Abstract and Keywords

The chapter introduces the *Oxford Handbook of Social Movements* through an exploration of the field of social movement studies. While scientific boundaries are inevitably— and luckily— porous, still they may define professional identities, encourage attention to specific issues to the detriment of others, nurture specific theoretical or methodological approaches, and hamper the growth of others. Therefore, looking for the factors that render social movement research distinctive provides an opportunity to map not only the range of empirical phenomena and the kind of intellectual questions that have shaped the field, but also some of its current limitations. The *Handbook* maps some of the different lines of investigation that have developed in recent years. Without denying the specificity of social movement research, it also highlights its burgeoning conversations with cognate intellectual fields and traditions, and the attempts to overcome conventional disciplinary boundaries out of dissatisfaction with dominant paradigms.
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Mapping the Field

The publication of an Oxford Handbook represents in the last instance a statement about a scientific field: not only about the principles and ideas guiding research activities and shaping discussions within it, but also about its very existence. Had the Oxford Handbooks been around in the 1960s, few would have probably thought of a volume focussing on “social movements.” And this not because issues of social conflict or citizens’ participation in political life were ignored by social scientists (they were not), but because a set of core ideas was missing, capable of connecting different lines of
research and thinking around the concept of social movement. Analysts of large-scale societal changes took an obvious interest in collective action processes (e.g., Wallerstein 1974) while students of individual political and social participation were similarly intent on exploring involvement in protest activities alongside conventional ones (e.g., Barnes and Kaase 1979), yet there was a shortage of analytic tools, focussing on social movements, enabling broader conversations between promoters of different lines of investigation. Of course, even today, many analysts of macro social change, or of individual protest behavior, happily go on with their business without defining themselves as “social movement scholars,” sometimes even without engaging with the concept. At the same time, however, social movements have consolidated as a distinct field of investigation and theorizing, with specialized journals such as Mobilization, Social Movement Studies, or most recently Interface, and annuals such as Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change.

Here we are not interested in viewing the social movement field, à la Bourdieu (1988), as a structure of power relations between actors competing for influence and status. Rather, borrowing on DiMaggio and Powell’s (1983) classic definition of organizational fields, we conceive of a scientific field as a “set of actors that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life.” In this chapter, we do not intend to trace the evolution of this particular field from the point of view of the interactions between social movement researchers (for this, see, if restricted to Europe, Diani and Cisar 2014). We intend, instead, to explore the criteria on the basis of which certain lines of research and their advocates may be recognized as social movement scholarship. While scientific boundaries are inevitably—and luckily—porous, still they may define professional identities, encourage attention to specific issues to the detriment of others, nurture specific theoretical or methodological approaches, and hamper the growth of others. What then are the factors that enable us to identify social movements as a distinct field of research? Far from being a purely academic exercise, exploring at least some of them provides an opportunity to map the range of empirical phenomena and the kind of intellectual questions shared among a significant number of social movement scholars and analysts.

First of all, the social movement field may be defined, in a purely empiricist way, by the set of actors on which social movement researchers primarily focus. A substantive amount of research has treated movements as sets of actors with specific characteristics. These have often been individuals. Building on the long-established tradition of survey research, the growing interest in protest politics has first resulted in specific questions included in surveys of the general population such as the World Values Survey or the European Social Survey (e.g., Dalton 2008), and later (since the late 1990s) in the promotion of specific surveys of demonstrators (e.g., Norris, Walgrave, and Van Aelst 2005; Walgrave and Rucht 2010) or of members of movement organizations (e.g., Tindall 2004). Deeper, more qualitative analyses have also been devoted to explore subjective feelings, motivations, and life stories of movement activists (e.g., della Porta 1995; Blee 2003) or, more rarely, of movement leaders (e.g., Barker, Johnson, and Lavallette 2001; Nepstad Erickson and Bob 2006). Other times, the focus has been on organizations, with
studies of “social movement organizations” ranging again from the qualitative, in-depth observation of specific cases to larger population surveys (Zald and McCarthy 1980; Minkoff 1995; Kriesi 1996; Andrews and Edwards 2005; Diani 2015). All in all, it is fair to say that investigations of individual protestors and their motives, or of “social movement organizations,” were largely promoted by people with a specific identification with social movements as a distinct area of research. At the same time, the boundaries have been far from impenetrable: the study of protest behavior has significantly overlapped with the study of political participation at large (van Deth and Kreuter 1998; Dalton 2008), while the difference between studies of “social movement organizations” and “public interest groups” has sometimes depended more on the individual orientation of specific researchers than on substantive differences in the object of study (see, e.g., Burstein 1998).

Social movement studies also stand apart as a field because of their attention to the practices through which actors express their stances in a broad range of social and political conflicts. Since the 1980s, the analysis of public challenges to existing authorities in the form of protest events has attracted considerable attention (Tarrow 1989; Kriesi et al. 1995; Rootes 2003; Soule and Earl 2005; McCarthy, Rafail, and Gromis 2013). While the study of public demonstrations as displays of worthiness, unity, numbers, and commitment (“wunc”: Tilly 2004: 54) has been focal to the social movement field, attention has always been paid to the broader and more diverse forms taken by contention across time and space (Tilly, Tilly, and Tilly 1975; Tilly 2005; Tilly and Tarrow 2007). As the institutionalization of the protest movements of the 1960s and 1970s proceeded, analysts also became increasingly wary of too rigidly identifying public protest as their main distinctive feature. The role played within conventional political processes, through the use of conventional repertoires, by organizations as well as individuals, emerged from, or still engaged in, protest activities, has been repeatedly recognized (Burstein 1998; Giugni, McAdam, and Tilly 1999; Goldstone 2003). The spread of Internet-based and related forms of communication has also been hailed as an important transformation in practices of collective action, as public challenges may lose their centrality and be replaced by various forms of online campaigning, giving more autonomy to individual choices and rendering forms of action promoted by organizations, and in particular public protest, less relevant (e.g., Bennett and Segerberg 2013, this volume).

Analysts have become similarly aware of the fact that collective action does not always imply the formulation of political demands (through confrontational as well as conventional repertoires). It may also take the form of the direct production of collective goods, through a broad range of actions that stretch from the communitarian enactment of alternative lifestyles to various forms of mutual help and service delivery. In reference to the latter, while service delivery has been mostly the preserve of voluntary, charitable organizations, addressed by a different tradition of study, the boundaries between these two sectors of civil society have not always been rigid. Movement organizations have often been involved in service delivery to their members/sympathizers/beneficiaries (think for instance of environmental, women’s or LGBT groups), while charitable
organizations (including formal charities, if in an oblique way) have been on occasion involved in protest on issue linked, for example, to welfare dismantling, deprivation, or global inequalities. This has reflected in some analysts working as bridges between the corresponding scientific fields (Anheier 2004; Anheier and Kendall 2002; Anheier and Scherer this volume).

Even a superficial and partial glance at social movement research, such as the one we have just presented, suggests that its empirical focus is at the same time relatively distinctive and overlapping with several cognate fields. One can certainly argue that the social movement field has been disproportionately characterized by the interest in (a) individuals critical of the status quo and prepared to engage in protest; (b) organizational forms intent on encouraging rank and file participation and bottom-up forms of deliberation; (c) public challenges to powerholders, often linked in chains of protest events; (d) actions providing goods to movement constituencies, and facilitating experimentation with alternative lifestyles. There is a clear community of scholars who define themselves as social movement analysts and interact in a variety of ways around these and related topics. At the same time, they are by no means the monopolistic owners of those themes, to which understanding analysts from fields as diverse as political participation, interest groups, voluntary and non-profit organizations, cultural studies, organizational studies, communication studies, to name just a few, also contribute.

The most probing criterion to explore the profile and consistence of a field is through the main theoretical questions it addresses, and the responses it has provided. In our previous work (della Porta and Diani 2006: 1) we have suggested that the bulk of social movement research in both North America and Europe developed since the 1960s around four main sets of questions, concerning (a) the relationship between structural change and transformations in patterns of social conflict; (b) the role of cultural representations in enabling collective action; (c) the mechanisms that render it rational to mobilize on collective goals; and (d) the effects of the political and institutional context on social movements’ development and evolution. Since the 1970s, “new social movement” theorists (e.g., Touraine 1981; Melucci 1989) noted how movements like feminism or environmentalism reflected the shifting focus of contemporary societies from the production of material goods to the production of knowledge, broadly conceived. They also suggested that new forms of social conflict differed from those embodied in the experiences of class and nationalist movements because of a critical ideology in relation to modernism and progress; decentralized and participatory organizational structures; defense of interpersonal solidarity against the great bureaucracies; and the reclamation of autonomous spaces, rather than material advantages; and how new movements tried to oppose the intrusion of the state and the market into social life, reclaiming individuals’ right to determine their own life projects and identities, against the omnipresent and manipulative systemic apparatuses. At the same time, new social movement theorists were not alone in keeping an interest in the relation between structural change and collective action. Notable lines of inquiry were pursued, among others, by Manuel Castells, whose focus shifted from changes in the urban sphere and in patterns of collective consumption (Castells 1984) to changing patterns of conflict in the network...
society, characterized by the pervasive presence of new technologies (Castells 1997, 2012); and by proponents of world system theory, exploring various forms of resistance to corporate and financial globalization in both the South and the North of the world (Arrighi, Hopkins, and Wallerstein 1989; Smith and Wiest 2012).

Other lines of research have taken the presence of structural grievances of various natures as a starting point for the analysis, focussing instead on the conditions under which certain structural tensions turned into collective action while others failed to do so. One approach to these issues has concentrated on cultural dynamics such as the production of proper frames, capable of providing motives and interpretations of situations enabling action, and the construction of collective identities. Building on the tradition of the collective behavior school and symbolic interactionism (e.g., Gusfield 1963) analysts have focussed on processes of symbolic production and identity construction as the essential mechanisms that enable actors to recognize aspects of their condition as worthy of collective action, and to define themselves as distinct carriers of collective goals and orientations (Snow et al. 1986; Benford and Snow 2000; Oliver and Johnston 2000). Since the 1990s, some researchers have expanded the cultural perspective by stressing that symbolic production is not only (or mainly) strategically oriented, but that movements produce condensing symbols and rhetoric oriented to provoke various types of emotional responses (e.g., Jasper 1997; Goodwin, Jasper, and Polletta 2001).

A different way to address the relation between structural conditions and action has originated from attempts to address the dilemma posed by Olson’s (1963) seminal discussion of the “irrationality of collective action.” Why should people participate in the production of collective goods that they will enjoy in any case if the attempt will be successful, while facing selective costs in case of failure? Theorists of resource mobilization (McCarthy and Zald 1977) identified in the presence of leaders acting as political entrepreneurs and in the availability of organizational and personal resources, some of the most important factors altering the terms of the rational calculation on the basis of which people decide whether to get involved or not in collective projects. Research has also highlighted the role of inter-personal, as well as inter-organizational networks in the circulation of resources and the creation of the solidarities that encourage action in pursuit of collective goals (Oberschall 1973; Marwell and Oliver 1993).

Finally, the perspective usually defined as “political process” (Tilly 1978; McAdam 1982; Tarrow 1994) has shared with resource mobilization theory a strategic view of action paying more systematic attention to the political and institutional environment in which social movements operate. Such environmental conditions have often been summarized under the heading of “political opportunity structure,” combining the degree of openness or closure of formal political access, the degree of stability or instability of political alignments, the availability and strategic posture of potential allies, and political conflicts between and within elites (Tarrow 1994). Characteristics relating to the functional division of power and also to geographical decentralization have also been taken into
account in order to explore which stable or “mobile” characteristics of the political system influence the growth of less institutionalized political action in the course of what are defined as protest cycles.

In this Handbook, we do not devote systematic attention to reconstructing the evolution of social movement research since the 1970s. This is so for two main reasons. First, those contributions have been repeatedly explored and summarized over the last few years, to different levels of detail (see, e.g., Crossley 2002; della Porta and Diani 2006; Opp 2009; Buechler 2011; Neveu 2011; Johnston 2014). Second, we do not want to contribute further to the reification of the different questions shaping the field as the basis of distinctive, objectified theoretical currents. While differentiating between “European” and “American” approaches (Klandermans and Tarrow 1988) or identifying the attention to frames, mobilizing structures and opportunities as the building blocks of a “classic agenda” of social movement research (McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly 2001) has certainly helped to start conversations at crucial points in time, there are also costs attached to this approach. For example, scholars who are routinely associated, even by ourselves (della Porta and Diani 2006: ch. 1), with one or the other theoretical current, are actually far more complex and richer in their thinking. To name just two major cases, the late Alberto Melucci’s analysis of identity-building mechanisms and small group network dynamics prevent us from associating him rigidly with the structural, deterministic version of new social movement theory; and David Snow’s work on framing can also be read (see, e.g., Gamson 1992) as strongly conversant in resource mobilization theory.

Accordingly, we found it more useful to abandon any attempt to identify distinct “schools” of social movement research, and to focus instead on the responses that social movement researchers have attempted to provide to a few key themes and issues, mapping some of the different lines of investigation that have developed in recent years. Oftentimes, such questions have been identified, and answers to them have been elaborated, in close and explicit dialogue with dominant paradigms; other times, however, recent research has sprung out of dissatisfaction with such paradigms, and their basic assumptions. Both the strengths and the limitations of traditional approaches have been made more explicit following the growth of attention for social movement research in disparate intellectual and scientific fields (from anthropology to geography), as well as in areas other than the West (e.g., Routledge in this volume; Juris and Alex Khasnabish in this volume; della Porta 2014). With this purpose in mind, the structure of the Handbook reflects both the embeddedness of recent research in the basic questions that have emerged since the 1970s, and its sustained efforts to transcend its disciplinary and geographical limitations.

**Expanding the Field**
Introduction: The Field of Social Movement Studies

The aim of this Handbook is to map, but also to expand the field of social movement studies, opening up to recent developments in cognate areas of studies, within and beyond sociology and political science. With this purpose in mind, we have looked for contributions which open conversations between classic social movement agendas and those developed on other issues and in diverse discipline. While we used quite traditional social movement concepts to structure the Handbook into parts, we tried in each Part to combine the purpose of mapping the state of the art with the one of broadening our knowledge of social movements finding inspiration outside of the classic agenda, as well as suggesting what contributions social movement studies can give to other fields of knowledge.

In structuring the different Parts of this Handbook, we have tried to use some main concepts around which research has converged within the fields of social movement studies, in each trying however to broaden the perspective by looking in cognate fields of research. After we cover some core theoretical perspectives, we go on to look at big social transformations that affect social movements, moving then to the analysis of microdynamics of collective action. We look then, at the meso-level, at movements’ cultures, organizational models, and repertoires of action. Finally, we look at the political and non-political opportunities for social movements’ development, as well as at the social movement effects on their environment.

The first Part of the Handbook, devoted to “Core Theoretical Perspectives,” attempts to locate what we have just summarized as the “classic agenda” of social movement research in a broader intellectual context. In the opening chapter, Klaus Eder elaborates on the ways in which social theory has been used in social movement studies and, vice versa, how social movements were addressed in social theory, proposing a novel and promising relations between the two fields. Reviewing the classical contributions of social theories to social movement studies, he distinguishes between a macro-theoretical approach, including Alain Touraine’s, Juergen Habermas’, and Nikolas Luhmann’s analysis of the role of social movements within structural transformations, and the “micro-theoretical” tradition, embedded especially in rational-choice explanations. In order to avoid a misleading opposition between structure and agency, he suggests looking then at the micro-foundation of collective action as well as at the emergency of complexity from within these social relations. Social movements are in fact theorized as structures of social relations that link social action events by circulating meaning through these relations. The narrative turn in social theory, the development of a network perspective, and the emergence of evolutionary theory are addressed in the search for new analytical tools to mobilize for this purpose.

In his chapter, Ondrej Cisar offers a parallel overview of the relations between social movement research and political science, looking at classical contributions in the field, with particular attention paid to the interactions between interest representation and social movement studies. As he observes, social movement studies did indeed develop in the United States within a paradigm of interest representation rooted in the pluralist approach that, from Madison to Truman, had then reached research on social
movements. If this perspective has offered important contributions to our understanding of social movements, the chapter also points however to the importance of the (European) tradition that, with a Weberian sensitivity, pays attention to the state and its intervention in the regulation of interest representation. Rather than a neutral arena, in the corporatist vision of interest representation, the state is an actor itself, actively promoting some interests against which social movements struggle either, in a Marxist vision, to overcome capitalism or, in a Polanyi’s approach, in order to balance the free market with (some) social protection. To what extent the Keynesian belief in macro-economic management as well as interest concentration based on state coordination will survive neoliberal capitalism remains an open question.

Historical research has also played an important role in social movement studies. In his chapter, John Markoff addresses the various ways in which history matters for the development of social movements. Covering a huge variety of literature in different fields of the social sciences, he discusses first of all big cross-historical comparisons that have located social movements within broad historical changes in the state and capitalism. The duration of some phenomena—from enduring to evanescent—is another way in which time matters for social movement studies that have been also interested in singling out trends and cycles in economic as well as electoral terms. Punctuated events such as big shocks or critical junctures are also ways in which history affects movements—as research on the interactions between social movements and wars or eventful protests have demonstrated. If this points at contingent (often, underdetermined) effects, path dependency as historical rootedness is however very important as well in social movement development and in the ways in which states deal with them.

The effort to connect social movements studies to other streams of political research, often from a strong historical angle, has shaped the contentious politics program, whose achievements and limits one of its promoters, Sidney Tarrow, discusses in the following chapter. At the very core of the project was indeed the bridging of different areas of studies: on social movements but also strike waves, revolutions, civil wars, and democratization processes. The main agenda was to innovate in the theory and empirics of social movement studies by singling out the recurrent causal mechanisms and more complex processes which are at the basis of the emergence and development of these various phenomena, which had been investigated through different lenses in fields that had remained strangely apart from each other. Some initial lacunae in the approach are discussed: a focus on episodes, which does not allow for an understanding of origins, developments or effects of contentious politics; the multiplication of mechanisms as well as an unclear definition of the concept of mechanism itself; the lack of reflection on structures and agencies. At the same time, the potential of contentious politics is stressed with examples coming from recent developments of the contentious politics approach in research on civil wars and revolutions, internal relations within movements, as well as their external relations with political parties.
Stephen Wulff, Mary Bernstein, and Verta Taylor focus then on gender theorizing and its impact on social movement theory. They analyze the ways in which the studies on gender and sexuality movements have influenced the broader field of social movement studies. In doing this, they look at the centrality of gender in shaping movements’ emergence, trajectory, and outcomes. Challenging masculinist assumptions in the dominant approaches in the field, feminist, gay, and queer scholars have studied gender and sexuality movements, challenging political process and resource mobilization approaches by a reconceptualization of the role of power in its multiple sources and forms, collective identity (with particular attention to how collective identities are deployed as a social movement strategy), multi-institutional politics (as movements target also non-state institutions), as well as emotions.

Part II, on “Social Movements and Structural Processes,” explores how some major recent changes in structural—in particular spatial—dynamics may have affected patterns of collective action. At their origins, especially in Europe, social movement studies used to pay attention to the ways in which social transformations affected social action. This attention had developed especially within the “new social movements” approach that had represented a critique of Marxism, which had however kept as a core question the relations between a post-industrial society and the specific characteristics of social movements within a new societal mode of production and reproduction. While still central in research in the global South, this question had however become more and more marginal in mainstream research on social movements that either considered them as middle-class phenomena or as non-class based ones. As it is often the case in a research field, this gap resulted in calls to bring classes, capitalism, and the like back into social movement studies (Hetland and Jeff Goodwin 2013; Barker, Cox, Krinski, and Gunvald Nilsen 2013; della Porta 2015). In the opening chapter, Beverly J. Silver and Sahan Savas Karatasli discuss the reemerging attention for class, especially labor, conflict in globalized societies. After a few decades in which issues of capitalism and class had almost disappeared not only from social movement studies (Hetland and Goodwin 2013; della Porta 2015), but even from economic sociology (Arrighi 2001), the authors forcefully call for returning capitalism and labor/class-based movements to a prominent position in the social movement literature. In particular, looking at class-based conflict, with special attention at the timing, location, and changing character of labor movement upsurges, they suggest that the temporal–geographical framework of the analysis should be lengthened and widened, but also that elements of a theory of “historical capitalism” should be brought back in, allowing for an understanding of the long-run dynamics of global capitalist development.

Jack Goldstone looks then at demography in order to address two main questions of how the demographic characteristics of the participants in social movements shape their collective expressions as well as how the demographic trends of societies shape those of social movements. Following various suggestions in demographic studies, he points in particular at the important effects of the growth of specific population groups. Special
attention is paid to the demographic effects of globalization in terms of the emergence of a large cohort of young people budge with high proportion of well-educated, as well as the potential development of a global middle class.

As one of the effects of globalization is indeed the movement of large groups of migrant people, with related social and cultural effects, the next two chapters look at the reciprocal contributions between social movement studies and two disciplinary fields that have grown to address the consequence of massive movements of people: migration studies and the sociology of religion.

Nina Eggert and Marco Giugni focus on the main structural changes in Western societies that might affect social movements related with migration. The increasing size and, especially, diversity (among other aspects, of religion) of the migrant population are analyzed together with the changing social and political cleavages (with opposition between “winners” and “losers” of globalization) as well as European integration as prompting both protest and counterprotest on migration issues. As migration is becoming an increasingly salient and politicized issue in politics and in academia, some new research trends are singled out with a more theoretical focus on resources and opportunities for migrants as well as an empirical focus on Muslim groups as well as on global mobilization on migrant rights. In a cross-national comparison, the characteristics of claim-making on migration are linked to citizens’ regimes.

Lasse Lindekilde and Lene Kühle look at structural transformations which affected religiosity and, then, religious revivalism as a foundation of social movement activities since the 1980s. Revisiting some classical studies in the sociology of religion, that had wrongly predicted a trend towards secularism, the authors locate religious revivalism within a greater visibility of religion, especially in its fundamentalist forms (Roy 2007) and a de-privatization of religion (Casanova 1994). The multiplication of religious communities on the same territory has not implied a loss of sacred canopy. The related effect is an intensified importance of religious-based social movements, both in the form of political expressions of religiosity (voice) as well as in a religious retreat (exit). As the authors suggest, the sociology of religion, looking at the cultural and ideological aspects of the phenomenon, could offer important tools in order to understand the prefigurative dimensions of collective action, moved by desire for salvation rather than mere interests.

In the following chapter, Diego Muro analyzes the relations between ethnicity, nationalism, and social movements. A main claim here too is that social movement studies would benefit from broadening the range of the analyzed forms of contentious politics by including nationalist and ethnic movements, that have been much studied in the social sciences, but within different approaches than the ones more commonly employed in social movement studies. From this perspective, the chapter addresses the wide variety of demands, activities, and goals displayed by ethnic and nationalist movements in their targeting of the state in their search for cultural recognition, territorial autonomy, and/or special rights or public goods provision. The research on repertoires of action, especially
violent ones, on identity building, as well as on the structural conditions which make ethnic and national cleavages salient, are all central topics in research on ethnic and nationalist movements whose results could usefully be included in reflections on other types of social movements.

The transformations in the urban dimension of conflict are addressed by Massimiliano Andretta, Gianni Piazza, and Anna Subirats. As these authors note, even though the central role of cities for social mobilization emerges as more and more central, and with it the relationship between space and contentious politics, the contributions from literature on urban social movements and social movement studies have not been much integrated as yet. Their chapter attempts to build bridges between the two, looking at specific urban movements and locating them within a broader transformation in urban policies and in urban structures. Attention to broad transformations in the urban context allows us to open up social movement studies to contributions from fields such as urban planning or even architecture. While constrained by their environment, social movements are presented however as relevant players within cities, given their capacity to address the implementation of urban policies so, the authors note, “redefining the process of urban transformation through social and political practice, by producing new ways of experiencing and perceiving the city and opening new windows of opportunity” (in this volume).

The third Part, “Micro-Dynamics of Contention,” focusses upon processes of individual involvement in collective action. One leading motive behind the development of social movement studies in the 1960s and 1970s was notoriously challenging views of political protest as irrational, anomic behavior (McAdam 2003). While this resulted in an emphasis on rational action and calculation, it also prompted critical responses that stressed the role of emotions in collective dynamics (e.g., Goodwin et al. 2001) or at least pointed at different rationalities operating for different social groups with uneven access to resources (e.g., Piven and Cloward 1977). Here we chart the different sides of this debate and some recent developments.

In the opening chapter, Bert Klandermans maps, from a social psychological perspective, the main steps of the process that brings individuals to enter into and remain involved in collective action. He differentiates between the demand-side of protest (individuals and their motives), the supply-side (organizations and their appeals), and the mobilizations that try to bring demand and supply together. He further differentiates between three types of motives (instrumentality, identification, and expressiveness) as well as between consensus mobilization (turning individuals into sympathizers) and action mobilization (turning sympathizers into participants).

While being far from the only important factor for individual choices, embeddedness in social networks involving people already active has been regarded as a major determinant of individual participation in protest activities. In his chapter, David Tindall discusses some of the theoretical processes that lie behind the empirical association between having network ties to other activists, and participating in a social movement.
He looks at how the production of new network ties, or the strengthening of existing ones, may be regarded as an outcome of social movements. He also considers networks at different scales in terms of units of focus, and geography. Literature on the social psychology of initial mobilization, and the importance of networks for targeting others for recruitment, and participation is reviewed.

Pamela Oliver’s assessment of the main contributions of rational action approaches to the study of collective action also has a strong network component. While she starts from an individualistic premise, she is quick to point out that the genuine contribution of this line of thinking has been at the group level, as “simplifying and even simplistic assumptions about individuals have permitted genuine insights into the differences between different kinds of actions and the differences between groups with different group-level properties” (Oliver, this volume). Group-level properties also need to be combined with a theory of strategic agency if they are to fulfill their potential.

While approaches focusing on the role of emotions have developed in stark opposition to rational-choice type of theories, one should not assume that the sudden exposure to highly emotional stimuli and the resulting moral outrage, as reflected in concepts such as “hot cognition” or “moral shock,” are sufficient to account for collective action dynamics. Tracing the development of such important concepts, Helena Flam notes that even the perception of certain stimuli as sources of shock/outrage necessitates deeper and longer-term work focussed on the reframing of reality and changes in habitus. The relational contexts in which such work takes place may vary substantially depending on the characteristics of specific societies and political systems, and should certainly include movement organizations. Flam also identifies some basic mechanisms through which emotions may contribute to long-term activism and not merely to short-term outbursts of indignation, and impact both relations within movement groups and the latter’s interaction with their environment.

This Part is rounded off by Olivier Fillieule’s discussion of disengagement. While it may refer to processes that involve social movements or sustained campaigns as a whole, the concept also applies to individual activists and their life-careers. That is actually the main focus of the analysis, with special emphasis on the literature that has dealt with the biographical consequences of activism. Fillieule shows how many of the mechanisms that account for recruitment also apply to withdrawal from collective action. However, if we are to achieve a genuinely process-oriented view of disengagement, we need to pay more attention to how the properties of a given social or political system may affect paths of disengagement, for example, through the creation of opportunities for people to take up different, more conventional lifestyles (a problem particularly acute in the case of withdrawal from terrorist organizations or cults).

The following Part on “How Movements Organize” explores the variety of forms through which collective action gets coordinated. While organizational approaches have been central to the development of the “classic agenda” of social movement research, some critics (e.g., Soule 2013) have lamented their relative marginalization since the 1990s.
Introduction: The Field of Social Movement Studies

This is due not only to the simultaneous development of approaches focussing respectively on the political process or on culture and emotions, but also to the growing attention paid to networks and participatory, leaderless action (Soule 2013: 108). Attempts to bridge organizational and social movement analysis in a new synthesis did actually flourish in the late 2000s (e.g., Davis et al. 2005, 2008). However, even when they look at fields of organizations, the focus of those attempts is really on the organizations that make up their fields, on their properties, and on isomorphic mechanisms (or lack of them), rather than on the broader ways through which collective actors relate. While these studies provide a rich documentation of a long established fact—namely, the heterogeneity of the specific organizations that operate within social movements—they pay less attention to the relationship between different organizational forms, and to the conditions under which certain organizational forms may prevail over others.

In this Part we try to remedy this situation. Rather than pitching (more or less formal) organizations against networks, we bring them under a common framework, that is, to conceive of “organization” more broadly, as the set of principles through which resources are pooled and coordinated. Two chapters set the tone for this approach. In their contribution, Frank den Hond, Frank de Bakker, and Nikolai Smith provide “an alternative answer to the question of whether ‘organization’ is beneficial or detrimental to mobilization, as this depends on the contingent balance between various organizational elements.” In particular, they suggest we focus on “several constitutive elements [of organizations]: membership, rules, hierarchy, monitoring and sanctioning” (in this volume), and on their changing weight and different combinations under different contingencies. Their distinction (borrowed from Ahrne and Brunsson 2011) between networks as “emergent” and organizations as “decided” orders in social life enables them to highlight the nature of social movements as a variable blend of both modes. The exploration of a specific case of mobilization in the Occupy movement shows how hierarchical and leadership mechanisms do not disappear even in the most “horizontal” forms of collective action.

The view of social movements as emerging forms of social organization is also central to Mario Diani’s and Ann Mische’s discussion of relational thinking in social movement analysis. They provide some analytic tools that may help the transition from treatments of collective phenomena as aggregates of the properties of their individual components, towards an interactive view of movements as embedded in collective action fields. After a preliminary discussion of the difference between two cognate yet different concepts such as “relations” and “interactions,” the chapter takes up the fundamental question of what represents a tie in the context of collective action processes (see also Mische 2011). It then looks at how ties combine in distinct relational patterns, or “modes of coordination” (Diani 2015) and at the factors (agendas, ideological stances, political opportunities, contingent interactions) that may facilitate the emergence of some tie configurations over others. Finally, it takes up one of the most important open issues of network analytic research, namely, how to map network evolution.
Two chapters then follow, that look in greater depth at some organizational forms among those highlighted by the first two contributions, namely, social movement coalitions and social movement communities. While coalitions are not necessarily equivalent to social movements (Tarrow 2005: 164-165; Diani 2015), they represent one of their building blocks. It is indeed difficult not to think of social movements as “nested coalitions.” In their chapter, Holly McCammon and Minyoung Moon discuss the principal mechanisms that may facilitate or discourage coalition building. They note that “shared beliefs and identities, prior social ties among activists, opportunities and threats in the broader context, and organizational resources all can play a role in coalition formation,” yet sometimes with ambiguous effects. In particular the opening of opportunities may both encourage and discourage coalition building, depending on the broader configuration of local conditions. McCammon and Moon’s contribution also tackles a less explored terrain, namely, the impact of coalitions over both social movement processes and actors in a mid-term perspective, and the political process in general.

At the same time, as important as coalitions may be, the interactions between movement actors are not limited to purposive collaborations in pursuit of specific goals between the best resourced organizations. To the contrary, they develop among a variety of actors, focussing not necessarily on campaigning but also on cultural activities and service delivery to movement actors or their constituents/beneficiaries. The concept of “social movement communities,” explored by Hatem Hassam and Suzanne Staggenborg in their contribution, tries to capture this relational pattern. It would be a mistake to reduce the heuristic value of the concept to a representation of subcultural or countercultural settings, a dimension which is often emphasized by scholars looking at democratic societies. As Hassam and Staggenborg show in relation to cases from the Middle East, the concept also yields a high potential for the analysis of collective action in non-democratic regimes, as it enables forms of coordination that are less exposed than formal, purposive organizations to regime repression (see also Diani and Moffatt forthcoming).

One important question is, of course, to what extent new communication technologies have affected collective action, its forms, and its coordination. Jennifer Earl, Jayson Hunt, Kelly Garrett, and Aysenur Dal show how ICT facilitates “ephemeral” forms of individual engagement from petitioning to attacks on specific sites, that do not require sustained commitments from participants; how it enables individuals with similar views to coordinate, sharing information and resources, without having to join organizations; how it changes existing organizations’ ways of operating; how it facilitates in particular forms of transnational organizing, and the spread of broader identities and solidarities, no longer confined within national boundaries. They conclude their chapter with a discussion of the ways in which the spread of ICT can stimulate the dialogue between social movement and political communication analysts, in particular on the mechanisms through which information circulates and is interpreted, both by the general public and by agenda setters and policy makers.
Earl et al.’s concerns are echoed in the next contribution, where Lance Bennett and Alexandra Segerberg explore how the advent of new digital technologies has transformed public communication, and the implications of those transformations for the ways in which mass contention is organized. Drawing upon their recent work (Bennett and Segerberg 2013), they point at “the use of digital and social media to supplement and even displace mass media in terms of reaching broad publics, often involving them in far more active roles than the spectator or bystander publics of the mass media era.... [T]he uses of media to create organizational networks among populations that lack more conventional institutional forms of political organization” (this volume). The overall result of such changes is the emergence of a new model of coordination of activism, “connective action,” which differs from modern collective action because of the reduced role of organizations and collective identity mechanisms and the greater reliance on individual choices.

Discussions of the role of new technologies in collective action processes regularly point at their potential contribution in overcoming spatial limitations and increasing opportunities for the promotion and coordination of contention across space. At the same time, most episodes of collective action are still heavily embedded in specific territories. In his chapter, Paul Routledge outlines the different forms through which space influences action, as an object of contention and source of “spatial inequalities,” as a source of specific resources and networks, and as an important symbolic reference in the construction of collective identities. Actors’ variable relation to geographical space also highlights some of the distinctive traits of the most recent waves of contention, in which social movements may be better conceived as temporary assemblages of actors in different localities than as a quasi stable aggregation of locally bound actors. While it covers multiple aspects of the relationship between geography and collective action, Routledge’s chapter nicely complements the overview of organizational mechanisms covered in this Part of the Handbook.

The next Part addresses “Repertoires of Collective Action.” The exploration of the characteristics of action repertoires—that is, of the “know how” which movement activists draw upon in order to promote their causes—and of their changes over time has represented a cornerstone of social movement research in the last decades (McAdam, McCarthy, and Zald 1996; della Porta 2013). Many earlier works tended (a) to associate movements with quite distinctive repertoires of unconventional tactics, and (b) to associate specific configurations of political opportunities to specific movement traits and repertoires (contra, e.g., Kitschelt 1986; Flam 1994; Kriesi et al. 1995). Recently, there has been growing recognition of the fact that movements’ courses of action are also—for some analysts, primarily—driven by strategic interactions within specific arenas.
conflictive relations, among movement actors as well as between them and their allies and opponents, they document recent attempts to go beyond rigid opposition between structuralist and culturalist perspectives.

While he is more embedded in the political process tradition than Jasper et al., Eitan Alimi shares their attention to the interplay of structure and strategy in his chapter on the dynamics of repertoire selection and change. First he shows how repertoires are selected through a complex set of interactions including contingent and strategic choices that involve movement organizations and broader constituents as well as authorities and security forces. Then, he proceeds to illustrate how repertoire change and selection are particularly salient during cycles of contention, when a broader set of actors is involved, including the general public, countermovements, and other non-state external actors. In such a context in particular, events with high emotional content may play a highly significant roles alongside more tactical and contingent calculations.

The association of social movements with disruptive, radical forms of collective action has long been recognized to be far from perfect, as different phases and contexts display different balances of institutionalized and unconventional tactics (della Porta 1995; Norris et al. 2005; Soule and Earl 2005; Dalton 2008; McCarthy et al. 2013 see among many others Tarrow 1989). The relationship to violence, and even the definition of what represents violence, has been a crucial issue for movement activists and observers alike (see, e.g., Tilly 2003: 1). In particular, the largely unplanned, spontaneous forms of collective action often defined as "riots" have attracted widespread (mostly negative) attention from media and institutions. In his chapter, David Waddington attempts to identify the underlying political motives and rationality behind forms of behavior that are regularly stigmatized as "self-defeating, irrational, and wantonly criminal" (Waddington, this volume). Focussing mainly on the 2008 Greek and the 2011 UK riots, he explores the "relationship between the political contexts in which each episode of rioting occurred, the processes by which they were instigated and developed, and the political 'meanings' which can therefore be attached to their defining sentiments and forms of behaviour."

The following chapter by Bosi and Malthaner complements Waddington’s, as its main empirical focus is on organized and higher levels forms of political violence. However, it shares with the previous chapter a view of different types of violent tactics (and indeed of social movement tactics without further qualification) as somehow connected parts of a broader repertoire, rather than as "discrete and mutually exclusive types.” Their discussion of recent contributions in this field highlights the importance of both contextual and dynamic variables, as violent repertoires are not so much the result of strategic planning alone, but are part of broader processes of contention, and heavily dependent on the forms taken by the escalation of conflicts.

At times, challenges to powerholders exceed actions undertaken by small, clandestine groups and result in guerrilla or generalized civil war or insurrection. Traditionally at the margin of social movement research focussed on Western societies, this form of contention has repeatedly occurred in other areas of the globe. A
consequence of differences in territorial focus has been the very limited overlap between analysts of movements and those of civil wars. In her chapter, Elisabeth Wood sets out to fill this gap through the identification of common themes to the two fields. These include, among others, escalation and de-escalation dynamics, the mobilization of affected publics, and the analysis of the outcomes of conflict. In drawing her parallels, Wood relies heavily on concepts from the classic agenda, such as political opportunities and framing.

It is worth stressing, however, that radical contentious challenges do not necessarily go along with violent repertoires. In his contribution, Daniel Ritter discusses nonviolent challenges to powerholders, including “un-armed insurrections.” Drawing upon a range of examples from different historical phases, Ritter shows how nonviolent civil resistance is not just a set of specific protest tactics but also a way of conducting major forms of the modern protest repertoire such as strikes or mass demonstrations. In doing so he provides a bridge between social movement and nonviolent action research, that has so far been relatively (if surprisingly) disconnected. He also devotes specific attention to those cases in which nonviolent mass protest actually succeeds in overturning powerholders despite the latter’s heavy reliance on repressive strategies.

Consumerism represents another, very different, form of challenge to corporate power, with strong cultural overtones. It has assumed growing relevance since the 1980s, in parallel although not overlapping with the rise of “new social movements.” In their chapter, Michele Micheletti and Dietlind Stolle show how critical consumerism is actually located at the crossroads of more conventional political pressure and practices of personal transformation. They illustrate this point looking at a range of examples, coming from the African–American civil rights movement, Nestlé boycott, gay rights’ movement, and the movement against the Israeli occupied territories. In particular they focus on four major practices (boycotts, buycotts, discursive actions, and lifestyle commitments), highlighting their strengths and weaknesses.

Finally, it is also important to notice the dual link between social movements and non-contentious forms like voluntary collective action. The relationship is dual because on the one hand, social movements often act to generate themselves the public goods in which they are interested, this way locating themselves close to a form of voluntary action oriented to service delivery; on the other hand, voluntary groups often connect in broad informal networks, sharing broad identities, that is, in a manner close to a social movement mode of coordination (Diani and Moffatt forthcoming; Diani and Mische, this volume).

In their chapter, Helmut Anheier and Nikolas Scherer discuss some aspects of the relations between volunteering and social movements. Even though addressing similar, sometimes overlapping, empirical cases, the two fields of studies have developed in parallel, remaining largely unconnected. This chapter aims at bridging insights from both, explaining how and why they could learn from each other. In doing so, they point to evidence that activities such as volunteering and political activism increasingly take place in voluntary organizations, that is organizations that are mainly based on the
voluntary contributions of money, in-kind, and of time; pursue political goals; and uphold or promote certain social or political values. Moreover, social movements mobilize both civic activists and volunteers in their claim-making activities. Finally, in their recent development social movements have often adopted more formalized structures as well as voluntary forms of help and self-help. In fact, as the authors stress, “Non-governmental or voluntary organizations are thus often both vehicle and outcome of social movements” (p. 495, in this volume).

The role of cultural dynamics in social movement processes is explored in this Part 6, devoted to “Cultures of Contention.” From being, if not totally absent, at least marginal, cultural issues and approaches have acquired centrality and relevance in social movement studies. This Part addresses different ways in which culture is conceptualized since when it was “brought back in” to social movement studies as well as to the potential bridges to be built on cultural issues with other fields of knowledge such as the sociology of art, literature studies, subaltern studies, visual analysis, and anthropology.

Anna Tan and David Snow provide a broad overview of such complex relations, drawing upon a notion of culture that comprises products, practices, and meanings. They show how culture is at the same time a major structural source of the conflicts in which social movements are engaged, and an important tool for collective action and social change.

In their chapter, Francesca Polletta and Beth Gharrity Gardner show how stories represent a powerful resource for social movement activists, but they add that, while the use of narratives has a strategic component, narratives are also part of the cultural fabric of a given society. Getting movements’ stories accepted in public discourse also implies undermining those deeper narratives, and represents an important indicator of movement success. Stories are also essential to the establishment of connections between events, phases, actors, and contentious episodes. As such, they are essential to the formation of movements’ identities (Mische 2003; White, Godart, and Corona 2007; White 2008).

While symbolic production is by no means reducible to the action of artistically gifted individuals or even professionals, the arts have historically provided an important source of inspiration and support for social movement activity, beyond representing arguably a distinctive form of social movements in their own right. In his chapter, Ron Eyerman builds on his view of movements as “cognitive praxis” (Eyerman and Jamison 1991) to illustrate how the arts enable the representation of movement causes and motives in a particularly effective form. Covering various forms of artistic expression, he also pays special attention to the role of “movements against the arts,” showing how certain cultural forms may become a primary target for countermovements and an object of contention in their own right.
The concept of performative protest is also central to Nicole Doerr, Alice Mattoni, and Simon Teune, as part of their discussion of the role of visual analysis in social movements. They note that, despite the obvious relevance of images in order to convey the emotions associated with political activism, the worthiness of certain causes, or the brutality of movement opponents, their analysis has not (yet) made it fully into mainstream social movement research. They also pay special attention to the role of different types of media in making movement practices and cultural productions visible to broader publics. Their attention to new technologies renders their contribution complementary to essays by Earl et al. in Part III of this volume.

The strong attention to cultural processes among movement researchers represents an important reminder of the fact that social movements cannot be equated to political challenges, a criticism that has long been leveled against the “classic agenda” of social movement research (Melucci 1996; Oliver and Snow 1995; Snow, Soule, and Kriesi 2004). At the same time, as Tan and Snow’s chapter also illustrates, critics have largely focussed on cultural movements that expressed an explicit criticism of dominant or emerging values and/or social structures. These took the form either of alternative life-worlds in which different cultural models might be put into practice, or of attempts to re-establish a moral order they considered to be undermined by the forces of modernization and social change. In her chapter, Julia Eckert adds an important element to the range of culture-based forms of collective action by looking at what she calls “practice movements.” These are forms of unorganized collective action, often based in urban areas and carried on by the most deprived sectors of the population. They focus on the appropriation or redistribution of basic goods rather than on a critique of systemic dominant values. This is achieved neither through explicit political representation nor through the creation of alternative worlds but rather through the exploitation of the opportunities that the system presents at the border between conformity and transgression. Building on her familiarity with non-Western societies, Eckert builds on the intellectual tradition focussing on the “weapons of the weak” (Scott 1985) to highlight a pattern of action that the global crisis might well render more relevant even in the most affluent areas of the world.

A sustained conversation with anthropology may also be found in the chapter by Jeffrey Juris and Alex Khasnabish, yet with a stronger methodological focus. They address one of the key issues in the study of cultural processes within social movements, namely, how to approach cultural forms which are not reducible to texts. They suggest that ethnographic approaches may usefully contribute to the exploration of how social movement activists experience everyday life, how intra- and inter-group tensions and conflicts are managed, and how meanings are generated in collective action processes. They look in particular at four different modes of activist practice: everyday cultural production, local–global networking, new media activism, and performative protest. They also address promises and limitations of engaged ethnographic research.

The next Part addresses “Political and Non-political Opportunities and Constraints.” Political opportunities are a core concept in social movement studies, which have mainly considered social movements as actors of normal politics. Even if criticized as stretched
and too vague, the concept has nonetheless proved a very useful heuristic device to investigate conditions for the expression of contention in particular in democracies. The chapters in this Part revise some of these contributions, but also go well beyond them by bridging social movements with recent trends in comparative politics, as well as international relations, international political economy, history, and law.

In both the classic political process approach and in the contentious politics agenda, the state does indeed occupy a central function. States and state transformations are thus at the core of the next three chapters. The transformation of states is addressed by Marc Beissinger in terms of increasing complexity of state activities, and therefore effects of state actions on everyday life, but also in terms of claims on identity and culture. Looking at states as arenas of conflicts, but also social movement targets and actors within them, the chapter addresses the broad trend of increasing competences of the state but also the effects of globalization in term of a reduction of state capacity as well as the development of informal relations at the border of state and society, to which the spread of corruption testifies. Moreover, from the cultural point of view, while the idea of national self-determination is more and more rooted, the ubiquitous conflicts over national borders testifies that “There is no such thing as a culturally-neutral state; all states, to varying degrees, represent repositories of cultural interest—even more so in a world beset by massive movements of populations across state borders” (Beissinger, this volume).

The effects of globalization are addressed by Jackie Smith who locates a growing attention of international relations studies to non-state action within the increasing success of the constructivist approach. This approach can indeed contribute to social movement studies its focus on the role of ideas and norms, as well as on their diffusion within organizations and across them. From the international political economy comes instead attention to power, in particular to the position of specific states within world system capitalism. While international organizations attempt to deradicalize challengers by a selective inclusion of NGOs, global social movements have nonetheless mounted important challenges against global (as well as local) political institutions.

A similar plea is presented in the following chapter by Hank Johnston who focuses on authoritarian regimes. As social movement studies have developed on the assumption that social movements need some openness in political opportunities, their interaction with research on authoritarian regimes as well as democratization has been very limited. Looking at this literature, the chapter singles out the importance of considering the differences within typologies of authoritarian regimes that vary significantly in terms of degree of liberalization as well as of state capacity. It also maps the specific repertoires of actions that social movements tend to develop. It is suggested that from the literature on authoritarian regimes as well as on transition, important contributions could be made to social movement studies: among others, their attention to agency, to the role of critical junctures, and to the building of cross-class coalitions.
Introduction: The Field of Social Movement Studies

Authoritarian regimes are particularly oriented toward repression. However, repression is not a peculiarity of non-democracies. Rather, the governance of internal dissent is a main occupation for state actors all around the globe. Delving into sociology and political science, but also criminology, law, geography, and developmental studies, Abby Peterson and Matthias Wahlstrom map practices of repression by distinguishing its scale (from interpersonal relations to international police cooperation), its institution (public in the shape of the police and the army, but also private in the forms of corporation and countermovements), and its different forms.

Private politics is at the core of Philip Balsiger’s contribution on the broad repertoire of political action that corporations develop in order to respond to and manage protest. Avoidance, acquiescence, compromise, sidestepping, confrontation, and prevention are selected as part of this repertoire. Bridging comparative political economy with social movement studies, the chapter reflects on some of the main transformations in the organization of corporate actors, such as the growth of firm internal units specializing in the management of protest, and the trends toward deregulation, the development of conceptions of corporate citizenship, as well as the potential effects of “varieties of capitalism” on corporate political strategies. As business interests tend to be more influential in “quiet times,” contentious politics represent a challenge indeed to firms’ power.

Within the political process approach as well as within the contentious politics approach, political parties have been considered as important potential allies and opponents for social movements. After revising this tradition (to whose development he has contributed greatly), Hanspeter Kriesi adds a new focus on how movements affect parties as well as party systems, by promoting the rise of new parties and the reshaping of existing ones. Bridging social movement and party studies, the chapter suggests a distinction between mainstream versus peripheral parties to be added at the more traditional one between party-in-government and party-in-opposition. At the same time, however, it also warns against too clear-cut a distinction between insiders and outsiders within a quickly changing and increasingly volatile party system.

The topic of political parties is also addressed in Kenneth Roberts’ contribution on populism and social movements. Distinguishing between definitions of populism as mere rhetoric and those that look instead at populist regimes, he insists in fact on the differences between social movements as grass-roots, horizontal forms of political participation, and populism as instead socio-political mobilization controlled from above by authority figures. As he writes, “Whereas social movements emerge from autonomous forms of collective action undertaken by self-constituted civic groups or networks, populism typically involves an appropriation of popular subjectivity by dominant personalities who control the channels, rhythms, and organizational forms of social mobilization. Indeed, populism does not require that mass constituencies engage in collective action at all, beyond the individual act of casting a ballot in national elections or popular referendums. Although both forms of popular subjectivity contest established elites, social movements mobilize such contestation from the bottom-up, whereas
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populism typically mobilizes mass constituencies from the top-down behind the leadership of a counter-elite” (this volume). While both social movements and populist parties emerge from the crisis of representative politics, with the former sometimes contributing to the rise of the latter, the chapter refers to research on populist regimes in Latin America to stress the tensions between participatory visions within social movements and populist regimes as forms of incorporation within a specific socio-economic system. Indeed, the author argues for more interaction between studies on social movements and studies of populist politics, both increasingly important given the crisis of representative democracies.

Sarah A. Soule and Brayden G. King are also in many ways conversant with the political process approach when they address transformation in corporations, firms, and markets, and how they influence the social movement dynamics. The concept of corporate opportunity structure is developed in order to link markets and social movements. They show how the level of competition among firms, as well as the extent of public and private regulation and the degree of concentration of specific sectors, constitute opportunities and constraints for social movements. The same applies to firms’ reputation and visibility as well as their corporatist culture. Attention is then focussed on some recent trends in the business world and their potential effects on contentious politics.

The final Part is devoted to “Movements’ Contributions to Social and Political Change.” For a long time, there has been a common lament about the lack of research on the effects of social movements. This gap was explained by the difficulties of singling out the specific impacts of civil society actors in complex processes as well as the long-term perspective from which outcomes had to be assessed. Addressing these challenges through process tracing and complex research designs, empirical analyses have however made progress on assessing the policy impacts of social movements at local, national, and international levels, and also on their cultural consequences (Giugni, McAdam, and Tilly 1999). In this Part of our Handbook, without aiming to paint a complete picture, we single out the scientific debates in some areas in which social movements had visible impacts.

First, two contributions look mainly at the policy effects in two important policy areas, namely, welfare and the environment. Colin Barker and Michael Lavalette analyze the intersection of welfare and social movements, both in terms of how changing welfare provisions affect social movements, but also how movements were able to transform, through long struggles, the provision of housing, monetary benefits, education and health, “and all manner of social and public policies and services.” In doing this, the authors bridge the literature on the different forms of welfare (social–democratic, corporatist, and liberal) with social movement studies, looking at the effects of class stratification as well as the interactions between unions and parties in labor politics on the forms and extension of welfare. The degree of overlapping of work and community struggles is referred to in order to explain in particular the specificity of the weak (liberal) protection of the US welfare state. Social movements are moreover addressed as
produces of welfare, which offer protection and alternative forms of de-commodification of goods and their constructions as rights.

If the welfare state has been a typical area of intervention of the “old” labor movements, the protection of the environment has been instead a main claim by so-called “new” social movements. By looking at transformations in environmental policies and politics, Christopher Rootes and Eugene Nulman analyze the impacts of environmental movements, both direct and indirect, positive and negative. The main puzzle addressed is the one of a movement which appears able to enjoy many successes, and is indeed often celebrated for its influence, while at the same time “the assault on the global environment proceeds at an unprecedented pace.” The long lasting and complex processes of mobilization of sympathies in the public opinion, but also among policy makers at different levels, are therefore investigated and the differential effects in the global North versus global South pointed out.

The complex interaction of international politics and social movements is at the core of the next two chapters that both look at normative changes as co-produced by social movements.

In her chapter on human rights, Kate Nash mobilizes concepts from international relations and social movement studies to cover the emergence and content of a human right regime. International law and global constitutionalism contribute to the understanding of the formal introduction of human rights as international norms, but social movement studies are also referred to in order to point to the limits of a legal perspective. The universalistic approach of a North-based international NGO is in fact scrutinized in the definition of an “elitist” view of human rights which is contrasted with the grass-roots version of subaltern cosmopolitanism.

In a similar vein, Raffaele Marchetti looks at the development in international organizations of pro-civil society participatory norms, which tend to selectively integrate professionalized NGOs and to exclude grass-roots social movement organizations. With reference to normative theory, the development of this specific normative approach is linked to the spread at international level of the stakeholder principle, the reliance on expertise, and the liberalism of Western principles. The participatory governance of stakeholders is however contrasted with the conceptions and practices of democracy from below developed within the global justice movement.

The characteristics of these conceptions and practices, as well as their capacity to affect institutional policies, are addressed in the next chapter. Here, Donatella della Porta analyzes progressive social movements as important actors in the development of conceptions and practices of democracy that go beyond representative ones. Bridging social movement studies with normative theory, the chapter reviews the main contributions to participatory and deliberative democracy by past and contemporary social movements—from the labor movement to new social movements, the global justice movements, and recent anti-austerity protests. It is observed that, while far from achieving their ideals of democracy, progressive movements play an important
Introduction: The Field of Social Movement Studies

Prefigurative role for the development of inclusive and transparent forms of internal decision making, with increasing emphasis on grass-roots participation and consensus building. As stressed in the final part, both external and internal factors impact on internal practices of decision making in social movements, with innovation and adaptation which follows activists’ critical self-reflections and attempts to overcome past failures.

Democratic innovations have indeed often travelled from social movements to public institutions. In his chapter, Julien Talpin notes the potential exchanges between research on social movements and research on democratic innovations and democratic theory. He suggests that social movements have played an important role in promoting, participating in or, sometimes, boycotting various institutions that have developed to compensate for the weakness of representative democracy. Participatory principles were embedded in several reforms in local politics in the 1960s as well as in most recent attempts to involve the public in decision making beyond the elections. Inspired by the participatory budgeting developed in Porto Alegre, Brasil, public institutions have experimented with ways of extending participation and, at the same time, improving deliberation through high-quality communication. The potential for expanding the public sphere as well as the limits in terms of atomization and depoliticization of some of these experiments are discussed.

Social movements might produce also most radical effects. As Jeff Goodwin and Rene Rojas observe, revolutionary situations are quite common situations in which substantial changes are claimed by revolutionary movements, defined as a special type of movement that tries to bring about broad changes, including minimally a change of political regime, and potentially encompassing transformation in class structures and the socio-economic institutions or mode of production. They observe however that revolutionary movements rarely succeed in overthrowing political regimes as, in order to win, they require previous weakening of the infrastructural power of the state due to economic circumstances, war, or élite divisions. Revolutionary situations then are situations of dual power as revolutionary movements clash with incumbent institutions. In these situations, regime repression, especially if indiscriminate and inconsistent, strengthens the resonance of revolutionary ideologies that depict the existing regime as fundamentally unjust, calling instead for drastic political and social changes.

In sum, we believe that these contributions facilitate not only the mapping of the current position in the field of social movements but also its reception to contributions and inspiration from other fields. This might be considered a satisfactory achievement in itself, yet it remains an inherently provisional one, as disciplinary borders seem to become more permeable with each new global wave of contentious politics. This means that the coverage of the “expanded field” could never be complete, and it is indeed our hope that the Handbook will pave the way for new conversations to be opened and new bridges to be built between different fields of knowledge. In particular, while we have tried to expand the focus of the research beyond the Western world, we must acknowledge that a sustained conversation with analysts located outside the West is still
missing, and our focus on non-Western objects remains limited. We hope, however, that this Handbook can at least provide the starting point toward the expansion of these broader conversations.
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Notes:

(1.) As theorized most forcefully by the late Alberto Melucci (1989, 1996).
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