24
Social Movements and Activist-Protest Volunteering

Jacob Mwathi Mati (Kenya), Fengshi WU (Hong Kong, China), Bob Edwards (USA), Sherine N. El Taraboulsi (Egypt), and David H. Smith (USA)

A. Introduction

Scholars of volunteering have long excluded the radical, political forms of formal volunteering from their analytical gaze, especially more contentious social movements and collective activist-protest volunteering. This false dichotomy hinders scholarship by perpetuating analytical blinders. The present chapter helps remedy this oversight by reviewing research and theory highlighting overlaps between conventional volunteering, including conventional political volunteering, and unconventional, social movement activism as volunteering. Conventional political volunteering and unconventional political activism are both means for inclusion, participation, accountability, and change (sometimes even democratization) of polities. Both conventional political volunteering and protest activism rely on commitment, values, solidarities, and often altruism, as ordinary citizens seek solutions to collective problems/issues.

We therefore conclude that scholarship on conventional volunteerism and unconventional, protest volunteering need to pursue more integrated analytical approaches. Many books and articles attempting to describe and discuss volunteering and the voluntary nonprofit sector (VNPS) in general omit political forms of volunteering and their corresponding associations, especially social activist-protest volunteering and social movement organizations (SMOs) as associations (e.g., Heinrich and Fioramonti 2008; O'Neill 2002; Powell and Steinberg 2006; Salamon 1999, 2012; Salamon, Sokolowski, and Associates 2004; Taylor 2010). Edward's (2011) *Oxford Handbook of Civil Society* is an unusual and very welcome exception, with its Chapter 6 focused on social movements (SMs). Smith, Macaulay, and Associates' much earlier (1980) edited volume was also an exception, with chapters examining the determinants of both conventional and unconventional/protest political activity, often similar.

September 8, 2016 15:6 MAC/SMILEY Page-516 9781137263162_26_cha24

Smith (2000:chapter 10) has critiqued all of VNPS scholarship, seeing (circa 2000 AD/CE) a wide variety of *flat-earth maps or paradigms* being widely used that omit many important topics or *territories* that should be included in a more accurate *round-earth paradigm* of the VNPS. Relevant here is Smith's description of the *Status Quo/Establishment Flat-earth Paradigm* (p. 235), which he suggests, "ignores social movement [Voluntary Groups/VGs, usually associations], protest, and advocacy volunteering." As first Editor-in-Chief of this Handbook, Smith has been careful to include a chapter such as this one on activist-protest volunteering – *unconventional* political volunteering, as well as Handbook Chapter 23 on conventional political volunteering.

Whereas Chapter 23 deals with conventional political volunteering, this chapter focuses on unconventional types of political volunteering by exploring linkages between social movement activism, collective protest, and volunteerism. Conventional political volunteering is concerned with *routine power* or *established power*, while unconventional political volunteering is concerned with *disruptive power* (Piven 2008). It is fair to say that the vast majority of scholarship on *volunteering* focuses only on *routine power* or *authority*, if power is studied at all, and *disruptive power* is generally ignored. As for the Handbook as a whole (except for Chapter 9 on informal volunteering), the focus here is on formal activist volunteering *in associations* or other collective contexts, not on individual/solitary acts of resistance or protest.

The central task for this chapter is to move beyond existing conceptual and analytical pigeonholes, overcoming traditional academic blinders, forced by this false dichotomy between the world of volunteerism and the world of social movement activism. We will do this by exploring in Section D how the two concepts are closely linked and how they are mutually reinforcing components of social change and development. The roots of this false dichotomy lie partly in the history of our field in study of philanthropy, which tends to be genteel and elitist in its approach. Another intellectual root of the false dichotomy is the persistent overemphasis on civility by civil society scholars (see more of this critique in the Handbook Introduction).

B. Definitions

The set of definitions of general terms in the Handbook Appendix are accepted here. But there are some special terms that also need definition.

Musick and Wilson (2008:541), citing Anheier and Salamon (1999), argue that the different words that describe volunteering in different languages have different histories and carry different cultural and political connotations. The contextual differences involved in the conception of volunteerism bring to fore a distinction between practices of volunteerism and values of volunteerism. But if a core set of values is maintained, then a diversity of

practices including voluntary participation, advocacy, campaigning, protest activity, and awareness-raising (all key aspects of both political volunteerism and social advocacy), still qualify as volunteering. This is where volunteerism overlaps with social activism. That said, and because of definitional confusion, Kleidman (1994:264) argues for a "range of voluntariness" that varies according to the "amount of compensation and sacrifice" (cited in Musick and Wilson 2008:541) and whose range, includes a number of values such as social solidarity, free will, benefits to community, and no expectation of financial compensation commensurate with the service.[1] Benefits to others must be aimed at people outside the household and immediate family, according to Smith, Stebbins, and Dover (2006:245).

As defined in the Handbook Appendix, a *Social Movement Group* (SMG) is:

> A nonprofit group that is usually a small, often independent, unit in a larger social movement. Based on a shared ideology and common goals but not usually a common bureaucratic structure or even formal affiliation with the larger movement, an SMG tries to effect change (or maintain the status quo, in "anti-movements") on a particular issue. The SMG is actually a subtype of political nonprofit. [Often] incorrectly referred to as social movement organizations, most SMGs are informal or semiformal groups.

The Appendix further states that a *social movement organization (SMO)* is, "A nonprofit social movement group that is formally organized. SMOs are usually associations, not nonprofit agencies." SMGs and SMOs tend to have loose network ties and horizontal peer-to-peer relationships, as opposed to hierarchical structures of, say, political parties (Mannarini, Legittimo, and Talò 2008; see also, Lofland 1996). Both volunteerism and activism are multidimensional and contextual at the same time. Moreover, there is considerable overlap between these two concepts. Social movements (SMs) are larger congeries of SMOs and various less formalized collective protest groups, plus individual acts of protest and resistance.

C. Historical background

Activist volunteering in SMOs (usually associations) and other collective protests go far back into history, at least four millennia. They arose first in ancient agrarian societies (cf. Nolan and Lenski 2006), such as ancient Greece, Rome, and China, but did not exist earlier in preliterate societies. Boot's (2013) book, *Invisible Armies*, is perhaps the best survey of guerrilla warfare, insurgencies, collective protests, and incipient or full-fledged, usually violent, SMs over this long period of time. For instance, most people in the West are aware of the Roman slave rebellion led by Spartacus c. 73 B.C. (Shaw 2001).

Fewer are aware of the Sicarii as an underground, revolutionary association in Jerusalem c. 70 A.D., which used assassinations to resist the Roman occupation of Israel. More will recall the Sicarii's last stand and mass suicide at Masada, by the Dead Sea (Brighton 2009). There were periodic rebellions of slaves and people of the underclasses generally in nearly all ancient civilizations, although not all have received sufficient, if any, historical treatment. Historians in the distant past have usually been part of the status quo and establishment, which has frowned on "memorializing" any collective resistance to absolute power.

For the past 500 years, historians have been more likely to record and describe, as collective protest and resistance, such events as revolutions, revolts, rebellions, insurrections, riots, demonstrations, protests, and marches. This has been done especially well for Europe (Goldstone 1993; Hobsbawm 1965; Tilly 1996) and America (Danver 2010), but also done for such events elsewhere as well (Goldstone 1993; Piven 2008). Some of these "collective activist events" were spontaneous, short lived (a day or two), and very poorly organized, if organized at all. Others were planned, of longer term (weeks, months, even years), and organized by single associations or larger social movements as cooperating sets of two or more associations and other groups. The latter, more organized activist events and their associations are the forerunners of contemporary social movements and formal activist volunteering. Some collective activist events have been local, others national, or even international, with the last two decades registering a proliferation of international protest actions commonly dubbed as anti-globalization protest movement(s) or terrorism. Included here are the democratization struggles of the last two decades in the developing world and the earlier decolonization struggles in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Also included are various terrorist campaigns, especially recently (Schmid 2011).

The origin of social movements in various parts of the world has been explained by different theories (cf. Buechler 2011; Staggenborg 2010.). Whereas earlier collective behavior theory conceived of movements as part of deviance and disorganization symptomatic of social malfunction, today's dominant political opportunities model views them as extensions of politics by other means because they are part of the ever-present political processes and organizations competing over interests in modern pluralistic societies (Buechler 2000, 2011). For the resource mobilization and political process theorists, social movements are created to tap new political resources and opportunities available in modern democratic societies. They, like other forms of political struggle, can be analyzed in terms of conflicts of interest (Buechler 2000; McCarthy and Zald 1977; Oberschall 1973; Tilly 1978; Voss and Williams 2012). These theorists emphasize that social movements develop only when individuals with grievances are able to mobilize sufficient resources to take action (Edwards and McCarthy 2004). The bottom line is that social movements create

substantive political uncertainty in democratic systems as they promote democratic accountability of the elected to the citizenry (Schedler 2001:19, cited in Habib 2008).

Over the past 200 years, and especially in the 20th century, activist associations and social movements, more generally, have become increasingly sophisticated in structure and strategies/tactics. The social movement – a social innovation – has spread around the world (Tilly and Wood 2008). The development of social movements has gone hand in hand with the evolution of their tactics and strategies. Whereas, in previous centuries violence had been the norm, the 20th century movements have used a variety of nonviolent strategies and tactics (Ackerman and DuVall 2001; Zunes, Asher, and Kurtz 1999). And, where in prior centuries issues of economic status, class, and power had been central, in the 20th century new social movements have arisen with a different focus: identity, rights, and justice for such categories of humankind as women, minority ethnic groups, disabled people, gays and lesbians, and people concerned with the environment (Larana 1994).

D. Key issues

1. Where does SM/SMO dissent and activism take place?

Volunteerism and social activism foster inclusion by offering opportunities for participation of people from diverse backgrounds and circumstances to influence policies affecting their lives. Volunteerism and activism also foster good governance, efficiency, and accountability. Indeed, in many parts of the world, changes in the forms and quality of governance from authoritarianism to democracy have been steered to a large extent by voluntary activism instead of violent revolution. In South Africa, for instance, a vibrant volunteer-led civil society coupled with social movement activism helped end the discredited apartheid system. In sub-Saharan Africa, the move from single-party dictatorships to semblances of multipartyism was spearheaded in early 1990s by unconventional mass dissents. Volunteerism and activism are therefore forms of active citizenship and possible means to *deepening democracy* (UNDP 2002) or *democratizing democracy* (Giddens 1998). Here, there is broadening public participation in processes of governance, aiding citizens' direct role in public decision making, as well as engaging more deeply with political issues and effecting greater responsiveness from government.

Furthermore, both volunteering and social activism are actions undertaken without pay; they are voluntary to the extent they are founded on individual free will and conviction. A key characteristic of volunteer and social activism initiatives is their reliance on commitment and capacities of ordinary people. While leadership, as shall become clear later in the chapter, is key in channeling collective outrage into collective action, the principal engine for such

commitment is the willingness of citizens to search for solutions to collective problems (Mati 2012). This commitment is exemplified through an activism based on core values that generate, among citizens, the unique solidarities needed in a united cause.

2. What has been the long-term impact of SMs and SMOs on human societies?

In a forthcoming publication, Smith (2017) examines in some detail the impact of associations on societies and history. In Section D, #2 there, the following conclusions are reached regarding protest-activist volunteering in SMSs and SMOs, quoted here with permission:

> SMOs and often their larger SMs have achieved many, remarkable, socio-cultural changes in their own societies in the past 200-plus years, and often in global human society. Lofland (1996:348–353) has usefully suggested a rather comprehensive set of analytical categories/types of possible SMO effects, outcomes, or impacts: (a) changes in governments, laws, policies, policy systems; (b) winning acceptance; (c) new or enlarged movement establishment; (d) new items of mainstream culture; (e) shifts in norms, cultural images, and symbols; (f) changes in the interaction order; (g) The shape of strata (socioeconomic status) structures; (h) cultural clarification and affirmation; (i) entertainment and spectacle; (j) violence and tyranny; (k) scholarly trade (academic pursuits/activities studying the SMO/SM); and (l) models for later SMOs.
>
> The early and exemplary, systematic, comparative research by Gamson (1990; first edition published in 1975) studied a *random* sample of 53 American SMOs (termed *challenging groups*), all of them MAs (usually national MAs published documents about each SMO, using a standardized set of questions that investigated various hypotheses and theories about the causes of SMO impact/effectiveness. From among the (much-later published) set of 12 potential kinds of impact listed and discussed by Lofland (1996), as above, Gamson (1990:28–29) independently chose versions of #a and b, which he called *new advantages* and *acceptance*.
>
> One very striking result of Gamson's research was that *fully 49% of the SMOs sampled from this period of US history achieved new advantages, as an indicator of SMO success*. Virtually no one would have guessed this high success rate in advance. Given his random sampling of SMOs, these results can be generalized to all major, American SMOs in this time period of 145 years. Most of the book explores the significance of various factors of resource mobilization and organizational structure/process associated with the two measures

of SMO success. But *the central result for present purposes is the great effectiveness of SMOs as a type of MA in a democracy like the United States over the time period studied.*

There is a huge research literature, including histories, that documents the impact of the many human rights–based SMOs in the United States and elsewhere in democratic nations (cf. Anderson and Herr 2007. Snow et al. 2013; Snow, Soule, and Kriesi, 2004). The 29 chapters of the social movements handbook edited by Snow, Soule, and Kriesi (2004) give a brief overview of this literature. Chapters 24–29 and their references document the impacts of such major SMs as the labor, women's/feminist, environmental, peace/antiwar, ethnic/nationalist, and various religious movements. Careful reading of social and institutional history in industrial and postindustrial nations, for instance, clearly indicates that the life situations, life opportunities, and general life satisfactions have been substantially greater for factory workers, women, consumers of the environment, conscientious objectors, a variety of racial–ethnic groups, and members of many minority/fringe religions since relevant SMs and SMOs have been active seeking such outcomes. Less clear is that the improvements have been the direct results of SM/SMO activity, but research such as Gamson's (1990) and studies of many single SMs/SMOs suggest that *these movements have indeed had a significant long-term impact.*

In addition to tying to understand participation in and the dynamics of SMs/SMOs, scholars have studied the outcomes and consequences of specific, single SMs/SMOs for the past seven decades and more. In many cases, the researchers involved have concluded that the SM/SMO has had some significant, positive impact on the targets of benefits – the kinds of people who were to be helped.

In the past two decades or so, many other scholars have studied *comparatively* the outcomes, consequences, and impacts of SMs/SMOs, following the path-breaking research of Gamson ([1975] 1990). We can only mention here a few documents that seem to be the best summaries of this SM/SMO outcomes/consequences/impacts literature. Amenta et al. (2010) conclude their review of the political consequences of SMs/SMOs as follows:

> In the past decade there has been extensive research on the political consequences of movements. The biggest and best-studied movements have been shown to be politically influential in various ways, and movement protest is especially influential in helping to set policy agendas' [of government legislatures and executive agencies]. On page 293, Amenta et al. (2010) present a table of the impact (influence) results from their comparative content analysis study of nine main SM types, based on articles in five relevant, high-quality journals published in 2001–2009. For

> seven of the nine SMs, the authors found evidence of moderate or strong influence. For five less well studied, non-US SMs (names not reported), they found such evidence for all five SMs. Hence, overall they found moderate or strong influence for 12 SMs out of 14 examined. The two SMs with weak or no influence were the nativist/ supremacist SM and the antiwar SM. The main positive outcome types were single or multiple policy changes by the government.

An earlier review by Burstein and Linton (2002:381) of research on political organizations in general, including SMs/SMOs, stated similarly as follows:

> Everyone who studies democratic politics agrees that political parties, interest groups, and social movement organizations (SMOs) strongly influence public policy' in a variety of ways (specified). The authors also stated (p. 382), 'They seem indispensable [as organizational forms] to democratic policy making; no democratic polity in the modern world is without them . . . .

Many other scholars have reached roughly similar conclusions (Gillion 2013; Giugni 1998, 2004; Giugni, McAdam, and Tilly. 1999; Meyer [2007] 2014; Meyer, Jenness, and Ingram 2005; Minkoff 1995, 1997; Snow, Soule, and Kriesi 2004:Part V; Skrentny 2004; Tarrow 1998; Tilly 2004). Most of Gamson's (1990) conclusions about the internal, mobilizing factors affecting success/failure have been confirmed, but there are still major theoretical and methodological difficulties and nuances of interpretation (Giugni 1998; Jenkins and Klandermans 1995; Meyer 2007). In particular, other scholars have argued for the significant, sometimes substantial effects of external factors, such as public opinion, culture, opportunity, and political party support (Amenta et al. 2010; Banaszak 1996). In sum, many SMs and SMOs have long had a powerful and enduring impact on their own societies and often on global human society as a whole.

3. What are the main factors influencing success and impact of SMs/SMOs?

Both conventional political volunteering and social protest-activism are tools for development and, particularly, for responding to society's challenges and needs. Here, both political volunteering and social activism benefit not just the activist or political volunteer but also the community at large or sections thereof, facing disadvantage or discrimination. Thus, participation in political volunteering and social activism has noticeable impacts on both individual volunteers and communities or sections of a society, sometimes on the whole society (see prior section).

At the individual level, serving as a volunteer social activist can help people take their first step to long-term involvement in politics, development, and

eventually political engagement and participation. In a study of 19 European countries, Dekker, Koopmans and Van den Broek (1997) reported that involvement in formal voluntary associations was negatively related to participation in protests. Under repressive conditions (e.g., the recent Arab awakening), protests are a more common form of political participation, since the state can more easily intimidate individuals in organized groups than those in non-institutionalized situations.

Political volunteering provides leadership, defines areas for engagement, mobilizes individuals, and keeps social activism relevant to local communities. In societies with strong traditions of activism, perceived state transgressions are not tolerated as protesters soon pour into the streets in peaceful protest when more subtle means (e.g., town hall meetings, protest letters, and petitions) are ineffective. These forms of collective action create difficult uncertainties for those in political power, forcing them to respond to popular demands. In the process, social movement activism can help expand freedoms and challenge power structures in society.

There is ample evidence that, through volunteer engagement especially in social movements, citizens successfully carry out such tasks, even in situations of limited space for autonomous action and ability to critique the state. Social movements have been widely celebrated for their ability to put on the collective agenda issues considered irrelevant by mainstream institutions and to broaden and extend ideas of citizenship to groups formerly excluded. Examples forcing significant concessions and social change include the women's movement, civil rights movement, antiapartheid movement, and the recent Arab Awakening.

Here, the question arises as to how does the national political context shape these relationships? Whereas the political context is a key determinant of the type of volunteer activism that may emerge, Kenny (2003) argues that volunteerism is embedded in the idea of a liberal democratic society. Nonetheless, this view fails to acknowledge that certain forms of volunteerism such as political advocacy and social movement activism emerge in many parts of the world transitions from *oligopolistic authoritarian*ism to democratic rule. Indeed, even under totalitarian communist regimes of Eastern Europe, volunteering did not completely disappear. It was a disguised volunteer action that sustained the pro-democracy movements in those same countries (Chimiak 2006). Drawing further from examples of Spain and South Africa, Smith argues that certain forms of civic participation and political engagement thrive better under conditions of tyranny and adversity. Volunteerism is therefore not limited to liberal democratic societies. Even in democracies, movements use so-called extra-institutional means to achieve their objectives.

Protests and collective actions are more likely to take place in political contexts where opportunity for public consultation with the state remains low and/or ineffective or the institutions are highly mistrusted (Uslaner and Brown

2005). In such situations, collective discontent resorts to direct confrontations, sabotage, even damage to symbols of power of the targeted institutions, all in a quest to elicit responsiveness and raise the state's willingness to meet citizen needs (Mannarini, Legittimo, and Talò 2008). In a sense, protests have become the only language forcing state institutions to respond as seen in the volatile South African context. As a result, the present, a time of great mistrust of political institutions and their occupiers, is an age of riots and uprisings (Badiou 2012; Tarrow 1998). In China for instance, government estimates indicate that there have been more that 700,000 "collective incidents" (*quntixing shijian*) since the mid-2000s, while in South Africa, Bond (2010:1, cited in Mottiar and Fowler 2012) states that since 2005 there are over 8,000 Gatherings Act incidents per year.

4. What motivates and triggers individual involvement in SMs/SMOs?

To understand the role volunteers play in SMOs and activism, we must analyze the agency of volunteer activist leaders and social movements as social structure. Scholarship on the relationship between the two places agency (demonstrated by leadership and membership in social movements) is a key factor in generating social movements, as well as in their ongoing operations. Scholars such as Osaghae (2008), Tilly (2004), and Tarrow (1998) make this link in their analysis of the question *why* and *how* social discontents translate into collective action groups and social movements. For Osaghae (2008:195), the answer lies in a deeper analysis of the "historical context of the struggles, the social basis of the movements, the nature of leadership of the movements, how the constituency of interests is mobilized . . . ." Leadership therefore plays an indispensable role in the three distinct phases of a movement: incubation, action, and institutionalization (Katumanga 1999; Nasong'o 2007).

Activist volunteers, where their activism is strongly resisted by the government of their society, often risk life and limb, jobs/income, assets, and harm to family and friends (Grotz 2011). In such cases, commitment is central to a citizen's choice to participate in social activism and collective dissent. Stern et al. (1999:81) explain such commitment with the value–belief–norm theory of social movement support. Here, "individuals who accept a movement's basic values, believe that valued objects are threatened, and believe that their actions can help restore those values experience an obligation (personal norm) . . . ." Further, such individuals participate in collective action in the belief that their actions will deliver public good that may not necessarily be limited to their immediate small group. Thus, these activists are also led by broader altruistic concerns.

5. What starts SMs/SMOs?

Activist leaders are responsible for catalyzing collective discontent into social movements by providing "a body of organising principles and slogans around

which people are organized for action" (Nasong'o 2007:21) while "mobiliz[ing] resources and found[ing] organizations in response to incentives, risks, and opportunities . . . ." (Morris and Staggenborg 2004:173). These catalysts/"men and women of words" (Nasong'o 2004)/"social movement entrepreneurs" (McCarthy and Zald 1977) utilize their charisma, oratory capacity, and the power of written word, to publicise existing social dysfunctions and discontents of people and philosophize on how these can be fixed (Katumanga 1999). Social movement entrepreneurs seek to "undermine the existing belief systems and institutional arrangement while simultaneously promoting hunger for faith among masses" (Nasong'o 2007:21).

Moreover, activists must overcome existing patterns of resource inequality by accessing a range of resources from a variety of sources. They redirect those resources into coordinated action leading to social change (Edwards and McCarthy 2004). Volunteers and members play similarly diverse roles within the spectrum of SMOs. They range from the much-discussed "check-book," or paper, members who do no more than pay a membership fee and receive e-mail notifications to volunteers who make core decisions about organizational governance and strategy (Foley and Edwards 2002).

Even without strong social movement traditions in which protest actions are not specifically led in a sustained manner by a social movement, leadership is crucial. In China, for instance, collective resistance is often led by local leaders, who negotiate with authorities regarding further collective actions. These leaders are volunteers, and they allocate all sorts of voluntary tasks among the most engaged individuals. Such has been reported in the "popcorn protests" in South Africa. Everywhere these protests tend to be short lived, usually winding down after public resentment is addressed by establishing a formal or informal association to safeguard the fruit of the resistance.

Committed activists launch many of the dissent and activist organizations. These volunteers get the movement's actions under way by "taking the ideology and words of the ideologues and translating them into comprehensible terms for the masses in distress" (Nasong'o 2007:21). Committed activists help explain why some movements develop and others fail (McAdam 1982; Tilly 1977). They form the core of the organization with the highest levels of commitment and greatest sacrifice for the movement. They also appeal to outsiders, the "bystanders, conscience constituents . . . third parties . . . and the audiences who collectively comprise public opinion" supporting the movement (Downey and Rohlinger 2008:12).

6. Who gets involved in SMs/SMOs?

Volunteering and activism reflect individual choices and appeals at different times to people of different persuasions, demographics, gender, ethnicities, and religions. Despite these generalities, research has also shown that certain demographics (age, gender, socio-economic status) are more inclined to participate in

social movement activism than others (Mannarini, Legittimo, and Talò 2008). These authors argue that as people grow older, their interest in conventional politics and their willingness to take an active role increases. For them, young people are more likely to participate in militant protest politics because they have "progressively distanced themselves from the traditional channels of politics, and rejected party affiliation and voting as the main modes for actively participating" (p. 96).

Furthermore, Mannarini, Legittimo, and Talò (2008) citing literature from several Western democracies hold that women are also more likely to take part in unconventional forms of social activism than men. The same is true even in sub-Saharan African countries where, for instance, culture has been invoked in designing protest strategies. An example of this is a protest by elderly mothers of Kenyan political prisoners that started in March 1992. The Mothers of Political Prisoners, as a way of cursing the Moi/KANU state that had imprisoned their sons, resorted to publicly stripping naked after being violently attacked by police while protesting peacefully (Maathai 2006). In Egypt, the period leading to the January 25 Revolution witnessed an increase in volunteerism within associations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) such as Resala, a youth-led organization established in 1999 and currently operating in approximately 14 governorates, has 100,000 youth volunteers from across the country. According to a 2007–2009 field study by Ibrahim and Hunt-Hendrix (2011:4) of "youth-led social service organizations in Egypt," youth are carving out "safe spaces" of volunteerism and community service to practice citizenship while flying under the radar of state security. Volunteering was a pathway to practicing democracy in an undemocratic environment, thereby setting the stage for the mass mobilization seen in the Revolution.

For instance, social movement scholars such as Osaghae (2008), Buechler (2000), Gurr (1970), Davies (1962), and Geschwender (1968) argue that collective action results when people subjectively judge or perceive themselves as lacking resources enjoyed by a particular reference group in society. McCarthy and Zald (1977) add that social movements are more likely to emerge when individuals with grievances are able to mobilize sufficient resources to take action. For its part, activist volunteering, according to CIVICUS, IAVE, and UNV (2008:6), is driven by a "desire to help others . . . interest in changing policies, raising awareness and empowering disadvantaged groups. While these actions may be undertaken for a combination of reasons, altruistic as well as self-interests, what binds people together is the common desire to be active citizens - to give as well as trying to change the conditions producing human suffering."

Personality traits can also influence protest participation (Opp and Brandstätter 2010). For instance, Brandstätter and Opp (2014) did a panel study of a sample of citizens of Leipzig, Germany. From multivariate analyses, they

concluded that the tendency to participate in protest was positively affected by the Big Five traits of more openness to new experience, lower neuroticism, and lower agreeableness, plus an attitude variable, higher reciprocity orientation. These predictors could explain 35% of the variance in protest tendencies, showing that such predictors are quite important irrespective of demographic factors.

To the attitudinal and personality side of social movement involvement, we must add its structural counterpart. Four structural factors have long been seen to affect who participates and who does not: first is one's availability as this varies across the life course; second is having a history of prior activism; third is holding membership in non-movement organizations; and fourth is being in contact with a movement member.

Several decades of research on social movement involvement in North America and Europe highlight four structural facilitators of participation and activism (Brady, Verba, and Schlozman 1995; Norris 2002; Wiltfang and McAdam 1991). First, the likelihood of participation ebbs and flows over a lifetime, following the rhythms of everyday life especially the demands of work and family obligations. People who are young, single with no dependents tend to have fewer competing demands on their time and are thus more likely to participate in social movements. A similar pattern appears for some older individuals with grown children and fewer demands from work. Many key activists in the Southern civil rights movement in the United States during the 1950s and 1960s depended little on the local white power structure for their livelihoods. Thus, ministers, funeral home operators, beauty salon operators, and barbers were more likely to be public leaders than, for example, school teachers who risked losing their jobs if publically associated with the movement.

Second, people who participate in non-movement organizations/associations are more likely to participate in social movements, partly because they have been socialized into participatory norms and routines and are members of extensive social networks of communication (Smith et al. 1980:chapters 4, 5). Third, participation in non-movement groups increases one's likelihood of having prior contact with a movement activist or participant and thus of being invited to participate in movement activities. Finally, those with a prior history of social movement involvement are much more likely to participate in subsequent social movements (Morris 1984).

Faith and religiosity also play a crucial role in social mobilizations and whether people participate in social activism and protests. In Egypt, for instance, El Taraboulsi, Khallaf, and Farouky (2013:17) shed light on faith-based motivations behind volunteering. Although mosques and churches have always been involved in the mobilization of resources and giving, their role was unleashed during and after the intense days of the January 2011 Revolution. It also came hand in hand with an interfaith citizen movement that called

for solidarity of all Egyptians irrespective of religion to bring down autocracy and build an Egypt where citizens enjoy equal rights. With the Muslim Brotherhood coming to power, this movement has, however, been challenged. It is currently enmeshed in a dialectical battle over definitions of citizenship in the constitution and in the role of religion in the new Egypt.

Networks and socialization also pull people into or out of activism. Friends and family are especially influential. Being among them people develop an interest in or a cynicism toward either conventional or unconventional forms of participation. This comes through "sharing of opinions and gathering of information on politics and social life within one's own family, or within one's own circle of friends or peers, positively affects the likeliness to become actively involved in . . . the public sphere" (Mannarini, Legittimo, and Talò 2008:98; see also Verba, Sholozman, and Brady 1995).

Yet, these very same processes of socialization and strong social ties of family, friends, and neighborhood can, at times, inhibit participation through competing loyalties and conflicting identities. For example, marriages of many female leaders in local antitoxic waste and environmental justice movements in the United States have been strained as these activists have become publically identified with protest or advocacy against the employer of their husbands or extended family members (Edwards 1995). Similarly, participation in Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) activism and volunteering requires one to "come out" and publically embrace their sexuality. All too often this process causes rifts with immediate family members and other community attachments.

7. What are the main barriers or obstacles to SMs/SMOs?

The political context is crucial in determining opportunities and threats for growth of social movement activism (Tarrow 1998). Moreover, as already noted, the presence or absence of trust in a political system and its institutions determines the preference for conventional (e.g., participation in political party systems) or unconventional political participation (e.g., protests) (Mannarini, Legittimo, and Talò 2008). In China for instance, the failure of collective action resistance to crystallize into social movements is attributed to existing political structure and context. Grassroots NGOs, the main forms of social organizations, are highly alert and cautious about not being directly involved in collective actions or mass protests. Most volunteers for these prototype SMOs are victims themselves, families, friends, and people directly affected by the specific policies or failed projects who take high risks in participating in these protests.

8. How are SMs/SMOs and protests organized and coordinated?

Context matters in how protests and social movement activism is organized. In more open and democratic political systems, where the state tolerates

dissent, social movement activism and protest action is most likely to happen in non-clandestine ways. Political opportunity theorists argue that the mix of political opportunities and threats is a key condition favoring or hindering social movement emergence and mobilization (Tilly 1978; McAdam 1982). That said, even in constrained political environments, citizens still subvert the state and are able to organize protests. Such is premised on disruptive power that is ever present even in supposedly weak citizens (Piven 2008). The exercise of disruptive power requires innovations in organizing protests and social movements.

One dimension of this is the capacity of the subaltern class to organize among themselves into movements and build alliances with professional middle-class associations to challenge power elites. The Kenyan constitutional reform struggles exemplify such organizations and interclass alliances pushing for change (Mati 2012). The Arab awakening exhibited mobilizations from below as well as ties with middle-class professionals. In Egypt's Tahrir Square, Tunisia's Habib Bourguiba Avenue, and Libya's Martyrs' Square, for instance, as protests broke out, citizen activists were faced with escalating needs on the ground for food, shelter, and medicine. To meet them, they had to organize and mobilize themselves. In Tahrir Square, protestors divided themselves into taskforces, each focusing on a particular need, maintaining security within the square, providing food and shelter, and developing makeshift hospitals.

Such initiatives were later consolidated into organized popular committees, or *legan sha'beyya*, to protect neighborhoods and fill the vacuum left by the absent state. A survey of philanthropic practices in Egypt shows how the 18 intense days of the Revolution saw the emergence of ad hoc services that continued to grow steadily post Mubarak (El Taraboulsi, Khallaf, and Farouky 2013). Social media were crucial in networking and sustaining those services. Given the popularity of Internet and mobile-driven social media access, one of the most prevalent forms of volunteerism was the collection of donations through SMS, e-mail, Facebook, and/or Twitter campaigns circulated among friends, family members, and anyone with access to social media via a smartphone or an Internet-ready computer. In Libya, a case in point is Hanaa Habashi (Naomidea), who won an American prize as one of the world's most courageous women. Naomidea, using various means, acted as the world voice of the Libyan Revolution. Women were active in all fields: media, military, and humanitarian aid.[2]

The media have traditionally been a critical ally in social movement mobilizations, organization, and coordination. Most recently social movements and activist associations have turned to the Internet as a new strategy for mobilization and advocacy, to promote their causes (Earl and Kimport 2011; Hands 2011). These new media have contributed in many parts of the world to the expansion of democratic space and even the defeat of political regimes.

In Egypt, for instance, even before the 2011 "revolution" part of the mainstream media reported that volunteers were taking part in e-campaigns with an aim to shape public opinion and transform society, culture, and politics. An example of this is Waqfeyat al Maadi Community Foundation (WMCF), which was founded in 2007 to revive and modernize the institution of *Waqf* within the Egyptian society. During the 18 days of the Egyptian Revolution, the Foundation established itself as an open platform, where the youth of the popular committees (activist volunteers) could discuss needs, exchange ideas, and explore a path forward (El Taraboulsi, Khallaf, and Farouky 2013).

Sacred spaces such as churches, mosques, and temples have also been important over the years in mobilizing against repressive regimes in such countries as Kenya in 1990s (Mati 2012) and, most recently, during the Arab Uprising. In a report by the Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies on the role of religion in the Revolution, Khalil (2012) describes how "Egyptian mosques, as is the case of Syria and Yemen, were places for organization and mobilization" for the "disaffected and angry, places to assemble and protest" against the regime.

E. Usable knowledge

Volunteering and protest activism promote social change not only by "influencing political processes such as agenda-setting policy-making, decision-making and representation, but also because it can change relationships between people from different parts of society" (CIVICUS, IAVE, and UNV 2008:5). Indeed social activism is itself, a reading of a crisis of confidence with political institutions and power elites to lead. Nevertheless, in such situations, volunteering and activism may offer a way of reengaging citizens with the broader political process and even achieve fundamental changes in society (Smith 2017).

Social movement activism and participation often lead to the formation of enduring SMOs and less formal movement infrastructures of communication and social relations. The very existence of such movement social capital becomes a preexisting resource for subsequent movement mobilizations. Existing movement mobilizing structures enable communities to mobilize more quickly and easily for subsequent campaigns, protests, advocacy, and the like than would be the case were each new campaign to "start from scratch." Thus, the enduring structure of past social movements is a resource worth preserving for the broader community, which it may tap for any purpose, but especially for movement purposes.

A study of several developing countries by Huntington and Nelson (1976) reported that people involved in voluntary associations are up to five times more likely to make political demands than those without such membership. This is so because participation in social movement activism endows individuals with skills necessary for monitoring and opposing government

policies through collective mobilization and associational representation. This way social movements act as schools of democracy that "teach civic skills" and foster civic attitudes. It is worth emphasizing that social movement participation socializes volunteers, enhancing their capacity for citizen engagement in all the same ways attributed to more traditional forms of civic engagement.

F. Future trends and needed research

While political and social activists have managed to push for the frontiers of citizen participation in a variety of areas of human rights and social justice, there has been a growing trend of SM growth borne out of what Bond (2007) calls *elite pacting*. In the developing world, there has been a general decline in volunteer protest activism, especially with the *NGOization* of activism and participation, which equals to a few unaccountable NGO elites based on per diem solidarity (Tajudeen 2007) dominating the spaces for participation that ultimately lead to slippery paths for citizen participation. Moreover, in more politically closed regimes such as China, while the mushrooming of NGOs signals new avenues for engagement in the policy process, it is collective social mobilizations that appear to attract quicker state responses.

Moreover, the three-sector model of state, market, and civil society has lost (or is losing, if you prefer) its relevance as an analytic framework, though it remains useful as a heuristic for guiding discussion. Organizations, movements, and issue campaigns that span sectors or operate in all three sectors are blurring boundaries if not erasing them entirely. Such trends should be investigated empirically to see whether and if so in what ways social movement volunteering is actually different from "traditional" volunteering. Is voluntary action in pursuit of social justice through structural social change fundamentally different than the volunteering done in charity or community service?

Throughout the world, the lines between social movement activism and more communal forms of collective/associational endeavor are blurring rapidly, if not already gone. For example, in the United States, the second wave of the women's movement in the 1970s and 1980s established thousands of feminist and other women's organizations around the country. These functioned as alternative communities, alternative institutions, being created mostly to facilitate everyday life and not necessarily or primarily for "movement" purposes. Yet, these organizations and institutions built the movement and became launching pads for mobilizing issue campaigns. The same holds for the LGBT movement, which was community building since the late 1960s. The "alternative food" movements are another good example of actively engaging in state-oriented, market-oriented, and civil society–based activities and organization building.

Membership means many things to many nonprofit, advocacy, and SMOs (cf. Smith 2010). Generally, more is better, so groups seem to do what they

can to develop and/or claim larger memberships. Yet, in one representative sample of an SMO population (Edwards and Foley 2003; Foley and Edwards 2002), the investigators asked about what groups required of people to be *members*. They included about a dozen different criteria, among them, to pay dues, attend meetings, be on a mailing list, make organizational decisions, and vote for organizational leaders. These were factor analyzed into four or five distinct, empirical "definitions" of membership, including some SMOs with no members of any kind, only supporters. Clearly, we need to better understand empirically (quantitatively and qualitatively) what concepts such as membership and participation actually mean. And what is an SMO? There is no consensus in the literature. This chapter uses a definition that incorporates extra-institutional, or confrontational, tactics as a defining characteristic.

A substantive trend and very important research question concerns the relationship between "cyber activism" and "face-to-face" activism or what some are calling "in real time (IRT)" voluntary/movement activity and "in real life (IRL)" activity. To play devil's advocate, can one really mobilize a revolution with social media and smart phones? We think not, which is not to deny that they are very important, transformative new tools. But, we suspect that a search of historical records would yield equally rapturous discussions of the impact of international postal service by sailing ship.

Although social movement research has been a burgeoning growth area in the past couple of decades, there is still much more to be done (cf. Anderson and Herr 2007; Snow, Della Porta, Klandermans, and McAdam 2013; Snow, Soule, and Kriesi 2004). The many contributors to the book by van Stekelenburg (2013) have much to say about needed future research on SMs and SMOs, as do the concluding sections of the handbooks and encyclopedias just cited. The seminal research project of Gamson (1990) on the period of 1800–1945 in America particularly needs to be replicated for many or most nations of the world.

G. Cross-references

Chapters 23, 27, 32, and 33.

Notes

1. See *The Volunteering Compact Code of Good Practice* (2005), which identifies four principles fundamental to volunteering. These are choice, diversity, mutual benefit, and recognition (http://www.uhsm.nhs.uk/involvement/Documents/Volunteering%20compact%20code%20of%20good%20practice.pdf).
2. Interview with Hanaa Habashi by Waseela Awlamy. May 2012. http://www.aljazeera.net/programs/pages/308cd666-acff-41b6-924b-592c9018c6db.

H. Bibliography

Ackerman, Peter, and Jack DuVall. 2001. *A Force More Powerful: A Century of Non-Violent Conflict.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Amenta, Edwin, Neil Caren, Elizabeth Chiarello, and Yang Su. 2010. "The Political Consequences of Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology* 36:287–307.

Anderson, Gary L., and Kathryn G. Herr. 2007. *Encyclopedia of Activism and Social Justice*, 3 vols. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Anheier, Helmut, and Lester M. Salamon. 1999. "Volunteering in Cross-National Perspective: Initial Comparisons." *Law and Contemporary Society* 62:43–65.

Badiou, Alain. 2012. *The Rebirth of History: Times of Riots and Uprisings*. London: Verso.

Banaszak, Lee A. 1996. *Why Movements Succeed or Fail: Opportunity, Culture, and the Struggle for Woman Suffrage*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bond, Patrick. 2007. "Perils of Elite Pacting." *Critical Currents* 1:43–52. Retrieved from at: http://www.daghammarskjold.se/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/critical_currents_1_web.pdf (assessed April 7, 2013).

Boot, Max. 2013. *Invisible Armies: An Epic History of Guerrilla Warfare from Ancient Times to the Present.* New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, a Division of W.W. Norton & Company.

Brady, Henry, Sidney Verba, and Kay L. Schlozman. 1995. "Beyond SES: A Resource Model of Political Participation." *American Political Science Review* 89:271–294.

Brandstätter, Hermann, and Karl-Dieter Opp. 2014. "Personality traits ('Big Five') and the propensity to political protest: Alternative models." *Political Psychology* 35(4):515–537.

Brighton, Mark A. 2009. *The Sicarii in Josephus's Judean War.* Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.

Buechler, Steven M. 2000. *Social Movements in Advanced Capitalism: The Political Economy and Cultural Construction of Social Activism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Buechler, Steven M. 2011. *Understanding Social Movements: Theories from the Classical Era to the Present.* Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Burstein, Paul, and April Linton. 2002. "The Impact of Political Parties, Interest Groups, and Social Movement Organizations on Public Policy: Some Recent Evidence and Theoretical Concerns." *Social Forces* 81(2):380–408.

CIVICUS, IAVE, and UNV. 2008. *Volunteering and Social Activism: Pathways for Participation in Human Development.* Johannesburg, South Africa: CIVICUS.

Chimiak, Galia. 2006. *How Individuals Make Solidarity Work*. Warsaw, Poland: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy.

Danver, Steven L., ed. 2010. *Revolts, Protests, Demonstrations and Revolutions in American History.* Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.

Davies, James C. 1962. "Toward a Theory of Revolution." *American Sociological Review* 2:5–19.

Davis-Smith, Justin. 2001. "The Inflatable Log: Volunteering, the State, and Democracy." *Voluntary Action* 3:13–26.

Dekker, Paul, Ruud Koopmans, and Andries Van den Broek. 1997. "Voluntary Associations, Social Movements and Individual Political Behaviour in Western Europe." Pp. 220–240 in *Private Groups and Public Life*, edited by Jan W. van Deth. London: Routledge.

Downey, Dennis J., and Deana A. Rohlinger. 2008. "Linking Strategic Choice with Macro Organizational Dynamics: Strategy and Social Movement Articulation." *Research on Social Movements, Conflicts and Change* 28:3–38.

Earl, Jennifer, and Katrina Kimport. 2011. *Digitally-Enabled Social Change: Activism in the Internet Age*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Edwards, Bob. 1995. "With Liberty and Environmental Justice for All: The Emergence and Challenge of Grassroots Environmentalism in the USA." Pp. 35–55 in *Ecological Resistance Movements: The Global Emergence of Radical and Popular Environmentalism*, edited by Bron Taylor. Albany, NY: SUNY University Press.

Edwards, Michael, ed. 2011. *The Oxford Handbook of Civil Society*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Edwards, Bob, and Michael W. Foley. 2003. "Social Movement Organizations Beyond the Beltway: Understanding the Diversity of One Social Movement Industry." *Mobilization* 8:85–105.

Edwards, Bob, and John D. McCarthy. 2004. "Resources and Social Movement Mobilization." Pp. 116–152 in *Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, edited by D. Snow, S. Soule, and H. Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

El Taraboulsi, Sherine, Mahi Khallaf, and Naila Farouky. 2013. "Egypt." *Giving in Transition and Transitions in Giving: Philanthropy in Egypt, Libya and Tunisia 2011–2013*. Cairo: John D. Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic Engagement, American University in Cairo, May 2013.

Foley, Michael W., and Bob Edwards. 2002. "How Membership Counts: Membership and Governance in the Nonprofit Advocacy Sector." Pp. 19–32 in *Nonprofit Advocacy and the Policy Process*, vol. 2, edited by E. Reid, and M. Montillo. Washington, DC: Center for Nonprofits & Philanthropy, Urban Institute Press.

Gamson, William A. 1990. *The Strategy of Social Protest*. 2nd edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Geschwender, James A. 1968. "Explorations in the Theory of Social Movements and Revolutions." *Social Forces* 47:127–135

Giddens, Anthony. 1998. *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity.

Gillion, Daniel Q. 2013. *The Political Power of Protest: Minority Activism and Shifts in Public Policy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

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

Giugni, Marco. 2004. *Social Protest and Policy Change: Ecology, Antinuclear, and Peace Movements in Comparative Perspective*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Giugni, Marco, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly. 1999. *How Social Movements Matter*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Goldstone, Jack A. 1993. *Revolution and Rebellion in the Early Modern World*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Gurr, Ted R. 1970. *Why Men Rebel*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Grotz, Jurgen. 2011. Less Recognized Impacts of Volunteerism. Unpublished Background paper for State of the World's Volunteerism Report. Bonn, Germany: United Nations Volunteers.

Habib, Adam. 2008. "Speaking to Global Debates with a National Lens: South African Social Movements in Comparative Perspective." Paper Presented at the 8th ISTR International Conference, Barcelona, Spain, July.

Hands, Joss. 2011. *@ is for Activism: Dissent, Resistance, and Rebellion in a Digital Culture*. London: Pluto Press.

Heinrich, V. Finn, and Lorenzo Fioramonti, eds. 2008. *CIVICUS Global Survey of the State of Civil Society. Vol. 2: Comparative Perspectives*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. 1965. *Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movement in the 19th and 20th Centuries*. New York: Norton.

Huntington, Samuel P., and Joan M. Nelson. 1976. *No Easy Choice: Political Participation in Developing Countries*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ibrahim, Barbara L., and Leah Hunt-Hendrix. 2011. "Youth, Service and Pathways to Democracy in Egypt." *Voices on Philanthropy and Civic Engagement Series*. Cairo, Egypt: John D. Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic Engagement, American University in Cairo.

Jenkins, J. Craig, and Bert Klandermans, eds. 1995. *The Politics of Social Protest*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Katumanga, Musmbayi. 1999. *Civil Society and the Politics of Constitutional Reforms in Kenya: A Case Study of the National Convention Executive Council (NCEC)*. Nairobi, Kenya: SAREAT.

Kenny, Sue. 2003. "Constructions of Volunteerism in Third Sector Organisations: Some Comparisons." *Australian Journal of Volunteering* 8:15–22.

Khalil, Al-Anani. 2012. *The Role of Religion in the Public Domain in Egypt after the January 25 Revolution*. Qatar: Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies.

Kleidman, Robert. 1994. "Volunteer Activism and Professionalism in Social Movement Organizations." *Social Problems* 41(2):257–276.

Larana, Enrique. 1994. *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Lofland, John F. 1996. *Social Movement Organizations*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Maathai, Wangari. 2006. *Unbowed*. London: William Heinemann.

Mannarini Terri, Monica Legittimo, and Cosimo Talò. 2008. "Determinants of Social and Political Participation Among Youth. A Preliminary Study." *Psicología Política* 36:95–117.

Mati, Jacob Mwathi. 2012. "The Power and Limits of Social Movements in Promoting Political and Constitutional Change: The Case of the Ufungamano Initiative in Kenya (1999–2005)." PhD thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.

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

McCarthy, John D., and Meyer N. Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 82:1212–1239.

Meyer, David S. [2007] 2014. *The Politics of Protest: Social Movements in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Meyer, David S., Valerie Jenness, and Helen Ingram, eds. 2005. *Routing the Opposition: Social Movements, Public Policy, Protest, and Contention*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Minkoff, Debra C. 1995. *Organizing for Equality: The Evolution of Women's and Racial-Ethnic Organizations in America, 1955–1985*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Minkoff, Debra C. 1997. "Producing Social Capital: National Social Movements and Civil Society." *American Behavioral Scientist* 40(5):606–619.

Morris, Aldon D. 1984. *The Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Black Communities Organizing for Change*. New York: The Free Press.

Morris, Aldon, D., and Suzanne Staggenborg. 2004. "Leadership in Social Movements." Pp. 171–196 in D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, and H. Kriesi, eds. *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Mottiar, Shauna, and Alan Fowler. 2012. "Social Protest, Contentious Politics and 'Uncivil' Society in South Africa – Researching Processes and Outcomes." A Paper Presented at the Africa ISTR Network Workshop: Economic Spaces and Political Opportunities for African Civil Society Organisations. 9 July. Siena, Italy.

Musick, Marc, and John Wilson. 2008. *Volunteers: A Social Profile*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Nasong'o, Shadrack W. 2007. "Negotiating the Rules for the Game: Social Movements, Civil Society and Kenya's Transition." Pp. 19–58 in *Kenya: The Struggle for Democracy*, edited by G. R. Murunga and S. W. Nasong'o. Dakar, Senegal & London: CODESRIA/ZED Books.

Nolan, Patrick, and Gerhard Lenski. 2006. *Human Societies: An Introduction to Macrosociology*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Norris, Pippa. 2002. *Democratic Phoenix: Reinventing Political Activism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oberschall, Anthony. 1973. *Social Conflict and Social Movements*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

O'Neill, Michael. 2002. *Nonprofit Nation: A New Look at the Third America*, 2nd edition. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Opp, Karl-Dieter, and Hermann Brandstätter. 2010. "Political Protest and Personality Traits: A Neglected Link." *Mobilization: An International Quarterly* 15(3):323–346.

Osaghae, Eghosa, E. 2008. "Social Movements and the Rights Claims: The Case of Action Groups in the Niger Delta of Nigeria." *Voluntas* 19:189–210.

Piven, Frances F. 2008. *Challenging Authority: How Ordinary People Change America*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Powell, Walter W., and Richard Steinberg, eds. 2006. *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, 2nd edition. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Salamon, Lester M. 1999. *America's Nonprofit Sector: A Primer*, 2nd edition. New York: Foundation Center.

Salamon, Lester M. ed. 2012. *The State of Nonprofit America*, 2nd edition. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Salamon, Lester M., Sokolowski, S. Wojchiech, and Associates. 2004. *Global Civil Society: Dimensions of the Nonprofit Sector*, vol. 2. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian.

Schmid, Alex P. 2011. *The Routledge Handbook of Terrorism Research*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Shaw, Brent S. 2001. *Spartacus and the Slave Wars: A Brief History with Documents*. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Skrentny, John D. 2004. *The Minority Rights Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Smith, David H. 2000. *Grassroots Associations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Smith, David H. 2010. "Membership and Membership Associations." Pp. 982–990 in *International Encyclopedia of Civil Society*, edited by H. K. Anheier, S. Toepler, and R. List. New York: Springer.

Smith, David H. (forthcoming) 2017. "The Global, Historical, and Contemporary Impacts of Voluntary Membership Associations on Human Societies." *Voluntaristics Review: Brill Research Perspectives* 2(2).

Smith, David H., Jacqueline Macaulay, and Associates. 1980. *Participation in Social and Political Activities*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Smith, David H., Robert A. Stebbins, and Michael Dover. 2006. *A Dictionary of Nonprofit Terms and Concepts*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Snow, David A., Donatella Della Porta, Bert Klandermans, and Doug McAdam, eds. 2013. *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements*, 3 vols. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Snow, David A., Sarah A. Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi, eds. 2004. *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Staggenborg, Suzanne. 2010. *Social Movements*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Stern, Paul C., Thomas Dietz, Troy Abel, Gregory A Guagnano, and Linda Kalof. 1999. "A Value-Belief-Norm Theory of Support for Social Movements: The Case of Environmentalism." *Human Ecology Review* 6:81–97.

Tajudeen, Abdul-Raheem. 2007. "African WSF: It Was a Meeting of NGOs, Not the Masses." *East African Standard* January 28, 2007.

Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in Movement: Collective Action, Social Movements and Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, Rupert, ed. 2010. *Third Sector Research*. New York: Springer.

Tilly, Charles. 1977. *Studying Social Movements/Studying Collective Action*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

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

Tilly, Charles. 1996. *European Revolutions: 1492–1992*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Tilly, Charles. 2004. *Social Movements, 1768–2004*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Tilly, Charles, and Lesley J. Wood. 2008. *Social Movements, 1768–2008*, 2nd edition. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

UNDP. 2002. *Human Development Report 2002: Deepening Democracy in a Fragmented World*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Uslaner, Eric M., and Mitchell Brown. 2005. "Inequality, Trust, and Civic Engagement." *American Politics Research* 33:868–894.

van Stekelenburg, Jacquelien. 2013. *The Future of Social Movement Research: Dynamics, Mechanisms, and Processes*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Verba Sidney, Kay L. Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Voss, Kim, and Michelle Williams. 2012. "The Local in the Global: Rethinking Social Movements in the New Millennium." *Democratization* 19:352–377.

Wiltfang, Gregory, and Doug McAdam. 1991. "The Costs and Risks of Social Activism: A Study of Sanctuary Movement Activism." *Social Forces* 69:987–1010.

Zunes, Stephen, Sarah B. Asher, and Lester Kurtz, eds. 1999. *Nonviolent Social Movements: A Geographical Perspective*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.