

NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND  
RESOURCE MOBILIZATION:  
THE EUROPEAN AND THE AMERICAN APPROACH\*

Bert Klandermans  
Vrije Universiteit  
Amsterdam, The Netherlands

*In the past 20 years, student movements, environmental movements, women's movements and peace movements developed both in America and in Europe. These actions meant an explosive growth in the number of publications about social movements. Theory formation took a different course in Europe and in the U.S. While in the U.S. resource mobilization theory shifted attention from deprivation to the availability of resources in explanation of the rise of social movements, in Europe the "new social movement approach" emphasized the development of postindustrial society. Resource mobilization and the new social movement approach are discussed. Both approaches are needed to arrive at a satisfactory explanation. The new social movement approach has concentrated on factors that determine mobilization potential, but does not give an answer to the question of how these potentials are mobilized. Resource mobilization theory does pay attention to the mobilization of resources, to the significance of recruitment networks, and to the costs and benefits of participation, but has no interest in the mobilization potentials from which a movement must draw in mobilization campaigns. Assumptions are formulated in explanation of the divergent development of the social movement literature on the two continents.*

---

\* This paper is a revised version of a paper presented at the CES Workshop on Social Movements held at Cornell University, Aug. 16-18, 1985.

In Europe as well as in the United States, important social movements have arisen in the past decades. The two continents show remarkable similarities in this. Student movements, environmentalist movements, women's movements, and peace movements developed on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. In Europe they were successors to large pre-war movements such as the suffrage movement, the workers' movement, and more generally, socialism, communism and fascism. In the U.S. the civil rights movement was their most important predecessor.

These movements not only influenced politics, but also left their mark on the literature: quantitatively, in an explosive growth in the number of publications; qualitatively, in new theoretical approaches. The people in the movements that had grown up starting in the 60s were generally not from the most deprived groups of society. And this cast a measure of doubt on the leading theories. Researchers in Europe and the U.S. were faced with the question: where, if not from deprivation, did these movements come from?

It is quite remarkable that, despite these similar developments, the direction in which answers were sought differed on the two continents. While in the U.S. resource mobilization theory shifted attention from deprivation to the availability of resources to explain the rise of social movements, in Europe the "new social movement approach" focused attention on the growth of new protest potentials resulting from the developing postindustrial society.

It is characteristic of the poor communication between social scientists in these two parts of the world that it would take until the mid-80s before Europe would really become aware of resource mobilization theory. The new social movement approach is practically unknown in the U.S. This is regrettable, not only from the point of view of the exchange of scientific knowledge, but more importantly because each of these approaches shows but one side of the matter. Taken separately, each of them offers an inadequate explanation for the rise of the movements of the 60s.

I will discuss and contrast resource mobilization and the new social movement approach. I will show how both are necessary to understand social movement participation. While leaving in-depth study of why the respective approaches developed as they did on the two continents to the sociology of knowledge, I will conclude by offering a few hypotheses on this.

## Social Movements in Europe and the U.S.

I will very briefly describe the four movements that have been important in the past two decades in Europe and the U.S. For practical reasons, for Europe I will confine myself to the Netherlands and West Germany because recent survey studies are available about these countries (Brand, Büsser & Rucht, 1983; Van der Loo, Snel & Van Steenberg, 1984). The same movements developed in other European countries. They were similar in many respects to the movements in the Netherlands and West Germany, although there were differences as well (cf. Cerny, 1982; Kriesi, 1985; Melucci, 1982).

The dynamics of successive movements shows remarkable similarity in the three countries. The student movement grew up in all three countries in the mid-60s. In that same period the anti-Vietnam war movement, a predecessor of the peace movement developed in each country. At the end of the 60s the women's movement and the environmental movement arose and early in the 80s the peace movement. The student movement is the only one of these that no longer exists. In the U.S., it was preceded by the civil rights movement, which greatly influenced both the student movement and the women's movement. The rise of the environmental movement was partly a case of the growth and radicalization of already existing organizations; the women's movement and the peace movement were revivals of movements that had first gotten started well before the turn of the century. The student movement was in many respects the starting point for the environmental movement and the women's movement: not only because many members of the student movement joined them, but also because the student movement popularized new forms of action that the later movements also employed (sit-ins, hearings, occupations etc.). In West Germany, the women's and the peace movements were modelled after the environmental movement, particularly the citizens' initiative (Bürgerinitiative, an entity of locally operating environmental groups). The women's movement and the environmental movement were important to the peace movement, as indicated by their overlapping activities and membership.

Although there was opposition to these movements in Europe nowhere did this lead to a counter-movement of the size of that in the U.S. Only in West Germany did such movements lead to the formation of a political party: the "Grünen" (The Greens), a rainbow coalition of environmentalists, feminists, pacifists and other anti-establishment groups. In the Netherlands the movements aimed much more to influence political parties

while in the U.S. they tried to set up lobbies that would be as effective as possible. Differences in political opportunity structure are responsible for this.

The student movement was fundamentally an anti-authoritarian movement aimed at the achievement of university reforms that would give students more power. It was also a movement against developments in post-industrial society. It opposed the university as a factory of knowledge, the continued mingling of universities and the military-industrial complex, and the war in Vietnam.

The student movement in the U.S. brought the action techniques of the civil rights movement (the sit-ins, for instance) to the campus and invented new action forms (teach-ins, happenings, occupations of university buildings). More generally, it contributed a great deal to the esthetic nature of protest when it surrounded protest meetings and protestors by a variety of artistic expressions. From the U.S., the movement came to Europe, where it was successful in its demands for university reforms. Although the movement stressed activities on the campus, there were coordinating organizations that played a key part for a period of time. In the U.S. this was SDS (Students for a Democratic Society), in West Germany SDS (German Socialist Student Union), and in the Netherlands SVC (Student Union Movement). In all three countries, internal conflicts were associated with an end to the movement in the late 60s and early 70s.

The environmental movement in the three countries ranges from conservative, or at least moderate nature preservation organizations at one end, to radical groups seeking direct confrontation with the government at the other end. Parts of the environmental movement aim at societal restructuring, others at personal transformation. Many of the nature preservation groups were not new, but took advantage of the growing interest in environmental issues in the 60s. Apart from these organizations, the movements teems with single-issue initiatives, e.g. against the construction of a road, a runway, or a pipeline, against large-scale urban development projects, soil or water pollution. The antinuclear energy protest has been particularly prominent. In the U.S., it was initially highly legalistic (court cases, appeals, referenda), but was not very successful in this. Encouraged by the successful occupation of the construction site of a nuclear power plant in West Germany, the U.S. movement also started using occupations. Protest against nuclear energy radicalized in the Netherlands as well, where it turned specifically to the issue of waste. Occupations and blockades of construction sites or plants



ultimately proved to be a dead end in all three countries. The government used its social control effectively. The movement did, however, succeed in delaying or even preventing the construction of nuclear power sites in the Netherlands and Germany. Although the movement was less successful in the U.S., the Three Mile Island accident had an equivalent impact.

There are also important differences between the countries. In the U.S. we see a strong environmentalist lobby, with national organizations that make much use of direct mail campaigns for the mobilization of resources. The organization made particularly successful use of this against the Reagan administration's environmental actions. The movement has a powerful lobby in the Netherlands as well. The concerns of environmental organizations have found their way far inside of government machinery. Good relations with government agencies are a regularly tapped resource. The West German environmental movement, on the other hand, has always been an anti-establishment movement. It is nowhere near as institutionalized as it is in the U.S. and the Netherlands. Wherever a certain degree of institutionalization has taken place (for instance, in the founding of the Green political party), it has been controversial within the movement.

The women's movement. Ferree (forthcoming) distinguishes between radical feminists, who take the oppression of women to be the root and image of all oppressing, socialist feminists, who attempt to combine feminist insights with socialist paradigms, and liberal feminists, who stress self-determination and individual rights. All three of these strands of feminism exist in the U.S., West Germany and the Netherlands. However, their relative importance varies considerably. In the U.S., liberal feminists constitute the mainstream, from which both radical and socialist feminists diverge. The key organization in the U.S. is the National Organization for Women (NOW). Neither West Germany nor the Netherlands has a similar coordinating organization. In West Germany, feminist refers primarily to the radical feminist strand, while the liberal feminists are weak. The women's movement in the Netherlands occupies an intermediate position, although it is closer to the West German than to the U.S. movement.

The greater part of the women's movement in the Netherlands and West Germany is autonomous, anti-hierarchical and highly decentralized. Much more than the movement in the U.S., the West German movement works outside of the system. The West German movement has not been very influential and has but little grasp of politics. The Dutch movement also occupies an intermediate position. On the one hand, parts of the women's

movement are autonomous; on the other hand, thanks to their ties with political parties, important segments of the movement work within the system and undertake the long march through institutions.

Despite the differences, the three movements still use many similar forms of action. The women's movement in the U.S. has been taken as an example in many respects by the movement in Europe. Consciousness-raising groups, women's networks, and women's shelters are some of the activities borrowed from the American movement.

The peace movement had several of the same predecessors in the three countries: the ban-the-bomb movement and the Vietnam movement. More specific for West Germany were the protests against German re-armament, and more specific for the U.S. was the Test Ban Movement. The new peace movement that arose in the late 70s and early 80s concentrates all its energies on nuclear disarmament. The general aggravation of the world political situation, and the chance of accidents and of misunderstandings imparted a feeling of urgency.

There are grass roots movements in all three countries. They tend to be non-institutionalized, not hierarchical, highly decentralized, and extra-parliamentary. The Dutch movement deviates a bit from this picture. The movement does have a centralized organization, but only a very modest one. The movement's real strength lies in the organizations at its base. The peace movement in the Netherlands has grown by leaps and bounds since the end of the 70s. One reason for this was the successful campaign against the neutron bomb. The NATO decision to locate cruise missiles in Europe considerably accelerated the growth, which manifested itself in demonstrations of unprecedented size in 1981 and 1983. The peace movement grew in other European countries, including West Germany, for the same reason. The movement has not been very successful in West Germany since then. Nor has it been very successful in the Netherlands, although one accomplishment was that the decision to locate the missiles was postponed several times.

The best known segments of the new American peace movement are the freeze campaign and the professional groups, particularly "Physicians for Social Responsibility". The freeze campaign had a strong grass roots appeal: freeze resolutions soon began to appear across the country. "Physicians for Social Responsibility" is the best organized and most effective professional group in the movement. All three countries show a high degree of overlap of the peace movement with the women's movement and the environmental movement.

This has been only a very brief survey of the four movements

1  
that have determined the political picture in highly industrialized western societies in the past two decades. It necessarily overlooks many differences which exist between the movements. And movements that colored the socio-political landscape on a more limited scale were left out. Nor was it my intention to give a detailed report of these two decades of social movement in Europe and the U.S. The object was to show that, despite national differences, the broad developments on both continents show remarkable similarities. It is interesting that efforts to explain these movements in the United States and Europe have taken very different form. In the former emphasis has been given to "resource mobilization" and in the latter to the "new social movement" approach.

### **Resource Mobilization**

Resource mobilization theory rejects the traditional social movement approach according to which social movements came about as a result of grievances due to relative deprivation. It was argued that grievances as a result of structural conflicts of interests are inherent in every society. The formation and the rise of social movements depend on changes in resource, group organization and opportunities for collective action (Jenkins, 1983). Whether or not a group takes action depends on the availability of resources.

The resource mobilization approach has been most fruitful in the analysis of mobilization processes. It emphasizes the importance of existing organizations and networks. The mobilization potential of a group is determined by the extent to which it is organized. Existing organizations and networks not only increase the chance that persons will be confronted with a mobilization attempt, but also make "bloc recruitment" possible.

Costs and benefits of participation play an important role in the analysis of mobilization processes. This part of the theory leans heavily on Olson's (1968) logic of collective action. The introduction of costs and benefits of participation into the analysis of recruitment made possible a more sophisticated approach to differential recruitment. Different sorts of incentives could be distinguished. Although the terms differed, collective (or purposive) benefits were distinguished from selective incentives, and selective incentives were divided into social and non-social incentives (Klandermans, 1984; Oberschall, 1980; Wilson, 1973). A distinction was made between different forms of action, and it could be shown that moderate and militant

action (Klandermans, 1984) and low and high risk activities (McAdam, 1984) appear to entail differences in participation because of a divergent cost-benefit ratio, and that a certain category of incentives appeals more to one social group than to another.

**Organization.** According to the resource mobilization approach, organization is an important resource for a social movement. Organization decreases the costs of participation (Morris, 1981), is important in the recruitment of participants (Oberschall, 1973, 1980) and increases the chances of success (Gamson, 1975; but see Piven & Cloward, 1979 for the opposite argument). Its emphasis on organization as a resource meant a rejection of the traditional view that a low level of organization was a distinguishing feature of social movements. Gerlach and Hine (1970) remarked in this connection that the impression of disorganization could easily be aroused by the specific organization form of social movements, which is a collectivity of groups and organizations with a mutual network of relations but without centralized decision making and leadership.

Expectations of success play an important role with respect to the collective incentives of participation. Expectations of success are related to several other concepts that the resource mobilization theory has brought to the foreground. The political systems in which social movement organizations operate vary in vulnerability to political pressure. The presence of third parties and alliances considerably increases the chance of success (Fireman & Gamson, 1979). The discovery of a new tactic sometimes inaugurates a protest cycle (McAdam, 1983; Tarrow, 1983). As long as the opponent does not know how to respond to the new tactic, the chances of success are higher. After a while this changes, because the opponent learns how to react.

To summarize, resource mobilization theory explains cycles of protest from the combined influence of changes in the availability of resources and in the perceived chances of success. When a societal group with certain grievances has more resources at its disposal and when the chances of success of a protest movement increase, the protest activity increases.

### **New Social Movements**

In contrast to the resource mobilization orientation, the new social movement approach sought the explanation for the rise of the social movements of the past decades in the appearance of new grievances. It stresses that the new movements (such as the environmental movement, the women's movement



and the peace movement) differ from the old movements (such as workers' movements) in values, action forms and constituency. It attempts to relate the growth of these movements and their essence to developments in western industrialized societies. New social movements are taken to be a reaction to modernization processes in such societies (Brand, 1982; Melucci, 1980; Van der Loo et al., 1984). In this respect the new social movement approach is related to Smelser's (1982) theory of collective behavior. Structural strain in his theory is akin to new grievances as a consequence of modernization processes in the new social movement approach.

The literature mentions the following characteristics typifying new social movements: Values: new social movements are anti-modernistic. They no longer accept the premises of a society based on economic growth. They have broken with the traditional values of capitalistic society. They seek a different relationship to nature, one's own body, the other sex, to work and to consumption. In other words, their interests lie in issues involving the superstructure, the sphere of reproduction. Matters that previously belonged to the private sphere are becoming topics of political discussion. This is sometimes referred to as the politicization of private life.

Action forms: new social movements make extensive use of unconventional forms of action. One of their chief characteristics is a profusion of single-issue groups and organizations. They take a dissociative attitude towards society, one expression of which is their antagonism to politics. They prefer small-scale, decentralized organizations, are anti-hierarchical, and have an antipathy for the principle of representation. The emphasis lies on self-help and self-organization.

Constituency: Two population groups are particularly predisposed to participation in new social movements. First, groups that are affected by problems resulting from modernization. These groups are not comprised of social classes or ranks, because the problems with which they are confronted (for instance, the construction of a nuclear reactor or the location of cruise missiles) are not limited to particular social strata. Second, there are groups that, owing to a more general shift in values and needs, have become particularly sensitive to problems resulting from modernization. These groups are primarily found in the new middle class - the well-educated young people working in the service sector. In reality, the picture turns out not to be as simple as the theories about new social movements present it (Brand et al., 1983; Van der Loo et al., 1984).

The new social movements literature sets out to answer the question, "Where do these new values, action forms and constituencies (or protest potentials, as they are called) come from?" The answer has been sought in various directions, although all explanations see a connection between modernization and continuing economic growth.

### New Aspirations

A great many authors ascribe the rise of new social movements to changed values. They fall back on Inglehart's theory about post-material values. In 1977, Inglehart described the "silent revolution" as he felt it was taking place in Europe. By this he meant a dramatic and continual change from materialist to post-materialist values. Seeing that post-war youth could be assured of the satisfaction of material needs, non-material needs such as self-actualization, participation, etc. had a chance to flower. In an international comparative study among young people from 16 to 29 years, Inglehart found that 28 percent of them in the Netherlands, 17 percent in the U.S., 15 percent in West Germany, 13 percent in the U.K. and nine percent in Austria favored post-materialist values (Inglehart, 1979). Other research has also established changes in values: the erosion of conventional middle-class values, the decline of the traditional achievement ethic, a changed attitude towards work and career. Supporters of post-materialist values come into conflict with a political and social system that is chiefly materialist. Their preference for unconventional action forms can be explained both by the pattern of values they favor and by the fact that they are in a minority position.

Another group of authors sees a reaction to the welfare state in the new social movements. Because the welfare state permeates more and more reaches of life, it is held responsible for the ensuing problems. At the same time it has created new entitlement needs with respect to government services. Furthermore, increased prosperity has caused the demand for scarce goods to grow. Many of them are positional goods (for instance, pleasant living surroundings, a car, education that gives access to attractive professions, etc.). However, when used extensively, these can be an obstruction to the satisfaction of needs (traffic jams, the "little boxes" of suburbia). The result is heightened competition, which leads to more disappointments. Briefly, the welfare state has created new needs which can no longer be satisfied.

movements by "new aspirations" (Klages, 1980), there are Marxist and non-Marxist authors who seek an explanation in the increased strain related to the problems resulting from industrialization and bureaucratization.

According to non-Marxist explanations, industrialization and bureaucratization have resulted in a loss of identity. Loss of identity leads to the loss of traditional ties and loyalties. People become receptive to new utopias and different commitments, thus creating a breeding ground for new social movements. Young people are said to be particularly vulnerable to this. The negative effects of economic growth, industrialization and technological development on the satisfaction of important needs have also been held responsible. Self-destructive aspects of western society were pointed to (the exhaustion of natural resources, the growing number of conflicts between industrialized countries, between East and West and North and South), the decreasing efficiency of production (rising economic, social, psychological and ecological costs), and the decreasing problem-solving capacity of highly industrialized societies. These developments, in conjunction with the evolution of postmaterial values, are seen as the breeding ground for new social movements. According to these authors, postmaterial values and the related protest movements primarily arise among professional groups that are not directly tied to market mechanisms, and groups that are better educated. It is among these groups that protest movements then flourish.

Marxist oriented scientists emphasize the intervention of both the state and the capitalistic economy in ever more reaches of life as the chief explanation for the rise of the new social movements. This leads to a network of regulatory, ministering, supervisory, and controlling institutions, and increases the danger of loss of legitimacy. As long as people can find adequate compensation for the unfavorable results of industrialization and modernization, and as long as traditional ties and normative structures maintain a private sphere the state cannot touch, loss of legitimacy can be avoided. But it is precisely the private sphere that is becoming more and more the domain of state intervention. As a result of these developments, traditional ties break down. In addition, because of the economic recession, compensation for the negative results of industrialization is often no longer certain. The new social movements fight for the "reappropriation of time, of space, and of relationships in the individual's daily experience" (Melucci, 1980, p. 219). This is the reason they demonstrate for freedom of choice in matters relating to the private sphere, such as abortion, death,

gender roles, and the reason for the emphasis on autonomy and independence.

### Touraine on New Social Movements

In conclusion, a brief comment on the views of Touraine (1981; Rucht, 1985). Although some say he introduced the term new social movements, his views are quite different from those discussed above. According to Touraine, we are presently in a transition from an industrial to a post-industrial society. Such profound transitions are marked by social movements: the workers' movement accompanied the transition to an industrialized society.

Nowadays, according to Touraine, the role played by the workers' movement is nearly over. In the post-industrial society, new social movements will join battle with the ruling class for control of society. The new social movement which will take over the historical role of the workers' movement is not now recognizable as such. Sociological analysis must prove whether protest movements that manifest themselves are indeed the precursors of new social movement. Touraine once took the student movement to be a herald of the new social movement (1978), later the environmental movement (1980). But in both cases he changed his mind.

The new social movement approach relates the location of new protest potentials to processes of modernization in the highly developed western societies. The new protest potential has two parts: a. Groups that are affected by the results of industrial modernization. These are primarily groups that have gotten behind as a result of marginalization processes: youths, women, the elderly, and groups that threaten to be disqualified by automation. b. Groups that have a specific sensitivity to the problems resulting from modernization processes. These are groups whose material needs are satisfied, and who are increasingly confronted with the negative results of economic growth in the competition for positional goods; groups working in the service sector whose profession makes them particularly sensitive to post-materialist values and vulnerable to the negative results of industrial development; and the post-war generation, which grew up under favorable material circumstances.

### Intermediate Balance

Resource mobilization and the new social movement approach complement one another. In Melucci's (1984) view, the new social movement approach explains why, but not how, a movement is set up and maintains its structure. It formulates hypotheses about the rise of protest potentials without saying anything



23

about concrete actions and actors. The resource mobilization theory does the reverse. It pays a great deal of attention to the how of collective action, but not to the why. In this sense the "European" models are the obverse of American resource mobilization theory. I would like to illustrate this by showing how each of the two approaches contributes to the explanation of the willingness of individuals to participate in activities of a social movement.

### Mobilization Potentials, Recruitment Networks and Motivations to Participate

The concept of participation in a social movement is too abstract to work with in theory and research. Particularly if we start looking into the motivations to participate, we cannot get around the fact that an individual associates very different costs and benefits with various activities. Klandermans (1984) demonstrated this for moderate and militant union action. McAdam (1984) for low and high risk activities in the civil rights movement, and Briët et al. (forthcoming) for high and low threshold activities in the women's movement. Furthermore different activities make different demands of the recruitment process. McAdam (1984) assumed that in the case of low risk activities, little more is needed than contact with a recruiting agent, but that high risk activities require much more intensive approaches. Briët et al. (forthcoming) showed that this was also true for low vs. high threshold activities. Participation must thus be specified into participation in specific activities.

Participation in social movements is something that takes place in the context of the formation of mobilization potentials, the formation of recruitment networks, and the arousing of the motivation to participate. It is important to distinguish these processes because they require very different activities of social movement organizations, and different theories are needed to analyze them. In the formation of mobilization potentials, a social movement must win cognitive, attitudinal and ideological support. In the formation of recruitment networks it must increase the chance that people who belong to the mobilization potential are reached. In arousing the motivation it must favorably influence the decision of people who are reached by a mobilization attempt.

**Mobilization potential.** Mobilization potential refers to the potential of people in a society who could theoretically be mobilized by a social movement. The mobilization potential of a social movement does not coincide with the groups whose relative deprivation the movement is concerned with and/or who will benefit by the achievement of the goals of the

movement, although such groups can easily be added to the mobilization potential. The same is true of groups that have lost confidence in the authorities. The mobilization potential of a social movement describes the limits within which a mobilization campaign can be successful. People who are not part of the mobilization potential will not consider participating in activities of the movement, even if they are reached by a mobilization attempt. The mobilization potential is the reservoir from which the movement can draw. This reservoir is not formed spontaneously. It is the result of consensus mobilization, that is, the often lengthy campaigns in which the movement propagates its view that certain states of affairs are unacceptable (Klandermans, 1984). Although widespread relative deprivation or lack of trust in the authorities are important factors, consensus mobilization is needed to convert it into mobilization potential (cf. Gurney & Tierney, 1982; Schwartz, 1976; Turner, 1969).

The distinction between proactive movements, which want change and claim new rights and reactive movements, which defend the existing order, is interesting in this connection (Tilly, Tilly & Tilly, 1975). Proactive movements need to do more in the way of consensus mobilization than reactive movements. The former must first legitimize new beliefs, while the latter simply uphold the existing ideology, which requires no legitimacy as long as its hegemony is not violated (Ferree & Miller, 1985).

Recruitment networks. The part of the mobilization potential that is the target of mobilization attempts tells us about a movement's organization and recruitment networks. The further the branchings of a movement reach, the more they are interwoven with other organizations, the greater will be the number of people who are reached by a mobilization attempt. However successful a movement may be in mobilizing consensus, however large its mobilization potential may be, if it does not have a recruitment network to reach people, its mobilization potential cannot be put to use.

The importance of networks for reaching potential participants has been pointed up in various ways in the literature. Gerlach and Hine (1970) found that people were much more inclined to join religious movements if they were approached by people whom they trusted on other grounds. Bolton (1972) showed how new members of peace groups were recruited in circles with a high proportion of people who were already members. Orum (1974) and Wilson and Orum (1976) pointed out the importance of friends or relatives who were already involved in a movement as a factor in the explanation of participation. The introduction of networks analysis in this field made possible more systematic analyses.

The formation of recruitment networks involves both extending the reaches of the organization, particularly at a local level, and forming coalitions with other organizations (Ferree & Miller, 1985; Klandermans & Oegema, 1984; Wilson & Orum, 1976). During the mobilization campaign itself, a movement organization will have to mobilize persons who hold positions in the recruitment network. It can then seek to reach sectors of the potential via a mobilization attempt. When such persons back out, a recruitment channel becomes a dead end. The chance of this happening is greater the more centralized and hierarchical a social movement organization is (Klandermans, 1985).

The density of the recruitment network also influences the method of recruitment. Using face-to-face recruitment, a social movement organization can only reach many people if it has a dense network. If it does not, it can turn to indirect forms of recruitment. McCarthy (1983) and Mitchell (1984) showed how American environmental organizations managed to make effective use of direct mail for the recruitment of participants. But indirect recruitment seems most likely to work in cases of low risk or low threshold participation (cf. Briët et al., forthcoming; McAdam, 1984).

Motivation to participate. Using the idea of costs and benefits of participation, various authors have attempted to specify the motivation to participate (Fireman & Gamson, 1979; Klandermans, 1984; McAdam, 1984; Mitchell, 1979; Muller, 1980; Oberschall, 1973, 1980; Opp, 1985; Pinard, 1983; Wilson, 1973). Most of them give a prominent role to Olson's logic of collective action (Olson, 1965). Fundamental to this is the distinction between collective and selective incentives.

Theories that assume participation in a social movement derives from a consideration of costs and benefits of participation must consider Olson's analysis. All of them see the motivation to participate as a function of collective and selective incentives. However, they reject Olson's statement that collective incentives make no difference at all. They assume an additive relationship between the two sorts of incentives, implying that they can reinforce or compensate one another. With respect to the collective incentives, a multiplicative relationship is assumed between the value of the collective good and the expectancy of success. Basically, the various elaborations show important similarities. The common building blocks are: the value of the collective good, the expectancy of success, social and non-social incentives. Elements of this basic model have been further elaborated by various authors. Klandermans (1984) distinguished between the goals of a specific collective action and the social

changes that a movement favors. The perceived instrumentality of specific goals for intended social changes and the attitudes towards these changes determine the value of specific goals. In his view, deprivations, aspirations, moral obligations, attitudes and ideologies make people a part of the mobilization potential of the movement. These cognitions are linked to participation in collective action by the perceived instrumentality of specific goals for social changes.

Oberschall (1980) and Klandermans (1984) elaborated the expectancy of success. Both of them linked the expectancy of success to the number of participants. From a hypothesized relationship between the number of participants and the probability of success, the individual contribution as a function of the number of participants can be derived (see also Oliver, Marwell & Teixeira, forthcoming). Klandermans (1984) added to this that persons have to decide to participate at a point when they do not know whether others will participate. Their decisions have to be based on their expectations about the behavior of others. The expectation that participation helps to produce the collective good was categorized as follows:

- a. expectations about the number of participants;
- b. expectations about one's own contribution to the probability of success;
- c. expectations about the probability of success if many people participate.

Muller (1980), Opp (1985) and McAdam (1984) elaborated the social incentives. Both Muller and Opp made a distinction between reactions of approval and disapproval of significant others and normative justifications of collective action. The latter may be considered generalized expectations about the reactions of the environment. McAdam (1984) showed that structural factors such as being integrated in activist networks, prior contact with a recruiting agent and ties with other participants are important determinants of participation. The social psychological explanation of this is simple. It is not so much the positive reactions that participation will yield in such networks, but the social costs of non-participation that play a role. For people who have many ties with such networks, non-participation would mean that they would have to justify to other people in those networks why they did not take part.

### Synthesis

We are now in a position to indicate how resource mobilization and the new social movement approach complement one another.



Besides that, there are some themes which both of them ignore. The new social movement approach has clearly concentrated on the factors that determine the mobilization potential of modern social movements. Developments in post-industrial societies effect deprivations and aspirations among the societal groups who most immediately experience their unfavorable consequences and among groups which are extra-sensitive because of the development of post-material values. However, it has not answered the question how these new potentials are activated. In resource mobilization theory we see the reverse: a great deal of attention to the mobilization of resources, to the significance of recruitment networks, to the costs and benefits of participation and to the factors that influence them, but no attention at all to the formation of the mobilization potentials movements draw from in mobilization campaigns.

One thing both approaches overlook is the importance of consensus mobilization. The new social movement approach too easily assumes that mobilization potentials form spontaneously through societal developments. It overlooks the fact that social movement organizations themselves have an important share in defining the situation. Seeing that resource mobilization theory does not concern itself with the formation of mobilization potentials, it, too, largely disregards the importance of consensus mobilization. An important part of consensus mobilization is defending and propagating the instrumentality of specific goals for social changes which would do justice to the deprivations and aspirations of people who belong to the mobilization potential of a movement. Resource mobilization theory simply assumes the existence of mobilization potentials. The new social movement approach does not make an issue of mobilization for specific collective actions. As a result, neither of them studies their tangent point: the instrumentality of goals of collective action for the solution to the problems that define the mobilization potential and the mobilization of consensus for this. An essential element of every mobilization campaign thus escapes the attention of both approaches.

### In Conclusion

The question now is why theory formation took such a different course on the two continents. Although I do not have the final answer to this question, some assumptions may be formulated. But first let me emphasize that I have not intended to leave the impression that the European and the American

literature stand in absolute contrast. This is certainly not true. As early as 1969, Turner surmised in a neglected article that a new social movement form had appeared. Turner thought (and this somewhat resembled Touraine's line of thinking) that, after the liberal humanitarian movement and the socialist movement, things were taking a new turn. The key concepts of the new movement would be personal value and alienation. The movement's adherents would be young people. Ten years later Perrow (1979) suggested explanations for the movements of the 60s in the U.S. with his terms "the greening" and "the graying" of America. These concepts showed remarkable similarities with the "rising expectations" and "need defense" of the new social movement literature.

The resource mobilization approach was applied in Europe as well. Klandermans used it in a study of participation in union action (Klandermans, 1984), the women's movement (Briët et al., forthcoming) and the peace movement (Klandermans & Oegema, 1984). In the same period, Opp (1985) applied it in research of participation in the anti-nuclear movement in West Germany. And resource mobilization theory has recently started to gain interest in Europe, as shown by such publications as Rucht (1984), Melucci (1984), and Van Noort (1984).

But why were developments so divergent, at least initially? A number of assumptions may be formulated. To start with, the movements may have been a different nature. There is something to be said for this, particularly in the case of West Germany as compared to the U.S. The American movements were less anti-establishment and more institutionalized than the West German ones. Yet there were important similarities. Neither in the Netherlands nor in West Germany were all segments of the modern movements anti-establishment, and the modern movements in the U.S. comprised radical groups as well. Differences in historic developments in the social movement sector might also be the explanation. The modern social movements in the U.S. succeeded the civil rights movement in a more or less unbroken line. There was also a smooth transition with respect to action repertoire. But the modern movements in Europe were the first great cycle of movements since World War II. They had no direct forerunners, and could only be compared with the workers' movement and the pre-war women's movement or peace movement. They quite clearly formed a break with the past, both in constituency and in action repertoire. Perhaps students in Europe concentrated more on the break with the past, while continuity was more emphasized in the U.S.

In the third place, differences in scientific tradition may

have played a role. The resource mobilization orientation fit into the pragmatic tradition of the American social sciences, while the new social movement approach found its place alongside the Marxist, Weberian social scientific tradition in Europe.

Again, the personal experience of a generation of scientists may have played a role. Many of the present generation of students of social movements in the U.S. were personally involved in the civil rights movement, and there they learned the importance of organizing, of mobilizing resources, etc. Perhaps they gave precedence to questions related to this in their own research and theory formation. European social scientists had no such training school.

Before raising the question, "Where will this go in the future", I would like to point out the probably unintended political implications of the blind spots of both approaches. With its argument that there are always grievances in a society, and that the rise of new social movements cannot be explained by the aggravation of grievances or the growth of new frustrations, the resource mobilization approach turns social movement organizations into a few of the many actors who must compete for scarce resources in a pluralistic society. The presence of resources rather than indignation over injustice explains the rise of protest movements; resources, moreover, that often must be made available by outsiders. The grievances themselves, the injustice at the root of it all, became subordinate. Protest movements were thus stripped of their political significance.

The new social movement approach definitely does not put the grievances that generate protest movements in second place. On the contrary: the weaknesses of highly developed societies are enlarged upon, and new social movements are interpreted as reactions to derailments in and of those societies. But in all its analytic power, the approach is not very helpful to movement activists. Many analyses excel in detailed descriptions of the problems of post-industrial society. At the same time, they seem to imply that these developments are inevitable. Protest movements may well be understood in this framework as an expression of discontent, but they cannot prevent things from happening or alter the march of time. In this way, too, protest movements are stripped of their political significance. A synthesis of the two approaches would be a step in the direction of acknowledging the political significance of social movements. Will theorizing on the two continents continue to diverge or will there be a move toward integration? There are signals of a growing interest in both approaches in Europe and the U.S. as well. Some recent publications have tried to bridge the gap

(cf. Melucci, 1984) between the new social movement approach and resource mobilization theory. There also have been meetings between scholars from the two continents (Klandermans and Tarrow, 1985). This is as it should be, for as I have argued, the European and American approaches complement rather than exclude each other. Such integration not only could enhance the field by improving theoretical frameworks, it could also mark the beginning of a tradition of comparative and cooperative research on social movements.

### References

- Bolton, C.D.  
 1972 "Alienation and action: A study of peace group members." *American Journal of Sociology*, 77:537-561.
- Brand, K.W.  
 1982 *Neue soziale Bewegungen, Entstehung, Funktion und Perspektive neuer Protestpotentiale, eine Zwischenbilanz.* (in German) Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Brand, K.W., D. Busser and D. Rucht  
 1983 *Aufbruch in ein andere Gesellschaft, neue soziale Bewegungen in der Bundesrepublik.* (in German) Frankfurt/New York: Campusverlag.
- Briët, M., P.G. Klandermans and F. Kroon  
 1986 "How women become involved in the women's movement." In M. Katzenstein and C. Mueller (Eds.), *Changing Paradigms.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Cerny, P.G.  
 1982 *Social Movements and Protest in France.* New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Ferree, M.M. and F.D. Miller  
 1983 "Mobilization and meaning: toward an integration of social psychological and resource perspectives on social movements." *Sociological Inquiry*, 55:38-61.



Ferree, M.M.

- Forth-coming "Feminist politics in the U.S. and West. In M. Katzenstein and C. Mueller (Eds.), *Changing Paradigms*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fireman, B. and W.A. Gamson

- 1979 "Utilitarian logic in the resource mobilization perspective." Pp 8-44 in M.N. Zald and J.D. McCarthy (Eds.), *The Dynamics of Social Movements*. Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop Publishers.

Gamson, W.A.

- 1975 *The Strategy of Social Protest*. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey.

Gerlach, L.P. and V.G. Hine

- 1970 *People, Power, Change: Movements of Social Transformation*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Gurney, J.N. and K.J. Tierney

- 1982 "Relative deprivation and social movements: A critical look at twenty years of theory and research." *Sociology Quarterly*, 23:3347.

Inglehart, R.

- 1977 *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles among Western Publics*. Princeton.

Inglehart, R.

- 1979 "Value priorities and socio-economic change." Pp. 305-343 in S.H. Barnes & M. Kaase et al. (Eds.), *Political Action, Mass Participation in Five Western Democracies*. Beverly Hills, Cal.: Sage.

Jenkins, J.C.

- 1983 "Resource mobilization theory and the study of social movements." *Annual Review Sociology*, 9:527-553.

Klandermans, P.G.

- 1984 "Mobilization and participation in a social movement: social psychological expansions of resource mobilization theory." *American Sociological Review*, 49:583-600.

Klandermans, P.G.

- 1985 "Unlonists, feminists and pacifists, comparisons of organization, mobilization and participation." Paper presented at the ASA-meetings.

Klandermans, P.G. and D. Oegema

- 1984 "Mobilizing for peace: the 1983 peace demonstration in the Hague." Paper prepared for the 79th Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association.

Klandermans, P.G. and S. Tarrow

- 1985 Participation in 'New' Social Movements in Western Europe and the United States, a research planning group, European Studies Newsletter, Center for European Studies, Columbia University.

Kriesi, H.

- 1985 Bewegungen in der schweizer Politik, Fallstudien zu politischen Mobilisierungsprozessen in der Schweiz. (in German) Frankfurt: Campusverlag.

Loo, H.v.d., E. Snel and B. v. Steenbergen

- 1984 Een wenkend perspectief? Nieuwe sociale bewegingen en culturele veranderingen. Amersfoort: De Horstink.

McAdam, D.

- 1983 "Tactical innovation and the pace of insurgency." American Sociological Review, 48:735-754.

McAdam, D.

- 1984 "Structural versus attitudinal factors in movement recruitment." Paper presented at the ASA-meetings.

McCarthy, J.D.

- 1983 Social infrastructure deficits and new technologies: Mobilizing unstructured sentiment pools. Working paper. Dept. of Sociology and Center for the Study of Youth Development, Catholic University.

Melucci, A.

- 1980 "The new social movements: A theoretical approach." Social Science Information, 19:199-226.

Melucci, A.

- 1982 L'invenzione del presente movimenti identità, bisogni collettivi. (in Italian) Bologna: Mulino.

Melucci, A.

- 1984 "An end to social movements?: Introductory paper to the sessions on 'New Movements and Change in Organizational Forms'." Social Science Information, 24:819-835.

Mitchell, R.C.

- 1979 "National environmental lobbies and the apparent illogic of collective action." In C.S. Russell (Ed.), *Collective Decision Making Application from Public Choice Theory*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Mitchell, R.C.

- 1984 "Moving backward vs. moving forward: Motivation for collective action." San Antonio: Paper presented at the 79th Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association.

Morris, A.

- 1981 "Black Southern students sit-in movements: an analysis of internal organisation." *American Sociological Review*, 46:744-767.

Muller, E.N.

- 1980 "The psychology of political protest and violence." Pp. 69-100 in T.R. Gurr (Ed.), *Handbook of Political Conflict Theory and Research*. New York: The Free Press.

Noort W. van

- 1984 *De effecten van de kraakbeweging op de besluitvorming van gemeentelijke overheden*. COMT, uitg. 15. (in Dutch) Leiden: Rijksuniversiteit..

Oberschall, A.

- 1973 *Social Conflict and Social Movements*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Oberschall, A.

- 1980 "Loosely structured collective conflict: A theory and an application." Pp. 45-68 in L. Kriesberg (Ed.), *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change*.

Oliver, P., G. Marwell and R. Teixeira

- forth- "Group heterogeneity, interdependence, and the  
com- production of collective goods: A coming theory  
ing of the critical mass, I.", *American Journal of  
Sociology*.

Olson, M.

- 1965 *The Logic of Collective Action. Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Opp, K.D.

- 1985 "Konventionelle und unkonventionelle politische Partizipation." *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 14:282-296.

Orum, A.M.

- 1974 "On participation in political protest movements." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 10:181-207.

Perrow, C.

- 1979 "The Sixties observed." In M.N. Zald and J.D. McCarthy (Eds.), *The Dynamics of Social Movements, Resource Mobilization, Social Control, and Tactics*. Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop.

Pinard, M.

- 1983 "From deprivation to mobilization." Detroit: Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the ASA.

Piven, F.F. and R.A. Cloward

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

Rucht, D.

- 1984 "Comparative new social movements, organizations and strategies in a cross-sectional and a cross-national view." Paper presented at the Conference of European Group of Organizational Sociologists on New Social Movements.

Rucht, D.

- 1985 *Soziologie als Theorie sozialer Bewegungen, ein Auseinandersetzung mit dem Ansatz von Alain Touraine.* München. (in German) (unpublished paper).

Schwartz, M

- 1976 *Radical Protest and Social Structure*. New York: Academy Press.

Tarrow, S.

- 1983 "Resource mobilization and cycles of protest: Theoretical reflections and comparative illustrations." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association.



Tilly, C., L. Tilly and R. Tilly

1975 *The Rebellious Century: 1830-1930*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Touraine, A.

1978 *La voix et le regard*. (Eng.: *The voice and the eye: an analysis of social movements*). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981. Paris: Editions du Seuil.

Turner, R.H.

1969 "The theme of contemporary social movements." *The British Journal of Sociology*, 10:390-405.

Wilson, J.Q.

1973 *Political Organizations*. New York: Basic Books.

Wilson, K. and M. Orum

1976 "Mobilizing people for collective political action." *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, 4:187-202.