns and strong leadership, the movement became a more prominent political force.

Stage 3: Bureaucratization

The third stage is known as bureaucratization. This stage, defined by Blumer as "formalization," (De la Porta & Diani, 2006) is characterized by higher levels of organization and coalition-based strategies. In this stage, social movements have had some success in that they have raised awareness to a degree that a coordinated strategy is necessary across all of the SMOs. Similarly, SMOs will come to rely on staff persons with specialized knowledge that can run the day-to-day operations of the organization and carry out movement goals. Social movements in this stage can no longer just rely on mass rallies or inspirational leaders to progress towards their goals and build constituencies; they must rely on trained staff to carry out the functions of organizations. In this phase their political power is greater than in the previous stages in that they may have more regular access to political elites. Many social movements fail to bureaucratize in this way and end up fizzling out because it is difficult for members to sustain the emotional excitement necessary and because continued mobilization becomes too demanding for participants. Formalization often means that paid staff can fill in when highly enthusiastic volunteers are not readily available (Macionis, 2001; Hopper, 1950).

The gay rights movement is an example of a movement that has passed through this stage. The gay rights movement moved from agitation and demonstrations to having many formal organizations that now work toward the goals of the gay rights movement. Some of these organizations include the Human Rights Campaign and the Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Discrimination (GLAAD). If they did not form these bureaucratic organizations, many movements would have most likely faded away and their demands would have gone unmet.

Stage 4: Decline

Finally, the last stage in the social movement life cycle is decline, or “institutionalization.” Decline does not necessarily mean failure for social movements though. Instead, Miller (1999) argues, there are four ways in which social movements can decline:

- Repression,
- Co-optation,
- Success, and
- Failure,
- Others have added establishment with mainstream as another way in which they decline (Macionis, 2001).

Repression

The first way social movements can decline is through repression. Repression occurs when authorities, or agents acting on behalf of the authorities, use measures (sometimes violent) to control or destroy a social movement. Further, Miller (1999) states “repressive actions may be defined as legitimate by the state...but they are never legitimate from the perspective of the movement” (p. 305). This means that governments will often pass laws outlawing specific movement activities or organizations, or justify attacks on them by declaring them somehow dangerous to public order. This type of repression makes it exceedingly difficult for social movements to carry out their activities and recruit new members. An example of state repression of social movement activity is that which was carried out by U.S. authorities against many New Left Organizations in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Many movements and their leaders were spied upon, jailed and even killed as a part of this repressive effort, leading to eventual break up (Boren, 2001; Churchill & Wall, 1990; Miller, 1999).

Co-optation

Movements can also decline, if their organizations are highly dependent on centralized authority or on charismatic leadership, through co-optation. Co-optation occurs when movement leaders come to associate with authorities or movement targets more than with the social movement constituents. For example, a leader could be asked to work for the organization that is the target of a movement with offers of being able to change things from the inside. Instead they themselves become integrated into the organization and take on its values, rather than the social movement's values. Leaders could also be paid off by authorities or target groups who ask them to redirect their activities in exchange.

Success

Of course, not all social movements end in defeat through repression or co-optation; some decline because they are successful. Smaller, localized movements with very specific goals often have a better chance at outright success. Miller (1999) uses the example of an area that mobilizes to halt the construction of an airport. He also mentions that the women's suffrage movement was a national organization that achieved its goals and thus declined. Both of these examples point to movements with very specific goals. Many social movements have goals that are much less clearly defined and many organize new campaigns once others are wrapping up either through success or compromise.

Miller (1999) suggests that this is what happened to Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), which was a student organization that emerged in the early 1960s and represented much of the ideology of the emerging student and youth movements of the time. They were one of the largest youth based organizations that organized protests against the Vietnam War and for school democratization. Many of its members participated in the early 1960's Civil Rights struggles and were influenced by that struggle (McAdam, 1988; Miller, 1999). Miller argues that an ever expanding definition of success and radicalization of members of SDS led to the decline of the movement itself. He suggests that the rapid growth and expansion of SDS led to these changing orientations. He argues, then, that their success was part of their demise.

An example of a group that re-orientes toward new goals once old goals are achieved is the organization, the March of Dimes. The March of Dimes originally formed in the late 1930s as a movement to raise awareness of and work towards curing the disease polio. Once a vaccine for polio was developed in the late 1950s though, the movement re-oriented to advocate toward the more general goals of preventing birth defects, premature birth and infant mortality.

Failure

In his analysis of the decline of SDS, Miller (1999) notes that SDS declined for many of the reasons stated above, but he also argues that the organization was not able to handle the rapid expansion that occurred because of their success and due to organizational strain, it collapsed into different factions. Failure of social movements due to organizational or strategic failings is common for many organizations. When failure occurs at the organizational level, Miller argues, it is usually for two reasons: factionalism and encapsulation.

As SDS grew, and partly due to its open structure in which everybody was encouraged to take part in the decision making process, the organization began to be controlled by different factions that were operating within the organization for the benefit of outside organizations - in the case of SDS they were dealing with the increasing power of the Progressive Labor Party faction. As the factionalism grew worse and repression continued, Miller argues that groups became increasingly insular, leading to encapsulation. This is the process wherein a cadre of activists become isolated from the broader movement because they come to share many of the same habits and culture and their ideology becomes more similar to one another's and at the same time more rigid. They become so dedicated to the movement that they fail to sympathize with those who do not make the movement the dominant aspect of their life. Likewise, potential recruits find it hard to penetrate the close knit group (Miller, 1999).

Establishment with Mainstream

Others have noted that a fifth reason for decline exists; mainly, that an organization becomes established with the mainstream. That is, their goals or ideologies are adopted by the mainstream and there is no longer any need for a movement. An example of this would be the labor movement

in the United States. For many years the labor movement was brutally repressed by authorities, but today the U.S. labor movement is well integrated into the political and economic system. Collective bargaining rights are guaranteed by the federal government (in most cases) and the labor movement is well established within the political system (Macionis, 2001).

Applications

Sociologists can use the theory of the four stages of social movements as an analytic tool for understanding how collective action occurs. Since social movements vary so greatly in individual goals and appearance, it can be helpful to place them within a common framework in order to determine how social movements affect society on a wide scale.

Sociologists, as well as potential social movement leaders and participants, can also use the four stages to evaluate the strategies of a specific social movement, and whether they were effective or not. For example, movements in the coalescence stage can anticipate the need to advance into the next level of development, bureaucratization, and can act accordingly to increase their power and influence. In addition, close consideration of the various modes of decline for social movements can help current social movements avoid the outcomes of co-optation and failure, and perhaps better position themselves for success.

The four stages of social movement development can also help scholars understand the ways that social movements affect society. By analyzing social movements that occur at given points and stages, sociologists can gain insight into the workings of society and the changes it undergoes - a fundamental component to the work of sociologists. For example, looking at the periods of emergence and coalescence in the American Civil Rights Movements presents a way to observe how society has changed as a result of the movement. In addition, we can better understand the events that occur at various stages in the social movement in retrospect as part of a process or change, rather than as individual events.

Viewpoints

While the theory of the four stages of social movements offers some useful insight into some movements, it has limitations as well. Some of the limi-

tations are a result of the organizational emphasis and a preoccupation with political change. Social movements with clearly defined political complaints and goals tend to fit well into the model, but other types of social movements present some problems. Social movements also emerge in response to cultural and social issues, and these movements do not fit as easily into the stages of development.

Social movement theory has increasingly moved toward examining new social movements, or movements that have emerged since the 1960s around issues of identity and quality of life (Inglehart, 1990; Melucci, 1995). Many also tend to emphasize social changes in lifestyle instead of specific changes in public policy or for economic change. For example, the Slow Food movement advocates in opposition to the fast-food lifestyle that members find unhealthy and unsustainable. The movement encourages lifestyle changes and altered consumer habits on an individual level, but it does not seek to outlaw fast-food or affect a specific policy change. Instead, the movement argues for a cumulative effect on society as a result of the movements' members' individual actions.

Social movements may not develop through the stages as described, or they may skip stages altogether. Generally, most movements do reach the stage of coalescence, since it is at that point that we begin to see behavior that we define as a social movement. Yet the movement may never grow beyond this second stage, and members may never develop into formal organizations. Some social movements consciously choose to reject bureaucratization for ideological reasons. This is particularly more prevalent as technology increases, making movement members able to communicate and engage with the movement through internet websites without formal groups ever coming together.

The four stages of social movements can be too rigidly applied as well. It is important to consider that the stages of development are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and that a movement could in fact move backwards at points. For example, the social movement organization SDS underwent a period of decline in the 1970s, but in the early 2000s saw a re-emergence. The contemporary SDS organizes around similar principles and draws upon the existing structure of SDS after the group had already undergone the fourth stage of decline. Another condition unaddressed by the four

stages is the state of social movement abeyance, in which a movement temporarily ceases outreach and mass mobilization in order to focus on maintaining identity and values (Taylor 1989; Meyers & Sawyers, 1999).

Sociologist Charles Tilly (1999) pointed out that “the employment of invariant models...assumes a political world in which whole structures and sequences repeat themselves time after time in essentially the same form. That would be a convenient world for theorists, but it does not exist” (as quoted in Giugni, 1999, p. xxv). Thus, while the analytic uses of the four stages may work to an extent, it is also important consider that each movement is responding to specific social conditions that affect the outcome and development of the social movement.

Conclusion

Social movements continue to be a major force in the world. Sociologists provide important analysis of social movements that helps us to understand both past and present societies, as well as to anticipate changes and trends that may play out in the future. As new movements develop, they can learn from the investigation of prior movements’ experience to better prepare for future possibilities. The model of analysis provided by the theory of the four stages of social movements is an important aspect in the development of knowledge about collective action. As social movements continue to change, so too do the methods sociologists use in analyzing them. Examining the four stages of social movements is one way of understanding how social movements form, develop, solidify, and decline. The model can be seen as one of many tools that sociologists use in examining our world.

Bibliography

- Boren, M. E. (2001). *Student resistance: A history of the unruly subject*. New York: Routledge.
- Churchill, W. & Wall, J. V. (1990). *The COINTELPRO papers: Documents from the FBI’s secret wars against domestic dissent*, Boston: South End Press.
- De la Porta, D. & Diani, M. (2006). *Social movements: An introduction* (2nd Ed). Malden MA:Blackwell Publishing.
- Freeman, J. & Johnson, V. (1999) *Waves of protest: Social movements since the sixties*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Giugni, M. (1999). How social movements matter: Past research, present problems, future Developments. In Giugni, M., McAdam, D., & Tilly, C. (Ed.). *How social movements matter*. (pp. xiii-xxxii). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hopper, R. D. (1950). The revolutionary process: A frame of reference for the study of revolutionary movements. *Social Forces* 28 (3), 270-280. Retrieved May 12, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=13582480&site=ehost-live>
- Inglehart, R. (1990). Values, ideology, and cognitive mobilization in new social movements. In R. J. Dalton & M. Keuchler (Eds.), *Challenging the political order: New social and political movements in western democracies* (pp. 43-66). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Macionis, J. J. (2001) *Sociology* (8th ed). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- McAdam, D. (1988). *Freedom summer*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Melluci, A. (1995). The process of collective identity. In H. Johnston & B. Klandermans (Eds.), *Social movements and culture* (pp. 41-63). Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Miller, F. D. (1999). The end of SDS and the emergence of weatherman: Demise through success. In J. Freeman & V. Johnson, (Eds.), *Waves of protest: Social movements since the Sixties* (pp. 303-324). Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Sawyers, T. M. & Meyers, D. M. (1999). Missed opportunities: Social movement abeyance and public policy. *Social Problems* 46 (2). 187-206.
- Taylor, V. (1989). Social movement continuity: The women's movement in abeyance. *American Sociological Review*, 89(54) p. 761-775, Retrieved May 10, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=15471353&site=ehost-live>

Suggested Reading

- Blumer, H. (1969). *Collective behavior*. In Lee A.M., (Ed.), *Principles of sociology* (3rd Ed.). New York: Barnes and Noble Books.
- Fréchet, G & Wörndl, B. (1993). The ecological movements in the light of social movements' development. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 34 (1/2), 56-74. Retrieved May 14, 2008, from EBSCO online database Academic Search Premier <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=9409010103&site=ehost-live>
- Kimmel, M. S. (1983). *Outbreaks: The sociology of collective behavior*. *Social movements: Development, participation, and dynamics*. [Book review]. *Contemporary Sociology* 12(3) p. 313-314. Retrieved May 14, 2008, from EBSCO online database Academic Search Premier <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=13354631&site=ehost-live>
- Tilly, C. (1978). *From mobilization to revolution*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Types of Social Movements

Simone I. Flynn

Overview

The following is an analysis of typologies of social movements. Sociologists use a wide range of measures, variables, and indices to classify social movements in order to facilitate comparisons. Understanding the main types of social movements is vital background for all those interested in the sociology of collective action. This article explores the classification of social movements in three parts:

- An overview of social movement theory and social movement typologies,
- A description of the main typologies of social movements including the alternative, redemptive, reformative, and revolutionary social movement model; the traditional social movements vs. new social movements model; and the economic classification of social movements model; and
- A discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of prominent social movement typologies.

The History of Social Movement Theory

Social movements refer to a deliberate voluntary effort to organize individuals to act in concert and thereby achieve a strong enough group influence to make or block changes. Sociologists consider social movements to

be power-oriented groups rather than participation-oriented movements. This distinction means that the collective actions of social movements are not necessarily of primary benefit to individual members, but instead are rather in service to the groups' larger goals. Coordinated group actions are undertaken to make changes in the larger socio-political context. Social movements tend to be most successful in open, democratic societies in which social mobility and social change are accepted concepts. In post-industrial societies, norm-oriented social movements are more common than value-oriented social movements. Norm-oriented movements refer to groups that attempt changes within the system. Value-oriented movements refer to groups that attempt to change the basic goals of a system (Morrison, 1971).

Sociologist Lorenz von Stein first introduced the term "social movement" in his book *The History of the French Social Movement from 1789 to the Present* (1850). Lorenz von Stein, who is known for his concern with class struggle, developed his concept of social movements from his analysis of mid-nineteenth century bourgeois-industrial society (Kastner, 1981). During that time, social movements (complete with collective identity, press attention, leadership, membership, and collective action) became popular in Europe and North America. The industrial revolution, which spread capital and people quickly across geographic regions, created great changes in political, social, and work environments during this period. Early social movements included labor unions and worker collectives. Following World War II, social movements grew more from concerns about social inequalities and environmental degradation than labor or work concerns.

Social movement theory, which proposes that social movements are, in many instances, created through the use and manipulation of frames, resources, and information, emerged in the late nineteenth century. The interdisciplinary history of social movement theory includes six main areas of study:

- New social movement theory,
- Value-added theory,
- Structural-strain theory,
- Relative deprivation theory,

- Resource mobilization theory, and
- Mass society theory.

Social movement theory refers to the study of social mobilization including its social, cultural, and political manifestations and consequences. Contemporary social movement scholarship is often motivated by a desire for social change and may integrate scholarship and activism (Benford & Snow, 2000). Prominent typologies of social movements, described in detail in the next section, include the alternative, redemptive, reformative, and revolutionary social movement model; the traditional social movements vs. new social movements model; and the economic classification of social movements model.

Further Insights

Typologies of Social Movements

Social scientists classify social movements based on numerous criteria, including their scope, chronology, geographical focus, strategies, targets, goals, economic resources, and membership characteristics. Typologies of social movements tend to reflect the trends and concerns of social science thought at the time they were developed. For example, the traditional vs. new social movement model emerged in the 1950s and 1960s as a means of explaining how new movements were distinct from those that came before. Social science research of the era confirmed and reflected the radical social changes (achieved by the civil rights movement, feminist movement, etc.) occurring in society. The three typologies of social movements described below, reflect sociology's nuanced study and classification of social movements over the last century.

The Alternative, Redemptive, Reformative, Revolutionary Model

Anthropologist David Aberle, in his book, "The Peyote Religion Among the Navaho," introduced a typology of social movements referred to as the alternative, redemptive, reformative, and revolutionary model (1966). Today, Aberle's model is one of the most influential social movement classification systems.

According to Aberle, social movements may be classified by reference to two dimensions: locus of the change sought and the amount of change

sought. The locus of change sought refers to the level or extent of change the social movement is seeking. For example, a social movement may work to change individuals, as seen in Alcoholics Anonymous, or work to change the larger society by changing the economic order, the technological order, the political order, or the law. The amount of change desired by a social movement may be partial or total. For example, the civil rights movement desires desegregation and equal rights across society while labor movements tend to work for change in specific businesses and industries.

Aberle's social movement classification scheme can be used to evaluate the target population and scope of most any social movement. For example, numerous sociologists have used Aberle's typology to study and classify religious movements such as Buddhism, Christianity (including Protestant, Roman Catholic, Evangelical faiths), Judaism, Islam, Shamanism, Native American belief, African Yoruba, Kabbalah, and Sufism (Masuda, 1998). The four types of movements described below (i.e. alternative, redemptive, reformative, and revolutionary social movements) describe the vast majority of nineteenth and twentieth century social movements:

1. **Transformative Movements:** Transformative movements, such as radical political groups, work for total or complete structural change. They may participate in violent action to achieve change and may anticipate the coming of a cataclysmic change (Almanza-Alcalde, 2005). For example, the Christian Identity movement, a movement of extremely conservative Christian churches and religious organizations and extreme right wing political groups and survival groups, is united by a belief in some form of white supremacy and Armageddon. Armageddon generally refers to the end of the world and the Second Coming of Christ. The Christian Identity movement is estimated to have 50,000 followers in dozens of sects. The largest and most well-known Christian Identity movement has historically been the Ku Klux Klan (Robinson, 2006).

2. **Reformative Movements:** Reformative movements work to create partial societal change in order to address injustices and inequalities. Reformative movements tend to have as their stated goal a desire to foster and promote positive change and achieve a just social order. Reformative movements tend to be single-issue

movements. In many instances, the single issue will become a starting point for a larger platform of change and social restructuring. For example, political reformative movements have begun working to reduce the external debt of poor countries and, once successful, branch out to change the world trade rules (Almanza-Alcalde, 2005). Fred Voget, cultural anthropologist and American Indian ethnologist, first used the term reformative movement in 1956 to refer to a conscious creative attempt on the part of a subordinate group to obtain a personal and social reintegration through a selective rejection, modification, and synthesis of both traditional and alien cultural components. A modern example of a reformative example is the Umbanda religion of Brazil. The Umbanda religious movement, a patchwork of African, Amerindian, Portuguese Catholic, and Spiritualist components, appeals to its members and adherents through expressions of national identity. The movement works toward social reform by reintroducing and revitalizing past cultural heritage (Dann, 1979).

3. **Redemptive Movements:** Redemptive movements seek a total change in individuals (Almanza-Alcalde, 2005). Personal recovery movements, such as Alcoholics Anonymous, are popular examples of redemptive movements. Alcoholics Anonymous, which was started in 1935, by a stockbroker and surgeon suffering from alcoholism, combines popular psychology and religion to offer its members personal redemption through the acknowledgment of their disease. Alcoholics Anonymous counts more than 113,000 groups and over 2,000,000 members in 180 countries.

4. **Alternative Movements:** Alternative movements work toward partial change in individuals. Alternative movements, which began forming in the 1960s, are characterized by countercultural values, the rejection of materialism, and the development of unconventional lifestyles. They do not work to change the existing social and political system. Instead, alternative movements work toward developing a parallel way of life that is ecological and spiritually viable and sustainable. For example, the sustainability movement and back-to-the-land movement of the 1960s and

1970s in the United States was characterized by a migration from cities to rural areas and a commitment to efficient and sustainable resource use (Almanza-Alcalde, 2005).

Traditional Versus New Social Movements

Sociologists also classify social movements using a traditional vs. new social movement model. This classification scheme is based both on the date (or era) of the social movement in question and the characteristics of the social movement itself. In this model, social movements are analyzed with the following criteria: the point of view of the actors in the social movement, the relationship of the actors in the social movement to culture, and the social movement's framework for action (Wieviorka, 2005).

Traditional social movements, most associated with the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries, are characterized by their isolated and alienated membership and large scale. New social movements generally date to the latter half of the twentieth century and are characterized as loosely organized networks. The traditional vs. new social movement model suggests that new social movements first developed in response to, and possibly in reaction against, traditional social movements. Whereas traditional social movements attracted members through targeted analysis of personality traits, grievances, disillusionment, and ideology, new social movements, beginning in the 1960s, abandoned the traditional social-psychological appeals common to these deprivation movements and mass society movements. By breaking with traditional social movements, they radically challenged perceived truths about how social movements operate (Klandermans, 1984).

The history of social movements from the late nineteenth to twentieth centuries includes two main periods: the industrial and post-industrial eras. Industrial society produced numerous working-class social movements that strove to improve working conditions, rights, and wages. The post-industrial period produced new social movements, such as the civil rights movement, the women's movement, and the environmental movement, distinct from traditional industrial-era social movements. (It must be noted that some scholars also draw a distinction between new social movements of the 1960s and 1970s and global social movements of the 1980s and 1990s.)

Since the 1950s, social movements have differed from traditional social movements. Whereas traditional social movements were characterized by local leadership, volunteer staff, collective actions, large membership, and resources donated from direct beneficiaries, new social movements are more professionalized with professional leadership, paid staff, invisible membership, resources donated from outside the movement, and actions that represent the movement, but do not require member participation. Successful professional social movements, such as the environmental movement, have become experts at mobilizing resources, both from inside and outside themselves, to effect desired change (Jenkins, 1983).

The traditional vs. new social movement model argues that contemporary social movements perform collective action in markedly different ways than their traditional counterparts. Their strategies, goals, and membership are distinct from traditional social movements. Some theorists and scholars believe that new social movements arise from numerous channels in society; for example, they see new social movements as expressions of civil society's desire for structural change. New social movements also arise from the growing importance of and ubiquity of information in our increasingly knowledge-based society. Additionally, new social movements can be seen as the inevitable outcome of changing social, economic, and political relationships in post-industrial society. They tend to be the desire for structural reform rather than revolution, and because they do not attempt to dismantle the existing political and economic systems, they are characterized by self-limited radicalism. New social movements are also reflective of the changing forms of political organization and the shifting relations between public and private spheres in post-industrial societies.

The traditional vs. new social movement model argues that new social movements, such as the anti-war, environmental, civil rights, and feminist movements, are distinct from other traditional social movements such as labor movements. Traditional social movements tend to be engaged in class conflict while new social movements are engaged in political and social conflict. Traditional social movements tend to focus on economic concerns and inequalities, while members of new social movements are most often from a segment of society referred to as the new middle class. New social movements also encourage members to engage in lifestyle changes, and are often based on loosely organized networks of support rather than formal

membership. Finally, new social movements often desire to see change on a global scale whereas protest groups tend to be local and devoted to single issues (Lentin, 1999).

Economic Classification

Finally, sociologists also classify social movements according to their economic resources and goals. Researchers have found that social movements may be classified as motivated either by economic factors or other variables, such as the environmental or civil rights concerns. While economics is inexorably linked to nearly all aspects of society, sociologists do distinguish between economically driven social movements and non-economically driven social movements.

Researchers argue that economically driven social movements most often arise from economic strain. For example, researchers have found that when the rate of growth in social income falls below a previously sustained high rate of growth, individuals become constrained in their actions and choices. In these conditions, individuals are more likely to participate in social movements that aim to improve their economic conditions. Depressed economic conditions are found to create a market and desire for social change. Social movements respond to individual upset and discontent by offering opportunities for economic, political, and social protest (Breton & Breton, 1969).

Social movements started by low-income people tend to be resource-poor; therefore, resource-poor social movements require and seek outside support and funding. There are two types of members belonging to social movement organizations: conscience constituents and beneficiary constituents. Conscience constituents refer to individuals or groups outside of the social movement that have a moral alliance with the social movement's cause, goal, or mission. Social movements often seek out and receive resources from conscience constituents. Because the social movement and the mass media are responsible for framing the social movement's message and character, conscience constituents tend to contribute more when these framers emphasize the beneficiaries' commonalities with the conscience constituents (Paulsen & Glumm, 1995).

Resource-mobilization theory, which is used to analyze economically driven social movements such as labor unions and gangs, holds that a social

movement arises from long-term changes in a group's organization, available resources, and opportunities for group action. The theory examines structural factors, including a group's available resources and the position of group members in socio-political networks, to analyze the character and success of social movements (Klandermans, 1984). It argues that successful social movements are created by the successful mobilization of resources and the development of political and economic opportunities for members.

Issues

The Strengths & Weaknesses of Social Movement Typologies

The typologies of social movements described in this article have distinct strengths and weaknesses. For example, Aberle's model of alternative, redemptive, reformative, and revolutionary social movements has numerous supporters and critics. Supporters of Aberle's model argue that the scale and inclusiveness of the model allow it to be used to analyze and classify almost every incarnation of social movement. Critics of Aberle's model argue that the typology describes only ideal or pure types of social movements. In reality, they say, social movements inevitably possess a combination of elements and characteristics from the four different types of social movements (Masuda, 1998). Ultimately, Aberle's model may serve as a tool for the analysis of shared or common social movements elements and characteristics.

Supporters of the traditional vs. new social movements model find that it aids in the classification of a wide range of contemporary and historical social movements. In addition, the model facilitates the comparison of new and traditional social movements. Critics of the model, however, dispute its assertion that new social movements replaced traditional social movements beginning in the mid twentieth century. Critics argue that social movements with the characteristics of new social movements existing during industrial times and traditional social movements continue to exist side-by-side with new social movements. Critics find that there is little research to support a true differentiation between new social movements and traditional social movements (Lentin, 1999).

Supporters of the classification of social movements by economic criteria argue that the ubiquity of economic concerns across social movements makes the model widely useful and applicable. Critics of the model, however, argue that it provides a limited view of the motivation of social

movement members. Critics find that the economic characteristics of social movement participants may tell an incomplete story of why individuals start and join social movements. In addition, critics note that the economic classification model does not give equal weight and importance to the material and non-material resources that social movements mobilize to achieve their goals. Material resources used by social movements include money, organizations, manpower, technology, means of communication, and mass media. Non-material resources of social movements include legitimacy, loyalty, social relationships, personal networks, personal connections, public attention, authority, and moral commitment. Critics assert that successful social movements require the mobilization of both economic and non-economic resources as well as the presence of economic and non-economic motivations and goals among members (Fuchs, 2006).

In the final analysis, typologies of social movements help researchers understand how social movements (with often seemingly distinct objectives, kinds of collective action, targets, strategies, and resources) are alike and reflect a shared history of collective action, as well as how they are distinct and reflect their own unique perspectives and situations (Almanza-Alcade, 2005).

Bibliography

- Almanza-Alcade, H. (2005). The norm implementation role of transnational social movements. Retrieved June 2, 2008 from: http://vinculando.org/comerciojusto/fair_trade/norm_implementation_tsm.html
- Benford, R. & Snow, D. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), 611-639. Retrieved June 4, 2008 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=3780387&site=ehost-live>
- Breton, A. & Breton, R. (1969). An economic theory of social movements. *American Economic Review*, 59(2), 198-206.
- Dann, G. (1979). Religion and cultural identity: The case of Umbanda. *Sociological Analysis*, 40(3), 208-225. Retrieved June 4, 2008 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=17586441&site=ehost-live>.
- Featherstone, R. & Deflem, M. (2003). Anomie and strain: Context and consequences of Merton's two theories. *Sociological Inquiry*, 73(4), 471-489. Retrieved June 5, 2008 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=11169661&site=ehost-live>.
- Fuchs, C. (2006). The self-organization of social movements. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, 19(1), 101-137.
- Jenkins, C. (1983). Resource mobilization theory and the study of social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9(1), 527-554. Retrieved June 4, 2008 from EBSCO online

database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=10458287&site=ehost-live>.

- Kastner, K. (1981). From the social question to the social state. *Economy & Society*, 10(1), 7-27. Retrieved June 4, 2008 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=10347365&site=ehost-live>.
- Klandermans, B. (1984). Mobilization and participation: Social-psychological expansions of resource mobilization theory. *American Sociological Review*, 49(5), 583-600. Retrieved June 4, 2008 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=14858682&site=ehost-live>
- Lentin, A. (1999). Structure, strategy, sustainability: What future for new social movement theory? *Sociological Research Online*, 4(3). Retrieved June 4, 2008 from: <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/4/3/contents.html>
- Morrison, D. (1971). Some notes toward theory on relative deprivation, social movements, and social change. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 14(5), 675.
- Masuda, Y. (1998). A reappraisal of typologies of new religious movements and characteristics of the Unification Church. *Journal of Unification Studies*, 2. Retrieved June 4, 2008 from: <http://www.tparents.org/library/unification/publications/Jus-2/JUS-2-5.htm>
- Paulsen, R. & Glumm, K. (1995). Resource mobilization and the importance of bridging beneficiary and conscience constituencies. *National Journal of Sociology*, 9(2), 37-62. Retrieved June 4, 2008 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=10718489&site=ehost-live>.
- Robinson, B. (2006). Christian identity movement. Ontario Consultants on Religious Tolerance. Retrieved June 4, 2008 from: http://www.religioustolerance.org/cr_ident.htm
- Wieworka, M. (2005). After new social movements. *Social Movement Studies*, 4(1), 1-19. Retrieved June 4, 2008 from EBSCO online database Academic Search Complete <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=17248956&site=ehost-live>

Suggested Reading

- Harrison, J. (1974). A knife and fork question: Some recent writing on the history of social movements. *Victorian Studies*, 18(2), 219-225. Retrieved June 4, 2008 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=6882141&site=ehost-live>
- Rose, F. (1997). Toward a class-cultural theory of social movements: Reinterpreting new social movements. *Sociological Forum*, 12(3), 461-494. Retrieved June 4, 2008 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=11302496&site=ehost-live>
- Steinberg, M. (1992). Recent social movement theory: Moving from the theoretical margins to Main Street. *Sociological Forum*, 7(3), 551-556. Retrieved June 4, 2008 from EBSCO online database Academic Search Complete: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=10797731&site=ehost-live>.

Major Social Movements

Ruth A. Wienclaw & Alexandra Howson

Overview

Social movements are a widespread form of collective behavior and feature of modern life. Collective behavior may be seen as “spontaneous and goal-oriented activity performed by a large number of people who try to develop a common solution to unclear situations” (Tesar & Doppen, 2007). As a specific form of collective action and behavior that typically operates outside established political institutions, social movements may be narrowly defined and target a specific social issue, or may be broader in scope and target fundamental issues within the society. Thus, some are small and local; others are vast and inspire global membership. The goals of social movements vary too. Some work toward policy or legal reform, while others exist to signal protest and draw attention to areas of social, cultural, economic or political life that are problematic in some way. Although social movements do not, generally, begin as formal organizations (with bureaucratic rules and regulations), they sometimes become formal organizations.

While there are many examples of people acting collectively to protest change (e.g. bread riots in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries) contemporary social movements tend to be organized efforts by a significant number of people to promote change. Such movements are associated with trade unionism, feminism, gay rights, and environmentalism and the civil

rights movement. These movements typically organize around a particular issue (such as discrimination) or are sparked by a crisis (especially economic or military). For instance, the civil rights movement was fueled by racial segregation in the Southern U.S. states and it used sit-ins, boycotts and nonviolent protests as ways of drawing attention to this persistent segregation (Seidman, 1997). Thus, social movements are intentional, relatively organized efforts on the part of individuals and groups to either bring about or resist social change within a society.

In order to answer questions about how social movements mobilize social and political action, and how practices of social change and political action might be blocked by counter-movements, researchers have classified social movements into different broad categories:

- Personal transformation movements whose goal is to bring new meaning to individual's lives by changing them for the better (referred to by some as New Social Movements);
- Social change movements that attempt to change a particular aspect of society as a whole (such as the civil rights movement); and
- Reactionary movements that have as their goal to either resist change that they see occurring within society, or to actively attempt to reinstate an earlier social order that they perceive as being superior to the current one. Some examples of major social movements today include the human rights movement, the women's movement, and the environmental movement.

Defining Social Movements

In the first part of the twentieth century, the study of collective action in sociology focused largely forms of behavior such as revolution and riots, violence, crowds, and mass hysteria. While some scholars, drawing on Durkheim's view that these forms of collective action were irrational responses to rapid social change, argued that these kinds of collective action or behaviors (typically associated with urban contexts) were threats to the established social order, others – notably Charles Tilly (1978) – argued that such action expresses the frustrations of social groups that do not have access to formal or established channels of protest. In a classic paper, Tilly

argued that there are four components of modern collective action that focuses on challenging some aspect of the established social order:

- Groups that form to protest against something (laws, ideals, practices) are typically organized; they are not haphazard or disjointed groups, though the form of organization may vary.
- Collective action mobilizes the resources (people, materials, communication channels) that are available to them in order to achieve their goals.
- Groups engaged in collective action share common interests – such as a belief in the injustice of the oppression of women, minorities or gay people.
- Collective action typically utilizes opportunity.

Social movements then, are particular kinds of collective action that may share the four components outlined by Tilly, but they are also more than the sum of these components. For Darnovsky, Epstein and Flacks (1995), social movements are:

. . . collective efforts by socially and politically subordinated people to challenge the conditions and assumptions of their lives . . . collective action becomes a ‘movement’ when participants refuse to accept the boundaries of established institutional rules and routinized roles (p.vii).

Contemporary Social Movement Theory

Resource Mobilization Theory

Resource Mobilization Theory (RM) captures two essential elements of and theoretical approaches to social movements in (post) industrial societies. First, North American approaches to social movements typically emphasize the ways that social movements mobilize available economic, political and communications resources to address and impact clearly identifiable political issues. In this view, social movements are in conflict with the state or agents of the state and mobilize resources to challenge it, to create social change and demand reform. For instance, the civil rights movement and the anti-Vietnam protest in the US might be seen as movements with clear

social and political objectives; that mobilized people and ideas to challenge the establishment view; and that were rationally organized.

New Social Movement Theory

New Social Movement (NSM) theory, developed initially in Europe, specifically addresses movements that have emerged since the 1960s and beyond, that seem to place emphasis on group or collective identity, values and lifestyles. As Canel (1997) puts it, NSM theory:

...emphasizes the cultural nature of the new movements and views them as struggles for control over the production of meaning and the constitution of new collective identities. It stresses the expressive aspects of SMs and places them exclusively in the terrain of civil society, as opposed to the state (par. 3).

As Seidman (1994) observes, NSM emerged in part from as responses to changes in the economic and political structure in Europe and North America after the Second World War. Social protest in both Europe and the U.S. was predominantly organized around race, gender and sexuality, spawning protest movements in support of civil rights, women's rights and gay rights; that not only challenged prevailing norms, but also sought to produce new knowledge and ways of living. Thus, while the NSM perspective acknowledges social movements as forms of collective action that are engaged in political and social protest, it also emphasizes that such movements are engaged in struggles over meaning and the means of cultural production.

Collective Identity

One of the things that distinguishes new social movements from other forms of collective action (such as trade unionism) is the sense of collective identity, or group self-image that emerges and is, indeed, cultivated and negotiated by a movement's members in an ongoing process (Melluci, 1995). Collective identity might be marked or symbolized by shared styles, behaviors or language (e.g. the long hair associated with 'hippies'); symbols (e.g. the Aztec eagle of the farmworkers flag); or a movement-identified form of artistic expression (black freedom songs, Chicano murals).

Social movements in general seek social change, although they do not necessarily go about it in the same manner. Such movements may be norm-

focused, value-focused, or both. For example, the civil rights movement of the early 1950s simultaneously worked to change the attitudes of people toward segregation as well as working to get laws implemented that supported integration. In general, social change movements may be either reform or radical in nature. Reform movements attempt to change society through legal or mainstream political means, and typically work within established institutions. Radical movements, on the other hand, try not only to reform society, but to seek even more fundamental change. For instance, the women's movement and the gay rights movement both, in their own ways, sought to challenge prevailing ideas and attitudes about gender roles and sexuality. Social movements not only raise awareness of specific issues but also challenge authority and those in power to enact legislation and regulations in order to enforce social change. For instance, the protests involving veterans of the Vietnam War in the 1960s and 1970s resulted in the passing of the Rehabilitation Act of 1974, while disability rights activism resulted in the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

Finally, reactionary social movements have the goal to either resist change that they see occurring within society or actively attempt to reinstate an earlier social order that they perceive as being superior to the current one. Examples of such reactionary movements include the Aryan Nation (a white supremacy coalition that seeks to suppress Jews and minorities), the right to life movement (a movement that seeks to overturn legalized abortion and recriminalize it), and the militia movement consists of individuals and groups who seek to risk this government authority and return power to the people.

Applications

The Women's Movement

The second wave women's rights movement in Europe and the United States (also known as the Women's Liberation Movement or the Feminist Movement) was concerned with issues of women's rights, gender inequality, and gender stratification (Whittier, 2002). While feminist movements existed prior to the second wave women's movement in the 1960s, these were focused on dismantling specific legacies and policies that prohibited women from participating in public, economic and political life.

Other social movements, such as the civil rights movement, student activism and the anti-war movement, influenced the resurgence of feminism in the twentieth century women's movement. Although the women's movement focused on policy and legal change (in relation to sexual discrimination in the workplace, inequalities in pay, barriers to particular occupations or holding public and political office), it was also organized around self and collective identity (or, as Betty Friedan observed, 'the problem with no name').

The women's movement continues to challenges social injustices across the globe that affect women. For instance, both in developing and advanced societies, women often are more likely than men to live in poverty and women tend to be more likely to be unpaid for their labors than men, not only within the home, but also as unpaid family agricultural workers. This leaves many women in a situation in which they have less access to social protection or job security. Yet, women are slowly becoming more able to participate in paid, non-agricultural employment around the globe, particularly in areas such as southern and western Asia and Oceania where, historically, women have had the lowest levels of participation in the labor market.

The Human Rights Movement

The human rights movement is an international movement that promotes the cause of human rights throughout the globe. According to Article 1 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations, 1948):

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

Although from a middle-class, postindustrial perspective it is difficult to imagine a situation in which individuals are not treated equally or with dignity, this is not a universal situation. For example, it has been estimated (Shifman, 2003) that there are thousands of sweatshops in Asian and Latin America that exploit labor by forcing employees to work 16-hour days and paying minimal wages. Moreover, torture and human trafficking still occurs in many places of the world and has been helped by the current

trend toward globalization and the use of technology: women and girls can now, for example, be obtained in one country and sexually exploited in another or even be sold over the Internet (Shifman, 2003). One of the goals of the human rights movement is to eradicate these trends and conditions through organized communication and protest efforts. However, the increasing reliance of organizations such as Amnesty International or Human Rights Watch on supranational organizations (specially the United Nations) to take the lead on human rights issues (Habibi, 2007) may have the consequence of diverting resources from where they can do the most good, to where they will receive the most political capital. The politicization of a social movement in this way not only reduces the effectiveness of the movement, but may also damage its credibility.

Conclusion

New Social Movements in the New Millenium

Movements organized around what Habermas (1987) has termed the colonization of the lifeworld, such as environmental justice, the politics of food, and environmental health and disease, are especially focused on responding to what its members view as evidence of risk. To this end, social movements increasingly rely on and make use of the print, broadcast and electronic media to communicate their messages, generate empathy and mobilize support. As Susser (2006) notes:

In moments of major transformation, people may find that new forms of action are more productive than the ones they are used to, or that older forms make sense in a different way, or that ideals they could only aspire to before are now realizable. Such moments lead to reconfiguring one's world; the process can be individual or collective (p. 212).

Indeed, social movements have been transformed by new media and the capacity of the Internet to "foster new affiliations and stage events" (Kahn & Kellner, 2004, p. 84) in protest against capitalism, such as the Battle for Seattle protest against the World Trade Organization meeting in Seattle in 1999 (Wood, 2008). As Edmunds and Turner (2005) observe, these new communication technologies and mechanisms provide new reasons for protest and engender global consciousness as global inequalities and injus-

tices are made more visible, and new means of protest through opportunities for counter-propaganda and co-ordination (p.568). Accordingly, social justice and grassroots movements, such as the environmental movement, which addresses the capitalist-industrial system's impact on the environment (Lueck, 2007) are using new media to stimulate, inform and support a global citizenry.

Bibliography

- Canel, E. (1997). New social movement theory and resource mobilization theory: The need for integration. In, M. Kaufman & H. D. Alfonso, Community power and grassroots democracy: The transformation of social life. University of California: Zed books. Retrieved January 28, 2009 from International Development Research Centre. http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-54446-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html.
- Darnovsky, M., Epstein, B. & Flacks, R. (eds). (1995). Introduction. Cultural politics and social movements. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1987). A theory of communicative action, Volume 2. Boston: Beacon.
- Habibi, D. A. (2007). Human rights and politicized human rights: A utilitarian critique. *Journal of Human Rights*, 6 (1), 3-35. Retrieved October 7, 2008 from EBSCO online database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=24175912&site=ehost-live>
- Kahn, R. & Kellner, D. (2004). New media and Internet activism: From the 'Battle of Seattle' to blogging. *New Media & Society*, 6(1):87-95. Retrieved December 5, 2008 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=12464105&site=ehost-live>
- Lueck, M.A.M. (2007). Hope for a cause as cause for hope: The need for hope in environmental sociology. *American Sociologist*, 38(3), 250-261. Retrieved January 28, 2009 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=27525890&site=ehost-live>
- Melucci, A. (1995). The process of collective identity. In H. Johnston and B. Klandermans, eds. *Social movements and culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Seidman, S. (1994). *Contested knowledges: Social theory in the postmodern era*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Shifman, P. (2003). Trafficking and women's human rights in a globalised world. *Gender and Development*, 11 (1), 125-132. Retrieved 30th January, 2009 from EBSCO online database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=10491895&site=ehost-live>.
- Susser, I. (2006). Global visions and grassroots movements: An anthropological perspective. *International Journal of Urban & Regional Research*, 30(1), 212-218. Retrieved September 23, 2008 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=20588417&site=ehost-live>

- Tesar, J. E. & Doppen, F. H. (2006). Propaganda and collective behavior. *Social Studies*, 9 (6), 257-261. Retrieved 5th August, 2008 from EBSCO online database Academic Search Premier. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=24329679&site=ehost-live>
- Tilly, C. (1978). *From mobilization to revolution*. London: Longman.
- United Nations. (1948). Article 1. Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Available at <http://un.org/Overview/rights.html>. Accessed 30th January, 2009.
- Whittier, N. (2002). Persistence and transformation: Gloria Steinem, the Women's Action Alliance, and the feminist movement, 1971-1997. *Journal of Women's History*, 14 (2), 148-150. Retrieved October 7, 2008 from EBSCO online database Gender Studies Database: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=fmh&AN=FMH3299065537&site=ehost-live>.

Suggested Reading

- Agnone, J. (2007). Amplifying public opinion: The policy impact of the U.S. environmental movement. *Social Forces*, 85 (4), 1594-1620. Retrieved October 7, 2008 from EBSCO online database International Bibliography of the Social Sciences: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ioh&AN=3431464&site=ehost-live>.
- Carmin, J. & Balsler, D. B. (2005). Mobilization routines in environmental movement organizations: Matching solutions to problems. Conference Papers, American Sociological Association 2005 Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, 1-27. Retrieved October 7, 2008 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=18615450&site=ehost-live>.
- Hess, D. J. (2004, Dec). Health, the environment and social movements. *Science as Culture*, 13 (4), 421-427. Retrieved October 7, 2008 from EBSCO online database International Bibliography of the Social Sciences: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ioh&AN=2898689&site=ehost-live>.
- Johnson, E. (2006). Changing issue representation among major United States environmental movement organizations. *Rural Sociology*, 71 (1), 132-154. Retrieved October 7, 2008 from EBSCO online database International Bibliography of the Social Sciences: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ioh&AN=3329649&site=ehost-live>

The Gay Rights Movement

Carolyn Sprague

Overview

“Today, American society is witnessing a social movement for another cause: gay rights. Those in favor of this movement refer to it as a revolution, as the next great step to genuine equality. Those opposed to the movement refer to it as the homosexual agenda or the decline of American morality” (Hudson, 2005).

The social movement led by and on behalf of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender (GLBT) people is both dynamic and active. This essay will discuss several current issues that are currently debated within and between the gay rights movement and its opponents, including the impact of AIDS on the gay community, same-sex marriage, and equal access to protection as employees in the workforce. The growth of the gay rights movement will be discussed, hereafter, along with some of the significant milestones that precipitated the rise of the movement.

The Rise of Gay Culture

Late in the nineteenth century, urban centers in the US began to grow as rural populations migrated to cities for work opportunities. Gays and lesbians were among the many who left their family networks and farm lives for the rapidly expanding cities. Within these cities, gay men and women found that, for the first time, they could remain anonymous while

forming social networks with other gays. As early as the 1920s and 1930s, an urban gay subculture began to emerge, though it remained largely hidden because of social hostility and shame.

World War II initiated a cultural shift for many gays and lesbians. A large number left their families to serve in the sex-segregated military, or to join the ranks of workers flooding the cities in search of wartime employment. Though homosexuality was not condoned in the military and some homosexuals were dishonorably discharged, many gays and lesbians who served in the military went undetected or were simply ignored. As a result, they were able to make life-long friendships (Bullough, 2002).

After the war, many of these gay former servicemen and women – who had, for the first time, met other gays through the service – decided to remain in metro areas like San Francisco and New York. Cities were welcoming to the rising gay culture and lifestyle, and social networks expanded along with a widening gay subculture that was quite active throughout the 1940s (“Milestones in the Gay Rights Movement,” 1991).

Though gay subculture thrived in many large cities, gays and lesbians still faced discrimination and prejudice. As Bullogh (2002) explained, “they were victims of what others said about them,” and what was said only served to perpetuate stereotypes and fear. Homosexuality was denounced by:

- The medical profession as pathological,
- Religious groups as immoral and sinful,
- The courts and law as criminal, and
- Mainstream society as perverse (Bullough, 2002).

During the 1950s, gays were routinely fired from government jobs, and many were forced to leave the military. In 1953, President Dwight D Eisenhower issued an executive order banning gay men and lesbians from all federal jobs. State and local governments and some private corporations followed suit, and the FBI began surveillance of known and suspected homosexuals. Federal policy in turn influenced local law enforcement and police began regularly raiding gay bars and arresting their patrons. Entrapment was common. Those arrested simply hoped that they would be fined and that their arrests would escape public notice (Bullough, 2002). Eventu-

ally, fed up with the harassment and growing intolerance, some gays and lesbians began to organize politically. At first the groups were small in size and political influence, but growing numbers of gays began to take a stand for their rights (“Milestones in the Gay Rights Movement,” 1991).

One of the first gay organizations was the Mattachine Society, which was founded in Los Angeles in 1948 by Henry Hay and Chuck Rowland. Initially secret, the group eventually went public, marking the start of “gay activism” (Bullough, 2002). A parallel lesbian organization, the Daughters of Billitis, was founded in San Francisco around the same time, and it later merged with the Mattachine Society.

The formation of small, but public, gay political groups represented the first steps of gays and lesbians to create a grass roots civil rights movement of their own. By the 1960s, many gay men and lesbians were becoming more willing to act out against the discrimination that they were experiencing. The social changes happening in 1960s, in particular the civil rights movement, inspired them to begin demanding change through what was initially called the homophile movement (“Milestones in the Gay Rights Movement,” 1991). This movement gave gays and lesbians much more visibility as a social group.

The numbers of gay who were willing to openly protest discrimination remained quite small through the 1960s: the numbers were probably only in the thousands (“Milestones in the Gay Rights Movement,” 1991). Though the civil rights and women’s movements had made major gains with the Civil Rights Act and other anti-discrimination legislation, the gay rights movement didn’t have the history of activism or the documented discrimination that these other movements had (Bullough, 2002).

It wasn’t until 1969 that a watershed event in New York City sparked an enormous grassroots movement.. During the 1960s, police raids on New York City gay bars were the norm; in general they resulted in general harassment and the patrons’ arrests. However, when police staged a raid on the Stonewall Inn in Greenwich Village on the night of June 27, 1969, the patrons fought back, sparking a riot that lasted for three nights. The Stonewall Riots came to represent the first real public backlash against police harassment, and a movement was born as gays and lesbians began to chal-

lenge all forms of hostility toward them (“Milestones in the Gay Rights Movement,” 1991). The movement coined the phrase “coming out of the closet” to describe a person’s decision to be openly gay. Major legislation was passed throughout the 1970s to decriminalize homosexual behavior, curtail police harassment, and include sexual orientation as a protected status within existing civil rights laws. Nearly two decades after the Stonewall Riots, a 1987 march in Washington drew 600,000 people (“Milestones in the Gay Rights Movement,” 1991).

However, gays and lesbians found that, despite their new visibility and legislative gains, they were not widely accepted within mainstream society. Within a decade of Stonewall, an unlikely and seemingly benign opponent would emerge. In 1977 Anita Bryant – a singer from Dade County, Florida – initiated a successful effort to repeal a gay rights ordinance in her county. Her activism, which was supported by conservative Christian leaders like Jerry Falwell, inspired other religious and social conservatives to organize against the gay rights movement (“Milestones in the Gay Rights Movement,” 1991). In the 1980s, a more organized coalition of conservatives took up the issue of what they termed “the gay agenda.” Today, many conservatives view LGBT activism as a threat to the moral and cultural fabric of American society.

Applications

AIDS & Its Impact on Gay Men & the Gay Community

During the 1970s, many gay men strongly identified themselves with the right to freely express their sexuality. Though a number admitted that their sexual behavior might be risky, they also believed that sexual freedom was their well-earned right. When the AIDS crisis developed during the 1980s, it was frequently perceived as a major threat to this freedom (DeNoon, 2007).

The Emergence of AIDS

In 1981, the Center for Disease Control (CDC) reported that five young gay men in Los Angeles had a rare form of pneumonia. Soon after, 26 men in New York City and San Francisco were diagnosed with Kaposi’s sarcoma (KS), a rare form of cancer. These diagnoses marked the beginning of the AIDS epidemic. Early on, there was a striking correlation between the disease and the victims’ sexual orientation. At first the disease was called

gay-related immune deficiency (GRID), but it was quickly realized that gays were not the only ones affected (Bateman, 2004).

At the beginning of the AIDS epidemic, little reliable information was available about how the virus (HIV) was actually transmitted. The dearth of accurate information about HIV and AIDS contributed to a general culture of fear within the gay community and the general public. The gay press took up the cause of calling for research, education, and moderation. At the same time, the disease's association with the gay community fueled anti-gay sentiment. To much of the public, the majority of the victims, like gay men and drug users, were dangers to society who could spread the disease to other, "guiltless" people like hemophiliacs or children born to infected mothers. Some public health officials even began to call for mandatory testing and quarantines (Bateman, 2004). In the minds of some, however, the American government's and public's indifference or outright hostility toward the disease and its victims perpetuated or even increased the rate of infection.

Gay Activism & the AIDS Epidemic

The AIDS epidemic increased anti-gay rhetoric, but it also spurred the gay community to take action on its own behalf. Faced with such a life-or-death crisis, political mobilization took on new importance to the gay community ("Milestones in the Gay Rights Movement", 1991). Because AIDS had had such a devastating impact on the community in the US and because AIDS research was so underfunded, gay men took it upon themselves to call for a political solution. The "social tragedy" caused by AIDS paradoxically strengthened the political arm of the gay movement ("Milestones in the Gay Rights Movement," 1991).

The Gay Press

Because of the strong association between AIDS and the gay community, the gay press spoke out passionately on the crisis. The press, which helped to raise awareness of the disease, also created a divide within the gay community. Some journalists were vehemently protective of the accomplishments of gay liberation and resented the demonization of the "gay male sex culture," which was widely associated with recreational drug use, multiple partners, and STDs (Bateman, 2004). More conservative voices in the gay press cautioned against the sexual and social excesses of the 1970s.

They “declared war on promiscuity and cautioned gay men to take responsibility for their sexual lives” (Bateman, 2004).

In the end, the lack of information also prompted gay men to demand more research and take responsibility for educating themselves. “Self-reliance” became the watchword as gay men realized that they had to become their own experts.

AIDS Service Organizations (ASO)

The legacy of the gay liberation movement served gay men well during the early years of the AIDS crisis. A number of grass roots networks established during the 1970s helped activists quickly mobilize in the face of the new threat. In 1982 the first AIDS service organizations (ASOs) were established to serve as support networks for gay men (Bateman, 2004). Two of the earliest ASOs were The Gay Men’s Health Crisis (GHMC) in New York and the Karposi’s Sarcoma Research and Education Foundation in San Francisco. These two ASOs offered medical and social support, educated gay men who were at risk of contracting HIV, and also advocated for AIDS patients’ rights.

Not all gay men supported the ASO mission. Some believed the ASOs were pandering to the mainstream establishment and moving away from the principals of gay liberation. In 1987 the AIDS Coalition to Unleash Power (ACT UP) was formed to counter the “political complacency” of the GMHC (Bateman, 2004). Besides calling for more accessible and effective treatment options, ACT UP’s high pressure tactics were meant to challenge bigotry and promote safe sex as a prevention method. Early on, many gay men were unconvinced that people’s sexual practices contributed to their chances of infection. Many gay men simply refused to “give in” to the safe sex rhetoric, and it took years to persuade some gay men that safe sex could save their lives. In 1983 two prominent gay authors, Michael Berkowitz and Michael Callen, published a book called *How to Have Sex in an Epidemic* which helped encourage and standardize safe sex practices within the gay community (Bateman, 2004).

Lesbian AIDS Activism

Lesbians, too, played an active role in the fight against AIDS by supporting their gay male friends who were suffering from the disease. And since

a large number of lesbians were also active feminists, they did much to mainstream the conversation about AIDS treatment. By tying the epidemic and its defeat to national health care and universal sex education, they were responsible for pushing the discussion on AIDS toward a broader social change agenda. And while lesbians were generally not considered to be at high risk for contracting AIDS, activists still argued that lesbians also participated in high risk behaviors and needed to actively educate themselves (Bateman, 2004).

The Waning of AIDS Activism

By the 1990s, the development of effective AIDS treatments brought hope to those afflicted with the disease. And as celebrities like Magic Johnson revealed that they had the disease, the stigma associated with it lessened.. AIDS is now a mainstream disease, and there is “less urgency” about its effects. It has moved being from an acute illness to a being chronic one.

Issues

Same Sex Marriage & Civil Unions

Same-sex marriage is one of the topics on the minds of many gays and lesbians today. “It was not until the 1990s, when the American courts came to recognize that denying lesbians and gay citizens the right to marry violated the principle of legal equality, that the issue become a central focus for the lesbian / gay rights movement” (Snyder, 2006).

There are four distinct aspects of marriage, according to author Claire Snyder:

- A personal bond between the partners,
- A community-recognized relationship,
- A religious rite, and
- A civil contract (2006).

Different cultures assign different meanings to marriage. In some cultures, all four of these components may be part of a marriage contract. In other countries and cultures, marriage may only involve only a few of the four aspects. For example, in countries that practice arranged marriage a personal bond between the partners may not exist. Likewise, in some

countries many couples chose to forego a religious ceremony, though this absence doesn't negate the legality of their marriage.

For many gays and lesbians who wish to marry, the civil contract aspect is at issue (Snyder, 2006). It is through a government recognized civil marriage that the social benefits of marriage are shared between partners. Benefits afforded to married individuals can include: access to partner's health insurance; tax benefits; retirement benefits; the right to make medical decisions for the partner; bereavement leave; custody and child visitation rights; and social security survivorship (Hudson, 2005).

As Snyder (2006) explained, "Many gay and lesbian people have committed personal relationships and within their communities may be widely recognized as couples; some religious denominations recognize and sanction same sex relationships. Where same sex couples lose out is with the benefits afforded to married individuals."

Conservative Views of Gay Marriage

The argument against gay marriage is made most vocally by social and religious conservatives. These conservatives argue that legalizing same-sex marriage would alter the definition of marriage and undermine the family. Most major religions prohibit homosexuality, and religious conservatives additionally argue that marriage, defined "as a sacred union ordained by god," necessarily precludes same-sex unions (Snyder, 2006). Both of these groups wish to define marriage as a union that can exist only between a man and a woman (Public Agenda, n.d.).

Opposing Views of Same-Sex Marriage within the Gay Community

However, it is not just social and religious conservatives who oppose same-sex marriage. Gay activist Michael Warner has been vocal in his opposition to gay marriage, which he sees as potentially "marginalizing" for gays who embrace a non-traditional lifestyle. He opposes the "correlative tendency" to valorize gay men and women who want to live more or less like straight people (Snyder, 2006). In his opinion, same-sex marriage will further marginalize non-conforming gays and lesbians who have non-monogamous relationships and do not wish to marry. Warner worries that "mainstreaming" gays and lesbians into American society might destroy the distinctive gay culture.

As long as Americans want the government to provide married couples with benefits, the choice to marry is not completely unconstrained. At least in part, people marry to protect themselves, their children, and their assets. Many committed gay couples want to have access to the same civil benefits afforded to heterosexuals who choose to marry. In several states, the legal recognition of civil unions has afforded gay couples the civil rights of marriage.

The issue of gay marriage is a divisive one, even within the gay community. The gay community still grapples with its social identity. Some gays welcome the opportunity to become integrated into “mainstream” cultural ideals. Others are fearful that “gay identity” and “gay culture” will be assimilated into the larger “homogeneous” culture.

The gay rights movement is very active today in its struggle for equality and the civil rights afforded to other minority groups. The movement is taking place within the gay community and across society as a whole as GLBT people work to secure equal and fair protection under the law while also negotiating with their unique identities.

Bibliography

- Bateman, J. (2004). “AIDS activism.” Retrieved April 27, 2008, from http://www.glbtc.com/social-sciences/aids_activism,3.html
- Bullough, V (2002) Before Stonewall: Activists for gay and lesbian rights in historical contexts. Harrington Park Press: New York.
- DeNoon, D. (2007) Men’s HIV/AIDS epidemic: It’s back. Retrieved April 28, 2008, from <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/11/29/health/webmd/main3553044.shtml>
- Eleved, K. (2007, November 20). Republican matters. Advocate. Retrieved April 24, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Complete. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=27759032&site=ehost-live>
- Hudson, D. (2005) Gay rights (point/counterpoint). Chelsea House Publishers: Philadelphia.
- “Milestones in the Gay Rights Movement.” (1991). In J. A. Garraty and E. Foner (Eds.), The Reader’s Companion to American History. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. Retrieved April 23, 2008, from <http://www.infoplease.com/ipa/A0194028.html>
- Public Agenda. (n.d.). “Gay rights: Overview.” Retrieved May 9, 2008, from http://www.publicagenda.org/Issues/overview.cfm?issue_type=gay_rights

- Rauch, J. (2008). The right kind of gun rights. *National Journal*, 40(11), 10-10. Retrieved April 24, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Complete. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=31489147&site=ehost-live>
- Snyder, R. (2006). *Gay marriage and democracy*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Suggested Reading

- Denike, M. (2007). Religion, rights, and relationships: The dream of relational equality. *Hypatia*, 22(1), 71-91. Retrieved April 24, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Gender Studies Database. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=fmh&AN=FMH2938122860&site=ehost-live>
- Lieber, L. (2007). Gender identity and expression in the workplace. *Employment Relations Today* (Wiley), 33(4), 91-96. Retrieved April 24, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Gender Studies Database. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=fmh&AN=23815633&site=ehost-live>

The Women's Rights Movement

Carolyn Sprague

Overview

Women's Rights

Like any almost every other modern social movement, the women's rights movement comprises diverse ideals. Feminist and American responses to the movement have generally fallen along three lines:

- Staunch opposition to change
- Support of moderate and gradual change
- Demand for immediate radical change (Leone, 1996)

The women's rights movement rose during the nineteenth century in Europe and America in response to great inequalities between the legal statuses of women and men. During this time, advocates fought for suffrage, the right to own property, equal wages, and educational opportunities (Lorber, 2005)

In the United States, suffrage proved to be one of the driving issues behind the movement. However, when the movement first began many moderate feminists saw the fight for voting rights as radical and feared that it would work against their efforts to reach less controversial goals like property ownership, employment, equal wages, higher education, and access to birth control. The divide between moderate and radical feminists started

early in America's history and continues to be present in the women's movement today (Leone, 1996).

Suffrage

First proposed as a federal amendment in 1868, women's suffrage floundered for many years before the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment gave women the right to vote in 1920. It was 1917 when the National Woman's Party (NWP) met with President Woodrow Wilson and asked him to support women's suffrage. When the women were dismissed by Wilson, members of the party began a picket at the White House. Their protest lasted 18 months. Harriot Stanton Blatch, the daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Alice Paul were amongst the first organizers of the picket. However, the picket was not supported by the older and more conservative women's rights group the National American Women's Suffrage Association (NAWSA). Its members saw the picket as somewhat "militant," and sought to win suffrage state by state rather than through a federal amendment (Leone, 1996)

America's involvement in World War I during the spring of 1917 impacted the women's suffrage movement in a number of ways. The NWP refused to support the war effort while NAWSA saw support of the war as an act of patriotism and a way to further women's rights issues. The differences between the two groups led to hostility that continued until August of 1919 when the Nineteenth Amendment was passed. Both the NWP and NAWSA claimed responsibility for the passage of the amendment. Historians disagree about which party was most influential. Many credit the combination of militant and moderate strategies that were employed by each group (Leone, 1996).

After the women's suffrage movement, some men and women considered the fight for women's rights to be over. Many of the organizations that had been so active in promoting suffrage disbanded after the Nineteenth Amendment was ratified. Though some women's suffrage groups did continue as organizations - namely, The League of Women Voters - the feminist movement sputtered without a unifying cause (Leone, 1996). The Great Depression of the 1930s further hurt the women's movement: most women simply did not have the time or energy to dedicate to feminist

causes. With America's entry into World War II, many women entered the workforce for the first time. However this entry was accompanied by the assumption that women would exit the workforce once American men returned from service. Postwar America saw a steep decline in participation in the women's rights movement. The numbers of women attending college dropped during the 1950s as women married earlier and had more children.

Applications

The women's rights movement re-formed during the 1960s as the women's liberation movement (Lorber, 2005). The period would mark the "revitalization of feminism" (Leone, 1996).

According to Judith Lorber, twentieth century feminism is more fragmented than nineteenth century feminism, perhaps as a result of deeper understandings of the sources of gender inequality (Lorber, 2005). There are still many issues that challenge women's economic and political status in the world, and women of all kinds are fighting many battles on many fronts.

Challenges to gender equality occur in many ways. Some of the most commonly recognized issues are:

- Education: Men tend to have higher educational attainments, though in the US and Western world this gap is rapidly closing
- Wages and Employment: Men occupying the same jobs as women tend to be paid more, promoted more frequently, and receive more recognition for their accomplishments.
- Healthcare: In some countries men have more access to and receive better healthcare than women.
- Violence and Exploitation: Women are subjected to violence and exploitation at greater rates than men.
- Social Inequality: Women still perform the majority of domestic duties like housework and childcare. (Lorber, 2005)

Issues

Educational Attainment

Women's unimpeded access to educational opportunities is strongly supported by feminists. The gap in educational attainment is shrinking rapidly in the industrialized world, and today the gap in the US is quite small. However, lack of education still hurts women in fundamental ways, the most obvious being economic. This essay will discuss in more detail the gender wage gap that exists in the US. While education does increase a women's earning potential, research suggests that a definite and pervasive gender wage gap exists at every level of the workforce.

Gender Pay Gap

A "gendered division of labor" exists across the globe. A 1980 United Nations report stated that women do two thirds of the world's work, garner 10% of wages world wide, and own 1% of the world's property (Lorber, 2005). The workplaces of industrialized nations demonstrate a curious paradox. While research shows that companies which encourage diversity and promote women to leadership roles have higher levels of financial performance than companies with less diversity, women's earnings are still significantly less than men's (Compton, 2007).

Great Britain, like the US, has grappled with the existence of the gender pay gap for many years. The US passed the Equal Pay Act in 1963 and Great Britain instituted its own Equal Pay Act in 1970. Both of these acts, "offered women a legitimate avenue to seek remuneration for unequal pay" (Compton, 2007, ¶20). In 1970 the pay differential in Great Britain between men and women's wages was 30%. Four decades later the gender pay gap hovers around 17%, and is the highest of all EU countries (De Vita, 2008). Some project that, at the present rate, the disparity in wages won't be eliminated for another 20 years (De Vita, 2008). The question remains, if women are legally guaranteed equal pay, and if promoting women is generally recognized as good for business, why do women still earn less than men? The causes of the gender wage gap are various and complex.

The fact that many women choose to leave their jobs in order to have children is often identified as one reason for the wage gap. Proponents of this theory argue that, statistically, women earn less than men because

some women do not hold paying, full-time jobs, thus dragging down women's average wages. However, most studies of the wage gap only count the earnings of women who work full-time. These studies reveal that of the women who do work full-time, those with children under the age of 18 earn 97.1% of what women who do not have children earn. On the other hand, men who have children under the age of 18 earn 122% of what men without children earn (Compton, 2007). These statistics show that women's incomes are negatively affected by parenthood while men's incomes appear to actually benefit from it.

De Vita (2008) offers a few other explanations for the gap:

- Social norms,
- Workplace biases,
- The low expectations women may have of themselves, and
- The competing demands that work and family responsibilities place on women

"Occupational segmentation," or the gendered division of different industries and types of work, is one pervasive societal norm. Women are more likely to enter "caring, catering, and public sector" jobs, according to De Vita (2008), where wages are generally low. Men, on the other hand, are more likely to pursue jobs in high-paying industries like energy and engineering (p. 62). Additionally, men are more likely to hold managerial positions while women more frequently occupy administrative positions. One reason for this segregation may be that women are socially conditioned to gravitate towards these jobs, and lack role models for careers and jobs that are generally male dominated (De Vita, 2008). However, other research shows that in the UK men still earn higher salaries than women even when they occupy similar positions in similar industries (De Vita, 2008). Thus, it would appear that the gender wage gap is pervasive across industries.

Furthermore, according to De Vita (2008), the pay gap starts before a woman even accepts her first job. In one study of American postgraduate students, during negotiations for their first jobs, 57% of men asked for higher salaries, while only 7% of women did. As a result, on average the men's starting salaries were 7.6% higher than the women's (De Vita, 2008). Because a person's starting salary is the figure on which all of his or her future salary negotiations are based, it can have an enormous

impact on his or her lifetime earnings. As De Vita (2008) demonstrates, a difference of \$5,000 can result in a \$300,000 difference in lifetime earnings.

How men and women approach salary negotiations may, again, be attributable to social norms and social conditioning. Men may be more confident in negotiations, and their behavior may be viewed in a positive way. Women, on the other hand, may be seen as aggressive or pushy if they try to negotiate, and their behavior may be viewed negatively (De Vita, 2008).

Additionally, women in business often don't have the same access to informal networks and decision makers that men have. Women aren't mentored as often as their male counterparts, and their access to high profile assignments is limited as well ("A Worldwide Gender Pay Gap", 2008). Globalization of the world's markets and economies has narrowed the gender pay gap, but closer examination reveals that instead of women's wages going up, men's wages are falling ("A Worldwide Gender Pay Gap," 2008).

Equal education is not proving to be as effective in leveling playing field for women wage earners as was once thought. For many years, educational deficits had been blamed for holding women's wages back over time and contributing to the wage gap. However, studies now suggest that wage gaps continue to exist regardless of a woman's educational attainment. A disturbing trend in both the UK and the US is the growing gap between men and women at the senior management level. Estimates put the gap at 27% (De Vita, 2008), and research shows that it extends through upper management levels all way to boards of directors. While it was once assumed that higher educational attainments increased earnings, in reality, as Table 1 shows, the more educated a woman is, the larger the gap between her lifetime earnings and those of her male peers (Compton, 2007).

Table 1: Life Time Earnings Gap & Level of Education

Level of education	Gender Wage Gap
High School	Men will earn \$700,000 more over lifetime.
College	Men will earn \$1.2 million over a lifetime
Graduate or Professional	Men will earn \$2 million over a lifetime.

(Murphy & Graff, 2005)

Women today are narrowing the gap in educational attainment which has long been one of the goals of the women's movement. But looking at the issue of the wage gap, one might wonder how exactly education is benefiting women. According to former lieutenant governor of Massachusetts Evelyn Murphy and Brandeis University's resident scholar E J Graff, "Unfair pay means all women lose. All women – rich and poor, whatever their race or color or native language – are being cheated by wage inequity" (2005, p. 3).

Reproductive Rights

Reproductive responsibilities and rights have been ongoing concerns for centuries. Throughout history, women and men have actively sought to make conscientious decisions about family planning. Today, education, contraceptives, and family planning information are among the greatest assets available to women seeking to control their reproductive systems. In the US, where safe and effective contraceptives are widely available, access to contraceptives is no longer the divisive topic it once was. Instead, the truly polarizing reproductive rights issue is abortion.

According to the New York based Center for Reproductive Rights, over 60% of the world's population now lives in countries where at least some type of abortion is generally allowed ("A Question of Life or Death," 2007.) Estimates put the number of abortions at 49 million per year, which means that 1 in 4 pregnancies are terminated by abortion ("A Question of Life or Death," 2007). The World Health Organization gauges that of the estimated 20 million illegal abortions performed every year, some 70,000 result in the woman's death ("A Question of Life or Death," 2007). It is difficult to calculate the numbers women who suffer serious consequences from self administered, or "botched" abortions, but the number is likely significant.

Though abortions had been available and tolerated in the US throughout the nineteenth century, by the turn of the twentieth century they were illegal in all 50 US states ("The History of Women's Reproductive Rights," 2005). It wasn't until the 1973, when the Supreme Court ruled that states could not ban first trimester abortions, that women were again able seek out legal abortion options. The landmark decision, *Roe v Wade* (1973) is still in force today. Shortly after the ruling, federal funds were authorized through

Medicare to help low-income women to pay for abortions. Almost as soon as the legislation passed, opposition arose (Kissling, & Michelman, 2008).

Feminists and others who support women's reproductive rights have been working ever since Roe to protect the gains they won through the ruling. While many countries are making access to abortion easier, in America similar efforts have faced considerable opposition. Polls show that most Americans are ambivalent about abortion: while most support keeping abortion legal, many also support keeping some restrictions in place ("A Question of Life or Death," 2007).

Recent Legislation

The Partial Birth Abortion Act of 2003 was seen as a victory to many opponents of abortion, or pro-life advocates. The law prohibits the procedure commonly known as partial-birth abortion which is generally performed during the second trimester of pregnancy. During this type of abortion, labor is induced and the fetus is partially delivered, with its head remaining inside the uterus.

The base of the fetal skull is then punctured, and the skull's contents are suctioned out, resulting in the skull's collapse. The fetus is then entirely removed from the woman's body. It is a highly controversial type of abortion that has been variously portrayed as

- A "rarely" employed procedure that is used to abort a fetus that is likely suffer severe developmental issues if brought to term, and do so in such a way as to pose the least danger to the woman undergoing the procedure (Frantz, 2007); and,
- "A gruesome and inhumane procedure that is never medically necessary and should be prohibited" ("The Partial Birth Abortion Act of 2003," 2004, ¶3)

Three years after it passed, the Supreme Court ruling *Gonzales v Carhart* (2007) upheld the act. To both pro-life and pro-choice advocates the ruling may be seen as a precursor to further restrictions on abortion rights ("A Question of Life or Death," 2007).

Feminist View – Reproductive Rights

Feminists who support abortion rights now see the need to imbed the abortion debate into the larger issue of reproductive rights. Their arguments include a more holistic approach which places importance on reducing the need for abortion by supporting sex education, access to contraceptives, and other educational initiatives. It is hoped that the women's movement's emphasis on prevention will help to win over middle ground by proposing solutions that will reduce unwanted pregnancies ("A Question of Life or Death," 2007).

Other feminist voices call for moving toward a more "European" model of women's reproductive health care that would support a wide range of services which would be covered under health insurance plans. They argue that women ought to have access to

- inexpensive contraceptives
- comprehensive prenatal care
- excellent birthing services
- paid medical leave (maternity leave or other),
- abortions, if desired

According to authors Kissling and Michaelman, the US has systematically "eviscerated" reproductive health services, leaving women struggling to maintain and control their reproductive health. The feminist perspective argues that society needs to "respect the necessity of allowing individual women to make [reproductive] choices" (Frantz, 2007).

Conclusion

The women's rights movement of the nineteenth and twentieth century has become the modern feminist movement of today. Early activists in the women's rights movement understood that many of the issues that affect women would be decided in the political arena. Thus passage of the Nineteenth Amendment laid a foundation which would insure that generations of women following the early suffragists would be able to exert political influence over issues that were of importance to them. The modern women's movement is seeking to educate and advocate on a number of important social issues including wage disparity, economic equality, and women's health issues.

Bibliography

- A question of life and death. (2007, May 19). *Economist*. Retrieved May 9, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Complete. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=25124658&site=ehost-live>
- A worldwide gender pay gap. (2008). *Report on Salary Surveys*, 8(4), 8. Retrieved May 7, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Business Source Premier. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=31804172&site=ehost-live>
- Compton, M. (2007). The gender pay gap. *Women in Business*, 59(6), 32-34. Retrieved May 7, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Business Source Premier. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=28454196&site=ehost-live>
- De Vita, E. (2008, March). The trouble with women. *Management Today*. Retrieved May 7, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Business Source Premier. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=31550377&site=ehost-live>
- Frantz, K. (2007). The female nature: A woman's destiny? *Humanist*, 67(4), 4-6. Retrieved May 9, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Complete. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=25473468&site=ehost-live>
- Kissling, F., & Michelman, K. (2008, February 4). Long Roe to hoe. *Nation*. Retrieved May 9, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Complete. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=28450618&site=ehost-live>
- Leone, B. (Ed.). (1996). *The women's rights movement: Opposing viewpoints*. San Diego: Greenhaven Press
- Lorber, J. (2005). *Gender inequality: Feminist theories and politics*. Roxbury Publishing Company: Los Angeles.
- Murphy, E., & Graff, E.J. (2005). The wage gap: Why women are still paid less than men. Retrieved May 9, 2008, from http://www.boston.com/news/globe/editorial_opinion/oped/articles/2005/10/09/the_wage_gap/
- Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003. (2004). *Find Law*. Retrieved May 12, 2008, from <http://news.findlaw.com/cnn/docs/abortion/2003s3.html>
- The history of women's reproductive rights (2005). Mount Holyoke College. Retrieved May 12, 2008, from http://www.mtholyoke.edu/~mbpatton/reproductive_rights/timeline.html

Suggested Reading

- Bartlett, E. (2008, March 18). Tackle equal pay before floodgates open. *Personnel Today*. Retrieved May 7, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Business Source Premier. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=31741989&site=ehost-live>
- Weinstein, S. (1996). The modern equal pay act: Liability in 'white-collar jobs. *Labor Law Journal*, 47(6), 356-375. Retrieved May 6, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Gender Studies Database. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=fmh&AN=9709053690&site=ehost-live>

Social Movements & Violence

Jonathan Christiansen

Overview

Anyone who has ever encountered a protest, rally, strike or other type of action associated with a social movement (either through participation or observation) knows that there is often an association with these types of actions and violence. Oftentimes police are seen warily watching over these events. Historically, as Tilly (2004) points out, the creation of professionalized police forces comes directly from the rise and growth of social movements. Further, one may even hear violent sounding rhetoric coming from protest speakers and participants. There is often a palpable sense of “us against them” in the rhetoric of social movements. Many have likely noticed police officials and politicians calling for calm and order ahead of (or during) major protest events such as political party conventions and other large political meetings. Similarly, the media will often remind people of the potential for violence during major protest events as well. As Greaber (2002) points out:

In the corporate [owned] media, the word ‘violent’ is invoked as a kind of mantra – invariably, repeatedly – whenever a large [protest] action takes place: ‘violent protests’, ‘violent clashes’, ‘police raid headquarters of violent protesters’, even ‘violent riots’... (p. 66).

Social movements, then, are often associated with violence, either through their rhetoric or actions. They are often portrayed as violent by authorities and the media. Are social movements inherently violent? If not, why are they so often associated with violence? If so, what is the relationship between violence and social movements? In order to address these questions it is important to understand what is meant by the term 'social movement' as well as the term 'violence.'

Defining Social Movements

Social movements can take many forms and address any number of issues. Despite this, scholars have noted many similarities among them. Social movements are comprised of groups of individuals that come together, usually to address some perceived grievance. Social movements can be localized or widespread. Not only do social movement participants share the same goals, they often share a particular set of understandings of the world and action repertoires. Oftentimes a number of groups and organizations make up social movements. These groups are called Social Movement Organizations (SMOs). Tilly (2004), states that all social movements display key characteristics:

- The campaign, all movements carry out sustained actions with an orientation towards specific goals
- Social movement repertoires, a standard set of actions that are used by social movements i.e. protests, rallies, etc., and
- Displays of worthiness, unity, numbers and commitment (WUNC). WUNC displays are carried out by social movements and (SMOs) in order to legitimize themselves in the eyes of potential adherents and target authorities.

Identifying these characteristics can help scholars more easily understand how social movements function and interact with opponents, authorities and the public.

Defining Violence

Although violence may seem like a relatively simple term to define, in the case of social movements it is more complicated. With regards to social movements, any violence that occurs should be thought of as collective political violence, or relational violence – that is, violence born out of interac-

tions between groups and individuals. Usually these groups are engaged in some sort of contentious politics, or claims making, which means groups that are engaged with each other in some sort of conflict oriented relation and/or are asking one or another group to address some demands or grievances (Tilly, 2003). What it does not refer to is personal, day-to-day, violence. Political violence is a specific type of collective violence. Della Porta explains:

Political violence is mainly symbolic: the cultural and emotional effects that it produces are more important than the material damage (2008, p. 226).

Political violence then is the use of physical force in order to damage a political adversary...violence may emerge intentionally or accidentally...in general, political violence consists of those repertoires of collective action that involve great physical force and cause damage to an adversary in order to impose political aims (1995, p. 2).

The term violence is controversial among social movement adherents. Definitions of what constitutes violence run the spectrum. Some believe that violent language is violence and oppose the use of violent or aggressive language altogether. Others believe that property damage and destruction is not violence because it does not harm humans or animals, while still others feel that self defense against the violence of the state is justifiable because it is the lesser violence (Christiansen, forthcoming; Graeber, 2002; Plows, Wall & Doherty, 2004; Juris, 2005). This article focuses on what would fall under della Porta's definition of violence. It will focus on harm towards humans and destruction of property with coercion or force as the intent. Although it is arguable that violent language is a form of violence or that property damage is not, the above definition is a more widely accepted definition. Some discussion of less harmful or coercive forms will also be addressed.

Further Insights

The Relationship Between Social Movements & Violence

Are social movements inherently violent? For many years sociologists seemed to say yes. Many of the earliest studies of social movements and

collective behavior focused on the seemingly negative aspects of collective behavior, including riots and lynching (e.g. Hopper, 1950; Le Bon, 1896). After the mass uprisings of the 1950s, 60s, and 70s in the U.S., many sociologists began to refocus their attention to the more potentially positive aspects of social movements. They also began to study them in a more systematic way in order to understand their processes, adherents, and relationships with the public, media and authorities.

Indeed, as McAdam, Sampson, Weffer & MacIndoe (2005) observe, the especially widespread and violent social movements of the late 1960s and early 1970s have distorted the fact that most social movements are more localized and to a degree, non-spectacular. Although scholars have noted that the vast majority of social movements and social movement actions are not violent, and are even mundane, there is still the occasional spectacular outbreak of violence that draws widespread attention. As a result, more recent scholars have begun to refocus on the relationship between violence and social movements. So when and why does violence occur at or within social movement actions? Scholars have noted various types of violence that occurs as well as reasons that it occurs.

Political Regimes & Political Opportunities

Oftentimes different types of violence occur in different contexts. For example, scholars have noted that different types of political regimes offer different political opportunities for social movements (e.g. della Porta 1995, 2008; Gamson, 1974; Piven & Cloward, 1977). A political opportunity is the opportunity that a social movement sees and takes advantage of in order to push their agenda. It has been noted that the more closed and unresponsive a political system, generally the greater the levels of violence that occur. Similarly, as opportunities close and authorities become less responsive to social movements, violence often increases. For example, Opp and Roehl (1990) find in their study of the anti-nuclear movement that as repression from police increased, movement adherents who were the most integrated into the protest movement became more radicalized, while those who were less integrated tended to become less involved. This means although the state increased its violence and repression against the movement, it did not diminish the movement; it only hardened those that remained and increased the likelihood of further violent interactions between protesters and police. Della Porta (1995) found a similar situation

in a study of social movement violence in Germany and Italy. As the state and counter movements mobilized in reaction to widespread movements in the 1960s and 70s, many left-libertarian movement groups became radicalized and went underground in order to carry out terrorist campaigns against the state. In both of these situations, as repression increased so too did social movement violence.

Sanchez-Cuenca (2009) observed that different types of political regimes inspired different types and levels of political violence. In a cross country analysis of a number of industrialized countries that experienced varying levels of political violence in the late 1960s and early 70s the author found that the countries with a recent past of authoritarian/fascist regimes and strong Communist parties experienced the highest levels of violence. Italy and Germany experienced some of the highest levels of violence, though the author did find the United States was somewhat exceptional as it tended to have higher levels of violence than others in its category. Different types of governments tend to produce different levels of social movement violence. If the regime is non-democratic, unresponsive, repressive, or has history of authoritarianism it will tend to have higher levels of political violence, including social movement violence.

Forms of Social Movement Violence

Just as violence occurs in different contexts not all violence that occurs in the context of social movements is the same. Some violence is in response to a particular situation, such as a baton charge by police, while at other times it is carried out in a strategic and coordinated manner. Della Porta (1995) identifies several types of violence that occur in relation to social movements. These include:

- Unspecialized violence – this is low level and unorganized violence that may occur on the fringes of protests or in reaction to a specific threat by police or counter protesters.
- Semimilitary violence – this is still low level, but more organized. This could include violence or property destruction carried out by organized groups in order to raise the stakes of social protest or display willingness to engage more militantly with authorities.

- Autonomous violence – used by loosely organized groups that emphasized a “spontaneous” recourse to high level violence.
- Clandestine violence – the extreme violence of groups that organized underground for the explicit purpose of engaging in the more radical forms of collective action (p. 4).

Della Porta (1995, 2008) also notes that for many movement groups, violence becomes part of the movement repertoire similar to rallies, sit-ins, and marches. Others have noted that violent repertoires can serve many purposes in a social movement context and there are many different forms that violence takes.

Violence as a Resource

Many scholars have noted that violent displays and violent repertoires can be replacements for movements with a lack of other types of resources (Juris, 2005; Piven & Cloward, 1977; Plows et al., 2004). As Resource Mobilization theory emphasizes, the level of resources is often related to the level of success of a social movement. Thus, movements with more resources such as money and man-power will be more likely to succeed in their efforts than resource-poor social movements. For example, Plows, et al. (2004) in their study of the use of covert eco-sabotage by direct action environmentalists found that sabotage was often the most effective use of limited resources. They cited one person in such a group:

economic sabotage is far more effective [a tool] against corporate enterprises to cost them money, and the most effective way to do that is to physically damage their property...yeah. It's the only thing that they recognise and take notice of... That's my strategy (p. 15).

This often means that adherents participate in above ground, or legal, activities during the day and at night participate in covert, underground or illegal, activities at night. In this case movement adherents were well integrated into the movement. In another example, Christiansen (forthcoming) found a similar situation was present with regards to the Angry Brigade in Britain in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The Angry Brigade set off a series of bombs at strategic targets in order to raise awareness about

certain grievances and garner media attention. The Weather Underground in the United States used similar tactics, though they seemed to have been more underground than members of the Brigade.

Apart from bombings, protest violence is also a way to garner media attention for resource-poor movements. Oftentimes protesters use violent displays, such as confrontations with the police, window smashing and the torching of cars as means to promote attention and raise awareness of issues. DeLuca and Peeples' study of the violence at the World Trade Organization protests in Seattle in 1999 provide a clear example:

The symbolic violence and uncivil disobedience worked together in a nuanced fashion. The non-violent protesters served to provoke the police at least as much as the anarchists did. Indeed, police violence against nonviolent protesters performing uncivil disobedience started before the anarchists acted. We suspect that the anarchists' symbolic violence justified intense media coverage of the police violence because media framing often portrayed the police violence as a response to the anarchists...In Seattle, then, symbolic violence and uncivil disobedience in concert produced compelling images that functioned as the dramatic leads for substantive discussions of the issues provoking the protests (2002, p. 14-15).

A similar use of symbolic and "performative" violence was seen at the anti-G8 protests in Genoa, Italy in 2001. Protesters using Black Bloc tactics used dramatic and violent displays to garner media attention and raise awareness of issues. In this particular situation, state repression of these protesters was so intense that it led to the gunning down of one protester and the raid on hundreds of others as they slept in a nearby school (Juris, 2005).

Violence & Identity

Movements can also use violence as a way to construct identities. Movements scholars have noted the importance of identity construction as an important part of movement building. In order for movement adherents to remain engaged in social moments and participate in what is oftentimes very risky behaviour their sense of identity must encompass part of the movement (Melucci, 1995). Juris (2005) explains that,

performative violence can be seen as a mode of communication through which activists seek to effect social transformation by staging symbolic confrontation based on 'the representation of antagonistic relationships and the enactment of prototypical images of violence' (p. 414).

He further explains that, "young militants enact performative violence in order to generate radical identities, while producing concrete messages challenging global capitalism and the state" (p. 414). Thus, not only do militants use performative violence to generate media coverage and confront the state they also "act out" militancy collectively in order to build collective identities.

Such performance can, in a way, be seen as similar to clothing style, which is itself a code that indicates membership in a certain culture (Hebdige, 1979). In this case a certain countercultural code is indicated through confrontational protest action. Violence in relation to social movements, then, should be seen as instrumental. Rather than being a result of personal anger it is often used for a reason. This is not to say that some violence does not occur as a result of personal anger, but that the more significant forms are generally more purposeful in character.

Viewpoints

Social movements are often presumed to be violent even when the vast majority of them are not. The police, government officials and the media often seem to indicate that when protesters gather for large demonstrations, mindless violence will ensue. There is often talk of violent "hooligans" whose only goal is property destruction and disruption. While this may be an accurate representation of some individuals, it is clearly not the case for many social movement adherents. Violence that does occur is predictable and often based on the amount of repression and the political regime's openness to grievances. It is instrumentally carried out and purposeful and rarely random.

It is important for sociologists and others to understand how, when and why violence may occur in a social movement setting not only so that lives can be protected, but also so that we can understand when authorities and/or the media may be trying to inaccurately influence perceptions

of certain social movements; especially movements that are critical of the state or its policies. If a protest is being planned for a major event such as a political gathering and the purpose of the protest is to criticize the event, it would be logical for the target of the event to frame the protest as negative or even potentially harmful. Understanding what may lead to violence and/or the types of violence to expect can lead to a more critical and well informed citizenry.

We may come to understand that the reason for so much violence at many protests indicates an increase in repression, or a closing off of political opportunities. Both of these may indicate a slide to less democratic forms of government. Violence at social protests could be an early indicator of authoritarianism or other such tendencies. It may also indicate that a particular movement is just poor in other resources so they resort to more spectacular displays, including violence, which the media will often cover with front page headlines. However, a movement that is declared violent is not necessarily dangerous.

Human Psychology & Personal Ideology

Social movement scholars and especially sociologists have focused on the social relations which may contribute to social movement violence. This means that rather than looking at psychological traits or ideology, sociologists look at how the relationships between people and groups may contribute to violence. For example, instead of seeing a religious extremist as carrying out political violence because s/he is a member of an extremist group, or because he or she was psychologically disturbed, the sociologist would instead point out that the more likely reason is a lack of access to other resources.

This approach may leave it out those important factors. Past scholars of collective behavior did tend to emphasize the psychological traits of people involved. There was an emphasis on the maddening effect of the crowd and the willingness of weak minded people to get wrapped up in social movement activities. This emphasis has clearly been lost in contemporary discussion of social movement violence. Since sociologists do not focus on psychological traits of individuals, this could be that a key component to social movement violence is being missed. For example Schmidt, Joffé, & Davar (2005) argue that the key to understanding extremist political

violence is in understanding how individuals' psyches can be manipulated by a regime or socialization force.

Similarly, a discussion of ideology is mostly left out of the discourse. It may be that certain ideologies are inherently violent. This would not explain why these ideologies would be more or less powerful or popular at any given time, which still leaves many questions. Despite these two possible shortcomings, the sociological perspective does seem to explain a significant amount of variables with regard to social movement violence. Further research is still needed to more fully understand the degree of individual variation as well as ideology.

Conclusion

Social movements have become a common part of life in many societies. Although most of the time social movements are peaceful, sometimes they become violent. Violence can occur for a number of reasons and take a number of forms. Oftentimes the violence that is carried out is strategic in nature and serves a purpose within the social movement. Despite the sometimes violent and confrontational nature of social movements, they are usually a positive aspect of a society as they often serve to highlight the needs of underrepresented groups within the society. If we can understand why and how violence happens, we can possibly stem not only the violence but also ease the conditions that create the need for violence.

Bibliography

- Christiansen, S. M. R. (forthcoming). *The Brigade is everywhere: Violence, the Angry Brigade and the British counterculture*. In L. Anton & T. Brown (Eds.), *Between the Avant Garde and the Everyday: Subversive Politics in Europe, 1958-2008*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- della Porta, D. (2008). Research on social movements and political violence. *Qualitative Sociology*, 31(3), 221-230. Retrieved January 29, 2010 from EBSCO online database Academic Search Complete <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=33770497&site=ehos-live>
- . (1995). *Social movements political violence and the state*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- DeLuca, K.M. & Peeples, J. (2002). From public sphere to public screen: Democracy, activism, and the "violence" of Seattle. *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 19(2), 125-151. Retrieved January 10, 2010 from California State University <http://www.csun.edu/~vcspc00g/454/pubspheretopubscreen-seattle-csmc.pdf>
- Graeber, D. (2002). The new anarchists. *New Left Review*, 13, 61-73.
- Hebdige, D. (1979). *Subculture*. London: Methuen.

- Juris, J. (2005). Violence performed and imagined. *Critique of Anthropology*, 25(4), 413-432. Retrieved December 28, 2009 from <http://www.jeffreyjuris.com/articles/Critique.Violence.pdf>
- McAdam, D., Sampson, R., Weffer, S., & MacIndoe, H. (2005). "There will be fighting in the streets": The distorting lens of social movement theory. *Mobilization*, 10(1), 1-19. Retrieved January 10, 2010 from Harvard University http://www.wjh.harvard.edu/soc/faculty/sampson/articles/2005_Mobilization.pdf
- Melucci, A. (1995). Constructing social protest. In Johnson, H. & B. Klandermans, Eds. *Social Movements and Culture*. 85-106. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Plows, A., Wall, D. & Doherty, B. (2004). Covert repertoires: Ecotage in the UK. *Social Movement Studies*, 3(2), 197-217. Retrieved January 29, 2010 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=15281336&site=ehost-live>
- Schmidt, C., Joffé, G., & Davar, E. (2005). The psychology of political extremism. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 18(1), 151-172. Retrieved January 29, 2010 from EBSCO online database Academic Search Complete <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=rst&AN=17032882&site=ehost-live>
- Tilly C. (2004). *Social Movements 1768-2004*. Boulder: Paradigm.
- . (2003). *The politics of collective violence*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Opp, K., & Roehl, W. (1990). Repression, micromobilization, and political protest. *Social Forces*, 69(2), 521-547. Retrieved January 29, 2010 from EBSCO online database Academic Search Complete <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=9103181790&site=ehost-live>

Suggested Reading

- Auyero, J., & Moran, T. (2007). The dynamics of collective violence: Dissecting food riots in contemporary Argentina. *Social Forces*, 85(3), 1341-1367. Retrieved from EBSCO online database Academic Search Complete. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=24391195&site=ehost-live>
- Earl, J. (2003). Tanks, tear gas, and taxes: toward a theory of movement repression. *Sociological Theory*, 21(1), 44-68. Retrieved from EBSCO online database Academic Search Complete. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=9048939&site=ehost-live>
- Fanon, F. (1963). *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Futrell, R., & Brents, B. (2003). Protest as terrorism? The potential for violent anti-nuclear activism. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 46(6), 745.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making & unmaking of the new left*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mass Society Theory

Simone I. Flynn

Overview

Mass society theory is an interdisciplinary critique of the collective identity that results from the mass commodification of culture and the mass media's manipulation of society. Mass society theory invokes a vision of society characterized by alienation, absence of individuality, amorality, lack of religion, weak relationships, and political apathy. Mass society theory developed at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries in response to the rise of the media industry and the socio-political changes created by industrialization, urbanization, and the fall of established political regimes. Major contributors to mass society theory include Alexis de Tocqueville, Emile Durkheim, Emil Lederer, José Ortega y Gasset, Robert Nisbet, Hannah Arendt, Herbert Blumer, William Kornhauser, Ferdinand Tönnies, and Karl Mannheim.

Early mass society theory asserted that the new urban masses, comprising uprooted and isolated individuals, were vulnerable to new forms of demagoguery and manipulation by the media (Hamilton, 2001). While popular media existed in the nineteenth century, mass media, as a discrete concept, did not develop until the early twentieth century with the advent of national circulation newspapers and national media networks like nationwide radio. To mass society theorists, the media represents and promotes the worst problems of modernity. Early proponents of the theory believed that

mass society is characterized by a collective identity and low-brow cultural interests. Because of these characteristics, they believed that dictatorships and bureaucracies can easily and quickly manipulate mass societies, making them vulnerable to extremist politics and the rise of disenfranchised.

Mass society theory belongs to the larger body of interdisciplinary work called social movement theory. Social movement theory refers to the study of social mobilization, including its social, cultural, and political manifestations and consequences. Social movement scholarship is often motivated by a desire for social change and, consequently, integrates scholarship and activism. The field took shape during the late nineteenth century and has since come to comprise six main areas of study: mass society theory, relative deprivation theory, resource mobilization theory, structural-strain theory, value-added theory, and new social movement theory. At its core, social movement theory holds that social movements are, in many instances, created through the use and manipulation of frames, or cognitive structures which guide an individual's or group's perception of reality. Social movements influence and control their members through tactics such as mobilizing fear, engaging in frame appropriation, social constructionism, and counterframing. Sociologists analyze social movements in two distinct ways: social constructionist perspective and frame analysis (Benford & Snow 2000).

Mass society theory emerged as a discrete field of interest at the turn of the century, in part as a result of the changes that scholars saw occurring in society as effects of industrialization, urbanization, and political change (Mackie, 1978). During the late 1800s and early 1900s, the rise of industrialization and urbanization changed society. The industrial era in Europe and America, which approximately spanned from 1750 to 1900, was a time characterized by the replacement of manual labor with industrialized and mechanized labor, as well as by the adoption of the factory system of production. The industrial era included the period of the industrial revolution and the resulting rise of capitalism. The industrial revolution refers to the technical, cultural, and social changes that occurred in the Western world during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The period saw a major increase in the mechanization of agriculture, manufacturing, and transportation (Ahmad, 1997). The industrial revolution - which brought with it new types and conceptions of employment, time, scale, landscape,

property, and social relationships – caused great social change. The nineteenth century saw major transformations in gender and class hierarchies, family units, gender relations, immigrants' roles in society, and childhood. The industrial revolution, with its increased need for workers, created a new working, middle, and consumer classes. The family unit and gender roles changed, too, during the period, largely as because of the factory system which employed both men and women and removed the workplace from the home (Abelson, 1995).

Mass society theory suggests that all these social changes created political-ly and psychologically unmoored masses. According to the theory, demagogues, or political leaders who achieve power by preying on people's emotions or prejudices, could easily manipulate these emerging mass.

The rise of the media industry in the twentieth century provided a formal means of communication that was accessible to almost everyone in a society. Early theorists and the ruling classes quickly came to see it as being largely responsible for publicizing and disseminating the changes, unrest, and discontent which typified the period. They blamed the mass media (like the penny press newspapers that were popular during the 1830s) for giving credence to and perpetuating the industrial era's discontent, alienation, and decline in community (Hamilton, 2001). As a result, it came to be seen as a symbol of all that was wrong with society.

Mass society theory grew out of these concerns. It holds that the mass media has the power to change cultural norms and power relations, and can thus contribute to and change the social order. As such, it can work to shape people's perceptions of the world.

Mass society theory tends to emphasize the breakdown of the primary groups in society such as the family and neighborhood. The theory does not apply to all modern societies, but rather to the most fragmented and decentralized political economies. These societies are most vulnerable to becoming mass societies because they contain vacuums created by declining participation in religious organizations, unions, political parties, and voluntary associations. In the absence of such communal associations, the mass media, which provides both communication and entertainment, steps in to fill the void (Kreisler, 2002).

Mass society theory is less prevalent today than it was during the early to mid twentieth century. That said, mass society theorists continue to critique the relationship between society and the mass media, and have renewed their efforts by incorporating new media such as the Internet.

Further Insights

Contributors to Mass Society Theory

Mass society theory is characterized by psychological explanations of human behavior. Participants in mass society are thought to be alienated from society at large. Mass society theorists tend to argue for the importance of emotional and psychological understanding of mass society. The main contributors to mass society theory, including Alexis de Tocqueville, Emile Durkheim, Emil Lederer, José Ortega y Gasset, Robert Nisbet, Hannah Arendt, Herbert Blumer, William Kornhauser, Ferdinand Tönnies, and Karl Mannheim, are described below.

Alexis de Tocqueville

Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-1859) was a political theorist who used the term mass society to refer to the power of the majority to challenge and topple the established power of aristocracy. Tocqueville's best-known works were *Democracy in America* (1835) and *The Old Regime and the Revolution* (1856), which focused on political democracy and public administration in the United States and France. Tocqueville explored questions about politics, religion, and more in the first modern democratic republics. He worked to understand the collective identities of Americans under their emerging democratic system and of the French under their toppling aristocratic regime. He believed that the American ethic was characterized by equality and dignity for all, and the French ethic by continued elitism and classicism. Tocqueville's work laid the foundation for mass society theory's understanding of the mass society's power to challenge and change a society's balance of power (Maletz, 2008).

Emile Durkheim

Emile Durkheim (1858-1917) was a French sociologist concerned with the problem of the individual within society as well as issues of solidarity and social cohesion. He used the term "mass society" to refer to society as a

mass of undifferentiated individuals. According to Durkheim, it is people's social roles or functions that hold a society together. His theories of cultural differentiation and structural differentiation influenced nineteenth century sociology by explaining how cultural and social structures could foster social cohesion and divisiveness. Cultural differentiation refers to the idea that the degree of consensus over cognitive orientations and cultural codes among the members of a population is related to their interpersonal interaction, level of emotional arousal, and rate of ritual performance. Structural differentiation, a term borrowed from sociologist Herbert Spencer, refers to the idea that the degree of differentiation among a population is related to the level of competition among these actors, the rate of growth in this population, the extent of ecological concentration of this population, and the rate of population mobility (Turner, 1990).

Emil Lederer

Emil Lederer (1882-1939) was an economic sociologist who wrote about the sociology of world war. He fled Nazi rule in Germany during World War II and found a professional home at the New School for Social Research in New York. Lederer's work *The State of the Masses: The Threat of the Classless Society* (1939), an influential analysis of the Nazi state, continues to influence studies of the ability of demagogues to control mass society. Lederer's work was characterized as Austro-Marxian, a system of economic theory that was based on a general social theory of economic relationships (Joas, 2006).

José Ortega y Gasset

José Ortega y Gasset, 1883-1955, was a public intellectual, journalist, and politician. His best-known work was *The Revolt of the Masses* (1930), which explored the political and social crisis of Western civilization. He believed the root cause of socio-political crisis to be the growing trend of sharing and distributing social power to the masses. He was opposed to the social distribution of equality to everyone regardless of education and class. Ortega argued that hyper-democracy, a system in which power is evenly distributed to everyone in society, results in cultural degradation and deterioration. He believed that rule by the masses (i.e. public opinion) inevitably leads to socio-political crisis and decline. Ortega drew a clear distinction between the mass human type (characterized as an average, ordinary man who accepts himself as he is) and the select man (character-

ized as a man who places great demands upon himself in the pursuit of excellence). According to Ortega, only the select man is capable of ruling and leading society (Statham 2004).

Robert Nisbet

Robert Nisbet (1913-1996) was a sociologist and communitarian who mourned and studied the demise of associational life in the United States. Communitarianism refers to a group philosophies which prioritize civil society over individualism. Nisbet's work emphasizes the importance of communities and societies over both the individual and the centralized government. Nisbet believed that local communities, rather than national governments, should maintain the most significant functions of society. He argued that political centralization leads to a society's social and cultural death. Nisbet's descriptions of American society were somewhat dire, as were his predictions of the society's future. He believed that a weakened civic life at the local level and a strengthened centralized government would deaden society and created disconnected masses of individuals. Critics of Nisbet argue that he failed to recognize the role of states in maintaining social life at the local level through institutions and organizations like schools and community centers. Nisbet's works include *The Quest for Community: A Study in the Ethics of Order and Freedom* (1953), *The Social Philosophers: Community and Conflict in Western Thought* (1973), *Twilight of Authority* (1975), and *The Present Age: Progress and Anarchy in Modern America* (1988). Other communitarians, including Robert D. Putnam, author of *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (2000) and Theda Skocpol, author of *Diminished Democracy: From Membership to Management in American Civic Life* (2003), have been strongly influenced by Nisbet's work (Nagal 2004).

Hannah Arendt

Hannah Arendt (1906-1975) was a political philosopher and World War II refugee. She studied Nazi and Stalinist regimes as well as the totalitarian phenomenon in general. Arendt, along with Karl Mannheim, argued that modern society is vulnerable to totalitarian movements, like Hitler's, because of the decline or loss of mediating associations – such as churches, trade unions, voluntary associations, and professions – that serve as a buffer between the individual and mass communication and the state. These mediating associations, she believed, create opportunities for par-

ticipation and protect individuals and society from totalitarian regimes. Arendt's best known works were *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951) and *The Human Condition* (1958). Overall, her work strengthened sociology's understanding of the connections between totalitarian movements and mass society (Kreiser, 2002).

Herbert Blumer

Herbert Blumer, born in 1900, was a civic sociologist concerned with some of the problems of modernity. He saw modern society as fully pluralized and segmented and studied race relations, worker conflict, urbanization, and popular culture to explore how difference and factions threaten social cohesion. He also helped develop the theory of symbolic interactionism. Building on the work of his teacher George Herbert Mead, Blumer's symbolic interactionism locates meaning in social interactions. According to Blumer, social actors ascribe meaning to things based on their experiences of and social interactions with them. Meaning, in this theoretical system, is an interpretive and evolving process. Symbolic interactionism, along with ethnomethodology, emerged as a leading paradigm of qualitative sociology (Snow, 2001).

William Kornhauser

William Kornhauser (1925-2004) was a sociologist and expert on social movements. He described his work as an effort to understand the art of associating together. Believing that society should encourage pluralist tendencies and discourage mass society tendencies, Kornhauser built on and expanded the work of Alexis de Tocqueville, Karl Mannheim, José Ortega y Gasset, and Robert Nisbet to identify the conditions under which societies become vulnerable to mass movements and totalitarian regimes. He believed that the socio-political changes brought about by rapid industrialization, urbanization, and economic crisis facilitated the creation of mass society and mass movements. He also analyzed the essential characteristics of mass society and sought to connect the political behavior of mass society with current social conditions. Additionally, Kornhauser studied the relationship between mass society and the democratic order. His works – the best known of which was *The Politics of Mass Society* (1959) – had a strong influence on the student activism movement of the 1960s and 1970s (Bay, 1961).

Ferdinand Tönnies

Ferdinand Tönnies (1855-1936) was a German sociologist inspired by the work of Hobbes, Spencer, Marx, and Comte, and is considered to be one of the originators of mass society theory. He published political-opinion writings, which were characterized by a utopian vision of the future, and during World War I and held the presidency of the German Sociological Society.

As one of the founders of classical German sociology, he influenced the direction of modern sociology worldwide. Tönnies proposed that sociology be divided into three parts: a theoretical or pure sociology, an applied sociology, and an empirical sociology. His most well-known book, *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* (1887), explained his theories of social groups. According to Tönnies, there were two types of social groups: *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft*. *Gemeinschaft*, which could be represented as a family or folk community, is a community with shared values and beliefs. *Gesellschaft*, which could be represented as a business or industrial society, is a group in which people associate with one another to meet their individual, rather than communal, interests.

Gesellschaft are characterized by self-interest and diverse values and mores, and Tönnies believed they were typical features of modern society.. He associated *gemeinschaft* with communism and *gesellschaft* with socialism. According to Tönnies, cultures may have elements of both *gemeinschaft* and *gesellschaft* (Thurnwald & Eubank 1936).

Karl Mannheim

Karl Mannheim, 1838-1947, was a Hungarian-born sociologist concerned with the sociology of knowledge, or the connections between human thoughts and the conditions of existence. He studied the role of the elite in mass society. In particular, he explored the role of education in selecting and training elite members of society. Mannheim found that in mass society the elite have access to specialized knowledge. H

istoricism, Marxism, and phenomenology all influenced Mannheim's work. His best known works include *Structures of Thinking* (1922), *Ideologie und Utopie* (1929), and *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction* (1940) (Hoyle, 1964).

Issues

Critique of Mass Society Theory

Mass society theory is wholly accepted by neither contemporary social scientists nor society at large. During the mid-twentieth century, social science's strongest critique of mass society theory came from the limited effects model. The limited effects model, developed by Paul Lazarsfeld (1901-1976), asserts that the mass media does not diminish but instead enhances democracy and society. The limited effects model was based on Lazarsfeld's and his colleagues' a study of the media's effect on voting patterns in the US electorate, which led Lazarsfeld to conclude that the media's effect on voting patterns was limited. Lazarsfeld also contributed to the field of media effect studies, a field devoted to measuring the behavioral effects of media on society. While Lazarsfeld, and media effect studies in general, acknowledge that the media does influence society, Lazarsfeld's research suggested it had a limited role in the formation of public opinion. The limited effects model shaped media studies through much of the twentieth century (Smith, 2001).

Ultimately, mass society may not be as destructive to selves and democracies as previously asserted by mass society theorists. The theory developed at a time of extreme social upheaval, and its critics have argue that it is, by and large, grounded in the desire of nineteenth century upper class aristocrats to retain their powers and rights. Additionally the theory's claims about the media industry, mass society, pluralism, and bureaucracy are difficult, if not impossible, to document, and, in some cases, research contradicts them. Arguably, some studies have shown that the theory underestimates people's abilities to make decisions for themselves. Further, the theory may underestimate the continued existence of anti-media influences in people's lives. In the final analysis, mass society theory may have limitations for contemporary sociology since it does not resonate with current studies of the media and society (Hamilton, 2001).

Bibliography

Abelson, E. S. (1995). Social hierarchies -- Transforming women's work: New England lives in the industrial revolution. *Contemporary Sociology*, 24(2), 188.

- Ahmad, I. (1997). Emergence of sociology and its relationship with social sciences. *Employment News*, 22(1), 1-3.
- Bay, C. (1961). The end of politics? *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 5(3), 326.
- Benford, R. & Snow, D. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 611-639. Retrieved April 22, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier : <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=3780387&site=ehost-live>
- Hamilton, R. (2001). *Mass society, pluralism, and bureaucracy: Explication, assessment, and commentary*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2001.
- Hoyle, E. (1964). The elite concept in Karl Mannheim's sociology of education. *Sociological Review*, 12(1), 55-71. Retrieved April 22, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=13675662&site=ehost-live>
- Jacobs, N. & Jowett, G. (1992). *Mass media in modern society*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Joas, H. (2006). Introduction to Lederer's sociology of World War. *Archives Européennes de Sociologie*, 47(2), 241-268.
- Kreisler, H. (2002). Comparing rich democracies: theory. Harold Wilensky Interview: Conversations with History. Institute of International Studies, UC Berkeley. Retrieved April 22, 2008 from: <http://globetrotter.berkeley.edu/people2/Wilensky/wilensky-con5.html>
- Lio, S., Melzer, S., & Reese, E. (2008). Constructing threat and appropriating "civil rights": Rhetorical strategies of gun rights and English only leaders. *Symbolic Interaction*, 31(1), 5-31. Retrieved April 22, 2008 from EBSCO online database SocIndex with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=26641947&site=ehost-live>
- Maletz, D. (2008). Review of a political life in Democratic times: On a new biography of Alexis de Tocqueville. *Public Administration Review*, 68(3), 578-581.
- Marlene, M. (1978). Review of mass society and political conflict: Towards a reconstruction of theory. *Canadian Review of Sociology & Anthropology*, 15(3), 420-422. Retrieved April 22, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=10622626&site=ehost-live>.
- Robert F Nagel (2004). States and localities: A comment on Robert Nisbet's Communitarianism. *Publius*, 34(4), 125-138,170.
- Smith, R. (2001). A legacy of Lazarsfeld: Cumulative social research on voting. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 13(3), 280-298.
- Snow, D. et al. (1986). Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation. *American Sociological Review*, 51(4), 464. Retrieved April 22, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=14795425&site=ehost-live>
- Snow, D. (2001). Extending and broadening Blumer's conceptualization of symbolic interactionism. *Symbolic Interaction*, 24(3), 367-377.

Statham, E. (2004). Ortega y Gasset's "Revolt" and the problem of mass rule. *Modern Age*, 46(3), 219-226. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=14382022&site=ehost-live>

Thurnwald, R. & Eubank, E. (1936). Ferdinand Tönnies -- in memoriam. *American Sociological Review*, 1(3), 430-431. Retrieved April 20, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=12543866&site=ehost-live>

Suggested Reading

Hipsher, P. (2005). Framing 'heretical' identities: Pro-Choice Catholic and pro-life feminist organizations in the American abortion controversy. Conference Paper: American Sociological Association, 1-19. Retrieved April 22, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=15928830&site=ehost-live>.

Konak, N. (2006). Local environmental struggles, environmental injustice, and frame construction: the case of Bergama, Turkey. Conference Papers: American Sociological Association, 2006 Annual Meeting, 1-22. Retrieved April 22, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=26642702&site=ehost-live>

Robnett, B. (2004). Emotional resonance, social location, and strategic planning. *Sociological Focus*, 37(3), 195-212. Retrieved April 22, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=14690362&site=ehost-live>

New Social Movement Theory

Simone I. Flynn

Overview

The following is an analysis of new social movement theory. New social movement theory argues that contemporary social movements are performing collective action in markedly different ways than traditional social movements. Sociologists use new social movement theory to analyze the role of new social movements in contemporary, post-industrial society. Understanding the history, applications, and strengths and weaknesses of new social movement theory is vital background for all those interested in the sociology of social movements and collective action. This article explains new social movement theory in three parts:

- An overview of the main principles and history of new social movement theory.
- A description of how new social movement theory is applied to analyze and understand social movements such as the environmental movement.
- A discussion of the main criticisms of new social movement theory.

The Main Principles of New Social Movement Theory

Sociologists use new social movement theory to explain the role of social movements in post-industrial societies. Social movements refer to a vol-

untary organization of individuals who act in concert to make or block changes. Social movements are power-oriented groups rather than participation-oriented movements, meaning that the group actions of social movements are not necessarily of primary benefit to individual members but instead serve the groups' larger goals. Coordinated group actions are undertaken to make changes in the larger socio-political context. Social movements tend to be most successful in open, democratic societies in which social mobility and social change are accepted concepts. Norm-oriented social movements are more common than value-oriented social movements. Norm-oriented movements refer to groups that attempt changes within the system whereas value-oriented movements refer to groups that attempt to change the basic goals of a system (Morrison, 1971).

New social movement theory refers to a new paradigm of social movement activity and collective action. Contemporary social movements are characterized by strategies, goals, and membership distinct from tradition social movements. New social movement theorists and scholars explain new social movements as arising from numerous channels in society. For example, new social movements are seen as expressions of civil society's desire for structural change and arise from the growing importance and ubiquity of information in our increasingly knowledge-based society.

New social movements are also seen as an inevitable outcome of changing social, economic, and political relationships in the post-industrial society. New social movements are movements for change based on the desire for structural reform rather than revolution, do not attempt to dismantle the existing political and economic systems and are characterized by their self-limiting radicalism. New social movement helps to explain the changing forms of political organization and the shifting relations between public and private spheres in post-industrial societies (Lentin, 1999).

New social movement theory dominates current social movement research and allows for the study of macro external elements and micro internal elements (Fuchs, 2006). New social movements, which began to emerge in the 1950s, include social movements that arise from the conflicts in post-industrial revolution society and economy. New social movements are a loosely connected group of collective actions that have displaced the traditional social movement of proletarian revolution (Buechler, 1993).

New social movement theory argues that new social movements, such as anti-war, environmental, civil rights and feminist movements, are distinct from other traditional social movements such as labor movements. Traditional social movements tend to be engaged in class conflict while new social movements are engaged in political and social conflict. Traditional social movements tend to focus on economic concerns and inequalities. Members of new social movements are most often from a segment of society referred to as the new middle class. New social movements encourage members to engage in lifestyle changes, tend to have supporters rather than members and are characterized as loosely organized networks. These movements differ from protest groups or movements as they often desire to see change on a global scale as opposed to the single issues taken on by protest groups.

The History of New Social Movement Theory

New social movement theory belongs to the larger body of interdisciplinary theory called social movement theory. Social movement theory, which began in the late 19th century, refers to the study of social mobilization including its social, cultural, and political manifestations and consequences. Social movement theory proposes that social movements are, in many instances, created through the use and manipulation of frames and information. Social movement scholarship is often motivated by a desire for social change and may integrate scholarship and activism. In the case of new social movement theory, social movement theorists study how groups manipulate information, identity, and structure to achieve goals. The interdisciplinary history of social movement theory includes six main areas of study:

- New social movement theory;
- Value-added theory;
- Structural-strain theory;
- Relative deprivation theory;
- Resource mobilization theory;
- Mass society theory (Benford & Snow, 2000).

New social movements, such as anti-war, environmental, civil rights and feminist movements, began to emerge in the 1950s and 1960s. In the 1970s

and 1980s, social movement theorists began to recognize the relationship between new social movements, structural transformation, and identity politics. New social movements were found to be promoting and facilitating new forms of collective action and behavior. Beginning in the 1960s, two new areas of social movement theory developed. New social movement theory developed in Europe and resource mobilization theory developed in North America. New social movement theory developed in the 1960s in response to traditional social movement theory that considered social movements to be irrational and the result of personal grievances and discontent (Fuchs, 2006). During this time and into the 1990s, social scientific studies of collective action experienced a paradigm shift from a focus on mass behavior in the early 20th century to political process and new social movements (Edelman, 2001).

New social movement theory developed in response to traditional analysis of social movements with its theorists abandoning the traditional social-psychological analysis of social movements typical of relative deprivation theory and mass society theory. Traditional social-psychological theories of social movements focused on what attracted individuals to social movements including factors like personality traits, grievances, disillusionment, and ideology. These traditional social-psychological theories of social movements also considered participation in social movements to be irrational and unconventional behavior.

In the 1960s and 1970s, new social movement theorists used the example of the many social movements happening at the time to challenge the assumptions of the traditional theories of social movements. For example, new social movement theorists, through their studies of the anti-war, environmental, civil rights and feminist movements, found that social movements focus on identity-construction, structural change, and information control to effect change. In the 1960s, new social movement theory eclipsed the traditional theories of social movements, namely relative deprivation theory and mass society theory, as the main European social theory explaining the workings of social movements. New social movement theory broke with traditional theories of social movements and radically challenged perceived truths about how social movements operate (Klandermans, 1984).

Important contributors to new social movement theory include Claus Offe, Alberto Melucci, Alain Touraine, and Jurgen Habermas. These prominent European new social movement theorists use examples of social movements from their European nations of origin, Germany, Italian, and France, to build and support their theories about new social movements and collective action. Claus Offe focuses on comparison of traditional and new paradigms of collective action. Alain Touraine examines the emergence of new social movements in post-industrial societies. Alberto Melucci analyzes how the movement of information affects contemporary conflicts and collective actions. Jurgen Habermas argues that new social movements develop from a tension between systems integration and social integration. Despite the very specific and local European examples used by these theorists, new social movement theory has been applied to collective action around the globe (Lentin, 1999).

Claus Offe

Claus Offe, born in 1940, is a political sociologists committed to analyzing political relationships through a Marxist lens. Offe focuses his study of new social movements on the structural issues associated with collective action and is committed to analyzing the shifting power relations in all social phenomena and social and political conflict. Offe argues that contemporary social movements are doing something fundamentally different from old or traditional social movements. Using examples from Germany, he argues that social movements should be divided into two prototypes of collective action: The old paradigm social movements and the new paradigm social movements (Offe, 1985). Offe considers new social movements to be non-institutional in nature and recognizes that new social movements and traditional social movements continue to compete for membership and notice. He predicts that the ability of new social movements to completely replace traditional social movements is based on new social movements' success with alliances. According to Offe, members of the new middle class and members of decommodified groups, such as students, the unemployed, and stay at home parents, often join forces in alliances to further the goals of new social movements.

Offe believes that new social movements emerged from the changes in class structure that occurred in the mid-twentieth century. The rise of a new middle class, comprised of highly educated, economically secure indi-

viduals, is associated with the development of new social movements. The new middle class is thought to be particularly sympathetic to the issues advanced by issue-based movements including the peace movement, environmental movement, women's movement and civil-rights movement. Ultimately, Offe argues that the new middle class will further the goals of new social movements by pushing for structural transformation of existing political and economic structures (Lentin, 1999). Offe's best known works include "Institutional Design in Post-Communist Societies" (1998), "The Varieties of Transition: the East European and East German Experience" (1996), and "Modernity and The State: East and West" (1996).

Alberto Melucci

Alberto Melucci, an Italian sociologist, was one of the first to describe contemporary social movements as new social movements. Melucci argues that the issue of identity separates traditional social movements from new social movements. His theory is based on the assumption that individual and group identity in new social movements is linked to important social processes. According to Melucci, new social movements reach out and appeal to supporters with offers of identity and belonging. This occurs for three reasons:

- The transition in the West from industrial to postindustrial society;
- The rise of the new middle class;
- The transformation of social identities from latent to visible.

Melucci's critics argue that his work is mired in traditional social movement theory and a limited view of the changing political identities in new social movements.

Melucci's study of new social movements focuses on the acquisition of information by new social movements. Melucci connects the evolution of social movements with new modes of information sharing and deployment. Melucci considers information to be the key resource of new social movements and post-industrial societies in general. Melucci argues that new social movements differ from traditional social movements in their ability manipulate information and their capacity to change institutional and political structures in direct and indirect ways (Vahabzadeh, 2001).

Alain Touraine

Alain Touraine, a French sociologist born in 1925, studies the relationship between the subject, or the individual, and social movements. He considers the subject to be the fundamental agent of social movements and studies the ways in which structural and cultural dimensions intersect in new social movements and collective actions. Touraine developed an action-theoretical analysis of the identity formation process that actors go through as members of social movements (Cohen, 1985). According to Touraine, social movements refer to collective actions aimed at the implementation of central cultural values. Touraine believes that new social movements combine social conflict and cultural participation (Lentin, 1999). Touraine's best known works include "Workers Movement" (1987), "The Return of the Actor" (1988) and "Critique of Modernity" (1996).

Jurgen Habermas

Jurgen Habermas, born in 1929, is a sociologist and philosopher who developed the concept of communicative action to explain the situations in which the actions of the agents involved are coordinated not through goal-directed activity but through acts of reaching cooperative understanding and interpretation. According to Habermas, the theory of communicative action allows theorists to reconceptualize rationality and the organization of the social world (Camic & Gross, 1998). Habermas argues that new social movements develop as a result of the intrusion by the state and the market into areas of private life. New social movements develop from the tension between system integration (i.e. the steering mechanisms of a society) and social integration (i.e. forces of socialization, meaning-production, and value-formation) and are, according to Habermas, defensive reactions of individuals and groups hoping to protect, defend, or recreate endangered lifestyles. New social movements form at the intersection of the larger social and political system and people's lived experiences (Canel, 2004).

In the final analysis, new social movement theory, which focuses on the connections between social movements, information, identity, and structure, redefines how contemporary social movements are studied and conceptualized. New social movement theory developed in the 1960s from the growing body of interest in and data collected about social movements. It marks a departure from the traditional understanding of social move-

ments and collective action. New social movement theory takes a new perspective on the old problem of the individual and society.

Applications

New social movements, including the anti-war, environmental, civil rights and feminist movements, first emerged in the 1950s in response to political, economic, and social changes in post-war society. Many early new social movements were classified as conflictual movements that used protests and strikes to achieve their goals. Sociologists use new social movement theory to analyze how new social movements form and achieve their objectives for change (Paletz 2002). In the case of the environmental movement, sociologists can apply new social movement theory to analyze and understand how it builds identity, solicits and builds support, manipulates and deploys information, and works to change structural elements in society to achieve goals.

Sociologists and social movement theorists in general are increasingly studying environmental organizations to understand the mechanisms and strategies employed by new social movements in general. Environmentalism refers to the study of the connections between the natural habitat of the earth's flora and fauna, changes in human social systems, and perceptions of justice concerning human-natural environment interactions. The modern environmental movement, which began in the 1960s and 1970s, was brought into public consciousness through three events including the publication of Rachel Carson's "Silent Spring" (1962); the founding of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in 1970; and the creation of green political parties. Green political parties refer to political groups that value and promote the issues of conservation of natural resources, environmental protection, and sustainable development.

The environmental movement in the United States has become deeply associated with environmental organizations such as the Sierra Club and Greenpeace. The Sierra Club and Greenpeace, and other environmental organizations, create and promote the environmental movement's identity. Environmental organizations manipulate and deploy information in strategic ways to convey their message and further identity-formation. In addition, environmental organizations serve as the voice and the muscle that works to bring about political, pro-environmentalism changes.

Sociologists study the multiple discourses present in the U.S. environmental movement. The most common types of environmental discourse include conservationism, preservationism, ecocentrism, political ecology, deep ecology, and ecofeminism. Sociologists studying the environmental movements follow two areas of inquiry: Qualitative examination and comparison of movement organizations and aggregate patterns of organizational behavior. Qualitative examinations of movement organizations tend to yield information about the discourse and practices of specific environmental organizations. Study of aggregate patterns of organizational behavior yield information about patterns of environmental collective action (Brulle, 1996).

The environmental movement works to change structures in society as a means of furthering the environmental agenda. The environmental movement builds identity through publications, events, and targeted positive media exposures. Identity-building is intentional and strategic. Environmental groups, such as the Sierra Club, have become proficient in reaching members through the mass media and direct contact campaigns. The Sierra Club issues online alerts to members informing their constituents about environmental issues. For example, in 2008, the Sierra Club issued an alert urging members to petition Congress to strengthen the global warming bill. The Sierra Club informed members that strong global warming legislation must set science-based targets for reducing global warming emissions and drive investment in our clean energy economy (Latest Alerts, 2008).

Issues

New social movement theory was based on the developments in the environmental, peace and women's organizations that originated in the 1950s through the 1970s. New social movement theory fell out of favor in the early 1980s. In the 1980s, once vocal supporters of new social movement theory, in the field of sociology and social theory in general, began to argue that the post-materialist movements of the 1970s and 1980s, such as those concerning the environment, peace and feminism, no longer challenged contemporary Western values and politics in any meaningful way.

Some sociologists criticize the new social movement theory's claim that new social movements replaced traditional social movements. Critics

argue that social movements with the characteristics of new social movements existed during industrial times and traditional social movements continue to exist side-by-side with new social movements. Critics find that there is little research to support a true differentiation between new social movements and traditional social movements. In addition, critics of new social movement theory find fault with new social movement theory's concern with and focus on liberal politics and near disregard for conservative politics and social movements. Critics of new social movement theory argue that the mission and goals of new social movements have been eclipsed by transnational agencies and agendas. Critics question whether new social movements have any relevance in the new millennium – a time characterized by globalization and the intersection of public and private interests (Lentin, 1999).

Bibliography

- Barker, C. & Dale, G. (1998). Protest waves in Western Europe: A critique of new social movement theory. *Critical Sociology*, 24(1/2). Retrieved May 23, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=4984362&site=ehost-live>
- Benford, R. & Snow, D. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), 611-639. Retrieved May 24, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=3780387&site=ehost-live>
- Brulle, R. (1996). Environmental discourse and social movement organizations: A historical and rhetorical perspective on the development of U.S. environmental organizations. *Sociological Inquiry*, 66(1), 58-83. Retrieved May 24, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=9603156001&site=ehost-live>
- Buechler, Steven M (1993). Beyond resource mobilization? Emerging trends in social movement theory. *Sociological Quarterly*, 34(2), 217.
- Camic, C. & Gross, N. (1998). Contemporary development in sociological theory: Current projects and conditions of possibility. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24(1), 453-477. Retrieved May 28, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=1056949&site=ehost-live>
- Canel, E. (2004). New social movement theory and resource mobilization theory: The need for integration. The International Development Research Center. Retrieved May 24, 2008, from http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-54446-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html
- Cohen, J. (1985) Strategy or identity: New theoretical paradigms and contemporary social movements. *Social Research*, 52(4), 663-716.

- Edelman, M. (2001). Social movement: Changing paradigms and forms of politics. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30, 285-317.
- Fuchs, C. (2006). The self-organization of social movements. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, 19(1), 101-137.
- Gentry, C. (2004). The relationship between new social movement theory and terrorism studies: The role of leadership, membership, ideology and gender. *Terrorism & Political Violence*, 16(2), 274-293.
- Latest Alerts. (2008). Sierra Club Action Center. Retrieved May 24, 2008, from <http://action.sierraclub.org/site/PageServer?pagename=TakeAction&JServSessionIdr009=htk75za522.app26a>
- Lentin, A. (1999). Structure, strategy, sustainability: What future for new social movement theory? *Sociological Research Online*, 4(3). Retrieved May 24, 2008, from <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/4/3/lentin.html>
- Morrison, D. (1971). Some notes toward theory on relative deprivation, social movements, and social change. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 14(5), 675.
- Offe, C. (1985) New social movements: Challenging the boundaries of institutional politics. *Social Research*, 52(4), 817-68.
- Paletz, D. (2002). *The Media in American Politics: Contents and Consequences*. New York: Longman.
- Ruggiero, V. (2000). New social movements and the 'centri sociali' in Milan. *Sociological Review*, 48(2). Retrieved May 24, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=3157178&site=ehost-live>
- Simsek, S. (2004). New social movements in Turkey since 1980. *Turkish Studies*, 5(2), 111-139. Retrieved May 24, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Complete. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=14572947&site=ehost-live>
- Touraine, A. (1985) An introduction to the study of new social movements. *Social Research* 52(4), 749-787.
- Vahabzadeh, P. (2001). A critique of ultimate referentiality in the new social movement theory of Alberto Melucci. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 26(4), 611-634. Retrieved May 24, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Complete. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=5888058&site=ehost-live>

Suggested Reading

- Klandermans, B. (1984). Mobilization and participation: Social-psychological expansions of resource mobilization theory. *American Sociological Review*, 49(5), 583-600. Retrieved May 24, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=14858682&site=ehost-live>
- Mees, L. (2004). Politics, economy, or culture? The rise and development of Basque nationalism in the light of social movement theory. *Theory & Society*, 33(3/4), 311-331.

Retrieved May 24, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Complete. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=14205233&site=ehost-live>

Rose, F. (1997). Toward a class-cultural theory of social movements: Reinterpreting new social movements. *Sociological Forum*, 12(3), 461-494. Retrieved May 24, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=11302496&site=ehost-live>

Relative Deprivation Theory

Simone I. Flynn

Overview

Understanding the history, applications, and strengths and weaknesses of relative deprivation theory is vital background for all those interested in the sociology of social movements. This article explains relative deprivation theory in three parts:

- An overview of the origins and main contributors to relative deprivation theory.
- A description of how relative deprivation theory is applied to analyze and understand why social movements form.
- A discussion of the main criticisms of relative deprivation theory.

The Basics of Relative Deprivation Theory

Relative deprivation theory refers to the idea that feelings of deprivation and discontent are related to a desired point of reference (i.e. reference groups). Feelings of relative deprivation arise when desires become legitimate expectations and those desires are blocked by society. Social satisfaction is the opposite of relative deprivation. Relative deprivation is generally considered to be the central variable in the explanation of social movements and is used to explain the quest for social change that inspires social movements; social movements emerge from collective feelings of relative deprivation (Morrison, 1971).

Relative deprivation theory is applied to socio-political, economic, and organizational problems. For example, relative deprivation theory is used to analyze the organizational issues of pay satisfaction and sex-based pay inequities. Relative deprivation theory focuses on feelings and actions. For example, the theory encourages the exploration of an individual's feelings of deprivation that may result from comparing his or her situation with that of a referent person or group as well as the behavioral effects of deprivation feelings. Relative deprivation theory distinguishes between egoistic deprivation and fraternal deprivation.

- Egoistic deprivation refers to a single individual's feeling of comparative deprivation.
- Fraternal deprivation, also called group deprivation, refers to the discontent arising from the status of the entire group as compared to a referent group. Fraternal deprivation may strengthen a group's collective identity (Singer 1992).

Relative deprivation theory has influenced the development of numerous fields in the social sciences including psychology, economics, and sociology. For example, the theory of relative deprivation has influenced psychological theory. In particular, relative deprivation theory is the foundation of multiple theories of social psychology including frustration-aggression theory, equity theory, social comparison theory, and reference group theory. The concept of relative deprivation and its measurement is used in the field of economics (Bossert & D'Ambrosio, 2007). Economics focuses on the measurement and quantification of relative deprivation using multiple summary indices of deprivation including the Gini coefficient, the maximum index, and the coefficient of variation (Chakravarty & Mukherjee, 1999). In the field of sociology, relative deprivation theory is used to explain the root causes of social movements and revolutions (Krahn & Harrison, 1992).

Social Movement Theory

Relative deprivation theory belongs to the larger body of interdisciplinary work called social movement theory. Social movement theory, which began in the late 19th century, refers to the study of social mobilization including its social, cultural, and political manifestations and consequences. Social movement scholarship is often motivated by a desire for social

change and may integrate scholarship and activism. The interdisciplinary history of social movement theory includes six main areas of study:

- Relative deprivation theory;
- Mass society theory;
- Resource mobilization theory;
- Structural-strain theory;
- Value-added theory;
- New social movement theory.

Social movement theory proposes that social movements are, in many instances, created through the use and manipulation of frames of reference. Social movements influence and control their members through tactics such as mobilizing fear, engaging in frame appropriation, social constructionism, and counterframing (Benford & Snow, 2000).

Social movements born of feelings of relative deprivation are referred to as relative deprivation social movements. Examples include the Labor Movement and Civil Rights Movement. Ultimately, sociology uses relative deprivation theory to explain how feelings of deprivation over power, money, or status may lead individuals and groups to create social movements and seek social change.

The History of Relative Deprivation Theory

Samuel A. Stouffer

Sociologist Samuel A. Stouffer (1900-1960) is credited with developing relative deprivation theory after World War II. Stouffer first wrote of relative deprivation theory in his study entitled "The American Soldier" (1949) which is part of a four-volume series entitled "Studies in Social Psychology in World War II." The series and its component study was a compilation of the data collected during a five-year war-time project that was funded by Carnegie Corporation and the Social Science Research Council (Heck & Wech, 2003).

Stouffer developed the relative deprivation theory while conducting research for the U.S. Army during World War II. Stouffer is remembered as a pioneer in the effort to combine theory and empirical research. Stouffer

reported that World War II soldiers measured their personal success by standards based on experience in the military units in which they serve as opposed to the standards in the armed forces in general. Stouffer's relative deprivation theory, developed to understand the psychology of soldiers, grew to be an established theory of social science scholarship; as such, he is remembered as a pioneer in the effort to combine theory and empirical research (Adams, 1970).

Stouffer conducted the research upon which the relative deprivation theory is based while serving as the director of the U.S. military's Research Branch. The Research Branch, which was officially established in 1941, was a part of the Morale Division, Special Services Division, and Information and Education Division. The Research Branch was created to provide facts about the attitudes of soldiers to the Army command for use in training and policy matters. Specifically, the Research Branch was created to provide a scientific foundation and rationale for policy making, inducting, training, directing, managing, and demobilizing the armed forces. The staff of the Research Branch was comprised of civilian academic advisors, Samuel Stouffer of the University of Chicago, Rensis Likert of the Department of Agriculture, Quinn McNemar of Stanford, and numerous social scientists at the beginning of their careers. The Branch, lead by Stouffer, operated on the notion that applied social science research could contribute in significant ways to pure social science theory and scholarship. Stouffer believed that social science research should have practical applications in industry. As evidenced by his own work with the relative deprivation theory, Stouffer advocated the development of social science theory that was grounded in empirical research (Heck & Wech, 2003).

Stouffer's relative deprivation theory, developed immediately following World War II, was part of the large change in the field of sociology. The U.S. Government and Western European corporations adopted sociological tools, theories, and research methods. The main topics of sociological inquiry during this time included the following:

- Sociological study of social movements;
- Marriage and family;
- Social stratification and political sociology;
- Work and organizations; large scale corporations;
- Gender roles and gender relations.

Stouffer undertook his research on the psychology of soldiers, and subsequent theory-making, as an exercise in applied sociology. This focus on applied sociology was representative of mid-20th century sociology; an increasingly popular department at colleges and universities with applications in industry, government, and family life. Social ethics for individual and social progress for society were no longer driving forces of sociological research; the focus shifted from studies of urban and rural communities to urban issues such as poverty, race relations, and group identity. Study of minorities decreased following World War II only to begin again in the 1960s with the Civil Rights Movement.

Stouffer used the cutting edge sociological research methods of his day to gather the empirical data upon which he based his relative deprivation theory. He helped to usher in a time when sophisticated quantitative and qualitative methods were developed and when descriptive statistics were replaced by mathematical measurements of relationships. Also during this time, surveys (in home, internet, and phone) replaced self-administered questionnaires, sampling and ordering questions became more sophisticated, case studies, popular in the first half of the 20th century, were eclipsed by participant observation, and hypothesis testing replaced scientific empiricism. Sociological theory was also changing during this time. For example, theoretical propositions, statements of how changes in one or more independent variable could affect a dependent variable, replaced concepts. Propositional systems and theoretical models, several propositions linked together on the basis of more abstract conceptions of underlying causal principles, have become popular.

Institutional and financial support for research in sociology changed during the contemporary period. Public funding for social science research grew during postwar period (the 1950s and 1960s), with organizations like the U.S. Government, the Carnegie Corporation and the Social Science Research Council funding Stouffer's work on relative deprivation theory. Such funding went towards crime control, criminology (focusing on crime control strategies), and social deviance. Federal support for sociological research waned in 1970s and 1980s.

Stouffer's work on relative deprivation theory is representative of the shift in sociology from a focus on social reform to theory. Relative deprivation

theory, while its applications to social movements can supply important data that could be used for social reform, is instead primarily used to gather empirical data. Sociology's relationships with other disciplines also changed in the decades following World War II. Sociology's social reform goal of the early 20th century facilitated and promoted a close connection with the field of applied social work. Contemporary sociology has separated from social work and is more closely tied to political science, anthropology, history, and psychology (Turner, 1990).

While modern relative deprivation theory developed in the 1940s, the concept of relative deprivation itself has a longer history in the social sciences. The social sciences have long recognized that deprivation relative to some another person or group can influence behavior. For example, Toqueville and Marx, in the 19th century, used the idea of relative deprivation in their respective analyses of the French Revolution and the problems associated with the rise of capitalism and personal property. Stouffer built on the social science concept of relative deprivation to build and cement his formal theory of relative deprivation following World War II (Krahn & Harrison, 1992).

Applications

Sociologists use relative deprivation theory to explain the origins of social movements. Social movements refer to a deliberate voluntary effort to organize individuals who act in concert to achieve group influence and make or block changes. Social movements are power-oriented groups rather than participation-oriented movements. This distinction means that the group actions of social movements are not necessarily of primary benefit to individual members but instead serve the groups' larger goals. Coordinated group actions are undertaken to make changes in the larger socio-political context. Social movements tend to be most successful in open, democratic societies in which social mobility and social change are accepted concepts. Norm-oriented social movements are more common than value-oriented social movements.

Norm-oriented movements refer to groups that attempt changes within the system.

Value-oriented movements refer to groups that attempt to change the basic goals of a system.

When applying relative deprivation theory to social movements, sociologists look to see what structural conditions exist within the society to foster feelings of relative deprivation and lead to the creation of specific social movements (Morrison, 1971).

Sociologists use relative deprivation theory to explain the origins of the Labor and Civil Rights Movements in the United States. The early American Civil Rights Movement, which occurred in the 1950s and early 1960s, grew to include a wide range of groups united by a belief in equality and equal access to resources. Civil rights activists framed their demands in the language of relative deprivation, democratic rights and Christian universalism. The narrative of the Civil Rights Movement highlights the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, famous public protests, as well as the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (Morisson, 1971). The early Civil Rights Movement was born from African Americans' feelings of deprivation in relation to Caucasian segments of society. Access to a public education was a defining issue of the Civil Rights Movement. In the 1950s, racial segregation in public schools was pervasive throughout the United States. At this time, the schools educating African-American students were inferior, as judged by limited resources and teacher quality, to schools educating Caucasian students.

In 1951, an African-American child, third-grader Linda Brown, became representative of the deprivation that African American school children faced as compared to Caucasian school children. Linda Brown was denied access to the "white" elementary school nearer to her home and was forced to walk a longer distance, across dangerous railroad tracks, to the "black" elementary school. This situation gave rise to the lawsuit by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) that challenged segregation in public schools. The court case, *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, requested an injunction that would forbid the segregation of Topeka, Kansas public schools.

In 1954, the United States Supreme Court ruled on *Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka* and found that separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. The Supreme Court found that racial segregation was a violation of the United States Constitution. Ultimately, Linda Brown's feelings of relative deprivation concerning access to schools and the result-

ing court case *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* served as one of the many sparks that ignited the Civil Rights Movement. Students' civil rights and civil liberties were expanded and clarified in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Civil Rights Act has the following goals:

- To enforce the constitutional right to vote.
- To confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations.
- To authorize the Attorney General to institute suits to protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education.
- To empower the Commission on Civil Rights.
- To prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs.
- To establish a Commission on Equal Employment Opportunity.

The influence of the early Civil Rights Movement's effort to desegregate public schools continues to influence the direction and running of public schools today. Public schools are overseen by both state and federal governments in an effort to insure equality in education for all students regardless of race or class. The U.S. Department of Education was established in 1980 under the Department of Education Organization Act. Prior to Department of Education Organization Act, the Department of Education and the Department of Health and Human Services were united in one agency called the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The U.S. Department of Education oversees funding and education law. Today, public education is decentralized and the domain of both state and federal governments.

Issues

Critics debate and question numerous aspects of relative deprivation theory. Namely, critics question the link between feelings of deprivation and the rise of social movements and argue that studies of relative deprivation must recognize egoistic deprivation, fraternal deprivation, and self-referenced relative deprivation.

Since the development of relative deprivation theory in the 1950s, sociologists have used relative deprivation theory to explain the origin of social movements. The central idea of relative deprivation theory suggests that individuals or groups feel deprived when their current circumstances are negatively compared to the situation of others. Scholars have questioned the link between relative deprivation and social movements. Much of the evidence linking social movements to feelings of relative deprivation is indirect. While absolute deprivation clearly leads to feelings of discontent and ultimately efforts to effect social change, feelings of relative deprivation may or may not definitively lead to the creation of social movements and collective identity (Morrison, 1971).

The second serious criticism of relative deprivation theory concerns a lack of focus on the individual. Critics assert that sociologists using relative deprivation theory tend to examine individual and collective relative deprivation but ignore self-referenced relative deprivation. Relative deprivation theory distinguishes between egoistic deprivation and fraternal deprivation. Egoistic deprivation refers to a single individual's feeling of comparative deprivation. Fraternal deprivation, also called group deprivation, refers to the discontent arising from the status of the entire group as compared to a referent group (Singer, 1992).

The importance of self-referenced relative deprivation is little recognized. Self-referenced relative deprivation results from comparisons with one's own previous or anticipated future situation rather than with the situation of others. Sociologists who dismiss self-referenced relative deprivation believe that self-referenced relative deprivation may have more impact on the efforts that individuals make to change their individual situations rather than on group-level political or social action. Sociologists who support further research into self-referenced relative deprivation believe that self-referenced relative deprivation may serve as a catalyst to examine one's beliefs about the fairness and justice in society. In this scenario, self-referenced relative deprivation influences economic beliefs, political attitudes, and voting behavior and ultimately can influence and lead to social action (Krahn & Harrison, 1992).

Bibliography

Adams, W. (1970). Academic self-image as a strong determinant of college entrance and adult prospects: relative deprivation theory applied to high school curriculum choice.

- American Journal of Economics & Sociology, 29(2), 199-220. Retrieved April 27, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=4515201&site=ehost-live>
- Benford, R. & Snow, D. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), 611-639. Retrieved April 27, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=3780387&site=ehost-live>
- Walter B & D'Ambrosio, C. (2007). Dynamic measures of individual deprivation. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 28(1), 77-88.
- Chakravarty, S. & Mukherjee, D. (1999). Measures of deprivation and their meaning in terms of social satisfaction. *Theory and Decision*, 47(1), 89-100.
- Grant, P. & Brown R. (1995). From ethnocentrism to collective protests: Responses to relative deprivation and threats to social identity. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58(3), 195-212. Retrieved April 27, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=9510300316&site=ehost-live>
- Heck, A. & Wech, B. (2003). Samuel A. Stouffer and The American Soldier: The serendipitous discovery of relative deprivation and its contribution to management thought. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 8(4), 52-67.
- Krahn, H. & Harrison, T. (1971). 'Self-referenced' relative deprivation and economic beliefs: The effects of the recession in Alberta. *Canadian Review of Sociology & Anthropology*, 29(2), 191-209. Retrieved April 27, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=9209072178&site=ehost-live>
- Martinson, D. (2000). A school responds to controversial student speech. *Clearing House*, 73(3), 145-150. Retrieved April 27, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=2681678&site=ehost-live>
- Morrison, D. (1971). Some notes toward theory on relative deprivation, social movements, and social change. *The American Behavioral Scientist* (pre-1986), 14(5), 675.
- Park, H. & Mason, T. (1986). The developmental parameters of relative deprivation theory. *Studies in Comparative Development*, 21(3), 85-118. Retrieved April 27, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=6969245&site=ehost-live>
- Singer, M. (1992). The application of relative deprivation theory to justice perception of preferential selection. *Current Psychology*, 11(2), 128-145. Retrieved April 27, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=9603062262&site=ehost-live>
- Taylor, M. (1982). Improved conditions, rising expectations, and dissatisfaction: A test of the past/present relative deprivation hypothesis. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 45(1), 24-33. Retrieved April 27, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search

Premier. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=13576551&site=ehost-live>

Turner, R. (1990). The many faces of American sociology: a discipline in search of identity. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 33(6), 662.

Suggested Reading

Jackson, L. (1989). Relative deprivation and the gender wage gap. *Journal of Social Issues*, 45(4), 117-133. Retrieved April 27, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=16407340&site=ehost-live>

Steinberg, M. (1992). Recent social movement theory: Moving from the theoretical margins to Main Street? *Sociological Forum*, 7(3), 551-556. Retrieved April 27, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Complete. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=10797731&site=ehost-live>

Turley, R. (2002). Is relative deprivation beneficial? The effects of richer and poorer neighbors on children's outcomes. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 30(6), 671-686. Retrieved April 27, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=11771887&site=ehost-live>

Resource Mobilization Theory

Simone I. Flynn

Overview

The term “social movement” refers to a deliberate, voluntary effort to organize individuals to act in concert to achieve enough group influence to make or block changes. Social movements are power-oriented groups rather than participation-oriented movements, meaning that the group actions of social movements are not necessarily of primary benefit to individual members, but instead serve the groups’ larger goals. Thus, coordinated group actions are undertaken to make changes in the larger socio-political context. Social movements tend to be most successful in open, democratic societies in which social mobility and social change are accepted concepts. Norm-oriented social movements, which are groups that attempt to make changes within a social system, are more common than value-oriented social movements, which seek to change the fundamental goals of a social system (Morrison, 1971).

Resource mobilization theory is one means sociologists use to explain the characters and outcomes of social movements. Understanding the principles, applications, and strengths and weaknesses of resource mobilization theory is vital background for all those interested in the sociology of social movements. This article explains resource mobilization theory in three distinct parts: an overview of the main principles and origins of resource mobilization theory; a description of how resource mobilization theory

is applied to analyze and understand the character and success of social movements; and a discussion of the main criticisms of resource mobilization theory.

The Basics of Resource Mobilization Theory

The resource mobilization theory of social movements holds that a social movement arises from long-term changes in a group's organization, available resources, and opportunities for group action. Resource mobilization theory has five main principles (Jenkins, 1983):

1. The actions of social movement's members and participants are rational.
2. A social movement's actions are strongly influenced by institutionalized power imbalances and conflicts of interest.
3. These power imbalances and conflicts of interest are sufficient to generate grievances that lead to the mobilization of social movement's intent on changing the distribution of resources and organization.
4. Centralized and formally structured social movements more effectively mobilize resources and achieve goals of change than decentralized and informal social movements.
5. The success of social movements is heavily influenced by group strategy and the political climate.

The resource mobilization theory of social movements examines structural factors, including a group's available resources and the position of group members in socio-political networks, to analyze the character and success of social movements. According to resource mobilization theory, participation in social movements is a rational behavior, based on an individual's conclusions about the costs and benefits of participation, rather than one born of a psychological predisposition to marginality and discontent (Klandermans, 1984).

The resource mobilization theory of social movements is used to explain how social movements since the 1950s have evolved from classical social

movements, which are characterized by local leadership, volunteer staff, collective actions, large membership, and resources donated from direct beneficiaries; to professional social movements, which characterized by professional leadership, paid staff, informal membership, resources donated from outside the movement, and actions that represent the movement but do not require member participation. Resource mobilization theory of social movements explains how social movements mobilize resources, from inside and outside their movement, to reach goals (Jenkins, 1983).

Resource mobilization theory argues that social movements succeed through the effective mobilization of resources and the development of political opportunities for members. Social movements can mobilize both material and non-material resources. Material resources include money, organizations, manpower, technology, means of communication, and mass media, while non-material resources include legitimacy, loyalty, social relationships, networks, personal connections, public attention, authority, moral commitment, and solidarity (Fuchs, 2006).

Resource mobilization theory holds that social movement organizations with powerless or resource-poor beneficiaries require outside support and funding. There are two types of members belonging to social movement organizations: conscience constituents and beneficiary constituents. Social movements often seek out and receive resources from conscience constituents. Conscience constituents refer to individuals or groups outside of the social movement who have a moral alliance with the social movement's cause, goal, or mission. The social movement and the mass media are responsible for framing the social movement's message and character. Resource mobilization theorists have found that conscience constituents tend to contribute more when beneficiaries are framed, by the social movement itself or mass media, to emphasize commonalities with conscience constituents (Paulsen & Glumm, 1995).

Ultimately, the resource mobilization theory of social movements helps to explain the formation of social movements, the process of social mobilization, and the politics of social movements. The connections between resource mobilization theory and the formation of social movements, the process of social mobilization, and the politics of social movements will be addressed below.

The Formation of Social Movements

Resource mobilization theorists analyze why social movements form. Traditional theories of social movements argue that social movements form from the personal grievances that arise from structural and social change. In contrast, resource mobilization theory argues that social movements arise from the long-term changes in group resources, organization, and collective action opportunities. The entrepreneurial theory of social movements, a sub-theory of resource mobilization, argues that the major factor in the formation of social movements is the availability of resources, not personal grievance. Support for the entrepreneurial theory of social movements was garnered from studies of public interest movements of the 1970s. Public interest movements, including the environmental movement, anti-nuclear movement, and consumer-safety movement, were found to be initiated by public-minded entrepreneurs rather than individuals motivated by grievance, alienation, or discontent. Numerous resources, such as the welfare movement, farm worker movement, and Civil Rights Movements, have benefited from the direction of entrepreneurial leadership (Jenkins, 1983).

Social mobilization refers to the process of persuading people to join and support a social movement organization, whether it is through material and non-material means. Social mobilization involves two steps: consensus mobilization and action mobilization. Consensus mobilization refers to the process by which a social movement organization attempts to garner support for its opinions. The consensus mobilization process includes the formation of a collective good, social movement strategy, confrontation with the opposition, and a review of results. Action mobilization refers to the process by which organizations within social movements solicit active participation. Action mobilization is based on the ability of social movement actors and organizers to motivate others to participate. Mobilizing organizations work to make people see that the benefits to participation and the costs of non-participation are high (Klandermans, 1984).

The process of mobilization is used to secure collective control of the resources necessary for collective action. The social movement organization must examine the resources the group has access to prior to mobilization, the strategies the group will use to gain new resources, and the likelihood of people adding new resources to the group.

Resources used to mobilize social movements may be intangible or tangible. Intangible resources, also referred to as human assets or resources, that can mobilize social movements include the specialized resources of organizational or legal abilities, the diverse skills of supporters, legitimacy, loyalty, social relationships, networks, personal connections, authority, moral commitments, and solidarity (Fuchs, 2006). Tangible resources used to mobilize social movements include money, facilities, and means of communication. Institutions, which may influence the mobilization of resources for social movements, include private foundations, social welfare organizations, colleges and universities, the mass media, government agencies, and business and industry.

Resource mobilization theorists consider the following categories of resources to significantly affect the character and success of social movements:

Instrumental resources are the resources that are used in the attempts to influence and motivate participants.

Infra-resources refer to the resources that condition and influence the use of instrumental resources.

Power resources are the resources that provide the means for controlling targets.

Mobilizing resources refer to the resources that facilitate the mobilization of power resources.

Resource mobilization theorists recognize that resources tend to have multiple uses (Jenkins, 1983).

The Politics of Social Movements

Resource mobilization theorists argue that the outcome and success of a social movement is dependent on the larger political climate. This perspective, referred to as an open system approach, is in contrast to the traditional closed system approach of traditional social movements in which social movements are believed to pass through fixed stages regardless of the political climate. Resource mobilization theorists believe that the outcomes

of social movements are influenced by strategic choices, the positions and actions of elites, the support of influential organizations, and governing coalitions and regimes. There are four outcomes for social organization: full success, acceptance without benefits or gains, benefits and gains without acceptance, and failure.

The mass media is an integral part of the political participation effort by social movements. It influences the politics of social movements by informing the elites and public about the actions of social movements as well as interpreting these actions (Jenkins, 1983). Social movements often solicit media coverage through the creation of quasi-political events that will be of interest to the news media. The mass media's depictions of the politics of social movements are usually mixed in tone. Social movements that engage in lawful, peaceful, and conventional forms of political participation tend to receive both positive and negative coverage. Social movements that engage in forceful, violent, or anti-authoritarian acts tend to be depicted in a negative way. Contextual factors that influence media coverage of social movements include the authorities' level of control over the political environment. Media factors that influence media coverage of social movements include the media's use of frames to interpret and represent political events and issues (Paletz, 2002).

The History of Resource Mobilization Theory

Social movement theory as a field of inquiry was founded in the late nineteenth century. The interdisciplinary history of social movement theory includes six main areas of study: resource mobilization theory, mass society theory, relative deprivation theory, structural-strain theory, value-added theory, and new social movement theory. Social movement theory proposes that social movements are, in many instances, created through the use and manipulation of frames. Social movements influence and control their members through tactics such as mobilizing fear, engaging in frame appropriation, social constructionism, and counterframing. Social movements are analyzed in two main ways: social constructionist perspective and frame analysis (Benford & Snow, 2000).

Resource mobilization theory developed in the 1960s in opposition to collective behavior theory (as advocated by Durkheim and Blumer), which considered social movements to be irrational and the outgrowths

of personal grievances and discontent (Fuchs, 2006). In the 1960s, social science studies of collective action experienced a paradigm shift. Abstract theories of collective action evolved from a focus on mass behavior in the early twentieth century gave way in the 1960s and 1970s to resource mobilization, which was in turn supplanted by new social movement theory in the 1990s (Edelman, 2001).

Resource mobilization theory developed in reaction to traditional social-psychological analysis of social movements. In developing it, theorists largely abandoned the social-psychological approach that characterized other social movement theories like relative deprivation theory, mass society theory, and collective behavior theory. These social-psychological theories all tended to focus on identifying factors that attract individuals to social movements (e.g. personality traits, grievances, disillusionment, and ideology). They also tended to consider participation in social movements to be irrational and unconventional behavior.

In the 1960s, however, resource mobilization theorists used many of the social movements happening at the time to challenge the assumptions behind the traditional social-psychological theories of social movements. For example, resource mobilization theorists (through their studies of the Civil Rights, student, union, political protest, anti-abortion, environmental, and anti-nuclear movements) found that social movements participants were not wholly marginalized or alienated individuals.

Traditional theories of social movements see the category of social movements as including personal change movements (such as cults and communes) and institutional change movements (such as the labor movement). Resource mobilization theory, however, limits the social movement's category to institutional change movement's intent on reshaping the social structure or distribution of power and resources in society. The three traditional approaches to understanding social movements - relative deprivation theory, mass society theory, and collective behavior theory - are united by their efforts to understand the individual problems that arise from social change. These theories assume that the participants in social movements are often isolated, desperate, and irrational. Resource mobilization theory offers an alternative to this view by focusing on the economic and political variables that can give rise to social movements. It

focused on the connections between social movements, institutionalized actions, the rationality of actors in social movements, and the potential for social movements to bring about social change.

In the 1960s, resource mobilization theory eclipsed the traditional theories of social movements to become the dominant theory explaining the origins and characters of social movements. It remained so until the 1990s (Klandermans, 1984).

Applications

Political Opportunities

When applying resource mobilization theory to a social movement, sociologists examine how the movement mobilizes resources and what political opportunities, if any, it creates or seeks out. Resource mobilization theorists look for evidence of material resource used, including the use of money, organizations, manpower, technology, means of communication, mass media; and non-material resource use, including legitimacy, loyalty, social relationships, networks, personal connections, public attention, authority, moral commitment, and solidarity. Resource mobilization theory argues that a group's level of affluence influences whether or not a social movement will form. Resource mobilization theory also recognizes the importance of charismatic leadership for motivating members to mobilize resources (Fuchs, 2006).

Resource mobilization theory argues that social movements arise from the long-term changes in a group's or organization's access to resources and opportunities for group action. For example, resource mobilization theorists seeking to explain the formation and success of the Civil Rights Movement would observe that the early Civil Rights Movement of the 1950s did not use external resources to mobilize and achieve gains, but instead relied on local community networks. By the 1960s, the Civil Rights Movement had made such sufficient gains within institutional realms, such as education and labor rights, that it could successfully mobilize resources from external sources.

Resource mobilization theorists would argue that the Civil Rights Movement was made possible by the urbanization and industrialization

of the South, a rise in the number of middle-class African-Americans, increased opportunity for and enrollment in historically African-American colleges, and the expansion of African-American churches. These structural and organizational changes, they would say, repositioned African-Americans in society. Their votes became influential in the outcomes of political elections, and their resources and number of organizations increased as historical, social controls over them lessened.

In contrast, a traditional psych-social explanation of social movements might argue that the Civil Rights Movement emerged from African-Americans' feelings of discontent, alienation, and deprivation. Relative deprivation theorists assert that the early American Civil Rights Movement grew to include a wide range of groups united by a belief in equality and equal access to resources. According to them, civil rights activists framed their demands in the language of relative deprivation, democratic rights, and Christian universalism. This narrative of the Civil Rights Movement highlights the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, the famous public protests, and the passages of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (Morison, 1971). All of these events, relative deprivation theorists argue, demonstrate that the early Civil Rights Movement was born from African Americans' feelings of deprivation in relation to Caucasian segments of society.

Issues

While resource mobilization theory dominated social movement theory from the 1960s to the 1980s, critics have begun to find fault with the theory's narrow political and economic focus. A number of issues pose a major theoretical challenge to the dominance of resource mobilization theory. For example, resource mobilization theory focuses almost exclusively on centralized social movement organizations and ignores decentralized social movement communities. Resource mobilization theory discounts the importance of a collective identity in the actions, characters, and outcomes of social movements, and it does not explain individuals' motivation to join and participate in social movements (Beuchler, 1993). In effect, resource mobilization theory's focus on large-scale analyses can undervalue the micro-level processes of individual motivation, personality transformation, and cultural change (Jenkins, 1983).

Further, resource mobilization theory limits the category of social movements to institutional change movement's intent on transforming the social structure or distribution of power and resources in society, claiming that all social movements are an extension of institutional actions. As a result, it ignores personal change movements, such as cults, communes, and religious sects, which the theory considers to rely on social interactions and charismatic leadership for defining goals rather than institutional structures. By so narrowly defining social movements, though, the theory can limit its applications.

Conclusion

While traditional theories of social movements, namely relative deprivation theory, mass society theory, and collective behavior theory, seek to provide a global explanation of social movements, resource mobilization theory is exclusively used to explain institutional change movements (Jenkins, 1983). Ultimately, resource mobilization theory can limit its usefulness by failing to recognize and account for the psycho-social elements of social movements (Klandermans, 1984).

Bibliography

- Benford, R. & Snow, D. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), 611-639. Retrieved May 4, 2008 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=3780387&site=ehost-live>
- Buechler, Steven M (1993). Beyond resource mobilization? Emerging trends in social movement theory. *Sociological Quarterly*, 34(2), 217.
- Cress, D. & Snow, D. (1996). Mobilization at the margins: Resources, benefactors, and the viability of homeless social movement. *American Sociological Review*, 61(6), 1089-1109. Retrieved May 4, 2008 from EBSCO online database Academic Search Complete: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=24258740&site=ehost-live>
- Edelman, M. (2001). Social movements: Changing paradigms and forms of politics. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30(1), 285-317. Retrieved May 4, 2008 from EBSCO online database Academic Search Complete: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=6533574&site=ehost-live>
- Fuchs, C. (2006). The self-organization of social movements. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, 19(1), 101-137.

- Jenkins, C. (1983). Resource mobilization theory and the study of social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9(1), 527-554. Retrieved May 4, 2008 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=10458287&site=ehost-live>.
- Klandermans, B. (1984). Mobilization and participation: Social-psychological expansions of resource mobilization theory. *American Sociological Review*, 49(5), 583-600. Retrieved May 4, 2008 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=14858682&site=ehost-live>
- Morrison, D. (1971). Some notes toward theory on relative deprivation, social movements, and social change. *The American Behavioral Scientist* (pre-1986), 14(5), 675.
- Paletz, D. (2002). *The media in American politics: Contents and consequences*. New York: Longman.
- Paulsen, R. & Glumm, K. (1995). Resource mobilization and the importance of bridging beneficiary and conscience constituencies. *National Journal of Sociology*, 9(2), 37-62. Retrieved May 4, 2008 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=10718489&site=ehost-live>

Suggested Reading

- Opp, K. & Roehl, W. (1990). Repression, micromobilization, and political protest. *Social Forces*, 69(2), 521-547. Retrieved April May 4, 2008 from EBSCO online database Academic Search Complete: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=9103181790&site=ehost-live>
- Park, H. & Mason, T. (1986). The developmental parameters of relative deprivation theory. *Studies in Comparative Development*, 21(3), 85-118. Retrieved May 4, 2008 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=6969245&site=ehost-live>
- Steinberg, M. (1992). Recent social movement theory: Moving from the theoretical margins to Main Street. *Sociological Forum*, 7(3), 551-556. Retrieved April 27, 2008 from EBSCO online database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=6969245&site=ehost-live> .

Structural-Strain Theory

Simone I. Flynn

Overview

The following is an analysis of structural-strain theory. Structural-strain theory argues that structures in society may promote deviance and crime. Sociologists and criminologists use structural-strain theory to analyze and predict deviant behavior. Understanding the history, applications, and strengths and weaknesses of structural-strain theory is vital background for all those interested in the sociology of deviant social movements and subcultures such as gangs. This article explains structural-strain theory in three parts:

- An overview of the main principles, history, and contributors to structural-strain theory.
- A description of how structural-strain theory is applied to analyze and understand why deviant social movements form.
- A discussion of the main criticisms of structural-strain theory.

The Main Principles of Structural-Strain Theory

Structural-strain theory refers to the idea that social structures put pressure on individuals to engage in deviant and criminal behavior. Structural-strain theory is part of a larger body of ideas called strain theories. Structural-

strain theory, and all strain theories in general, is a structural-functional explanation of deviance and criminality (Featherstone & Deflem, 2003). The concept of strain refers to the pressure on lower economic classes to engage in any means necessary to achieve society's goals of monetary success. Sociologists use individual and group expectations, and a combination of income, education, and occupation, to measure strain.

There are two main types of strain in society that may promote deviance and crime: structural strain and individual strain.

- Structural strain refers to the cycle of inadequate regulation at the societal level that negatively impacts how an individual perceives his or her needs, means, and opportunities.
- Individual strain refers to the problems individuals experience as they work to meet needs and satisfy desires (O'Connor, 2007).

The History of Structural-Strain Theory

Structural-strain theory, developed by Robert Merton in the 1930s, was based on Emile Durkheim's theory of anomie. Anomie refers to idea that the problems in society, such as crime and deviance, result from social deregulation. Building on Emile Durkheim's ideas about anomie, Robert Merton, Albert Cohen, Richard Cloward, Lloyd Ohlin, and Robert Agnew each developed and contributed to structural-strain theory. Merton, Cohen, Cloward, Ohlin, and Agnew's strain theories assert that the frustration and stress caused by goal blockage increases the likelihood of deviance, criminality, and delinquency (Agnew, 1987).

The field of sociology quickly embraced structural-strain theory as a structural explanation for deviant behavior. Strain came to be understood as the social-psychological mechanism that caused deviant behavior from the effects of anomie. Structural-strain theory was the dominant explanation for deviance from the 1930s through the 1960s. But, starting in the 1970s, scholars began to question the empirical support and evidence for structural-strain theory. This skepticism within the field of sociology towards the structural-strain theory lasted into the 1970s and 1980s, but the theory experienced a rekindling of interest in the 1990s (Featherstone & Deflem, 2003).

Structural-strain theory belongs to the larger body of interdisciplinary work called social movement theory which began in the late 19th century. Social movement theory refers to the study of social mobilization including its social, cultural, and political manifestations and consequences. Social movement scholarship is often motivated by a desire for social change and integrates scholarship and activism. In the case of structural-strain theory, social movement theorists study strain to understand how and why deviance and criminality occurs. The interdisciplinary history of social movement theory includes six main areas of study:

- Structural-strain theory,
- Relative deprivation theory,
- Resource mobilization theory,
- Mass society theory,
- Value-added theory,
- New social movement theory.

Social movement theory proposes that social movements are, in many instances, created through the use and manipulation of frames. Social movements, including deviant social movements (such as gangs), influence and control their members through tactics such as mobilizing fear, engaging in frame appropriation, social constructionism, and counterframing (Snow & Benford,1992).

The Main Contributors to Structural-Strain Theory

There have been five main contributors to structural-strain theory. Building on Emile Durkheim's ideas about anomie, Robert Merton, Albert Cohen, Richard Cloward, Lloyd Ohlin, and Robert Agnew developed and evolved versions of structural-strain theory used today by sociologists, psychologists, and criminologists.

Emile Durkheim

Emile Durkheim (1858-1917), a protégé of Auguste Comte, was a French sociologist concerned with the problem of the individual and society as well as issues of solidarity and social cohesion. Durkheim's theory of anomie, introduced in "Suicide" (1897), became the foundation for structural-strain

theory. Anomie refers to the idea that problems in society, such as crime and deviance, result from social deregulation. According to Durkheim, people's social roles or functions hold society together. He developed two important theories:

- Organic solidarity, which relates the bonds of a population of people with their employment, labor, and social roles, and;
- Mechanical solidarity, the bonding or of a small group of people around similar interests, values, and beliefs.

Organic and mechanical solidarity promote social cohesion and collective conscience. Durkheim's theories of cultural differentiation and structural differentiation influenced the field of sociology by explaining how cultural and social structures could foster social cohesion and divisiveness.

Cultural differentiation refers to the idea that the degree of consensus over cognitive orientations and cultural codes among the members of a population is related to their interpersonal interaction, level of emotional arousal, and rate of ritual performance. Structural differentiation, a term borrowed from Spencer, refers to the idea that the degree of differentiation among a population is related to the level of competition among these actors, the rate of growth in this population, the extent of ecological concentration of this population, and the rate of population mobility.

Durkheim, over the course of his life, moved from a macro focus on structural processes to a micro focus on social, psychological, and interpersonal processes such as co-presence, ritual, interaction, and emotional arousal. To learn how individuals related to society, he studied the social structure, societal norms, laws, community, groups, and societal roles in French society. In his research, Durkheim looked for the causes and functions of social phenomena. Durkheim may be most famous for his observations of suicide rates among certain social groups, which underscores his interest in the power of social cohesion (Turner, 1990).

Robert Merton

Robert Merton (1910-2003) made significant contributions to the sociology of deviance. Merton's work on social structure and anomie is considered

to be a classic in sociology. In addition, Merton's work is often used in the field of criminology. Merton argued that the cultural system in the United States encouraged everyone to pursue financial success over all other goals. Merton's version of strain theory, which posits that social structures may encourage actors to commit criminal acts, preserves the theoretical link between culture and social structure. Merton was heavily influenced by the work of Pitirim Sorokin, a Russian sociologist who used quantitative methods to study the variables of social change (Rosenfeld, 1989).

Merton developed two theoretical elements in his social-structure-and-anomie paradigm: a strain theory and an anomie theory. Building on Durkheim's concept of anomie, Merton considered the anomie concept to explain deviation from socially prescribed patterns of conduct. Merton's theory of anomie refers to the "deinstitutionalization of social norms that occurs when there is a disjunction between cultural goals and institutional means" (Featherstone & Deflem, 2003, p. 472). In the field of sociology, anomie generally refers to an imbalance between cultural goals and the legitimate means of achieving those goals. Merton argued that the lower classes experienced the greatest pressures toward deviant behavior. For example, individuals who are blocked from attaining wealth, a recognized and shared goal of our society, may engage in illegal activity to gain money. In this scenario, Merton asserts that it is the social structure exerting pressure on the individual to engage in deviant and criminal behavior.

Merton's strain theory of deviant behavior argues that "people are more likely to pursue illegitimate means of attaining culturally prescribed goals when they are blocked from the institutionalized means" of reaching these goals (Featherstone & Deflem, 2003, p. 472). For example, people without the means or cultural knowledge to enter higher education and respected professions are more likely to engage in deviant behavior than those with access to legitimate means of achieving goals. Merton's strain theory includes macro and micro elements. Merton developed strain theory to explain individual social-psychological consequences of cultural and social-structural phenomena. According to Merton, "the social structure strains the cultural values, making action in accord with them readily possible for those occupying certain statuses within the society and difficult or impossible for others" (cited in Featherstone & Deflem, 2003, p. 479-80).

Merton's concept of strain includes five ways to analyze how individuals adjust to society's patterns of goals and means. These modes are referred to as modes of adaptation. Individual adaptations include mainstream and deviant options: conformity, retreatism, rebellion, ritualism, and innovation.

- Conformity refers to an individual's acceptance of both cultural goals and institutionalized means.
- Retreatism refers to an individual's rejection of the goals and the means of society.
- Rebellion refers to an individual's rejection and active substitution of both the goals and the means of achieving goals.
- Ritualism occurs when the means to legitimately pursue society's goals are followed despite the fact that the goals themselves are out of reach or abandoned.
- Innovation refers to an individual's acceptance of goals but rejection of established means for achieving goals (Featherstone & Deflem, 2003, p. 479).

Merton developed the idea of the reference group to show how "relative deprivation could mediate between social structure and interpersonal patterns of behavior." A reference group develops when individuals compare themselves to others who are similar and evaluate "their own condition by reference to the general conditions of their peers and associates." When individuals compare themselves to others, they develop a sense of relative deprivation (O'Connor, 2007).

Albert Cohen

Cohen (1918-) was a criminologist who studied subcultures like gangs. Cohen argued that class-based status frustrations facilitate and promote the formation of subcultures. In sociology and criminology, frustration refers to an aversive internal state due to goal blockage or most any irresolvable event. Cohen's theory of status frustration refers to the negative feelings created by lower status origins. Status frustration is associated with serious, repetitive criminal offenses. Cohen found that Merton's strain theory did not explain purposeless crime and deviant behavior such as vandalism or

loitering. Subcultures produced malice, non-utilitarianism, and negativism. Cohen argued that strain was not structural so much as interpersonal. According to Cohen, the “social variable of peer influence” and the “psychological variable of reaction formation” determine who engage in criminal and deviant behavior. Reaction formation refers to the process that occurs when individuals from lower economic classes replace social norms and values with alternative values of a subculture. According to Cohen’s strain theory, reaction formation is the link between frustration and criminal deviant behavior (O’Connor, 2007).

Richard Cloward & Lloyd Ohlin

Cloward (1926-2001) and Ohlin (1918-) developed the theory of differential opportunity systems (also known as different opportunity theory). The theory of differential opportunity systems argues that intervening variables explain the particular forms of criminal and deviant behavior. Cloward and Ohlin, building on the ideas of Emile Durkheim and Robert Merton, argue that the most important intervening variable is the degree of integration between criminal and conventional values in a community environment. The withdrawal of legitimacy variable stabilizes inner conflict and prepares the individual for recruitment and entry into a subculture. Subcultures, such as gangs, seek out individuals who exhibit evidence that they have given up a belief in and hope for fairness in the world (O’Connor, 2007).

Cloward and Ohlin’s theory of delinquent gangs is considered to be a prime application and example of strain theory. The delinquent gang theory argues that delinquency develops when youth are unable to achieve socially valued goals through conventional, socially-approved means. Cloward and Ohlin identify three categories of delinquent gangs: Criminal; conflict; and retreatist.

- Criminal gangs refer to stable gangs with older criminals serving as role models for younger members.
- Conflict gangs refer to informal gangs focused on conflict as a means of developing their reputation.
- Retreatist gangs refer to gangs that retreat into sex, drug, and alcohol-based activities.

Cloward and Ohlin argue that a complex set of processes; beginning with strain, lead youths to pursue delinquent and criminal solutions to their problems.

According to Cloward and Ohlin, four conditions are necessary for the development of collective patterns of delinquency:

- The weakening of commitment and belief in codes of conduct;
- Joining with others to develop solutions to adjustment problems;
- Acquiring means for managing the guilt and fear from delinquent acts;
- Avoiding obstacles that preclude the possibility of group problem solving (Hoffman & Ireland, 1995).

Robert Agnew

Agnew (1953-) developed a general strain model in the 1990s based on a wide range of negative social relations such as negative life events, physical punishment, adverse school experiences, and negative parental relationships. He argued that variables, such as high self-esteem, high self-efficacy, temperament, conventional social supports, personal belief systems, delinquent peers, externalization of blame, and disposition to delinquency, influenced whether or not an individual would engage in delinquent behavior. Self-efficacy refers to the cognitive quality of attributing outcomes such as success or failure to personal attributes rather than external sources and the perception that one's course of action has a real effect on various outcomes. Self-esteem refers to judgments about one's self-worth. Agnew's strain theory of delinquency argued that strain may weaken an individual's attachment to conventional institutions, stress social bonds, and result in delinquent behavior. Agnew's work on strain theory reignited interest in the study of structural strain by criminologists and social psychologists (Hoffman & Miller, 1998)

Agnew argued that there are three major types of deviant-producing strain:

- Failure to achieve positively valued goals;
- Removal of positively valued stimuli;
- Exposure to negative stimuli.

Agnew found that adolescents were the most sensitive to the variables and conditions of deviant producing strain. He found that an individual's exposure to and experience of strain shaped the individual's personality.

Strain, according to Agnew, leads individuals to feel anger, resentment, rage, dissatisfaction, disappointment, and unhappiness (O'Connor, 2007).

Applications

Sociologists use structural-strain theory to explain the causes of individual and group deviant behavior and criminality. Sociologists and criminologists use strain theory to explain the activities and origins of gangs and subcultures. Gangs and subcultures are types of deviant social movements which refer to a deliberate voluntary organization of individuals who act in concert to make or block changes. Social movements, both mainstream and deviant types, tend to be power-oriented groups rather than participation-oriented movements. This distinction means that the group actions of social movements are not necessarily of primary benefit to individual members but instead serve the groups' larger goals. Coordinated group actions are undertaken to make changes in the larger socio-political context. Social movements tend to be most successful in open, democratic societies in which social mobility and social change are accepted concepts. Norm-oriented social movements are more common than value-oriented social movements.

- Norm-oriented movements refer to groups that attempt changes within the system.
- Value-oriented movements refer to groups that attempt to change the basic goals of a system (Morrison 1971).

Structural-strain theory can be applied to predict and hypothesize about deviant group and individual behavior. For example, sociologists and criminologists use general strain theory (GST) to understand the relationship between gender and crime. Sociological research demonstrates that the gender gap in crime can be explained by gender differences in types of strain and reactions to strain. Higher rates of male crime are linked to the failure to achieve positively valued goals, the loss of positively valued stimuli, and the presentation of negative stimuli (Broidy & Agnew, 1997). Classic strain theory with its focus on poverty status, perceived blocked opportunity, and gang membership, can be used as predictors of adolescent violent behavior (Vowell & May, 2000). Sociologists and criminologists analyze attachment variables, such as family attachment, school attachment, and grades, as well as outcome variable of delinquency, such as property offenses and violent offenses, to predict delinquent behavior:

The family attachment variables assesses family relations based on the degree of emotional bonding that family members perceive toward one another.

The school attachment variable assesses whether respondents feel upset, satisfied, bored, frustrated, unhappy, relaxed, accepted, worried, or popular when thinking about school.

The grades variable collects self-reported data on a respondent's recent grade in the following school subjects: English, Math, History, or Social Studies, and Science.

The property offenses measures criminal behaviors, such as shoplifting, damaging or destroying property, theft of items over \$50 in value, theft of items under \$50 in value, breaking into a house or business to take money or property, lying about one's age to buy liquor or cigarettes, and motor vehicle theft, in the previous year.

The variable of violent offenses includes self-reported information on incidences of beating up another person, participating in a gang fight, carrying a weapon such as a knife or a gun, attacking someone with the intent to kill or seriously hurt, and using a weapon to obtain money or property (Hoffman & Miller, 1998).

Issues

Structural-strain theory, while widely used in sociology and criminology, is criticized for its vague and evolving nature. In particular, Robert Merton's work on strain theory has been criticized for being unfinished and changing. Merton never clearly distinguished between the concepts of strain and anomie. Instead, Merton allowed these concepts, which sociologists agree are distinct concepts, to be used interchangeably. In addition, Merton's definition of anomie has changed over time. He has referred to anomie any kind of imbalance between cultural goals and institutionalized means and has also referred to anomie as a particular type of disjunction of social means and goals. Merton's strain has been celebrated as among the most significant of all major sociological theories and also criticized as being flawed. Merton's inconsistent use of related terms in his writings created confusion and mistrust. Ultimately, Merton's two distinct theories

of anomie and strain remain inexorably connected in his social-structure-and-anomie paradigm (Featherstone & Deflem, 2003).

Bibliography

- Agnew, R. (1987). On testing structural strain theories. *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency*, 23(4), 281-286. Retrieved May 10, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=5547654&site=ehost-live>
- Benford, R. & Snow, D. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), 611-639. Retrieved May 11, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=3780387&site=ehost-live>
- Broidy, L. & Agnew, R. (1997). Gender and crime: A general strain theory perspective. *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency*, 34(3), 275-306. Retrieved May 11, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=9708051578&site=ehost-live>
- Edelman, M. (2001). Social movement: Changing paradigms and forms of Politics. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30, 285-317.
- Enyon, T. (1970). Black equality: Revolution from the movement? *Sociological Focus*, 70(3), 23-31. Retrieved May 9, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=14643677&site=ehost-live>
- Featherstone, R. & Deflem, M. (2003). Anomie and strain: Context and consequences of Merton's two theories. *Sociological Inquiry*, 73(4), 471-489. Retrieved May 9, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=11169661&site=ehost-live>
- Fuchs, C. (2006). The self-organization of social movements. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, 19(1), 101-137.
- Hoffman, H. & Miller, A. (1998). A latent variable analysis of general strain theory. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 14(1), 83-110. Retrieved May 9, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=11303442&site=ehost-live>
- Hoffman, J. & Ireland, T. (1995). The legacy of anomie theory: Cloward and Ohlin's strain theory reexamined. *Advances in Criminological Theory*, 247-270. Retrieved May 9, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=11846856&site=ehost-live>
- Morrison, D. (1971). Some notes toward theory on relative deprivation, social movements, and social change. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 14(5), 675.
- Myers, D. (1997). Racial rioting in the 1960s: An event history analysis of local conditions. *American Sociological Review*, 62(1), 94-112. Retrieved May 12, 2008, from EBSCO

Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=81882&site=ehost-live>

O'Connor, T. (2007). Strain theories of crime. Megalinks in Criminal Justice. Retrieved May 9, 2008, from: <http://www.apsu.edu/oconnort/crim/crimtheory11.htm>.

Rosenfeld, R. (1989). Robert Merton's contributions to the sociology of deviance. *Sociological Inquiry*, 59(4), 453.

Turner, J. (1990). Emile Durkheim's theory of social organization. *Social Forces*, 68(4), 1089.

Vowell, P. & May, D. (2000). Another look at classic strain theory: Poverty status, perceived blocked opportunity, and gang membership as predictors of adolescent violent behavior. *Sociological Inquiry*, 70(1), 42-60. Retrieved May 9, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=2850828&site=ehost-live>

Suggested Reading

Konty, M. (2005). Microanime: The cognitive foundations of the relationship between anomie and deviance. *Criminology*, 43(1), 107-131. Retrieved May 9, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=16438267&site=ehost-live>

Qi, D. (2005). Collective Resistance in post-Mao rural China: an examination of two social movement models. American Sociological Association Annual Meeting. Retrieved May 9, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=18614619&site=ehost-live>

Steinberg, M. (1992). Recent social movement theory: Moving from the theoretical margins to Main Street. *Sociological Forum*, 7(3), 551-556. Retrieved May 9, 2008, from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Complete: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=10797731&site=ehost-live>.

Value-Added Theory

Simone I. Flynn

Overview

The following is an analysis of value-added theory. Value-added theory of collective behavior argues that certain social conditions are necessary for the development of social movements. Sociologists use value-added theory to analyze the origins of social movements during periods of great social change. Understanding the history, applications, and strengths and weaknesses of value-added theory is vital background for all those interested in the sociology of collective identity and social movements. This article explains value-added theory in three parts:

- An overview of the main principles and history of value-added theory.
- A description of how value-added theory is applied to analyze and understand social movements.
- A discussion of the main criticisms of value-added theory.

The Main Principles of Value-Added Theory

The value-added theory of collective behavior determines whether or not collective behavior will occur. The theory argues that a specific combination of determinants facilitates and promotes collective outcomes and behaviors. The determinants of collective behavior form a value-added process. Value-added processes, which originated in the field of economic

theory, refer to processes in which additional value is created at a particular stage of development or production. According to Knottnerus (1983), the value-added theory asserts that determinants to collective behavior combine according to a predictable pattern. Collective behavior requires the appearance of the determinants in a logical and predictable order; specifically, the theory asserts that six social conditions or “determinants are required for the development of a social movement: structural conduciveness, structural strain, generalized beliefs, precipitating factors, mobilization of participants, and social control” (Abstract).

- Structured conduciveness refers to a social situation that permits or encourages some type of collective behavior.
- Structural strain refers to a situation in which some type of deprivation exists.
- Growth and spread of a generalized belief refers to a belief that makes the situation meaningful to actors by identifying the possible source of strain, attributing characteristics to the source, and articulating possible responses to the strain.
- Precipitating factors refers to an act that confirms a generalized belief or exaggerates the condition of strain.
- Mobilization of participants for action refers to bringing the affected group into action.
- Operation of social control refers to the counter-determinants that prevent, deflect, or inhibit the accumulation of the previous determinants (Knottnerus, 1983, p. 390).
- In the value-added theory of collective behavior, four components are said to account for social behavior: situational facilities, roles, norms, and values.
- Situational facilities refer to the means and resources used to attain goals in an organization or role.
- Roles refer to the expected behavior of a person in a social situation.
- Norms refer to the rules governing the pursuit of goals.
- Values refer to the goals or ends of social action.

These four components are ordered hierarchically. Value-added theory asserts that values, followed by norms, roles, and facilities, are the most important factor influencing social behavior and collective action. Values, in this scheme, are the foundation for social system integration and institutionalized action (Knottnerus, 1983, p. 390).

Value-added theory explains how grievances turn into generalized beliefs and then into social movements (Arthur, 2005). Value added theory, also referred to as social strain theory, is part of a larger body of theory called strain theory. Strain refers to the cycle of inadequate regulation at the societal level that negatively impacts how the individual perceives his or her needs, means, and opportunities. Value-added theory of collective behavior argues that individuals join hostile and radical social movements because they experience social strain. Social movements develop to reassure members that action is being taken to address strain, grievances, and deprivation (Weeber & Rodeheaver, 2003).

The value-added theory of collective behavior can be used to understand all variations in collective behavior. According to Lewis (1972), the determinants of collective behavior, structural conduciveness, structural strain, growth of a generalized hostile belief, mobilization of participants for action and operation of social control, take into account a vast range of scenarios that may result in collective behavior such as social movements. While value-added theory explains all types of collective behavior, value-added theory is particularly suited to analyzing and possibly predicting collective hostile outbursts. Hostile outbursts, a form of collective action often a precursor to social movement, refer to the act of mobilization for action under a hostile belief. The spread of hostile outbursts is understood in two main ways: Real and derived phases.

- The real phase of a collective hostile outburst forms in response to the accumulation of unfavorable conditions prior to the beginning of the hostile outburst.
- The derived phase of a collective hostile outburst includes a divide between the hostility and the conditions that caused the outburst (Lewis, 1972).

History

Neil Smelser (1930-) developed value-added theory, also referred to as social strain theory, in the 1960s in response to the belief that all social movements form in the same way. Over the course of his career, Smelser has served as a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford, president of the American Sociological Association, a member of the National Academy of Sciences, and a fellow of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences. Smelser disagreed with the notion that social movements have a predetermined life cycle or stages through which each social movement will move. Smelser, mentored by Talcott Parsons, is a sociologist of collective behavior, social change, and social movements. Smelser's best-known works include the following: "Economy and Society" (1956); "Social Change in the Industrial Revolution" (1959); "Theory of Collective Behavior" (1962); "The Sociology of Economic Life" (1962, 1973); "Essays in Sociological Explanation" (1968); "Comparative Methods in the Social Sciences" (1976); "Social Paralysis and Social Change" (1991); "Social Change and Modernity" (1992); and "Diversity and Its Discontents" (1999).

Smelser based his value-added theory of collective behavior on the belief that collective behavior and social movements occur when feelings of deprivation and strain are created by a culture in contact with a more dominant culture. Smelser viewed social movements, particularly revitalization movements, as an adaptive response to feelings of economic deprivation and social strain. Smelser based his value added theory of collective behavior, which posits that social movements result from a lack of social integration, on the works of Talcott Parsons and Emile Durkheim. Smelser developed his value-added theory of collective action in response to and opposition to the solidarity theory of collective behavior which argues that solidarity and organization (rather than disorganization) facilitate and promote the development of social movements. Ultimately, Smelser's value-added theory can be understood as a description of the specification of conditions necessary for deprivation, strain, and grievance to cause collective episodes (Knottnerus, 1983).

Value-added theory, like other psychological theories of collective identity and collective action, argues that social movements form from individuals who are emotionally reacting to social situations outside of their direct

control. Traditional theories of social movements (including value-added theory, relative deprivation theory, and mass society theory) seek to provide a global explanation of social movements and see the category of social movements as including personal change movements, such as cults and communes, and institutional change movements, such as the labor movement. Collective behavior theories (as advocated by Durkheim, Blumer, and Smelser) consider social movements to be irrational and the result of personal grievances and discontent (Fuchs, 2006).

Traditional social-psychological theories of social movements, such as value-added theory, relative deprivation theory, and mass society theory, considered participation in social movements to be irrational and unconventional behavior. The traditional social-psychological theories of social movements focused on what attracted individuals to social movements including personality traits, grievances, disillusionment, and ideology. Value-added theory, relative deprivation theory, and mass society theory, are united by their efforts to understand the individual problems that arise from social change and assume that the participants in social movements are isolated, desperate, and irrational.

Value-added theory belongs to the larger body of interdisciplinary theory called social movement theory. Social movement theory refers to the study of social mobilization including its social, cultural, and political manifestations and consequences. Social movement theory proposes that social movements are, in many instances, created through the use and manipulation of frames. Social movements, including hostile social movements, such as militias, influence and control their members through tactics such as mobilizing fear, engaging in frame appropriation, social constructionism and counterframing. Social movement scholarship is often motivated by a desire for social change and integrates scholarship and activism. In the case of value-added theory, social movement theorists study individual and group grievances to understand how and why social movements form. Social movement theory began in the late 19th century; the interdisciplinary history of social movement theory includes six main areas of study:

- Value-added theory;
- Structural-strain theory;
- Relative deprivation theory;

- Resource mobilization theory;
- Mass society theory;
- New social movement theory (Benford & Snow, 2000).

Value added theory was a predominant social movement theory throughout the 1960s, however; in the late 1960s, social scientific studies of collective action experienced a paradigm shift. Theories of collective action evolved from a focus on collective behavior in the early 20th century to resource mobilization in the 1970s and then to the political process and new social movements in the 1990s (Edelman, 2001). Resource mobilization theory replaced value-added theory in the 1970s as the predominant explanation for the origins and character of social movements. Resource mobilization theorists largely abandoned the social-psychological analysis of social movements characterized by relative value-added theory, deprivation theory, and mass society theory. Resource mobilization theory refers to the idea that social movements arise from long-term changes in a group's organization, available resources, and opportunities for group action. While traditional theories focused on the problem of individual participation in social movements, resource mobilization theory focused on the economic and political variables. Resource mobilization theory remained the dominant social movement theory from the 1960s through the 1980s (Klandermans, 1984).

Applications

Sociologists use value-added theory to explain the origins of social movements. Social movements refer to a deliberate voluntary organization of individuals who act in concert to make or block changes. Social movements tend to be power-oriented groups rather than participation-oriented movements. This distinction means that the group actions of social movements are not necessarily of primary benefit to individual members but instead serve the groups' larger goals. Coordinated group actions are undertaken to make changes in the larger socio-political context. Social movements tend to be most successful in open, democratic societies in which social mobility and social change are accepted concepts (Morrison, 1971).

Smelser, the originator of value-added theory, has very particular guidelines or parameters for the application of value-added theory to social sce-

narios. For example, Smelser instructed social scientists to look for negative evidence as a means of evaluating whether or not the value-added theory of collective behavior is relevant to a social situation. Smelser argued that two types of social movement scenarios exist:

- First, a collective episode occurs but one or more determinants of collective action are absent.
- Second, all the determinants of collective action are identified but no collective action outburst occurs (Knothnerus, 1983).

Social movement theorists use value-added theory of collective behavior to extensively evaluate whether or not collective action occurs. The following examples of value-added analyses of collective behavior include a wide range of collective behaviors in different historical periods, societies and institutions.

Social scientists used elements of the value-added theory of collective behavior, to explain a 1914 outbreak of monoplane sightings within British South Africa. Researchers identified the collective behavior as a form of mass hysteria or “negative or hostile hysterical belief manifestation.” All of Smelser’s determinants of collective action, such as “structural conduciveness, structural strain, growth and spread of a generalized belief, mobilization of participants for action, and inadequate measures by agencies of social control, were found to be present” prior to and during the collective episode of monoplane sightings (Bartholomew, 1989, Abstract).

Social scientists used value-added theory of collective behavior to study militia presence and activity on the Internet. Researchers hypothesized that individuals who join militias tend to have experienced periods of social strain (as described by Smelser). Researchers analyzed the content of Internet traffic of U.S. militia websites as a means of exploring what types of individuals joined militias. Ultimately, researchers, from 1998-2001, gathered information on 171 men and women from 28 different U.S. militias. Researchers confirmed Smelser’s value-added theory of collective behavior by finding that militia joiners tend to experience social strain prior to and during the time of their militia involvement. In addition, researchers confirmed that Smelser’s determinants of collective action, in

particular “structural conduciveness, structural strain, growth and spread of a generalized belief, mobilization of participants for action, and inadequate measures by agencies of social control,” were present (Weeber & Rodeheaver, 2003).

Social scientists used value-added theory of collective behavior to study a short period of time, two and a half hours, on May 4, 1970 at Kent State University when four students were killed and nine students were wounded. Researchers studied the events occurring prior to and during the campus attack. Researchers found that Smelser’s determinants to collective action, in particular structural conduciveness, structural strain, growth and spread of a generalized belief, mobilization of participants for action, and inadequate measures by agencies of social control, were present prior to and leading up to the hostile outburst (Lewis, 1972).

Ultimately, value-added theory, which can be used to explain all types of collective behavior, is particularly suited to analyzing and possibly predicting collective hostile outbursts. Hostile outbursts, a form of collective action that is often a precursor to social movement, refers to mobilization for action under a hostile belief. The spread of hostile outbursts, such as the Kent State killing and militia involvement described above, is understood in two main ways: Real and derived phases.

The real phase of a collective hostile outburst forms in response to the accumulation of unfavorable conditions prior to the beginning of the hostile outburst. The derived phase of a collective hostile outburst includes a divide between the hostility and the conditions that caused the outburst (Lewis, 1972). Value-added theory of collective behavior argues that individuals join hostile or radical social movements because they experience strain. Value added theory argues that social movement develops to reassure members that action is being taken to address strain, grievances, and deprivation (Weeber & Rodeheaver, 2003).

Issues

Smelser’s value added theory of collective behavior was the predominant theoretical explanation for social movements in the 1960s but fell out of favor in the 1970s. Critics of Smelser’s value added theory of collective

behavior argued that the theory was overly objective in nature. Value-added theory argues that all collective behavior is irrational. Ultimately, value-added theory, with its focus on identifying and labeling the determinants and conditions associated with particular social action, has a limited usefulness and applicability for social scientists (Bartholomew, 1989). In addition, contemporary social movement theorists find fault with the functionalist foundation and leanings of value-added theory. Functionalism explains all social behavior and social institutions as an effort or means of satisfying basic human needs. Functionalist explanations, which are characterized by the idea that social institutions exist solely to meet social needs, tend to be disempowering to social actors in society. Lastly, critics of value-added theory of collective behavior find fault with the theory's argument that all strains on society are disruptive. Social movement theorists have documented numerous strains and resulting social movements that have created positive change for society. Examples of strains and their resulting positive social movements and include the Civil Rights movement and the environmental movement (Arthur, 2005).

Conclusion

Neil Smelser's value-added theory of collective behavior is a useful tool for determining, and in some instances predicting, whether collective behavior will occur. The value-added theory, developed in the 1960s, argues that a specific combination of determinants facilitates and promotes collective outcomes. These social conditions or determinants required for the development of a social movement include structural conduciveness, structural strain, generalized beliefs, precipitating factors, mobilization of participants, and social control. Structured conduciveness refers to a social situation that permits some types of collective behavior.

Structural strain refers to a situation in which some type of measurable deprivation exists. Growth and spread of a generalized belief refers to a belief that makes the situation meaningful to actors by identifying the source of strain, attributing characteristics to the source, and specifying possible or appropriate responses to the strain.

Precipitating factors refers to an act that confirms a generalized belief or exaggerates a condition of strain.

Mobilization of participants for action refers to bringing the affected group into action. Social control refers to the counter-determinants that prevent, interrupt, deflect, or inhibit the accumulation of the previous determinants.

The value-added theory of collective behavior can be used to understand all variations in collective behavior. The determinants of collective behavior, structural conduciveness, structural strain, growth of a generalized hostile belief, mobilization of participants for action and operation of social control, take into account a vast range of scenarios that may result in collective behavior, i.e. social movements. In the value-added theory of collective behavior, the four components which are said to account for social behavior, situational facilities, roles, norms, and values, can be studied to predict where grievances, strain, and deprivation are likely to occur (Knotterus, 1983). Value-added theory explains how grievances, often caused by tension or conflict in expected values, norms, or roles, turn into generalized beliefs and ultimately into social movements (Arthur, 2005).

Bibliography

- Bartholomew, R. (1989). The South African monoplane hysteria: An evaluation of the usefulness of Smelser's theory of hysterical beliefs. *Sociological Inquiry*, 59(3), 287-300. Retrieved May 18, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=13759881&site=ehost-live>
- Benford, R. & Snow, D. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), 611-639. Retrieved May 11, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=3780387&site=ehost-live>
- Edelman, M. (2001). Social movement: Changing paradigms and forms of politics. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 30, 285-317.
- Fuchs, C. (2006). The self-organization of social movements. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, 19(1), 101-137.
- Klandermans, B. (1984). Mobilization and participation: Social-psychological expansions of resource mobilization theory. *American Sociological Review*, 49(5), 583-600. Retrieved May 17, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=14858682&site=ehost-live>
- Knotterus, J. (1983). The Melanesian cargo cults: A test of the value-added theory of collective behavior. *Sociological Inquiry*, 53(4), 389-403. Retrieved May 18, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=13794099&site=ehost-live>

Lewis, J. (1972). A study of the Kent State incident using Smelser's theory of collective behavior. *Sociological Inquiry*, 42(2), 87-96. Retrieved May 17, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=13794046&site=ehost-live>

Morrison, D. (1971). Some notes toward theory on relative deprivation, social movements, and social change. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 14(5), 675.

Weeber, S. & Rodeheaver, D. (2003). Militias at the millennium: A test of Smelser's theory of collective behavior. *Sociological Quarterly*, 44(2), 181-205. Retrieved May 18, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Premier: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=10492981&site=ehost-live>

Suggested Reading

Beckford, J. (1990). Ferment without synthesis. *American Sociologist*, 21(3), 283-285. Retrieved May 18, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=9602290720&site=ehost-live>

Maines, D. (1990). Pursuing the simplifications in Smelser's vision. *American Sociologist*, 21(3), 294-297. Retrieved May 18, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=9602290723&site=ehost-live>

Mann, L. & Nagel, T. (1976). A study of economic panic: The "run" on the Hindmarsh building society. *Sociometry*, 39(3), 223-235. Retrieved May 18, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=15235394&site=ehost-live>

Framing Theory

Jonathan Christiansen

Overview

Social movements have played and continue to play a significant role in many societies. They can range from reform oriented, to conservative and even revolutionary. Social movements can be found in open and democratic societies to authoritarian societies. Indeed, many social movements have been responsible for democratic transformation of their respective societies (Tilly, 2004). Some social movements attempt to change political systems while others seek only to reorient adherents' worldview. Because social movements are so widespread and can potentially effect great change, they are of interest to many sociologists. Social movement scholars have noted that despite the variation between location and goals social movements share many similarities.

Although there is no single definition of what constitutes a social movement there are some general agreements among scholars about what a social movement looks like. Charles Tilly (2004), for example, argues that social movements are their own unique form of contentious politics. He states that all social movements display key characteristics:

- The campaign. All movements carry out sustained actions with an orientation towards specific goals;
- Social movement repertoires. A standard set of actions that are used by social movements i.e. protests, rallies, etc. and,

- Displays of worthiness, unity, numbers and commitment (WUNC). WUNC displays are carried out by social movements and social movement organizations (SMOs) in order to legitimize themselves in the eyes of potential adherents and target authorities.

De la Porta and Diani (2006) explain that social movements are “involved in confliction relations with clearly identified opponents; are linked by dense informal networks; [and] share a distinct collective identity” (p. 20). A social movement, then, can be considered a unique form of contentious politics, which is goal-oriented and which is carried out by individuals and/or organizations that act outside of formal political or social institutions.

Social Movement Theories

Early scholars of collective action and social movements often focused on broad social conditions which they thought produced social movements. Inherent in much of this work was the assumption that social movements were a result of individuals’ sense of alienation from society. Scholars theorized that people were drawn into social movements or collective action because they were not adequately integrated into the existing social structures. Scholars believed mass, industrialized society led to social alienation and isolation, which in turn, led people towards revolutionary social movements that sought to undo the existing order (Hopper, 1949-50). Later social movement scholars focused on deprivation as a theory for social movement participation. This theory assumes that the people who feel deprived in some way participate in social movements.

As scholars studied social movements more closely and as social movements became less stigmatized, research began to focus on how rather than why social movements occur. Resource Mobilization theory emphasized the need for resources in successful social protest. Theorists pointed out that for any social movement to be successful it needed access to resources such as money and man-hours. Later, Political Process theorists argued that not only are resources needed but so is the opportunity to use those resources. This theory combined the internal movement dynamics with external conditions. Political opportunities are seen as moments that movements can take advantage of for some political and or social gain.

For example, a report about the increasing cost of a war, or the publishing of gruesome pictures of the war would be an opportunity for anti-war activists to mobilize. The problem with this approach, as Gamson & Meyer (1996) point out, is that "...opportunities are subject to interpretation and are often matters of controversy. Political opportunities are subject to framing processes and are often the source of internal movement disagreements about appropriate action strategies" (p. 276). In other words, there is no fixed "opportunity." People interpret what is an opportunity and what to do with that opportunity. Social movement framing theory attempts to address this issue.

Framing Theory

Social movement framing theory attempts to understand the way in which social movements and social movement actors create and use meaning, or how events and ideas are framed. This meaning work has become a key way in which social movements are understood and analyzed. Benford & Snow (2000) point out that "framing processes have come to be regarded, alongside resource mobilization and political opportunity processes, as a central dynamic in understanding the character and course of social movements" (p. 612).

The idea of frame analysis comes from the work of Erving Goffman (1974). Goffman argued that people frame experiences in order to organize and understand the world around them. Much like a picture frame excludes things while focusing attention on others, so does framing. Framing helps people interpret the world based on their social position and their previous experiences. Every social interaction that occurs is understood through a frame of reference within which people react based on their perception of the situation and the way they perceive the people with whom they are interacting. In the study of social movements, collective action frames are used to bring people together and incite them to action. Benford and Snow (2000) explain, "collective action frames are action-oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimate the activities and campaigns of a social movement organization (SMO)" (p. 614). A social movement organization is a formal group that functions as part of a broader social movement and that often provides the resources for the broader social movement. SMOs deploy collective action frames in order to create a set of meanings which will inspire people to act collectively towards some goal.

Social movement framing analysis focuses on four broad areas: 1). the creation and use of collective action frames, 2). framing processes, 3). opportunities and constraints, and 4). the effect of framing on movement outcomes and other processes (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 612-13). Within each of these broad areas there are sub-categories of analysis.

Further Insights

Collective Action Frames

Collective action frames are an important part of any social movement mobilization. As Gamson and Meyer (1996) explain, “collective action frames deny the immutability of some undesirable situation and the possibility of changing it through some form of collective action. They define people as potential agents of their own history” (p. 285). Collective action frames, then, define a situation as problematic, but also give people a sense that a problem is something that can be overcome through concerted efforts therefore leading to collective action. Collective action frames are understood as having three core framing tasks:

- Diagnostic framing,
- Prognostic framing, and
- Motivational framing (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 615).

Diagnostic Framing

Diagnostic framing refers to the identification of a problem. In order for any social movement to be successful to any degree a problem must be identified. If there is no perceived problem then it is difficult if not impossible to mobilize potential adherents. Framing theory, like Resource Mobilization theory, assumes that at any given moment there are enough grievances in the world to incite people to action. Unlike Resource Mobilization theory though, Framing theory assumes that it is not solely about the SMO’s leaders’ ability to garner resources which contributes to growth and mobilization of social movements, but instead it is about their ability identify--or frame--problems correctly. As Jenness (1995) explains, “One way in which social conditions come to be seen as social problems is through the work of social movements” (p. 146). Jenness notes that the Gay/Lesbian Rights movement, like the Women’s Movement, successfully

framed violence against gays as a social problem, thus creating a powerful diagnostic frame for the movement to use. After having diagnosed the problem, the movement was able to move forward towards solutions.

Many diagnostic frames include what has been referred to as an injustice frame. Injustice frames identify victims of some injustice and amplify the victimization (Benford & Snow, 2000). Injustice framing is more successful if there is a specific target -- someone or something that is responsible for the injustice and at which moral indignation can be directed (Gamson, 1995). On the other hand there is danger in focusing anger too narrowly on a specific thing or individual. As Gamson (1995) further explains, "As long as moral indignation is narrowly focused on human actors without regard to the broader structure in which they operate, injustice frames will be a poor tool for collective action, leading to ineffectiveness and frustration..." (p. 92). Injustice frames and diagnostic frames, then, cannot be the only way in which problems are framed. Frames must also include an analysis of the potential solutions to the problems that SMOs have identified. Prognostic framing provides this analysis.

Prognostic Framing

Prognostic framing "involves the articulation of a proposed solution to the problem, or at least a plan of attack, and the strategies for carrying out the plan" (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 616). Specific SMOs diagnosed problems and the proposed solutions seem to line up. This means that although there is a consistency in which an organization diagnoses a problem and the potential solution that they are advocating for. This is similar to a social movement repertoire in which plans of action are constrained by the ideology and/or habits of SMOs. Similarly, proposed solutions fall within a narrow range based on the habits and ideology of the movement (Benford & Snow, 2000). For example, the Gay/Lesbian Rights movement would not likely respond to violence against gays by calling for gays and lesbians to hide their sexual orientation, which could in theory limit potential violence. Instead, because of the ideology and goals of the organization they chose a strategy of documentation and empowerment in which they raised public awareness and attempted to gain legal support for their goals. Benford & Snow (2000) further note that prognostic framing also often attempts to refute or minimize the framing of social movement opponents. This refutation is known as counterframing. Counterframing aims

to prevent negative framings from taking hold and minimizing the impact of the movement. Of course, movements must do more than just identify problems and propose solutions; they must also mobilize people.

Motivational Framing

Motivational Framing “provides a ‘call to arms’ or rationale for engaging in ameliorative collective action, including the construction of appropriate vocabularies of motive” (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 617). Motivational frames, then, create reasons for people to get involved. They provide a sense of agency to potential actors. These types of frames are essential for social movements, as mobilization is a key and yet difficult task for social movements. Some of the vocabularies of motive that have been identified are:

- Severity, which refers to the perceived danger of the threat;
- Urgency, which refers to the swiftness in which the problem needs to be addressed;
- Efficacy, which refers to the sense of power one has to address the problem; and
- Propriety, which refers to one’s duty to act (Benford, 1993; Benford & Snow, 2000).

These vocabularies of motive can act in contradictory ways. As Benford & Snow explain, with regard to the anti-nuclear movement, “activists’ framings amplifying the severity and urgency of the nuclear threat contributed to a diminished sense of efficacy among the frame articulators” (p. 617).

How Frames are Used

Social movement scholars, beyond identifying the tasks of collective action frames, have also investigated the types and variations among such frames. They have noted that there is wide variation in the kinds and ways collective action frames are used. The two most important ways that frames vary is in interpretative scope and resonance.

Interpretative Scope

Social movements are often successful depending on the degree to which the frames they use are widely interpretable. Thus, if a social movement’s

frame has wide appeal it is more likely to be successful. The degree to which the frame is not specific to a particular SMO is helpful for creating widespread appeal. For example, an SMO that advocates for the rights of HUD tenants, in order to be successful, must frame the issue as important to not only HUD tenants but also to people outside that sphere. An example may be the framing of housing as a human right rather than HUD tenants demanding amelioration of a specific problem. The “rights” frame has been noted to be a broad, or “master frame” (Benford & Snow, 2000). A master frame is a frame that has widespread appeal across many social movements and potential constituencies.

Resonance

Similar to the idea of interpretative scope is the idea of frame resonance. If frames resonate with audiences then they are typically more successful. Benford & Snow (2000) have identified two ways which contribute to resonance: credibility and salience.

Credibility includes three factors. The first is frame consistency. If consistency refers to the perceived gap between what social movement actors and/or SMOs do and what they say. If people perceive that the action of social movement participants is consistent with what the stated goals are then they are perceived as having more credibility. The second factor is empirical credibility. Benford & Snow (2000) explain that “this refers to the apparent fit between the framings and events in the world” (p. 620). If potential recruits to a movement don’t see the frame and the real world lining up then the social movement is less likely to be seen as credible. The frame should in some way explain the world around them and provide for potential solutions. The third way frames can be resonant is if the people expressing the frame are seen as credible. This often leads to a division of labor in movements where movement participants who are seen as more credible in the eyes of the press or public are given roles as spokespeople while others take on the role of those who break the law and commit civil disobedience. This aspect of credibility is especially important as it is related to the press (Benford & Snow, 2000; Gamson, 1995). This can be seen in anti-war movements, which will often have soldiers and family members of soldiers as spokespeople in order to create a higher degree of credibility in the public’s mind.

Salience also affects frame resonance. Salience also includes three major factors: centrality, experiential commensurability, and narrative fidelity (Benford & Snow, 2000). Centrality refers to the importance of certain beliefs in people's lives. Thus if an issue being framed is seen as important in someone's life the frame is said to have centrality. Experiential commensurability refers to the way in which a frame fits with a person's lived experience. If the way an issue is framed matches with people's experiences the frame is said to be more credible. Finally, narrative fidelity refers to whether or not frames conform to broad cultural narratives or cultural ideologies. If a frame fits nicely with a shared cultural narrative has a higher degree of narrative fidelity (Benford & Snow, 2000).

Frame Development

Frames, of course don't just happen, they are created through processes. The three processes identified in which frames are created are:

- Discursive processes,
- Strategic processes, and
- Contested processes.

Discursive processes are the processes related to communication and include frame amplification and frame articulation; the ways events and experiences are organized, discussed and sold together in a simplified conceptual package. First, a frame is simplified (articulated) and then it is highlighted (amplified). This makes the frame an easy point of reference for the public and for journalists. Strategic processes are the processes that are "developed and deployed to achieve a specific purpose" (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 624). Contested processes are the arena in which frames are contested and reconstituted.

Competition between frames is known as framing contests and counterframing. Counterframing and framing contests occur when groups try to frame a specific situation in order to discredit opponents. Micili (2005) discusses the framing contests between Gay/lesbian/bisexual rights groups and the Christian right in the United States. She notes that each group attempted to control the debate with its preferred frame. These frames, Micili explains, appealed more to each group's base than the wider public and therefore were not as successful at creating widespread support for

either group. Frame contests and counterframing activity can often lead to the development of new frames, which take into consideration the changing dynamics.

Framing Opportunities & Constraints

Framing is not a static or fixed process. Social movement framing must take into consideration the environment in which it operates. Collective action frames can be constrained or helped by the political and social structures within which they exist. Further, social movement framing can alter both opportunities and constraints (Benford & Snow, 2000). Indeed, as Gamson & Meyer (1996) point out, "if movement activists interpret political space in ways that emphasize opportunity rather than constraint, they may stimulate actions that change opportunity, making their opportunity frame a self fulfilling prophecy" (p. 287). The widespread movement mobilization of the 1960's is often described as a situation in which social movements interpreted a political opportunity that was created from earlier movement mobilizations such as the civil rights movement. As more movements interpreted the opening of new space for political action more space was opened for even more movement mobilizations.

Discussion

Social movement framing theory followed the creation of resource mobilization theory and political process theories. Both of these theories emphasized rational choice with regards to social movement activists and SMOs. They both also emphasized the broad political structures that promoted social movement growth. Framing theory brought the social constructivist analysis to social movement theories. It emphasizes that realities are not fixed, but are interoperated. It also attempts to bridge the divide between agency and structure; meaning that it includes both the acknowledgment that people are active and empowered agents in their lives, but that they also exist within a social and political system that shapes their reality.

One criticism of framing theory is that the construction of meaning is highly personal and can never be fully understood at an individual level. As pointed out by Goffman, every person brings a unique and distinct set of values and beliefs into every social interaction. Thus, attempting to understand how people understand the meanings that social movements construct is fruitless because everybody interprets them differently.

Further, Hart (2008) points out that not all social movement adherents buy into the preferred collective action frames. In a study of the John Birch Society (JBS), he found that although the JBS was a conspiratorial, far right, anti-communist organization not all of the activists espoused the same beliefs. He discovered that while many of the activists generally agreed with the organization, many joined instead because there were no good alternatives for those who wanted to act on their own belief system. So, rather than having a widely appealing collective action frame they instead had a widely appealing model for action.

Conclusion

Social movement framing theory is a useful analytical tool. Sociologists can more easily understand how and why movements coalesce and mobilize by applying framing theory. Framing theory not only informs sociologists about the nature of movements, but it also helps to illuminate processes of popular consensus and popular support for different ideas and policies. Successful social movements often illustrate, shape and take advantage of popular sentiments. For example, the widespread mobilizations which took place in the 1960's were illustrative of the desire for rights and empowerment.

Social movement framing theory is also beneficial for movement activists. The better movement activists understand how to use the process of framing and how the construction of collective action frames works, the more empowered and successful they will be. Movement activists well versed in framing theory will understand the need for frames which diagnose problems, inform solutions and activate people.

Bibliography

- Benford, R. (1993). "You could be the hundredth monkey": Collective action frames and vocabularies of motive within the nuclear disarmament movement. *Sociological Quarterly*, 34(2), 195-216. Retrieved November 29, 2009 from JSTOR <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4120698>
- Benford, R., & Snow, D. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), 611. Retrieved November 29, 2009 from EBSCO Online Database Academic Search Complete.<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=rst&AN=3780387&site=ehost-live>
- De la Porta, D. & Diani, M. (2006). *Social movements: An introduction* (2ndEd). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

- Gamson, W. A. (1995). Constructing social protest. In Johnson, H. & B. Klandermans, ed., *Social Movements and Culture* 85-106. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gamson, W. A., & Meyer, D. S. (1996). Framing political opportunity. In D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy, M. N. Zald, eds., *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings*, 275-90. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper Colophon.
- Hart, R. (2008). Practicing Birchism: The assumption and limits of idiocultural coherence in framing theory. *Social Movement Studies*, 7(2), 121-147. Retrieved November 29, 2009 from EBSCO online database Academic Search Complete. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=34011179&site=ehost-live>
- Hopper, R. D. (1950). The revolutionary process: A frame of reference for the study of revolutionary movements. *Social Forces*, 28(3), 270-280. Retrieved May 22, 2008 from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=13582480&site=ehost-live>
- Jeness, V. (1995) Social movement growth, domain expansion, and framing processes: The Gay/Lesbian Movement and violence against gays and lesbians as a social problem. *Social Problems*, 42(1), 145-170. Retrieved November 29, 2009 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3097009>
- Miceli, M. (2005). Morality politics vs. identity politics: Framing processes and competition among Christian right and gay social movement organizations. *Sociological Forum*, 20 (4), 589-612. Retrieved November 29, 2009 from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=19246189&site=ehost-live>
- Tilly, C. (2004). *Social Movements 1768-2004*. Boulder: Paradigm.

Suggested Reading

- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making & unmaking of the new left*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Noonan, R. (1995). Women against the state: Political opportunities and collective action frames in Chile's transition to democracy. *Sociological Forum*, 10(1), 81-111. Retrieved November 29, 2009 from EBSCO Online Database SocINDEX with Full Text. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=sih&AN=11056609&site=ehost-live>
- Sandberg, S. (2006). Fighting neo-liberalism with neo-liberal discourse: ATTAC Norway, Foucault and collective action framing. *Social Movement Studies*, 5(3), 209-227. Retrieved November 29, 2009 from EBSCO online database Academic Search Complete. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=23414357&site=ehost-live>
- Snow, D., Rochford Jr., E., Worden, S., & Benford, R. (1986). Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation. *American Sociological Review*, 51(4), 464-481. Retrieved November 29, 2009 from EBSCO online Database Academic Search Complete. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=rst&AN=14795425&site=ehost-live>

Terms & Concepts

1963 Equal Pay Act: Prohibits employers from offering unequal pay to employees on the basis of sex.

Action Mobilization: The process by which organizations within social movements solicit active participation.

Action Repertoires: A standard set of actions that are used by social movements, i.e. protests, rallies, etc.

Alternative Movements: Social movements that work toward partial change in individuals.

Anomie: The idea that problems in society, such as crime and deviance, result from social deregulation.

Brown v. Board of Education: The 1954 Supreme Court case ending racial segregation in the public schools.

Bureaucratization: The third stage of a social movement's life cycle in which strategy is carried out by formal organizations and trained staff. Also known as formalization.

Civil Marriage: A type of marriage that is officiated by a civil authority, such as a judge, rather than by a religious authority or body. Though sometimes spoken of as a contract, marriage in the eyes of the municipal law affords specific benefits to the married parties.

Civil Rights Movement: A social movement that occurred in the United States from about the mid 1950s through the late 1960s aimed at dismantling discriminatory laws against African Americans.

Coalescence: The second stage of a social movement's life cycle, which is characterized the coming together of social movement constituents. This stage is marked by demonstrations and formulation of strategy.

Collective Action Frames: Collective action frames define a situation as problematic and give people a sense that a problem is something that can be overcome through concerted efforts therefore leading to collective action.

Collective Action: Spontaneous social actions that occur outside of prevailing social structures and institutions.

Collective Behavior: Spontaneous social actions that occur outside of prevailing social structures and institutions.

Collective Identity: The tendency of social movements to form a self-image that is shaped by the movement's individual participants, and that also works to shaped the individual participant's consciousnesses.

Conformity: An individual's acceptance of both cultural goals and institutionalized means.

Conscience Constituents: Individuals or groups outside of a social movement who have a moral alliance with the movement's cause, goal, or mission.

Consensus Mobilization: The process by which a social movement organization attempts to garner support for its viewpoints.

Constituencies: A group of people who share a set of goals, values, and/or ideologies.

Contentious Politics: The use of confrontational, flamboyant, disruptive or violent tactics to achieve desired political goals.

Co-Optation: One of the five ways in which social movements decline. This occurs when movement leaders are offered rewards by the movement's opponents in order divert movement pressure. For example, leaders can either be "paid off" or given a job by the movement's target so as to divert leadership.

Daughters of Billitis: A lesbian organization founded in San Francisco, California in 1955. As the gay community “came out,” the group grew considerably and provided a place for lesbians to meet outside the bars and speak freely about their lives. Its members also promoted civil rights for GLBT people.

Decline: The fourth stage in a social movement’s life cycle. This stage usually marks the end of mass mobilization. Decline can occur in five ways: repression, co-optation, success, and failure, and establishment within the mainstream.

Demagogues: Leaders who garner political power through impassioned appeals that play on the public’s fears and prejudices.

Diagnostic Framing: The part of a collective action frame that refers to the identification of a problem.

Direct Action: Action taken, usually by social movements, that aims to directly affect the target, such as a strike

Durkheim, Emile: A French sociologist concerned with the problem of the individual and society as well as issues of solidarity and social cohesion.

Egoistic Deprivation: A single individual’s feeling of comparative deprivation.

Emergence: The first stage of a social movement’s life cycle, which is characterized by individualized, but widespread feelings of discontent. Movements in this stage lack clearly defined strategy for achieving goals and little organization.

Encapsulation: One of the ways in which social movements fail. It is marked by an increasing inability for movements to grow because close knit, highly dedicated activist groups become difficult for new adherents to penetrate.

Extra-Institutional: The area outside of formal political and social institutions in which social movements operate.

Factionalism: One of the ways in which social movements fail. It is marked by increasing internal strife within social movements between groups who have differing ideas about how the movement should function or what its goals should have.

Feminism: An ideology that is opposed to gender stratification and male dominance. Feminist beliefs and concomitant actions are intended to help bring justice, fairness, and equity to all women and aid in the development of a society in which women and men are equal in all areas of life.

Frame: A cognitive structure which guides an individual's or group's perception of reality.

Framing Contests: A contest between two opposing groups and/or organizations with different preferred meanings of a subject and/or event.

Fraternal Deprivation: The discontent arising from the status of the entire group as compared to a referent group.

Gender Inequality: Disparities among individuals based solely on their gender rather than objective differences in skills, abilities, or other characteristics. Gender inequalities may be obvious (e.g., not receiving the same pay for the same job) or subtle (e.g., not being given the same subjective opportunities for advancement).

Gender Pay Gap: The disparity in wages paid to men and women irrespective of the fact that they may hold similar jobs or perform similar work.

Gender Role: Separate patterns of personality traits, mannerisms, interests, attitudes, and behaviors that are regarded as "male" and "female" by one's culture. Gender role is largely a product of the way in which one was socialized and may not be in conformance with one's gender identity.

Gender Stratification: The hierarchical organization of a society in such a way that members of one gender have more access to wealth, prestige, and power than do the members of the other gender.

GLBT or LGBT: Gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender. Can be used to collectively refer to people who identify themselves with these terms, or to gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender cultures in general.

Grassroots Movement: A movement that is initiated by the members of a community rather than from a formal center of major political activity. Grassroots movements tend to be naturally spontaneous rather than structured as in the case of traditional organizations.

Human Rights Movement: An international movement that promotes the cause of human rights throughout the globe. According to Article 1 of

the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights: “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act toward one another in a spirit of brotherhood.”

Individual Strain: The problems individuals experience as they work to meet needs and satisfy desires.

Industrial Era: A historical period in the Western world that was characterized by the replacement of manual labor with industrialized and mechanized labor.

Industrial Revolution: The technical, cultural, and social changes that occurred in the Western world during the late eighteenth and early to mid nineteenth centuries.

Innovation: An individual’s acceptance of social goals but rejection of the means to achieve those goals.

Limited Effects Model: A media theory developed by Paul Lazarsfeld which asserts that mass media does not diminish but instead enhances democracy and society.

Mass Media: A sector of the media dedicated to reaching large audiences. Typically comprises television, radio, and newspapers and magazines.

Mass Society Theory: An interdisciplinary critique of the mass media’s effect on society.

Mattachine Society: A gay men’s organization founded in Los Angeles in 1948. By 1951 it had adopted two major goals: 1) the establishment of a grassroots effort to challenge anti-gay discrimination; and 2) the development of a positive homosexual community and culture. Besides raising consciousness through discussions and publications, Mattachine legally challenged the entrapment of gay men by law enforcement officials, and polled political candidates on gay rights issues.

Motivational Framing: The part of a collective action frame that creates a reason for people to get involved in a social movement mobilization.

Narrative: A story, but also refers to a wider set of storytelling devices

beyond oral storytelling. Narratives contain plot, protagonists and antagonists and can give meaning to situations.

New Middle Class: A segment of society comprised of highly-educated, economically-secure individuals.

New Social Movement Theory: A new paradigm of social movement activity and collective action.

New Social Movements: Social movements that arise from the conflicts in the post-industrial revolution society and economy.

Occupational Segmentation: The gendered division of different industries and types of work.

Origin Story: A story which is told about a group's beginning. Within social movements this is often a strategic point at which to begin the narrative of the movement.

Performed Violence: Aggressive displays of confrontation and property destruction performed by militants to garner media attention and build radical identities.

Political Regime: Also known as form of government. Refers to the political institutions, norms and systems of a nation.

Political Violence: Instrumental violence with the goal of doing some sort of harm to political adversaries.

Post-Industrial Society: A society characterized by the transition from an economy based on manufacturing to an economy based on service and privatization of capital.

Prognostic Framing: The part of a collective action frame that refers to the proposed solution of a problem.

Reaction Formation: The process that occurs when individuals from lower economic classes replace social norms and values with alternative values of a subculture.

Rebellion: An individual's rejection of both the goals and the means of society.

Redemptive Movements: Social movements that seek a total change in individuals.

Reformative Movements: Social movements that work to create partial change in a society to address injustices and inequalities.

Relative Deprivation Theory: The idea that feelings of deprivation and discontent are related to a desired point of reference (i.e. reference groups).

Repression: Actions taken by political regimes or authorities that aim to diminish social movement activity or other forms of dissent.

Resource Mobilization Theory: The idea that social movements arise from long-term changes in a group's organization, available resources, and opportunities for group action.

Roe v Wade: A 1973 US Supreme Court case which resulted in the ruling that states cannot ban first trimester abortions.

Sabotage: Similar to direct action. Usually refers to the physical damage meant to exact a physical cost against a target.

Same-Sex Marriage: Marriage between people of the same sex. When recognized by the government, it affords gays and lesbians with the same economic and social benefits afforded to heterosexual married couples such as access to partner benefits, survivorship benefits, and protection of assets.

Self-Referenced Relative Deprivation: Feelings of deprivation that result from comparisons with one's own previous or anticipated future situation rather than with the situation of others.

Sexual Discrimination: The differential treatment of individuals based on their sex. Although sexual discrimination can occur against either sex, in most cases in today's society it occurs against women. Sexual discrimination can be exhibited in such actions as lower wages being given to one sex for the same work when performed by the other sex, discounting of the characteristics or attributes of one sex in comparison with the other, or unfair hiring or promotion policies that are biased against one sex.

Social Change: The significant alteration of a society or culture over time. Social change involves social behavior patterns, interactions, institutions,

and stratification systems as well as elements of culture including norms and values.

Social Justice: A striving to achieve justice in every aspect of society not merely through the application of the law. Social justice is based on the principle of universal human rights and working to ensure that all individuals receive fair treatment and equally share the benefits of society.

Social Mobilization: The process of persuading people to join a social movement organization and support it, whether through material or non-material means.

Social Movement Abeyance: A period in some social movements characterized by little or no mobilization. During this period, SMOs often focus inward to focus on identity or values.

Social Movement Organization (SMO): A social movement organization is a formal group that functions as part of a broader social movement and that often provides the resources for the broader social movement.

Social Movement Theory: The study of social mobilization including its social, cultural, and political manifestations and consequences.

Social Movement: An intentional, relatively organized effort on the part of individuals and groups to either bring about social change or resist it within a society. Social movements typically operate outside established political institutions. Social movements may be narrowly defined and target a specific social issue or may be broader in scope and target fundamental issues within the society.

Society: A group of individuals united by values, norms, culture, or organizational affiliation.

Sociology: The scientific study of human social behavior, human association, and the results of social activities.

Strain: The cycle of inadequate regulation at the societal level that negatively impacts how the individual perceives his or her needs, means, and opportunities.

Structural-Strain Theory: A theory which asserts that structures in society may promote deviance and crime.

Symbolic Interactionism: A sociological theory that locates meaning in social interactions.

Symbolic Violence: Violent actions usually carried out against property which is meant to dramatize conflict and increase tension in social movement settings.

Traditional Social Movements: Social movements, associated with the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries, characterized by an isolated and alienated membership and large scale.

Transformative Movements: Social movements, such as radical political groups, that work toward total or complete structural change.

Trope: A storytelling device which combines and simplifies ideas into a more generalized symbolic representation.

Value-Added Theory: A social movement theory which argues that certain social conditions are necessary for the development of social movements.

Wage Gap: See gender pay gap.

Woman's Suffrage: A social movement of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries which sought to secure voting rights for women. It resulted in the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment in 1920.

Contributors

Jonathan Christiansen received his M.A. in Sociology from Boston College. A long time activist, he has continually advocated for collaboration between the academic institution of sociology and community based organizations. His work focuses on social movements, cultural resistance and discourse. In particular, he is interested in the interaction of politics and culture.

Simone I. Flynn earned her doctorate in cultural anthropology from Yale University, where she wrote a dissertation on Internet communities. She is a writer, researcher, and teacher in Amherst, Massachusetts.

Alexandra Howson, Ph.D. taught Sociology for over a decade at several universities in the UK. She has published books and peer reviewed articles on the sociology of the body, gender and health and is now an independent researcher, writer and editor based in the Seattle area.

Carolyn Sprague holds a bachelor's degree from the University of New Hampshire and a master's degree in library science from Simmons College. Carolyn gained valuable business experience as the owner of her own restaurant which she operated for ten years. Since earning her graduate degree, Carolyn has worked in numerous library/information settings within the academic, corporate, and consulting worlds. Her operational experience as a manager at a global high tech firm and more recent work as

a web content researcher have afforded Carolyn insights into many aspects of today's challenging and fast-changing business climate.

Ruth A. Wienclaw holds a Doctorate in Industrial/Organizational Psychology with a specialization in Organization Development from the University of Memphis. She is the owner of a small business that works with organizations in both the public and private sectors, consulting on matters of strategic planning, training, and human/systems integration.

Index

A

Action Mobilization, 114
Action Repertoires, 67
Agnew, Robert, 129
AIDS, 46, 49, 50, 51, 52
Alternative Movements, 30
Anomie, 123-126, 131
Autonomous Violence, 71

B

Brown v. Board of Education, 106, 107,
119
Bureaucratization, 18, 22, 23

C

Civil Marriage, 53
Civil Rights Movement, 17, 18, 102,
104, 106, 107, 118, 119
Civil Unions, 52
Clandestine Violence, 71
Cloward, Richard, 128
Coalescence, 17, 22, 23
Cohen, Albert, 127

Collective Action Frames, 147-150, 154
Collective Behavior, 4, 37, 69, 74, 116,
117, 120, 134, 135-137, 139, 140-143
Collective Identity, 5-8, 11, 15, 27, 40,
42, 77, 78, 101, 108, 119, 134, 137, 146
Conformity, 127
Conscience Constituents, 33, 113
Consensus Mobilization, 114
Constituencies, 18, 151
Contentious Politics, 68, 145, 146
Co-Optation, 20, 22

D

Daughters of Billitis, 48
Demagogues, 79, 81
Diagnostic Framing, 148
Direct Action, 71
Durkheim, Emile, 77, 80, 123, 124, 128, 137

E

Egoistic Deprivation, 101, 107
Emergence, 7, 16-18, 22, 23, 92
Encapsulation, 21
Extra-Institutional, 15

F

Factionalism, 21
Feminism, 37, 42, 58, 96
Framing Contests, 152
Fraternal Deprivation, 101, 107

G

Gay Activism, 50
Gender Inequality, 41, 58
Gender Pay Gap, 59, 61
Gender Stratification, 41
GLBT, 46, 54
Grassroots Movement, 48

H

Habermas, Jurgen, 94
Human Rights Movement, 42

I

Individual Strain, 123
Industrial Era, 78, 79
Industrial Revolution, 27, 78, 79, 89
Innovation, 127

L

LGBT, 49
Limited Effects Model, 85

M

Mass Media, 33, 35, 77, 79, 80, 85, 96,
113, 115-118
Mass Society Theory, 77, 78, 80, 84, 85,
91, 116, 117, 120, 138, 139
Melucci, Alberto, 93
Merton, Robert, 125
Motivational Framing, 150

N

New Middle Class, 32, 90, 92
New Social Movement Theory, 78, 88,
90-92, 94,-96, 116, 117

O

Offe, Claus, 92
Ohlin, Lloyd, 128
Origin Story, 8

P

Political Regime, 73
Political Violence, 67, 68, 70, 74
Post-Industrial Society, 32, 88, 89
Prognostic Framing, 149

R

Reaction Formation, 128
Redemptive Movements, 30
Reformative Movements, 30
Relative Deprivation Theory, 78, 91,
100-108, 116, 117, 120, 138
Repression, 11, 19, 20, 21, 69, 70, 72-74
Reproductive Rights, 64
Resource Mobilization Theory, 78, 91,
111-120, 139, 153
Roe v Wade, 62

S

Same-Sex Marriage, 46, 53
Self-Referenced Relative Deprivation,
107
Semimilitary Violence, 70
Sexual Discrimination, 42
Social Change, 27, 28, 33, 38-41, 52, 78,
79, 89, 90, 100, 101, 102, 105, 108,
111, 114, 117, 118, 124, 126, 130, 134,
137-139
Social Justice, 44
Social Mobilization, 28, 78, 90, 101, 113,
124, 138
Social Movement Abeyance, 24
Social Movement Organization (SMO),
16, 17, 147, 148, 151
Social Movement Theory, 26, 39, 40, 77,
90, 101

Structural-Strain Theory, 123, 124
Suffrage, 57
Symbolic Interactionism, 83
Symbolic Violence, 72

T

Touraine, Alain, 94
Traditional Social Movements, 26, 28,
31, 32, 34, 88, 90, 92, 93, 96, 115

Transformative Movements, 29
Trope, 6, 8, 9

U

Unspecialized Violence, 70

W

Wage Gap, 59, 60, 61, 62