



Chapitre de livre

2016

Accepted version

Open Access

This is an author manuscript post-peer-reviewing (accepted version) of the original publication. The layout of the published version may differ .

---

## The Consequences of Social Movements: Taking Stock and Looking Forward

---

Bosi, Lorenzo; Giugni, Marco; Uba, Katrin

### How to cite

BOSI, Lorenzo, GIUGNI, Marco, UBA, Katrin. The Consequences of Social Movements: Taking Stock and Looking Forward. In: The Consequences of Social Movements. Lorenzo Bosi, Marco Giugni and Katrin Uba (Ed.). Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2016. p. 3–38.

This publication URL: <https://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/unige:85873>

# INTRODUCTION

PROOF

PROOF

# 1 THE CONSEQUENCES OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Taking stock and looking forward

*Lorenzo Bosi, Marco Giugni, and Katrin Uba*

Citizens of both democratic and authoritarian countries seem to become less supportive of those in power and more willing to use non-conventional forms of collective action for putting pressure on authorities. This was the case for example, during the past few years, with the major upsurges of protest, in Eastern Europe (Coloured Revolutions), in the Middle East (Arab Spring), in Southern Europe (the *Indignados* in Spain, the *Agonaktismenoi* in Greece), in the United States (Occupy Wall Street), in Chile (the *Pinguinos*), as well as anti-government protests in Hong Kong, Thailand, and South Africa. Such waves of mobilization, comparable in their size to those of the 1960s and 1970s, bring to the fore some important questions for social movement research and call for a deeper understanding of social and political change: When and how does mobilization make a difference? When and how do activists achieve their goals? Is protest a necessary and/or sufficient condition for producing social and political change? Do social movements have any long-term legacies on our societies? Do they change the life choices of those participating in protest activities? How does all this vary both across contexts and across different movements?

These and related questions are not new, but until 1970s scholars have paid little attention to the consequences of social movements as protest was mainly regarded as an irrational action with no instrumental goals (Buechler 2004). Since then, also thanks to some pioneering works (Gamson 1990; Piven and Cloward 1979; Schumaker 1975), a new research field emerged slowly and allowed one of the present

authors to note as late as in 1998 that “we still lack systematic empirical analyses that would add to our knowledge of the conditions under which movements produce certain effects” (Giugni 1998: 373). The field was revamped, amongst other things, also thanks to two edited collections entirely devoted to the study of different kinds of the effects of social movements (Giugni et al. 1998, 1999). This sudden focus on social movement outcomes could be related not only to the wave of democratization in the Eastern Europe and Latin America in the 1990s, but also to the fact that sufficient time had passed from the mobilization of the 1968 generation in Western Europe and civil rights mobilization in the United States. While research on social movements can study ongoing events, research on their outcomes has to wait for some changes to take place before being able to inquire into their causes. Even if the immediate political outcomes of Colored Revolutions or the Occupy movement seem self-evident, to find out about the broader cultural outcomes of such recent events one has to wait for a longer time.

Since the late 1990s, a wealth of studies have improved our knowledge of how collective mobilizations and protest activities may bring about social and political change. Scholarship has in particular focused on three broad types of outcomes. First, scholars interested in the personal and biographical consequences of social movements have studied “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” (Giugni 2008: 1588–1589, see Giugni 2004a for a review). Second, cultural change or changes in the social norms and behaviors in which political actors operate, have been studied the least (see review in Earl 2004). The third, political change, or those effects of movement activities that alter in some way the movements’ political environment, have been studied most often (see reviews in Amenta and Caren 2004; Amenta et al. 2010; Burstein and Linton 2002; Giugni 1998, 2008; Uba 2009). Research on the biographical, cultural, and political outcomes of social movements has provided a number of important insights into the conditions and processes through which movements succeed or fail. At the same time, however, there remain a number of silences that must be voiced. This book expressly addresses such silences. It challenges conventional studies of the consequences of social movements by covering issues on which there has been little or no research at all.

The volume covers such issues as the impact of social movements on the life-course of movement participants and the

## 5 / The consequences of social movements

population in general (Part I: People), on political elites and markets (Part II: Policies), and on political parties and processes of social movement institutionalization (Part III: Institutions). We believe this volume makes a significant contribution to research on social movement outcomes by achieving three aims: (1) *theoretically*, by showing the importance of hitherto undervalued topics in the study of social movements outcomes; (2) *methodologically*, by expanding the scientific boundaries of this research field through an interdisciplinary approach and new methods of analysis; and (3) *substantially*, by providing new empirical evidence about social movement outcomes from Europe and the United States, such as mobilization for ethical fashion, protest against school-closures, institutionalization processes in deeply divided societies, and effects on activists of far-right and LGBT movements.

In the remainder of this chapter we introduce the contributions included in the volume. In doing this, we point to theoretical, methodological, and substantial developments made by scholarly work on each of the three issues mentioned above, on the one hand, and to remaining blind spots on all three counts, on the other. We conclude with some directions for future research.

### People

#### Previous work on social movements and personal change

People might change for a variety of reasons over their lifetime: because they go to school, because they go through the army, because they find a partner (or split up from one), because they find a job (or lose a job), have children, move from where they live (neighborhood, city, country), because they meet new friends, because they go through particular transformative events. And among other reasons, people might change in part due to their involvement in social movement activities. This type of personal change is what interests us in this section. If contentious politics scholars have spent quite an amount of energy trying to explain why, when, and how people join social movements activities – with competing analytical approaches – it is also true that the post-movement lives of former activists have received some attention (see Giugni 2004a for a review).

Scholars focusing on the long-term biographical impact of movement participation have suggested through their empirical works, mainly concerning highly committed activists within the New Left in the United States, that activists in their post-movement lives tend to continue to espouse political attitudes close to those they embraced during their mobilization, and to show a high level of socio-political commitment and to pursue different lifestyles (jobs and structure of families) in concert with their beliefs (Fendrich 1993; McAdam 1988; Jennings 1987; Taylor and Raeburn 1995; Whalen and Flacks 1989; Wilhelm 1998; Whittier 1995). Further studies examining participation in other types of movements (Klatch 1999), less committed activists (Sherkat and Blocker 1997), and movements embracing political violence (Kampwirth 2004; Viterna 2013) have shown similar results, confirming that participation in social movements has long-term powerful and enduring effects on the political and personal lives of those who have been involved.

A more recent trend in the literature, rarely mentioned in relation to biographical outcomes, examines “institutional activists” (Grodsky 2012; Pettinicchio 2012; Santoro and McGuire 1997), also labeled “inside agitators” (Eisenstein 1996), “insider activists” (Banaszak 2010), “unobtrusive activists” (Katzenstein 1998), and “activists in office” (Watts 2006). Following this literature, past participation in social movements might continue to influence political action inside the institutions (Kim et al. 2013). In pursuing the movement’s goals through conventional bureaucratic channels, “institutional activists” show their long-term commitment to the cause. For example, in the period spanning from the Kennedy to the Clinton administration, women’s commitment to the feminist cause in the United States “creat[ed] concrete policy changes that altered the social landscape” of the country (Banaszak 2010: 4). Similar processes occurred in the north of Europe when environmentalists went into the political institutions through green parties (Rootes 2004).

In the case of regime changes, the impact of “institutional activists” is even clearer (Bosi, Chapter 14; Della Porta, forthcoming). Furthermore, activists retaining their commitments in their post-movement lives can also continue to participate politically and join new movements during their life-course. In doing so, they are “direct routes” in the spillover effect of frames, discourses, tactics, organizational structure, and identities occurring among different movements across time (Meyer and Whittier 1994; Whittier 2004).

## 7 / The consequences of social movements

In transforming individuals, social movements may also engender broad processes of social change. Social movement scholars have investigated, even if to a lesser extent, the aggregate-level change in life-course patterns, where social movements activism has much broader social and cultural consequences on society at large behind former social movement activists (McAdam 1999; Wilhelm 1998). Alternative life-style patterns, stripped of their original political or counter-cultural content, are diffused and adapted through socialization processes across new cohorts as new life-course norms in the long term. As Rochon notes, “the microfoundations of movement mobilization thus create new patterns of social thought and action, contributing to the breadth and pace of change in cultural values . . . The ripple effects of movement activism also have an impact on family, friends, and fellow members of a group” (1998: 162). The biographical consequences affect then not only those who were active participants in a cycle of protest, but also “many casual participants” (Polletta and Jasper 2001: 296).

Social movements are often presented in the literature as transforming their activists and societies in unintended ways. The category of unintended consequences has been attached to these types of outcomes because it has been said that social movements publicly claim policy changes. But social movements, through their everyday politics, publicly contest cultural values, opinions and beliefs with the aim of self-changing societies through “educating as well as mobilizing activists, and thereby promoting ongoing awareness and action that extends beyond the boundaries of one movement or campaign” (Meyer 2003: 35).

### The chapters in Part I of the book

The five chapters that form Part I of this volume extend beyond existing research on biographical outcomes at the empirical, methodological, and analytical levels. Unlike the bulk of the literature on social movement outcomes, which is primarily interested in examining successful mobilizations, in Chapter 2, Karen Beckwith examines why social movement activists persist after experiences of loss. To address this question, the author examines two coalfield communities and women’s activist experience in the National Union of Mineworkers (NUM) strike against the National Coal Board in Britain in the 1984–85 period, and compares remobilization efforts in the same communities in the NUM’s 1992–94 anti-pit closure campaign. Testing competing explanations of

political opportunity, political resources, and political learning, in her work Beckwith hypothesizes that the impact of loss upon future remobilization chances may be less dependent on the actual material circumstances of the actors or even on the issues involved than on the nature of the collective experience of the campaign. Former activists' experience in the course of a campaign – whether they have won or lost in the past – can lead to political learning that can instruct and inspire second attempts or lead to the decision to never try again.

In Chapter 3, Kathleen Blee uses extensive life history narratives with an innovative model that infers causal mechanisms from narrated counterfactual processes to understand, from the perspectives of activists themselves, the steps by which social movement involvement changes the lives of activists. In doing so, she draws on four fields of research in order to build her conceptual framework, the scholarships on narrative, on political imagination, on turning points, and on interpretive processes. Blee draws her empirical research from two right-wing women activists (a current member and a former activist of the US racist movement), underlying their self-definitions before they entered the racist movement, their experiences of mobilization and participating in a racial movement, and their assessments of how they were affected by such activism.

In Chapter 4, Marco Giugni and Maria Grasso test the relationship between engagements in social movement activities, measured through participation in demonstrations, and the subsequent political life of participants (i.e., political interest, self-positioning on the left-right scale, voting for the left, membership in environmental organizations, and party membership). They use panel data on Switzerland to inquire whether low-degree engagement in social movement activities also has the strong impact observed by previous work on strongly committed activist. They find that previous participation in demonstrations in Switzerland significantly affected the participants' political attitudes and behaviors in the long term, namely fifteen years later. Their findings suggest that the results found on New Left activists in the United States are broadly generalizable to other countries, other cohorts, non-New Left activism, and lower levels of involvement.

In Chapter 5, Camille Masclet examines the unexplored topic of the intergenerational influence of social movements by looking at the specific case of feminist activists and their children. The analysis is based on a case study of women who took part in the French Women's

## 9 / The consequences of social movements

Liberation Movement in the 1970s and their offspring. Drawing on the political socialization and biographical outcomes literatures, in her chapter Masclet focuses on two main aspects: first, the study of the second generation and the issue of family transmission can bring to our understanding of the activists' careers and the long-term effects of activism on their lives; second, the content of the political inheritance of the activists' children. The analysis reveals the existence of effects of the feminist movement on the children's political socialization. This chapter suggests another way of looking at aggregate-level changes through the study of the children of former social movements activists.

Finally, in Chapter 6, Nancy Whittier analyses aggregate-level biographical outcomes of the LGBT movement in the United States (specifically the gay and lesbian movements), focusing on collective identity as a biographical outcome in the broader population, the impact of cultural and policy change on life-course outcomes, and generational/cohortal variations. Whittier focuses first on collective identity definition and diffusion as conditioned by cohort for both participants and non-participants. She then looks at how cultural and policy outcomes affect the life-course of the beneficiary constituency, LGBT people. She focuses on the following life-course outcomes: employment and earnings, couplehood and marriage, and parenting.

### Avenues for future research on social movements and personal change

The five chapters in this part of the book introduce unresearched themes, alongside new methodological and analytical approaches, which we hope will be developed further in future research on social movements and personal change. Yet, a number of avenues for future research on social movements and personal change may be mentioned as well. First, it is necessary for future research to focus on the life-course patterns of movements' targets, in addition to movements' activists and participants. Here the literature on victims of armed groups can be particularly helpful, specifically as it entails the trauma experienced by victims in both the short term and the long term (Bosi and Giugni 2012).

Second, more attention should be placed on variation among different types of biographical outcomes (Stewart et al. 1998; Corrigan-Brown 2012; Viterna 2013; Blee, Chapter 3; Masclet, Chapter 5). Once we have established that participating in social movements has a lasting

effect on individuals, we should investigate differences among those who participate as we have looked at such differences in the mobilization process, for example on their level of involvement, closeness to the leadership or previous biographical characteristics, etc. Jocelyn Viterna suggests in her important work (2013) that the arena where an activist demobilizes determines his/her post-movement activist life.

Third, if it is true that research on biographical consequences has been mainly biased toward studying social movements and personal change in Western countries among progressive movements, we should broaden our knowledge by starting to look at biographical outcomes in “awkward” movements (Viterna 2013; Blee, Chapter 3) and in non-Western societies (Hasso 2001; Viterna 2013).

Finally, we need to recognize the structure–agency dynamic shaping participants’ post-movement lives (Bosi 2014), connecting biographical outcomes “to the historical contexts where they are developing” (Fillieule and Neveu 2014). If the literature on social movements has started progressively to move beyond the movement-centric approach explanations, this has not yet happened in the sub-field of research that examines biographical outcomes. Micro-level analyses are still very much concerned with how individual experience in social movements is fundamental for participants’ post-movement lives, so they lose the rest of the picture. The rest of the picture concerns in particular the determining power of the modern state within the political and social environment, which is able to produce the external factors and forces that channel and mitigate contentious politics and thus ultimately shapes the post-movement lives of activists (Bosi 2014). In order to do this, we need to re-locate our studies on personal change at the intersection of thematic focus on disengagement/transformation/outcomes. This means we ought to study biographical outcomes together with conflicts’ decline and post-conflict transformation of societies and institutions (Bosi 2014).

## Policies

### Previous work on social movements and policy change

Research on the consequences of social movement has long focused on political, and even more narrowly, policy outcomes, and still often does so (see Amenta and Caren 2004; Amenta et al. 2010 for reviews). Nearly

## 11 / The consequences of social movements

twenty years ago, one of the present authors distinguished between two waves of scholarly work on the political outcomes of social movements and protest activities (Giugni 1998). The first wave, chronologically situated in the late 1960s and early 1970s, was mainly interested in the ability of social movements to be successful by focusing on movement-controlled variables. He then depicted the literature from this first wave, perhaps a bit simplistically, as being characterized by a double tension, or by two interrelated debates: one about the role of disruption versus moderation and another about the effectiveness of strongly organized movements versus loosely organized ones (see Gamson 1990).

Around the late 1990s, a second wave of scholarship on the policy outcomes of social movements emerged. With this new wave, attention shifted from an interest in the impact of movement-controlled variables to the role of the context, especially the political-institutional context. In this vein, a number of studies have shown that the political impact of social movements is conditional and contingent on political opportunity structures (e.g., institutional allies, state structures, political regimes) and public opinion (Agnone 2007; Amenta 2005, 2006; Amenta et al. 1992, 1994; Cress and Snow 2000; Huberts 1989; Kane 2003; Olzak and Soule 2009; Schumaker 1978; Soule and Olzak 2004; Uba 2009). In addition, some have shown that the impact of social movements varies across different stages of policy making, being more effective at the stages of agenda setting and less influential at the stages of adoption and implementation of policies (King et al. 2005; Soule and King 2006). The increased attention to context and exogenous factors did not mean that strategies of movements were neglected, rather it was emphasized that strategies and tactics should be seen in its cultural settings. Thus, for example, Banaszak (1996) has shown how movement tactics, beliefs, and values are critical in understanding why political movements succeed or fail.

Since then, scholars have made a lot of progress. For instance, they recognized that policies are not only adopted by state authorities, but also by businesses, and there is a growing research field on how social movements influence change of corporate practices and policies (see King and Pearce 2010 for a review). This scholarship also suggests that the impact of social movements is often conditional on movement controlled factors, such as stakeholders' activism, and contextual factors such as the type of enterprises (Bartley and Child 2011; King 2008; Vasi and King 2012).

Apart from progress made because of the broadened empirical scope of these studies, as well as availability of more sophisticated

techniques, the major progress of the field is related to the “episodes-processes-mechanisms” turn proposed by McAdam et al. (2001; see further Tarrow and Tilly 2007). A number of scholars have started to identify and unveil the causal mechanisms that allow movements to have an impact on policy. Among the pieces that we consider valuable in this respect are Andrews’ (2004) study of the impact of the civil rights movement on poverty programs and Kolb’s (2007) comparison of the political outcomes of the civil rights movement and anti-nuclear energy movements. Both these works explicitly address mechanisms linking movement action to political outcomes. Andrews (2001) argues that movements must be able to create leverage through multiple mechanisms, such as disruption, persuasion, and negotiation, in order to be successful. Kolb (2007) stresses a number of causal mechanisms of political change, such as the disruption, public preference, political access, judicial, and international politics mechanisms.

But others have wandered along this path as well. For example, in their effort to put forward their political mediation model, Amenta and his collaborators (Amenta et al. 1992; see further Amenta 2005) distinguished between four different models of social movement formation and outcomes, which can be seen as four potential mechanisms of influence: economic models, social movements models, political opportunity models, and the political mediation model. Others have distinguished between three main models of movement influence: the direct-effect, indirect-effect, and joint-effect models (Giugni 2004b, 2007). Again, we may look at these models as possible mechanisms relating protest to policy change. The way these mechanisms work, however, is contingent upon context. Thus, for example, while Giugni (2004b) did not find much direct effect of disruption in the United States, Italy, or Switzerland, Uba (2005) showed that for explaining the varying impact of anti-privatization protests in India, the disruption mechanism is more useful than the persuasion one. Yet, these efforts were not explicitly putting forward mechanisms and processes. Quite on the contrary, they were quite static in their emphasis on political-institutional conditions.

### **The chapters in Part II of the book**

The four chapters forming Part II of this volume all attest to the importance of comparisons and, above all, mechanisms in the study of social movement outcomes. Katrin Uba looks in Chapter 7 at policy makers’

### 13 / The consequences of social movements

attitudes vis-à-vis different forms of protest. She examines more specifically the extent to which politicians accept protest against school closures in Sweden. She maintains that relating effectiveness to targets' attitudes helps understand why the political context plays a role in explaining the varying outcomes of disruptive protests. The underlying assumption here is that politicians who have positive attitudes toward protest are more likely to listen to activists' claims and be more responsive to their arguments. Combining survey and protest event data pertaining to Swedish municipalities, her study suggests that both personal background and the power position of the targets of social movements are key to the explanation of their attitudes on protest actions as well as on how they respond to such actions. Attitudes and perceptions here can be seen as a crucial mechanism allowing us to account for why and how policy makers positively respond to social movements' demands.

In his contribution in Chapter 8, Joseph Luders raises the question of why do the targets of social movements and other benefit-seekers groups concede to their demands at center stage. He rightly sees the answer to this question as key to understanding the policy impact of movements. In order to provide an answer to this question, he outlines a general explanation for the influence of benefit-seekers – a term that includes both social movements and interest organizations – on political actors. The fundamental mechanism in this explanation, in his view, lies in how targets assess the costs of acceding or resisting: variation in exposure to costs account for different responses of targets and bystanders. He then illustrates empirically the proposed explanation through the case of the contemporary women's movement, looking at its multiple demands. The latter aspect is important as it shows that, in addition to cross-national and cross-movement comparisons, it is also important to compare across different demands made by a given movement. Additionally, his study points, among other things, to the need for a more fine-grained inspection of movements as diverse entities with multiple agendas.

The other two chapters shift the focus of the analysis from political-institutional targets to economic ones, looking at the responsiveness of corporate actors and of fashion-market actors. Brayden King looks in Chapter 9 at business corporations as potential targets of social movements. Starting from the observation that activists are often able to pressure corporate targets to reform their practices and policies, but that the mechanisms whereby activists influence corporate behavior are still largely unknown, he proposes a theory of social movement effectiveness

in corporate campaigns stressing two economic mechanisms that give movements leverage to influence corporate targets: reputational threats and creations of risk perceptions. On the one hand, movements may generate reputational threats by using tactics to communicate negative image claims about their corporate targets that undermine the firms' cultivated reputations. On the other hand, they may create perceptions that a firm's actions are financially risky. He concludes by arguing that a theory of corporate-targeted movement outcomes should consider the effects of movement tactics on these intangible sources of economic value.

Finally, Philip Balsiger examines in Chapter 10 the rise of ethical fashion in Switzerland as an example of the impact of social movements on markets, an aspect that has long been overlooked by students of social movements until recently. He addresses the role of tactical competition, asking how the interplay of different tactics used by different movement players shape market change such as the emergence of niches. He looks more specifically at three different approaches adopted by social movement to promote ethical fashion: launching campaigns targeting fashion brands, developing ethical labels, and promoting an alternative ethical fashion niche. He shows, based on ethnographic materials, that the transformations of the clothing market in Switzerland are the result of the interplay between such different approaches. His analysis points to the importance of a dynamic approach to the study of the consequences of social movements, one which takes into account the interplay of movement actors using different tactics and, more generally, the diversity within the social movement arena. This may provide important insights into the mechanisms and processes through which social movements bring about social change.

### **Avenues for future research on social movements and policy change**

Notwithstanding the major advances provided by scholarship in the past fifteen years or so, including those offered in this book, there is still much margin for improvement. In this regard, a number of avenues for further research can be outlined. We already mentioned two of them: embedding the study of the political consequences of social movements in a comparative research design and looking at the mechanisms and processes connecting movement actions to observed outcomes. No need to come back to that. But there are other paths that future research could

## 15 / The consequences of social movements

and should take. Perhaps the most important one comes out forcefully from the four chapters in this part of the book: focusing on targets. All four chapters put at center stage not only what movements do and how they do it, but also which are the targets of protest, how they see the protest as well as the movements, and how they react to them. This implies redefining the political consequences of social movements in two directions. On the one hand, a closer attention to the target of protest requires thinking of social movement outcomes in terms of responsiveness. On the other hand, and related to that, in order to better understand how social movements can obtain responsiveness, one needs to refocus the analysis on the targets of protest, that is, those who are supposed to respond. These are often represented by policy makers – which is the main focus of much research in this field – but they can also be other actors, including economic actors, as shown by the chapters in this part of this book. In brief, one should not only look at what movements do and how they do it, but also to who the targets of the challenges they pose are, what they do, and why.

In addition to multiplying comparative analyses (across countries or other political-administrative levels, movements, and movement demands), shifting the focus from conditions to mechanisms and processes, and especially paying more attention to targets, a few other suggestions for further research, mainly methodological, may be made. Four of them are worth mentioning, as they promise to push the boundaries of research on the policy impact of social movements a step farther. The first consists in considering the interplay of different levels of analyses. Research so far has most often focused on a single level – the macro-level or the meso-level, in case of policy outcomes – paying only little attention or no attention at all at the other two levels. Scholars should acknowledge that, in the end, those who can respond to the challenges and demands by social movements are individual policy makers. One therefore needs to consider how collective action (macro-level) can lead to policy change (macro-level) through the intervention of individual decisions (micro-level).

A second suggestion that can be made originates in the very early days of research on the political outcomes of social movements, namely in Gamson's (1990) seminal work. His study was based on a random sample of US challenging groups, albeit a small one made of fifty-three groups. In spite of its innovative character at the time, this approach was almost completely ignored by scholars interested in the consequences of social

movements (while it was of course adopted repeatedly by those addressing individual participation in social movements). Sampling was recently given new legitimacy by Burstein (2014), who maintains that this is a key methodological device one should adopt when studying social movements and in particular their policy outcomes. Sampling was also adopted, in combination with more qualitative techniques such as fuzzy set / Qualitative Comparative Analysis and process tracing, by McAdam and Boudet (2012) in their study of opposition to energy projects in the United States. The lesson we draw from these efforts is that, unless one cannot examine the entire population of policies (Uba 2005), which, however, limits external validity, this research strategy proves extremely helpful if one is interested in causal inference.

A third suggestion is to combine rigorous quantitative methods of analysis (e.g., multi-level modeling, event history analysis) with more qualitative techniques (e.g., in-depth interviews, process tracing) in order to move from the search for simple correlations to causal thinking. This also requires that scholars do not focus only on short-term processes, but evaluate as well the long-term consequences of mobilization.

A fourth and final suggestion consists in making more extended use of experimental data. Experimental designs have been used to study the effectiveness of interest groups (Richardson 2013), but to our knowledge they have never been applied to the analysis of the policy impact of social movement tactics. Again, this would help moving from a correlational to a causal approach. For example, one could conduct lab experiments allowing to effectively establish causal relationship or, even better, field experiments (i.e., experimental designs in “real world” situations), thus avoiding the well-known shortcomings of the former. Quasi-experiments would be a good compromise when truly experimental designs are not possible.

## **Institutions**

### **Previous work on social movements and institutional change**

Institutional change takes a central place in political science and sociology alike. Not surprisingly, there are different definitions of change as well as different approaches to the role of social movements in this

## 17 / The consequences of social movements

process (Amenta and Ramsey 2010; Clemens 1998; Schneiberg and Lounsbury 2008). Defining institutions as the basic rules of the game, one can mention changes in formal institutions such as state structure, political regime, legislation, corporations and their policies, and informal institutions such as unwritten rules (Helmke and Levitsky 2004). The following discussion leaves aside institutions in terms of norms or social practices. The role of social movement in changing such institutions is the best covered by research on cultural consequences of social movements (see Earl 2004 for review). Another approach to study institutions is looking at them as state organizations (government, parliament, bureaucracy) and non-state organizations (religious, cultural, medical, or educational organizations). Institutional change is also examined in various ways. Some scholars focus on the incremental change of power relations or on the sequential change of formal and informal institutions or on slowly changing norms (see Mahoney and Thelen 2009 for a review). Others, on the other hand, investigate the abrupt transformation of organizations, regime changes via revolutions, or significant policy changes during instances of crisis (Greenwood and Hinings 1996; Goldstone 2001; Kriesi and Wisler 1999).

The role of agency in explaining institutional change has become increasingly popular, for instance many have studied the role of political leaders and their ideas for institutional change (Beland 2007). The explicit impact of social movements on institutional change has been examined much less (see Scheinberg and Lounsbury 2008 for a review). Many such studies focus on changes in state or corporate policies, but a few also look at changes in state structures, for example changes in party systems (Hanagan 1998) or political regimes (Hipsler 1998).

One of the first systematic attempts to examine the impact of social movements on institutional change was made by Kitschelt (1986) in his already mentioned comparative study on anti-nuclear movements. He showed that the emergence of Green parties is related to the mobilization of anti-nuclear power movements, which thereby have influence on political opportunity structures in general and party systems more specifically. Since his influential work, there has been a steady increase in the number of studies investigating the relationship between social movements and institutional change.

An important mechanism facilitating such interaction is the institutionalization of social movements. This means that social

movements can achieve their goals by becoming more professional, hierarchal, and cooperating closely with authorities such as political parties, international organizations, or state bureaucracies (Banaszak 2010; Costain 1981; Giugni and Passy 1998; Gusfield 1955; Meyer 2007; Ruzza 1997; Seippel 2001; Suh 2011; Zald et al. 2005). For example, Staggenborg (1988) showed how the pro-choice movement in the United States created new opportunities for influencing policy change via institutionalization. Similarly, Cowell-Meyers (2014) demonstrates how women's movement in Northern Ireland created own political party and increased thereby women's access to political system. However, the consequences of institutionalization vary and a recent comparative study on women's movements shows that autonomous movements rather than insider lobby were instrumental for the adoption of legislation to combat violence against women (Htun and Weldon 2012). This variation is not surprising because such a close cooperation with authorities involves a threat of co-optation and de-mobilization (Coy and Hedeon 2005; Meyer and Minkoff 2004; Meyer and Tarrow 1998; Piven and Cloward 1979).

Despite the significant importance of the question of institutionalization, there are only a few studies that empirically examine how the factors external to movements influence this process. For example, Suh (2011) analysis of Korea's women's movement demonstrates international organizations and regime responsiveness facilitated the institutionalization process of this movement. Similarly to the argument on political consequences institutionalization is not determined by structural factors, but contingent to many different contextual factors.

Another approach for studying how social movements influence institutions consists in investigating radical institutional change, particularly regime change via revolution or a slow transition to democracy (Goldstone 1998; Goodwin 2001; Hipsher 1998; Tilly 1978) or the outcomes of self-determination movements (see Gurr 2015 for a review). There are also many studies about how regime change influences social movements (Maney 2007; Pickvance 1999), the two processes being obviously related to each other. However, we focus here on the consequences of mobilization in the first place. Several studies have shown that the achievement of movements' revolutionary goals – that is, regime change – is facilitated by coalition building across different movements (Schock 2005) and elites (Slater 2009). Movement tactics are also an important factor. Based on a large sample of cases,

## 19 / The consequences of social movements

Chenoweth and Stephan (2011) show that nonviolent strategies or civil resistance tends to be more successful in achieving regime change than violent strategies. On the other hand, revolutionary movements might be successful at some point in time, but fail later on. For instance, Meirowitz and Tucker (2013) look at the cases of Arab Spring and Coloured Revolutions, showing that the actions of the initial governments after democratization can easily bring about new mobilizations and new radical change of institutions. Considering the recent events in the world, the role of movements in the process of regime change is a growingly important question and emerging studies focus particularly on the impact of new media in this process (Breuer et al. 2015).

### The chapters in Part III of the book

Similarly to the challenges posed by the study of other types of consequences of social movement actions (Earl 2000; Jenkins and Form 2005), investigating the impact of social movements on regime change, or institutional change more generally, requires careful analysis of other possible explanatory factors than mobilization itself and detailed tracking of entire, often even repeated, processes of change. The four chapters forming Part III of this volume address some of these challenges successfully.

In Chapter 11, Daniela Piccio, addresses a much neglected issue in the studies of the consequences of social movements. The chapter investigates how social movements interact with formal political institutions, such as political parties, in a comparative perspective. She explains the varying impact of ecology movements on the Dutch Social Democratic Party and the Italian Christian Democratic Party. The impact is measured as the changed discourse and organization of these political parties. The results of her detailed comparative analysis show that electoral benefits and ideological distance between the movement and party, that is the factors usually emphasized in prior research, are not enough to explain the variation in movement impact on parties. The movement had small, but still noteworthy, discursive and organizational impact on the least likely case of Italian Christian Democrats, while in the most likely case, the Dutch Social Democrats, the party adopted unexpectedly small amount of ecological claims.

In Chapter 12, Mattias Wahlström studies how protests and related police actions influenced the change of one of the most stable

institutions – a state's bureaucracy. His careful comparative analysis shows how the changes in practices of police organizations followed the failed protest policing in Sweden, Denmark, the United Kingdom, and the United States, but not in Italy. This investigation shows that for better understanding of changed bureaucratic practices, we need to look beyond the factors emphasized by social movement scholars, particularly the political opportunity structures, or the well-known arguments from the research on institutional change, namely international learning process. The change in police practices was more related to characteristics of police organization and the triggering protest events.

In Chapter 13, Abby Peterson examines another rigid institution, looking at how social movements influence party systems. She investigates how the Swedish Neo-Nazi movement transformed in a political party – the Swedish Democrats. She provides a detailed theory-driven empirical description of important events and relationships that helps us to understand how a relatively small movement can affect the entire party system. Her analysis also shows the benefits of combining research on social movement institutionalization to the theories of political party institutionalization, particularly emphasizing the interplay between emerging parties and established parties. The empirical case has a significant importance for Swedish politics today, as in the parliamentary elections of 2014 the party received entire 13 % of votes.

Finally, in Chapter 14, Lorenzo Bosi examines the complex interplay of regime change and social movements, focusing on the shifting balance of power relations at different stages of the movements' institutionalization process. He provides a detailed empirical description of the institutionalization of the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Movement and shows how the transformation of this movement affected the incremental regime change in Northern Ireland. Bosi's work does not tend to fall in the trap of creating a rigid and deterministic vision of development sequences toward institutionalization process, but rather to suggest a dynamic strategic-relational approach capable of recognize the shifting complex web of socio-political relations. The method he uses – process tracing – not only helps the reader to trace the complicated interactions between the movement and democratizing authorities, but also shows the usefulness of this method for the study of the consequences of social movements.

## 21 / The consequences of social movements

### Avenues for future research on social movements and institutional change

All the chapters in this part of the book address the structural impact of social movements from a new angle. However, there are a few aspects that may be pushed further in future research. First, it is worth following the example discussed by Bosi in Chapter 14, and examine further why some strands of the movement institutionalize and others not. How this affects the relations between these two strands, the movement in general and how the differences of state regime affect such developments. Such knowledge helps us better understand the development of social movements, but also the emergence of political parties. One interesting case of study could be the institutionalization of Spanish movement M15, which gave roots to three different political parties – Podemos, Ganemos, and Partido X.

Second, the thin line between co-optation and institutionalization has been examined before, but we need to learn more about the reasons why party members and bureaucrats listen to movements' claims. While, in the case of decision-makers, one can refer to their interest in being re-elected, this should not matter for those working in the state's bureaucracy. However, as shown by Wahlström (Chapter 12), bureaucratic institutions do change as a result of mobilizations. Similarly, the motives of political parties for listening and responding movements' claims also require more analysis than the present research provides. Scholars interested in this issues might learn a lot from the literature on political party and party system development (Mair 1997), as well as from research on public administration and planning (Thomas 2013).

Third, and related to the previous point, more attention should be paid on the content of the claims formulated and framed by activists. This has been shown to be important for policy change (McCammon 2009), but it is likely that clear problem formulations, new information for solving the problems at hand or proposed alternative solutions play an important role for the movements' impact on institutional change. While elected officials care about votes, those working in bureaucracy, appointed officials, might be more interested in information that helps to solve particular problems (Besley and Coate 2003).

Fourth, and more closely related to regime change, students of the consequences of social movements would benefit much from paying

more attention to the wide literature on transition to democracy, revolutions, as well as the outcomes of self-determination movements (Della Porta, forthcoming). This has benefited research on civil resistance (Chenoweth and Stephan 2011), and would also help us better explain the complex interrelations between movements and state authorities, especially in non-democratic contexts. The last aspect also emphasizes the importance of thinking beyond the electoral interests of decision-makers when explaining the reasons why targets respond to activists' demands.

Fifth, although some of the chapters in Part III use comparative case-studies (Piccio, Wahlström), we still know little about how structural factors affect the impact movements have on institutional change. The same applies for different types of movements and their claims. Hence, future research would benefit from comparative analyses, both across countries and across movements as well as over time. The latter is particularly important for understanding how the consequences of mobilization change in time and whether the effects are the same regardless of prior experiences.

### **Toward greater synergy**

All the chapters in this volume fill some important research gaps in the study of the consequences of social movements and help us better understand how movements may bring about personal, policy, and institutional change. These contributions, however, are still largely confined to a given type of movement outcome, each one addressing one type of outcome at a time. Furthermore, when presenting the chapters, we also indicate some avenues for future research, but again remaining within the specific types of outcome examined in the chapter at hand. We believe it is now time to go beyond such a segmented approach – for all the benefits it provided and will keep providing – and try to move to greater synergy in the field. By that we mean moving from an approach that looks only at one type of movement outcome to a new perspective that embraces different types at the same time and that look at how one type of outcome may “spill over” another type (Bosi 2011).

To be sure, this has already been done to some extent. For example, Rochon and Mazmanian (1993) maintained as far back as in the early 1990s that substantial policy effects, or “new advantages,” are

## 23 / The consequences of social movements

more easily obtained once a movement or movement organization has first obtained “acceptance,” that is, a procedural effect. Along similar lines, Camille Masclet (Chapter 5) in looking at the intergenerational influence of social movements implicitly addresses the interrelated agenda by showing how the biographical effect on the activists has a lasting effect on their children. However, these works are still confined to one single kind of outcome (political or biographical), however large it is. We need to move beyond that, if we are to open up new avenues for future research and push the boundaries of our knowledge from the consequences of social movements to how social movements are capable to generate processes of social change.

The final chapter does precisely so. Jennifer Earl refers in Chapter 15 to four different types of outcomes – policy, cultural, internal to the movement, and biographical – in relation to Internet activism. She discusses various ways of understanding and evaluating the potential impacts of different forms of Internet activism. More specifically, she presents and reviews research on four broad types of Internet activism and discusses how effective or ineffective these forms of actions could be, also compared to the consequences of similar offline mobilizations. For instance, online participation has arguably the highest potential for achieving independent consequences.

The approach suggested by Jennifer Earl in her contribution, which she applies to Internet activism, can be made more general. One way to do so consists in looking at the interrelated effects of social movements and question. Both Nancy Whittier (Chapter 6) and Lorenzo Bosi (Chapter 14), without explicitly taking forward the interrelated outcomes agenda, suggest trajectories of change through which social movement outcomes may mutually affect each other: political-biographical and political-cultural (Whittier) and biographical-political (Bosi). By giving a short example of what we mean, we might suggest to look at how cultural outcomes “spill over” political ones. *In the long term, cultural changes can be translated into different policies, or in the short term introduce new problems from the private realm to the public agenda.* Social movements have the ability to raise the salience and public profile of a particular set of issues by introducing changes in cultural values, opinions, and beliefs to social and political public discourses (Rochon and Mazmanian 1993; Rochon 1998; Meyer 1999, 2005; Polletta and Jasper 2001). Therefore, movements that win victories in terms of political culture, even where they have suffered

immediate defeats on policy issues, can obtain public policy gains in the long term. Strong and clear changes in public opinion that are favorable to the movement's "message" provide the opportunity to significantly influence the process of public policy change, albeit indirectly. Elected officials will, where they see prospects of electoral success and/or support for their mission, follow changes in public discourses by placing a movement's "message" on the political agenda, co-opting it for the governmental agenda, and initiating a change in legislation (Baumgartner and Jones 1993; Burstein 1998, 1999; Burstein and Freudenburg 1978; Burstein and Linton 2002). "[L]egislators – [as Burstein writes] – must become convinced that the issue is so important to the public that its votes will be affected by what the legislature does, or fails to do. And it is important that the shift be large and clear because legislators want to be sure that their votes reflect real changes in public opinion – changes not likely to be reversed before the next election, when their votes may be held against them" (1998: 37). Therefore, policy makers pay much attention to the public perceptions of an issue, and are likely to respond in a way that will satisfy such perceptions, especially if they are considered to reflect a majority opinion. For example, Kane (2003) finds that public opinion, which she sees as a form of cultural opportunity, has helped gay and lesbian movements in decriminalizing sodomy laws in American states.

What needs to be determined accurately is how, when, and where interrelated effects are likely to take place (Bosi 2011). We have to ask more complex questions about the extent and operation of interrelated effects of social movement outcomes. For example: How do different types of effects of protest activities relate to each other? What are the processes and mechanisms underlying the interrelations between different types of effects or between the same types of effect over time? Under what conditions does each interrelation of effects work, fail to occur, or even reverse? Are some types interrelations more frequently observed than others? How do such interrelations vary across different types of non-electoral behavior (for example, between right-wing and left-wing movements)? Which kinds of methodological developments are required for studying these interrelated processes and mechanisms?

Answering these questions makes the research on the consequences of social movements even more challenging, both theoretically and methodologically. Still, it is worth taking up the challenge.

## References

- Agnone, Jon. 2007. "Amplifying Public Opinion: The Policy Impact of the U.S. Environmental Movement." *Social Forces*, 85: 1593–1620.
- Amenta, Edwin. 2005. "Political Contexts, Challenger Strategies, and Mobilization: Explaining the Impact of the Townsend Plan." In David S. Meyer, Valerie Jenness, and Helen Ingram (eds.), *Routing the Opposition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 29–64.
- Amenta, Edwin. 2006. *When Movements Matter: The Townsend Plan and the Rise of Social Security*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Amenta, Edwin and Kelly M. Ramsey. 2010. "Institutional Theory." In Kevin T. Leicht and J. Craig Jenkins (eds.), *Handbook of Politics: State and Society in Global Perspective*. New York: Springer, 15–39.
- Amenta, Edwin and Neal Caren. 2004. "The Legislative, Organizational, and Beneficiary Consequences of State-Oriented Challengers." In David A. Snow, Sarah Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Oxford: Blackwell, 461–488.
- Amenta, Edwin Amenta, Neal Caren, Elizabeth Chiarello, and Yang Su. 2010. "The Political Consequences of Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36: 287–307.
- Amenta Edwin, Bruce G. Carruthers, and Yvonne Zylan. 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: 308–339.
- Amenta, Edwin, Katleen 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.
- 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.
- Andrews, Kenneth. 2004. *Freedom is a Constant Struggle: The Mississippi Civil Rights Movement and Its Legacy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Armstrong, Elizabeth A. and Mary Bernstein. 2008. "Culture, Power, and Institutions: A Multi-Institutional Politics Approach to Social Movements." *Sociological Theory*, 26: 74–99.
- Banaszak, Lee Ann. 2010. *The Women's Movement Inside and Outside the State*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bartley, Tim and Curtis Child. "Movements, Markets and Fields: The Effects of Anti-Sweatshop Campaigns on U.S. Firms, 1993–2000." *Social Forces*, 90: 425–451.
- Baumgartner, Frank R. and Bryan D. Jones. 1993. *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Beland, Daniel. 2007. "Ideas and Institutional Change in Social Security: Conversion, Layering, and Policy Drift." *Social Science Quarterly*, 88(1): 20–38.
- Bennett, Andrew. 2010. "Process Tracing and Causal Inference." In Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds.), *Rethinking Social Inquiry*, Second edition. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Besley, Timothy and Stephen Coate. 2003. "Centralized versus Decentralized Provision of Local Public Goods: A Political Economy Approach." *Journal of Public Economics*, 12: 2611–2637.
- Bosi, Lorenzo. 2011. "Movimenti e cambiamento sociale: l'interrelazione delle conseguenze." *Società degli Individui*, 42: 69–78.
- Bosi, Lorenzo. 2014. "Contextualizing the Biographical Outcomes of Provisional IRA Former Activists: A Structure-Agency Dynamic." unpublished paper, presented at the conference *Activists Forever? The Long-term Impacts of Political Activism in Various Contexts*. Rennes, France.
- Bosi, Lorenzo and Marco Giugni. 2012. "The Study of the Consequences of Armed Groups: Lessons from the Social Movement Literature." *Mobilization*, 17(1):85–98.
- Breuer, Anita, Todd Landman, and Dorothea Farquhar. 2015. "Social Media and Protest Mobilization: Evidence from the Tunisian Revolution". *Democratization*, 22, 764–792.
- Buechler, Steven M. 2004. *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by David A. Snow, Sarah Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi. Oxford: Blackwell, 47–66.
- Burstein, Paul. 1998. *Discrimination, Jobs, and Politics*, Second edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

## 27 / The consequences of social movements

- Burstein, Paul. 1999. "Social Movements and Public Policy." In Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly (eds.), *How Social Movements Matter*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 3–21.
- Burstein, Paul. 2014. *American Public Opinion, Advocacy, and Policy in Congress: What the Public Wants and What It Gets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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 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.
- Busby, Joshua. 2010. *Moral Movements and Foreign Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chenoweth, Erica and Maria J. Stephan. 2011. *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Clemens, Elisabeth S. 1998. "To Move Mountains: Collective Action and the Possibility of Institutional Change." In Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly (eds.), *From Contention to Democracy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 109–123.
- Corrigall-Brown, Catherine. 2012. "From the Balconies to the Barricades, and Back? Trajectories of Participation in Contentious Politics." *Journal of Civil Society*, 8(1):17–38.
- Costain, Anne N. 1981. "Representing Women: The Transition from Social Movement to Interest Group." *The Western Political Quarterly*, 34: 100–113.
- Costain, Anne N. and Steven Majstorovic. 1994. "Congress, Social Movements and Public Opinion: Multiple Origins of Women's Rights Legislation." *Political Research Quarterly*, 47:111–135.
- Cowell-Meyers, Kimberly. B. 2014. "The Social Movement as Political Party: The Northern Ireland Women's Coalition and the Campaign for Inclusion." *Perspectives on Politics*, 12(01):61–80.
- Coy, Patrick G. and Timothy Hedeon. 2005. "A Stage Model of Social Movement Co-optation: Community Mediation in the United States." *The Sociological Quarterly*, 46(3):405–435.

- 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: 1063–1104.
- Della Porta, Donatella. Forthcoming. *Where Did the Revolution Go? The Outcomes of Democratization Paths*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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." In David A. Snow, Sarah Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Oxford: Blackwell, 508–530.
- Eisenstein, Hester. 1996. *Inside Agitators*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Fendrich, James. 1993. *Ideal Citizens*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Fillieule, Olivier and Erik Neveu. 2014. "Activists Forever? The Long-term Impacts of Political Activism in Various Contexts." Unpublished paper, Conference, Rennes, France.
- Finkel, Steven E. and Edward N. Muller. 1998. "Rational Choice and the Dynamics of Collective Political Action: Evaluating Alternative Models with Panel Data." *American Political Science Review*, 92:37–49.
- Gamson, William A. 1990. *The Strategy of Social Protest*, Second edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Gamson, William A. and Emilie Schmeidler. 1994. "Organizing the Poor." *Theory and Society*, 13:567–585.
- Giugni, Marco. 2004a. "Personal and Biographical Consequences." In David A. Snow, Sarah Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Oxford: Blackwell, 489–507.
- Giugni, Marco. 2004b. *Social Protest and Policy Change*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- 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: 101–116.

## 29 / The consequences of social movements

- Giugni, Marco. 2008. "Political, Biographical, and Cultural Consequences of Social Movements." *Sociology Compass*, 2: 1582–1600.
- Giugni, Marco and Lorenzo Bosi. 2012. "The Impact of Protest Movements on the Establishment: Dimensions, Models, Approaches." In Kathrin Fahlenbrach, Martin Klimke, Joachim Scharloth, and Laura Wong (eds.), *The Establishment Responds: Power, Politics, and Protest since 1945*. New York: Palgrave, 17–28.
- Giugni, Marco and Florence Passy. 1998. "Contentious Politics in Complex Societies." In Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly (eds.), *From Contention to Democracy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 81–108.
- 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: University of Minnesota Press.
- Giugni, Marco, Lorenzo Bosi, and Katrin Uba. 2013. "Outcomes of Social Movements and Protest Activities." *Oxford Bibliographies Online: Political Science*. doi:10.1093/obo/9780199756223-0037.
- Goldstone, Jack. A. 1998. "Social Movements or Revolutions?" In Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly (eds.), *From Contention to Democracy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 125–145.
- Goldstone, Jack. A. 2001. "Toward a Fourth Generation of Revolutionary Theory". *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4(1): 139–187.
- Goldstone, Jack A. (ed.). 2003. *States, Parties, and Social Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldstone, Jack A. and Doug McAdam. 2001. "Contention in Demographic and Life-Course Context." In Ronald Aminzade, Jack Goldstone, Doug McAdam, Elizabeth Perry, William H. Sewell Jr., Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly (eds.), *Silence and Voice in the Study of Contentious Politics*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 195, 195–221.
- Goodwin, Jeff. 2001. *No Other Way Out: States and Revolutionary Movements, 1945–1991*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Greenwood, Royston, and Christopher R. Hinings. 1996. "Understanding Radical Organizational Change: Bringing Together the Old and the New Institutionalism." *Academy of Management Review*, 21(4): 1022–1054.
- Grodsky, Brian K. 2012. *Social Movements and the New State: The Fate of Pro-Democracy Organizations When Democracy is Won*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Gurr, Ted Robert. 1980. "On the Outcomes of Violent Conflict." In Ted Robert Gurr (ed.), *Handbook of Political Conflict, Theory and Research*. New York: Free Press, 238–294.
- Gurr, Ted Robert. 2015. *Political Rebellion. Causes, Outcomes and Alternatives*. London: Routledge.
- Gusfield, Joseph R. 1955. "Social Structure and Moral Reform: A Study of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union." *American Journal of Sociology*, 61: 221–232.
- Hanagan, Michael. 1998. "Social Movements, Incorporation, Disengagement, and Opportunities – A Long View." In Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly (eds.), *From Contention to Democracy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 3–30.
- Hasso, Frances S. 2001. "Feminist Generations? The Long-Term Impact of Social Movement Involvement on Palestinian Women's Lives" *American Journal of Sociology*, 107(3): 586–611.
- Helmke, Gretchen and Steven Levitsky. 2004. "Informal Institutions and Comparative Politics: A Research Agenda." *Perspectives on Politics*, 2(04): 725–740.
- Hipsher, Patricia L. 1998. "Democratic Transition and Social Movement Outcomes: The Chilean Shantytown Dwellers Movement in Comparative Perspective." In Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly (eds.), *From contention to democracy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 149–168.
- Htun, Mala and Laura Weldon. 2012. "The Civic Origins of Progressive Policy Change: Combating Violence Against Women in Global Perspective, 1975–2005." *American Political Science Review*, 106(03): 548–569.
- Huberts, Leo. 1989. "The Influence of Social Movements on Government Policy." *International Social Movement Research*, 2(1): 395–426.
- Isaac, Larry and William R. Kelly. 1981. "Racial Insurgency, the State, and Welfare Expansion: Local and National Level Evidence from

## 31 / The consequences of social movements

- the Postwar United States." *American Journal of Sociology*, 86: 1348–1386.
- Jenkins, Craig and William Form. 2005. "Social Movements and Social Change." In T. Janoski, R. Alford, A. Hicks, and M. Schwartz (eds.), *The Handbook of Political Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 331–349.
- Jennings, M. Kent. 1987. "Residues of a Movement: The Aging of the American Protest Generation." *American Political Science Review*, 81: 367–382.
- Kampwirth, Karen. 2004. *Feminism and the Legacy of Revolution: Nicaragua, El Salvador, Chiapas, Cuba*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Kane, Melinda D. 2003. "Social Movement Policy Success: Decriminalizing State Sodomy Laws, 1969–1998." *Mobilization*, 8: 313–334.
- Katzenstein, Mary Fainsod. 1998. "Stepsisters: Feminist Movement Activism in Different Institutional Spaces." In David S. Meyer and Sidney Tarrow (eds.), *The Social Movement Society: Contentious Politics for a New Century*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 195–216.
- Kim, Sookyung, Paul Y. Chang, and Gi-Wook Shin. 2013. "Past Activism, Party pressure, and Ideology: Explaining the Vote to Deploy Korean Troops to Iraq." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*, 18(3): 243–266.
- King, Brayden G. 2008. "A Political Mediation Model of Corporate Response to Social Movement Activism." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 53: 395–421.
- King, Brayden G. and Nicholas A. Pearce. 2010. "The Contentiousness of Markets: Politics, Social Movements, and Institutional Change in Markets." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 36: 249–267.
- King, Bayden G., Maria Cornwall, and Eric Dahlin. 2005. "Winning Woman Suffrage One Step at a Time: Social Movements and the Logic of the Legislative Process." *Social Forces*, 83(3): 1211–1234.
- 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: University of California Press.

- Kolb, Felix. 2007. *Protest and Opportunities*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter and Dominique Wisler. 1999. "The Impact of Social Movements on Political Institutions: A Comparison of the Introduction of Direct Legislation in Switzerland and the United States." In Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly (eds.), *How Social Movements Matter*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 42–65.
- Luders, Joseph. 2010. *The Civil Rights Movement and the Logic of Social Change*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mahoney, James and Kathleen Thelen (eds.). 2009. *Explaining Institutional Change: Ambiguity, Agency, and Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mair, Peter. 1997. *Party System Change: Approaches and Interpretations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Maney, Gregory. 2007. "From Civil War to Civil Rights and Back Again: The Interrelation of Rebellion and Protest in Northern Ireland 1955–1972." *Research in Social Movements, Conflict, and Change*, 27: 3–35.
- McAdam, Doug. 1988. *Freedom Summer*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McAdam, Doug. 1989. "The Biographical Consequences of Activism." *American Sociological Review*, 54: 744–760.
- McAdam, Doug. 1999. "The Biographical Impact of Activism." In Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly (eds.), *How Social Movements Matter*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 117–146.
- McAdam, Doug and Hilary Schaffer Boudet. 2012. *Putting Social Movements in Their Place: Explaining Opposition to Energy Projects in the United States, 2000–2005*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McAdam, Doug and Sidney Tarrow. 2010. "Ballots and Barricades: On the Reciprocal Relationship Between Elections and Social Movements." *Perspectives on Politics*, 8: 529–542.
- McAdam, Doug, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly. 2001. *Dynamics of Contention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McAdam, Doug and Yang Su. 2002. "The War at Home: Antiwar Protests and Congressional Voting, 1965 to 1973." *American Sociological Review*, 67: 696–721.

## 33 / The consequences of social movements

- McCammon, Holly J. 2009. "Beyond Frame Resonance: The Argumentative Structure and Persuasive Capacity of Twentieth-Century US Women's Jury-Rights Frames." *Mobilization*, 14(1): 45-64.
- Meirowitz, Aadam and Joshua Tucker. 2013. "People Power or a One-Shot Deal? A Dynamic Model of Protest." *American Journal of Political Science*, 57(2): 478-490.
- Meyer, David S. 2003. "How Social Movements Matter". *Contexts*, 2(4): 30-35.
- Meyer, David S. 1999. "How the Cold War Was Really Won: The Effects of the Antinuclear Movements of the 1980s." In Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly (eds.), *How Social Movements Matter*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 182-203.
- Meyer, David S. 2005. "Social Movements and Public Policy: Eggs, Chicken, and Theory." In David S. Meyer, Valerie Jenness, and Helen Ingram (eds.), *Routing the Opposition: Social Movements, Public Policy, and Democracy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1-26.
- Meyer, David S. 2007. *The Politics of Protest: Social Movements in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Meyer, David and Debra Minkoff. 2004. "Conceptualizing Political Opportunity." *Social Forces*, 82(4): 1457-1492.
- Meyer, David S. and Sidney Tarrow. 1998. "A Movement Society: Contentious Politics for a New Century." In David S. Meyer and Sidney Tarrow (eds.), *The Social Movement Society: Contentious Politics for a New Century*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1-28.
- Meyer, David S. and Nancy Whittier. 1994. "Social Movement Spillover". *Social Problems*, 42(2): 277-297.
- Micheletti, Michele. 2003. *Political Virtue and Shopping: Individuals, Consumerism, and Collective Action*. New York: Palgrave.
- Muller, Edward N., Henry A. Dietz, and Steven E. Finkel. 1991. "Discontent and the Expected Utility of Rebellion: The Case of Peru." *American Political Science Review*, 85: 1261-1282.
- Nagel, Joane. 1995. "American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Politics and the Resurgence of Identity." *American Sociological Review*, 60: 947-965.
- Oberschall, Anthony. 1973. *Social Conflict and Social Movements*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Olzak, Susan and Sarah A. Soule. 2009. "Cross-Cutting Influences of Protest and Congressional Legislation in the Environmental Movement." *Social Force*, 88: 210-225.
- Pickvance, Christopher G. 1999. "Democratisation and the Decline of Social Movements: The Effects of Regime Change on Collective Action in Eastern Europe, Southern Europe and Latin America." *Sociology*, 33(02): 353-372.
- Pettinicchio, David. 2012. "Institutional Activism: Reconsidering the Insider/Outsider Dichotomy" *Sociology Compass*, 6(6): 499-510.
- Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward. 1979. *Poor People's Movements*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Piven, Frances Fox and Richard A. Cloward. 1993. *Regulating the Poor*, Second edition. New York: Vintage Books.
- Polletta, Francesca and James M. Jasper. 2001. "Collective Identity and Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27: 283-305.
- Richardson, Liz. 2013. "We Need to Decide!": A Mixed Method Approach to Responsiveness and Equal Treatment." In Peter Esaiasson and Hanne Marthe Narud (eds.), *Between-Election Democracy: The Representative Relationship After Election Day*. Colchester: ECPR Press, 171-188.
- Rochon, Thomas. 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.
- Rootes, Christopher. 2004. *Environmental Protest in Western Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rucht, Dieter. 1992. "Studying the Effects of Social Movements: Conceptualization and Problems." Paper for the ECPR Joint Session, Limerick (Ireland).
- Ruzza, Carlo. 1997. "Institutional Actors and the Italian Peace Movement: Specializing and Branching Out." *Theory and Society*, 26(1): 87-127.
- Santoro, Wayne A. and Gail M. McGuire. 1997. "Social Movement Insiders." *Social Problems*, 44: 503-520.
- Schneiberg, Marc and Michael Lounsbury. 2008. "Social Movements and Institutional Analysis." In Royston Greenwood, Christine Oliver, Roy Suddaby, and Kerstin Sahlin-Andersson (eds.),

## 35 / The consequences of social movements

- The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. Sage: London, 6648–6670.
- 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: 168–184.
- Schock, Kurt. 2005. *Unarmed Insurrections: People Power Movements in Non-Democracies*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Seippel, Ørnulf. 2001. "From Mobilization to Institutionalization? The Case of Norwegian Environmentalism." *Acta Sociologica*, 44(2): 123–137.
- Sherkat, Darren E. and T. Jean Blocker. 1997. "Explaining the Political and Personal Consequences of Protest." *Social Forces*, 75: 1049–1070.
- Slater, Dan. 2009. "Revolutions, Crackdowns, and Quiescence: Communal Elites and Democratic Mobilization in Southeast Asia." *American Journal of Sociology*, 115(1): 203–254.
- Snyder, David and William R. Kelly. 1976. "Industrial Violence in Italy, 1878–1903." *American Journal of Sociology*, 82: 131–162.
- Soule, Sarah A. 2004. "Diffusion Processes within and across Movements." In David Snow, Sarah Soule and Hanspeter Kriesi (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Oxford: Blackwell, 294–310.
- Soule, Sarah A. and Brayden G. King. 2006. "The Stages of the Policy Process and the Equal Rights Amendment, 1972–1982." *American Journal of Sociology*, 111: 1871–1909.
- Soule, Sarah A. and Susan Olzak. 2004. "When Do Movements Matter? The Politics of Contingency and the Equal Rights Amendment." *American Sociological Review*, 69: 473–497.
- Staggenborg, Suzanne. 1988. "The Consequences of Professionalization and Formalization in the Pro-Choice Movement." *American Sociological Review*, 53: 585–605.
- Stewart, Abigail J., Isis H. Settles, and Nicholas J. G. Winter. 1998. "Women and the Social Movements of the 1960s: Activists, Engaged Observers, and Nonparticipants." *Political Psychology*, 19(1): 63–94.

- Suh, Dowoon. 2011. "Institutionalizing Social Movements: The Dual Strategy of the Korean Women's Movement." *The Sociological Quarterly*, 52(3): 442-471.
- Vasi, Ion Bogdan and Brayden G. King. 2012. "Social Movements, Risk Perceptions, and Economic Outcomes." *American Sociological Review*, 77: 573-596.
- Tarrow, Sidney and Charles Tilly. 2007. *Contentious Politics*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Taylor, Verta and Nicole C. Raeburn. 1995. "Identity Politics as High-Risk Activism: Career Consequences for Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Sociologists." *Social Problems*, 42: 252-273.
- Tilly, Charles. 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Tilly, Charles. 1999. "From Interactions to Outcomes in Social Movements." In Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly (eds.), *How Social Movements Matter*. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 253-270.
- Tipaldou, Sofia and Katrin Uba. 2014. "The Russian Radical Right Movement and Immigration Policy: Do They Just Make Noise or Have an Impact as Well?". *Europe-Asia Studies*, 66(7): 1080-1101.
- Thomas, John Clayton. 2013. "Citizen, Customer, Partner: Rethinking the Place of the Public in Public Management." *Public Administration Review*, 73(6): 786-796.
- Uba, Katrin. 2005. "Political Protest and Policy Change: The Direct Impacts of Indian Anti-Privatization Mobilizations, 1990-2003." *Mobilization*, 10: 383-396.
- Uba, Katrin. 2009. "The Contextual Dependence of Movements Outcomes: A Simplified Meta-Analysis." *Mobilization*, 14: 433-448.
- Viterna, Jocelyn. 2013. *Women in War. The Micro-Processes of Mobilization in El Salvador*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Watts, Nicole. 2006. "Activists in Office: Pro-Kurdish Contentious Politics in Turkey". *Ethnopolitics: Formerly Global Review of Ethnopolitics*, 5(2): 125-144.
- Whalen, Jack and Richard Flacks. 1989. *Beyond the Barricades*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Whittier, Nancy. 1995. *Feminist Generations*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

## 37 / The consequences of social movements

- Whittier, Nancy. 2004. "The Consequences of Social Movements for Each Other." In D. Snow, S. Soule, and H. Kriesi (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Oxford: Blackwell, 531–551.
- Wilhelm, Brenda. 1998. "Changes in Cohabitation across Cohorts: The Influence of Political Activism." *Social Forces*, 77: 289–310.
- Zald, Mayer N., Calvin Morrill, and Hayagreeva Rao. 2005. "The Impact of Social Movements on Organizations". In Gerald F. Davis, Doug McAdam, W. Richard Scott, and Mayer N. Zald (eds.), *Social Movements and Organization Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 253–279.

PROOF