The Power of Legacy
A Review of Social Movement Outcomes

Kate Gunby
Sociology Comps
Kenyon College
January 2009

ABSTRACT

What happens to a social movement after it is victorious? The vast social movement literature has neglected the importance of movement outcomes until recently and, even now, the study of outcomes tends to focus on forms of institutionalization and measuring impacts on policy. This paper traces social movement theories, examines how theories of social movement development have shaped the study of outcomes, grapples with the limited dichotomy of success and failure, summarizes possible movement outcomes, and explores how these outcomes impact politics. A synopsis of case studies on movement outcomes then assesses which theories are upheld by the evidence, and reveals gaps in the literature. I conclude that further work on social movement outcomes requires a more nuanced, comprehensive, and comparative approach that accounts for the influences of public opinion, emotions of movement members and leaders, and the movement's history.

The African National Congress (ANC) was a social movement in South Africa that led the struggle against apartheid. In 1994, ANC leader Nelson Mandela became South Africa's first democratically elected president. This is just one of the growing number of cases in which social movements have achieved their goals. The power of the ANC that led to the end of apartheid in 1994 has not faded away since this great success. The ANC is now a political party, but the organization's history as a movement continues to influence how South Africans vote and how ANC politicians rule.

What happens to a social movement after it is victorious? Most movements never achieve their goals, but some do so well that their "raison d'être" is no longer relevant. The way social movement organizations (SMOs) proceed once they have reached this level of success can cement the changes in their society, or allow their progress to slip away. Yet it is uncommon for social movement researchers to study social movement success. The bulk of social movement literature deals with how movements are created and maintained. When researchers do examine the outcomes of social movements, they tend to focus on biographical consequences for activists or the methods of measuring short and long term successes and failures. Mixed results are typical for most social movements, yet there are a growing number of cases in which social movements are able to achieve their primary goals. Social movements focused on liberation, suffrage, human rights, and other social changes sometimes lead to successful revolutions and reforms. Issues of power and class, and the history of oppression linger, but these are not regarded as shortcomings of the movements, since their principal purposes have been achieved.

Returning to the example of a liberation movement like the ANC, we can assume that the process of liberation requires drastic political, structural, and societal

transformations. Once these changes have taken place, the SMO involved in the liberation must adapt to the new landscape to stay relevant. Few studies have examined what happens to movements in these situations, and most academics who mention these scenarios conclude with one of three overly simplistic responses: the movement changes its goals, the leaders are institutionalized and leave the realm of social movement studies, or the SMO ceases to exist. Yet these are not the only possible results of movement success, and the scholars who limit their studies to these options ignore the power of the legacy of liberation movements. Even in the cases where the leaders are institutionalized or the organization dissolves, the movement still has a powerful position in the hearts and minds of the citizens, supporters, and members who benefited from the liberation. It is important when movements are successful that their leaders and members understand the lasting power they hold, even when their work is done, and make a conscious effort to move forward in a way that will preserve the changes they fought for.

In this paper, I review academic works that examine social movements after they achieve success. Social movement success was neglected by academics until recently, and when scholars study outcomes they tend to focus on policy effects and forms of institutionalization, rather than the broader framework of social and political change. I trace the development of theories of movement success, state common themes, highlight gaps in theories and research, and show how they have influenced case study research on social movement outcomes. This paper concludes with recommendations for further inquiry with the ultimate goal of helping activists and scholars to better understand this neglected aspect of the study of social movements and collective action.

I limited my research to works that are topical and scholarly, but did not rule out sources by their academic field or publishing date. Thus my research involves books, journal articles, and conference papers, while excluding news media, magazines, and websites. My research spans several disciplines that study social movements, including sociology, political science, social psychology, and anthropology. It is important to examine studies across the social sciences because all of these disciplines have done work on social movements, yet they do not always heed the findings of other fields. Finally, my research extends back to the first writings that discussed social movement success. This provides an understanding of how more modern research has expanded from, disproven, or neglected writings going back several decades.

DEFINING TERMS

The definition of social movements has been highly contested and changes frequently as new movements take on different forms. Meyer and Tarrow offered a good starting point for the definition when they described social movements as "collective challenges to existing arrangements of power and distribution by people with common purposes and solidarities, in sustained interaction with elites, opponents and authorities" (1998:4). However, there is an important distinction between social movements and social movement organizations. Social movement organizations are formal, coherent groups that make organized decisions and lead activities that may involve the broader social movement (Oliver and Myers 2002:2; McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald 1988:716-7). This paper will not be limited to SMOs, though it is important to consider that the majority of social movement theories have SMOs in mind because their trajectories are easier to follow (Oliver 1989).

Revolutions also have a variety of forms. Charles Tilly argues that older definitions are too demanding because they place too much focus on outcomes. If the focus is on outcomes, people will not know if they are experiencing a revolution until the outcomes can be adjudicated afterward. Tilly (1978) offers the alternative perspective that revolutionary situations can occur without revolutionary outcomes (193). Goodwin outlines an even broader definition of political revolution than Tilly's. Goodwin defines revolution as "any and all cases in which a state or political regime is overthrown, supplanted, and/or fundamentally transformed by a popular movement in an irregular, extraconstitutional, and/or violent fashion" (2005:404). This kind of revolution requires the broad participation of citizens in overthrowing the existing regime. The narrower types of revolutions are social in nature and require a "more or less rapid and fundamental social, economic, and/or cultural change during or soon after the struggle for state power" (Goodwin 2005:405). These social revolutions require more from the people fighting against the regime, and are consequentially more difficult to create.

Both types of revolutions tend to be the product of revolutionary movements. While most social movements try to influence the decisions of the existing power holders, revolutionary movements are a subset of social movements that try to fundamentally change who holds the power. Goodwin explains that the extent of change promoted by revolutionary movements varies, with some seeking power and others fighting for more fundamental transformations (2005:405).

This paper includes a mix of theories and studies that address social movements, SMOs, and revolutionary movements. I use the term "movement" when talking broadly about all three types, and specify the category of movement when necessary. While most

of this paper will be looking for broad trends and not discriminating between theories or case studies of social movements, SMOs, and revolutionary movements, the differences between these classifications impact their outcomes.

Democracy is another difficult idea to define because with each new government, new variables are created and questioned. The definition of democracy is debated not only by academics, but by people involved in political struggles and citizens of many countries, making it particularly hard to decide on one universal definition (Markoff 2005:396). Furthermore, democracy should not be regarded as a system that is either present or absent, but should instead be analyzed on a spectrum (Glenn 2001:10). Just because a government holds free and democratic elections does not mean that its country is democratic in all spheres. For example, many democracies punish people and groups that dissent, while still holding free, fair, and regular elections.

While there is no universally applicable definition of democracy, the idea is still central to the study of social movements. Most research on social movement and SMO outcomes involves changes made within a democracy, changes made to the way the democratic system works, or revolutionary movements that resulted in some form of democratization. If scholars settle on one definition of democracy, they delegitimize the work that movements have done to improve civil society, equal rights, individual freedoms, and the like. In this paper I refer to democracy broadly, showing how important the idea is for many social movements. This understanding that democracy is not a dichotomous variable is perhaps most important in instances where a revolutionary movement leads to democratization. While the movement has created a new democracy, there is still much work that can be done to improve the quality of democracy.

HOW DO SOCIAL MOVEMENTS DEVELOP OVER TIME?

The relationships of movements with state and social politics have been largely underdeveloped in social movement theory. As Buechler explains:

> Social movements were not granted political status for decades because collective behavior theory defined them as psychological, noninstitutional, or irrational; each of these formulations obscured the political status of social activism. At the same time, prevalent theories of the state left very little theoretical space for social movements as agents of state politics (1999:165).

There are four basic schools of thought regarding the trajectories of social movements and revolutions (McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly 2001:193).

The first three schools were defined by Jack Goldstone (1980a). He said that the first "generation" of social movement theories focused on the development of social movements as organizations with rigid stages of producing routines and oligarchy, and was popular from about 1900 to roughly 1940 (Goldstone 1980a; McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly 2001:193). One of the most prominent theories in this collection is Robert Michels' *iron law of oligarchy* which illustrates how movements transformed from somewhat informal participation to more bureaucratic and hierarchical systems of action (Michels 1962 [1911]; Davis et al. 2005:xiii). This became the dominant model of movement trajectories for some time, and Zald and Ash (1966) later labeled it the Weber-Michels model.

The second collection of theorists, dominant from about 1940 to 1975, focused on structural strains, and includes the works of Blumer, Kornhauser, Selznick, and Smelser. (Goldstone 1980a; Buechler and Cylke 1997; McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly 2001). This "generation" criticized the Weber-Michels model for being too limited because it restricted all social movements to an outcome of institutionalization and ignored other possible results (Zald and Ash 1966; McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald 2005:718). They

also viewed activists as social outsiders who participate in movements as a result of their alienation and anxiety (Smelser 1962; Selznick 1970). As Doug McAdam explains, for these theorists, "The social movement is effective not as political action but as therapy" (1997:139). Goldstone's review criticized this "second generation" for limiting possible outcomes, in addition to being difficult to observe and test, and giving too much power to the elites.

The third series of theories tried to compensate for the shortcomings of the previous two by offering a more comparative analysis that examined the impact of political, economic, and demographic factors (Goldstone 1980a; McAdam et al. 2001; Skocpol 1979). Within this grouping, there are three subsets of theory: resource mobilization, political opportunity structure, and political process theory. Resource mobilization theory follows Michel's understanding of the complex role of bureaucratization and borrows from organizational studies when it stresses that organization is necessary for a movement to be sustained (Gamson 1975; McCarthy and Zald 1977; Zald and Berger 1978; Zald and McCarthy 1987; Davis et al. 2005:6). Political opportunity structure theory combines the importance of political openness and permeability with the "critical role of various grassroots settings – work and neighborhood, in particular – in facilitating and structuring collective action" (McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald 1996:4). This theory has been used as the basis for many studies, but is criticized for simply substituting political structuralism in the place of economic structuralism (Tilly 1978; McAdam, 1996; Goodwin and Jasper 1999, Wolfson 2001; Desai 2002). The final subgroup focuses on political processes and was developed to counter resource mobilization and the first two "generations" of theory. Political process

theory combines elements of political opportunity structure with *frame aligning* and the power of members and leadership to provide a more comprehensive approach (McAdam 1982; McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald 1996; Desai 2002:622). These theories on movement trajectories provide the foundation for studies of social movement success to focus on changes based on resources, political power, and decisions made by leaders. The result has been academic works that ignore the broader effects of social movement victories, and instead focus on how specific environmental factors and decisions have created certain policies, or impacted members of the movements.

The fourth and youngest "generation" of social movement theory is critical of the exclusive focus on structures, and calls for a more human approach to understanding social movements. Desai explains that these scholars are "calling for a better understanding of the role of emotions, culture, and the creative and innovative capacity of leaders" (2002:622; see also Goodwin and Jasper 1999; Aminzade et al. 2001; McAdam et al. 2001). Furthermore, they view activists and movement leaders as rational decision makers who are participating in collective action to create political and social change. This focus on human emotion is also a step towards incorporating public opinion, an aspect Burstein and Linton have championed because it is particularly important when studying the impacts of social movements in democratic countries (2002:395-6). This collection of theories allows scholars to begin to address social movement success without simply measuring quantifiable changes and trying to prove causality.

WHAT ARE THE OUTCOMES OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS?

While social scientists disagree on many aspects of collective action, most concur that the discipline has neglected the effects of social movements (Berkowitz 1974; Gurr

1980; McAdam et al. 1988; Tarrow 1993; Burstein, Einwohner, and Hollander, 1995; Giugni, 1998, 1999; Lofland, 1993:347-8). This is particularly surprising, since change has usually been regarded as the reason for forming and continuing collective action (McAdam and Snow, 1997:xviii-xxv; McCarthy and Zald, 1997:1217-18; Tarrow, 1998:4-6). Burstein (1999) suggests that this area of study was neglected because academics held contradictory beliefs about the power of social movements. Though they believed that social movements were valuable endeavors and worthy of being studied, academics also believed that collective action rarely had an impact (Burstein 1999:3). This was exacerbated by movement trajectory theorists of the second category who saw collective behavior as a way for psychologically abnormal people to cope with their situation. It is difficult to justify studying social movement outcomes when most scholars think movements are based on "magical beliefs" (Smelser 1962:8) that will not create successful social changes. While scholars have now moved beyond that framework, the collection of social movement literature stunted the development of theories and studies on movement outcomes through the mid 1970s.

Fortunately, social movement outcomes have not been completely overlooked, and have gained attention in recent years. As Giugni points out, "a striking disparity exists between the large body of work on political and policy outcomes and the sporadic studies on the cultural and institutional effects of social movements" (1998:373). When scholars have studied the outcomes of social movements, they have generally focused on policy effects and biographical consequences for activists, but failed to examine the broader framework of social and political change (Jenkins and Form 2005:331). This

paper addresses work done in both areas, using research on social movement outcomes so that we can better understand how to study broader social movement change.

What is Success, and Can it Be Achieved?

Regardless of how possible or frequent movement success is, the belief that a movement can achieve some form of victory is crucial for movements to be effective. Most social movement members participate because they believe that their actions will result in success. Klandermans outlines three types of *success expectations*: "expectations about (1) the effectiveness of collective action, (2) the effectiveness of the individual's contribution, and (3) the behavior of other individuals" (Klandermans 1992:86; see also Klandermans 1984). These expectations are social constructions and can be self-fulfilling because they influence the participation of members and thus can impact the outcomes.

Zald and Ash said in 1966 that when a movement actually manages to achieve its goals, there are two major possible responses: an SMO can either create new goals, or simply cease to exist (1966:333). They offer a third, less likely option of *ex-movement organization* using the example of the Townsend Movement, a group that remained relevant after achieving the policies they set out to implement. Based on their analysis, Zald and Ash offer four propositions to be tested by future research. They propose that SMOs are less likely to vanish if they have: (1) many individual supporters rather than a separate founding organization, (2) more general and fewer specific goals, (3) goals aimed at changing society rather than individuals, and (4) exclusive rather than inclusive membership (1966:334). Zald and Ash were sure to include the perspective of movement participants in their study, saying simply that "the member leaving a successful

movement may either search for new goals and social movements or lapse into quiescence" (335).

Earlier studies on movement effects examined specific policy successes, indirect outcomes including public perceptions and countermovements, and activist careers and biographies (McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald 1988:727-8). More recent studies on movement success and failure still tend to focus either on the structural factors that facilitate or hinder movement success, or on the strengths and weaknesses of the SMO (Younis 2000:7). Yet there has been a shift in the way scholars think about movement outcomes, with a new appreciation for the "importance of broader patterns of change in culture, opinions, and lifestyles" (Oliver, Cadena-Roa, and Strawn 2003:219). This line of thought includes the possibilities of "nonlinear" outcomes that go beyond achieving goals and analyzing various actions and reactions (Gusfield 1981; Oliver 1989; Giugni 1999; Tilly 1999:268).

Like social movements, each revolutionary movement has a different level of success, and very few manage to seize power (Goodwin 2005:405). This is because the success of a revolutionary movement depends on the failure of the state. Since there are revolutions that can be studied, we can assume that radical change is possible, even if the movement is not the only reason for the breakdown of the state (Goodwin 2005:409).

What is the Relationship Between the State and Political Parties?

Wolfson (2001:9) outlines three relationships between the movement and the state including government facilitation, government co-optation or goal repression, and active government facilitation or repression (see also McCarthy and Zald 1977; Piven and Cloward 1977; Tilly 1978; McAdam 1982; Gamson 1990; della Porta 1995). These

categories make more sense when linked to understanding how they operate on spectrums of active to passive and correlate with degrees of movement success. Thus, I propose these categories: government facilitation (success), government co-optation (partial success), and government repression (failure).

Most SMOs, and the people who study them, regard the state as the target of their actions (Wolfson 2001:7-8). Since the state controls social goods and has a monopoly on legitimate violence, it is "simultaneously target, sponsor, and antagonist for social movements as well as the organizer of the political system and the arbiter of victory" (Jenkins and Klandermans 1995:3). Particularly in democracies, social movements are required to interact with the state in order to attain any lawful and lasting outcomes.

Some movements seek formal entry or acceptance from authorities, while others seek concessions (Tilly 1978; Gamson 1990). Movements are considered challengers, which are different from *polity members* who are able to consult with government leadership habitually (Lo 1992:230). This improves the chances that polity members are able to influence authorities in comparison to challenge groups who do not have the same access (Tilly 1978:53-4, 117). As Wolfson explains, "It is argued that entry into the polity, and consequent access to institutionalized means of influence, represents a qualitative change in the potential influence of groups on government decision making" (8). However, Burstein and Linton's (2002) study of social movements from 1990 to 2000 found that there is little reason to assume that political parties actually have a significant amount of power over public policy. They conclude that: "The impact of political organizations is significantly different from zero, by conventional statistical tests, only about half the time, and important in policy terms (as assessed by the authors)

in just over a fifth. There is little evidence that parties have more impact than other organizations" (385). This means that studies that only assess the policy impacts of political parties with movement pasts are limiting their research to a variable that might not even be significantly affected by the organization's movement to party transformation.

What are the Categories of Success?

The Strategy of Social Protest by William Gamson offered one of the first comprehensive definitions of movement success. He also asked many of the big questions that scholars have yet to answer:

> What of the group whose leaders are honored or rewarded while their supposed beneficiaries linger in the same cheerless state as before? Is such a group more or less successful than another challenger whose leaders are vilified and imprisoned even as their program is eagerly implemented by their oppressor? Is a group a failure if it collapses with no legacy save inspiration to a generation that will soon take up the same cause with more tangible results? And what do we conclude about a group that accomplishes exactly what it set out to achieve and then finds its victory empty of real meaning for its presumed beneficiaries? (1975:28)

Gamson began to answer these broad questions by creating a system of determining movement outcomes. He defined four kinds of social movement outcomes, based on the movement's abilities to gain acceptance and new advantages. These four categories are (1) a full response: acceptance and new advantages, (2) co-optation: acceptance without new advantages, (3) preemption: new advantages without acceptance, and (4) failure: neither acceptance nor new advantages (Gamson 1975:29). Acceptance can be assumed when a movement is engaged in consultations or negotiations, receives formal recognition, or is included in the power holding organizational structure (Gamson 1975:32). It must be noted here that revolutionary groups are unique because they attempt to overthrow the existing power holders, and thus the only way they can be "accepted" is by taking over the role of power (Gamson 1975:32-3). For a movement to

receive new advantages, it does not have to be the cause of these benefits. Rather than getting caught up in trying to prove causality, or the worthiness of these benefits, Gamson simply asked if the new advantages a movement sought after are actualized (1975:34).

Through Gamson's systematic study of a large sample of American SMOs, he found that co-optation was most common (Gamson 1975, McAdam et al. 1988:727). Giugni notes that Gamson's classification system has not been used to its fullest extent by quantitative researchers, and that when Gamson's model has been utilized by social scientists they are limited to studying organizations and ignoring the influence of broader cycles of protest (1998:382-3, see also Tarrow 1994). A variety of scholars built off of Gamson's theory in the decades following his model for movement success. Skocpol presented an innovative theory based on international pressures, conflicts between economic elites and political rulers, and social structure. Her three-factor theory offered easy solutions to the limitations of previous theorists, but was almost immediately disproved by a number of revolutions around the world in the following decades (Skocpol 1979, 1982; Goldstone 2002:211-2).

Kitschelt added a third aspect to Gamson's theory and amended his criteria of success (1986). This new categorization judged movement outcomes on structure effects, procedural effects (acceptance), and substantive effects (new advantages). Then Kriesi further clarified Kitschelt's theory by splitting the category of substantive effects into reactive and proactive effects, "i.e. the prevention of 'new disadvantages'…[and] introduction of 'new advantages'" (Giugni 1998:384). Rochon and Mazmanian, like Kitschelt, also renamed Gamson's categories and added a third factor for determining movement impacts (1993). They judge movement success based on changes in social

values, policy process (acceptance), and policy changes (new advantages). Essentially, Kitschelt, Kriesi, and Rochon and Mazmanian all agree that acceptance and new advantages are important variables in determining movement outcomes, but they offer additional factors based on either structural effects (Kitschelt and Kriesi) or social values (Rochon and Mazmanian).

Are Success and Failure the Only Options?

Judging a movement based on the dichotomy of success and failure assumes the movement has unified goals, raises the problem of subjectivity, and exaggerates the objectives of movement participants (Giugni 1998:383). Furthermore, social movement outcomes can be unintentional, do not necessarily benefit movement participants, and are not always immediately apparent (Jenkins and Form 2005:331-2; Amenta and Young 1999). Despite these flaws, many scholars have analyzed movement success and failure, and effects continue to be framed in this way (Giugni 1998; see also: Piven & Cloward 1979; Goldstone 1980b; Gamson 1990; Amenta et al. 1992).

The idea that the success/failure dichotomy is insufficient is not new. Hiller offered three alternatives to movement success in 1975. He suggests a movement may (1) become *defensive* of the favorable outcomes it has achieved or towards the risk of failure, (2) *reformulate* its goals, or (3) lose the chance to completely attain its goals through either partial success or losing immediate relevancy, and is thus *becalmed* (355). More authors have added to this pool of general outcomes, not viewed as strictly successes or failures, including the options of political or economic change, the creation of new institutions or organizations, and changes in public attitudes (Marx and McAdam 1994:112-3). Some examples are labor unions throughout the USA and Western Europe,

the National Organization of Women (NOW), National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), Boy Scouts, Sierra Club, and YMCA (Marx and McAdam 1994:114).

Marco Giugni distinguishes notions of incorporation, transformation, and democratization (Giugni 1998; Giugni, McAadam, and Tilly 1998:xv; Oliver, Cadena-Roa and Strawn 2003:218-9). *Incorporation* is when a movement or its leadership is absorbed into the existing structures without changing the institution. Incorporation may lead to *institutionalization* that allows the movement to become part of the established politics, or *preemption* where policy is made without creating space for further movement participation. *Transformation* occurs when there is a redistribution of power, but new leaders have the same roles as the authorities they replaced. *Democratization* is when there is both a transfer of power and change in the character of the government and society. *Democratic adjustment* occurs when the rights and obligations between citizens and the state change without a transfer of power.

Hopper's work on revolutionary movements offered only two movement outcomes: revolutionaries could either stay "rebels" or institutionalize (1950). He defined institutionalization as legalizing or organizing power to fit within the structure of political power, and when this happens the revolution is complete and a new society may be formed (1950:277). This makes institutionalization the crucial process that determines the change a movement creates:

> The success of the entire revolutionary movement hinges on what happens at this point in its evolution. If the objectives (values) that were formulated in doctrine, written into the constitution, and expressed in ritual and ceremony, are really attitudinally accepted and become the basis for behavior, the goals of the movement have been assimilated and the victory has been relatively complete (278).

Hopper admits that it is more common that the revolutionary group is legally accepted but the attitude of society does not change to fit the new system, and thus the revolution is more of a changing of the guard than a complete social transformation (278). He concludes that revolutionary victory in the institutionalization stage requires effective mechanisms, effective administrative leadership, and new social form (278-9).

Other scholars viewed institutionalization not as an outcome by itself, but instead as the key turning point for a movement. Armand Mauss created a five-stage model for the life cycle of movements (1971). They are (1) incipiency, (2) coalescence, (3) institutionalization, (4) fragmentation, and (5) demise (Hiller 1975:344). The first two stages show the growth of the movement, the third is the turning point, and then the final two stages show the movement's decline. This structure makes institutionalization a critical point in the life of a social movement. Mauss implies that if a movement is to achieve any favorable outcomes, they are only possible through institutionalization.

The focus on institutionalization was concerning for Hiller, since movements are inherently dynamic and unstable. He agrees that organization is central to achieving goals, but that institutionalization is rarely all-encompassing and that movement actions can take place outside of the organized structure (1975:344). For both Mauss and Hiller, the point of demise is not institutionalization. Hiller suggests that the end of a social movement is when it transforms into a voluntary association such as the YMCA (Zald 1970) or Saskatchewan Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (CCF) (Lipset 1968).

Seippel claims that theories of institutionalization are not fully developed, and writes "to pave the way for more complex and nuanced analyses of the phenomenon of institutionalization of social movements" (2001:134). He explains that

“institutionalization is taken to mean differentiation (division of labour and professionalization) and formalization (development of (in)formal rules)” (2001:125; see also Rucht, Blättert, and Rink 1997). However, the concept of institutionalization goes beyond new organizational structures, and introduces stability to the interactions of the movement and the state (Seippel 2001:125). Seippel offers three routes of institutionalization. A movement may (1) undergo a *traditional* transition to a bureaucratic structure, (2) become a *vibrant organization* that preserves its values and norms while incorporating new organizational structures, and (3) transform into a *non-contentious movement* by changing their normative foundation without creating an organized structure.

Lounsbury compares the notion of institutionalization in social movement theory with organizational theory, finding that “both literatures have tended to invoke an imagery of incremental change that focuses on how existing social structures maintain stability and elite positions become reproduced” (2005:73; see also Meyer and Tarrow 1998; Strang and Soule 1998). This has evolved into a new focus on qualitative shifts in the logics, institutional beliefs, and core practices of movements (Scott 2001; Lounsbury 2005:73). These scholars have found that institutionalization is not inevitable, and instead look at the importance of historical variation and elements of stratification when a movement creates new organizational structures. He concludes, "Drawing attention to the role of broader logics and contexts of action is also consistent with recent directions in social movements research that have extended the resource focus of the political process perspective by creating a more cosmopolitan framework that takes cultural

processes seriously – especially through the study of framing" (Lounsbury 2005:74; see also McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald 1996; Moore and Hala 2002; Zald 2000).

Co-optation is a complicated topic in movement literature because it has been used to represent both an effect of the movement upon the state, and vice versa. McCarthy and Wolfson define co-optation as "using group resources for purposes *other than those for which they were originally created*" (1992:189) and discuss the concept of a movement using state elements for their own purposes. Wolfson also notes, “others have argued that apparent facilitation by authorities often results in the co-optation or channeling of movements into adopting moderate goals and tactics” (2001:9; see also McAdam 1982; Jenkins and Eckert 1986; Helfgot 1974; Piven and Cloward 1977). To put it simply, the first kind of co-optation happens when a movement is able to gain some amount of power within the institution; the second is when the institution gains power over the movement.

It is odd that the relationship between movements and democratic development has not received more attention, particularly since, “[a]t its dawn in Western Europe and North America, modern democracy was unquestionably a social movement” (Tarrow 1994:1). Furthermore, democratic transitions are usually coupled with a “resurrection of civil society” and the transition to democracy or improving democracy are often goals of social movements (Hipsher 1998:149).

To better understand democratization, McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly offer several categories “*substantive* criteria emphasizing qualities of human experience and social ties; *constitutional* criteria emphasizing legal procedures such as elections and referenda; *political-process* criteria emphasizing interactions among politically constituted actors”

(2001:265). While these three groups overlap, they offer a foundation for a more nuanced view of democratization. Tilly warns against an oversimplification in the study of democratization, lamenting that some scholars have a tendency to reduce all types of regimes into two categories: democratic and authoritarian (2005:426). This results in comparative case studies in which regimes are quantitatively judged for their degree of democracy.

One example of movement to party transformations are what Panebianco refers to as "sponsor institutions," which essentially are groups that turn into a political party (1988, see also Schwartz and Lawson 2005:268). When studying social movements, it is not likely that multiple SMOs will join together to form a new party. Schwartz and Lawson argue that "More often, it is a single group that transforms itself into a political party, as did the African National Congress after the fall of apartheid in South Africa (prior to which it was an illegal movement) and the trade union-based movement of Solidarity in Poland after the fall of communism" (2005:268).

How do Movement Outcomes Impact Politics?

Social movement and party activities tend to increase or diminish in unison, and since the 1800s it has been common for social movements to develop parties or be directly associated with them (Van Cott 2005:6; Goldstone, ed. 2003: 4; Gunther and Montero 2002: 6; Glenn 2003:149) Even so, social movements and political parties have traditionally been studied in separate literatures. When they are studied together, the focus has been on "why, and with what consequences, social movements might form political parties" (Van Cott 2005:6; see also Yishai 1994:184; Thomas 2001; Goldstone, ed. 2003; Tilly 2003). Studying party evolution from a historical perspective allows us to

better understand parties that have recently emerged from social movements (Desai 2003:171). This is particularly true because there is no sound distinction between institutionalized and noninstitutionalized politics (Goldstone 2003). As Panebianco explains:

> The way in which the cards are dealt out and the outcomes of the different rounds played out in the formative phase of an organization, continue in many ways to condition the life of the organization even decades afterwards…the crucial political choices made by its founding fathers, the first struggles for organizational control and the way in which the organization was formed, will leave an indelible mark (1988:xiii).

Thus, movement outcomes can only be adequately studied within the context of the movement's history. In order to understand what elements of an organization's formation are impacting the movement's outcomes and how, social movement researchers must look beyond policy changes.

Jack Goldstone says that while there has been an increase in study on social movement outcomes in recent years, most have failed to do adequate research. He finds the existing research unsatisfactory because it has kept the studies of social movement outcomes and institutionalized politics separate, and Goldstone insists that these topics should not be studied independently because they do not exist separately (2003:1). Scholars must examine movements and the state together because "the very existence, actions, and structure of institutionalized political actors are permeated by social movement activity on an ongoing basis. Understanding how social movements give rise to parties, shape political alignments, and interact with normal political institutions has become essential to comprehending political dynamics" (Goldstone 2003:12).

Goldstone argues that revolutionary movements have a great deal of power in creating the new economic system, but ultimately fail to live up to expectations. He agrees with Skocpol that revolutions in Europe and Asia have developed out of similar

economic and political beginnings, and resulted in considerable institutional changes. However, European revolutions have also included greater shifts in social values and denounced the old government (Goldstone 2002:214). This leads him to insist that:

> social-structural conditions alone could not account for the different character of revolutionary outcomes, rather, the revolutionary breakdown of the former regime offers a uniquely fluid situation in which the new revolutionary leadership has choices as to how to present itself, and how to rebuild the social and political order. The ideology of the new revolutionary regime can therefore, he argued, be decisive in determining the outcome and trajectory of the postrevolutionary state (2002:214).

Goldstone focuses on the importance of this handover from the old regime to the new system, explaining that in the months following the demise of the old regime there is a "honeymoon" period in which individuals think that their hopeful desires will be realized. He notes that "the honeymoon cannot last, for the problems that initiated state breakdown—fiscal crisis, elite competition, and popular deprivation—do not disappear and still require solutions" (1991:422). At this point, the new governance fails to be much better than the old government, Goldstone explains.

> As popular groups almost invariably have only local concerns and goals, the task of building a dominant coalition to address these issues falls to members of the elite. Taking the various particular complaints and the various elite and folk ideologies, and forging from these elements an ideology with broad appeal, is critical to the construction of a dominant coalition (1991:422).

This shows that movement to party transformations will not live up to the expectations of movement supporters and sympathizers. Nevertheless, Goldstone argues that this relationship between social movements and institutionalized politics must be further examined, with a focus on the ideologies and values of regimes.

CASE STUDIES OF MOVEMENT OUTCOMES

There is a growing collection of case studies that addresses social movement success, outcomes, and change. Some of these movements have also been a part of democratization or transformed into a political party; others have achieved their goals

through different methods. Each case study helps provide insights, means of comparison, and fresh theoretical ideas for other scholars to consider.

Townsend Movement. The Townsend Movement was started by Dr. Francis Townsend, a retired MD, and his idea for creating the American Social Security system during the Great Depression. Messinger (1955) studied the decline of the Townsend Movement after the Social Security system's implementation. He found that the Townsend Movement was able to stay active because the leadership reframed their goals and began to view members, and potential members, as customers who wanted the rewards of participation. Messinger concludes, "by altering the basis for whatever recruitment may take place, would seem to insure that the organization, if it continues to exist, will be changed from a value-implementing agency to a recreation facility" (10). Though Messinger's work was written over half a century ago, the finding that movements can remain relevant by reframing their objectives and using a more business-like style where members are seen as customers is not bound to the idea of "success."

Brazilian Workers' Party. The Partido dos Trabalhadores (PT, or Worker's Party) in Brazil won the country's first democratic election in several decades in 1989. Margaret Keck's book is a comprehensive analysis of the PT's trajectory, the new party's association with the labor movement, and the process of Brazilian democratization (1992). She asks many important questions that are applicable to any movement to party transformation:

> What were the trade-offs involved in becoming a legal party within the limits established by the military regime? How could the party simultaneously help to promote autonomous organization of the working class (broadly conceived) and represent workers and the poor at the political level? Were elected officials from the party responsible to the party membership or to a broader constituency? How could the party best insure internal democracy and widespread participation? How would it deal with internal factors? How would it resolve the electoral dilemma, that is, the competing demands of remaining closely identified with a working class base and developing a

> sufficiently broad appeal to win elections? Would alliances with other parties dilute its programmatic message? (6)

She agrees with Panebianco's statement that the founding of parties and institutions have immense and long term effects on their futures (see Panebianco 1988:xiii). Keck finds that "the PT's initial legitimacy and its ability to survive in spite of an adverse political conjuncture has a great deal to do with its links with an increasingly autonomous and powerful movement of Brazilian unions for substantive change" (7).

Mississippi Civil Rights Movement. The Civil Rights Movement is one of the United States' most prominent examples of social movement success, and Andrews sets out to examine the role of the movement in creating change and how lasting the effects have been. He focuses on three aspects of movement infrastructure: "leadership, organizational structure, and resources" (2004:22). Furthermore, Andrews lays out five guidelines for selecting movement outcomes to study. Scholars should: (1) identify broad domains of movement claims without limiting their study to only explicit objectives, (2) appraise multiple outcomes within each of those domains, (3) examine the collective benefits and costs to the movement constituency, (4) assess relative outcomes, not absolute successes or failures, and (5) study the effects of the movement in the long term, extending far beyond the movement's decline.

One significant challenge Andrews' work illustrates is leaders being confronted with unrealistic expectations once they were in office. He states:

> The pursuit of black political power was built on the assumption that black elected officials would be responsive to the demands of the black community and address the deeply entrenched inequities in the distribution of "public goods." All facets of southern politics reflected these inequalities. As a result, newly elected black officials faced a tremendous burden of expectations, ranging from employment to paved roads (2004:185).

This onus is likely one that most leaders face if they are elected into power while being a member of the existing movement or after a movement to party transformation.

Chilean Shantytown Dwellers. Chile has become a model of democratization that scholars have urged new democracies in Europe, Latin America, and Africa to follow (Cash 1993; Christian 1994). Patricia Hipsher argues that in order to have a lively democracy, the government must allow social movements to exist and operate with a moderate degree of freedom. In some countries, "by demobilizing movements and attempting to control popular organizations, leaders of these new democracies and of popular movements may be alienating large sectors of society and ultimately be undermining the development of a healthy democratic polity" (1998:166). She notes that this has been a problem in countries like South Africa, where the African National Congress silenced many social movements to create an easier government transition. Hipsher warns, "if democracy is to survive in the long term, power relations must be restructured in a more democratic way, such that social movements can have a greater voice" (1998:166). This urges scholars to look at the way a movement that has transformed or achieved social change deals with other social movements.

South African ANC and Palestinian PLO. Mona Younis's comparative study of liberation and democratic transformation in South Africa and Palestine found that they went through surprisingly similar liberations because the African National Congress (ANC) and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) had comparable movement developments and the same global circumstances. Their very different outcomes "may be attributed to the fact that global and internal dynamics play out on a field of struggle where opponents meet in particular ways circumscribed by inclusion/exclusion. The process and product are thus mediated by the indigenous populations' inclusion or exclusion in the settler projects—that is, by class" (2000:20-1). Younis concludes that in

both countries, “the current political orders took shape in the very process of national liberation that produced them” (2000:21). This again highlights the importance of the process and movements involved in national liberation in shaping the future of the country.

Indian Political Parties. Manali Desai’s work compares policies of a leftist Indian political party in Kerala and West Bengal. Her analysis concentrates on three dimensions of political parties: “the social origins of party leadership, party strategies and tactics, and the relationship of parties to movements” (2003:181). Desai also builds from Panebianco's work, adding that “political struggles waged at one time under party leadership can for decades afterward impact the extent of their political power. Thus there can be significant (and unintended) ‘lag effects’ through which political struggles affect future generations” (Desai 2003:172). This makes it particularly important that social movements and parties are studied together with their histories in mind.

Czech Republic and Slovakia. After the end of Soviet rule, Czechoslovakia split into two new democratic countries: the Czech Republic and Slovakia. John Glenn compared the cases of party emergence in these two countries and found that the act of governing truly transforms a movement (2003:147). Furthermore, parties that come out of movements do not always follow standard ideas of political parties, but instead might form around political issues (rather than socioeconomic ones) and are prone to influence from international actors (2003:147).

Postcommunist reform is relatively unstable, and Glenn found that during this time, “leaders of new political parties are likely to act as social movement entrepreneurs seeking to mobilize potential supporters in light of varying opportunities, resources, and

ways of framing their claims" (2003:165; see also McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald 1996). International assistance for new democracies in the Czech Republic and Slovakia focused on free elections. After these countries held democratic elections in 1990, international funding dramatically decreased and the state became the main source of funding for political parties (2003:167). Furthermore, in these two case studies, the "antipolitics" that is common in revolutionary movements and their members is "virtually powerless against the imperatives of contemporary political competition…as social movements gain political power, even in the context of emerging democracy, they must confront the issue of transforming themselves into parties, despite inexperience or even reluctance to engage in party politics" (2003:168).

Conducting more comparative research in other postcommunist countries will help us to understand other variations of party emergence. Glenn suggests a comparison with Poland "where party fragmentation hobbled postcommunist governments…or with new parties in South Africa might provide contrasting paths of democratization" (2003:168; see also Klandermans, Roefs, and Oliver 1998). He concludes that movement success does not guarantee successful democratic parties, and that democratic outcomes cannot be determined by international supervision and aid. Change "involves complex and contingent interactions among movements, new parties seeking electoral support, the policy they seek to mobilize, and the international agencies that provide both assistance and guidance for party formation" (2003:169).

What Theories Do the Case Studies Uphold?

The case studies on movement to party success tend to support the theories of Goldstone and Panebianco. One of the main points of Panebianco and Goldstone, simply

put, is that the creation of a new political party by a former movement has large and long-lasting effects. More specifically, these case studies have found that the process of liberation shapes the political order (Younis 2000), the group's history as a movement shapes their new party (Desai 2003), and movements are changed when they enter the sphere of government (Glenn 2003). Keck found in Brazil that affiliations with unions can have a significant impact on party legitimacy and survival (1992), showing that ties with current groups can also influence movement outcomes and change.

Goldstone also makes it clear that the new party will not be able to fix all of the problems of the old regime (1991, 2002, 2003). Younis found in the cases of South Africa and Palestine that class has a role in shaping the new system (2000), and Andrews observes that civil rights movement leaders who gained power were faced with unrealistic expectations (Andrews 2004). Hipscher warns in particular that it is important for new parties to allow social movements to flourish in new democracies because the problems of their former regimes will not disappear (1998).

ANALYSIS

Theories on social movement trajectories have been mostly concerned with processes and structural effects. These, in turn, have led to limited theories of movement outcomes based on their positions within or regarding government, or the movement's impact on policy. Yet the changes that movements are capable of go far beyond technical policy and governmental modifications. While some scholars have recently created theories and study cases that attempt to fill this gap, social scientists have not yet developed a cohesive theory on how the role of a social movement's history and transformation influences their future, after they achieve their initial goals.

Nevertheless, some clear guidelines have emerged from this review of the literature. The notion of movement "success" is limited, and a word of the past. Movement research should focus on specific outcomes or broader changes, but the notions of success and failure cannot encompass the various trajectories and influences of movements. Models of understanding movement outcomes are constantly changing, and there may be no universally applicable model that will work in every scenario. Yet this should not create confusion when scholars are designing future research projects, because their main goal should be to understand the nuances of the situation, not to force their case studies to fit into existing categories.

Marco Giugni wrote ten years ago in his article "Was It Worth the Effort? The Outcomes and Consequences of Social Movements" that future research should provide a comprehensive comparison of social movement outcomes, noting their different political environments, time periods, and movement compositions (1998:388-9). While this sort of research has been sorely lacking, the case studies previously mentioned have initiated this form of examination of social movement outcomes.

I urge scholars to study social movement outcomes and changes from a nuanced, comprehensive, and comparative perspective. Scholars must look beyond policy changes and examine the influences of a movement's history, emotions of movement members and leaders, public opinion, and broader situations surrounding outcomes. The studies of social movements that create social change cannot end once they gain political power, transform into another organization, or even dissolve. It is crucial that these cases are studied extensively and comparatively so that social scientists, politicians, activists, and citizens can better understand the lasting power of social movements.

References

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* 98:308-39.

Amenta, Edwin and Michael P. Young. 1999. “Democratic States and Social Movements: Theoretic Arguments and Hypotheses.” *Social Problems* 57:153-68.

Aminzade, Ronald, Jack A. Goldstone, Doug McAdam, Elizabeth J. Perry, and Sidney Tarrow. 2001. *Silence and Voice in the Study of Contentious Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Andrews, Kenneth T. 2004. *Freedom is a Constant Struggle: The Mississippi Civil Rights Movement and Its Legacy*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Berkowitz, William R. 1974. “Socioeconomic Indicator Changes in Ghetto Riot Tracts.” *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 10:69-94.

Buechler, Steven M. 1999. *Social Movements in Advanced Capitalism: The Political Economy and Cultural Construction of Social Activism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Buechler, Steven M. and F. Kurt Cylke, Jr., ed. 1997. *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

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: University of Minnesota Press.

Burstein, Paul, Rachel L. Einwohner, and Jocelyn A. Hollander. 1995. “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 Minnesota Press.

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(2):381-408.

Davis, Gerald F., Doug McAdam, W. Richard Scott, and Mayer N. Zald, ed. 2005. *Social Movements and Organization Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

della Porta, Donatella. 1995. *Social Movements, Political Violence, and the State*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Desai, Manali. 2002. "The Relative Autonomy of Party Practices: A Counterfactual Analysis of Left Party Ascendancy in Kerala, India, 1934–1940" *American Journal of Sociology* 108(3):616–57.

------. 2003. "From Movement to Party to Government: Why Social Policies in Kerala and West Bengal are So Different." Pp. 170-96 in *States, Parties, and Social Movements*, edited by Jack A. Goldstone. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gamson, William A. 1975. *The Strategy of Social Protest*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.

------. 1990. *The Strategy of Social Protest*. 2nd ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Giugni, Marco G. 1998. "Was It Worth the Effort? The Outcomes and Consequences of Social Movements" *Annual Review of Sociology*. 24:371-393.

------. 1999. "How Social Movements Matter". Pp. xiii-xxxiii in *How Social Movements Matter*, edited by Marco C. Giugni, Douglas McAdam & Charles Tilly. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Glenn, John K. 2001. *Framing Democracy: Civil Society and Civic Movements in Eastern Europe*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

------. 2003. “Parties out of Movements: Party Emergence in Postcommunist Eastern Europe.” Pp. 174-69 in *States, Parties, and Social Movements*, edited by Jack A. Goldstone. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Goldstone, Jack A. 1980a. “The Weakness of Organization: A New Look at Gamson's The Strategy of Social Protest.” *The American Journal of Sociology* 85(5):1017-42.

------. 1980b. “Theories of Revolution: The Third Generation.” *World Politics* 32(3):425-453.

------. 2002. “Theory Development in the Study of Revolutions” Pp. 194-226 in *New Directions in Contemporary Sociological Theory*, edited by Joseph Berger and Morris Zelditch Jr. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

------., ed. 2003. *States, Parties, and Social Movements*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, Jeff. 2005. “Revolutions and Revolutionary Movements.” Pp. 404-22 in *The Handbook of Political Sociology*, edited by Thomas Janoski, Robert Alford, Alexander Hicks, and Mildred A. Schwartz. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, Jeff and James M. Jasper. 1999. “Caught in a Winding, Snarling Vine: The Structural Bias of Political Process Theory.” *Sociological Forum* 14(1):27-54.

Gunther Richard and José Ramón-Montero. 2002. “Introduction: Reviewing and Reassessing Parties.” Pp. 1-38 in *Political Parties: Old Concepts and New*

Challenges, edited by Richard Gunther, José Ramón-Montero, and Juan J. Linz. Oxford, UK: Oxford 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: Free Press.

Gusfield Joseph R. 1981. *The Culture of Public Problems: Drinking-Driving and the Symbolic Order*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Helfgot, Joseph. 1974. "Professional Reform Organizations and the Symbolic Representation of the Poor." *American Sociological Review* 39(4):475-491.

Hiller, Harry H. 1975. "A Reconceptualization of the Dynamics of Social Movement Development." *The Pacific Sociological Review* 18(3):342-360.

Hipsher, Patricia L. 1998. "Democratic Transitions and Social Movement Outcomes: The Chilean Shantytown Dwellers' Movement in Comparative Perspective." Pp. 149-68 in *From Contention to Democracy*, edited by Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Hopper, Rex D. 1950. "The Revolutionary Process: A Frame of Reference for the Study of Revolutionary Movements." *Social Forces*, 28:270-79.

Jenkins, J. Craig and Craig M. Eckert. 1986. "Channeling Black Insurgency: Elite Patronage and Professional Social Movement Organizations in the Development of the Black Movement." *American Sociological Review* 51(6):812-829.

Jenkins, J. Craig and Bert Klandermans, ed. 1995. *The Politics of Social Protest: Comparative Perspectives on States and Social Movements*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Jenkins, J. Craig and William Form. 2005. "Social Movements and Social Change." Pp. 331-49 in *The Handbook of Political Sociology*, edited by Thomas Janoski, Robert Alford, Alexander Hicks, and Mildred A. Schwartz. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Keck, Margaret E. 1992. *The Brazilian Workers Party and Democratization in Brazil.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kitschelt, Herbert. 1986. "Political opportunity structures and political protest: anti-nuclear movements in four democracies." *British Journal of Political Science* 16:57-85.

Klandermans, Bert. 1984. "Mobilization and Participation: Social Psychological Expansions of Resource Mobilization Theory." *American Sociological Review* 49:583-600.

------. 1992. "Social Construction of Protest and Multiorganizational Fields." Pp. 77-103 in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Klandermans, Bert, Marlene Roefs, and Johan Oliver. 1998. "Protest Intentions On The Eve Of South Africa's First Nonracial Elections: Optimists Look Beyond Injustice." *Mobilization* 3(1):51-68.

Kriesi, Hanspeter. 1995. "The political opportunity structure of new social movements. its impact on their mobilization." Pp. 167-98 in *The Politics of Social Protest: Comparative Perspectives on States and Social Movements*, edited by J. Craig Jenkins and Bert Klandermans. Minneapolis, MN: University Minnesota Press.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1968[1950]. *Agrarian Socialism: The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation in Saskatchewan. A Study in Political Sociology*, updated. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Lo, Clarence Y. H. 1992. "Communities of Challengers in Social Movement Theory." Pp. 224-47 in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lofland, John. 1996. *Social Movement Organizations: Guide to Research on Insurgent Realities*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine De Gruyter.

Lounsbury, Michael. 2005. "Institutional Variations in the Evolution of Social Movements: Competing Logics and the Spread of Recycling Advocacy Groups." Pp. 73-95 in *Social Movements and Organization Theory*, edited by Gerald F. Davis, Doug McAdam, W. Richard Scott, and Mayer N. Zald. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Markoff, John. 2005. "Transitions to Democracy." Pp. 384-403 in *The Handbook of Political Sociology*, edited by Thomas Janoski, Robert Alford, Alexander Hicks, and Mildred A. Schwartz. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mauss, Armand C. 1971. "On being Strangled By The Stars and Stripes: The New Left, The Old Left, and The Natural History of American Radical Movements." *Journal of Social Issues* 27:183-202.

McAdam, Doug. 1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930-1970*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

------. 1997. "The Classical Model of Social Movements Examined." Pp. 135-48 in *Social Movements: Perspectives and Issues*, edited by Steven M. Buechler and F. Kurt Cylke, Jr. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald. 1988. "Social Movement." Pp. 695-737 in *Handbook of Sociology*, edited by Neil J. Smelser. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

------., eds. 1996. *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

McAdam, Doug and David A. Snow. 1997. *Social Movements: Readings on Their Emergence, Mobilization, and Dynamics*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.

McAdam, Doug, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly. 2001. *Dynamics of Contention*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, John D. and Mark Wolfson. 1992. "Consensus Movements, Conflict Movements, and the Cooptation of Civic and State Infrastructures." Pp. 273-297 in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, edited by Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *American Journal of Sociology*, 82:1212-41.

Messinger, Sheldon L. 1955. "Organizational Transformation: A Case Study of a Declining Social Movement." *American Sociological Review*, 20(1):3-10.

Meyer, David S. and Sidney Tarrow. 1998. "A Movement Society: Contentious Politics for a New Century." Pp. 1-28 in *The Social Movement Society: Contentious*

Politics for a New Century, edited by David S. Meyer and Sidney Tarrow. Lanham, Rowman and Littlefield**.**

Michels, Robert. 1962 [1911]. *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy*. New York: Free Press.

Moore, K. & Hala, N. 2002. "Organizing Identity: The Creation of *Science for the People*." In *Research in the Sociology of* Organizations. 19: xx-xx., edited by Michael Lounsbury and Marc J. Ventresca. New York:JAI/Elsevier.

Oliver, Pamela E. 1989. "Bringing the Crowd Back In: The Nonorganizational Elements of Social Movements." *Research in Social Movements and Conflict*, 11:1-30.

Oliver, Pamela E., Jorge Cadena-Roa, and Kelly D. Strawn. 2003. "Emerging Trends in the Study of Protest and Social Movements." Pp. 213-44 in *Political Sociology for the 21st Century*, Vol. 12. edited by Betty A. Dobratz, Lisa K. Waldner, and Timothy Buzzell. Stanford, CT: JAI Press.

Oliver, Pamela E. and Daniel J. Myers. 2002. "The Coevolution of Social Movements." *Mobilization: An International Journal*, 8(1):1-24.

Panebianco, Angelo. 1988. *Political Parties: Organization and Power*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

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

------.1979. *Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail*. New York: Vintage.

Rochon, Thomas R. and Daniel A. Mazmanian. 1993. "Social Movements and the Policy Process." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 528(1):75-87.

Rucht, Dieter; Blättert, Barbara and Dieter Rink, eds. 1997. *Soziale Bewegungen auf dem Weg zur Institutionlisierung*. Frankfurt: Campus.

Schwartz, Mildred A. and Kay Lawson. 2005. "Political Parties: Social Bases, Organization, and Environment." Pp. 266-86 in *The Handbook of Political Sociology*, edited by Thomas Janoski, Robert Alford, Alexander Hicks, and Mildred A. Schwartz. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Scott, W. Richard. 2001. *Institutions and Organizations*. 2nd ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Seippel, Ørnulf. 2001. "From Mobilization to Institutionalization? The Case of Norwegian Environmentalism." *Acta Sociologica* 44:123-37.

Selznick, Phillip. 1970. "Institutional Vulnerability in Mass Society." Pp. 258-74 in *Protest, Reform, and Revolt*, edited by Joseph R. Gusfield. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States & Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, & China*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

------. 1982. "Rentier State and Shi'a Islam in the Iranian Revolution." *Theory and Society* 11(3):265-83.

Smelser, Niel J. 1962. *Theory of Collective Behavior*. New York: The Free Press.

Strang, David and Sarah A. Soule. 1998. "Diffusion in Organizations and Social Movements: From Hybrid Corn to Poison Pills." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24: 265-290.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1993. "Social protest and policy reform: May 1968 and the Loi d'Orientation in France." *Comparative Political Studies* 25:579-607

------. 1994. *Power in Movement*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

------. 1998. *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Mass Politics in the Modern State*. 2nd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, Clive S. 2001. "Studying the Political Party-Interest Group Relationship." Pp. 1-23 in *Political Parties and Interest Groups: Shaping Democratic Governance*, edited by Clive S. Thomas. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Tilly, Charles. 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

------. 1999. "Conclusion: From Interactions to Outcomes in Social Movements." Pp. 253-70 in *How Social Movements Matter*, edited by Marco C. Giugni, Douglas McAdam & Charles Tilly. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

------. 2003. "Afterward: Agendas for Students of Social Movements." Pp. 246-56 in *States, Parties, and Social Movements*, edited by Jack A. Goldstone. New York: Cambridge University Press.

------. 2005. "Regimes and Contention." Pp. 423-40 in *The Handbook of Political Sociology*, edited by Thomas Janoski, Robert Alford, Alexander Hicks, and Mildred A. Schwartz. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Van Cott, Donna Lee. 2005. *From Movements to Parties in Latin America: The Evolution of Ethnic Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wolfson, Mark. 2001. *The Fight Against Big Tobacco : The Movement, The State, and The Public's Health*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Yishai, Yael. 1994. "Interest Parties: The Thin Line Between Groups and Parties in the Israeli Electoral Process." Pp. 197-225 in *How Political Parties Work. Perspectives From Within*, edited by Kay Lawson. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Younis, Mona N. 2000. *Liberation and Democratization: South African and Palestinian National Movements*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Zald, Mayer. 1970. *Organizational Change: The Political Economy of the YMCA*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

------. 2000. "Ideologically Structured Action: An Enlarged Agenda for Social Movement Research." *Mobilization*, 5:1-17.

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

Zald, Mayer N., Calvin Morrill, and Hayagreeva Rao. 2005. "The Impact of Social Movements on Organizations: Environment and Responses." Pp.253-79 in *Social Movements and Organization Theory*, edited by Gerald F. Davis, Doug McAdam, W. Richard Scott, and Mayer N. Zald. New York: Cambridge University Press.