



Article scientifique

Article

2008

Published version

Open Access

This is the published version of the publication, made available in accordance with the publisher's policy.

Political, Biographical, and Cultural Consequences of Social Movements

Giugni, Marco

How to cite

GIUGNI, Marco. Political, Biographical, and Cultural Consequences of Social Movements. In: Sociology compass, 2008, vol. 2, n° 5, p. 1582–1600. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9020.2008.00152.x

This publication URL: <https://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/unige:86057>

Publication DOI: [10.1111/j.1751-9020.2008.00152.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2008.00152.x)



Political, Biographical, and Cultural Consequences of Social Movements

Marco Giugni*

Department of Political Science, University of Geneva

Abstract

This essay reviews recent and less recent literature on the consequences of social movements and protest activities. It focuses on three types of consequences: political, personal and biographical, and cultural. Political consequences and, in particular, policy outcomes receive most attention, as they are those which have been addresses most often by students of social movements. The review of existing work shows that the field is full of valuable works dealing with this crucial issue and is rapidly growing thanks in particular to a new wave of scholars interested in this topic. Further work should pay more attention to the unintended consequences of social movements, look also at other types of impacts, and carry more comparative analyses.

To say that social movements and protest activities have consequences is to state the obvious. Any action, for that matter, has some kind of effect, small or big. Yet, for decades, students of social movements and collective action have apparently paid only scant attention to the outcomes and consequences of movement activities. Some have a good excuse for that. Breakdown and collective behavior theorists in the 1950s and early 1960s considered movements basically as dysfunctional and irrational, as something separate from the realm of politics. Therefore, they were more interested in understanding the reasons why people get together in the streets to display an often violent behavior than in studying the outcomes of such behavior. The most common answer was that this is because people feel frustrated by rapid social change which creates social stress, deprivation, and discontent (see Buechler 2004; Useem 1998 for reviews). In other words, it is quite understandable that scholars who do not conceive of social movements and protest activities as a form of politics are not interested in their political effects.

Resource mobilization and political process theorists, however, have no excuse. They consider social movements as political actors and stress the importance of resources and opportunities for their mobilization (see Edwards and McCarthy 2004; Jenkins 1983; Meyer 2004; Kriesi 2004 for reviews).¹ Therefore, they should have made the study of the (political)

impact of movements one of their primary goals. They did not, or at least not as one might have expected given the refocusing on movements as political actors, perhaps discouraged by the theoretical and above all methodological difficulties inherent in the task (Amenta and Young 1999; Earl 2000). Among such difficulties, we can mention the problem of causal attribution, the problem of time reference and effect stability, the problem of goal adaptation, the problem of interrelated effects, and the problem of unintended and perverse effects (Rucht 1992).

But the field is not as empty as some have pictured it years ago (Gurr 1980; McAdam et al. 1988). For one thing, students of social movements have been looking at the effects of protest activities at least since the late 1960s, although very few systematic studies can be counted among the earlier studies. In addition, a new wave of scholars has recently started to take this issue much more seriously into consideration.² Most of this renewed interest focuses on the determinants of policy outcomes and most work is geared towards assessing whether, when, and how movements influence the policy process and its outcomes (see Amenta and Caren 2004; Giugni 1998 for reviews). Thus, we have today a fair amount of studies of the political (mainly, policy) effects of social movements and protest activities than other types of consequences.

Although my focus, following the state of the art in the literature, will be on policy outcomes, in the following I will review work dealing with three main types of movement consequences: political, biographical, and cultural. Such a review will show that, in spite of a still relatively limited, but rapidly growing number of scholars who explicitly, directly, and systematically address the outcomes and consequences of social movements, the field is full of valuable works. Although a new generation of European scholars has emerged in recent years, most of the studies reviewed here have been done by American scholars or deal with the case of the United States. This should not be seen simply as a deliberate choice on my part, but largely reflects the state of affairs in the discipline. Indeed, one of the main challenges of the literature on the consequences of social movements lies in broadening the scope of the analysis, trying to apply the insights derived from the American context to other contexts, including outside the western world.

Political consequences

Political consequences are those effects of movement activities that alter in some way the movements' political environment. Many scholars have proposed typologies aimed at identifying the outcomes of social movements. Most of them deal with political outcomes. Perhaps the most well known is Gamson's (1990) distinction between acceptance (being accepted by political authorities as legitimate actors) and new advantages (new gains for the movement or the group on behalf of which it mobilizes). Another,

often-cited distinction is the one proposed by Kitschelt (1986) between procedural (Gamson's acceptance), substantial (Gamson's new advantages), and structural impacts (changing the structural conditions in which movements act, for example, by provoking the fall of a government).³ Most existing studies deal with what Gamson (1990) called 'new advantages' and Kitschelt (1986) 'substantial impacts'. Accordingly, in this section, I will focus on these types of consequences, which we might call more simply 'policy outcomes'.⁴

Earlier studies

A first wave of studies of the consequences of social movements and protest activities occurred in the late 1960s and early 1970s. As I mentioned earlier, the interest in this topic is partly due to the shift of paradigm from a view of movements as dysfunctional and irrational to considering them as political actors. Yet, there is probably another reason for that. The late 1960s were a period of turmoil both in Europe and the United States. This is likely to have spurred scholars to inquire more thoroughly about the consequences of the important mobilizations and protests going on at that time. Indeed, much of the earlier work was done in the aftermath of the urban riots of the 1960s in the United States, especially with the aim of assessing the impact of disruptive protest and movements, rioting, and the effectiveness of violence, often with different results (Berkowitz 1974; Button 1978; Colby 1975; Feagin and Hahn 1973; Hahn 1970; Isaac and Kelly 1981; Jennings 1979; Kelly and Snyder 1980; Mueller 1978; Sears and McCanahay 1973; Welch 1975; see Gurr 1980; Isaac and Kelly 1981; Piven and Cloward 1993 for reviews).

Accordingly, earlier studies have focused on the ability of social movements to be successful and on movement-controlled variables. More generally, earlier studies of the policy impact of social movements have been framed along two main lines of inquiry and attempt to answer one of two basic questions (Giugni 1998): (1) Are disruptive movements more successful than moderate ones? (2) Are strongly organized movements more successful than loosely organized ones?

William Gamson is among the leading figures of this body of works. His *Strategy of Social Protest* (1990) remains one of the most systematic treatments – if not the most systematic one – of the effects of social movements and exemplifies quite nicely the two main lines of inquiry followed by the scholars of the first wave. Gamson has studied the careers of a random sample of challenging groups active in the United States between 1800 and 1945 in order to assess their degree of success on the two dimensions of acceptance and new advantages. His most important conclusions provide strong evidence for the role of movement-related variables and can be summarized as follows: first, groups with single issue demands were more successful than groups with multiple issue demands;

second, the use of selective incentives was positively correlated with success; third, the use of radical and violent tactics is associated with success, while the receipt of violence made it more difficult; fourth, successful groups tended to be more bureaucratized, centralized and to escape factionalism. Furthermore, the author examined the role of contextual variables and found that time did not matter much, while political crises did so.

Gamson's seminal study was the object of both a number of criticisms, mostly methodological, and reanalyses. The strongest threat to his findings came from Goldstone's (1980) reanalysis. On the basis of a series of methodological criticisms of Gamson's study, Goldstone challenged his main conclusions and central theoretical tenet. The author found that the organizational and tactical characteristics had no effect on group success, and showed that the timing of success is independent of the challengers' organization and tactics. Finally, he suggested that the resource mobilization model be replaced by a model that stresses the crucial role of broad, system-wide national crises for the success of social movements.

Further criticisms of Gamson's work have been advanced, pointing to its weaknesses on several counts (Gurr 1980; Snyder and Kelly 1976, Webb et al. 1983; Zelditch 1978). In contrast, others have reanalyzed his data and basically confirmed most of his main findings. They supported the argument that movement-controlled variables and the mobilization of internal resources are the most important determinants of a group's success. For example, Steedly and Foley (1979) found group success related to the non-displacement nature of the goals, the number of alliances, the absence of factionalism, specific and limited goals, and the willingness to use sanctions; Mirowsky and Ross (1981) found protester-controlled factors such as organization, beliefs, and goals more important than the support of third parties or the situation for a successful outcome; Frey et al. (1992) have stressed the importance of not having displacement goals and group factionalism to obtain new advantages.

Gamson's study, as well as subsequent reanalyses and criticisms, have dealt with both of the two lines of inquiry mentioned earlier: the impact of disruption and the effectiveness of organization. While no consensus can be found on both counts, the second aspect was the object of a dispute in the scholarly literature about the role of organization in mounting successful challenges. This debate has in particular opposed Gamson himself to Piven and Cloward (Cloward and Piven 1984; Gamson and Schmeidler 1984). While the former showed the effectiveness of organized challenges, the latter argued that social movements are more successful if they avoid building strong organizational structures. This would be due to the fact that movements, especially 'poor people's movements', should take advantage of their main resource, disruption, if they are to be successful. At the same time, however, such success is only temporary, as it results from the willingness of the political authorities to make concessions in order to abate the protest. Once the protest abates, concessions are withdrawn (Piven and Cloward 1979).

The evaluation of the chances that protest activities have to lead to durable changes in policies has been forcefully stated by Piven and Cloward (1993) in their well-known thesis about the regulating functions of public welfare. According to this thesis, welfare systems serve two principal functions: to maintain a supply of low-wage labor and to restore order in periods of civil turmoil. From the point of view of the impact of protest, therefore, turmoil and disruption do provoke policy change, but such concessions are usually withdrawn once the turmoil subsides. A great deal of works have tried to re-examine this thesis (see Piven and Cloward 1993; Trattner 1983 for reviews). Most have done so concerning the urban riots of the 1960s (Albritton 1979; Betz 1974; Colby 1982; Hicks and Swank 1983; Isaac and Kelly 1981; Jennings 1979, 1980, 1983; Schramm and Turbott 1983; Sharp and Maynard-Moody 1991), while others have focused on the relief expansion of the 1930s (Jenkins and Brents 1989; Kerbo and Shafer 1992; see further Valocchi 1990). All these works, however, do not provide a clear-cut answer to the question whether disruption can produce policy changes and, if yes, what this means for the movements.

The new wave

If earlier studies were mostly interested in assessing the impact of movement-controlled variables and, more specifically, of the degree of disruption and organization, a new wave of scholars have paid a lot more attention to contextual factors. Edwin Amenta has done much in this direction. He and his collaborators have largely contributed to shift the focus of scholarly work from variables internal to the movements to environmental and contextual factors. In one of the first articles, they distinguish between four models of social movement formation and outcomes (Amenta et al. 1992): in line with earlier work in this field and following a resource mobilization approach, social movement models maintain that the emergence and success of movements stem above all from their mobilization, the modalities of their actions, and their internal resources; as can be seen in modernization and collective behavior theories, economic models identify the main factor both of movement emergence and policy change with the economic conditions, therefore stripping all the power from the hands of social movements; political opportunity models see in external factors pertaining to the political context the main factors explaining movement formation and outcomes; the political mediation model, which is the explanation stressed by the authors, is a variant of the latter, maintaining that the impact of social movements depends on their organization and mobilization, but it is mediated by certain aspects of their political context.

The political mediation model brings to the fore the role of the political context in facilitating or preventing movements from being successful.

According to this line of reasoning, social movements can have a substantial impact on public policy to the extent that the structures of political opportunities (e.g. the political alignments within the institutional arenas) are favorable to them.

Political opportunity structures, however, are not the only contextual factor that may mediate between the action of social movements and policy change. Others have stressed the crucial role of public opinion. Paul Burstein has repeatedly done so (Burstein 1998a, 1999; Burstein and Freudenburg 1978), to the point of suggesting that when scholars find a direct effect of protest on policy the latter diminishes or even disappears if they include the preferences of the public in their models (Burstein 1998b; see further Burstein and Linton 2002).

Political alliances and public opinion have been shown to work in two ways (Giugni 2004a, 2007). On one hand, these external resources may play a role according to an indirect model of social movement outcomes (i.e., following a two-step process in which movement mobilization first influences certain aspects of their environment such as their institutional allies or public opinion), then policy change is brought about thanks to such external factors. Concerning political opportunity structures, for example, this model maintains that political allies carry into the institutional arenas the issues social movements address in the public space by incorporating movements' claims into their own agenda. Once they have gained institutional access, movements' claims are more likely to impinge upon public policy. Similarly, policy makers might be influenced by public opinion when it represents a sizeable and electorally relevant share of the population, rather than by minority actors such as social movements. In this case, the latter could have an indirect impact by sensitizing the public about a given issue. On the other hand, what may be called the joint-effect model underscores the need for a joint and simultaneous presence of a strong social movement and one or both of such external resources. Both models differ from the more traditional view stressed by the earlier studies, which may be called direct-effect model (Giugni 2004a, 2007), according to which social movements may bring about policy change in the absence of external support.

An increasing number of studies today point to the conditional impact of social movements and protest activities. In perhaps one of the first attempts to go in this direction, for example, Schumaker (1978) showed that disruptive tactics are more effective when the conflict remains confined to the protesters and their target and less effective when the public becomes involved in the conflict. Similarly, the political mediation model stresses the conditional effects of certain aspects of the political opportunity and social movements. More recently, apart from the political mediation model put forward by Amenta and collaborators (Amenta et al. 1992; see further Amenta et al. 1994, 2005); Cress and Snow (2000); Giugni (2004a, 2007); Kane (2003); Soule and Olzak (2004); and Uba (2007), among others,

have all argued that the policy impact of social movements is interactive and contingent.

In the end, underlying both waves of scholarly work on the political outcomes of social movements is the more fundamental issue of the power of social movements and their ability to bring about policy changes. Authors have often disagreed on that. On one hand, some have shown that social movements are able to influence the policy makers through their internal characteristics and in the absence of external support (Cress and Snow 2000; Frey et al. 1992; Gamson 1990; Kowalewski and Schumaker 1981; Mirowsky and Ross 1981; Steedly and Foley 1979). Yet, findings point to different tactics and organizational features as the main driving force behind the movements' policy impact: disruptive and even violent tactics (McAdam and Su 2002; Piven and Cloward 1979; Uba 2005), moderate and institutional tactics (Rochon and Mazmanian 1993; Soule and Olzak 2004), or a strong organizational infrastructure, resources, and leadership, allowing them to employ multiple mechanisms of influence (Andrews 2001). On the other hand, a number of authors have stressed the importance of the political environment and the context of social support (Barkan 1984; Goldstone 1980; Kitschelt 1986; Jenkins and Perrow 1977; Lipsky 1968; McAdam 1999a; Schumaker 1975, 1978). Two such external resources have received special attention in this perspective. First, a number of studies have pointed to the role played by political opportunity structures as a mediating factor between protest activities and policy change (Amenta 2005, 2006; Amenta et al. 1992, 1994, 2005; Giugni 2004a, 2007; Kitschelt 1986; Kriesi et al. 1995; Jenkins and Perrow 1977; McCammon et al. 2001; Soule and Olzak 2004; Tarrow 1993, 1998). Second, a favorable public opinion was found to be another crucial external resource that can significantly boost the chances of social movements to be able to influence the policy makers (Burstein 1998a, 1999; Burstein and Freudenburg 1978; Burstein and Linton 2002; Costain and Majstorovic 1994; Giugni 2004a, 2007; Kane 2003; McAdam and Su 2002; Soule and Olzak 2004).

The most important insight of recent research, however, comes from the idea that the political impact of social movements is conditional and contingent on the presence of facilitating external factors pertaining to their social and political environment, such as political opportunity structures and public opinion (Amenta 2005, 2006; Amenta et al. 1992, 1994, 2005; Cress and Snow 2000; Kane 2003; Schumaker 1978; Soule and Olzak 2004; Uba 2007).

Personal and biographical consequences

A second important body of literature on the outcomes and consequences of social movements has addressed the individual level of analysis. Personal and biographical consequences of social movements are effects on the

life-course of individuals who have participated in movement activities, effects that are at least in part due to involvement in those activities (see Giugni 2004b; Goldstone and McAdam 2001; McAdam 1989 for reviews).

Similarly to the rise of interest in the political outcomes of social movements, the study of personal and biographical consequences has received a strong kick from the protest wave of the 1960s, which has spurred a series of follow-up studies of former movement participants. Since that protest wave, at least in the European and North American contexts, mobilized above all leftist movements that later led to the rise of left-libertarian and new social movements, most if not all of these studies have examined the impact of the involvement of former activists in movements of the New Left. Furthermore, many of them have focused on participants in the US civil rights movement.

In numerical terms, this body of work does not get even close to match the high number of studies of the policy outcomes of social movements. However, in contrast to the latter, which have yield somewhat ambivalent findings, these follow-up studies of New-Left activists provide a more consistent picture, as in general, they all point to a strong and durable impact of involvement in movement activities. These studies suggest that activism has a strong effect both on the political and personal lives of the subjects. Concerning the political life, former activists had continued to espouse leftist political attitudes (Demerath et al. 1971; Fendrich and Tarleau 1973; Marwell et al. 1987; McAdam 1989; Whalen and Flacks 1980); had continued to define themselves as 'liberal' or 'radical' in political orientation (Fendrich and Tarleau 1973); and had remained active in contemporary movements or other forms of political activity (Fendrich and Krauss 1978; Fendrich and Lovoy 1988; Jennings and Niemi 1981; McAdam 1989). Concerning the personal life, former activists had been concentrated in teaching or other 'helping' professions (Fendrich 1974; Maidenberg and Meyer 1970; McAdam 1989); had lower incomes than their age peers; were more likely than their age peers to have divorced, married later, or remained single (McAdam 1988, 1989); and were more likely than their age peers to have experienced an episodic or non-traditional work history (McAdam 1988, 1989).⁵ However, often these studies, in addition to having a narrow focus on a specific type of participant, suffer from certain methodological limitations (e.g. in the small number of subjects included, the lack of a control group of non-activists, and the lack of data collected before they participated in the movements; see Giugni 2004b; McAdam 1989).

New Left activists, although they have been privileged by most of the existing studies, especially in the aftermath of the protest wave of the 1960s, are not the only object of work on the biographical impact of activism and, more generally, participation in social movements.⁶ Indeed, the narrower focus on leftist movements and on strongly committed participants to a large extent limits the scope of these studies, which can hardly be

generalized to other movements (movements of the right) and subjects (less committed participants).

In addition to those conducted on New Left activists, other studies examined the consequences of the involvement of activists who strongly identify with a movement and found an important biographical impact of such involvement (Nagel 1995; Taylor and Raeburn 1995; Whittier 1995). More recently, a number of authors have inquired into the individual-level effects of involvement in social movements by not-so-committed participants. For example, Sherkat and Blocker (1997), using panel survey data, found ordinary involvement in antiwar and student protests of the late 1960s to have both a short-term and a long-term impact on the lives of those who had participated. Compared with nonactivists, demonstrators held more liberal political orientations and were more aligned with liberal parties and actions; they selected occupations in the 'new class', were more educated, held less traditional religious orientations and were less attached to religious organizations, married later, and were less likely to have children. Similarly, McAdam and collaborators (McAdam 1999b; McAdam et al. 1998; Van Dyke et al. 2000; Wilhelm 1998) have conducted a randomized national survey of US residents born between 1943 and 1964 to study the impact of movement participation in America. Consistently with previous research, they found that movement participants are more likely to have been divorced, to have been married later, to have cohabited outside of marriage, and to have experienced an extended period of unemployment since completing their education, and conversely, less likely to have had children and to have ever married (see further Goldstone and McAdam 2001).

The advantage of these more recent studies, compared with those conducted on New Left activists, is that they expand the scope of the research from a small group of strongly committed activists to the personal consequences of more 'routine', low-risk forms of participation using survey data. Therefore, they offer a better ground for generalizations and show that people who have been involved in social movement activities, even at a lower level of commitment, carry the consequences of that involvement throughout their life.

But there is more than that. These studies pave the way to a broader understanding of the impact that individual participation in social movements can have on the aggregate-level change in life-course patterns. The research by McAdam and his collaborators mentioned earlier (McAdam 1999b; McAdam et al. 1998; Van Dyke et al. 2000; Wilhelm 1998), in particular, suggests that participation in the movements of the 1960s is partly responsible for the broader cultural shift associated with the people born during the period of the so-called 'baby boom' after the end of World War Two. To explain the link between the movements of the 1960s and 1970s and the changes in life-course patterns associated with the baby boom cohorts, McAdam (1999b; see further Goldstone and McAdam

2001) hypothesizes a three-stage process: first, activists in the political and countercultural movements of the period rejected normal life-course trajectories in favor of newer alternatives (e.g. cohabitation, childlessness, and an episodic work track); second, these alternatives to traditional patterns became embedded in a number of geographic and subcultural locations (most notably college campuses and self-consciously countercultural neighborhoods) that were the principal centers of the '1960s experience' and of New Left activism, thus leading upper-middle-class suburbs to embody the new alternatives through socialization processes; third, these alternative life-course patterns spread to increasingly heterogeneous strata of young Americans through processes of diffusion and adaptation, and were largely stripped of their original political or countercultural content to be experienced simply as new life-course norms. The lesson to be drawn from this analysis is that the involvement of few in social movements has much broader consequences on society at large.

Cultural consequences

Work on the aggregate-level change in life-course patterns leads me to talk about the cultural consequences of social movements (see Earl 2004 for a review). According to several observers, this is the aspect that has received by far less attention by students of social movements (Burstein et al. 1995a; Earl 2000, 2004). Yet, it is perhaps precisely in being able to altering their broader cultural environment that movements can have their deepest and lasting impact.

Even more than for political and biographical impacts, when studying cultural effects, we face the difficulty of identifying such effects. Students of social movements have focused on three dimensions of culture (Hart 1996), each having its own long-standing tradition in sociology: a social-psychological dimension in which culture is embodied in individual values, beliefs, and meanings; a more sociological dimension relating to cultural production and practices in which culture is formed by signs and their signified meanings; and a broader dimension usually embraced by anthropologists and social historians in which culture frames the worldview and social situation of communities or subcultures.

These three views of culture can serve as a way to classify work on the cultural consequences of social movements. As my focus is on the other two types of consequences, especially political ones, here I will content myself with briefly mentioning some relevant work, using Earl's (2004) excellent review of the literature on this type of effects. First, following a social-psychological approach, some have examined the role of social movements in shaping the general public's values, beliefs, and opinions (d'Anjou 1996; d'Anjou and Van Male 1998; Gamson and Modigliani 1989; Rochon 1998).⁷ Second, based on a vision of culture as cultural production and practices, others have looked at the impact of movements

on such aspects as literature (Farrell 1995; Pescosolido et al. 1997), media coverage (Gamson 1998), visual culture (Oldfield 1995), music (Eyerman and Barretta 1996; Eyerman and Jamison 1995, 1998), fashion (McAdam 1988, 1994), science and scientific practice (Epstein 1996; Moore 1999), language (McAdam 1988; Rochon 1998), and discourse (Gamson 1998; Gamson and Modigliani 1989; Katzenstein 1995). Third, looking more broadly at worldview and communities, still others have studied the effects of movements on the formation and reproduction of collective identity (Polletta and Jasper 2001; Taylor and Whittier 1992)⁸ and subcultures (Bordt 1997; Fantasia 1988; Hall and Jefferson 1976; Hebdige 1979; Kanter 1968).

Not all these studies focus explicitly on the consequences of social movements. Many, if not most of them treat cultural effects of movements as one aspect within a broader perspective (e.g. discussions of cultural change and the role of movements therein). Even more than for political and biographical consequences, the theoretical and methodological obstacles inherent in the task have perhaps prevented scholars to dig more deeply into one of the most interesting aspects of the study of social movements and protest activities.

Conclusion

This review of existing work on the political, personal and biographical, and cultural consequences of social movements and protest activities shows that the field is full of valuable works dealing with this crucial issue and, moreover, is rapidly growing thanks in particular to a new wave of scholars interested in this topic. Yet, most of this renewed interest is still geared towards studying policy outcomes, while biographical and cultural effects remain somewhat understudied. This holds especially for the latter type of effects.

The more recent works on policy outcomes has the merit to shift the focus of attention from the organizational features of movements that are more likely to be conducive to success to a broader view that takes into account the crucial role of external factors. In particular, the most important insight of recent research comes from the idea that the political impact of social movements is conditional and contingent on the presence of facilitating external factors pertaining to their social and political environment (Amenta 2005, 2006; Amenta et al. 1992, 1994, 2005; Cress and Snow 2000; Kane 2003; Schumaker 1978; Soule and Olzak 2004; Uba 2007).

Stressing the conditional and interactive nature of movement effects promises indeed to be a fruitful avenue for further research. Another one consists in going beyond a narrower focus on policy adoption (such as changes in legislation or government spending as indicators of public policy) to embrace a broader view which looks also at what comes before and after that particular stage of the policy process (Andrews 2001; Burstein et al. 1995b). This is not only important because we still know too little about the impact of social movements on aspects other than policy adoption, both

before and after adoption of specific legislation, but above all, it is likely that such an impact will vary according to the stage of the policy process (King et al. 2005). Finally, future research should move from an analysis of the conditions favoring the impact of social movements to the search for the processes and mechanisms leading to movement impact, thus making a stronger case for causal linkages between movement activities and policy change (Andrews 2001; Kolb 2007). This would also be in line with the proposal by McAdam et al. (2001), according to whom we should adopt more dynamic explanations of social movements and contentious politics.

Concerning more generally the three types of consequences I addressed here, a first, obvious line of investigation may come from paying much more attention to the cultural effects of social movements. Compared with the large amount of works on political and policy outcomes, this aspect was largely understudied.

A second avenue for further research consists in bringing a comparative perspective into the study of the consequences of social movements (Giugni 1999). While comparative analyses are not lacking, and efforts going in this direction have been done recently, most of the existing studies are still confined to single case studies. Comparisons both across countries and across movements promise to shed light on the conditions under which movements have an impact as well as on the varying processes and mechanisms underlying their effects. This is all the more important that most of the case studies have been carried in the American context. While the United States certainly presents certain features, both in the institutional setting and in political culture, that influence the consequences of social movements in specific ways, only a comparative perspective can tell us to what extent the insights provided by the analysis conducted on movements in this country can be applied to institutionally and culturally different contexts.

A third line of inquiry lies in examining more closely the unintended consequences of social movements (Deng 1997). Again, most previous works, including the more recent ones, have focused on intended effects (i.e. those effects which are directly relating to the movement's stated goals). Yet, sometimes, perhaps even most often, the major effects of social movements have little or nothing to do with their stated goals (Tilly 1999). These effects, which are often unintended and sometimes go even counter the movements' goals and interests, should be studied more thoroughly.

Political, biographical, and cultural effects, of course, do not exhaust the range of possible outcomes and consequences of social movements. For example, one should also take into account the impact that movements have on each other (see Whittier 2004 for a review). This could represent an important avenue for further research, as interorganizational exchanges and diffusion processes among movements can be strong predictors of mobilization. Here, however, I focused on what I see as the main types of consequences of social movements, trying to be comprehensive for

political consequences, a bit less for personal and biographical ones, and only very cursory for cultural ones.

Short Biography

Marco Giugni is a researcher at the Laboratoire de recherches sociales et politiques appliquées (resop) and teaches at the Department of Political Science at the University of Geneva. He was visiting scholar at the New School of Social Research (New York, NY), at the University of Arizona (Tucson, AZ), and at the University of Florence (Italy). He had teaching appointments at the University of Trento (Italy), at the University of Fribourg (Switzerland), and at the Graduate Institute of International Studies (Geneva, Switzerland). He has authored or co-authored several books and articles on social movements and contentious politics. Recent books include *Social Protest and Policy Change* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2004), *Contested Citizenship* (University of Minnesota Press, 2005; with Ruud Koopmans, Paul Statham, and Florence Passy), and *La citoyenneté en débat* (L'Harmattan, 2006; with Florence Passy). He has directed and collaborated in a number of comparative projects on topics relating to social movements and contentious politics, social exclusion, and social and political integration. His research interests include: social movements and collective action, immigration and ethnic relations, and unemployment and social exclusion.

Notes

* Correspondence address: Department of Political Science, University of Geneva, Uni Mail, 1211 Geneva 4, Switzerland. Email: marco.giugni@politic.unige.ch

¹ Most scholars today agree to define social movements as informal networks of actors having a collective identity and mobilizing on conflictual issues through various forms of protest (della Porta and Diani 2006).

² Two edited volumes published in the late 1990s and entirely devoted to the study of the consequences of social movements, among other works, attest to this renewed interest in the topic (Giugni et al. 1998, 1999).

³ See Amenta and Young (1999); Burstein et al. (1995a); Cress and Snow (2000); Earl (2000); Kriesi et al. (1995); and Schumaker (1975) for other categorizations and typologies, sometimes much more detailed than these ones.

⁴ Other recent studies of the political consequences of social movements could be mentioned, in addition to the works reviewed below (Andrews 1997; Banaszak 1996; MacDougall et al. 1995).

⁵ Other relevant works on this topic include Abramowitz and Nassi (1981); Fendrich (1977, 1993); Jennings (1987); Nassi and Abramowitz (1979); Whalen and Flacks (1984, 1989).

⁶ Among the few studies that do not look exclusively at New Left activists, see, for example, Klatch's (1999) study of longstanding personal and biographical consequences of both leftist and rightist movement participants.

⁷ The works mentioned above and concerning the impact of social movements on public opinion could be added to this list.

⁸ More generally, all the new social movements literature has inquired into the role of collective identities in social movements, including the impact of the latter on the former (see Buechler 1995 for a review).

References

- Abramowitz, Stephen I. and Alberta J. Nassi 1981. 'Keeping the Faith: Psychological Correlates of Activism Persistence into Middle Adulthood.' *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* **10**: 507–23.
- Albritton, Robert B. 1979. 'Social Amelioration through Mass Insurgency? A Reexamination of the Piven and Cloward Thesis.' *American Political Science Review* **73**: 1003–11.
- Amenta, Edwin, Bruce G. Carruthers and Yvonne Zyglidopoulos 1992. 'A Hero for the Aged? The Townsend Movement, the Political Mediation Model, and U.S. Old-Age Policy, 1934–1950.' *American Journal of Sociology* **98**: 308–39.
- Amenta, Edwin and Micheal P. Young 1999. 'Making an Impact: Conceptual and Methodological Implications of the Collective Goods Criterion.' Pp. 22–41 in *How Social Movements Matter*, edited by M. Giugni, D. McAdam and C. Tilly. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Amenta, Edwin and Neal Caren 2004. 'The Legislative, Organizational, and Beneficiary Consequences of State-Oriented Challenges.' Pp. 462–88 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by David A. Snow, Sarah Soule and Hanspeter Kriesi. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 2004.
- Amenta, Edwin, Kathleen Dunleavy and Mary Bernstein 1994. 'Stolen Thunder? Huey Long's Share our Wealth, Political Mediation, and the Second New Deal.' *American Sociological Review* **59**: 678–702.
- Amenta, Edwin, Neal Caren and Sheera Joy Olasky 2005. 'Age for Leisure? Political Mediation and the Impact of the Pension Movement on U.S. Old-Age Policy.' *American Sociological Review* **70**: 516–38.
- Amenta, Edwin 2005. 'Political Contexts, Challenger Strategies, and Mobilization: Explaining the Impact of the Townsend Plan.' In *Routing the Opposition*, edited by David S. Meyer, Valerie Jenness and Helen Ingram. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Amenta, Edwin 2006. *When Movements Matter*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Andrews, Kenneth T. 1997. 'The Impacts of Social Movements on the Political Process: A Study of the Civil Rights Movement and Black Electoral Politics in Mississippi.' *American Sociological Review* **62**: 800–819.
- Andrews, Kenneth T. 2001. 'Social Movements and Policy Implementation: The Mississippi Civil Rights Movement and the War on Poverty, 1965 to 1971.' *American Sociological Review* **66**: 71–95.
- d'Anjou, Leo and John Van Male 1998. 'Between Old and New: Social Movements and Cultural Change.' *Mobilization* **3**: 207–26.
- d'Anjou, Leo 1996. *Social Movements and Cultural Change*. New York, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Banaszak, Lee Ann 1996. *Why Movements Succeed or Fail*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Barkan, Steven E. 1984. 'Legal Control of the Southern Civil Rights Movement.' *American Sociological Review* **49**: 552–65.
- Berkowitz, William R. 1974. 'Socioeconomic Indicator Changes in Ghetto Riot Tracts.' *Urban Affairs Quarterly* **10**: 69–94.
- Betz, Micheal 1974. 'Riots and Welfare: Are They Related?' *Social Problems* **21**: 345–55.
- Bordt, Rebecca L. 1997. 'How Alternative Ideas Become Institutions: The Case of Feminist Collectives.' *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* **26**: 132–155.
- Buechler, Steven M. 1995. 'New Social Movement Theories'. *Sociological Quarterly* **36**: 441–64.
- Buechler, Steven M. 2004. 'The Strange Career of Strain and Breakdown Theories of Collective Action.' Pp. 47–66 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by David A. Snow, Sarah Soule and Hanspeter Kriesi. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Burstein, Paul and April Linton 2002. 'The Impact of Political Parties, Interest Groups, and Social Movement Organizations on Public Policy: Some Recent Evidence and Theoretical Concerns.' *Social Forces* **81**: 380–408.
- Burstein, Paul and William Freudenburg 1978. 'Changing Public Policy: The Impact of Public Opinion, Anti-War Demonstrations and War Costs on Senate Voting on Vietnam War Motions.' *American Journal of Sociology* **84**: 99–122.
- Burstein, Paul, Marie Bricher and Rachel L. Einwohner 1995b. 'Policy Alternatives and Political Change: Work, Family, and Gender on the Congressional Agenda, 1945–1990.' *American Sociological Review* **60**: 67–83.

- Burstein, Paul, Rachel L. Einwohner and Jocelyn A. Hollander 1995a. 'The Success of Political Movements: A Bargaining Perspective.' Pp. 275–95 in *The Politics of Social Protest*, edited by J. Craig Jenkins and Bert Klandermans. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Burstein, Paul 1998a [1985]. *Discrimination, Jobs, and Politics*, 2nd edn. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Burstein, Paul 1998b. 'Bringing the Public Back in: Should Sociologists Consider the Impact of Public Opinion on Public Policy?' *Social Forces* **77**: 27–62.
- Burstein, Paul 1999. 'Social Movements and Public Policy.' Pp. 3–21 in *How Social Movements Matter*, edited by Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam and Charles Tilly. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Button, James W. 1978. *Black Violence*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Cloward, Richard A. and Frances Fox Piven 1984. 'Disruption and Organization: A Rejoinder.' *Theory and Society* **13**: 587–99.
- Colby, David 1975. 'The Effects of Riots on Public Policy: Exploratory Note.' *International Journal of Group Tensions* **5**: 156–62.
- Colby, David 1982. 'A Test of the Relative Efficacy of Political Tactics.' *American Journal of Political Science* **26**: 741–53.
- Costain Anne N. and Steven Majstorovic 1994. 'Congress, Social Movements and Public Opinion: Multiple Origins of Women's Rights Legislation.' *Political Research Quarterly* **47**: 111–35.
- Cress, Daniel M. and David A. Snow 2000. 'The Outcomes of Homeless Mobilization: The Influence of Organization, Disruption, Political Mediation, and Framing.' *American Journal of Sociology* **105**: 1063–104.
- Demerath, N. J., Gerald Marwell and Michael Aiken 1971. *Dynamics of Idealism*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Deng, Fang 1997. 'Information Gaps and Unintended Outcomes of Social Movements: The 1989 Chinese Student Movement.' *American Journal of Sociology* **102**: 1085–112.
- Earl, Jennifer 2000. 'Methods, Movements and Outcomes: Methodological Difficulties in the Study of Extra-Movement Outcomes.' *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change* **22**: 3–25.
- Earl, Jennifer 2004. 'The Cultural Consequences of Social Movements.' Pp. 508–30 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by David A. Snow, Sarah Soule and Hanspeter Kriesi. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Edwards, Bob and John D. McCarthy 2004. 'Resources and Social Movement Mobilization.' Pp. 116–52 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by David A. Snow, Sarah Soule and Hanspeter Kriesi. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Epstein, Steven 1996. *Impure Science*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Eyerman, Ron and Andrew Jamison 1995. 'Social Movements and Cultural Transformation: Popular Music in the 1960s.' *Media, Culture, and Society* **17**: 449–68.
- Eyerman, Ron and Andrew Jamison 1998. *Music and Social Movements*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Eyerman, Ron and Scott Barretta 1996. 'From the 30s to the 60s: The Folk Music Revival in the United States.' *Theory and Society* **25**: 501–43.
- Fantasia, Rick 1988. *Cultures of Solidarity*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Farrell, Amy 1995. '“Like a Tarantula on a Banana Boat”: Ms. Magazine, 1972–1989.' Pp. 53–68 in *Feminist Organizations*, edited by Myra Marx Ferree and Patricia Yancey Martin. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Feagin, Joe R. and Harlan Hahn 1973. *Ghetto Revolts*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Fendrich, James M. 1974. 'Activists Ten Years Later: A Test of Generational Unit Continuity.' *Journal of Social Issues* **30**: 95–118.
- Fendrich, James M. 1977. 'Keeping the Faith or Pursuing the Good Life: A Study of the Consequences of Participation in the Civil Rights Movement.' *American Sociological Review* **42**: 144–57.
- Fendrich, James M. 1993. *Ideal Citizens*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Fendrich, James M. and A. T. Tarleau 1973. 'Marching to a Different Drummer: Occupational and Political Correlates of Former Student Activists.' *Social Forces* **52**: 245–53.

- Fendrich, James M. and E. M. Krauss 1978. 'Student Activism and Adult Left-Wing Politics: A Causal Model of Political Socialization for Black, White and Japanese Students of the 1960s Generation.' *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change* 1: 231–56.
- Fendrich, James M. and Kenneth L. Lovoy 1988. 'Back to the Future: Adult Political Behavior of Former Political Activists.' *American Sociological Review* 53: 780–84.
- Frey, R. Scott, Thomas Dietz and Linda Kalof 1992. 'Characteristics of Successful American Protest Groups: Another Look at Gamson's *Strategy of Social Protest*.' *American Journal of Sociology* 98: 368–87.
- Gamson, William A. 1990 [1975]. *The Strategy of Social Protest*. 2nd edn. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Gamson, William A. 1998. 'Social Movements and Cultural Change.' Pp. 57–77 in *From Contention to Democracy*, edited by Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam and Charles Tilly. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Gamson, William A. and Andre Modigliani 1989. 'Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power: A Constructionist Approach.' *American Journal of Sociology* 95: 1–37.
- Gamson, William A. and Emilie Schmeidler 1984. 'Organizing the Poor.' *Theory and Society* 13: 567–85.
- Giugni, Marco, Doug McAdam and Charles Tilly, eds. 1998. *From Contention to Democracy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Giugni, Marco, Doug McAdam and Charles Tilly, eds. 1999. *How Social Movements Matter*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Giugni, Marco 1998. 'Was it Worth the Effort? The Outcomes and Consequences of Social Movements.' *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 371–93.
- Giugni, Marco 1999. 'How Social Movements Matter: Past Research, Present Problems, Future Developments.' Pp. xiii–xxxiii in *How Social Movements Matter*, edited by Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam and Charles Tilly. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Giugni, Marco 2004a. *Social Protest and Policy Change*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Giugni, Marco 2004b. 'Personal and Biographical Consequences.' Pp. 489–507 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by David A. Snow, Sarah Soule and Hanspeter Kriesi. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Giugni, Marco 2007. 'Useless Protest? A Time-series Analysis of the Policy Outcomes of Ecology, Antinuclear, and Peace Movements in the United States, 1975–1995.' *Mobilization* 12: 101–16.
- Goldstone, Jack A. 1980. 'The Weakness of Organization: A New Look at Gamson's *The Strategy of Social Protest*.' *American Journal of Sociology* 85: 1017–42.
- Goldstone, Jack and Doug McAdam 2001. 'Contention in Demographic and Life-Course Context.' Pp. 195–221 in *Silence and Voice in the Study of Contentious Politics*, edited by Ronald R. Aminzade, Jack A. Goldstone, Doug McAdam, Elisabeth J. Perry, William H. Sewell Jr, Sidney Tarrow and Charles Tilly. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gurr, Ted Robert 1980. 'On the Outcomes of Violent Conflict.' Pp. 238–94 in *Handbook of Political Conflict, Theory and Research*, edited by Ted Robert Gurr. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Hahn, Harlan 1970. 'Civic Responses to Riots: A Reappraisal of Kerner Commission Data.' *Public Opinion Quarterly* 34: 101–7.
- Hall, Stuart and Tony Jefferson, eds. 1976. *Resistance through Rituals*. New York, NY: Holmes and Meier.
- Hart, Stephen 1996. 'The Cultural Dimension of Social Movements: A Theoretical Assessment and Literature Review.' *Sociology of Religion* 57: 87–100.
- Hebdige, Dick 1979. *Subculture*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hicks, Alexander and Duane H. Swank 1983. 'Civil Disorder, Relief Mobilization, and AFDC Caseloads: A Reexamination of the Piven and Cloward Thesis.' *American Journal of Political Science* 27: 695–716.
- Isaac, Larry and William R. Kelly 1981. 'Racial Insurgency, the State, and Welfare Expansion: Local and National Level Evidence from the Postwar United States.' *American Journal of Sociology* 86: 1348–86.
- Jenkins, J. Craig and Barbara Brents 1989. 'Social Protest, Hegemonic Competition, and Social Reform: A Political Struggle Interpretation of the Origins of the American Welfare State.' *American Sociological Review* 54: 891–909.

- Jenkins, J. Craig and Charles Perrow 1977. 'The Insurgency of the Powerless: Farm Workers' Movements (1946–1972).' *American Sociological Review* **42**: 249–68.
- Jenkins, J. Craig 1983. 'Resource Mobilization Theory and the Study of Social Movements.' *Annual Review of Sociology* **9**: 527–53.
- Jennings, Edward T. 1979. 'Civil Turmoil and the Growth of Welfare Rolls: A Comparative State Policy Analysis.' *Policy Studies Journal* **7**: 739–45.
- Jennings, Edward T. 1980. 'Urban Riots and Welfare Policy Change: A Test of the Piven–Cloward Theory.' Pp. 59–82 in *Why Policies Succeed or Fail*, edited by Helen M. Ingram and Dean E. Mann. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Jennings, Edward T. 1983. 'Racial Insurgency, the State, and Welfare Expansion: A Critical Comment and Reanalysis.' *American Journal of Sociology* **88**: 1220–36.
- Jennings, M. Kent and Richard G. Niemi 1981. *Generations and Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jennings, M. Kent 1987. 'Residues of a Movement: The Aging of the American Protest Generation.' *American Political Science Review* **81**: 367–82.
- Kane, Melinda D. 2003. 'Social Movement Policy Success: Decriminalizing State Sodomy Laws, 1969–1998.' *Mobilization* **8**: 313–34.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss 1968. 'Commitment and Social Organization: A Study of Commitment Mechanisms in Utopian Communities.' *American Sociological Review* **33**: 499–517.
- Katzenstein, Mary Fainsod 1995. 'Discursive Politics and Feminist Activism in the Catholic Church.' Pp. 35–52 in *Feminist Organizations*, edited by Myra Marx Ferree and Patricia Yancey Martin. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Kelly, William R. and David Snyder 1980. 'Racial Violence and Socioeconomic Changes among Blacks in the United States.' *Social Forces* **58**: 739–60.
- Kerbo, Harold R. and Richard A. Shaffer 1992. 'Lower Class Insurgency and the Political Process: The Response of the U.S. Unemployed, 1890–1940.' *Social Problems* **39**: 139–54.
- King, Brayden G., Marie Cornwall and Eric C. Dahlin 2005. 'Winning Woman Suffrage One Step at a Time: Social Movements and the Logic of the Legislative Process.' *Social Forces* **83**: 1211–34.
- Kitschelt, Herbert 1986. 'Political Opportunity Structures and Political Protest: Anti-Nuclear Movements in Four Democracies.' *British Journal of Political Science* **16**: 57–85.
- Klatch, Rebecca 1999. *A Generation Divided*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Kolb, Felix 2007. *Protest and Opportunities*. Frankfurt, Germany/New York, NY: Campus.
- Kowalewski, David and Paul D. Schumaker 1981. 'Protest Outcomes in the Soviet Union.' *Sociological Quarterly* **22**: 57–68.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter, Ruud Koopmans, Jan Willem Duyvendak and Marco Giugni 1995. *New Social Movements in Western Europe*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter 2004. 'Political Context and Opportunity.' Pp. 67–90 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by David A. Snow, Sarah Soule and Hanspeter Kriesi. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Lipsky, Michael 1968. 'Protest as a Political Resource.' *American Political Science Review* **62**: 1144–58.
- MacDougall, John, Stephen D. Minicucci and Doug Myers 1995. 'The House of Representatives' Vote on the Gulf War, 1991: Measuring Peace Movement Impact.' *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change* **18**: 255–84.
- Maidenberg, M. and P. Meyer 1970. 'The Berkeley Rebels Five Years Later: Has Age Mellowed the Pioneer Radicals?' *Detroit Free Press* **February**: 1–7.
- Marwel, Gerald, Michael Aiken and N. J. Demerath 1987. 'The Persistence of Political Attitudes among 1960s Civil Rights Activists.' *Public Opinion Quarterly* **51**: 359–75.
- McAdam, D., N. Van Dyke, A. Munch and J. Shockey 1998. 'Social Movements and the Life-Course.' Unpublished paper, Department of Sociology, University of Arizona.
- McAdam, Doug and Yang Su 2002. 'The War at Home: Antiwar Protests and Congressional Voting, 1965 to 1973.' *American Sociological Review* **67**: 696–721.
- McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald 1988. 'Social Movements.' Pp. 695–737 in *Handbook of Sociology*, edited by Neil J. Smelser. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- McAdam, Doug, Sidney Tarrow and Charles Tilly 2001. *Dynamics of Contention*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- McAdam, Doug 1988. *Freedom Summer*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- McAdam, Doug 1989. 'The Biographical Consequences of Activism.' *American Sociological Review* **54**: 744–60.
- McAdam, Doug 1994. 'Culture and Social Movements.' Pp. 36–57 in *New Social Movements*, edited by Enrique Laraña, Hank Johnston and Joseph R. Gusfield. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- McAdam, Doug 1999a [1982]. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930–1970*, 2nd edn. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- McAdam, Doug 1999b. 'The Biographical Impact of Activism.' Pp. 117–46 in *How Social Movements Matter*, edited by M. Giugni, D. McAdam and C. Tilly. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- McCammon, Holly J., Karen E. Campbell, Ellen M. Granberg and Christine Mowery 2001. 'How Movements Win: Gendered Opportunity Structures and U.S. Women's Movements, 1866 to 1919.' *American Sociological Review* **66**: 49–70.
- Meyer, David 2004. 'Protest and Political Opportunities.' *Annual Review of Sociology* **30**: 125–45.
- Mirowsky, John and Catherine Ross 1981. 'Protest Group Success: The Impact of Group Characteristics, Social Control, and Context.' *Sociological Focus* **14**: 177–92.
- Moore, Kelly 1999. 'Political Protest and Institutional Change: The Anti-Vietnam War Movement and American Science.' Pp. 97–115 in *How Social Movements Matter*, edited by Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam and Charles Tilly. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mueller, Carol McClurg 1978. 'Riot Violence and Protest Outcomes.' *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* **6**: 49–63.
- Nagel, Joane 1995. 'American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Politics and the Resurgence of Identity.' *American Sociological Review* **60**: 947–65.
- Nassi, Alberta J. and Stephen I. Abramowitz 1979. 'Transition or Transformation? Personal and Political Development of Former Berkeley Free Speech Movement Activists.' *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* **8**: 21–35.
- Oldfield, John R. 1995. *Popular Politics and British Anti-Slavery*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Pescosolido, Bernice A., Elizabeth Grauerholz and Melissa A. Milkie 1997. 'Culture and Conflict: The Portrayal of Blacks in U.S. Children's Picture Books through the Mid- and Late-Twentieth Century.' *American Sociological Review* **62**: 443–64.
- Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward 1979. *Poor People's Movements*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward 1993. *Regulating the Poor*, 2nd edn. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Polletta, Francesca and James M. Jasper 2001. 'Collective Identity and Social Movements.' *Annual Review of Sociology* **27**: 283–305.
- della Porta, Donatella and Mario Diani (2006). *Social Movements: An Introduction*, 2nd edn. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Rochon, Thomas R. 1998. *Culture Moves*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rochon, Thomas R. and Daniel A. Mazmanian 1993. 'Social Movements and the Policy Process.' *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* **528**: 75–87.
- Rucht, Dieter 1992. 'Studying the Effects of Social Movements: Conceptualization and Problems.' Paper for the ECPR Joint Session, Limerick (Ireland).
- Schramm, Sanford F. and J. Patrick Turbott 1983. 'Civil Disorder and the Welfare Explosion: A Two-Step Process.' *American Sociological Review* **48**: 408–14.
- Schumaker, Paul D. 1975. 'Policy Responsiveness to Protest-Group Demands.' *Journal of Politics* **37**: 488–521.
- Schumaker, Paul D. 1978. 'The Scope of Political Conflict and the Effectiveness of Constraints in Contemporary Urban Protest.' *Sociological Quarterly* **19**: 168–84.
- Sears, David O. and John B. McCanahay 1973. *The Politics of Violence*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sharp, Elaine B. and Steven Maynard-Moody 1991. 'Theories of the Local Welfare Role.' *American Journal of Political Science* **35**: 934–50.
- Sherkat, Darren E. and T. Jean Blocker 1997. 'Explaining the Political and Personal Consequences of Protest.' *Social Forces* **75**: 1049–70.

- Snyder, David and William R. Kelly 1976. 'Industrial Violence in Italy, 1878–1903.' *American Journal of Sociology* **82**: 131–62.
- Soule, Sarah A. and Susan Olzak 2004. 'When Do Movements Matter? The Politics of Contingency and the Equal Rights Amendment.' *American Sociological Review* **69**: 473–97.
- Steedly, Homer R. and John W. Foley 1979. 'The Success of Protest Groups: Multivariate Analyses.' *Social Science Research* **8**: 1–15.
- Tarrow, Sidney 1993. 'Social Protest and Policy Reform: May 1968 and the *Loi d'Orientation* in France.' *Comparative Political Studies* **25**: 579–607.
- Tarrow, Sidney 1998 [1994]. *Power in Movement*, 2nd edn. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, Verta and Nancy E. Whittier 1992. 'Collective Identity in Social Movement Communities: Lesbian Feminist Mobilization.' Pp. 104–29 in *Frontiers of Social Movement Theory*, edited by Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Taylor, Verta and Nicole C. Raeburn 1995. 'Identity Politics as High-Risk Activism: Career Consequences for Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Sociologists.' *Social Problems* **42**: 252–73.
- Tilly, Charles 1999. 'From Interactions to Outcomes of Social Movements.' Pp. 253–70 in *How Social Movements Matter*, edited by M. Giugni, D. McAdam and C. Tilly. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Trattner, W. I., ed. 1983. *Social Welfare or Social Control*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Press.
- Uba, Katrin 2005. 'Political Protest and Policy Change: The Direct Impacts of Indian Anti-Privatization Mobilizations 1990–2003.' *Mobilization* **10**: 383–96.
- Uba, Katrin 2007. *Do Protests Make a Difference? The Impact of Anti-Privatisation Mobilisation in India and Peru*. Ph.D. dissertation, Uppsala University.
- Useem, Bert 1998. 'Breakdown Theories of Collective Action.' *Annual Review of Sociology* **24**: 215–238.
- Valocchi, Steve 1990. 'The Unemployed Workers Movement of the 1930s: A Reexamination of the Piven and Cloward Thesis.' *Social Problems* **37**: 191–205.
- Van Dyke, Nella Doug McAdam and Brenda Wilhelm 2000. 'Gendered Outcomes: Gender Differences in the Biographical Consequences of Activism.' *Mobilization* **5**: 161–77.
- Webb, Keith, Ekkart Zimmermann, Michael Marsh, Anne-Marie Aish, Christina Mironesco, Christopher Mitchell, Leonardo Morlino and James Walston 1983. 'Etymology and Outcomes of Protest: New European Perspectives.' *American Behavioral Scientist* **26**: 311–31.
- Welch, Susan 1975. 'The Impact of Urban Riots on Urban Expenditures.' *American Journal of Political Science* **29**: 741–60.
- Whalen, Jack and Richard Flacks 1980. 'The Isla Vista 'Bank Burners' Ten Years Later: Notes on the Fate of Student Activists.' *Sociological Focus* **13**: 215–36.
- Whalen, Jack and Richard Flacks 1984. 'Echoes of Rebellion: The Liberated Generation Grows Up.' *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* **12**: 61–78.
- Whalen, Jack and Richard Flacks 1989. *Beyond the Barricades*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Whittier, Nancy 1995. *Feminist Generations*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Whittier, Nancy 2004. 'The Consequences of Social Movements for Each Other.' Pp. 531–51 in *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by David A. Snow, Sarah Soule and Hanspeter Kriesi. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Wilhelm, Brenda 1998. 'Changes in Cohabitation across Cohorts: The Influence of Political Activism.' *Social Forces* **77**: 289–310.
- Zelditch, Morris 1978. 'Review Essay: Outsiders' Politics.' *American Journal of Sociology* **83**: 1514–20.