

P2



HARVARD LIBRARY

Borrower: HLS**Lending String:** HLS**Patron:** Jones, Alison**Journal Title:** Methods of social movement
research**Volume: Issue:****Month/Year:** 2002 **Pages:** 201-230**Article Author:** Elisabeth S. Clemens, Martin
Hughes**Article Title:** Recovering past protest: historical
research on social movements**Imprint:****Special Instructions:**

Table of Contents

Title/Verso Page(s)

RAPID request held locally (Widener Library)**ILL Number: 5070308****Processing Notes:**☐ Not on Shelf☐ Other problem

(please explain why below)

Other Notes:

Initials: _____

Call #: HM881 .M475 2002**Location:** WID**ODYSSEY ENABLED****Borrowing Library:**

Harvard University - Widener Library

Email:**Notes:** RAPID request held locally (Widener
Library)

Transaction Date: 10/17/2018 8:18:40 AM

- ☐ Not as cited
- ☐ Duplicate
- ☐ Multiple articles
- ☐ Exceeds 10% of work
- ☐ Not on shelf
- ☐ On Reserve
- ☐ Too fragile
- ☐ Checked out/on hold
- ☐ Exceeds 100 pages

Interlibrary Loan



ILLiad TN: 5070502





HARVARD LIBRARY

Resource Sharing – Scan&Deliver
ILL@HARVARD.EDU

☐ Best copy available

☐ Item has tight binding

☐ Bibliography exceeds page scan limit

☐ No Table of Contents available

☐ No accompanying notes available

☐ No accompanying images/plates

☐ Other:

Copyright statement:

In providing the Scan & Deliver service, the Harvard University Libraries will responsibly administer Section 108(d) of Title 17, United States Code, and related subsections, including Sections 108(a) and (g).

Scan & Deliver requests should be for no more than:

- One article or other contribution to a periodical issue or copyrighted collection;
- One chapter or other small part of any other copyrighted work.

Consistent with Section 108, the purpose of the service is to provide a patron a copy of the requested material for *private study, scholarship, or research*. The service applies only to the *isolated and unrelated* reproduction of a single copy of the same material on separate occasions. It does not apply to the related or concerted reproduction of multiple copies of the same material (whether made at one time or over a period of time, and whether for use by one person or multiple people). Nor does it apply to the systematic reproduction of single or multiple copies.

This scan may not be used for course materials, including course reserves.

Scanned by:

AR

Date:

10/10/18

TN:

Social Movements, Protest, and Contention

Series Editor: Bert Klandermans, Free University, Amsterdam

Associate Editors: Ron R. Aminzade, University of Minnesota

David S. Meyer, University of California, Irvine

Verta A. Taylor, University of California, Santa Barbara

- Volume 16** Bert Klandermans and Suzanne Staggenborg, editors, *Methods of Social Movement Research*
- Volume 15** Sharon Kurtz, *Workplace Justice: Organizing Multi-Identity Movements*
- Volume 14** Sanjeev Khagram, James V. Riker, and Kathryn Sikkink, editors, *Restructuring World Politics: Transnational Social Movements, Networks, and Norms*
- Volume 13** Sheldon Stryker, Timothy J. Owens, and Robert W. White, editors, *Self, Identity, and Social Movements*
- Volume 12** Byron A. Miller, *Geography and Social Movements: Comparing Antinuclear Activism in the Boston Area*
- Volume 11** Mona N. Younis, *Liberation and Democratization: The South African and Palestinian National Movements*
- Volume 10** Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly, editors, *How Social Movements Matter*
- Volume 9** Cynthia Irvin, *Militant Nationalism: Between Movement and Party in Ireland and the Basque Country*
- Volume 8** Raka Ray, *Fields of Protest: Women's Movements in India*
- Volume 7** Michael P. Hanagan, Leslie Page Moch, and Wayne te Brake, editors, *Challenging Authority: The Historical Study of Contentious Politics*

For more books in the series, see page 355.

METHODS OF SOCIAL MOVEMENT RESEARCH

**Bert Klandermans and
Suzanne Staggenborg, Editors**

**Social Movements, Protest, and Contention
Volume 16**



University of Minnesota Press
Minneapolis • London

D-2C
7
1
-75
02

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

SEP 25 2002

Copyright 2002 by the Regents of the University of Minnesota

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

Published by the University of Minnesota Press

111 Third Avenue South, Suite 290

Minneapolis, MN 55401-2520

<http://www.upress.umn.edu>

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Methods of social movement research / Bert Klandermans and Suzanne Staggenborg, editors.

p. cm. — (Social movements, protest, and contention ; v 16)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-8166-3594-3 (HC : alk. paper)

ISBN 0-8166-3595-1 (PB : alk. paper)

1. Social movements. 2. Social movements—Research. 3. Social surveys. I. Klandermans, Bert. II. Staggenborg, Suzanne. III. Series.

HM881 .M475 2002

303.48'4'07—dc21

2002003435

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper

The University of Minnesota is an equal-opportunity educator and employer.

Contents

Preface	vii
Introduction	ix
<i>Bert Klandermans and Suzanne Staggenborg</i>	
Methods of Social Movement Research: From Micro to Macro	
1. Survey Research: A Case for Comparative Designs	3
<i>Bert Klandermans and Jackie Smith</i>	
2. Formal Models in Studying Collective Action and Social Movements	32
<i>Pamela E. Oliver and Daniel J. Myers</i>	
3. Verification and Proof in Frame and Discourse Analysis	62
<i>Hank Johnston</i>	
4. Semi-Structured Interviewing in Social Movement Research	92
<i>Kathleen M. Blee and Verta Taylor</i>	
5. Seeing Structure Happen: Theory-Driven Participant Observation	118
<i>Paul Lichterman</i>	
6. The Case Study and the Study of Social Movements	146
<i>David A. Snow and Danny Trom</i>	
7. Network Analysis	173
<i>Mario Diani</i>	
8. Recovering Past Protest: Historical Research on Social Movements	201
<i>Elisabeth S. Clemens and Martin D. Hughes</i>	

9. Protest Event Analysis	231
<i>Ruud Koopmans and Dieter Rucht</i>	
10. Macro-Organizational Analysis	260
<i>Debra C. Minkoff</i>	
11. Comparative Politics and Social Movements	286
<i>Donatella della Porta</i>	
Conclusion: Blending Methods and Building Theories in Social Movement Research	314
<i>Bert Klandermans, Suzanne Staggenborg, and Sidney Tarrow</i>	
Contributors	351
Index	357

Recovering Past Protest: Historical Research on Social Movements

Elisabeth S. Clemens and Martin D. Hughes

The past is full of protest, but only some protests have left footprints. Throughout the Middle Ages, Europe was swept by a series of popular religious mobilizations (Kaelber 1995; Ladurie 1978). We know something of this resistance to the Roman Catholic Church because it was persecuted as heresy. Villagers in the Ottoman Empire used the courts to articulate their grievances (Barkey and Van Rossem 1997), while English soldiers and merchants presented a stream of petitions to Parliament and demanded redress of their grievances (Zaret 1996). We can reconstruct these mobilizations because they produced official documents archived by government institutions. To a far greater extent than contemporary social movement research, historical research is shaped by the politics, practices, and events that selectively document protest.

Deprived of the opportunity to distribute a survey, conduct interviews, or embark on a spell of participant observation, researchers interested in social movements of the past must discover evidence originally collected by others and make that evidence speak to core theoretical questions. The questions that can be asked may be constrained by the material that is available for constructing answers. But despite the challenges of finding and mining evidence, the questions are vitally important: When and how and why have people resisted authority? What visions of other worlds and possible futures motivate challengers? How does social change happen?

For social movement researchers, the most basic question is whether social movements existed in past societies. If one takes some of the leading figures in the field literally, then historical research on social movements has

a horizon of only two centuries or so. Based on his studies of contention in France and England, Tilly argues that the "national social movement" was an innovation of the early nineteenth century (1995a: 61). Tarrow (1998: 2) concurs that "mounting, coordinating and sustaining [confrontations with elites, authorities, and opponents] are the unique contribution of the social movement—an invention of the modern age and an accompaniment to the rise of the modern state." Consequently, much research on past protest explores social formations that are not quite movements in the contemporary sense. But these conflicts and mobilizations reveal modern politics in the process of becoming.

In turning to the past, social movement research begins by questioning its core concept. Many of the basic elements of social movement theory have emerged from studies of particular places at particular times, most significantly, the advanced industrial democracies in the decades following World War II. Consequently these concepts are history-laden in ways that may not be evident until one ventures to apply them to protest in very different settings.¹ What is an opportunity in a polity where representative democracy is not yet even thinkable? What is a resource in a preindustrial society? For earlier periods, research on protest addresses events and processes that bear a family resemblance to contemporary social movements while lacking some defining features such as orientation to the state or modularity of the forms of protest.

A researcher looking for evidence of past protest with a checklist drawn from the present may easily miss—or misrepresent—evidence of other forms of resistance or mobilization. Rather than assuming that past protest took the same form as contemporary social movements, historical research should begin by identifying the distinctive components of "movement-like" processes: identities and networks, events and repertoires, grievances and frames, organizations and resources. Even when past protest diverges from the taxonomies of contemporary movement research, many of these constitutive elements will speak to basic theoretical questions. The challenge is to avoid anachronism, to apply contemporary concepts to past protest without ignoring the otherness of the past.

With these conceptual issues on the table, we turn to some of the nuts and bolts of historical research. How do you locate archives and other resources for historical research? How can one assess the authenticity, representativeness, and interpretation of historical documents? What are possible strategies for linking theoretical concepts and different kinds of evidence? Because there is no single "historical method," we survey exemplary studies that illustrate the creative and persuasive use of different kinds of evidence.

Whereas many of the other chapters in this volume present a specific method, this chapter provides a set of exemplars. Given a research question and available evidence, what combinations are possible?

In light of these challenges and possibilities, historical research on social movements is best approached with a measure of opportunism. The most careful research design may falter if the critical data cannot be located; innovative contributions often stem from unanticipated discoveries in the archives. Good historical research is essentially detective work; this chapter is intended to help researchers recognize when a clue is a clue.

Finding Sources

Assuming an interesting topic and a general theoretical question, the next challenge is to find out whether there is any relevant evidence. Begin by knowing enough about your topic to make effective use of these reference tools. In the relevant secondary literature, what are the key terms, places, and names? What are the major sources of evidence in published studies of the topic? If formal organizations were involved in protest, pull together a preliminary list. Do the same for individuals who seemed to have played an important role. Such basic preparatory work will facilitate a more effective search for available materials. Before committing to a specific research design, it is wise to get a sense of your options.

Although work in the archives is often the most fun, take some time to survey what can be gathered from standard sources used in other related research. Beyond a standard literature review on a particular topic, the constitutive components of past protest—organizations, individuals, events, and frames—provide a guide to research strategies based on primary documentation. Sources of evidence are inevitably peculiar to particular topics. In this discussion, we emphasize sources useful for research on U.S. history; for those embarking on research in other settings, this discussion may provide a checklist for scavenging the footnotes and methodological appendixes in other literatures.

Organizations

Organizations provide a useful starting point because they tend to produce documents (although this is far less likely under repressive regimes). To judge whether a project is feasible, you will want to know whether any of the organizations involved left records. Organizations that still exist—such as the Women's Christian Temperance Union or the American Federation of Labor—may have their own collections; contact information for associations in the United States is available in the *Encyclopedia of Associations*

(Gale). Documents produced by many associations, both defunct and ongoing, have been deposited in archives around the country. *ArchivesUSA* (Chadwyck-Healey; also available online in many research libraries) is a source for bibliographic records and indexes for approximately one hundred thousand archives and manuscript collections in the United States. The American Association for State and Local History publishes a directory of historical societies in the United States. For the old-fashioned bibliophile, the *National Union Catalog* (available in the reference section of many research libraries) is a valuable source for organizational records such as conference proceedings, serial publications, and official histories.

Organizational documents are often a treasure trove for research, but they may also omit or distort crucial information in order to present the organization more favorably, for the sake of present legitimacy or future legacy. For example, internal turmoil may be downplayed or excluded completely. The conference proceedings of nineteenth-century voluntary associations often printed only those resolutions that were adopted; defeated proposals left only a trace in the skipped numbering of resolutions (Clemens 1997). Consequently, researchers should be alert for signs of the internal politics of documentation as well as the (self-imposed) constraints associated with government surveillance or repression.

The fruitfulness of beginning with formal movement organizations is likely to decline as topics become more distant in time. Historically, the right of association or the ability to establish a durable formal organization has been tightly controlled under a wide variety of regimes. Consequently, the success of many studies of past protest will depend on finding evidence of the individuals and networks engaged in some form of contention.

Individuals

It is also possible to begin your search by following individuals. In some cases, organizational documents will provide a framework for research on individual activists; in the United States, for example, many movement organizations published lists of officers or members, souvenir volumes featuring prominent members, and obituaries. *ArchivesUSA* can be used to search for individual names; manuscript collections may include personal correspondence, published essays, newspaper clippings, and various memorabilia. When assessing such sources, remember that not everyone is an equally good or diligent correspondent; it is always possible that the most valuable troves will be found in the files of someone slightly off to one side of your investigation.

For relatively prominent individuals, published sources are also available:

Who's Who in America (Marquis), the *Dictionary of American Biography* (Scribner), and the *National Cyclopedia of American Biography* (White). The *Biographical and Genealogical Master Index* (Gale) acts as a search engine for these volumes as well as a number of others. Finally, the *New York Times Names Index* (1851–1974) and *Obituary Index* (1858–1968) are valuable sources for reconstructing careers of organization and activism. Research in other national settings can be aided by comparable sources (e.g., Stenton 1976).

It is likely, however, that only prominent leaders and political celebrities will be included in such volumes and sources. For the rank-and-file membership of social movements, consider genealogical records. The U.S. Genealogy Web Project (<http://usgenweb.org>), a free service maintained by a national network of volunteers, is an electronic gateway for genealogical research. Oral histories are another valuable resource. The Oral History Association (<http://omega.dickinson.edu/organizations/oha>) maintains a directory of oral history centers and collections. When relying on such sources and collections, be clear about the criteria that were used to compile a biographical dictionary or to invite individuals to produce an oral history. The categories employed in constructing these resources will shape what can be learned from them.

Beyond these resources compiled by researchers and associations, a wide variety of historical records can be treated as sources of individual-level data. In Europe, historical demographers have made extensive use of parish records; Bearman and Deane (1992: 35) explore the links between social mobility and radicalization using “a register reporting the occupations of the 7,654 men who, from 1548 to 1689, obtained the freedom of the city of Norwich.” Note that in both these cases, evidence is available because some institution—itself potentially the target of protest—created a list or registry. Consequently, the forms of resistance and precursors of protest that are generated in “hidden spaces” (Scott 1990) rarely leave traces recoverable by researchers—and then often only in police files or the reports of spies. Given the limited evidence of the private or covert side of protest, much historical research focuses on those moments when protest becomes public.

Events and Outcomes

Whereas tracing organizations and individuals focuses on the movement itself, other research strategies mine the intersection of protest with important institutions: the press and the government. Newspapers, whether a local “sheet” or a “newspaper of record,” are a staple for research on past protest. Many research libraries have microfilmed holdings of some newspapers. The

New York Times is among the most widely available and is, conveniently, indexed from the 1850s. Other guides to newspaper holdings include the *History and Bibliography of American Newspapers, 1690–1820* (American Antiquarian Society 1947) and *American Newspapers, 1821–1936: A Union List of Files Available in the United States and Canada* (H. S. Wilson 1937). For periodicals, see the *Union List of Serials in Libraries of the United States and Canada*.

All the problems of selection bias widely discussed in contemporary research (McCarthy, McPhail, and Smith 1996) are as great—and probably even greater—for earlier periods. In the United States, most nineteenth-century newspapers were explicitly partisan and cannot be read as even attempting to produce an objective record of “all the news that is fit to print.” This partisanship can be turned to advantage, however, by reconstructing the multiple claims and frames linked to different political camps (Ellingson 1995).

Reconstruction of past protest can also begin at the state. In some cases—notably in France—a highly developed system of government surveillance has left a rich lode of records on protest and subversion (Gould 1995; Tilly 1986). In the United States, police records are less centralized and accessible (although they have been used in rich studies of crime, vagrancy, and domestic abuse), but movement outcomes may be addressed through evidence of legislation or court challenges. At this time, the Library of Congress, the world’s largest library, is making increasing portions of its holdings available electronically; the National Archives and Records Administration, which houses documents from all three branches of the federal government, is in the midst of a similar process. States and localities are also expanding their electronic presence, although the lower the level of government, the more uneven the progress. In many cases, old-fashioned library work will still be in order, starting with the designated “federal depository” in each state (often the main university library), which should have holdings of state legislation and legal proceedings for most of the twentieth century.

Government documents and newspapers have distinctive advantages and disadvantages. The former include the consistency and range of data gathered every year, every decade, or at every occurrence of a particular type, such as a strike or an arrest. So long as one checks that data collection procedures have not changed significantly over time, these sources provide rarely rivaled sequences of evidence over time. For example, 150 years of data from the U.S. Census is now available from the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series. This advantage, however, brings with it potential dangers. Government agencies and newspapers collect and publish data in accordance with their

own interests and their own procedures. Although official documents are often the best sources of systematic evidence, a researcher must always ask who collected the data, by what procedures, and for what purposes?

Evaluating Evidence and Interrogating Sources

The preceding discussion of sources has been full of caveats. Documentary research requires particular attention to questions of authenticity, representativeness, genre, and interpretation (for an excellent discussion, see Platt 1981). To the extent that challenges involve claims-making, the resulting documents must be read as arguments rather than “objective” representations. Much of the available evidence is the product of the targets of protest, a problem that increases with distance from the present. Religious authorities documented heresy trials; judicial authorities produced records of arrests, trials, and executions. Public expressions of grievances were often carefully tailored to evade censors and repression. Other sources of evidence may be colored by the perceptions of earlier commentators or the conventions of genres such as newspapers. The capacity to create and to preserve documents was typically more closely held by elites than in many contemporary societies. And when an individual account of resistance is preserved, the absence of formally recognized organizations makes it difficult to link the statements of a single person to some broader pattern of subversion or mobilization.

The danger lies in reliance on a simple “reflection” model that takes a text or account as evidence of what “really” happened or what people “really” believed or how society “really” was. Inasmuch as archives are collections of cultural artifacts, historical research should attend to issues developed in the sociology of culture. As the art historian Michael Baxandall explains, “The maker of a picture or other historical artefact is a man [or woman] addressing a problem of which his product is a finished and concrete solution. To understand it we try to reconstruct both the specific problem it was designed to solve and the specific circumstances out of which he was addressing it” (1985: 14–15). Religious authorities are trying to solve a problem with a heresy trial; the resulting documents are shaped by the institutional politics of the church, by the conceptions of orthodoxy, by established conventions of argument, and so on. Newspapers present “stories” that are shaped by events, interpretations of events, journalistic conventions, assessments of what will attract audiences and please powerful sponsors. Contemporary evidence, of course, is beset by similar problems. But to the extent that we study social movements in our own society in our own time, we are less likely (although not guaranteed) to make howling errors in our assumptions about evidence.

When research relies on documents produced by others for other purposes, it is particularly critical to be skeptical. First, is a document authentic? Look for evidence of authorship, the circumstances of production, and the typical features of a document produced in that particular time and place. Is it credible? (Platt 1981; for an extended treatment of the use of evidence in historical description, see McCullagh 1984). Even if the author was an eyewitness, he or she may have been unreliable or intentionally deceptive. Who was the intended audience, and what were the conventions of a particular genre—letter, petition, public speech? What seems surprising to a modern reader may have been utterly predictable to a member of the intended audience; similarly, contemporary researchers may well fail to be surprised by what is most novel or unusual in a particular document. Questions of authenticity, credibility, genre, and representativeness are central to the craft of the historian, and historical sociologists are now expected to meet their fellow discipline's standards of research.

Historical sociologists also face particular challenges with respect to interpretation and theoretical explanation. While questions of the completeness and representativeness of archival holdings are a major concern for research designs that involve counting events or mapping ties, analyses that address meanings and motives face challenges more closely linked to the sociology of culture. In a virtuoso essay, "Workers Revolt: The Great Cat Massacre of the Rue Saint-Séverin," Darnton (1985) elegantly dissects one particular text: a former apprentice printer's memoir of a particularly gruesome joke played on his master and the master's wife some two or three decades earlier. Darnton transforms one text infused with particularities into a window on the past by locating the memoir's specifics in historical knowledge of broader fields of practice: patterns of conflict among apprentices, journeymen, and masters; the state of the eighteenth-century printing industry; and the peculiar uses of cats in early modern festivities and rituals. This strategy does not rest on the "representativeness" of the document (for this is a rather extraordinary memoir) but rather on the consistency of the account with knowledge derived from many other sources.

Of course, virtuoso performances are often poor exemplars for discussions of methods—one is a virtuoso or one isn't. In a discussion of methodology in the sociology of culture, Griswold (1987) offers a more attainable guide for the interpretation of cultural objects. Cultural objects, including archival documents, may be *comprehended* in light of the "symbols, patterns of symbols or relations, and formal structures" (24) that characterized the context of production or reception by some audience. An abolitionist pamphlet is to be comprehended in terms of antebellum constructs of race, reli-

gion, and rights, not in those of a post–civil rights researcher. The cultural object may then be *explained* with reference to the agent, to the mentality or situation of the social group(s) to which the agent belongs, and, finally, to social and cultural experience both proximate and remote (23). Appropriated by historical sociologists, this methodology provides a discipline for ensuring that you understand your sources.

Bearing these challenges of documentary research in mind, one can find much in the archives to illuminate key theoretical concerns in social movement research. In the sections that follow, we survey how social movement researchers have located and analyzed data relevant to a series of core theoretical concepts: identities, networks, and careers; events and repertoires; resources and organizations; framing; movement attributes and outcomes; and social change.

Linking Theory, Concepts, and Evidence

Social movement theory offers a rich selection of theoretical concepts linked to particular units of analysis. Consequently, the process of developing a research design is inevitably iterative: given the questions that you want to ask, is there evidence to answer them? Given the evidence available in the archives (see Figure 8.1), what sorts of theoretical questions can be addressed? Of the various methodologies surveyed in this volume, which can be adapted for historical or archival research? Although one cannot interview the dead or expect them to return completed surveys, many of the standard questions on those instruments can be answered using archival evidence. Although participant observation strategies are obviously precluded, to what extent can one make use of first-person accounts found in letters or diaries? In the discussion that follows, we identify exemplars of historical research that link diverse sources of evidence to the constitutive elements of past protest: identities, networks, and careers of activism; protest events and repertoires; resources and organizations; and framing and grievances.

Identities, Networks, and Careers of Activism

One of the most basic questions in social movement research is, Who participates? This question calls for individual-level evidence that is rare in newspaper accounts, which are as likely to invoke a collective actor—“farmers” or “metalworkers”—as to enumerate specific individuals with identifiable social characteristics. To answer the question of participation, some researchers have turned to documents produced by movement organizations themselves. Membership lists provide a starting point for names and sometimes additional information such as occupation or residency (Schwartz 1976). In

Identities, Networks, and Careers of Activism

Organizational archives	Rosenthal et al. 1985, on joint membership Anheier and Neidhardt 1998, on membership
Government documents	Gould 1995, on arrest records for participation and marriage certificates for network ties
Newspapers	Clemens 1999, on obituaries for careers
Biographical dictionaries	Clemens 1999, on careers of activism

Protest Events and Repertoires

Newspapers	Tilly 1995a; Fransozi 1987, 1998 (both for protest events)
Organizational archives	Kniss (1997: 197–202), for conflict events Clemens 1997, on convention proceedings for repertoires
Government documents	Shin 1998, on agrarian tenancy disputes Munger 1991, on litigation as a tactic

Framing and Grievances

Newspapers	Babb 1996; Gould 1995
Government documents	Barkey and Van Rossem 1997, on court cases Markoff 1996, on <i>cahiers de doléance</i>
Organizational archives	Brustein 1996, on party platforms

Organizations and Resources

Organizational archives	Aminzade (1993: 75), on budgets Banaszak (1996: 74–81) Clemens (1997: 90), on budgets Conell and Voss 1990, on organizational forms Redding 1992, on size
-------------------------	---

Figure 8.1. Linking concepts and evidence: exemplary studies.

some cases, membership followed an application process, and surviving documents can provide much richer information about individuals, their history of other memberships or activism, and the identity of their sponsors for membership. Anheier and Neidhardt (1998) constructed a rich portrait of members of the Nazi party in Munich based on newly available membership archives. In other cases, membership lists may provide only names, but these can then be used to link membership to information in municipal directo-

ries, biographical dictionaries, *Who's Who*, other membership lists, and virtually any other source of data at the level of individual participants. Given that such sources are more likely to provide information on social elites, this has been a particularly effective strategy for reconstructing the social identity of a movement's leadership (Beisel 1997: 49–53; Schwartz 1976: 116).

By tracing these linkages across social identities, the analysis of individuals who participate can lead to an examination of the social networks that sustain participation and mobilization. In some cases, individual-level data can reconstruct interorganizational ties and the migration of activism across movements and through individual careers. In research on the U.S. woman suffrage movement, Rosenthal and colleagues (1985, 1997) exploited the organizational convention of publishing membership lists. Given that many nineteenth-century associations compiled such lists, the joint membership of individuals in organizations can be used to reconstruct the interorganizational field of the woman suffrage movement. To the extent that the same individuals belonged to both the Women's Christian Temperance Union and the suffrage organization, those organizations are held to be closely tied to one another, and the changing strength of interorganizational ties can be traced over time.

To reconstruct movement networks, Clemens (1999) exploited organizational documents in a different way. Over the course of the struggle for the vote, suffrage leaders documented their own efforts and accomplishments. Of the six volumes that resulted, two include reports on activities in each of the different states. Using these reports to construct a concordance of names, Clemens constructed a list of active suffragists; some, however, are never mentioned elsewhere in the official narrative of the movement since they had been effectively purged, usually for excessive partisanship or inappropriate behavior. In this way, the movement's own documents can be used to reconstruct the divergence of patterns of activism from the "official story" of the winning faction. Supplemented by evidence from biographical dictionaries, newspapers, and archives, this collective biography of activists also uses the principle of "joint membership" to document how the suffrage movement was embedded in a broader organizational field and how that embedding contributed to patterns of movement schism and decline.

In the absence of evidence of "individual joint membership," diverse indicators of social connectedness can be aligned to suggest the interlocking networks that generated activism. Gould's (1995) study of Paris during the 1848 revolution and the Commune of 1871 exemplifies the creative pursuit of this approach. Individual records of membership in the National Guard or arrest provide evidence of where participating individuals lived. To assess

what types of social networks organized these neighborhoods, Gould sampled marriage licenses, which required a number of witnesses, each also identified by residence. Adding evidence on occupation gathered from these records and other directories, Gould concludes that in some neighborhoods individuals were embedded in occupation- or trade-based networks that crossed neighborhoods, while others (those most involved in the uprisings) were more likely to be embedded in cross-class networks within a neighborhood. The two sources of evidence are linked by claims of typicality; given that most residents of a neighborhood were married in front of witnesses with diverse class backgrounds, residents of the same neighborhood would be mobilized into politics through economically diverse networks. These claims were then tested against individual accounts drawn from trial records, newspaper reports, and other sources of evidence. Resting on the dogged construction of systematic evidence for quantitative analysis, Gould's argument also invokes criteria of triangulation and sufficiency in order to test his interpretation.

For the more recent past, the absence of extensive membership lists or individual records can be circumvented in additional ways. In *Women of the Klan* (1991: 4–5), Blee combined evidence of individual participation gleaned from organizational records, from obituaries, and from interviews generated by public notices and connections with local historical societies. As this tool kit of research strategies suggests, however, one of the key factors that distinguishes historical research on social movements is the difficulty of collecting systematic individual-level data. Consequently, whereas much contemporary research has focused on processes of micromobilization, historical research has tended to emphasize dimensions of social movement activity that are more readily available in archival sources, notably protest itself.

Protest Events and Repertoires

In important respects, social movements are like icebergs with much of the action happening below the surface. This is particularly true of past movements that developed in societies lacking rights of association or petition, in regimes that actively suppressed political challenge and protest. But because the authorities were troubled by protest, they tended to keep track of it. Consequently, one extremely productive strategy has been to reconstruct social movements by tracking *protest events*, the moments when movements break through the veils of conspiracy and private grievances into public protest (for a more extensive discussion, see the chapter by Koopmans and Rucht, this volume).

Exemplified by the work of Tilly, this strategy builds on institutionalized practices of recording protest events. In a setting with a well-developed press, the media provide one source of such accounts. To trace the transformation of popular contention in Great Britain, Tilly and colleagues created data sets by coding "contentious gatherings" mentioned in a number of publications as well as in parliamentary records (1995a: 393–405). For other settings, notably France (Tilly 1986), police and judicial archives have been mined to reconstruct a record of extralegal, or at least disruptive, protest. Barkey and Van Rossem (1997) argue that court cases were an important form of contention in the Ottoman Empire and used judicial records to reconstruct both the social identities and grievances that typified struggles over economic development. Munger (1991) used court cases to illuminate the grievances and tactics of coal miners in West Virginia. Shin (1998) relied on government documentation of agrarian conflicts in Korea.

Reliance on either newspapers or government documents offers the benefit of relatively consistent documentation of protest; both sources pose the challenge of interpreting the evidence in light of the institutional biases in documentation. For news publications, what constitutes a "newsworthy event" (Franzosi 1987; Gitlin 1980: 27–30), and how do these cultural understandings shape the silences and emphases of the records left for historical researchers? In the case of official police archives, how did the interests and ideologies of state actors shape when action was deemed "illegal" and how it was understood?²

With protest event or court case data in hand, one can ask a number of different questions. One line of research addresses the composition of the population of events: what forms of contention (Tilly 1995a), grievances and targets (Markoff 1986), or tactics (Munger 1991) predominate? How do these patterns of protest change over time? These questions speak to the core understanding of the development of the form of the social movement as a part of the process of social change that also produced capitalism and modern nation-states. Records of protest events provide one tool for reconstructing *repertoires* of protest or organization. In cases where movements themselves published newspapers or convention proceedings, these documents provide evidence of which tactics and models were *considered* as well as actually deployed: "A close reading of such proceedings reveals two sets of available models: those already used by group members (or traditionally identified with 'this sort of group') and those used by other groups in society. Both are analytically important. First, familiar models were one way in which a group defined its identity, both for its own members and for others. Second, the known but not yet used organizational models were both recipes

for innovation and symptoms used to diagnose social problems" (Clemens 1997: 60).

A second approach explores the ecological covariates of protest (e.g., Soule 1992): what are the economic or demographic or cultural characteristics of communities or districts where protest is more or less frequent? In this case, the research design is often doubly dependent on institutionalized practices of documentation, for both the event data and for the statistics compiled by government agencies.

A further, potentially complementary strategy mines the event data for more information about the character and unfolding of protest itself. Markoff (1986) coded the character of protest in revolutionary France, finding that mass literacy is not associated with the frequency of revolt but with its targets. Both Tilly (1995a: 87–105) and Franzosi (1989, 1998) exploit the narrative structure embedded in accounts of protest: *who* (workers, peasants, etc.) engaged in *what action* (petition, food riot, etc.) directed at *what target* (parliament, employers, etc.). Examining lynching in the American South, Griffin (1993) analyzed the "event-structure," or sequence of particular actions, of a narrative to develop a generalizable causal interpretation. Through these methods, data on events can do much more than track the incidence of protest. Event data can reconstruct the relational and temporal dynamics of protest and response.

Whereas event data focus research on the sporadic eruptions of protest into public visibility, this turn to the processual dimensions of protest raises questions about the mobilization of insurgency, the organization of challenges, and the framing of grievances. To address these issues, historical research turns to strategies different from the analysis of protest events.

Resources and Organizations

Membership lists cross levels of analysis: they provide evidence of individual participation but also document the role of formal organization in the mobilization of protest. Where individual-level data are either unavailable or hopelessly unsystematic, organizational evidence can provide the foundation for historical research on social movements. As with government documents and newspaper reports, however, organizational documents (or their absence) should not be interpreted uncritically. In many cases, oppositional politics takes the form of protest precisely because the rights of association are severely limited and, at times, entirely suppressed. Under such conditions, extensive organization may fuel mobilization without leaving a trace in the archives; secret societies are an important element in the history of organized protest. Finally, even where the right of association is guaranteed,

movement organizations may seek to hide information about their assets or activities from the authorities. Organizational documents tend to reflect the perspective of the movement leadership and may suppress internal debates or purge dissidents and losers from the official history of the movement (Clemens 1999). Consequently, such sources will tend to overstate the degree of consensus within movement organizations.

With these caveats in mind, organizational evidence provides some of the most fertile material for the historical analysis of social movements. In addition to the membership data discussed earlier, organizational documents can illuminate many issues theoretically central to social movement research: the mobilization of resources (McCarthy and Zald 1977), the perception and exploitation of opportunities (Banaszak 1996), and the repertoire or deployment of frames (Snow et al. 1986) and organizational forms (Buechler 2000: 204–9; Clemens 1996).

Perhaps the most prominent line of research asks about the consequences of the presence (and sometimes the size or resources) of organizations for either the formation or outcomes of social movements. In a study of a nineteenth-century labor association, the Knights of Labor, Conell and Voss (1990) explore how variations in local labor organizations (“trade” versus “mixed” or quasi-industrial) influenced subsequent mobilization into the Knights of Labor. Their analysis combined organizational evidence published by a historian with demographic and economic data available from the U.S. Census and other government studies. Exploring the consequences of the presence of an organized Farmers Alliance on voting for the People’s Party in North Carolina in the 1890s, Redding (1992) similarly combined organizational data drawn from the Alliance’s own records with demographic, economic, and electoral data collected and published by government agencies.

The proliferation of studies on nineteenth-century France, Britain, and the United States is not accidental. These analyses rest on multiple processes of archiving evidence that researchers deem reliable: organizational archives, government documents, and other public sources such as city directories. As always, the quality of historical research turns on the researcher’s judgments about the quality and character of evidence.

Framing and Grievances

Inasmuch as archives shelter cultural artifacts, historical researchers frequently pursue cultural analyses of movement activity. In recent years, “framing” (Snow et al. 1986) has been among the most important theoretical guides to such research. Drawing on Goffman (1974), the core argument is that frames

constitute “‘schemata of interpretation’ that enable individuals ‘to locate, perceive, identify, and label’ occurrences within their life space and the world at large. By rendering events or occurrences meaningful, frames function to organize experience and guide action, whether individual or collective” (Snow et al. 1986: 464). This theoretical orientation has an affinity with methods of literary analysis long used to interpret texts: analyzing narratives, tropes, images, and metaphors. With a few exceptions (e.g., Ansell 1997; Ellingson 1995), however, social movement researchers have emphasized the presence/absence of key themes and arguments rather than appropriating more complex forms of literary interpretation.

In a study of the U.S. greenback movement, Babb (1996) provides an exemplary combination of frame analysis and the construction of a quantitative data set. Unlike many early modern mobilizations where evidence was produced largely by the targets of protest, the greenbackers organized in a society characterized by universal male suffrage (outside the South), relatively high literacy, and a vibrant newspaper industry. In this case, analysis can be based on documents produced by members of the movement (if disproportionately by leaders and the more literate) and largely for the members of the movement. Babb focused on two newspapers, the *Workingman's Advocate* and the *National Labor Tribune*, that are recognized by historians as important publications of the labor movement in the decades after the Civil War.

In this case, the problems of “representativeness” are different from those faced by contemporary researchers relying on the *New York Times* for a record of protest events; these earlier newspapers were explicitly allied with a cause rather than aspiring to “objectivity.” Babb began with orienting themes related to political cleavages and programs; using these as guides, she identified a total of almost 250 relevant articles. Articles were coded by content: by the invocation of identity, either of the enemy or the movement/author; by the definition of problems and proposed solutions. Her analysis then focused on responses to “anomalies” or exceptions to the ideologies of labor-greenback advocates; the result is a rich illumination of the interplay of events and frames, of the robustness of frames in confrontation with evidence or experience.

This systematic approach to frame analysis depends on a particular set of historical conditions: relatively continuous publication by the same sources in a relatively open polity. Working with more diverse sources—pamphlets, newspapers, records of meetings—and a more contested polity, Gould employed a threshold criterion to identify salient frames in a series of contentious mobilizations in Paris: “it would not be terribly useful to go further and present a systematic accounting of the locutions used in public dis-

course in 1848, 1871, and the intervening years, even if such an enterprise were practical. The reason is that appeals based on a specific collective identity need not numerically swamp other sorts of appeals to be regarded as significant for mobilization: what is necessary is that they be sufficiently widespread to make plausible the claim that large numbers of people might have responded to them" (1995: 31). Such arguments rest on the researcher's documentation of a wide, at times exhaustive, reading of available sources; this wide reading undergirds claims to expert interpretation (Carruthers and Babb 1996).

Here again, it is critical that any analysis of frames rest on an appreciation of the social organization of cultural production and reception (Griswold 1987). Elite representations of workers' motives are evidence—indeed important evidence—of something, but they are not an unproblematic documentation of the grievances or narratives that fueled participation in popular protest. An individual diary or testimony may or may not illuminate "typical" understandings of the situation; this depends on the ways in which the individual author was "typical" of his or her times. In such cases, criteria of dependability and triangulation developed by qualitative researchers (Erlandson et al. 1993: 28–35) are useful guides to deciding when a judgement of what is "typical" is warranted.

To gain more leverage on the variation of frames over time and between places, many historical researchers have turned to creative uses of comparison: across time periods, across groups, across settings, and across conflict events.³ Gould's elegant study of insurrections in nineteenth-century Paris is organized around a comparative question: "the very clarity and robustness of the class awareness permeating the events of 1848 make its faintness in 1871 a puzzle in need of resolution" (1995: 4). In a comparison of nineteenth-century labor movements in the United States and Britain, Voss (1996) suggests that differences in "fortifying myths" can explain why models of organizing used in a first wave of mobilization were not revived in the United States but were resurrected in Britain a few decades later. Banaszak (1996) uses a comparison of the U.S. and Swiss movements for woman suffrage to isolate causally important differences in the opportunities—and perceptions of opportunity—that distinguished the early success of the former from the belated enfranchisement of Swiss women. In all these examples, the argument rests on comparisons in the set of frames—dominant, typical, or simply present—that characterized movement mobilization and conflict in different times or settings.

Other studies hold time and place constant in order to gain leverage from comparisons across groups or social settings. In a comparative study of

labor, agrarian, and women's organizations at the turn of the twentieth century, Clemens (1997: 59–62) relies on extensive readings of convention proceedings, movement publications, and archival sources to identify the distinctively different ways in which members of these groups tended to answer the question, How shall we organize? Based on patterned relationships between the “organizational repertoires” of different kinds of political challengers and the kinds of political outcomes these challengers secured, she argues that understandings of legitimate models of mobilization had important consequences for trajectories of institutional change.

Focusing on the employers of the same period, Haydu (1999) argues that a “case for frame correspondence requires demonstrating that some of the same individuals and organizations were active on multiple fronts, shaping managerial, civic, and status group identities. Such personal and organizational networks provide mechanisms for harmonizing frames across institutional spheres. They also render more plausible the claim that specific frames prevailed in fighting unions *because* they replicated those deployed in other battles” (1999: 319). Although in this particular study Haydu relies on a thick analysis of primary and secondary historical sources, this argument could easily inform a systematic design contingent on the existence of evidence for a matrix of multiple individuals or organizations participating in multiple conflicts (Clemens 1996, 1997).

A further approach to frame analysis involves tracking changes in episodes or moments within a sequence of conflicts. As in Babb's study of the labor-greenbackers, Ellingson (1995) relies on nineteenth-century newspapers to document the discursive struggle over slavery and antiabolition violence in antebellum Cincinnati. This research addressed “three discrete periods of public debate . . . separated by two episodes of collective violence. . . . After each episode, speakers altered their discourses by framing new diagnoses and solutions according to the real and perceived outcomes of collective violence and formed new discursive alliances in order to gain legitimacy and support for their positions” (1995: 115–16). Complementing Haydu's research on the consistency of frames across settings, Ellingson demonstrates how events changed the frames deployed by the same (collective) actors across a series of conflicts.

In her study of the anti-vice movement in three nineteenth-century American cities, Beisel (1997) uses a still finer-grained approach. Here the goal is to delineate what was at stake in a conflict for different contenders, what precisely constituted vice or a threat to the virtue of American children? Were museum exhibitions of paintings of nude women pornography? Etchings of paintings of nude women? Photographs of such paintings? Or

what of photographs of nudes themselves? Through close comparison of the controversy around different methods and venues of presentation, Beisel specifies the specific understandings of the problem of vice that motivated participants in the anti-vice movements of the time.

Finally, some studies have harnessed frame analysis to the questions of network-based mobilization that motivate many individual-level studies. In the absence of evidence on individual-to-individual ties or comemberships, Ansell (1997) demonstrates how distinct discourses mobilized and realigned French labor organizations in voting to support a general strike in 1894.

From Movement Attributes to Outcomes: Developing Explanatory Arguments

Historical research on participation, events, organizations, and resources is typically motivated by the underlying assumption that "movements matter," that protest makes things happen. Those studies that concentrate more directly on the causal relationships between movement attributes or actions and various historical outcomes typically rely on the demonstration of correlations; the greater requirements for systematic quantitative evidence result in this area of research being concentrated on the relatively recent past of collective protest in nation-states with extensive systems of social documentation, whether through newspapers or government agencies.

Two distinct patterns emerge from a review of recent quantitative analyses of social movements prior to World War II (for a few examples, see Table 8.1). First, some quantifiable attribute of the movement in question invariably appears, either as a causal or as an outcome variable. The attribute may be movement size, measured by counts of individuals (Redding 1992) or number of groups (Amenta and Zylan 1991; Kaufman 1999); number of movement activities, such as strikes or other protests (Ragin, Coverman, and Hayward 1982; Markoff 1986); or number of outcomes associated with the movement. Examples of the latter include Townsend memorials endorsed by state legislatures (Amenta, Carruthers, and Zylan 1992), and Townsend-endorsed candidates for Congress (Amenta and Zylan 1991). Studies of countermovements (e.g., Griffin, Wallace, and Rubin 1986; Jenkins and Brents 1989) are no exception to this pattern. Griffin and colleagues measure countermovement size by the expenditures and number of members in the National Association of Manufacturers. Jenkins and Brents (1989) measure a single type of countermovement event: congressional testimony concerning the Social Security Act of 1935.

In most of these studies, note how issues central to a resource mobilization perspective influence the existence of evidence. Formal organizations create lists of members and formal budgets; organizations with some social

Table 8.1. From movements to outcomes in U.S. politics, 1880s–1950s**a. Electoral Outcomes**

Redding 1992: Did the strength of the Farmers' Alliances translate into electoral strength for the People's Party?

<i>Unit of analysis</i>	<i>Movement data</i>	<i>Selected correlates</i>
North Carolina counties, 1890–1900	Dues-paying members/county (Farmers Alliance Archives)	Votes/county (U.S. Census) Tenancy/crops (U.S. Census) Commercialization/ increase in cotton (U.S. Census) Economic, racial, and religious composition (U.S. Census)

b. Public Policy and Spending

Kaufman 1999: Did the presence of different kinds of associations influence patterns of municipal spending?

<i>Unit of analysis</i>	<i>Movement data</i>	<i>Selected correlates</i>
U.S. cities over 50,000 (1890)	Presence of different types of civic associations (city directories, 1879–81)	Municipal expenditures (U.S. Census) Voting, party competitiveness, and third parties (U.S. Census) Population, economic, and regional controls (U.S. Census)

Amenta, Carruthers, and Zylan 1992: Did movement strength influence the generosity of state-level old-age pensions?

<i>Unit of analysis</i>	<i>Movement data</i>	<i>Selected correlates</i>
48 U.S. states (1939–48)	Union density, membership in the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Townsend clubs per capita, Townsend-endorsed members of U.S. House (secondary sources, organizational publications, U.S. Census)	Aged population (U.S. Census) Employment and industrialization (U.S. Census and other government reports) Party strength and voting rights (U.S. Census and secondary sources)

standing are invited to testify as "representatives" of different political constituencies. Protests by the relatively unorganized or less literate are much less likely to leave an evidentiary trace. In all of these cases, the significant primary research involves collecting systematic data on some aspect of a "movement" (presence of a type of association, occurrences of strikes or protests, number of members, etc.), which is then related to other evidence available from standard government sources or other studies.

The second pattern emerges from a visual examination of the second and third columns in Table 8.1. In most instances, data come from records kept either by governments or by social movement organizations themselves. Secondary literature is cited only where earlier scholars have already assembled the data from such primary sources. It is noteworthy that almost all the studies discussed in this section involve Western industrializing nations (United States, U.K., and France) where governments are characterized by extensive record-keeping. Consequently, this type of research design will be much more challenging when used to understand protests in earlier periods or in national settings where government collection of data was less extensive or systematic.

This interplay of case selection and standard research strategies helps to define the state of the art in historical research on social movements and to identify opportunities for innovation. As represented by publications in major journals, sociological research on past protest converges on a limited set of cases and research strategies. Substantively, almost three-quarters of the historical research literature (which we defined as anything up to World War II) published in the *American Journal of Sociology* and the *American Sociological Review* over the past two decades addressed either the United States (especially the period between the Civil War and the New Deal) or France between the Revolution of 1789 and World War I. A survey of research published in other journals or in books or in other languages, as well as the important contributions by historians, political scientists, and anthropologists to the study of past protest, would add to the list of topics covered without erasing the prominence of a limited set of cases. Because of this combination of patches of dense inquiry with vast stretches of unexplored territory, research strategies will be strongly conditioned by one's initial choice of topic. An examination of the class basis of protest in France requires grappling with an extensive, rich, and sophisticated research literature (e.g., Aminzade 1993; Gould 1995; Markoff 1996; Tilly 1986). The same question posed in another setting at another time may well be a voyage into the unknown. In these cases, research questions will be guided by general theoretical expectations or by comparisons with better-documented cases.

Is Historical Research Different?

The discussion so far has proceeded as if the only distinctive challenge of historical research is that the evidence is harder to find, more likely to provoke dust allergies, and less likely to generate the hoped-for adventures of a participant-observer. But this pragmatic approach to finding evidence and linking evidence to theoretical concepts has, thus far, blithely ignored a host of questions about the entire project of historical research.

In recent years, there has been a spirited, sometimes heated debate over the theoretical standing of historical sociology. Kiser and Hechter advance one line of argument, contending that causal explanations in historical research require attention to causal relations and mechanisms specified in general theory. This argument contrasts the use of "general, transhistorical" theoretical concepts with the purported retreat of historical sociology to particularism and purely inductive inquiry (1991: 4–5; 1998). For movement researchers, this manifesto calls for historical research to test theoretical generalizations established in work on contemporary movements: do opportunities or resources produce higher rates of mobilization or protest in early modern Spain as well as in late-twentieth-century Germany? In response, Somers (1998) and others have argued for alternative understandings of theory as profoundly historical.

In an extreme simplification, this second position requires social movement researchers to remember that they necessarily study "opportunities" or "resources"—rather than opportunities or resources—since each of these is constituted and understood in distinctive ways in different historical settings. For an understanding of popular protest, the division among elites constituted by a struggle among early modern courtiers is not the same as the sharing of control by different parties in a constitutional democracy. To the extent that research necessarily involves translating theoretical concepts into empirical measures or observations, historical research demands particular care in thinking about how to transport modern theories to past settings.

While this debate continues to rage, a set of less contentious guidelines for historical research have emerged calling for "different forms of explanatory principles, differently emphasizing the role of initial conditions, general laws and path dependency" (Goldstone 1998: 829; on comparative research design, Mahoney 1999). From the literature on revolution, Tilly draws practical implications that are equally applicable to social movement research: "Students of revolution have imagined they were dealing with phenomena like ocean tides, whose regularities they could deduce from sufficient knowledge of celestial motion, when they were actually confronting phenomena

like great floods, equally coherent occurrences from a causal perspective, but enormously variable in structure, sequence, and consequences as a function of terrain, previous precipitation, built environment, and human response" (1995b: 1601). So how does this directive translate into social movement research?

One strategy is to be particularly sensitive to changes in relationships among factors over time. Delineating methods attentive to both general theory and historical specificity, Isaac and Griffin argue that "much conventional quantitative time-series research is 'ahistorical' . . . [insofar as] critical contingencies of social change, understood as the sudden or gradual temporal conditioning of historical-structural relationships are generally ignored in quantitative explorations of historical processes" (1989: 873). Using time-series data on unionization and strikes, they demonstrate methods for detecting "historical contingencies" that may significantly alter relationships among factors such as organizational foundings and protest events. Haydu (1998) also uses research on labor organizing to illustrate methods for delineating causal mechanisms that link events across different periods, contributing to either the reproduction or change of theoretically important structural relationships.

Other researchers have developed methods for addressing the most basic characteristic of historical research: attention to sequence or temporality (Abbott 1984) as well as the "event-structure" of historical narratives, specifically lynchings in the American South (Griffin 1993). Finally, any historical researcher needs to be constantly on guard for inadvertent anachronisms: the absence of published grievances in the heavily censored newspapers of eighteenth-century France is not evidence of quite the same thing as the absence of published grievances in the vibrantly partisan press of the nineteenth-century United States or in the increasingly monolithic corporate press of the late twentieth century.

As this brief sketch of metatheoretical debates and methodological innovations suggests, historical research can lead into extraordinary complex puzzles. Although the prospect of such conceptual thornbushes may be daunting, there remains one exceptionally good reason to venture into this thicker: the explanation of social change.

Social Movements and Social Change

Perhaps the most important contribution of historical research on social movements is the demonstration that "social movements" are themselves the historical accomplishment of particular kinds of societies (Buechler 2000: 3–11). All sorts of people have engaged in widely varying sorts of protest

throughout history. But, as Tarrow (1998: 2) argues, "mounting, coordinating and sustaining [confrontations with elites, authorities, and opponents] are the unique contribution of the social movement—an invention of the modern age and an accompaniment to the rise of the modern state."

In keeping with this insight, historical researchers have begun to document the transition from earlier forms of protest—bread riots, *charivari*—to the more sustained mobilizations that identify "the social movement." This research is most advanced in the case of Western European nations, anchored by Tilly's studies of France (1986) and England (1995a). Other research has explored the conditions that facilitated this transition from one repertoire of protest to another; Markoff (1986), for example, addresses the transitional moment of the French Revolution, discovering that in less literate regions protest was more likely to take traditional forms such as food riots, whereas greater literacy was associated with attacks on government buildings and symbols of national authority.

In historical settings after the appearance of recognizable social movements, research has explored how early forms of protest and organization gave way to new forms. Gould (1995) asks why the class-based character of the 1848 insurrection in Paris was not evident in the Commune of 1871. Conell and Voss (1990) investigate the consequences of labor organization for mobilization into the Knights of Labor. Clemens (1997) traces how movement activity based in large voluntary associations gave rise to interest-group lobbying a few decades later. Addressing the history of social movements themselves, the growing body of research documents the complex sequence and succession of forms of mobilization, although a great deal of research remains to be done outside the most-studied cases of France, England, and the United States.

A second goal of historical research on social movements is more daunting. To what extent has historical research answered the question of whether and how "movements matter"? The challenge of documenting the *outcomes* of social movements is shared by contemporary movement research, yet it is here that the longer time horizon of historical research offers potential advantages. Most historians would agree that the heretical movement now known as the Protestant Reformation "mattered," although there is a lively debate over precisely how and why, over whether it should be understood as a cause, an effect, or both of modernization. Most would also concur that the abolitionist movement, both in the United States and abroad, "mattered" in some way for the economic and political development of the United States and the global economy. Again, however, there are fierce debates over the extent to which movement activity was a central cause or merely a banana peel

on the bottom step of a trajectory defined by economic, technological, and institutional conditions.

Recovering Past Protest

These debates underscore the difficulties faced by those embarking on archival research. But historical research also possesses distinctive advantages, particularly with respect to movement outcomes. Such studies can explore the impact of movement involvement on individual lives through biographical data, the influence of movements on changes in political institutions or discourse, and the perpetuation of cultures of activism through personal networks or institutionalized “abeyance structures.” Many are drawn to social movement research out of a belief that social movements (sometimes) matter; historical research provides an opportunity to explore when and how and why they do.

Many of the challenges in historical research turn on questions of evidence: finding it, interpreting it, and using it. But as the research discussed throughout this chapter amply illustrates, movement researchers have met these challenges with considerable creativity and success. If necessity is the mother of invention, historical scholarship on social movements will continue to generate methodological innovation and advances in the use of a wide range of sources.

Notes

For their insightful comments and criticisms, we would like to thank Bert Klandermans, Suzanne Staggenborg, and Mayer Zald.

1. We discuss current debates over the status of historical sociology in the final section of this chapter.

2. For well-researched and extensively documented cases, such as the French Revolution, it may be possible to construct a data set of protest events by relying on the secondary literature. For an example, see Markoff 1985.

3. Mahoney (1999) provides an extremely useful analysis of strategies of causal assessment—nominal (presence or absence of a factor), ordinal (more or less), and narrative—in comparative history.

References

- Abbott, Andrew. 1984. “Event Sequence and Event Duration: Colligation and Measurement.” *Historical Methods* 17: 192–204.
- Amenta, Edwin, and Yvonne Zylan. 1991. “It Happened Here: Political Opportunity, the New Institutionalism, and the Townsend Movement.” *American Sociological Review* 56: 250–65.

- Amenta, Edwin, Bruce Carruthers, and Yvonne Zylan. 1992. "A Hero for the Aged? The Townsend Movement, the Political Mediation Model, and U.S. Old-Age Policy, 1934–1950." *American Journal of Sociology* 98: 308–39.
- Aminzade, Ronald. 1993. *Ballots and Barricades: Class Formation and Republican Politics in France, 1830–1871*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Anheier, Helmut K., and Friedhelm Neidhardt. 1998. "The Nazi Party and Its Capital: An Analysis of the NSDAP Membership in Munich, 1925–1930." *American Behavioral Scientist* 41: 1219–37.
- Ansell, Christopher K. 1997. "Symbolic Networks: The Realignment of the French Working Class, 1887–1894." *American Journal of Sociology* 103: 359–90.
- Babb, Sarah. 1996. "'A True American System of Finance': Frame Resonance in the U.S. Labor Movement, 1866 to 1886." *American Sociological Review* 61: 1033–52.
- Banaszak, Lee Ann. 1996. *Why Movements Succeed or Fail: Opportunity, Culture, and the Struggle for Woman Suffrage*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Barkey, Karen, and Ronan Van Rossem. 1997. "Networks of Contention: Villages and Regional Structure in the Seventeenth-Century Ottoman Empire." *American Journal of Sociology* 102: 1345–82.
- Baxandall, Michael. 1985. *Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Bearman, Peter S., and Glenn Deane. 1992. "The Structure of Opportunity: Middle-Class Mobility in England, 1548–1689." *American Journal of Sociology* 98: 30–66.
- Beisel, Nicola. 1997. *Imperiled Innocents: Anthony Comstock and Family Reproduction in Victorian America*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Blee, Kathleen M. 1991. *Women of the Klan: Racism and Gender in the 1920s*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Brustein, William. 1996. *The Logic of Evil: The Social Origins of the Nazi Party, 1925–1933*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Buechler, Steven M. 2000. *Social Movements in Advanced Capitalism: The Political Economy and Cultural Construction of Social Activism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Carruthers, Bruce G., and Sarah Babb. 1996. "The Color of Money and the Nature of Value: Greenbacks and Gold in Postbellum America." *American Journal of Sociology* 101: 1556–91.
- Clemens, Elisabeth S. 1996. "Organizational Form as Frame: Collective Identity and Political Strategy in the American Labor Movement, 1880–1920." In *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*, edited by Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald, 205–26. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- . 1997. *The People's Lobby: Organizational Innovation and the Rise of Interest Group Politics in the United States, 1890–1925*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1999. "Securing Political Returns to Social Capital: Women's Associations in the United States, 1880s–1920s." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 29: 613–38.
- Conell, Carol, and Kim Voss. 1990. "Formal Organization and the Fate of Social Movements: Craft Association and Class Alliance in the Knights of Labor." *American Sociological Review* 55: 255–69.
- Darnton, Robert. 1985. *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History*. New York: Vintage.
- Ellingson, Stephen. 1995. "Understanding the Dialectic of Discourse and Collective Action: Public Debate and Rioting in Antebellum Cincinnati." *American Journal of Sociology* 101: 100–144.
- Erlandson, David A., Edward L. Harris, Barbara L. Skipper, and Steve D. Allen. 1993. *Doing Naturalistic Inquiry: A Guide to Methods*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Franzosi, Roberto. 1987. "The Press as a Source of Socio-Historical Data: Issues in the Methodology of Data Collection from Newspapers," *Historical Methods* 20: 5–16.
- . 1989. "From Words to Numbers: A Generalized and Linguistics-Based Coding Procedure for Collecting Textual Data." *Sociological Methodology* 19: 263–98.
- . 1998. "Narrative Analysis—Or Why (and How) Sociologists Should Be Interested in Narrative." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 517–54.
- Gitlin, Todd. 1980. *The Whole World Is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame Analysis: An Essay in the Organization of Experience*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Goldstone, Jack A. 1991. *Revolution and Rebellion in the Early Modern World*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- . 1998. "Initial Conditions, General Laws, Path Dependence, and Explanation in Historical Sociology." *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 829–45.
- Gould, Roger V. 1995. *Insurgent Identities: Class, Community, and Protest in Paris from 1848 to the Commune*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Griffin, Larry J. 1993. "Narrative, Event-Structure Analysis, and Causal Interpretation in Historical Sociology." *American Journal of Sociology* 98: 1094–1133.
- Griffin, Larry J., Michael Wallace, and Beth Rubin. 1986. "Capitalist Resistance to

- the Organization of Labor before the New Deal: Why? How? Success?" *American Sociological Review* 51: 147-67.
- Griswold, Wendy. 1987. "A Methodological Framework for the Sociology of Culture." *Sociological Methodology* 17: 1-35.
- Haydu, Jeffrey. 1998. "Making Use of the Past: Time Periods as Cases to Compare and as Sequences of Problem Solving." *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 339-71.
- . 1999. "Counter Action Frames: Employer Repertoires and the Union Menace in the Late Nineteenth Century." *Social Problems* 46: 313-31.
- Isaac, Larry W., and Larry J. Griffin. 1989. "Ahistoricism in Time-Series Analyses of Historical Process." *American Sociological Review* 54: 873-90.
- Jenkins, J. Craig, and Barbara Brents. 1989. "Social Protest, Hegemonic Competition, and Social Reform: A Political Struggle Interpretation of the Origins of the American Welfare State." *American Sociological Review* 54: 891-909.
- Kaelber, Lutz. 1995. "Other- and Inner-Worldly Asceticism in Medieval Waldensianism: A Weberian Analysis." *Sociology of Religion* 56: 91-119.
- Kaufman, Jason. 1999. "Three Views of Associationalism in Nineteenth-Century America: An Empirical Examination." *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 1296-1345.
- Kiser, Edgar, and Michael Hechter. 1991. "The Role of General Theory in Comparative-Historical Sociology." *American Journal of Sociology* 97: 1-30.
- . 1998. "The Debate on Historical Sociology: Rational Choice Theory and Its Critics." *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 785-816.
- Kniss, Fred. 1997. *Disquiet in the Land: Cultural Conflict in American Mennonite Communities*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Ladurie, Emmanuel Le Roy. 1978. *Montaillou: The Promised Land of Error*. Trans. Barbara Bray. New York: George Braziller.
- Mahoney, James. 1999. "Nominal, Ordinal, and Narrative Appraisal in Macro-causal Analysis." *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 1154-96.
- Markoff, John. 1985. "The Social Geography of Rural Revolt at the Beginning of the French Revolution." *American Sociological Review* 50: 761-81.
- . 1986. "Literacy and Revolt: Some Empirical Notes on 1789 in France." *American Journal of Sociology* 92: 323-49.
- . 1996. *The Abolition of Feudalism: Peasants, Lords, and Legislators in the French Revolution*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- McCarthy, John, Clark McPhail, and Jackie Smith. 1996. "Images of Protest: Dimensions of Selection Bias in Media Coverage of Washington Demonstrations, 1982 and 1991." *American Sociological Review* 61: 478-99.
- McCarthy, John, and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 82: 1212-41.

- McCullagh, C. Behan. 1984. *Justifying Historical Descriptions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Munger, Frank. 1991. "Legal Resources of Striking Miners: Notes for a Study of Class Conflict and Law." *Social Science History* 15: 1–33.
- Platt, Jennifer. 1981. "Evidence and Proof in Documentary Research, 1 and 2: Some Specific Problems, and Some Shared Problems, of Documentary Research." *Sociological Review* 29: 31–52, 53–66.
- Ragin, Charles, Shelley Coverman, and Mark Hayward. 1982. "Major Labor Disputes in Britain, 1902–1938: The Relationship between Resource Expenditure and Outcome." *American Sociological Review* 47: 237–52.
- Redding, Kent. 1992. "Failed Populism: Movement-Party Disjuncture in North Carolina, 1890–1900." *American Sociological Review* 57: 340–52.
- Rosenthal, Naomi, Meryl Fingrutd, Roberta Karant, Michele Ethier, and David McDonald. 1985. "Social Movements and Network Analysis: A Case Study of Nineteenth-Century Women's Reform in New York State." *American Journal of Sociology* 90: 1022–54.
- Rosenthal, Naomi, David McDonald, Michele Ethier, Meryl Fingrutd, and Roberta Karant. 1997. "Structural Tensions in the Nineteenth-Century Women's Movement." *Mobilization* 2: 21–46.
- Rubin, Beth. 1986. "Class Struggle American Style: Unions, Strikes and Wages." *American Sociological Review* 51: 618–33.
- Schwartz, Michael. 1976. *Radical Protest and Social Structure: The Southern Farmers' Alliance and Cotton Tenancy, 1880–1890*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Scott, James C. 1990. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Shin, Gi-Wook. 1998. "Agrarian Conflict and the Origins of Korean Capitalism." *American Journal of Sociology* 103: 1309–51.
- Snow, David, E. Burke Rochford Jr., Steven K. Worden, and Robert Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review* 41: 464–81.
- Somers, Margaret R. 1998. "'We're No Angels': Realism, Rational Choice, and Relationality in Social Science." *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 722–84.
- Soule, Sarah A. 1992. "Populism and Black Lynching in Georgia, 1890–1900." *Social Forces* 71: 431–49.
- Stenton, Michael. 1976. *Who's Who of British Members of Parliament: A Biographical Dictionary of the House of Commons Based on Annual Volumes of Dod's Parliamentary Companion and Other Sources*. Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: Humanities Press.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. 2d ed. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Thornton, Russell. 1981. "Demographic Antecedents of a Revitalization Movement: Population Change, Population Size, and the 1890 Ghost Dance." *American Sociological Review* 46: 88–96.
- Tilly, Charles. 1986. *The Contentious French*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap.
- . 1995a. *Popular Contention in Great Britain, 1758–1834*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- . 1995b. "To Explain Political Processes." *American Journal of Sociology* 100: 1594–1610.
- Voss, Kim. 1994. *The Making of American Exceptionalism: The Knights of Labor and Class Formation in the Nineteenth Century*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- . 1996. "The Collapse of a Social Movement: The Interplay of Mobilizing Structures, Framing, and Political Opportunities in the Knights of Labor." In *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*, edited by Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald, 227–58. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Zaret, David. 1996. "Petitions and the 'Invention' of Public Opinion in the English Revolution." *American Journal of Sociology* 101: 1497–1555.